



PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OFFICIAL REPORT

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

AFFIRMATION:

Mr. H. W. Amarasuriya

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 2]

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948-49

[Sixth Allotted Day.]

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE

Heads 1 to 26

LOCAL GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS [Col. 193]

PRINTED AT THE CEYLON GOVERNMENT PRESS, COLOMBO.

Annual Subscription Rs. 50, by post Rs. 56, and each part 70 cents, by post 76 cents, payable in advance to the SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS BUREAU, P. O. Box 500, Secretariat, Colombo 1.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

Volume 4

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OFFICIAL REPORT

Second Session of the First Parliament of Ceylon
12 GEORGE VI

PRINTED AT THE
CEYLON GOVERNMENT PRESS
COLOMBO

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

1948

GOVERNMENT OF CEYLON

GOVERNOR-GENERAL

HIS EXCELLENCY SIR HENRY MONCK-MASON MOORE, G.C.M.G.

CABINET

(RE-FORMED BY THE HON. MR. DON STEPHEN SENANAYAKE, JULY, 1948).

Prime Minister and Minister of Defence and External Affairs—The Hon. Mr. DON STEPHEN SENANAYAKE, M.P.

Minister of Health and Local Government and Leader of the House of Representatives—The Hon. Mr. SOLOMON WEST RIDGEWAY DIAS BANDARANAIKE, M.P.

Minister without Portfolio—The Hon. Mr. ALEXANDER EKANAYAKE GOONESINHA, M.P.

Minister of Labour and Social Services—The Hon. Mr. TUAN BRAHANUDEEN JAYAH, M.P.

Minister of Finance—The Hon. Mr. JUNIUS RICHARD JAYEWARDENE, M.P.

Minister of Transport and Works—The Hon. Sir JOHN KOTELAWALA, K.B.E., M.P.

Minister of Education—The Hon. Mr. EDWARD ALEXANDER NUGAWELA, M.P.

Minister of Justice and Leader of the Senate—The Hon. Dr. LALITA ABHAYA RAJAPAKSE, K.C.

Minister of Food and Co-operative Undertakings—The Hon. Mr. RATNAYAKE WASALA MUDIYANSELAGE ABEYARATNE RATNAYAKE, M.P.

Minister of Agriculture and Lands—The Hon. Mr. DUDLEY SHELTON SENANAYAKE, M.P.

Minister of Posts and Telecommunication, and Industries, Industrial Research and Fisheries—The Hon. Mr. CATHIRAVELU SITTAMPALAM, M.P.

Minister of Commerce and Trade—The Hon. Mr. CHELLAPPAH SUNTHARALINGAM, M.P.

Minister of Home Affairs and Rural Development—The Hon. Mr. EDWIN ALOYSIUS PERERA WIJEYERATNE.

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Social Services—Mr. MOHOTTALLAGE DINGIRI BANDA, M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Lands—PUNCHI BANDA BULAMKULAME DISSAWA, M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice—Mr. GEORGE REGINALD DE SILVA, M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Food and Co-operative Undertakings—Mr. HAMEED USSÉN MARIKAR SEGU ISMAIL, M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance—Mr. HERBERT ERIC JANSZ, C.M.G.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Posts and Telecommunication—Mr. ALEXANDER PERERA JAYASOORIYA, M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Home Affairs and Rural Development—Gate Mudaliyar MAHMOUD SHAMSUDDEEN KARIAPPER, M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health and Local Government—Mr. VALLIPURAM NALLIAH, M.P.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industries, Industrial Research and Fisheries—Mr. HECTOR DE ZOYSA SRIWARDANA, M.P.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES : PRINCIPAL OFFICERS

THE SPEAKER—The Hon. Mr. A. F. MOLAMURE, M.P.

THE DEPUTY-SPEAKER AND CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—Mr. R. A. DE MEL, M.P.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES—Mr. J. A. MARTENSZ, M.P.

Clerk to the House of Representatives—R. ST. L. P. DERANIYAGALA.

Clerk-Assistant—B. COSWATTE.

Serjeant at Arms—M. ISMAIL.

Assistant Serjeant at Arms—A. J. R. DE SILVA.

Office: Chief Clerk—C. G. VANDERWALL.

Senior Clerks—N. D. WIJEYARATNE,
A. E. ST. M. TOUSSAINT,
V. PALAVENAYAGAM.

Chief Reporter—L. W. PERERA.

Reporters—M. SIVASAMBU, P. B. RATNAYAKE, M. T. FOENANDER, G. E. P. DE S.
WICKRAMARATNE, J. C. A. BROHIER, P. L. RAMENADEN, M. NAVARAJASINGHAM,
W. P. NANAYAKKARA.

Librarian—K. V. D. V. PERERA.

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

IN THE SECOND SESSION OF THE FIRST PARLIAMENT OF CEYLON

TWELFTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING GEORGE VI

VOLUME 4

SECOND VOLUME OF SESSION 1948

1

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, 3rd August, 1948

The House met at 10 a.m., Mr. SPEAKER [THE HON. MR. A. F. MOLAMURE] in the Chair.

AFFIRMATION

Mr. H. W. Amarasuriya (Baddegama) made and subscribed the Affirmation required by law; and signed the Book at the Table.

PAPERS PRESENTED

Regulation made under Section 3 of the Passports Ordinance (Cap. 250.) [*Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake.*]

Ordered to lie upon the Table.

Supplementary Estimate No. 16 of 1947-48. [*Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake.*]

Ordered to lie upon the Table.

Rules made under Section 205 and 206 of the Urban Councils Ordinance, No. 61 of 1939. [*Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike.*]

Ordered to lie upon the Table.

List of Proposed Alterations in Details in the Legend, &c., of Sub-heads in the Draft Estimates, 1948-49 (Second Print).

Ordered to lie upon the Table.

Supplementary Estimate No. 15 of 1947-48. [*Hon. Mr. Jayewardene.*]

Ordered to lie upon the Table.

Supplementary Estimate No. 14 of 1947-48. [*Hon. Mr. Nugawela.*]

Ordered to lie upon the Table.

2

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
Uniforms for Minor Employees of
Medical Department

1. **Mr. S. A. Silva:** Will the Hon. Minister of Health and Local Government state: (a) Whether he is aware that only a section of the permanent employees in the Medical Department are supplied with uniforms? (b) If so, whether he will take early steps to supply uniforms to all minor employees of the Medical Department?

The Hon. Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike (Minister of Health and Local Government and Leader of the House): (a) Yes. All permanent male and female attendants get uniforms at present. In addition to them, labourers, hospital orderlies, &c., in some of the institutions get uniforms.

(b) The Treasury has stated that the question of issue of uniforms to all employees who are not in receipt of them, should await improvement in the textile position. The Treasury has been written to recently as to whether the question can now be reconsidered.

Mr. S. A. Silva: Is the Hon. Minister aware that only a section of the permanent employees get uniforms now?

The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike: That is what I have stated in my Answer, and I have given the reason why. I am taking up the whole question with the Treasury.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: Will the Hon. Minister consider the possibility of utilizing handloom cloth produced in Ceylon for the purposes of the hospitals?

The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike: The handloom cloth that is being produced at the moment is not quite satisfactory for this purpose. But as far as possible I will go into the question of utilizing the cloth that is produced for purposes of uniforms.

Mr. Dahanayake: As some of the permanent employees are not being supplied with uniforms, will the Minister consider the feasibility of making money grants in lieu of the uniforms which have not been given?

Mr. Speaker: That is a new Question.

The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike: On the principle of a fig leaf, I do not know whether a five-rupee note can be tucked round the waist.

Mr. Dahanayake: In what manner has this discrimination been made as to who should get uniforms and who should not?

The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike: That is the question I have answered. I said that all minor employees, such as attendants, are given uniforms, and there are labourers and hospital orderlies who are given in some of the institutions, but not in all. I am taking up the matter regarding the whole lot of them with the Treasury.

“ Viriya ” Building Units

2. **Mr. Martensz:** Will the Minister of Finance state: (a) Whether he is aware that a Ceylon Registered Company has advertised its ability to supply cheaply, “ Viriya ” building units which can be quickly erected? (b) Whether he will consider the possibility of utilizing the units and services offered by the Company concerned?

The Hon. Mr. J. R. Jayewardene (Minister of Finance): This does not come under my purview, and I suggest that the hon. Member address the Question to the Hon. Minister of Transport and Works.

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948-49

Considered in Committee.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

The Chairman: I wish to inform hon. Members who have sent in Amendments that two-thirds of the Amendments sent in are out of Order. Most

of the Amendments sent in by the hon. Member for Ruwanwella (Dr. Perera) are out of Order. All the Amendments of the hon. Member for Galle are in Order. For instance, an Amendment like, “ Vote 1 be reduced by Rs. 5 in respect of Sub-head 1,” is out of Order; you must say which item of Sub-head 1; because, if the Amendment is passed that Rs. 5 be deducted, from whom is the Government to deduct it?

Dr. N. M. Perera (Ruwanwella): The difficulty is——

The Chairman: You must send in the Amendment correctly. Wherever a sub-head is itemized, you must say that the deduction should be from item No. so-and-so. The hon. Member for Galle, in every one of his Amendments, has said, “ Sub-head so-and-so, item ‘ Director ’ or ‘ Assistant Director ’ ”, or whatever it is. In moving a cut, you must indicate the item from which that cut is to be made. You must indicate to me and to the House the item you want discussed.

Dr. Perera: The position is this. You have already ruled that, without an Amendment, it is not possible to have a discussion on a sub-head. It may be that we do not want particularly to reduce the Director's salary, but to discuss the whole question of Personal Emoluments. If you itemize the Director, then obviously it will be his salary that will be discussed; here I want to discuss the whole question of the Personal Emoluments.

The Chairman: I cannot allow it; that is completely out of Order.

Dr. Perera: How else can you discuss it? For instance, I want to discuss the whole cadre, not merely one person; the whole personnel, perhaps, is too much. How am I to discuss it?

The Chairman: You can do so under the Head “ Minister.”

Dr. Perera: That will be a discussion of policy, not the cadre of the Department. You see the difficulty in which hon. Members are placed. That is the difficulty particularly in my case.

The Chairman: The hon. Member must also remember that the Committee stage is not meant for discussion of policy; that is done at the Second Reading Debate.

Dr. Perera: Therefore, we want to discuss the details.

The Chairman: You can discuss only an item.

Dr. Perera: That unnecessarily circumscribes the whole position. That is the difficulty I am placed in in most of these cases. I am not out really to reduce these items by Rs. 5, but merely to get information on the particular items.

The Chairman: But the items must be mentioned, that is my point. You have mentioned the whole sub-head. I cannot allow the whole sub-head to be discussed. The hon. Member for Galle, for instance, has mentioned the items.

Mr. W. Dahanayake (Galle): May I humbly request you to give the Members of the Opposition your indulgence in this matter and allow us at this stage to add the words, "Item so-and-so?"

The Chairman: I mentioned this last year, too, and I allowed it last year.

Mr. Dahanayake: So many things have happened between the last Budget Debate and this that we are inclined to forget many things.

Dr. Perera: But you are not ruling these Amendments out of Order?

The Chairman: I have ruled them out of Order. I cannot help it; I must follow procedure.

Dr. Perera: Might I point this out to you, that, so far as I am concerned, I handed in my Amendments earlier than the date mentioned, and if the Clerk had informed me that these were not in the proper form, I would have made the necessary alterations.

The Chairman: I could not look into all the Amendments before they were printed.

Dr. Perera: If at least one or two Amendments had been indicated, I could have corrected them.

The Chairman: The date for sending in the Amendments had passed by then.

Dr. Perera: In the circumstances, I suggest that a certain amount of latitude should be allowed.

The Chairman: Wherever there is any difficulty of that nature, I will allow it, but I cannot allow it in every case.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake (Prime Minister): Shall we go on, Sir?

The Hon. Sir John Kotelawala (Minister of Transport and Works): This is a waste of time. Shall we go on?

Dr. Perera: Where the purpose is to move a cut in the salary of a particular individual, I can understand mentioning it specifically, but where the purpose is merely to get information—

The Chairman: I will allow it where the intention is to cut the salary of any particular individual, but where the object is to discuss the whole sub-head, I will not allow it.

Dr. Perera: Merely to get information.

The Chairman: You may ask a question to get information, but it is quite impossible to allow a discussion.

Mr. Dahanayake: Will you please permit those Members who wish to have those words inserted, to do so now?

The Chairman: If you wish to discuss a particular item and mention it, I will allow it, but not the whole of the Personal Emoluments. All the Amendments of the hon. Member for Chavakachcheri (Mr. Kumaraswamy) are also out of Order; not a single Amendment of his is in Order.

Clause 1 agreed to, and ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 2 and 3 ordered to be postponed till after the consideration of the Schedule.

First Schedule.

Head 1.—His Excellency the Governor-General

Vote 1.—Salaries and Expenses of the Establishment and Office of His Excellency the Governor-General, Rs. 447,831.

The Chairman: The Amendment of the Hon. Member for Dehiowita (Mr. A. Reginald Perera) is in Order, his

[The Chairman.]

Amendment on Sub-head 2. If there is any Amendment which hon. Members wish to mention under Sub-head 1—

Dr. Perera: Might I point out the difficulty I have? In this particular case my Amendment was given notice of with the purpose of drawing the attention of the Government to what I consider to be excessive expenditure on the whole of this particular Head—His Excellency the Governor-General.

The Chairman: You can do it on one individual item.

Dr. Perera: One individual item will not permit it. I cannot very well move a cut in the salary of the Private Secretary or someone like that and then discuss the whole vote. For instance, the whole amount in respect of Personal Emoluments, I consider excessive.

The Chairman: Not the whole amount of Personal Emoluments, the whole amount of staff.

Dr. Perera: That is what I mean.

The Chairman: You cannot discuss the amount of Personal Emoluments at all. It is out of Order; it is provided by Special Law.

Dr. Perera: Except His Excellency's vote, I want to discuss the rest. I want to say that it is too much. If I move a cut in the Private Secretary's salary—

The Chairman: The hon. Member could have pointed that out on a particular item. He could have said a particular item was too much; for example, that the provision for the Private Secretary, or the A.D.C., or the Sinhalese Interpreter was too much.

Dr. Perera: That is my difficulty. I want to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that we are paying too much for this establishment, that the provision for the Governor-General's staff is too much.

The Chairman: You cannot do it. You must say what is necessary, and what is unnecessary. The hon. Member must mention what is unnecessary from his point of view and move its elimination.

10.15 A.M.

Dr. Perera: Will you permit me to say this? It may be possible for me to itemize in one instance, but surely it is much more feasible and sensible to put before the Government—

The Chairman: The hon. Member cannot do that in Committee. He is only entitled to object to any items that are in the Budget.

Dr. Perera: But the House is voting on Heads.

The Chairman: By Votes. Well, take a Vote. The hon. Member can ask for the rejection of any item under that Vote.

Dr. Perera: It will make it absolutely impossible for us to continue this Debate if that is your Ruling.

The Chairman: No.

Dr. Perera: I am now precluded from discussing the whole question of the staff of the Governor-General.

The Chairman: If the hon. Member had moved an Amendment like this, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Private Secretary'", I would have allowed the hon. Member to discuss the staff of the Governor-General.

Dr. Perera: On the whole question?

The Chairman: Yes. If the cut does take place, Government has got to deduct Rs. 5 from the salary of the Private Secretary. If the Amendment is passed as it is, how is the Government going to act? From whom is the Government going to deduct the sum of Rs. 5?

Dr. Perera: On the whole of the sub-head.

The Chairman: And take it from whom?

Dr. Perera: My aim is not so much to make a deduction in the salary of the Private Secretary. It is only to show a lack of confidence in the Government, and if the Motion is accepted, they will have to resign.

The Chairman: The hon. Member is completely mistaken.

Dr. Perera: That is the basis on which we proceed.

The Chairman: Not in the case of an item. If you turn down the whole of the Budget, it is different. I think the hon. Member is completely mistaken.

Dr. Perera: That was the impression on which I worked. There was no question—

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: No.

The Chairman: Does the hon. Member mean to say that, if a snap vote is taken on a little item, the Government has got to resign?

Dr. Perera: Not a snap vote.

The Chairman: Whatever it is.

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: Join our study circle.

Dr. Perera: I thought that, if I had to move a cut in the salary of the Private Secretary, I would have to confine myself to that question only.

The Chairman: If the hon. Member asked me permission to talk about the whole staff, I would certainly have allowed it.

Dr. Perera: If I had known it, I would have made the Amendment in that form.

The Chairman: The hon. Member is an old Parliamentarian and can understand procedure better than the new Members.

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: The hon. Member is writing a book.

The Chairman: I am not following any new procedure. I am following the procedure of the House of Commons.

Dr. Perera: This procedure was not adopted last year.

The Chairman: I said that I would be allowing indulgence in this matter. Last year I was new to the work, and so was the hon. Member. Last year I said that I would not allow the procedure adopted then to be followed this year.

Dr. Perera: I do not remember that last time we had such Amendments. If you rule our Amendments out of Order, you will practically preclude all discussion.

The Chairman: May I ask how it is that certain hon. Members sent in their Amendments correctly?

Dr. Perera: They are itemizing them for a particular purpose.

The Chairman: Merely for the purpose of discussing that particular Head.

Dr. Perera: Honestly, I am not trying to get—

The Chairman: The hon. Member must understand the difficulty in which I am placed and the Government is placed if the cut of Rs. 5 is accepted without any definite indication as to the item to be reduced.

Mr. N. H. Keerthiratne (Kegalla): I rise to a point of Order. There is only 10 minutes more for the discussion of the Head to end.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Dr. Perera: I would beg of you at least to grant us indulgence in this matter.

The Chairman: If the hon. Member wishes to discuss any particular item and to move a cut, I think it will be allowed as an indulgence.

Dr. Perera: If you will permit me, I want to present a case that the amount is too much under this Head.

Mr. Dahanayake: May I suggest a way out to the hon. Member, with your permission? The hon. Member can move a cut under the item 'Private Secretary,' and thereupon proceed to discuss the entire question of Personal Emoluments. If this Motion is passed, there will be a cut in the salary of the Private Secretary, so that the hon. Member's purpose will be served. The hon. Member will be in a position to discuss the whole subject.

The Chairman: That is exactly what I said. If any hon. Member will indicate any particular item, and if I consider that a discussion can be allowed,

[The Chairman.]

I will allow it. But Amendments are in my keeping. I can rule out all the Amendments I referred to, all these Amendments which are not in keeping with procedure. But I am going to allow a certain amount of indulgence. If an hon. Member mentions any particular item and if I think an Amendment can be allowed, I will allow it.

The hon. Member for Chavakachcheri has the first Amendment to move.

Mr. V. Kumaraswamy (Chavakachcheri): I do not want to argue with you, Mr. Speaker.

The Chairman: Here, again, I wish to point out that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Chavachcheri is to reduce the vote by Rs. 5 in respect of sub-head 1. All the Amendments of the hon. Member for Ruwanwella are covered by that.

Dr. Perera: Any one Amendment is enough.

The Chairman: I am not going to put the Amendment of the hon. Member for Ruwanwella after that of the hon. Member for Chavakachcheri.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I have only two questions to ask.

The Chairman: Will the hon. Member move his Amendment under sub-head 1 and mention some item?

Mr. Kumaraswamy: Governor-General.

The Chairman: The hon. Member cannot do that. It is against the law.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: Then, let it be 'Private Secretary.'

Mr. Dahanayake: The House can now proceed to a discussion.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 5 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Private Secretary'."

My object in moving this cut is to have two questions answered by the Government, namely, what the length of service of the present Governor-General is—

The Chairman: I have told the House that it cannot discuss the Governor-

General except on a substantive Motion. The hon. Member cannot discuss the salary at all because it is provided by special law.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: Can I put it this way then? When can a Ceylonese gentleman become Governor-General?

The Hon. Mr. A. E. Goonesinha (Minister without Portfolio): When he is appointed.

The Chairman: From whom is the hon. Member asking the question?

The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike: The Minister of Finance?

Mr. Kumaraswamy: No, the Prime Minister.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: When he is appointed by the King, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister.

Dr. Perera: May I speak on that Amendment?

The Chairman: Yes.

Dr. Perera: The position I would like to place before the House is this. If hon. Members will look at the Vote under this Head, they will find that, while the actual expenditure in 1946-47 was very nearly Rs. 400,000—last year's estimate was well over Rs. 500,000—this year's estimate is Rs. 447,831.

Well, with the so-called Independence that we got, apparently His Excellency the Governor-General is now only a ceremonial Head and he has very few duties to perform, nothing compared to the responsibilities that he had in the sense of executive responsibility—traveling about the country to satisfy himself as to the working of the Government, and so on. These obligations are no longer there. Could we not, therefore seriously retrench on this item of His Excellency the Governor-General's expenditure and bring it down to much more reasonable proportions?

May I remind the Government that, when Ireland got her Independence after the famous Act of 1922, if I remember right, the first thing she did was to reduce substantially the emoluments of the Governor-General whom she

appointed. A local man was appointed, and I think the expenditure under the Head of Governor-General was reduced to very nearly one-third of the previous amount, or less.

The Chairman: Again, the hon. Member is discussing the Governor-General's salary.

Dr. Perera: No. I am not talking about the Governor-General whom we will have to appoint, whether we like it or not. I am talking of his other expenses, his travelling vote, the number of officers we provide for him. I am considering the question of the total expenses. I am not suggesting for a moment that we can alter the salary unless we decide to have a local person as Governor-General. Until then perhaps we are not in a position to touch this salary scale, but I am talking of the other expenses.

The Chairman: Rs. 327,831?

Dr. Perera: Yes. I wish to know whether it is not possible, in the light of the new situation, seriously to curtail the expenses that are being incurred under this Head. That is the position I want to place before this House.

Mr. Dahanayake: I want to direct the attention of the Government to the salary which is given to the Secretary of the Governor-General's office. It will be seen that the Governor-General, besides having a personal staff of his own, has also what is called the Governor-General's Office for the purpose of carrying out statutory obligations.

Under the Head 'Office' the Secretary has under him eight clerks and an Office Assistant. That is apparently a very small office, and one imagines from the number of clerical hands in the office that work is not very voluminous. Nevertheless, one finds that the Secretary is given a salary scale which is the same as that given to a Permanent Secretary.

Before the Cabinet decided upon the salary scale of a Permanent Secretary, the highest salary that a member of the Civil Service in Ceylon drew was £1,750. With the creation of the post of Perma-

nent Secretary, a super grade was created in the Civil Service. We, on this side of the House, consider that there was no reason for the creation of that super grade.

Now, to make matters worse, the salary that is offered to a Permanent Secretary is being offered to the Secretary of a small, potty office like the Governor-General's Office. On what standard of judgment do you base your salary scale? Is it on the volume of work that has to be performed? If so, the volume of work in the Governor-General's Office, after the inauguration of the new Constitution, has become less and less. Or is the salary based on the responsibilities that the personnel in that Office have got to shoulder? Again, after the inauguration of the new Constitution, the responsibilities of the Governor-General have dwindled down. Therefore, we see no reason why there should be a super grade man at this office. I personally feel that a member of the Executive Clerical Service can very well function as Secretary of the Governor-General's Office. If the Government is unable to say why a super grade man is needed for this post, the only reason can be that sentiment has moved them to put a super man in the Office of the Governor-General. We do not want sentiment to play ducks and drakes with the taxpayer's money. We demand that the expenditure on the Governor-General's Office should be reduced by the substitution of an officer from the Executive Clerical Service as Secretary.

The Chairman: Any other remarks on that point.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: It is 10.30 A.M. now.

Dr. Perera: It does not matter.

The Chairman: Any further remarks?

Mr. I. M. R. A. Iriyagolla (Dandagamuwa): I find that there is a Chief Sinhalese Interpreter in the Governor-General's Office.

The Chairman: There is no such post.

The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike: It is deleted. Look at your copy of the Estimates.

Mr. V. T. Nanayakkara (Matale): On the question of the furniture of the Governor-General—

The Chairman: We have not come to that. We are still on sub-head 1.

10.30 A.M.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I shall try to be as brief as possible. The question of the salary of the Secretary to the Governor-General was considered last year when considering salaries to be paid to Permanent Secretaries, and it was decided by this House that the Secretary to the Governor-General should be paid the same salary as that paid to a Permanent Secretary.

Mr. Dahanayake: Why?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: That was the decision of this House.

Hon. Members: No! No!

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: That was the decision arrived at in the course of the last Budget Debate, and even if hon. Members opposite are not satisfied with that decision, I do not think it necessary for me to make any further explanation now.

With regard to the duties of the Governor-General, although there may be an impression that there is no responsibility attached to the office now, I must point out that there is a certain amount of responsibility attached to the office. The Governor-General is the representative of the King, and as such all Cabinet papers and papers relating to various other matters have to be sent to him. He has a great deal of work, although most of the responsibility is ours. We have, however, been able to reduce expenditure on the staff by Rs. 33,000, and that is all that can be done.

Mr. Dahanayake: As a matter of fact, the number of clerks has been reduced from 10 to 7.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Yes.

Mr. Dahanayake: But the man at the top gets a super salary for doing nothing.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: All depends on the quality of the work.

The Chairman: Do you press your Amendment?

Mr. Kumaraswamy: Yes.

Question put, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 5 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Private Secretary'".

The Committee divided (under Standing Order 48): Ayes, 22; Noes 38.

Sub-head 2.—Travelling, Rs. 20,000.

Mr. A. Reginald Perera (Dehiowita): I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 2."

You will observe, Mr. Chairman, that a sum of Rs. 20,000 has been set apart for travelling expenses of the Governor-General. You will agree with me when I say that our having to vote a large sum of money as travelling expenses of the Governor-General, is really a legacy we have inherited from the past. We are aware of the time when His Excellency the Governor had to go or did go round this country in ceremony to various towns. That naturally involved the country not only in a certain amount of unnecessary expenditure, but also in large sums of money being spent on the travelling of the Governor. Today it must be conceded that the entire status of the Governor has changed. Responsibilities may have increased from the point of view of the Government, but he is really at best today a liaison officer between this Government and the Imperial Government.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: That is not correct.

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: We do not see him travelling as often as he did in the past under the old Constitution. I, therefore, move a reduction in the Vote.

Mr. K. Kanagaratnam (Vaddukkodai): May I know from the Hon. Minister of Finance the amount so far

charged to this vote during the current financial year, because, so far as I am aware, he has not visited any part of the country.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: My good Friend, the former acting Auditor-General, would know that the travelling expenses of the staff of the Governor-General to the different residences, which number three, is met from this vote. The Governor-General has residences at Colombo, Kandy and Nuwara Eliya, and the cost of transferring his staff to these various places is met from this vote.

Apart from that, it is pretty well known that there is a desire on the part of the general public to invite the Governor-General to functions, and that he invariably attends these functions. The amount charged to this vote is the actual expenditure. The current year is not over yet, and we do not know what the actual expenditure will be.

Mr. Kanagaratnam: What was it up to the end of last month?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I cannot give the exact figures, but certainly the amount has almost been expended.

Mr. Dahanayake: In the olden days it was the duty of the Governor to visit the provincial capitals and find out for himself the grievances of the people. Today nobody will ever dream of addressing grievances to the Governor-General. So that today, if the Governor-General goes about at all, he must be picnicking.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: No.

Mr. Dahanayake: He has no duties to perform. For instance, I ask of what use is a visit of the Governor-General to the people of Galle?

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: You can garland him.

Mr. Dahanayake: We do not want him at Galle, unless he can come there for us to see him without any expenditure to the taxpayer. Things that are done by the Governor-General should be those that bring some profit to the people. You must not throw away your

money on picnic parties and holiday jaunts. Therefore, because the duties of the Governor-General have decreased it is very necessary that his travelling, too, should be cut down.

On the other side, we find the travelling votes of the Hon. Ministers, including the Hon. Prime Minister, being increased.

The Chairman: You can raise that point at the proper time.

Mr. Dahanayake: I am only saying that, by way of contrast, to add point to my argument, because the work which the Governor did by visiting various centres and finding out grievances is today being done by the Ministers. Therefore, there is great reason why this travelling vote should be drastically reduced.

The Chairman: Is the hon. Member pressing his Amendment?

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: Yes.

Question, "That the vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 2", put, and *negatived*.

Sub-head 5.—Purchase and upkeep of furniture, equipment, &c.,
Rs. 25,000.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera (Matugama): I move, "That the vote be reduced by Rs. 15,000 in respect of sub-head 5."

I feel that the provision of Rs. 25,000 for furniture and equipment for the Governor-General's residence is excessive, particularly when you take into consideration the fact that in the previous two years also we have provided almost similar amounts. One can understand an amount such as this being budgeted for once in three or four years, but to spend such a sum of money every year on furniture is, apart from everything else, morally wrong.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: The fact that the same amount is provided every year ought to show hon. Members that that amount is necessary to maintain the furniture, as the same furniture is there every year. This is an amount that has to be spent. It is not an amount which the Governor-General gets. The furniture is maintained by the Stores Department.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: You do not spend Rs. 2,000 a month on maintenance.

Mr. Dahanayake: The correct position is that, prior to 1946-47, the amount voted for the purchase and upkeep of furniture was Rs. 15,000. In 1947-48 the vote was increased to Rs. 25,000, and when hon. Members on this side of the House asked the Government why there was that increase, the reply given was that it was necessary to refit and equip Queen's House for the Independence celebrations.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: No.

Mr. Dahanayake: An extra amount was needed, because a number of distinguished visitors were coming for the Independence celebrations and it was necessary thoroughly to repair and re-equip Queen's House. I ask whether the extravagance, the squandermania, of your Independence week is going to be repeated year after year and you are going to spend Rs. 25,000 every year.

The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike: Anniversary celebrations.

Mr. Dahanayake: How many new items of furniture did you buy in the past year, and how much repair work was done? How many old pieces of furniture were cast away? It is not a joke for this House to be passing Rs. 25,000 each year for furniture, when lives and souls are being lost because the Government takes no note of the unemployment prevailing in the country.

May I point out that in other cases, as you are aware, people take a great delight in having in their homes old pieces of furniture? For instance, Sir, in your old Walauwa at Balangoda, you would not sacrifice an old bit of furniture for ten new pieces of furniture. But there is topsy-turvydom in Queen's House. New furniture is obtained every year. What happens to the old furniture? Who is doing the vanishing trick there? Is the Government taking the trouble to probe into the matter?

I have one other weightier point to raise. I have made private inquiries and find that, whenever new items of furniture are purchased for Queen's

House, those bits of furniture come from private furniture shops. I warned the Government last year that they should cease patronizing private furniture shops and should, instead, go to the Government furniture workshops where excellent bits of furniture are turned out. I want a guarantee from the Government to the effect that whatever money is spent out of this vote for new furniture will be expended on furniture that will come from Government furniture workshops.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: This vote is not usually used for the purpose of buying new furniture. It may be necessary to repair some broken furniture or to purchase cutlery or linen, and so on, for the three residences of the Governor-General. It is true that the vote was Rs. 15,000 some years ago, but at that time a labourer was paid one-third what he is paid today.

Dr. Perera: What is the difference in pay of a labourer between 1946 and today?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: He is paid very much more.

Mr. Dahanayake: No.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: In 1946, Rs. 24,000 was actually spent. So there is very little difference.

Mr. S. A. Silva (Agalawatta): The argument adduced by the Minister of Finance last year was that there was an increase of Rs. 10,000 for purchase of furniture, because of the Independence celebrations and that distinguished visitors had to be entertained. Therefore, I cannot understand why the same amount is to be voted this year. We are not going to have another celebration.

The Chairman: Do you press your Amendment?

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: Yes.

Question put, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 15,000 in respect of sub-head 5".

The Chairman, having collected the voices, declared that the "Noes" had

Dr. Perera: Divide!

The Chairman: Surely, you are not going to call a Division on everyone of these items. It is possible to find out the majority from the voices.

Dr. Perera: It is necessary to have a record in regard to certain matters.

The Committee divided (under Standing Order 48): Ayes, 24; Noes, 40.

Sub-head 7.—Labour and upkeep of gardens of Governor-General's residences, Rs. 24,750.

10.45 A.M.

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 7."

I would like to state that only Rs. 3,825 has been set aside for gardens, out of the sum of Rs. 24,750 asked for. It is not that we are not alive to some of the necessities, as the Hon. Minister of Transport and Works mentioned under Sub-head 5, when he spoke of necessities such as curtains, draperies, bath room requirements, and so on; but this expenditure must be related to the problems of this country. How can we go on passing votes like this?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: If there is anything that is related to the problems of this country, it is this expenditure which is to give work to labourers. If you cannot give them extra pay and do not want to increase the wages that they draw, then you may object to this vote.

Mr. Dahanayake: If that is the position, those labourers who are being employed by you in the Queen's House gardens, year after year, should be made permanent and their salaries should be included in the details of this sub-head. You say you want Rs. 24,750 for the upkeep of the gardens. But we assume that your labourers are casual labourers.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Why?

Mr. Dahanayake: If they are not casual labourers, their designation should appear in the Estimates, because you have included provision for three gardeners.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake:

I do not know whether it is quite in Order for hon. Members to deal with this question of making people permanent on a discussion on this cut that has been moved.

Mr. Dahanayake: That is not my main question. The Hon. Prime Minister ought to remember that I mentioned this fact in order to add force to my argument. But that is not my main question. If the Hon. Prime Minister says that this sum of Rs. 24,750 is being utilized for the wages of labourers, then we are entitled to know how many labourers are employed, what their wages are, and how long they have been employed. We would also like to know how many labourers the Government proposes to employ in the future. Thereafter will arise the question why they should not be put on the permanent cadre.

Mr. Iriyagolla: I do not object to the labourers being paid a higher wage, but their wages must be paid by the Governor.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Then we need not come to the House for getting this vote passed.

Question, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of Sub-head 7", put, and *negatived*.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 327,831 for Head 1, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule," put, and agreed to.

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

Head 2.—Prime Minister.

Vote No. 1.—Salaries and Expenses of the Establishment and office of the Prime Minister, Rs. 145,907.

Sub-head 1.—Personal Emoluments, Rs. 82,482.

Dr. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 1."

I presume the Amendment is in Order. Can I add the words "item 'Prime Minister' " ?

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: There is an Amendment appearing in the name of the hon. Member for Maskeliya. Can any hon. Member move

[Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala.]
another hon. Member's Amendment? The hon. Member for Maskeliya, who has to move his Amendment, is not here. He has not given authority to anyone else to move that Amendment.

The Chairman: The hon. Member for Ruwanwella has given notice of a similar Amendment. The Question is that Sub-head 1 be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of the item, "Prime Minister."

Dr. Perera: My main reason for moving this Amendment is to draw the attention of the House to the question of the Pioneers who are in Malaya. This House has more than once—I think at least some of us—have indicated quite clearly that we would like the position completely changed; that we would like to see our own nationals back again in Ceylon and not used as instruments of the Imperialist Regime in Singapore. That has been the position taken up by hon. Members of this House. But, I am afraid, the Hon. Prime Minister has not made any effort to see that that position is changed. I have, in my possession, a large number of letters which have been sent to me by various members of the Pioneer Corps, expressing great dissatisfaction at the way in which things are going on in Singapore. A number of young men have been court martialled. I am still trying to get at the facts as to whether they had a fair trial or not, and I think there are now seven or eight of them who have been sentenced to various terms of imprisonment—about four years and similar periods.

I would like the Hon. Prime Minister to make a statement in this House as to whether a fair trial was given to those individuals who have been sentenced to four years rigorous imprisonment in a distant land. I should like to know whether lawyers appeared on their behalf and placed the cases of these men before the Judges. So far, from the letters I have received, there is no indication that these people were defended. There has been a general complaint that the trials have been unfairly held, and that the accused have not been given a fair chance of placing their cases before the Magistrates. All the indications are

that the Pioneer Corps in Malaya is not very happy with the conditions prevailing there. I have seen photographs of the conditions in which these people live. There is no place, apparently, for them to take their meals. They hang about, carrying their plates for their meals. There is no accommodation for these people, and, generally, conditions are thoroughly unsatisfactory and unsuitable. The Hon. Prime Minister had a chance, when those supposed disturbances took place, to send some civilians who would have had really the welfare of those Ceylonese at heart. Instead of doing that, he chose to send an Army Officer and a fairly aged Bhikkhu to do this task. A Bhikkhu is very useful for ministering. . . .

Mr. Dahanayake: To the souls of the Hon. Ministers.

Dr. Perera:——to the souls of the members of the Pioneer Corps, but, apparently, what is worrying them at the present moment are the conditions in this world and not the conditions in the world to be. I would, therefore, urge upon the Hon. Prime Minister the necessity, immediately, of sending two or three disinterested men to submit a full report on the conditions of work and the conditions under which the members of the Pioneer Corps are living in regard to their wages, and so on. We have had no assurance from the Hon. Prime Minister that the members of the Pioneer Corps are not being paid less than what the other workers in Malaya are paid. I have letters with me which indicate that a good number of Pioneers went with the hope of being able to save some money and send it to their families here in Ceylon. In point of fact, the letters I have seen indicate that these men find it very difficult to make ends meet with the amount of pay they receive. The cost of living is apparently very high there. They have to spend a couple of rupees, I find, even for a hair cut. Such are the conditions under which they are working. Those are the statements made by members of the Pioneer Corps.

I do not know whether the Hon. Prime Minister has got other information, but we are thoroughly perturbed by the information we have received. If the Hon. Prime Minister has no information

we would like him to send disinterested parties, say, two or three gentlemen from Ceylon, to make a full and comprehensive survey of the position and set some of our misgivings at rest. A mother of one of these young men came to me only yesterday with a complaint. As a matter of fact, daily I get visits from the parents and wives of these young men who have been sent across under various pretexts. I would ask the Hon. Prime Minister, therefore, to consider the representations made by hon. Members of this House and to set about this matter without further delay. If he is unable or unwilling to recall these men immediately, will he, at least, get a full statement of the position in Malaya on the conditions of living of the members of the Pioneer Corps?

Mr. P. G. B. Keuneman: (Third Colombo Central): On the remarks made by the hon. Member for Ruwanwella, I should like to know whether it is possible to take up the general question of Defence and External Affairs under this Vote.

The Chairman: I will allow it. What does the hon. Member mean by general remarks? Any question put should be relative to the Estimates.

Mr. Keuneman: Yes, they would refer to the Hon. Prime Minister's salary.

The Chairman: A question which is asked now cannot be asked later under the item "Defence."

Mr. Keuneman: My question is really more appropriate under the item "Defence" except that I would like to mention it under the Ministerial Vote.

The Chairman: Yes, you may do so, provided you do not discuss that question again.

Mr. Keuneman: It is really a question with regard to Defence and External Affairs.

The Chairman: Then the hon. Member can wait until that item is taken up.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: May I ask the Hon. Prime Minister what the position is with regard to the Pioneers who were convicted? Are they to be brought to Ceylon? I mentioned a particular case to the Hon. Prime Minister. There is some impression that these people will be brought to Ceylon. May I ask the Hon. Prime Minister what is being done?

Mr. S. J. V. Chelvanayakam (Kankasanturai): May I also ask the Hon. Prime Minister to place before this House the Report of the two Commissioners who were sent to Malaya to enquire into the disturbances there?

Mr. Dahanayake: On the same question, I remember the Hon. Prime Minister telling the House that neither he nor the Cabinet was in any way concerned with the recruitment of the men of the Pioneer Corps. He told us, in fact, that the men made their choice and that a certain recruiting agency was allowed to recruit the men in this country. He stated that the men went of their own free will. That was the explanation given by the Hon. Prime Minister. I say that that explanation cannot be accepted by a responsible House. We cannot permit a recruiting agent to make recruitments in this country. If we do allow such recruitment, the Hon. Prime Minister will be tacitly admitting that there is another empire within his empire, an *imperium in imperio*. He is supposed to be the Prime Minister of this Government and the big man of this land. But he shuts his eyes to an Imperial Agent operating here for the purpose of recruiting our young men for what may be an undesirable purpose. What are his functions, Mr. Chairman, as Minister of External Affairs and as Prime Minister? His functions are to look after all activities that take place in this country.

11.0 A.M.

If recruiting takes place here by an outside agency, we say that he is responsible as Prime Minister. Thereafter we argue that, if he had shut his eyes at the early stages of this recruitment, it was up to him then at least to have followed these young men to their new homes and to see that they were well looked after.

[Mr. Dahanayake.]

The first Debate on this question took place about last November, and since then no statement has been made to this House or to the country from any authoritative source, to allay the fears that have arisen in the minds of the people of this country, especially in the minds of the parents of those who were sent out to Malaya and to other countries.

We demand on this occasion a full statement of how these young men are getting on, what wages they draw, what type of work they are made to do, and by what means and methods they are being punished. It is not enough for the Hon. Prime Minister to be satisfied with sending an aged Bhikkhu who, according to his calling, will not make any very severe strictures on happenings in Malaya. What we ask for is that, even at this stage, an independent Commission not attached to the Government should be sent to Malaya to inquire into the conditions of these Pioneers and to report to the Government immediately thereon.

Mr. J. C. T. Kotalawela (Second Badulla): May I be permitted under this Head to address a question to the Hon. Prime Minister relating to workers employed by the British Admiralty?

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: Where?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: That will come under External Affairs.

Mr. J. C. T. Kotalawela: It will come under the Head, "Prime Minister."

The Chairman: The hon. Member might raise that question under the Vote, "Defence and External Affairs."

Mr. S. Sivapalan (Trincomalee): Sir, some time back certain representations were made by those men who were in the Ceylon Garrison Artillery and in the Royal Artillery.

The Chairman: The hon. Member might raise that matter when the Defence Vote is reached.

Mr. S. A. Silva: Might I be permitted to ask a question under entertainment allowance?

The Chairman: We have not come to that sub-head as yet. I am very sorry, but why did the hon. Member not give notice of it?

Mr. S. A. Silva: Can I not ask a question under the item, "Personal Emoluments?"

The Chairman: Entertainment allowance is quite a different subject.

Dr. Perera: It is the same allowance—Personal Emoluments allowance.

The Chairman: Very well.

Mr. S. A. Silva: When we discussed this question of entertainment allowance the last time, the Hon. Prime Minister made us understand that he would be charging to this Vote the actual amount expended. And when it was asked why an explanatory note to that effect was not made, the Hon. Minister of Finance confessed that it was his mistake, and the Hon. Prime Minister also said that he was sorry that it had not been done. But even in these Estimates I find that no explanatory note has been made.

The Chairman: Under the last Estimates regarding entertainment, all expenses were met by Government.

Mr. S. A. Silva: But with regard to this particular allowance, the Hon. Prime Minister made us understand that he would be charging the actual amount spent on travelling done, and so on. But we have not been informed whether it is so or not. I should like to know how much was spent out of this item up to date?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: With regard to these Pioneers, I might inform my hon. Friends of the attitude that has been adopted by the Government so far. Those hon. Members who spoke about these Pioneers feel that the men in Ceylon must be free to go to any country they consider desirable, and that they should be given the necessary facilities to get employment if they so desire. These people were not compelled by Government to go to Malaya. They were given the freedom of choice

to go anywhere they liked. It is true that some time ago, before this new Constitution came into being, there was a request made of the last Government to recruit people from Ceylon. This the Government was not prepared to do. They said that if the Military authorities could set up a recruiting agency and offer to recruit people on attractive terms, there would be people who would be willing to enlist for service overseas. In that event the Government said that it would not be inclined to stop them from going; in fact, it was prepared to give them all facilities to go.

I do not see any reason why the people in Ceylon should be prevented from choosing any calling they like to follow. That was the attitude that was adopted by Government with regard to these Pioneers. But at the same time we realized that as these men were men of Ceylon and would be serving overseas, we should try to keep track of them and try to see how they got on, that is, whether they wanted any assistance from us or not. I might say that we have been from the very beginning in touch with prominent gentlemen of that place, who were good enough not only to look after these Pioneers, but also to send us information about them.

They were getting on fairly well when trouble broke out. We made inquiries with regard to this trouble, and we made certain representations, especially with regard to the improvement of their diet and with regard to their accommodation, and so far as I can gather, there have been improvements made in both those respects. Well, on that score, I believe a good majority of them are now quite satisfied.

With regard to the question of additional pay, it is not a matter that could be dealt with by the people in Malaya itself. Representations have to be made to the Imperial authorities to see whether we could get them an additional pay and we are corresponding with the Imperial authorities with regard to that, and I hope we will be successful. But whatever it is, I say that these people knew the pay they were going to receive and the allowances they were going to get. Their allowance and pay certainly looked attractive, but I did not know what their living conditions were going to be, in that

country, whether a hair cut there was going to be more expensive than here. It may be that the barber there does not cut the hair short enough, and that may be the reason why these people have to take a hair cut more often than in Ceylon. Well, whatever it is, I am not aware of it.

Mr. Dahanayake: You ought to be aware of it.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I think with regard to barbers, my hon. Friend is more aware of the position than myself.

Mr. Dahanayake: If you are not aware of it, you ought to resign from the post of Prime Minister.

The Chairman: Order, please.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: As far as I am aware, I can say that the majority of the people there are quite satisfied. They are very happy. But there may be a few who may have got into trouble and have not been able to get over their trouble yet.

With regard to these men being tried on certain charges framed against them, I might say that they were defended by lawyers.

Dr. Perera: No.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: What is the use of denying when I have had communication myself with those lawyers?

Mr. Keuneman: All of them?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Yes. According to the Army Act, there is provision made for their defence. As a matter of fact, I wrote to a lawyer friend, who was taking an interest in these Pioneers, to allow the accused to choose their lawyers. But if they are found guilty of any offence for which they are charged, then they will have to undergo the punishment meted out to them. I believe they can appeal to the Military authorities, but other than that I do not think there is any other appeal.

Mr. Keuneman: It is for court martial?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Yes. The prisoners, of course, will not be brought here, for the simple reason that, if they commit an offence in that country and are convicted, they will have to undergo that punishment there and not here. That is about all I can say.

Mr. Chelvanayakam: What about the Report that was made by the two-man Commission?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: With regard to that Report, I might tell my hon. Friend that I have received a very satisfactory Report. In fact that Report was a very good one and a useful one, and I am taking action on it. As I have not finished taking action on it completely, I am not in a position to release that Report.

Mr. Keuneman: Will the Hon. Prime Minister eventually place that Report before the House?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: If it becomes necessary, I will place that Report before the House.

Mr. Dahanayake: The Hon. Prime Minister airily says that he has nothing to do with the men whether they are in jail or not——

The Chairman: He did not say that.

Mr. Dahanayake: Can he give us the names of those people who are in jail, what terms they are serving, and how they are being treated in jail? He has a duty by the parents, the citizens of this country. The parents get no information whatever about their sons.

The Chairman: The hon. Member must realize that, if he wants information of that nature, he must give notice of it.

Mr. Dahanayake: We gave notice of it last November when this matter was mooted, and since then we have waited and waited for information, and it is because we have waited so long for this information that a cut has been proposed in his Vote.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I can tell this much, that, when any

parent of any one, whether convicted or not in Malaya, came to see me, I passed on to him any information I had in my possession.

Mr. Dahanayake: Will he do so in every case and not wait for people to call at "Temple Trees"? Will there be some sort of an Information Bureau?

Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena (Kotte): Could the Hon. Prime Minister tell us whether these people who were recruited were informed before they were sent to Malaya about the general conditions of work, &c., and the restrictions they would have to undergo there?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: All the conditions were laid down.

Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena: The Hon. Prime Minister says that all the conditions were laid down, but what I want to know is whether the parents were informed that, if there should be a disturbance, the people involved in it would be tried by court martial? They were recruited for a particular purpose, and not merely as a military unit.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Actually these people who volunteered to enlist knew that they were being recruited to the Army. They knew it because they were under Military law for 3 months here, and I believe everyone who joins the Army knows that he has to be subject to Military law.

Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena: Most of the people, when they were recruited, did not know really the conditions in the Army. They should have been informed, particularly by the Hon. Gallant Major,——

Mr. Dahanayake: Gallant Colonel.

Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena:—— before they left the shores of this Island, about the conditions under the Army Act. Most of the people who were recruited came from the country-side or from workshops here, and they were forced to join because——

The Chairman: No.

Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena:—they were starving and had no way of eking out an existence. They were, therefore, forced by the Government to enlist in this Unit. The other day the Hon. Prime Minister referred to the fact that in Bengal several people had died because there was no food. That is not so. People died directly at the hands of the Military authorities, because that section of the people were nationalists.

The Chairman: We are not concerned with that.

11.15 A.M.

Mr. Keuneman: I would like to urge upon the Hon. Prime Minister to consider seriously the question of having some officer, or some committee set up, for the benefit of the dependants of these young men who are in Malaya. As a Member for Colombo Central, from where a large number of these Pioneers have gone, I find that one of the biggest problems is the tremendous anxiety among the parents, wives and dependants as to what is happening to the Pioneers in Malaya. They do not go for the information to the Military authorities, but they go to the Member, and we have got to communicate with the Military authorities in Malaya. It would be of great assistance to these dependants if the Hon. Prime Minister could make some arrangement for some sort of officer who could intervene and dispel a good deal of anxiety which is existing among the dependants regarding the Pioneers who are away in Malaya. I hope he will give an assurance.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: That is what I was doing all this time. I will certainly have some one.

Mr. Dahanayake: We were doing the same thing, but much better than the Hon. Prime Minister. At least five mothers have come and said that they have not heard from their sons for three or four months. I sent an urgent telegram to the Welfare Officer, R. P. C., Havelock Town, Colombo. Beyond that I was not able to help those women. What we want is that there should be some sort of Information Bureau for the benefit of the dependants who are in this country. Surely, we have no such

bureau in "Temple Trees", and every mother cannot go to the Members.

The Chairman: Surely, the Hon. Member knows that the Hon. Prime Minister has an office.

Dr. Perera: The Hon. Prime Minister states that he feels satisfied that the conditions of the Pioneers have improved as a result of representations. The misgiving is that the Hon. Prime Minister's statements are really governed by the statements made to him by officials.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Official sources.

Dr. Perera: Military officials and the military persons whom you sent.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: There are some gentlemen who take a great deal of interest in this matter.

Dr. Perera: I know the person to whom you are referring. All I can say is that the Pioneer Corps has absolutely no confidence in the gentleman you have in mind. I have letters to that effect. I do not know why the Hon. Prime Minister should jib at it. We would like an independent body of men sent there—civilians who can really look into the conditions of work, not from the Military eye but from the purely civilian eye. I do not know why the Hon. Prime Minister should not agree to that proposal. Surely, that is a feasible proposal and, if adopted, will allay the anxiety, as pointed out by the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central. That will allay all the anxiety of the parents of these young men. I would strongly urge upon the Hon. Prime Minister to send a body of independent men from this country to inquire into the conditions and satisfy themselves and this country.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I have to send a person on whom I could depend. It may be my misfortune or their misfortune that they cannot think of anyone being independent except themselves. I think the last officer who went there was one Mr. Muttucumaru on whom—

Mr. Dahanayake: Why do you not send a Parliamentary Commission?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: After all, I have got to choose people in whom I have got confidence and who would give me a proper opinion. I have absolute confidence in the people whom I sent. Even the people with whom I am in communication are men in whom I have confidence.

Mr. Keuneman: I want to raise another point on this Vote.

Mr. S. A. Silva: Entertainment allowance—

The Chairman: Will the hon. Member please wait for that?

Mr. Keuneman: I would raise a point in connection with the advice which the Hon. Prime Minister, in his capacity as Prime Minister, offers to the Governor-General in the performance of statutory functions connected therewith. I think in this particular period, when we are in a formative stage of our development, it is very necessary that healthy conventions should be established. I would ask the Hon. Prime Minister whether he is prepared to give an assurance to the House on this matter.

Today Supreme Court Judges are appointed by the Governor-General on the advice of the Prime Minister. It is very essential that the Supreme Court of this country should be kept clear of any allegations of political favouritism or of special partiality, or that these appointments should be regarded as political appointments, which is perfectly possible when it is well known to one and all that all these appointments are, in actual fact, made on the advice of the Hon. Prime Minister, and that the person behind is the Hon. Prime Minister. I would ask the Hon. Prime Minister whether he is prepared to create a convention now by setting up some type of independent body to advise him on this matter, so that the necessary legal forms can be maintained and at the same time suspicions of political favouritism and of political control of the Supreme Court can be removed from the minds of the people of this country.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I do not think that, if there is a democratic Government, the politicians should not have control over such

matters. Politicians are chosen by the people, and it is on their advice alone that the country must be governed. As far as I am concerned, I am not going to give any assurance that I would get advice from any committee or not. It is left to me. As long as I am Prime Minister, I shall certainly discharge my duty on my own responsibility and according to my own conscience. Whether I will accept anybody's advice or not, is a thing left to me. Rightly or wrongly, if I consider a person not fit to hold a certain post and if the country does not agree with me, it is left to the country to send me out. I certainly say that no Prime Minister should be suspected, and I do not agree to be a suspect, however much it may please others to make me one.

Dr. Perera: May I follow that up? Does the Hon. Prime Minister know that the Prime Minister in England never interferes with appointments to the Judiciary?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Lord Chancellor.

Dr. Perera: And the Lord Chancellor, as the Hon. Minister of Finance knows, is more or less considered to be a judicial officer with judicial experience.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: He is a politician.

Dr. Perera: But he is at least one step removed, in that he is maintained as the head of the Judiciary.

The Chairman: Our Constitution provides for that. The Governor-General shall make appointment in his discretion. What the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central wants to do is to have an advisory board set up to advise the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister says he will not accept that suggestion. He gave an emphatic reply.

Dr. Perera: The only difficulty is this. It is important that justice should not be tainted with any suspicion at all of political influence. That is very important. Therefore, to remove it one step further, if even the pretence of the mere suspicion of such political influence can be removed, I think it is a very healthy tradition. That applies not only to the present Prime Minister, but to future Prime Ministers as well.

The Hon. Mr. Goonesinha: When you become Prime Minister, you can do that.

Dr. Perera: I shall certainly do that when I become Prime Minister, and that is a matter which I think we will seriously entertain, though I think the Government Whip will not do so. There is no personal reflection intended here. The Hon. Prime Minister assumed that there was a personal reflection.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: No.

Dr. Perera: That is why you got so hot about it.

The Chairman: Each Prime Minister will do his duty according to his conscience without any dictation from anybody else. If he wants to seek advice, he will do so. That is what he said.

Dr. Perera: To the best of my knowledge, only in the United States do you get the appointment of members of the Supreme Court by the chief executive officer.

The Hon. Mr. A. Ratnayake (Minister of Food and Co-operative Undertakings): What about Russia?

Dr. Perera: You are never prepared to follow the example of Russia. Then why do you raise the question?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: We will follow it.

Dr. Perera: In this respect only. Every other country that I can think of has removed this one step of making it a purely political appointment. Therefore, it is worth considering whether this convention should not be established.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I can assure my hon. Friend that I do not consider it a personal reflection. I feel that the Prime Minister of this country, whoever he is, should enjoy the confidence of everybody.

The Chairman: Will the Hon. Minister of Finance kindly answer the question as regards entertainment allowance?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: What is the question?

Mr. S. A. Silva: Last year you made us understand that it was a mistake that a footnote was not attached to say that only actual expenditure incurred would be charged. But this has not been done even this year. Is the Hon. Prime Minister going to say that he has made a mistake this time also?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I shall answer that. As far as that is concerned, only expenditure that is incurred has been charged to this vote. I can tell you that it so happened that it was not possible to keep an account of the expenditure when I entertained people. In fact more money than the actual sum provided was spent in entertaining. It is impossible to keep details of expenditure. This year this footnote has been omitted because of the difficulty of keeping these accounts. Up to this date we have not charged anything except the actual expenditure, and perhaps less than the actual expenditure.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: What does the hon. Member want to know?

The Chairman: He wants to know whether there should be a footnote.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: There is no mistake here. We are now considering next year's Estimates.

Mr. S. A. Silva: How much has been spent is not given. According to the Hon. Prime Minister's statement, only the actual expenditure incurred will be charged to this vote. We do not know whether he has spent more.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: My expenditure was more than the amount provided.

Mr. S. A. Silva: Then we must pay.

Question, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 1", put, and *negatived*.

Sub-head 5, Upkeep of Prime Minister's Residences.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 1,200 in respect of sub-head 5". Will the

[Mr. Wilmot A. Perera.]

Hon. Minister of Finance say why the expenditure has gone up by over 100 per cent?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I went into occupation of "Temple Trees" last year in December, and the annexe was not ready till the end of February. So, all the expenditure that has been charged, has been for the balance period and not for the earlier period. "Temple Trees" as well as "The Lodge" are maintained not by me but by the Government, and they did not require all the servants for the whole period. All that they have asked for this year are two additional servants whom they consider very necessary.

11.30 A.M.

The Chairman: Are you pressing that Amendment?

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: No, I am not pressing it.

Sub-head 7.—Upkeep of Prime Minister's garages and transport, 12,000.

The Chairman: The hon. Member for Chavakachcheri has an Amendment under this sub-head.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I am not pressing it.

Dr. Perera: I am pressing the Amendment in my name under that sub-head. I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 4,400 in respect of sub-head 7," I would like to know from the Hon. Prime Minister why there is an increase of Rs. 4,000—odd.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I will answer that. The reason is that last year we had made provision for only one chauffeur; but, as it is, the Prime Minister happens to have two cars.

Dr. Perera: One was a gift.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: This has actually become very necessary because, when there are Visitors, one car has to be placed at their disposal. In any case, even if there were no

visitors, still in order to adhere to the eight-hour working day, it would be necessary to have two chauffeurs. Otherwise, the chauffeur of the Prime Minister of Ceylon would have to work for about 14 hours a day.

Mr. Dahanayake: One man would have to work for 14 hours?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Yes, it will come to that.

The Chairman: Are you pressing that Amendment?

Dr. Perera: No.

Sub-head 8.—Government Hospitality, Rs. 7,500.

Dr. Perera: With regard to sub-head 8, I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 2,500 in respect of sub-head 8." Provision for Government hospitality has been increased—is that because of last year's experience?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Last year provision was made for a shorter period. Then, again, you will find that the expenditure incurred in regard to some of the visitors who came last year was met from the main Vote. This year expenditure on visitors will have to be met from this sub-head.

The Chairman: Is the hon. Member pressing his Amendment?

Dr. Perera: No.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 145,907 for Head 2, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule," put, and agreed to.

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

Head 3.—Supreme Court

Vote No. 1.—Salaries and expenses of the Supreme Court, Rs. 931,650.

Sub-head 1.—Personal Emoluments, Rs. 660,150.

The Chairman: Any Amendments?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I have an Amendment, Sir.

Mr. Iriyagolla: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 1,800 in respect of sub-head 1, items "Sword Bearer" and "Mace Bearer". I move this Amendment because it is not necessary to preserve a relic of the past to maintain the dignity of the Supreme Court. These posts are quite unnecessary.

The Chairman: Any further remarks? Has the Hon. Minister of Finance anything to say?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: As a matter of fact, if we delete these items, we will be adding to the unemployment problem.

Dr. Perera: That does not matter, Sir. This affects only two posts.

The Chairman: Is the hon. Member for Dandagamuwa pressing his Amendment?

Mr. Iriyagolla: I am not pressing it.

Mr. J. A. Martensz (Appointed Member): I am afraid my first Amendment refers to "Stenographers", but that item comes before "Sword Bearer" and "Mace Bearer".

The Chairman: You cannot go back; but I will allow you to ask any questions regarding that item.

Mr. Martensz: Am I permitted to ask any questions?

The Chairman: Yes, if you have any.

Mr. Martensz: In that case, Sir, I wish to ask the Government whether they would be prepared to consider the recommendation that was made by the Cadres Commission in regard to the establishment of a central typing department in the Supreme Court to deal with the typing of appeal briefs. The Cadres Commission made a very good case for the resumption of the practice which existed prior to 1938.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I might say that I have made inquiries into this matter and have learnt that there seems to be a difference of opinion regarding this question among the Judges. Some of them are of the

opinion that it will be an advantage to have a central typing bureau as before, to get all the cases typed there and sent out, while others hold the view that the maintenance of typists at the various Court-houses is the best way of dealing with the matter.

I myself am inclined to agree with my good Friend the Appointed Member; but as there seems to be so much difference of opinion among the Judges, I think that we should wait till they come to a decision about the matter. It is under consideration now.

Mr. Martensz: Arising out of the Hon. Prime Minister's reply, Sir, may I know whether an opportunity will be given to the legal profession to express their views on this subject? The opinions of lawyers practising before the various Courts in the Island might be considered in arriving at a decision.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I shall certainly ask the Hon. Minister of Justice to go into the question with lawyers as well as others.

Mr. Chelvanayakam: May I ask a question under sub-head 1, item 2?

The Chairman: What is the item?

Mr. Chelvanayakam: Item 2, Puisne Justices.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Page 19,

The Chairman: You have not given any notice of an Amendment.

Mr. Chelvanayakam: There is the Amendment of the hon. Appointed Member, Mr. Martensz, in respect of sub-head 1.

The Chairman: I have already ruled that the moving of Amendments to a whole sub-head is out of Order. You must pick out some item, for instance "Sword Bearer," Mace "Bearer", &c.

Mr. Chelvanayakam: I thought you said you would allow the hon. Appointed Member—

The Chairman: I said I would. but he mentioned the item as "Stenographers".

Mr. Chelvanayakam: In respect of that item of "Stenographers", may I ask the Hon. Prime Minister or the Hon. Minister of Finance to let me know whether he is aware that a good deal of the delay experienced in the hearing of appeals is due to the fact that the stenographers take many months for the preparation of typewritten copies? Due to this a number of months elapse before the appeals are ready to be heard. Therefore, first, I want a sufficient number of stenographers to attend to the typing of copies of records.

Secondly, by reason of the shortage of stenographers attached to the Court of Criminal Appeal, the notes of trials held in the Assize Court are not available to Counsel appearing on appeal at the Court of Criminal Appeal. It is also a fact that, in Ceylon, the notes of the trial are not made available to Counsel, whereas, in England, within the appealable period, the notes of trial are available to Counsel. What happens here is that, even in cases involving capital punishment, Counsel have to study the grounds of appeal, and, unless they do so at the time of filing the appeal, they may not be allowed to raise any point which might strike them later, when the notes of trial come into their hands after the grounds of appeal are filed.

I would, therefore, like to know whether it has not been brought to the notice of the Hon. Prime Minister that the shortage of stenographers in respect of the Assize Court trials is a matter that denies justice to many men even charged with capital offences.

The Chairman: I do not think the typing is done by stenographers. There are special typists who type briefs.

Mr. Chelvanayakam: The stenographers themselves are the typists.

The Chairman: That is in some cases.

Mr. Chelvanayakam: It is so in the case of the Court of Criminal Appeal.

The Chairman: But not in the case of the typing of appeal briefs.

Mr. Chelvanayakam: The typing of appeal briefs is done by another department.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: The position is this—that the present way of doing things is not at all satisfactory. At one time when it was considered that the method of doing the work was not satisfactory, the late Chief Justice evolved a system, but that, too, in its turn has not proved satisfactory. We do not deny that we must improve matters.

I have no definite authority from anybody to say so, but the general impression is that the cases are delayed due to the fact that a few individual Advocates command a large practice, with the result that the cases are not listed promptly for hearing, because the convenience of those Advocates would not permit it.

We know that the present system of doing the work is unsatisfactory and, as far as we are concerned, the Government is prepared to give stenographers, typists and even Judges, in order to expedite the disposal of cases; but let the lawyers also help them in doing this.

Mr. G. R. de Silva (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice): As far as the Hon. Minister of Justice is concerned, he is fully aware of these defects. First of all, there is a great shortage of stenographers in this country—that is one of the main difficulties. Not only that, the whole system has to be recast, and I wish to say that the Hon. Minister of Justice is doing everything to put this right.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva (Wellawatta-Galkissa): I wish, if I may be permitted to do so, to make a remark on this matter, particularly in view of the remarks that the Hon. Prime Minister chose to make.

It is a fact, Sir, that at a certain period, especially in the Appeal Courts, the system of committing cases to stand down and stand out for the convenience of particular Counsel did stand in the way of the expeditious disposal of certain cases. Never, in fact—I think all lawyers in those Courts can say—has it

been the experience that that system has stood in the way of disposing of cases as such, that is, of getting through a certain volume of work on a given day.

To attribute, Sir, the delays in the law and its administration to the fact that work happens to be concentrated in a certain number of hands, as some appear to think, disproportionately, is really to say that we are having in Ceylon in the Courts a phenomenon which exists everywhere in the world.

The legal profession, Sir, happens to be, as you will appreciate, a profession in which the question of the ability of the given individual lawyer plays a predominant part in the choice of the client; but as things are functioning today, if anyone will look into the Courts, they will find that the profession has precious little to do with this question of delays of cases, because the old system of standing out is substantially gone; even the system of standing down is not much observed; and the concentration of work in a few hands is unavoidable so long as the Hon. Prime Minister defends the system in which that system of concentration is itself a characteristic. Finally, Sir, if the Hon. Prime Minister is deeply concerned with the avoidance of delay in the disposal of cases, he should first of all address himself to the question, as the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice seems to think he will, to the entire system of administration of the law.

Sir, to my own certain knowledge, I will say I have found that, especially in the original Courts, if we are allowed to conduct a certain proportion or quantum of our cross-examination, for instance, in Sinhalese, then we can save an enormous amount of time; but because of the state of the law, which has not yet been set right, despite certain old decisions of this House—I mean the State Council—there are still judicial officers in the Island who are not merely impatient of the language—not to use the word Vernacular—but who really seem to think that it is obnoxious.

Therefore, the delays of the law, Sir, are the delays in a system which have to be looked into with far greater comprehensiveness than the mere question of whether lawyers are responsible.

I know there are many—

11.45 A.M.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I said "one of the causes".

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: There are many folk in this country to whom this is an easy way out. The lawyers should take a portion of the blame, and I for one will join anybody who makes the correct attack on the legal profession. But, as the Prime Minister did, to place upon the legal profession so disproportionately, as he did in his speech, the responsibility for delays in the administration of justice, is to forget all the other aspects of the matter, which I do not think it will be appropriate for us to go into now.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I ask the hon. Member to take only the right proportion of the blame!

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: The Prime Minister never understood proportion!

Mr. G. R. de Silva: The delays in the disposal of criminal cases are getting very much less now. Criminal cases are being disposed of more quickly. Civil appeals, too, are being disposed of quickly. There are delays in disposing of the old cases, cases which came up before the present regime under the Minister of Justice. Criminal cases are not now held up for more than two or three months. Civil appeals, too, are being disposed of more quickly.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I move, "That the Vote be increased by Rs. 518 in respect of sub-head 1, item "Peons".

We reduced the number of peons by one last year, and we are trying to correct that mistake.

Mr. Dahanayake: The number of peons last year was 28; it has been reduced to 27—

The Chairman: It was a mistake.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: We are adding one now.

Mr. Dahanayake: You are keeping to the same number, but four of them are temporary appointments. There

[Mr. Dahanayake.]
were 28 peons on the fixed cadre last year. This year there will be 28, 4 of whom are temporary men. Why is that?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: They are not permanent.

Mr. Dahanayake: Why do you not make them permanent?

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: He is putting off the question with a joke!

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: The Chief Justice will have to consider their records and send us a Minute if he wants to make them permanent. When he does that, we shall sanction it.

Question, "That the Vote be increased by Rs. 518 in respect of item 'Peons'", put, and agreed to.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 932,168 for Head 3, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

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

Head 4.—Cabinet Office

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

Head 5.—Senate

*Vote 1.—Salaries and expenses of the Department of the Senate,
Rs. 357,985.*

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 5 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Superintendent of Senate Building and Gentleman Usher'".

This officer is paid a salary of Rs. 5,455, and I see that, apart from this officer, there are 4 watchers. I want some details about this Superintendent of Senate Building and Gentleman Usher. What is his age? What are his qualifications? Has he had any previous experience in supervising buildings? Has he had any architectural training, and undergone training in building supervision? This is a large sum, over Rs. 400 a month.

Mr. J. C. T. Kotalawela: I have an Amendment that this whole Head be deleted.

The Chairman: That is out of Order. If you are against the whole Vote, you cannot move its deletion by way of an Amendment.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: This officer is paid over Rs. 400 a month for what I consider to be work of a very minor nature. I do not know what is meant by the term "Gentleman Usher". It is reminiscent of feudal times. Could the Minister elucidate the various points I have mentioned?

Mr. A. Reginald Perera (Dehiowita): There is an Amendment in my name. Could I bring it under the item "President"?

The Chairman: Yes.

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: The Senate was a creation of the old State Council. Unlike parallel assemblies in other parts of the world, this body was created by violent methods, almost in artificial conditions. This same body is sustained by money voted by this House. This Senate is not a body that developed naturally year by year, and it is, therefore our duty to examine—

Mr. H. W. Amarasuriya (Baddegama): I rise to a point of Order: This is an item of expenditure provided for by special law. The Senate is a body set up under the Constitution, and that being the case, we vote the funds—

Dr. Perera: Under what law?

The Chairman: The hon. Member for Baddegama has risen to a point of Order. Let me give my Ruling.

It is perfectly true that the Senate has been created by law, but the voting of the salary of the President of the Senate and everybody else in that body is a matter in our keeping. We are discussing that.

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: I thank you very much for that Ruling, Mr. Chairman, but—

The Chairman: In speaking about the President, or the Members, of the Senate, I hope the hon. Member will bear in mind that he must use very moderate language.

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: Yes. You have imposed on me a rather difficult condition, Mr. Chairman.

We sustain this body. This democratic body sustains the Senate by an annual vote, and it is, therefore, our duty to determine, year by year, whether this Assembly is performing the task for which it was created, and whether the decision of the earlier Assembly—the State Council—in creating the Senate, is correct.

In my view, and I state this with a full sense of responsibility, the Senate, as constituted today, and judged by its achievements both this year and last year, is not performing any useful service. I cannot imagine a body—

The Chairman: You are against the whole vote?

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: I am dealing with the Office of President, as he is the fountain head, the person responsible for everything that happens in that Assembly—

The Chairman: You can bring up these matters when I put the whole Vote to the House. The hon. Member for Badulla has a similar Amendment. You and he can speak against the whole Vote when I put it to the House.

Is the hon. Member for Chavakacheri pressing his Amendment?

Mr. Kumaraswamy: Is there no reply to my questions?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I was about to reply when I was interrupted.

The Gentleman Usher plays the same role in the Senate as the Serjeant at Arms in this House. The Gentleman Usher is a retired Police official, a Mr. Dickman. He occupied a very important post in the Police Department, and on his retirement the President of the Senate has engaged him to look after the building and to keep order and discipline in the public gallery, as our Serjeant-at-Arms does here.

It may be that the choice of the words “Superintendent of Senate Building” to describe him is rather unfortunate, but as regards the title “Gentleman Usher”, we are trying to create Parliamentary traditions, and have here an official similar to the “Black Rod” in England. The suggestion at first was to call him the “Black Rod”, but we thought “Gentleman Usher” would be more appropriate. His salary is very low—

Mr. Keuneman: Is the term “Gentleman Usher” used in order to distinguish between a man and a woman Usher?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I cannot answer that question, and say whether, if a lady were appointed, the word “Gentleman” would be changed.

The four watchers are to look after the whole Senate building, which includes not merely the Senate Chamber but also the Cabinet rooms, and the Prime Minister's office. The whole Senate building is looked after by the watchers and others whose salaries are provided here.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I am not pressing my Amendment.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 357,985 for Head 5, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule”, put.

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: Sir, I was interrupted when I was going to say that one could understand the need for a body like the Senate if it was composed of men equipped with special technical knowledge, if it was composed of leading doctors, engineers, and so on, so that when a Motion of this House was put before them, they could offer constructive criticism.

What is happening to day in our Senate? We find a milk and water repetition of the Debate in this House, and nothing is altered, no addition is made—

The Chairman: You are out of Order. You cannot criticise the actions of that Assembly in this House.

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: I shall restrict myself to this point, and say that no really useful purpose is served by the

[Mr. A. Reginald Perera.]
Senate as it is constituted today. I stand for the complete deletion of this entire Vote.

Mr. J. C. T. Kotalawela: Our attitude is that, on principle, we are opposed to the very existence of the Senate, and therefore we shall vote against this Head.

Mr. Dahanayake: Even if any useful purpose could have been served by the Senate, I say that that has been prevented by the Government. Recently, a Motion was carried in the Senate that a Commission should be appointed to inquire into the conditions prevailing in the Government hospitals. That Motion was fully debated in the Senate, and was carried by a majority, but the Government has chosen to ignore that Motion of the Senate.

From our angle, on first principles, we say that there is not the slightest justification for the existence of this body. From the angle of the Government, if they are not prepared to accept the decisions of a body created by themselves, for what purpose then has the Senate been created at all? Is it merely to drain away the money of this country?

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: The chief function of the Senate was supposed to be to act as a brake on hasty legislation passed by this House. May I ask whether it has acted in that way?

The Chairman: The need for it has not yet arisen, perhaps!

Mr. Kumaraswamy: There is a vote here for "Expenses of Committees, &c.". Judging from the remarks of hon. Members, the Senate is not a very useful institution. I want to know how many Committees of the Senate have been functioning, and what is the nature of these Committees. For what purpose were they appointed?

The Chairman: That is not a question you should ask.

Mr. Iriyagolla: The provision for Clerks, under Head 5—

The Chairman: There is no Amendment in the hon. Member's name, under Head 5—

Mr. Iriyagolla: There is, under sub-head 1.

The Chairman: We have finished with sub-head 1. I am now putting the whole Head 5 to the House, Vote 1—

Mr. D. B. R. Gunawardena: It is said that the Senate was intended to act as a brake on the decisions of this House, that its main business—

The Chairman: All that we can do is to refuse the money.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 357,985 for Head 5, Vote 1, be inserted in the Schedule," put.

The Chairman: The "Noes" have it.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Divide.

The Committee divided (under S.O. 48): Ayes, 49; Noes, 30.

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

The Chairman: The Sitting is suspended till 2 P.M.

Sitting accordingly suspended until 2 p.m., and then resumed.

2.0 P.M.

Head 6.—House of Representatives

Vote No. 1—Salaries and Expenses of the Department of the House of Representatives, Rs. 1,219,315.

Sub-head 1, Personal Emoluments, Rs. 249,197.

Mudaliyar M. M. Ebrahim (Pottuvil): I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Telephone Operator.'"

The purpose of my moving this Motion, Mr. Chairman, is to bring to the notice of this House the fact that, although the Telephone Operator of the House of Representatives was originally the Telephone Operator of the old State Council, his salary is not even equal to the pay of some of the labourers. In my opinion, not only the telephone operator, but also the Arachchi, peons and other labourers of this House should be paid more. Will the Hon. Minister of Finance be pleased to move in this matter and see that the salaries of this section of the staff are increased?

Mr. Dahanayake: I, too, wish to commend to you, Mr. Chairman, the plight of the minor employees of the House of Representatives. Although it was expected that, with the changed status of the Government, these minor employees would receive better treatment, those expectations remain yet to be realized. For instance, the peons of the House of Representatives are now styled "Messengers". Although they have been given a more dignified title, there has been no change in their prospects.

Again, the watchers and the liftmen of the House of Representatives receive just the same wages as watchers and liftmen of other Government departments, whereas in other instances the wages given to employees of the House of Representatives are more favourable than the wages given to similar employees in other branches of the Government Service.

If a parallel is necessary, Sir, one can look up page 327 of the Draft Estimates for the conditions of service of the minor employees of the Department of the Government Archivist. There you will notice, Sir, that the peons are called "attendants", and the book binders are called "document repairers"; and as a result of their changed titles they have been given better scales of salaries.

There is a reason, Mr. Chairman, why we press that the minor employees of the House of Representatives should and ought to receive better treatment than their compeers in other branches of the Government Service. These employees have to serve longer hours, have to be more alert, and have to please the 101 Representatives of the people, who are very exacting in their calls upon the employees for service. Nothing, in other words, should go wrong in this House of Representatives; even though things may go wrong outside, you are here, thank God, Mr. Chairman, to see that things go right here. We regret to note, however, that, though your heart is full of the milk of human kindness, there is no reciprocal increase in the wages of the minor employees of the House of Representatives. I am certain that the fault is not yours, Sir; the fault must be with the Government, and we ask you, Mr. Chairman, to give us a guarantee that the entire question

of the terms and conditions of service of the employees of the House of Representatives will be carefully studied by you in the near future.

It is not merely a case of the wages that should be given to these men. Think, Sir, of the nature of work they have to do, the conveniences that they do not have, and the normal amenities of life that they are deprived of. When the House sits here from hour to hour, where are these minor employees to take their food? Do they get a meal at all? And where do they sleep? These, Mr. Chairman, are questions that ought to engage your kind attention, and I have not the least doubt, now that attention has been focussed on this question, that you will take very early steps to go thoroughly into this question.

Dr. Perera: If you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise a question of principle that is involved, and I should like this question settled once and for all. It is a vital principle of democratic government that the legislative body should not be in any way subordinate to the Government in office. It is very important, for instance, that the budget of the legislative body should be outside the purview of the Government in a strict sense. If a proposal emanates from the Chief Officer or Member of the legislative body, namely, the Speaker of this House, I think the Government should have no right, on principle, to change that proposal and refuse to accede to that request. Any proposal that emanates from the highest authority of this House should receive either the approval or disapproval of the House, but I do not think that the Government are entitled to reject it off-hand and say that they cannot accede to that request, on whatever grounds it may be. I would like to urge that that principle be recognized and the independence of this House of Representatives maintained in keeping with, I think, the traditions throughout all democratic institutions.

I have been constrained to make those remarks, Mr. Chairman, because I have heard it said that one or two proposals—I hope I will be corrected if I am wrong—which have emanated from you did not find favour with the Government

[Dr. Perera.]

and, therefore, they had to be given up. I sincerely hope that is not so, because that would, I think, be a very bad tradition or principle to be established.

Mr. Keuneman: I would just like to make one or two remarks, Mr. Chairman, about the position of the staff of the House of Representatives and, in particular, the Reporting Staff. I think it should be brought to your attention and to the attention of this House that the Reporting Staff of the House of Representatives are undergoing considerable hardships at the present moment. The number of Reporters of the present House is exactly the same as that which was provided for the former State Council, but the amount of work which they have to do has very much increased. It is sometimes said, when the Reporting Branch asks for an increase of staff, that this is not necessary because they have long periods of recess and that they also receive compensation in the form of overtime. But I think that, even though the House is in recess, these Reporters have far more work to do now, because, during the recess at the present moment, Committees of this House are in session. These Reporters have got to attend the Committees of the House, and not only take down verbatim what goes on at those Committees, but also do all the necessary typing work in connexion therewith. As there has been such an increase of work, I think it is fair by these men that provision should be made at an early date for an increase of staff, because, otherwise, the efficiency of these men will be sorely taxed and a very valuable asset of this House in the matter of the correct keeping of records would thereby be wasted.

I hope that the Government will look into this matter.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I entirely associate myself with all what the hon. Member for Pottuvil (Mudaliyar Ebrahim) has said about the telephone operator of the House of Representatives, but I should like to bring to the notice of the Hon. Speaker that, sometimes after 4.30 P.M.; hon. Members are deprived of the service of the telephone because of the lack of a direct telephone for their use. Once the telephone operator leaves the place, it is very difficult for hon. Members, who have been delayed here owing to a Party meeting or a Committee

meeting, to get in touch through the telephone with anybody whom they wish to contact.

I would, therefore, urge the authorities concerned that they should have two telephone operators instead of one, and that their salaries be also proportionately increased.

With regard to the minor employees, I agree with the hon. Member for Galle (Mr. Dahanayake) that they are not paid enough. Although their wages, compared with other departments, may be similar, the work that they do here, by reason of the fact that they have to satisfy all the hon. Members of this House, is of a very severe and uncongenial nature; I would, therefore, ask that a special concession be given to the minor employees of this House.

I must make special mention of those waiters who serve us during sessions. Most of them are temporary employees and they are very old. Once the sessions are over and they are discontinued, they will be out of billet. I, therefore, suggest that these waiters be retained on a monthly basis of remuneration, and that, during the recess, some sort of food production work or some other work, such as for instance, maintaining the lawns of the House of Representatives, be given to them.

With regard to the Reporters, in the Central Assembly in India a Reporter is paid Rs. 900 a month, I am reliably informed by the hon. Member for Alutnuwara (Mr. Ramanujam). The purchasing value of the rupee in India is very high, hence we can understand the high status the Reporters have in the Legislative Assemblies in India.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Rs. 900 a month?

2.15 P.M.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: Yes, Rs. 900 a month in the Central Assembly of India, I am reliably informed by the hon. Member for Alutnuwara (Mr. Ramanujam). Recently the All-India Newspaper Editors' Conference passed a resolution, requesting that all reporters must be paid at least Rs. 400 a month. It was only the other day that, soon after the Hon. Leader of the House had spoken in Sinhalese, the Reporter was found massaging his arm. That gives an indication of the strenuous nature of the work of these Reporters,

and with the present inflationary tendencies of currency, their pay is comparatively low. I would earnestly request, in view of the vast importance of their work, that they be given a status that is commensurate with the type of work they do.

Lastly, may I point out that you have been very considerate to Members in trying to secure clerical assistance for them in the shape of two typists—*[Interruption]*—the hon. Member for Dehiowita (Mr. A. Reginald Perera) is asking whether they are pretty. Whatever that may be—

Mr. Dahanayake: Let their work be pretty.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: We welcome your endeavours to give every comfort to hon. Members. But there is a small snag in this proposal. It will mean that, as in the case of the Peons and Messengers now, these two typists will have to be at the beck and call of all hon. Members, and in the end they will have no work during the day, because all the hon. Members will be trying to employ them; that is the unfortunate position into which they will be reduced. I make the alternative suggestion that hon. Members be given an additional allowance of Rs. 25 or Rs. 30, so that members belonging to certain Parties may pool their resources and employ a clerk to do their Party work and attend to the correspondence relating to their constituencies.

These are the few points I would like to bring to your notice, as the Head of this House, and I am sure they will receive your attention.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: May I just say a few words? I want to reply to the hon. Member for Ruwanwella (Dr. Perera).

The Chairman: I am sorry to see that hon. Members think that I am hard-hearted. I am not. As a matter of fact, I put certain proposals to the Treasury; some of them have been accepted, and some of them have been turned down.

As regards the principle involved, as stated by the hon. Member for Ruwanwella, the remedy is in your hands. Unfortunately for us, in the Privileges Bill, the Speaker has not been given financial power over the salaries of the personnel, except to put up whomsoever

he thinks should be put up on the existing scales, whether he has served one year or two years; I can put officers up in certain segments of the scales. That is about all the power I have got where finances are concerned.

As for anything further, I do not want matters to be brought up and for the Treasury to have a veto over them. If you wish to amend the Privileges Bill or bring in a new Privileges Bill, giving the Speaker the power to adjust the salaries as he thinks they should be adjusted, then it is an entirely different matter. At the present moment the only power I have is to adjust the segments of the scale allowed to each officer of the House. I have done so in every instance which has been brought to my notice, either by the officer, or through the Clerk of the House, and where certain adjustments should have been made, I have never hesitated for a moment to adjust those scales.

As regards the Telephone Operator, I am sorry to say that I did put up a certain proposal that the salary should be increased, at least to that of the Female Telephonist of the Governor-General's Office, but it was turned down; from their point of view, rightly, too, because the position taken up by the Government is this, that if we put up the salaries of our staff, those same adjustments will have to be made in the salary scales of various other Departments, like the Senate and other places. But I pointed out that the salary scale of the Female Telephonist at Queen's House who has much less work, should be given to the Telephone Operator here. That was turned down.

I also made certain suggestions to the Treasury for the convenience of the Members who now, at every turn, try to make a slave of my Librarian, giving him twenty-four hours' work for the day. I put up certain proposals, because I found that hon. Members of this House did require clerical assistance, especially in view of the fact that there is no Leader of the Opposition legally appointed, who would get the clerical assistance and other assistance on behalf of the Opposition of the House. That is again your fault, and not mine, for not appointing a Leader. If you do, you would have clerical assistance and everything else you

[The Chairman.]

As a matter of fact, I put up certain proposals to the Treasury in order that Members of this House would be able to have that clerical assistance available here, because I know hon. Members get up from their seats and go to the Library or to some room and do their clerical work themselves. From my point of view, I felt that it was not correct; so I put up certain proposals to the Treasury, but those proposals are turned down, and instead of those proposals, they have given us, as the hon. Member for Chavakachcheri mentioned, two clerk-typists. Under Sub-head 2, "Allowances to Members", you will find Rs. 4,512 provided for that purpose; it is an Amendment that the Hon. Minister of Finance is bringing forward; you will find in the Amendments Sheet an Amendment to increase the Vote by Rs. 4,512 to give us two clerk-typists. On the other page, you will find another sum of Rs. 1,000, under Sub-head 4, which is meant for the purchase of typewriters for the typists. Of course, the proposal I put forward was entirely different to this, but I have to be satisfied with what I have been able to get from the Treasury, and if you require any more assistance and bring it to my notice, I can put it to the Treasury, and I dare say they will consider the matter and give you what you need.

On the broad principle, the matter is entirely in your hands; I have nothing more to say about that.

As regards the Reporters, there I can say this, that in cases where an increment was necessary, I have looked into every single case, and I have always put them up and given them an increment. I have done so, and I do not think there is any heart-burning on the part of the Staff where that is concerned. Of course, they would like to draw larger salaries, but, in practice, you have to keep the Stenographer class in this House in the same position as Stenographers of the other Departments. But I do believe that Stenographers in this House are paid a little more than Government Stenographers. So that, on that point, I do not think that they have any cause to grumble.

But I certainly think that some of the minor staff might have been given a little more. You find that there are

so many Messengers—ten Messengers. I suggested that those Messengers be separated into two different classes, because I find that those Messengers who joined the Staff after the last Budget draw the same salary as those who have served for twenty, thirty years. I felt that that was not correct. So I wanted two sections for the Messengers, but that has been turned down—

Mr. Dahanayake: But the Treasury should be turned out.

The Chairman: Then, again, I want to mention—so that you may not think that I am unmindful of the interests of the Staff—the case of the Arachchi. I wanted to give him the allowance which the Arachchi of the old State Council received here. You will notice that one Messenger gets an allowance of Rs. 120 a year, that is, Rs. 10 a month.

That happens to be a Messenger who is working directly under me in my office. That was an allowance which was given to him under the regime of the last Speaker. The late Arachchi, who joined the Senate, draws Rs. 20 a month. As you are aware, the Arachchi of this House has much more work than the Arachchi of the other place. As you are aware, he is supervising the Refreshment Room, the Buffet, and so on, I put his case up to the Treasury, and the Treasury has been fit to give him only an allowance of Rs. 90, that is Rs. 7.50 a month.

Dr. Perera: The Treasury has no control over this House.

The Chairman: I am sorry I have no further control over these matters. So that I may make my position perfectly clear, I have stated those facts in order that you may draw any conclusion you like.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: Regarding the Reporters, the question is not so much one of increase of salary as of increase of staff.

The Chairman: I may say that I have looked into this matter very carefully. If we get more staff, my own opinion is that, during certain seasons of the year, they have little work to do—

Dr. Perera: Not in the future, Sir.

The Chairman: At present, when we are hard pressed, we even appeal to the Senate and get their Reporters to help them. Having looked into the matter carefully, I do not think that they can have cause to grumble. We are fully staffed, and I think there are sufficient Reporters. As you are aware, we have now got two Sinhalese Reporters, and they practically do nothing, except at the time I allow an hon. Member to speak in Sinhalese. What I do want to say is that we have got in the Budget this year an extra Rs. 5,000 to get at least a couple of persons, not on the permanent staff, but whenever required, for sub-editing the reports that are issued by the Reporters. That work, too, is being done by the Reporting Staff now, and I feel that is far too much work for them. As you are aware, what takes place in the House today we try to bring out tomorrow. All the sub-editing is done by the Staff. So I have asked for assistance of that nature, and I am glad to say that the Treasury has given us Rs. 5,000 for that purpose this year. I believe the Hon. Minister of Finance will tell the House the difficulties in the way of giving us all that we have asked for.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: May I move my Amendment? I can speak on my Amendment and the Amendments that have been brought forward.

The Chairman: Amendments are brought forward only to draw the attention of the House to certain matters. Hon. Members are withdrawing all those Amendments.

Sub-head 2.—Allowances to Members, Rs. 547,200.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I move, "That the Vote be increased by Rs. 4,512 in respect of sub-head 2."

You have referred, Sir, to an increase in the allowance paid to Members by Rs. 25 a month, but after consultation between the Prime Minister and myself, we decided that, instead of paying each Member Rs. 25 a month, it might be better if we provided actual clerical assistance—

Dr. Perera: One for the Government side and one for the Opposition?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Not to be allocated either to the Government or to the Opposition, but to be allocated to all Members of the House. The reason why we thought it better was that the same amount of work would be placed on the Librarian of the House. Further, Members may not have typewriters and shorthand-typists to do their work, and Rs. 25 would not provide them with those facilities. Once they come here, they will have the typewriters and the shorthand-typists. We thought all Members would be better served and that is why we suggested this additional sum of Rs. 4,512.

The hon. Member for Ruwanwella (Dr. Perera) has raised a very important point to which you, Sir, have referred. I do not know exactly what he means when he says that the Vote of the House of Representatives should be independent of the Government—the Minister of Finance and the Treasury. If he makes himself clearer, it may be possible for Government to express their views on what he has said. But, as long as the Constitution is what it is, and the Treasury and the Minister of Finance and the Cabinet have got to decide finally as to what matters should enter into the Estimates, I do not think we can abdicate our functions. According to our conscience, certainly, we have decided with regard to the matters that have come up from the Hon. the Speaker. We will adopt the procedure of personally consulting him before coming to a decision.

2.30 P.M.

In this instance, the Hon. Prime Minister and myself saw Mr. Speaker with regard to the suggestions that had emanated from his office, and I think it is with his agreement that we have included in the Estimates matters that now appear before hon. Members.

The hon. Member for Ruwanwella would be quite right in what he says if he puts into practice what he says. I take it that the Senate is also an integral part of our Constitution, and as long as it is so, I do not see how those who are so keen on preserving the rights and functions and powers of our Constitution should seek to abolish the Senate.

Dr. Perera: Why not?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: That is only one matter.

I think the hon. Member's point was that the Speaker should be above the influence of the Government. But, surely, the Speaker must have some furniture for his official residence. The Government has provided a sum of Rs. 75,000 for your furniture, Mr. Chairman, and here the very hon. Member, who says that the Government should have nothing to do with the Votes proposed by the Speaker, is proposing that the whole of the sum of Rs. 75,000 be deleted.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: With a higher motive.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I do not know what the motive is. It is rather incongruous that the Hon. Member should say that the Minister of Finance and the Cabinet should have nothing to do with matters concerning the Hon. Speaker.

The Chairman: The hon. Member for Ruwanwella said that the House should have the right to delete any Motion of the Speaker, not anybody else. That is the point.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: That the House should have the right?

Dr. Perera: Yes, not the Cabinet.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: The Hon. Minister will have to withdraw what he said.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: In other words, it means that the Opposition should have the right, but not the Government.

Dr. Perera: No, the whole House.

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: To act without a Party.

The Chairman: The Speaker is above Parties.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I maintain that the effect of what the hon. Member for Ruwanwella says, if it is put into effect, is that the Opposition will have the right to delete, but not

the Government, because the Government cannot bring in a Motion to reduce the Estimates, that it is only the Opposition that can.

The Chairman: But any hon. Member of the back-benches can.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: But they cannot do it in opposition to the Government. Anyway, I do not want to discuss the matter. Until the hon. Member for Ruwanwella gives us notice of a specific Motion, or unless the Constitution is changed, we have to perform our functions. Otherwise, the first person to pull us up for giving the Speaker "Mumtaz Mahal", or Rs. 75,000 worth of furniture, would be the hon. Member for Ruwanwella.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: There is one remark I would like to make. I do not think there has been any disagreement or any dispute with regard to the status of the Speaker or any intention on the part of the Government not to recognize his position as Speaker. I feel that it is necessary, as long as the Budget has got to be presented by Government and they have got to be responsible for it, and as long as it forms a part of the one Ordinance which, if thrown out, means the dissolution of the House, that the Cabinet should have the right to decide certain matters. If that right is taken away and a special law is provided, it is a different matter. Supposing the Speaker makes certain proposals which are accepted by the Cabinet and the House turns them down, what happens?

Mr. Kumaraswamy: Resign.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: And resign without any—

Dr. Perera: No.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: If there is resignation, the whole Government has to go. I am not against any law being enacted—as in the case of the Governor-General's salary—to protect anyone's salary, nor am I against any salary being fixed by law. But as long as the responsibility is placed on the Cabinet to decide these questions, it has to discuss the question

of expenditure and indicate what the difficulties are to the parties concerned. as has been done in this instance with the Hon. Speaker, and come to what both parties consider, a reasonable agreement.

After all, it is quite easy for us, when we meet stenographers or librarians or peons to be naturally sympathetic to them. And one would feel sympathetic, specially when these people are very attentive to us, and be disposed to be very generous with Government money. I am not speaking of individuals; I am saying this—

Mr. Dahanayake: Give them a living wage.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I believe a living wage is a thing that every Government servant expects, not only these people. I think there must be a sense of proportion. After all, we ourselves sometimes consider that as we are elected by the people, we are of a higher status. It may be that some of us may think that, since our status has been raised, that the status of our servants and every one else must be raised without any consideration of the salaries paid to other people.

We must have a contented Public Service as far as we could manage it. This is not a dispute between the Speaker and ourselves, and I can assure the House that we have discussed the proposals and placed before the Speaker the difficulties we had, and he has himself explained to you what the trouble was. That is all that I want to say. If you want to have a law which enables the Speaker to fix salaries, that is quite a different matter.

Dr. Perera: May I explain the position?

It will be remembered, as a matter of fact, that all the officers we had in the State Council were part of the normal Government Service, in the sense that the clerical servants formed part of the Clerical Service and could be transferred from station to station. We separated them from that and established a new service confined to the House of Representatives. Why was that done? This is the most important democratic body in this country. Now, that is true of all legislatures.

The position I am taking up is this, that once the Speaker decides on the question of salaries, the number of people that are wanted, the nature of service, and so on, it is not for the Treasury to turn the proposals down. That is my point, that if that is done, the executive has more power than the legislative body. The legislative body must be independent of the executive. It is a vital principle that is involved. It is for this House, when a proposal comes forward—as a matter of fact, the Vote for the House of Representatives is no longer a Party matter, it is a matter for the legislature as a whole—to decide the question. That is not because it emanates from a non-Party man.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Then the Government can vote against it.

Dr. Perera: Certainly, the Government can vote against it just as much as any back-bencher can vote for it.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: The case of the Senate is the same.

Dr. Perera: I cannot understand the Hon. Minister of Finance. He does not understand simple logic.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I cannot.

Dr. Perera: The Senate is on an entirely different footing. The question of whether this whole Government should be run on a unicameral or bicameral basis is a matter which should be decided by this House, which is the final authority.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: No.

Dr. Perera: That is why the question does not arise. It is a matter of higher policy whether we should have one Chamber or two Chambers.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: The question does not arise on the Budget.

Dr. Perera: It is a fact that we cut salaries. But that does not prevent the Senate from sitting. They can still continue to sit if they want.

Mr. H. Sri Nissanka (Kurunegala): Without pay.

Dr. Perera: That question does not arise.

The example given you was very important. The Speaker thought that giving clerical assistance to hon. Members by the provision of two clerks would not meet the purpose, because 101 members would go and pester these two men at all times of the day. How many letters can they write? How many items of correspondence—there are various reports of Committees to be distributed; amendments to the Budget, for instance—and other matters could these two people attend to? It would be utterly impossible for two people to do that work. As against that, if the proposal you put forward was accepted—and there are various groups—the various groups could have pooled the allowance and appointed their own clerk—7 or 8 Members to have one clerk. From the point of view of Members, this would be cheaper.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: And sensible and practical.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Why not ask for an increased allowance, Rs. 600 to 700?

Dr. Perera: That is right. That is one way of tackling this question, and it is for the House to decide. It is likely that it will emanate from the Speaker, who is the correct authority. I hope the position is fairly clear to the Hon. Minister of Finance. I do not want the Government to sit in judgment and veto proposals emanating from the Speaker of this House; that should be done by this House and nobody else. That is the principle.

If you will permit me, there is one point which the Hon. Prime Minister raised. He said that since there was no law—it may be true that there is no law at the moment, but there is no Government that has not copied tradition; even the Socialists of England have copied tradition and maintained it—nothing could be done. But why cannot we maintain that principle and copy tradition?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: The British Constitution is different.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Do you want the British or the Russian method?

Dr. Perera: The Hon. Prime Minister is not prepared to accept Russian tradition. He wishes to have British tradition. Let us have it.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Leave it to us.

The Chairman: Does the hon. Member withdraw his Amendment?

Mudaliyar Ebrahim: Yes.

Question, “That the Vote be increased by Rs. 4,512 in respect of sub-head 2”, put, and agreed to.

Sub-head 4.—Stationery, office furniture and office requisites. Rs. 16,000.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I move, “That the Vote be increased by Rs. 1,000 in respect of sub-head 4”.

I see that the hon. Member for Matugama thinks it is unnecessary and wants the amount provided in the Estimates reduced.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: Cannot we save on this item in regard to the printing of the Orders of the Day?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: What are you going to print these things on?

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: Paper obviously. Can we not reduce the amount on printing?

I move, “That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 1,000 in respect of sub-head 4”.

The Chairman: As regards that question, I wish to say that I have had various letters from Members about the inadequacy of the stationery that is issued to them at present. I know that, in the case of certain Members, they write about 200 or 300 letters a month, and that for the considerable amount of work they do the stationery issued to them is not enough. A number of complaints have been made to the House Committee, and we decided that

for the moment the same amount of stationery should be given, and that if any hon. Member required anything further we would be willing to grant it on application.

Dr. Perera: The hon. Member for Matugama is not raising that question. I think we are all agreed that there is really a lot of difficulty where stationery is concerned. I find it difficult to get small envelopes and small letter heads.

I think the hon. Member for Matugama has raised another question about the Orders of the Day with which I do not agree. There are many Orders of the Day printed. But that is a different matter.

Mr. Sri Nissanka: As far as envelopes are concerned, there is no gum on the flap.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: That is questioning the Speaker.

Dr. Perera: This House is entitled to question the Government.

The Chairman: Does the hon. Member for Matugama withdraw his Amendment?

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera Yes.

Question, "That the Vote be increased by Rs. 1,000 in respect of sub-head 4", put, and agreed to.

Sub-head 5.—Expenses of Committees, &c., Rs. 10,000.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 5 in respect of sub-head 5". There is a Committee known as the Petitions Committee. That is a standing joke, for the simple reason—

The Chairman: I think that is a reflection on that Committee. The hon. Member must withdraw that remark.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I withdraw it. But I wish to state that I never intended to cast aspersions on the personnel of the Committee, which is composed of men of high calibre and—

The Chairman: To term a Committee a joke is not right.

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: A joke is a serious thing!

2.45 P.M.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: When a petition is submitted to that Committee, what happens is, as happened the other day, a statement is issued to us to the effect that the petition was considered and that it may be referred to a particular Minister. Surely, the petitioner can forward the petition direct to the Minister?

The Chairman: The hon. Member is out of Order in reflecting on the findings of a Committee. If he wishes to say anything about the findings of a Committee, he must do so by way of substantive Motion. I cannot allow criticism of the work of a Committee.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: The point is whether it is necessary for this Committee to meet at all.

The Chairman: I might say that in these matters petitions are sent to this House only as a last resort, when people cannot get relief from anybody else. Otherwise, there is no need for petitioning this House. The Committee go through a petition, and they find that certain action has been taken while there is certain further action which might be taken by a Minister.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: That is exactly my point, that the Ministers have not taken certain action.

The Chairman: That is why we refer the petition to the Minister.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: The people who should be blamed are the Ministers.

The Chairman: The Committee have no executive power to look into any allegations made in a petition. So we send it to the authority concerned. When this House refers a matter to a Minister, unlike a petition sent direct by a person, I am sure the Minister will give due consideration to the petition sent by the House.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I hope the Ministers will act on that advice.

[Mr. Kumaraswamy.]

The next point I wish to mention is the undue delay that occurs in publishing certain reports, I refer particularly to the Report of the Budget Leakage Committee. The Committee was appointed to inquire into the leakage of Budget secrets of last year, and it would have been in the best interests of the country if that particular Report had been issued before the introduction of the Budget this year. Unfortunately, hon. Members did not have the benefit of the views expressed by the Members of that Committee before the introduction of the present Budget, as a result of delay in publishing the Report.

The Chairman: I might mention that there was no delay whatsoever. As the proceedings of the Committee were going on, the matter was set up in type and we had the Report brought out directly the Committee reported.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I am glad to hear that from you, Sir.

I withdraw my Amendment.

Sub-head 11.—Furniture and running expenses of "Sravasti", Club and Hostel for Members of Parliament, Rs. 50,000.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 5 in respect of sub-head 11".

I find, Sir, that "Sravasti" is being converted into a dormitory, and when I dropped in there one day I found four Disavas packed in one room. There is no doubt that you are concerned with the interests and welfare of Members, and I feel that a hostel provided for Members of this House should have all the necessary facilities and amenities, and that four or five Members should not be packed into one room to share it with a Member who would be snoring loud. [Laughter]. I would request hon. Members not to treat this matter lightly, because I am one of those victims driven out of "Sravasti" by snoring.

Then, Sir, I remember there was a suggestion—I hope you will correct me if I am wrong—of providing a conveyance between this House and "Sravasti". So far no conveyance has been provided, and I hope that steps will be taken to provide one soon.

Another point is that the charges at "Sravasti" are fairly high. I was informed by Members who had to foot the bill last week that the charges were high.

I hope you will look into these matters and see that these facilities are provided.

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: Is it possible to have separate dormitories, one for Disavas and one for law students?

Mr. Kumaraswamy: There should be a special room for benighted Knights.

Mr. Dahanayake: I feel that we are spending far too much on "Sravasti". We should set the example of plain living and high thinking, I feel the cost of equipment has been far too much, and we would have been satisfied with furniture and equipment that was more modest. Members never asked for luxury quarters, and I do hope the Government will not make the mistake of making "Sravasti" luxury quarters.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I think there was an application for a lift. I do not know whether the Member is withdrawing that application.

Mr. Dahanayake: We, Members of the Opposition, have much more important things to do, and valuable time spent in climbing a large number of stairs can be saved. If you go and look at the place, you will see that it looks like a dreamy palace, only matched by the splendour and brilliance of "Mumtaz Mahal".

The Chairman: Lest hon. Members should get a wrong impression, may I say the furniture supplied to "Sravasti" is furniture made locally by Government depots and chiefly by the Prison Department? We did not buy a single bit of furniture from outside. So that the furniture is not so elegant as the hon. Member for Galle tried to make out. It is true that there is a new coat of polish or paint on the furniture and the furniture looks very nice. I hope hon. Members who inhabit the place will keep the furniture nice.

As regards snoring, I do not know whether it is a reflection on hon. Members, but I would say that if any hon. Members are disturbed by the snoring of others, there are single rooms on the ground floor where they can sleep without being disturbed.

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: They are said to be haunted.

The Chairman: I am sure hon. Members are clever enough to drive away all ghosts.

As regards a conveyance, it is my intention to apply for one later on, but, as things are, I must inform the House that we are running "Sravasti" at a loss. Though hon. Members spoke of high charges, I would tell them that last month we did not get sufficient money to pay the salaries of the staff of "Sravasti".

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: We predicted that.

The Chairman: I do not mind running it at a small loss, and I am sure the Government will not mind running it at a small loss, but not at a big loss, because there must be certain conveniences provided for Members who come from outstations. If I find "Sravasti" well patronized, I shall then consider the question of providing a conveyance. Until then, I am afraid, I cannot increase the staff or recommend the installation of a lift or ask for any other amenities.

If hon. Members will look at the matter very carefully, without exaggeration, they will find that they get the bare necessities of life and no luxuries whatsoever.

We have been fortunate enough to get a gentleman on Rs. 100 a month to run that place when he is worth over Rs. 1,000 a month. By special request he has agreed to come and look after the place. You cannot get a person like that for less than Rs. 1,500 a month. I know that he was paid Rs. 2,000 in a Colombo hotel.

I hope hon. Members will patronize the place more and that the hon. Member for Galle will induce his Friends of the Opposition to patronize the place more.

Dr. Perera: The only reason why I gave notice of my Amendment to reduce the vote by Rs. 50,000 was that the same amount was provided last year.

The Chairman: Practically the whole of that vote has been exhausted. There is a sum of about Rs. 4,000 left, and that is sufficient to enable us to run the place till September.

Dr. Perera: In other words, you want Rs. 100,000 for "Sravasti".

The Chairman: No. Rs. 50,000 is wanted as running expenses for next year. We want to get a grant from Government of Rs. 50,000, which they have consented to give, so that we can run "Sravasti" on that vote and credit the revenue we get to that vote.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: When am I to move the amendments to the legend?

The Chairman: It is not necessary to move the amendments to the legend. That statement has been tabled for information.

Another reason why I asked for a grant was that I thought there might be legal implications, and someone might say that there was a contract between an hon. Member and Government. To obviate that I asked for a grant.

Hon. Members are not pressing their Amendments?

Mr. Kumaraswamy: No.

Dr. Perera: No.

Sub-head 14.—Purchase of furniture and equipment for official residence of Speaker, Rs. 75,000.

Dr. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 75,000 in respect of sub-head 14".

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Withdraw!

Dr. Perera: I do not know why I should be asked to withdraw this Amendment. There is nothing wrong in opposing something. I move this Amendment as a matter of principle.

[Dr. Perera.]

We do not feel that the country should be called upon to pay for furnishing and equipping the residence of the Speaker. That is the position we take up, and that is the only reason why I move this Amendment. There is no personal reflection on you, Sir.

The Chairman: Not at all.

Dr. Perera: It is purely as a matter of principle that I move the Amendment. You will remember that, last year, we were opposed to the taking over of "Sra-vasti" on the same ground. We thought it too expensive, and, as a matter of fact, we suggested that a section of the Echelon Barracks, which is close to this House, may be leased out. On the same basis we are not disposed to spending Rs. 75,000 for the purpose of furnishing and equipping the official residence of the Speaker. That is the position we take up.

Mr. Dahanayake: It strikes me that some of the improvements may be of a permanent nature. Therefore, I would like to know whether the Government has any intention of purchasing this property.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: There is nothing here about purchasing.

Mr. Dahanayake: The improvements you try to introduce through this vote may be of a permanent nature.

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: Such as?

Mr. Dahanayake: Structural alterations to the building.

The Chairman: I might say that this vote has been allowed to remain in error. I applied for Rs. 75,000 for equipment plus a certain amount for acquisition of the whole premises. The Government turned down the proposal to acquire the house this year, but they allowed this vote of Rs. 75,000 for equipment to remain in error. Such a large sum is not necessary, and I would be perfectly satisfied if there was a small sum like Rs. 5,000, for purchase of equipment, such as the replacement of curtains, and so on. Such a large sum is not necessary unless the building is acquired, and

the furniture which is there, which is worth about a lakh of rupees, is purchased.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: There were two items; one for the purchase of furniture, and the other for purchasing the house. The latter was deleted.

Dr. Perera: May I move an Amendment to reduce the vote to Rs. 5,000?

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: Not the Opposition.

The Chairman: I suggested it.

3.0 P.M.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Would my hon. Friend withdraw the Amendment?

The Chairman: I invite the Hon. Minister of Finance to do it.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: The hon. Member is for deleting the item of Rs. 75,000.

Dr. Perera: On the explanation of the Hon. Speaker, I am prepared to amend my Amendment; that is, to reduce the figure by Rs. 70,000. If you think that is going to affect your personal prestige, I do not mind it.

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: When this question came up, once with regard to Loan Funds and again here, it was indicated to us that the house of the Hon. Speaker had to be furnished. If that furniture is removed today by the owner of the house, the house will have to be re-furnished. In such an event, money would have to be obtained to purchase new furniture. If the house is to be taken on with the furniture, then it is our duty to see that this amount is reduced. Therefore, at your request, Sir, we suggest reducing the amount. We do not want the Opposition to move a reduction, because it was at your request that we put the item in the Estimates.

The Chairman: The Hon. Minister of Finance might move the reduction of the sub-head from Rs. 75,000 to Rs. 5,000.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I am not prepared to move the reduction of the sub-head. Let it be in the Estimates, and if it is not wanted, it will not be spent.

Dr. Perera: That is not the correct procedure to follow.

Mr. Amarasuriya: I do not think there is any point in purchasing the furniture if the house is not to be acquired. The furniture should be acquired with the house. I do not think the present owner of the house will remove the furniture, because the rent has been fixed on the footing that the furniture will be available to you.

The Chairman: Supposing the owner takes the house back, he would take the house and the furniture.

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: Then there would be no furniture.

Mr. Amarasuriya: We can come for a Supplementary Vote at any time.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I do not like that.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: There is no final decision with regard to the acquiring of that property.

The Chairman: That is what I said.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: It may be that, during the course of the year, we may have to acquire the property, so it might be necessary for us to have this money.

The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike: Let the money remain where it is.

The Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Dahanayake: What is the present position? Much of the talk has taken place in whispers.

The Chairman: The present position is that the Government states that it may be able to start proceedings for the purchase of the property before long this year. In that case the Rs. 75,000 must be here. That is why the value of the furniture is shown here. We are

not spending any money. But, in case the house is taken away from the Speaker, then the Government will have to give the Speaker a house.

Dr. Perera: Will not the whole amount come from Loan Funds?

The Chairman: No, it will not come from Loan Funds.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: If this money is not required this year, we will not spend it. It is only in case it becomes necessary that we should like to have it; otherwise we will be put to a great deal of inconvenience when the money is actually wanted.

The Chairman: Only a sum of Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000 will be necessary.

The vote might remain on the understanding that only a sum of about Rs. 4,000 will be spent.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Yes.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 1,224,827 for Head 6, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule," put, and agreed to.

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

Head 7.—Judicial Service Commission

Vote No. 1.—Salaries and Expenses of the Judicial Service Commission, Rs. 65,161.

Sub-head 1.—Personal Emoluments, Rs. 50,561.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I move, "That the Vote be increased by Rs. 840 in respect of sub-head 1, item, 'Clerks—General Clerical Service.'"

This money is required for extra clerks.

Dr. Perera: That would not preclude us from raising a few questions on this sub-head. I am subject to your Ruling, but, Sir, there has been a certain amount of disquiet in this country over the resignation of the Secretary of the Judicial Service Commission. There have been certain misgivings that everything is not all right in the Judicial Service Commission. I would like, if it is

[Dr. Perera.]

possible, for the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Hon. Minister of Justice, to make a statement as to the position of the working of the Judicial Service Commission. It has been stated that the Secretary of the Judicial Service Commission, who resigned and went back to the Bench, I think,—and now apparently he is on leave—did so because of differences of policy, or because of the manner in which the Judicial Service Commission functions. I should like to have some information from the hon. Parliamentary Secretary with regard to the actual position created by the resignation of the Secretary of the Judicial Service Commission.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Before the hon. Parliamentary Secretary answers the question, there is one thing that I should like to mention. That is that the Judicial Service Commission is an independent body. It is a body that has been created under our law, and it is that Commission itself that chooses its Secretary to serve on it. As far as we are concerned, we have not heard any rumours that there has been a quarrel between the Judicial Service Commission and its Secretary.

Dr. Perera: It may have been with the Hon. Minister of Justice.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: No, we have not heard anything about it. I cannot understand what my hon. Friend wants to know. If there was any quarrel, it must have been between the Judicial Service Commission and the Secretary.

The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike: As far as we are aware, there is no difference. All is well with the rest of the world.

Dr. Perera: Will the hon. Parliamentary Secretary be in a position to state whether the Secretary of the Judicial Service Commission resigned on a difference or a question of policy between the Hon. Minister of Justice and the Secretary?

Mr. G. R. de Silva: Certainly not, because the Secretary of the Judicial Service Commission is appointed by that Commission and they are responsible to

the Ministry. As a matter of fact, the Hon. Minister of Justice has certain functions which he performs, while the Judicial Service Commission has entirely different functions to perform. It is so constituted that they are independent of each other.

Mr. T. B. Subasinghe (Bingiriya): Can the hon. Parliamentary Secretary explain why the Secretary of the Commission was transferred after such a short period of service?

Mr. G. R. de Silva: It was only at his request. The Secretary of the Commission resigned and went back as Magistrate. We are not aware of what has happened, because it is a matter entirely outside our scope.

The Chairman: He is on leave now.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I should like to ask a question on this sub-head.

The Hon. Mr. Goonesinha: What is the question?

The Chairman: I do not think the hon. Member can raise a question of policy, because there is nobody to defend the Judicial Service Commission. But on the question of salaries, the hon. Member may raise questions.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I am referring to the question of acting appointments.

The Chairman: That is a question of policy.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: At what stage can I raise that question?

The Chairman: The hon. Member will remember that nothing can be done with regard to the administration of justice except by way of a substantive Motion. It cannot be done by an Amendment or in any other way.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I find that the Hon. Minister of Justice has made certain appointments.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: What appointments?

Mr. Kumaraswamy: Acting appointments.

The Chairman: No, it is the Judicial Service Commission that makes such appointments.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: If I am right, the Hon. Minister of Justice told me that all these appointments are made under powers delegated to the Secretary of the Commission.

Mr. G. R. de Silva: In the case of acting appointments, the power is vested in the Minister, but he has delegated that power to the Secretary of the Judicial Service Commission.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I think you will allow me to continue now what I have to say on the question of acting appointments. Actually, the power is vested in the Hon. Minister. With regard to acting appointments, what I was trying to say was this.

The Chairman: The hon. Member may bring that question up when we come to the votes of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: Yes, I shall do that.

The Chairman: Will the Hon. Minister of Finance move his next Amendment?

Question, "That the Vote be increased by Rs. 840 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Clerks—General Clerical Service', put, and agreed to.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I move, "That the Vote be increased by Rs. 63 in respect of sub-head 1, item "Rent Allowance." "

Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 66,064 for Head 7, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 7, Vote 1, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 8.—Public Service Commission

Vote No. 1.—Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Public Service Commission, Rs. 148,100.

Dr. Perera: We are in a bit of a difficulty. I do not know what really

is the position. Apparently, the Public Service Commission is independent, but I should think there should be some provision by which elected Members of this House would have an opportunity of expressing certain doubts about appointments they have and drawing the attention of the Public Service Commission to them. We think there may be mistakes that they have made.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: On a point of Order, is the hon. Member entitled to speak on this matter, because he has not mentioned the exact item with which he wants to deal? He merely says, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 with regard to sub-head 1," which refers to Personal Emoluments. He can speak on my Motion if he wishes to speak.

Dr. Perera: If you will permit me, Sir—

The Chairman: Let the Hon. Minister move his Amendment.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I move the following Amendments: "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 6,000, in respect of sub-head 1, item Assistant 'Secretary, P.S.C. etc.' "

"That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 450 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Rent Allowance' "

The Public Service Commission needs an Assistant Secretary at present.

3.15 P.M.

Dr. Perera: I am placing this matter before the House for its consideration, because I am one of those who are very reluctant to interfere with appointments whatsoever. Even during the time of the last State Council, we strongly resented the power that the Executive Committees had, but there are occasions, however, when I think that we, as elected Members, should have the right to get certain wrongs redressed, and that we should be in a position to state that the independent body you have established is going wrong here, and that they should correct it—by way rather of getting the Public Service Commission to appreciate the point of view of the public. After all, our duty is to make every Government Department feel the

[Dr. Perera.]
full impact of their actions on the public. Therefore, we, as representing the public, must be in a position to put in that point of view. That is the position that I would like to place before the House.

I have two or three appointments in mind where certain doubts have been expressed by various members of the public, and I feel that there is some justification. . . .

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Might I rise to a point of Order? I am wondering whether the general question of whether the Public Service Commission should continue or should have these powers, could be discussed here. I do not think that, as long as that is an independent body and remains outside the control of politicians, any reference to it could be made here, or instances cited or any criticism made on any individual cases.

The Chairman: The hon. Member was not criticizing the Public Service Commission.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: It was at that point when the hon. Member stated that he had three or four cases in mind that I rose to a point of Order.

Dr. Perera: I did not specifically mention anyone. All that I am expressing is that there are certain misgivings—I do not know. I should like to throw out a suggestion, whether they should not provide some means by which those misgivings could be settled by the Public Service Commission. I, for one, would like to place that point of view before the Government, whether it is not desirable that the Legislature should be given this right of making certain criticisms and, if necessary, even to suggest amending the Ordinance. That is for the Government to decide.

I am entirely in favour of letting no elected Member have any hand or finger in the pie of appointments. I am prepared to accept that on the same basis as I supported the L.G.S.C. But, still, I think that it is desirable that we, the elected Members, should have a chance

of placing our point of view where we think certain mistakes have been committed. That is the point I should like to place before the House. I am not going to say anything more.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: All that I want to say is this. Now that we have constituted this body, let us give it a trial and see whether it is advisable for us to continue this independent Public Service Commission or to abolish it. Of course, in any new thing that is to be tried out, there is always a desire for change. Now I remember, for instance, in the morning my good Friend, the hon. Third Member for Colombo Central saying that politicians should not have anything to do with public servants but that a body should be created for the purpose, and now that a body has been created they say, "Let us have a change".

Dr. Perera: I am not suggesting a change.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Human desire being what it is, it is always eager for a change. After all, it is a weakness of human beings. So all that I ask is, why not give it a chance?

Mr. Dahanayake: Sir, I want to raise another matter, that is, the functions of this Commission, and the manner in which those functions are exercised are a matter of grave concern and anxiety to all members of the Public Service. Under the old regime, when a member of the Public Service was dismissed by the Head of his Department, he had a right of appeal to the Chief Secretary; and if he failed to obtain redress, he thereupon had a right of appeal to the Governor; and if he failed to obtain redress through the Governor, he had a right of appeal to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Now, under the new regime, the position is not clear.

I have in mind certain instances in which public servants with genuine grievances, instances in which public servants had been dismissed, have sought in vain to get the hearing of the public Service Commission. Today if the Head of a Department dismisses a public servant, that public servant appeals in the first instance to the Permanent Secretary, and thereafter, if the

Permanent Secretary is not prepared to grant that public servant redress he makes his final appeal to the Public Service Commission.

I want to stress this, Mr. Chairman, that inasmuch as the four sources to which an appeal could have been made have been reduced to three, greater care and diligence should be exercised by the Public Service Commission, particularly in regard to dismissals. It has, however, been my unfortunate experience to come across cases in which the Public Service Commission has merely sent the formal reply, "The Commission is unable to intervene". I am quoting the very words of the Secretary of the Commission—"the Commission is unable to intervene".

Then, Sir, under those circumstances, to whom is there an appeal? To God Almighty, Mr. Chairman? If an aggrieved public servant has failed to obtain redress through the Permanent Secretary and is told by the Commission that the Commission is unable to intervene, what is he to do?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Under what circumstances was he told that?

Mr. Dahanayake: He was dismissed, Mr. Chairman. He made an appeal against the Head of his Department to the Permanent Secretary—I will give more details of this instance—and the Permanent Secretary turned it down. He made a second appeal to the Permanent Secretary, and the Permanent Secretary held an inquiry and that Permanent Secretary was pulled up by the Public Service Commission for arrogating to himself the powers of the Public Service Commission. Thereafter this aggrieved public servant appealed to the Public Service Commission, and the reply he received was that "the Public Service Commission is unable to intervene".

I have related the details of this case in order to indicate to the Government, the very fearful consequences that may arise, if the procedure that a dismissed public servant has got to pursue is not made clear. Today there is greater chance, I say, of victimisation of public servants through dismissal than there was under the old regime. Many a

public servant has made an appeal to a Minister, only to be told, "I have nothing to do in the matter", and I know of public servants who have written to the Public Service Commission, asking it, "Can I be allowed to be represented before the Commission by a lawyer or by some friend who will place the facts of my case more lucidly than I have been able to place in my petition". Even that request has been turned down.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: What is it that you suggest?

Mr. Dahanayake: I ask whether the Public Service Commission, as it functions today, has become a law unto itself, a Star Chamber? There is certainly a danger that it is gradually developing itself into a Star Chamber of the worst type, and I earnestly appeal to the hon. Members of the Government to take precautionary measures to see that that does not happen.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: How can we do it?

Mr. Dahanayake: I do not want to interfere at all with that august body called the Public Service Commission. It is not that that I am asking for. What we ask is that the public servant who has a grievance should have the normal channels of redress, and that at each stage he should be permitted to place his case as fully as he possibly can before the proper authority. That has now been denied to him.

I know of several instances, and I must tell the Hon. Prime Minister that even Members of the Government Front Benches have, in their more lucid intervals, admitted to some of us that this body cannot always go the way it is going now, but that there should be a check on its autocratic career.

These remarks of mine, Mr. Chairman, are of a general nature. I appeal to the Hon. Prime Minister to go into the question carefully to see that the lot of the public servant, particularly in regard to dismissals, is not made any harder now than it was before.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: My suggestion to hon. Members is this: if they would introduce a substantive

[Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake.]

Motion in this House to abolish the Public Service Commission, well, we might consider it. I feel that, as long as there is a Public Service Commission, we must maintain its independence. It is not the intention of Government either to interfere or to curtail in any way the independence of this Commission as long as it exists.

With regard to the remarks made by my hon. friend with regard to an appeal made by a public servant to the Public Service Commission receiving the reply, "We are not in a position to intervene", I do not know whether it could be the same case that I became aware of. As far as I am aware, there was a person or there was more than one person who had been dismissed long ago from the service. I can remember one person in particular who was dismissed from the Public Service about 12 years ago.

Mr. Dahanayake: These are recent cases.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake:

They were dismissed about 12 years ago, and they appealed to the Public Service Commission for reinstatement. Well, of course, the Public Service Commission, when they received that appeal, wrote back to say that they could not intervene. After all, these people were dismissed from the service long before the Public Service Commission came into being, and as such they had no authority over those people who were not in the Public Service or who may have a claim to have been in the Public Service. I do not know whether my good friend wants the Public Servants to have the same right as they had before to appeal to the Secretary of State. After all, the right of appeal to the Secretary of State was a matter which we did away with, because we did not want to have those people over us and because we felt that we could manage our own affairs without either the Secretary of State or His Majesty the King interfering. So why should the hon. Member complain now?

Mr. Dahanayake: The point of my remarks has been misunderstood. What I said was, that I am more concerned with the question of dismissals and disciplinary action, particularly dismissals,

than with the question of appointments. I quite agree in regard to appointments, all that we should do is to lay down the general policy, but that we should not interfere at all as to whether "X", "Y" or "Z" gets the job. We are only concerned with questions of general policy. But now in regard to dismissals, we have got to see that every public servant is given the fullest opportunity to free himself from any charge that is made against him. My grievance is that it is not possible to do so under the present regime. For instance, a dismissed Public Servant, dismissed very recently appealed to the Public Service Commission in a petition of normal length and said, "May I bring somebody with me, a friend or lawyer, to point out the facts of my case more lucidly than I have been able to do in this petition"? That simple request was turned down. Why should such a request be turned down? If anything, it should be the desire of this Commission to give every dog a chance and, if possible, help the lame dog over the stile, if the facts warrant such assistance being given.

It must not be assumed that a public servant who is dismissed deserves his dismissal. I think, we should act the other way, that a Public Servant who is dismissed deserves to have stayed on until something very clearly has been proved against him and that he should be helped on to get out of that difficulty. Today the Public Service Commission sits in its room and refuses to interview anybody, and it makes decisions, perhaps, without reading through the files. I am informed reliably, Mr. Chairman, that all the files are not carefully read and that the Public Service Commission considers it a sort of an unpardonable sin to vary the order of a Permanent Secretary or the Head of a Department. That should not be the spirit in which a Commission should work. The Commission should investigate each case that comes before it *de novo*. That is the sort of work that we demand of this Commission, and all that I ask the Prime Minister is to look carefully into the complaint. I do not charge the Commission with any heinous crime, but I say that the present tendency is for it to develop itself into a Star Chamber.

3.30 P.M.

Mr. Kanagaratnam: Arising out of the remarks of the Hon. Prime Minister, may I ask him one question to make one point clear? If I understood him correctly, he stated that officers, who were dismissed before the constitution of the present Public Service Commission, had no right now to make further representations to the Public Service Commission in regard to their dismissal. I thought that under the old Constitution there were several officers who, after years of dismissal, were reinstated when the full facts were investigated. I have a number of cases in view where officers were dismissed before the new Constitution came into effect. They want their cases to be submitted to the Public Service Commission for reconsideration. Am I right in assuming that such cases will not be entertained by the Public Service Commission?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I only gave my interpretation of the functions of the Public Service Commission, but I do not know what the law is. I believe that the Public Service Commission has to deal with the Public Service as it is constituted now, and that they can only admit or transfer officers in the service, but not deal with the cases of officers who might have been in the Service long ago. It is quite possible that, if dismissed officers apply to be re-admitted into the Public Service, the Commission may consider their claim. I am only giving my interpretation of the Commission's functions for what it is worth. If the Public Service Commission is asked to review all the cases of people who had been dismissed from the Public Service, I am inclined to think that another Public Service Commission will have to be set up, because there will be so many appeals.

Mr. Kanagaratnam: There are a number of cases like that.

Mr. Martensz: The hon. Member for Galle said that his information was that members of the Public Service Commission do not read carefully through the files. That strikes me as a very serious charge against the members of the Commission, and it is

something that perhaps requires investigation. I do not know from where the hon. Member got his information, but it strikes me that there must be something wrong somewhere. I can hardly believe that such a thing can happen. If my hon. Friend will pardon my saying so, it is a very wild statement.

Mr. Dahanayake: I made the statement in all seriousness because I had to help a few officers. The file was very huge and the Public Service Commission, I am sure, would never have waded through all that material unless the poor officer was allowed to take somebody to make representations on his behalf.

Under the old regime, if a Government servant was dismissed, it was open to a Member of the State Council to study his case and to go up to the Chief Secretary and place the relevant facts of the case before the Chief Secretary. I have done that on several occasions and obtained redress for a number of lame dogs, but today the position is reversed.

Mr. Chelvanayakam: Even from the point of view of the Hon. Prime Minister that the Public Service Commission is being given a trial, let it be given a fair trial; and the point of view of the hon. Member for Galle is that the only way in which the Public Service Commission could be given a trial is for the Public Service Commission to give a fair opportunity of trial to people who appeal to them. The hon. Member for Galle says that the public servants who appeal to the Commission do not get a chance of being represented. They do not even get a chance of being heard. How can the Public Service Commission act in fairness to itself, leave aside the public servants, unless they get the points of view of the men who have grievances put to them, if not by somebody who is paid to do it, at least, by the public servants who are appealing to them? Case after case where a public servant had appealed to make this representation to the Public Service Commission had been refused, as if the Public Service Commission is all-wise and that it requires no elucidation of the complaints of the public servants.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: All that I said was this. As far as we are concerned, it is a body created by law. I certainly feel that, if there are charges that are to be made, if there is dissatisfaction, it should be brought up by way of a substantive Motion. Merely making remarks and making accusations that the members of the Commission do not read this or do not do that, is not fair by a statutory body that has been created and over whom we have got no power. If you bring forward a substantive Motion and if all the circumstances are brought up, then we can certainly make inquiries and abolish the Commission and substitute another body for it. But merely making remarks in this House about the Commission is not fair.

Dr. Perera: The Chairman of the Public Service Commission—

The Chairman: It has been discussed enough.

Dr. Perera: Only as a matter of information. The Chairman of the Public Service Commission was appointed a year and a half back. Now he is on leave. How did it happen that he got leave so soon? What is the normal period of service that an officer has to put in before leave is granted to him?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: An officer can get three months' leave for every year of service.

An Hon. Member: Six weeks.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Six weeks' leave for every year of service. If he had been working for 1½ years, he would be entitled to nine weeks' leave.

Mr. Dahanayake: Good mathematics.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I do not think that the Chairman of the Commission was granted any leave to which he was not entitled.

Question, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 6,000 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Assistant Secretary, Public Service Commission, etc.'," put, and agreed to.

Question, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 450 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Rent Allowance,'" put, and agreed to.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 141,650 for Head 8, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

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

Head 9.—Audit Office

Vote No. 1.—Salaries and Expenses of the Department of the Auditor-General, Rs. 1,321,023.

The Chairman: There is no Amendment under this Head.

Mr. Nanayakkara: I want to speak on the whole Vote.

The Chairman: That should have been done during the Debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. Keuneman: There is an Amendment in the name of the hon. Member for Akuressa.

The Chairman: I have already ruled that as being out of Order.

Mr. W. P. A. Wickremasinghe (Akuressa): My Amendment deals with Vote 1, sub-head 1.

The Chairman: But you have not said so.

Dr. Perera: Permit him to say that.

The Chairman: You say that the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10. It is completely out of Order. It means that the Vote of Rs. 1,321,023 be reduced by Rs. 10.

Mr. Nanayakkara: I wish to ask whether a Member has no right to elicit information on the Vote.

The Chairman: The hon. Member should have criticised it at the Second Reading Debate.

Mr. Nanayakkara: Not to criticise. I want some information.

The Chairman: If you want to do that, you should have put forward some Amendment to draw the attention of the House or the Minister concerned to any particular Vote.

Mr. Nanayakkara: I would wish to ask, for instance, why the Audit Service is not amalgamated with the Accountants' Service.

The Chairman: All that the hon. Member had to do was to move a cut of Rs. 5 from the salary of the Auditor-General.

Mr. Nanayakkara: I did not want to embarrass the Government like that.

Mr. Keuneman: Can observations be made on the whole Vote?

The Chairman: When the whole Vote comes up, you can oppose it.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 1,321,023 for Head 9, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule," put, and agreed to.

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

Head 14.—Minister of Defence and External Affairs

Vote No. 1.—Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Permanent Secretary to the Minister of Defence and External Affairs, Rs. 275,848.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: All the Amendments are out of Order.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: Can we hear from the Hon. Prime Minister about his foreign policy?

Mr. Dahanayake: Say item 'Permanent Secretary' and continue.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Where is your Amendment?

The Chairman: The only Amendment is that the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 1. That has already been ruled out of Order. Is there any particular item that you want to raise?

Mr. Keuneman: I have an item under Permanent Secretary.

The Chairman: You have given no notice.

Mr. Keuneman: When I asked the question, you said that you would allow me to raise it now.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Permanent Secretary'."

The Hon. Minister of Finance said in his Budget speech that he wanted to be a friend of all and enemy of none. I want to know whether that statement is consistent with the persistent criticism of another friendly country, which is occupying a very weighty position in the Councils of the world, namely Russia. Not that we do agree with everything Russian, or we accept the policy of Russia, but I, as a Member of this legislative assembly, must protest against this country criticising openly the activities of another country enjoying an independent status. The result of this rather bickering attack on the Russian policy had—

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I rise to a point of Order. I do not think any Member of the Government criticized Russia. The hon. Member's whole argument is based on a false premise.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: I am very glad that an assurance has come, though too late. If it had come before the entry of Ceylon to the U.N.O. was objected to by Russia and if no statement was made, it would have been all the better for this country rather than having wrong motives attributed to other countries in our relations with them.

The second point I want to make is in regard to the state of our defence. We are supposed to be hitched to the waggon of the Commonwealth, and the present international position is very serious; at any time, at least in my opinion, a war might break out, and I wonder how we are prepared to meet such a situation, particularly when there is an outbreak of large scale insurrection in certain quarters. In South East Asia, the Communists are trying to oust the Government, and the British Government are trying to increase the forces to maintain law and order and, at the same time,

[Mr. Kumaraswamy.]
are trying to have their hold. A similar position might develop in Ceylon. I feel we will be dragged into the war, because South East Asia is in the rear of the European recovery programme of General Marshall of America. Under these circumstances, I feel that our defences are very weak, and I want to know what steps the Hon. Prime Minister has taken with regard to our defences in the international set-up as it is constituted today.

The Chairman: Surely, are not those matters confidential? The Hon. Prime Minister will only say that he is taking every possible step to secure the safety of the Island in an emergency. Do you expect him to give all the details openly in this House?

Mr. Keuneman: I want to make certain observations on this matter in connection, first, with external affairs, and then with the policy regarding the defence of this country.

3.45 P.M.

Now, Sir, we see that, since quite recently, we have begun to take an interest in external affairs. Of late we have opened up an External Affairs Department, and here we are being asked to vote money for this Department.

I think it is the duty of this House, before it votes money for this Department, to be sure that the external policy of this country—the external affairs policy of this country—is one which can meet with its approval. It is not just a matter of routine, or like a matter of building a road or a bridge or a dam. These are vital matters—matters of external affairs—which involve the entire fate of all the people of this country. That is why I think that, when the Government comes for a vote for External Affairs, it is necessary to have something like a comprehensive statement from the Cabinet, on its policy as to the countries Ceylon is to be associated with and what policy it is going to follow in the world of External Affairs. This is all the more necessary, because the most general glib statements are being made by Members of the Government from time to time in this House, whenever reference is made to these matters.

I want to refer to the remark made by my hon. Friend the hon. Member for Chavakachcheri (Mr. Kumaraswamy). I think it is clear to everyone that this Government, far from following a policy of peace and friendship towards all other nations, has been following a policy of calculated insult towards one of the nations forming the United Nations Organization—and that is the Soviet Union. I think that is a highly dangerous policy to follow.

An application for Membership of the United Nations was sent to that organization by Ceylon. There the credentials of Ceylon were questioned and time was asked for examination of those credentials. And yet a Minister of the Government of Ceylon stands up on the Floor of this House, and proclaims to this House and the world that there is an attempt to obstruct the entry of Ceylon to the United Nations. What is the authority for making such statements?

When the hon. Members of the Government brought this Independence of theirs to this House for approval and rejoicing, we were told that the acid test of whether we were going to be an independent power would be decided by the United Nations, and that if Russia objected, they would have an opportunity of objecting; but when a Power like the Soviet Union wishes to see that they are not admitting to the United Nations, in the name of Independence, another stooge State of Great Britain and America, then it is a matter for an Hon. Minister of the Government to criticize other Powers and say that other powers are forcibly obstructing us. I do not think that is the way in which External Affairs of this country should be conducted.

I do not wish to refer to other remarks—for instance, there were remarks made by the Hon. Prime Minister, which I have often repudiated in this House—

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: What is the remark?

Mr. Keuneman: There was his remark suggesting that certain parties in this country were flirting with Moscow with intentions not in the best interests of this country. I take exception to that statement, not only because it casts a reflection on certain parties in this country

who are alleged to be flirting with another Power, but because it is an accusation that another Power is maintaining some type of subversive connections with this country, which, I think, is hardly proper for the Prime Minister to make, unless he can well substantiate it. That is not the way to conduct External Affairs.

I do not want to go into the rest; but, on the other hand we find that in the matter of External Affairs the Government of Ceylon is following a policy of trailing behind Great Britain and America—the main Imperial Powers, the main instigators of war, the main opponents of world peace——

The Chairman: The hon. Member is not entitled to attack any other Government in this House.

Mr. Keuneman: If you object, Sir——

An Hon. Member: Withdraw!

Mr. Keuneman: I will not say anything further on that matter.

Recently we had an example of how our External Affairs are conducted, when a representative of Ceylon formed part of the British delegation which went to the Ootacamund Conference of the UNICAFE. There, as part of the British delegation, we had to take part in objecting to the entry of Indonesia to that Conference.

An Hon. Member: Shame!

The Chairman: Order, please! I cannot allow such words to be used here.

Mr. Keuneman: Mr. Chairman, the British delegation——

The Chairman: Why need we go into all these world politics?

Mr. Keuneman: These are External Affairs, Sir. A Vote has been asked, and I think that we have a right to insist that some kind of proper External Affairs policy is followed by this country.

The Chairman: That is all right; but I do not think that you have the right to criticize what takes place in other parts of the world.

Mr. Keuneman: The Ceylon representative was a member of the British delegation which obstructed the entry of Indonesia to that Conference.

The Hon. Mr. Ratnayake: They did not appose——

Mr. Keuneman: There is another point to which I want to refer. It is this, that in the name of External Affairs the Government sends a large number of Missions abroad. Whether these missions have been of any value to this country is not known to the people of this country. I think it will be extremely valuable if the Government would make provision, whenever delegates are sent out to attend international conferences, that the Members of this House——

The Chairman: That is covered by a separate Vote under Head 16—Department of External Affairs Abroad.

Mr. Keuneman: I am referring to the general policy that governs foreign missions—with regard to the necessity of providing us with further information about these missions. I am not now criticizing the missions themselves. What I am referring to is the fact that the Government does not give publicity to what has been achieved by these missions. They do not furnish reports to this House or the country of what has been done in the sphere of External Affairs.

On the question of Defence of the country, there are one or two matters to which I would like to refer. The first is, this. I think the Hon. Prime Minister, in his capacity of Minister of Defence, must be aware that, in the camps of the British Forces which we find in this country, Ceylonese workers who are employed there are not receiving wages which are the same or equivalent to those——

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: That does not come under my Vote. It is a matter that comes under the Ministry of Labour and Social Services.

Mr. Keuneman: It is a matter concerning Defence.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: The wages of labour is not my concern.

Mr. Keuneman: This is not a matter which is governed by the Ministry of Labour.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: The question of labour or the rates of labour—

The Chairman: Only the Assistant Secretary and the Clerks are concerned in this. Under Defence we are only concerned with the Assistant Secretary and the Clerks. You find that on page 32 of the Estimates.

Mr. Keuneman: What I have to say concerns the general policy of what goes on in Defence establishments in this country. The point I am trying to make is this—I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether you will hold me in Order—that Ceylonese workers who are employed in British Defence installations here are not being paid the same rates as the Ceylonese whom we find in those installations controlled by the Government or private establishments, or who come under the Regulations laid down by Wages Boards or by the Ordinances of Government; and I want an assurance from the Minister of Defence that he will take up this matter speedily with the British Military Authorities and insist that they do obey the Labour Laws of this country, and tell them that they are not privileged persons who can break with impunity the Labour Laws of this country. I think if the Hon. Minister of Defence takes up this matter, he will be doing a great service to the poor people who are employed in these particular British Defence installations.

One more question that I want to ask the Hon. Prime Minister is what exactly is the status of Trincomalee, Koggala and other British bases in this country?

A Defence Agreement was signed between our Government and the Government of Great Britain; but even much earlier than that Trincomalee, Koggala and other bases were existing. I would like to know whether these places have been brought under the terms and conditions of the Defence Agreement which has been signed, or whether they are carrying on under the

old leases which existed prior to that. I want a clarification from the Minister of Defence on this point.

Mr. J. C. T. Kotalawela: With regard to the workers employed by the British Admiralty and other Military Departments—there are nearly 8,000 of them in Colombo, Veyangoda and Trincomalee—it has been found that these workers do not come within the Labour Laws of this country, and that the Labour Department has refused to intervene in the matter. Representations were then made to the Hon. Prime Minister as the Ministry of Defence comes under him, but even he has failed to intervene. In fact, if this country, as the Prime Minister says, is independent—if that is true—then he should have seen to it that our nationals are not exploited by a foreign Power. But so far nothing has been done, although these workers have time and again made representations to the Labour Department and to the Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. Sivapalan: There is one point that I want to ask the Hon. Prime Minister. Certain representations were made to the Hon. Prime Minister by members of the C.G.A. and the R.A. about three months ago—may I know what has happened to those representations?

The Chairman: Any further remarks?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake *rose.*

Mr. Dahanayake: Would the Hon. Prime Minister please speak after the other Members have made their observations?

The Chairman: That is why I asked for any further remarks.

Mr. Dahanayake: Now, the cut that has been proposed refers to the item "Permanent Secretary". I want to raise two points—one is with regard to the question of the salaries of the Permanent Secretaries.

The Chairman: That question could have been raised under a different Head

Mr. Dahanayake: Under what Head, Sir? This is the first Permanent Secretary we have been dealing with.

The Chairman: Where the salary of the Secretary to the Governor was concerned.

Mr. Dahanayake: The salary of the Secretary to the Governor; yes, but not in this connection.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: There is no Amendment regarding this.

The Chairman: The hon. Member can raise the question when we take up the Ministry of Finance.

Mr. Dahanayake: The second point is this. To my mind, we are being called upon to spend Rs. 275,000 on a white elephant. The Department of Defence and External Affairs is, in my opinion, a very big white elephant.

If you examine the cadre of this Department you will see that the Permanent Secretary, who is in the Super Grade of the Civil Service, has under him an Assistant Secretary who is in the Civil Service and an Office Assistant who is also in the Civil Service, and that they have to supervise 12 clerks.

If you turn to the next page, you will find that the sub-Department of External Affairs has a highly paid Assistant Secretary, another Civil Servant, whose duty is to supervise the work of 5 clerks.

If you proceed further, you will find that the sub-Department of Defence has a highly paid Assistant Secretary, a member of the Civil Service, who also has 5 clerks under him.

Going further down, you will find that the sub-Department of Immigration also has a highly paid Civil Servant whose work is to supervise 5 clerks.

From all this you will see how the members of the Civil Service have been taken on by the Minister of Defence and External Affairs to idle away in his office, so that this Department may get "a local habitation and a name". A Permanent Secretary on a super salary has 5 Civil Servants who are very highly paid to undertake the supervision of the work of just about 25 clerks.

I ask the Hon. Prime Minister whether all this work—the main portion of the work that is being done by the 25 clerks—cannot be supervised by a few members of the Executive Clerical Service, so that the Civil Servants who are being employed in this office may do more useful work elsewhere? I think a strong case exists for the removal of these Civil Servants from this office.

Perhaps the Prime Minister thinks that, because he is almighty in this country, all his Departments and sub-Departments should have at their head supermen who must be paid very high salaries. That is just the type of notion that we feel should be done away with by this Government.

The Chairman: The Hon. Member is putting a notion into the head of the Hon. Prime Minister and he is attacking that notion.

Mr. Dahanayake: I beg your pardon, Sir, may I know what you said?

The Chairman: Do you know that that notion is in the Prime Minister's head? You attribute it to him and you attack him.

Mr. Dahanayake: He is the Head of these Departments, Sir.

The Chairman: Please finish.

Mr. Dahanayake: I have done.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Shall I reply now?

The Chairman: We will now adjourn for tea. The Sitting is suspended until 4.30 P.M.

Sitting accordingly suspended until 4.30 p.m., and then resumed.

Mr. Dahanayake: I was asking the Prime Minister—

The Chairman: I thought you had finished.

Mr. Dahanayake: I will sum up. I was asking the Hon. Prime Minister how he could explain the presence of six Civil Servants, with salaries ranging from Rs. 15,000 to Rs. 27,000 a year, to

[Mr. Dahanayake.]

supervise the work of 31 clerks. I made an appeal that some of these Civil Servants should be released for more important work elsewhere.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Any other remarks?

Dr. Perera: You might answer those questions first.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I was surprised to hear the remarks of the hon. Member for Galle. With his close association with Government, I thought he knew something about the conduct of Government business. He appears to be under the impression that a Civil Servant is a sort of *Kangany* supervising the work of labourers—

Mr. Dahanayake: A kangany does more useful work than some of our Civil Servants!

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: That is not how we employ Civil Servants. A Civil Servant is required to do a certain type of work, which, normally cannot be done by an ordinary member of the Clerical Service. There are, of course, some clerks who are quite capable of doing the work of a Civil Servant. The number of Civil Servants in any Department is not determined by the number of clerks in that Department. It is determined by the nature of the work requiring the services of Civil Servants.

The Ministry of Defence and External Affairs is organized on somewhat different lines from the other Ministries. We are adopting a system more akin to that found in England. Instead of Heads of Departments, we employ Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries. For next year we require two additional Assistants. The Police Department has been transferred to the Ministry of Defence and External Affairs. Another officer is required—I forget for the moment the exact nature of his work—[*Interruption*—Yes, we have to deal with External Affairs, Police, Passports, Immigration—

An Hon. Member: The High Commissioners!

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake:

These four Secretaries do the work Heads of Departments do in other Ministries. We have no Heads of Departments in this Ministry.

I can assure hon. Members that the number of Civil Servants in this Ministry, considering the nature of the work they have to perform, is not excessive. If anything, we need more assistance.

The hon. Member for Trincomalee referred to certain representations made by some Military personnel, and complained that those representations had not received adequate attention from the Government. The hon. Member is probably aware that, when a person is recruited for Military service, he is subject to certain procedure. The regulations regarding discipline, and so on in the Military are different to those obtaining in Civil administration. If the employees have any grievance, they must in the first instance make representations to the Military authorities.

That is the procedure followed, and if interference from outside, from politicians, regarding salaries and discipline is allowed, I am afraid a military force cannot be maintained.

I was rather surprised at the indignation displayed by the hon. the Third Member for Colombo Central over certain remarks some people are supposed to have made about Russia. The hon. Member said that people in this country, whether they were Ministers or others, should not say anything against the Russian Government, or against Russian Parties. Of course, I shall never suspect my good Friend of any wrong doing, but I must say I did not like his display of indignation in this matter. I notice that he does not display much indignation when anything is said against England. He himself had a good deal to say against that country.

The hon. the Third Member for Colombo Central apparently feels that he has every right to criticize the methods and policy of the British, but I am sure he has no intention of involving us in a quarrel with Britain or any other country. Neither have we any intention of involving this country in a quarrel with Russia.

Each man has his own views regarding the policy adopted by the different countries of the world. Some of us may approve the policy followed by one country, while disapproving the policy of another. It should not surprise anybody if there were in this country people who did not regard Russian policy in the same light as——

Mr. Keuneman: What is your policy?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: My policy I shall keep to myself. So far as the policy of the Ceylon Government is concerned, we have already stated that it is our desire to be on the friendliest terms with every country of the world. We were very glad, therefore, to notice that Russia sent a representative to Ceylon to the Independence celebrations we held a few months ago. We were very glad to invite Russia to send a representative to the celebrations. We would not have extended that invitation if we entertained any feelings of hostility towards that country, or if we did not wish to be on the friendliest terms with Russia.

When we speak about certain Parties in this country receiving inspiration from Russia, it should not be imagined that we imply that that inspiration comes from M. Stalin or some other individual. Members on the Opposition Benches belong to many Parties; these Parties differ from one another in their ideology. Some of these Parties are opposed to the policy of the present Russian Government, to M. Stalin's policy. They criticise that policy quite openly. We on this side want to be on the friendliest terms with Russia, while there are apparently people in this House who are opponents of Russia, and who do not wish us to adopt a friendly attitude towards Russia!

Let no one imagine that we are against Russia. We want to be on the best of terms with that country. But that, of course, does not mean that we want to adopt in this country the policy followed by Russia. That country can adopt any policy it likes in its own country, whatever policy suits the people there. We would like to adopt the policy that suits us. We do not want to quarrel with Russia merely because it

holds views that are different from ours. That applies to Russia or any other country.

The hon. the Third Member for Colombo Central wanted to know whether we wanted to be with the British. We belong to the Commonwealth of Nations; we are in that group. We are a Dominion. We are, therefore, in closer contact today with the British people than with any others. We hope that we shall be in as close a contact with other nations in the future. Our relations with other countries may be strained owing to some reason or other, or because of some happenings in the future. I cannot tell the hon. Member here today that our attitude towards any nation or country is going to be the same in the future as it is today, or that there would not be any change hereafter. Our attitude would depend on the attitude of other countries towards us. Our desire is to be on the friendliest terms with all, and I hope we shall succeed in achieving that desire.

I do not think I can give my hon. Friend the Third Member for Colombo Central the information he wanted on the other point he mentioned. If any information has to be given to the House, and if the necessity arises, I shall give that information. Whether the time has come, or whether the necessity has arisen, to give that information, is a matter for judgment by Government. We cannot disclose all the correspondence and other information at any and every stage. Foreign relations cannot be conducted in that way. I am not able to give any further information to the hon. Member.

Mr. Keuneman: I asked a question about the international conferences.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: The hon. Member will be glad to learn that, on the occasion he referred to, Ceylon's representative and the Russian representative were on the same side; they expressed the same opinion. If there is any sort of connexion between our Friends here and Russia, I hope our Friends will follow that good example and be sometimes with us also. That is a good example to follow——

Mr. Keuneman: You should follow it more often!

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: Co-operation with the other end of the rope——

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: That does not matter. The heavier side will benefit, and the other side will hang itself.

There was no other point, I think——

Mr. Keuneman: I asked a question about the status of Koggala and Trincomalee after the Defence Agreements with the U.K., and also about the employees of the Admiralty.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: We have not come to any other agreement with the U.K.——

Dr. Perera: The second agreement has not been signed?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: There is no second agreement. The arrangement is that, whenever it suits the British Government and ourselves to do so, we come to an agreement, an agreement that is in the best interests of the British and ourselves. It depends. If any alteration in the existing agreement, or any further agreement, is necessary, when the need arises, we come to an agreement. There is no agreement now——

Mr. Keuneman: Then Koggala and Trincomalee are still under the old agreement? As regards the lease of Koggala, how does it stand——

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: There is no lease. During the war, certain lands were acquired for use by the military authorities. They were requisitioned during the war. They are there; we know they are there. With our consent they are there. They have no rights, but the right given by us——

Mr. Keuneman: There is a tacit agreement?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: If we want them, we will keep them. The provisions of the Order in Council relating to acquisition will expire in 1950. They have no rights except by consent——

Mr. Keuneman: That is not the question. I do not think the Prime Minister has got my question clear. The Trincomalee base has been there for some time, long before we achieved this "Independence" of ours. Is the present status of Trincomalee a continuation of the old status, or has it been brought under the Defence Agreement? Can the Ceylon Government today—as it claims it can under the Defence Agreement—can the Ceylon Government cancel that British base at Trincomalee? The same question applies to Koggala base. It was used as a British base during the war. Is it operating on the old basis, or on the new basis under the Defence Agreement?

4.45 P.M.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Trincomalee had become a naval base when Ceylon was a Colony. Now, when we have become a Dominion, all the Colonial properties belong to the Ceylon Government, not to anyone else. And I believe that my good friend, who is a lawyer, will know the literal interpretation of the relevant clause. As far as I am concerned, I am satisfied that our position is not at all impaired by the presence of those troops at that naval base.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: Are we to understand that no fresh agreements were necessary at all?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: There was no fresh agreement.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: Is it a continuation of the old status?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: My good Friend should realize that the status has changed, inasmuch as we have become, from a Colonial possession, a Dominion. So that, there is no continuation, only a change of status.

Dr. Perera: What is the change? That is the point.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: We have changed to the status of a Dominion. All the Colonial possessions are now ours.

Mr. Dahanayake: Can the British use Koggala as an air base today for military purposes?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: With our consent.

Mr. Dahanayake: With your consent?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: When it becomes necessary. They are there with our consent, and, of course, if it becomes necessary—suppose we find, for our own defences, we want the assistance of the British, or the Americans, or, for a matter of that, the Russians—we might ask them to bring the fleet for our own purposes.

Mr. Dahanayake: Has that consent been given in writing?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: No.

Mr. Dahanayake: Then who gave that consent?

Mr. Keuneman: I do not want to cross-examine the Defence Minister, but may I know this? Has there been an agreement regarding Trincomalee or Koggala sites? Is it a tacit agreement that the old position of Trincomalee or the old position of Koggala is to continue as in the past with the knowledge of the Ceylon Government?

The Chairman: Those are not fair questions to ask of the Hon. Minister. If he says “Yes” to one question, he will have to say “No” to the other. I think the Hon. Prime Minister made the position perfectly clear. When we were a Colony we were forced to give those possessions, whether we liked it or not. Now that we are a Dominion, we are not forced to do anything. It would be at our will and pleasure to allow or not to allow those forces to remain there.

Mr. Keuneman: Is the Hon. Prime Minister asserting that, for instance, Trincomalee today fully belongs to the Ceylon Government, and that at any moment the Ceylon Government can eject the British forces?

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: At any time the agreement could be torn up.

Mr. Keuneman: Under the so-called Independence Declaration?

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: Why “so-called”?

Mr. Keuneman: The Hon. Prime Minister did not speak on the question I raised.—[*Interruptions*].

The Chairman: Order, order!

The Hon. Mr. Goonesinha: I want a Ruling from you, Mr. Chairman, with regard to this matter. I would draw your attention to Standing Order 128 (2) which reads as follows:—

“When a question has been proposed for the reduction or omission of a sub-head or item, members shall speak to such question only, until it has been disposed of.”

Could hon. Members discuss policy on a matter by asking for the reduction of a Vote, as has been done a while ago? I would like to have your Ruling on that point, Sir.

The Chairman: I said that I would only allow an hon. Member to speak on the policy, where certain matters are concerned, at my will and pleasure.

Mr. Keuneman: May I point out that the Hon. Prime Minister did not answer my question regarding the difference in the wages of workers employed by British military installations in this country?

Mr. Sri Nissanka: That was precisely what I wished to ask a moment ago.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: My hon. Friend said that the Military authorities were acting contrary to law. I am not aware of the law for fixing any rates for Military employees.

Mr. Keuneman: I did not say “contrary to law.” I was speaking of the Military paying legal rates to workers of similar skill.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: If that is so, it is a matter for the Labour Ministry.

Hon. Members: No, no.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: The reason for my saying that is this. The fixing of rates for different employees is a matter for the Labour Ministry. We are not fixing the rates of any labourers.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: The Minister of Labour is powerless, because this is a matter that comes under Foreign Affairs.

Dr. Perera: We did raise this question last year, if you will remember, Mr. Chairman. On that occasion I think the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Social Services himself undertook to look into the matter, but no change has been made. We were, therefore, faced with the difficulty that the Labour Department was powerless to interfere, because those labourers did not come within its purview. The Military authorities were also apparently taking up the position that the normal laws of this country did not operate so far as they were concerned. That is why we appeal to the Hon. Prime Minister, as Minister of Defence and External Affairs, to get in touch, if necessary, with the Military authorities overseas, and see that those concerned are made to adhere to the laws of this country with regard to the particular labour legislation.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I do not subscribe to the contention put forward that anyone here is not subject to our law, whether it is the British soldier or anyone else. As far as they are concerned, perhaps among themselves there may be different laws that govern them, but everyone in Ceylon is subject to our law.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: Will the Hon. Prime Minister please give a thought to the distinction between the generalization that everybody is subject to our law and the particular proposition with which he is faced? If an example will help; a British soldier stationed in Ceylon is paid the rates fixed by the British Parliament for the British army. Those rates may be lower than rates which the Ceylon Parliament has fixed for the Ceylon Army. Then the fact that the British soldier in Ceylon is generally subject to our law does not entitle him to our pay. That is why this becomes a matter of foreign relations. The British army or the British navy in Trincomalee or elsewhere is employing, as part of its establishment and forces, certain nationals of this country. They are paid according to the rates that the British

Parliament has fixed for its employees and forces. Those rates happen to be different from and, in particular, less than the rates fixed in this country by our Government for people of equal skill in comparable employment. So what is being requested is that the Hon. Minister of Defence and External Affairs do negotiate with the British Government—because it becomes now an aspect of the question of external affairs—that that Government should pay to such nationals of our country as it employs for its purposes on those jobs the rates that are paid by the laws of our Government to people of equal skill in our country. Thus you will see, Mr. Chairman, that the general proposition does not cover the particular case. Will the Hon. Minister of Defence and External Affairs please take up this matter with the British authorities?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: As a matter of fact, since my hon. Friends on the back benches asked the question, I am not actually aware that they were in favour of our nationals being employed by someone else without our control.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: This is irrelevant.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Whether it is irrelevant or not, I will give the reason why I said I thought all our nationals in Ceylon should be subject to our law. But since my good Friends are in favour of the admittance into the service of the British of a certain number of people—

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: They are already there.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: If you want them to continue, I will certainly—

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: The Hon. Prime Minister must not misunderstand us like this.

The Chairman: I think the Hon. Prime Minister answered this question on an Adjournment Motion. What the Hon. Prime Minister then said was that,

so far as he was aware, the wages were not less, but, if they were less, he would get in touch with the authorities concerned.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: Today he seeks to—

The Chairman: If I mistake not, the matter is under consideration.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: What was intended was to remind the Hon. Prime Minister that, irrespective of the question whether we are in favour of these men being employed under the British Government, they are there employed, and the Hon. Prime Minister has got to look after them.

The Chairman: The Hon. Prime Minister said that the fixing of wages was a matter for External Affairs.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: It is within our competence to tell anyone who comes here that Ceylon labour must be paid so much, otherwise they cannot be employed.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: You say so?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: My contention is that we can say so.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: We wish you to say so.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: What you wish me to say is quite a different thing. What you wish me to do is to approach the British Government or naval authorities and make representations. If there is a representation to be made, I am prepared to make it.

The Hon. Mr. Goonesinha: May I, in regard to this matter, make a statement, Mr. Chairman? The hon. Member for Ruwanwella (Dr. Perera) drew attention to the fact that I, as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour and Social Services, promised to deal with this matter. I did deal with this matter, and a communication was addressed to the Hon. Prime Minister. But the Captain/Superintendent concerned told me that they were prepared to abide by any decision of the Hon.

Prime Minister would make in regard to this matter and the whole matter should be afterwards settled. Then it came to the question of some people being paid higher wages than the Wages Board's decision; thus, certain people stood to lose by that. What we thought was that they should be always governed by our laws—the Wages Boards Ordinance—and the matter was again referred to the Hon. Prime Minister and the Hon. Minister of Labour and Social Services. The question is now being examined as to whether we should have the Wages Boards Ordinance in operation in respect of those men, and whether those men who are already drawing a higher rate should be made worse off or should be paid the same. That is the position now, and it is being examined, and I am sure, as the Hon. Prime Minister has already mentioned, they should always be governed by our laws here.

Dr. Perera: If you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the Hon. Prime Minister on another point. Provision has been made for 4 Probationers (Overseas Service). Is it the intention of the Hon. Prime Minister to recruit more Probationers from overseas and, if so, why should they be paid sterling salaries?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Probationers are to be recruited. We want men—we have not enough men—so that they can be trained and used for that service itself. Their salaries are fixed on a sterling basis for the simple reason that it is easier to calculate the rates of pay and allowances which they would have obtained working overseas on a sterling basis.

Mr. Dahanayake: What will be the nature of the work they will have to do?

The Chairman: I think there has been enough argument on this point.

Mr. Dahanayake: I want to know the nature of the work that will devolve on these Probationers.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: “External” work. Surely the hon. Member knows the nature of that work.

Question put, "That the sum of Rs. 275,848 for Head 14, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule".

The Committee divided (under Standing Order 48): Ayes, 44; Noes, 21.

Head 14, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Vote No. 2.—Relief to and Repatriation of Destitute Persons, Rs. 15,000.

5.0 P.M.

Mr. J. C. T. Kotalawela: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of Sub-head 1."

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: With the permission of the hon. Second Member for Badulla, I wish to bring up a certain matter very briefly under this Vote. Although I move it in the form of a cut, what I am asking for is an appropriation, that is, the appropriation of this in a different way. I have found that many of our Representatives abroad, for instance, in Bombay, and so on—

The Chairman: I do not understand what the hon. Member means by "appropriation."

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: I am merely asking that the Vote be divided in a certain way, but I have to move it by way of a token cut. I wish to bring a certain matter to the notice of the Hon. Minister.

The Chairman: Are you moving that the Vote be divided in a different way?

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: I am suggesting to the Hon. Minister that a certain proportion of the Vote be left to the handling of our Representatives abroad, free of the necessity for reference back to the Hon. Minister.

The Chairman: Yes.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: I find that many of our Representatives abroad are constantly up against the problem of having to assist Ceylon nationals abroad in urgent or in indigent circumstances, not from the point of view of maintaining them permanently, or anything like

that, but in unexpected difficulties, to advance them a sum of money, or even, on occasion, to give them a sum of money, say to get back home. I find, as far as my information goes, that in every case where these Representatives have to come up against cases like that, they have to refer back to the appropriate quarter in Ceylon before they can expend any moneys, unless they do so, to some degree, at their own risk. I wish to suggest to the Hon. Minister that steps should be taken to provide some specific sum—a few thousand rupees or the like—which can be entrusted to these Representatives, with freedom to them to expend it at their discretion, subject to the usual courses of subsequent accounting, that is, that every Representative of this Government abroad should be given the control of a specific sum of money which he is free to spend on appropriate urgent matters, without needing first to refer back to the usual quarters here.

Dr. Perera: Before the Minister replies, may I ask a question? You will notice that the wording of this Vote is slightly different from last year. They have removed the provision for the repatriation of destitute immigrants. Is the new wording intended to cover both? I want that position made quite clear. Originally, as the Vote stood, there was provision for destitute immigrants also to be sent off. Is the present wording adequate for that?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Yes.

As far as the request made by the hon. Member for Wellawatta-Galkissa is concerned, there is an opportunity for our Representatives to spend money when they consider it necessary to do so or help anyone there. It is only in cases where they feel that they must refer to this country, that they do so. But in certain matters they can take the responsibility. There is no limit, and they can carry on; they can give such assistance.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 15,000 for Head 14, Vote No. 2 be inserted in the Schedule," put, and agreed to.

Head 14, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Vote No. 3.—Maintenance of War Graves in Ceylon, Rs. 27,000.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: Apart from the general question of the maintenance of these graves, which is really the responsibility of the Imperial Government, is it necessary for us to spend all this money on clerical assistance in connexion with this work?

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: I do not wish to be charged with the lack of a sense of delicacy in raising the question of these war graves. It is not a matter of sentiment. Every year we have been asked to vote this sum of money, which is recurrent expenditure. I think the maintenance of a grave becomes a Governmental concern only when that grave assumes the proportion of a monument. Therefore, before we, in all conscience, can pass this money, there are certain questions we must address to the Government. Who are these people? What did they die for? And did they die in this country, and in the interests of this country? These questions must be asked from the Government, because in this country even today we find that certain monuments are there all over the towns, commemorating the Imperial phase of this country—a phase we would like to forget. We find monuments commemorating the men who captured our towns, the men who murdered our people——

The Chairman: This Vote does not deal with such monuments.

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: I only ask these questions in view of the existence of such monuments.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: This is an international arrangement. It has nothing to do with monuments which had been erected long ago or the graves of people who had fallen in the previous wars; it refers to people who died during the last war. And the arrangement that is made is this——

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: That is the 1939-45 war?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Yes.

Even our people have died in other countries. Whether they have died in France or in Egypt or anywhere else, those graves of our people are maintained by that Government, and the graves of people who died here during that period are maintained by us. It is an international arrangement, and when we have fought together—which was the best thing to do—it is only right and proper that each country should look after the graves of those who died within their shores.

Mr. Dahanayake: The Hon. Prime Minister might look after the living.

Question, “That the sum of Rs. 27,000 for Head 14, Vote No. 3, be inserted in the Schedule”, put, and agreed to.

Head 14, Vote 3, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 15.—Ceylon Defence

Vote No. 1.—Salaries and Expenses of the Ceylon Defence Force Rs. 2,075,085.

The Chairman: Does any Member move an Amendment?

Mr. J. C. T. Kotalawela: I move, “That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 2,075,085.”

I have moved the deletion of the whole Vote. I would like to know the purpose of this amount being allocated? Is this Army to defend Ceylon from external aggression? If that is so, my point is that this is not sufficient, and with this army no external aggression can be prevented. Why is it that such a small sum of money is being spent on this army? It may be that this small army is required to fight the people of Ceylon themselves. That is my fear. What I fear is that this money is being allocated to create an army to fight the people of Ceylon.

The Chairman: I do not think the hon. Member is entitled to say that. He is attributing very bad motives to the Government.

Mr. J. C. T. Kotalawela: I want to know why such a small sum is being allocated.

The Chairman: This is a nucleus.

Mr. J. C. T. Kotalawela: An army cannot consist of just a handful of soldiers in beautiful uniforms.

Mr. S. A. Pakeman (Appointed Member): On sub-head 1, I wish to refer to the "Commandant", and what I wish to say also applies to the other Staff Officers. I only want to know whether the Hon. Minister of Defence intends taking steps to have officers of the Staff of the Ceylon Defence Force sent abroad for actual training in Staff duties and other Military duties.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: If I may supplement what my hon. Friend the Second Member for Badulla (Mr. J. C. T. Kotalawela) said, the Defence Vote, as it stands, is neither the one thing, nor the other. The point I wish to make is this: Is it the aim of the Ministry of Defence to build up an army in relation to what the Government thinks are Ceylon's needs in respect of Defence? If so, in respect of defence against whom? Secondly, Sir, does the effort to build up a Force by this Government have any relationship to the obligations that we appear to have undertaken, under our Military agreement, with the British Government in respect of the defence of the British Empire? If so, what is the extent of the commitment which we have undertaken, or which we are expected to undertake? Thirdly, what proportion of our Budget is it the aim of this Government ultimately to spend upon this item of a Defence Force?

Mr. Dahanayake: A very interesting point strikes me. I feel that this Ceylon Army for which we are budgeting is not one that can face and defeat even an army of tin soldiers, because this army consists of 33 soldiers and 32 clerks.

The Chairman: The Ceylon Army is under Vote 4; now we are on Vote 1.

5.15 P.M.

Mr. Dahanayake: Yes, Sir, under Vote 1.

The Chairman: That is not the Ceylon Army; that is the Ceylon Defence Force as it exists today.

Mr. Dahanayake: Yes. How many men does it consist of?

The Chairman: It is not an army.

Mr. Dahanayake: If it is not an army, what is it? Is it something like a map or a design of what is contemplated?

The Chairman: Surely, the hon. Member understands.

Mr. Dahanayake: I say we are simply wasting our money in keeping up a show. There are more clerks than soldiers, and there are more arms cleaners than soldiers.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: I wish to bring to the notice of the Minister—

The Chairman: The hon. Member for Galle is speaking now.

Mr. Dahanayake: It seems to me that this shows that the Government here has a little skeleton army ready to be supplemented with people from outside when it suits their purpose, or, in the alternative, that this little skeleton army is created and maintained by the Government for purposes other than Military purposes, as we found during the last strike. I say that this is not a Defence Force, but it is an offensive force against the workers of this country.

Mr. Keuneman: I would like some clarification from the Hon. Minister of Defence of the exact relationship between the Ceylon Defence Force and the British troops which are stationed in this Island. There is, as the House knows, the British G.O.C., Brigadier Jones. Does the Ceylon Defence Force also come under his command? Is he responsible, or does he report to our Minister of Defence? We would like to know the exact status of the Ceylon Defence Force in relation both to our Minister of Defence and also to the British Forces which are here in this Island. I think the Prime Minister should enlighten us on this point.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I will answer the last question first. The British forces are quite separate from our forces. There is no doubt

that they were all under Brigadier Jones some time ago—that is when they were mobilized.

Mr. Keuneman: That means our C.D.F.?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Yes. Some men have been demobilized. In future what we intend to do is to carry on the old Volunteer force. We are now trying to get officers trained and to start our Army. As we get our officers and personnel trained we add on to the Army and then replace the Volunteer force. It is a matter that has got to be done gradually. The provision that is here is for the reason that members of the Volunteer force are paid according to the efficiency they show in camp, training, and so on.

Mr. Keuneman: My question is, who is in command of the present C.D.F. Is it Brigadier Jones?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: No.

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: Mendis.

Mr. Keuneman: And he is responsible to the Prime Minister direct?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Yes.

Dr. Perera: On page 34 hon. Members will find that the salary provided for the Commandant is Rs. 21,000. How many of these officers are Europeans?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I believe all are Ceylonese.

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: Not even a Sergeant Major.

Dr. Perera: Who is the officer now?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Mr. Mendis.

Dr. Perera: He is already in Government service.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: It may become necessary for me to get officers from abroad to train our men. But at present all the officers are Ceylonese.

Dr. Perera: They are obviously not paid because they are already in Government Service.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: They have been seconded for service.

The Hon. Mr. Nugawela: They are being paid an allowance.

*Sub-head 7. Training expenses.
Rs. 346,500.*

Mr. S. A. Pakeman: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 7".

In connexion with Training expenses, I want to ask the Hon. Prime Minister if there is an intention of having a full camping programme for these units.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Yes.

*Sub-head 11. Incidental expenses.
Rs. 10,000.*

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 6,000 in respect of sub-head 11". To whom are medals given?

The Chairman: This sub-head deals with incidental expenses.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: Rs. 7,000 is set apart for the purpose I mentioned.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Medals are given to efficient men.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: That provision is not only for medals.

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: It is for efficient socialism.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: This sub-head also deals with the cost of telegrams and advertisements.

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: Rs. 2,000 is provided for medals.

Dr. Perera: What medals are you going to give these people?

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: Efficiency medals.

Sub-head 14. Outstanding claims from the C.D.F. in respect of previous years. Rs. 1,074,402.

Dr. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 1,074,402 in respect of sub-head 14".

What are these outstanding claims in respect of?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Men were mobilized for certain duties. We have to pay them.

Dr. Perera: Are these Ceylonese?

Mr. Keuneman: I take it that you are paying them off now.

Dr. Perera: On what basis?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: At the usual rates of pay.

Dr. Perera: They are being paid off by way of compensation. These people were suddenly demobilized, and the question arose whether they should be paid something extra, so that if they had to go back to civilian work they could be in a position to start life. Is that one of the factors you have considered in this connexion?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: There were payments made when these men were discharged. When we want to keep them on for a longer period, the difference in pay is paid by us.

Mr. Kanagaratnam: It is to avoid questions of this type that I suggested, even during the last Budget, that details should be given in as full a manner as possible in the Estimates. Hon. Members will see that, in regard to sub-head 14, no details are given. This is a very important item and involves an expenditure of Rs. 1,074,402.

Mr. Sri Nissanka: That is to meet outstanding claims.

Mr. Kanagaratnam: If the information was given nothing would have happened.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: As a matter of fact, I gave the information now.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 2,075,085 for Head 15, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Mr. Kanagaratnam: May I ask the Hon. Prime Minister why the total sum under Vote No. 1 has been reduced by Rs. 162,250?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: That is under-expenditure.

Mr. Kanagaratnam: The explanatory note says, "Less estimated under expenditure 7½ per cent." Is it because the Cabinet is unable to budget for the amounts required for expenditure under the various items?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: My good Friend knows that even he could not estimate for the correct amount when he was in charge of the Auditor-General's department.

Mr. Kanagaratnam: No. This is one of the many cases in which the total expenditure under various Heads has been reduced at the end of the Vote. I want to know the basic principle under which the reduction is made. In some cases it is 3 per cent; in others 7 per cent. and 10 per cent.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: This is done by experience. Very often it has been found that provision has to be made for certain expenditure in connexion with staff. Experience has shown that, although a certain amount is put down, it is not spent. There are vacancies and other factors that come into consideration.

In regard to this sub-head, it will be seen that payment is made according to efficiency. A number of years have shown us that this amount can be saved. But we have got to provide for the total amount to avoid further complications.

Mr. Kanagaratnam: Leave these amounts at the end of the Estimates.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 2,075,085 for Head 15, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule, put, and agreed to.

Vote No. 2.—Salaries and Expenses of the Ceylon Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve, Rs. 785,509.

Sub-head 10. Additional provision required to man and maintain 2 sloops to be presented by His Majesty's Government—Rs. 400,000.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: I have a question on sub-head 10. I want some information from the Hon. Prime Minister in regard to this matter. A sum of Rs. 400,000 is being asked for.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: We are trying to get two sloops.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: How many men will you want to man them?

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: About 100.

Mr. Sri Nissanka: Do they carry guns?

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: Revolvers.

Mr. Sri Nissanka: What calibre?

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: Water pistols.

Mr. Sri Nissanka: Back firing?

Sub-head 11. Reconditioning H.M.S. "Landguard" for use as a depot training vessel Rs. 60,000.

Dr. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 60,000 in respect of sub-head 11."

Can the Hon. Prime Minister give us some details about this? We had a training vessel some time ago. Does this sub-head deal with that?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: No, this is an American vessel which is lying in Trincomalee. It is necessary for us to train our men. We are paying the American authorities a nominal sum and taking the vessel over.

Dr. Perera: We have had this experience before, of taking over vessels which are not in good order and even having to pay more for reconditioning them.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: This is not in very good order, either.

Dr. Perera: I am thinking of the fishing trawler.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: This is for the purpose of housing and training the men. It is not in very good order.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: Why does not the Hon. Minister of Defence arm the whole lot of people and be done with it?

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 785,509 for Head 15, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule," put, and agreed to.

Vote No. 3.—Other Defence Expenditure, Rs. 619,800.

Sub-head 1. Defence expenditure Rs. 619,800.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 20,000 in respect of sub-head 1, item "Assistant C.D.C.'s Office, etc." Why is this provision here? Has not the question about the fire gaps been settled? I thought that the Municipal Council has——

The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike: It is settled.

Dr. Perera: We should like to have a statement with regard to these fire gaps. We are continuing to pay Rs. 400,000 for rent and other expenses connected with fire gaps. I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 100 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Defence Expenditure'."

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: This is only for a skeleton staff.

The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike: The position is this. During the war it was necessary to have fire gaps in case of bombing. At the same time we made the building of the fire gaps fit in with the Municipal Scheme for the development of the city—opening of roads, and so on. That was done by the Central Government. They acquired the land, and houses were pulled down. The question arose about the permanent development of these areas, and it was dealt with and an Ordinance was passed in the last State Council before its dissolution, whereby a Board was set up.

[Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike.]

The Board is now functioning, and the Government proposes to finance the whole scheme for the acquisition of any other portions required, to plan out the area, to build roads and make land available for development by way of putting up buildings for commercial purposes, shops, and so on, the total cost of which will be somewhere, I believe, in the region of Rs. 20,000,000. We found that was the best way of dealing with this matter, because if we handed the land back to the owners, Government would still have been under the necessity of paying them very nearly the sum I mentioned by way of compensation. Government is taking over the work and doing it. A Board has been constituted in which the Central Government authorities and Municipal authorities are represented. The Board has just started work. It has been fully constituted recently under the Fire Gaps Ordinance.

Mr. Dahanayake: May I bring to the notice of the Hon. Minister that payment on account of damage compensation is being scandalously delayed?

The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike: That is a separate matter.

Mr. Dahanayake: All accounts should be closed as soon as possible. We have said this time and again. Some people seem to be sleeping over the whole matter.

The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike: Special officers are working on this.

Mr. Keuneman: Even on this question of fire gaps there is delay.

The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike: That had to wait the functioning of the new Ordinance.

Mr. Keuneman: I take it that the Board has started working?

The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike: Yes.

Mr. Keuneman: Can people go and have their business settled?

The Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike: Very quickly.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 619,800 for Head 15, Vote No. 3, be inserted in the Schedule," put, and agreed to.

Vote No. 4.—Ceylon Army, Air Force, etc., Rs. 500,000.

Dr. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 100." There is provision for an Air Force. I want to know how many fighter planes we have and whether there are any bombers.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: It is our intention as time goes on to have not only an Army but a Navy and Air Force. We want to alter the heading as we expand. We are going to have aeroplanes and things of that sort as time goes on.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: I think the Hon. Prime Minister will realize that the entire sum of Rs. 500,000 would not do for one fighter plane.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I know it.

Mr. Dahanayake: No details have been given with regard to Vote No. 4.

The Chairman: It is just beginning.

Mr. Dahanayake: This is a Vote that is in the air.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 500,000 for Head 15, Vote No. 4, be inserted in the Schedule," put, and agreed to.

Mr. J. A. Rambukpota (Haputale): I wish to know how the new Army is going to be recruited, whether the Hon. Prime Minister will give a chance to the villagers to join up.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Yes.

Mr. Rambukpota: I have heard it said that an Army of 3,000 is going to be raised. I suggest that this number should be divided among the nine Provinces, so that each Province, will be able to provide 300 men.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake:

Head 16.—Department of External Affairs Abroad

Vote No. 1.—Salaries and expenses of the Ceylon High Commissioner in London, Rs. 620,972.

Sub-head 1, Personal Emoluments, Rs. 344,952.

5.30 P.M.

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 27,000 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Deputy High Commissioner, etc.'"

I quite appreciate the necessity for having a Representative in London, and also the necessity for this Representative being given a staff of well-trained men, but I do not see the necessity for having a Deputy High Commissioner. You will observe that the Representative is given various Assistants and a Trade Commissioner. Therefore, what is the necessity for a Deputy High Commissioner? I do not see any work which a Deputy High Commissioner can do which cannot be done by men who are already there. Perhaps the staff of Secretaries might not be able to cope with the heavy work. In that case they can employ more Secretaries, but I do not see any reason why we should have a Deputy High Commissioner, apart from all the officers enumerated in the Estimates. Almost invariably we find a person of Cabinet rank in England. So what is the necessity for a Deputy High Commissioner?

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: If I may, under this vote, I would like to raise a few points so that the Prime Minister can answer all of them together.

With regard to this whole business of the establishment that is being maintained in London, I think certain matters ought to be brought to the notice of the Hon. Minister at this stage. First of all, Sir, this is an establishment which plainly falls between two stools, as, I may say, I myself found. Either we have too ambitious an objective and too small a staff, or we have too large a staff for a very small objective.

The Government does not appear to have decided clearly in their own mind on their policy in regard to this matter. As things are, what seems to be happening there is that the small staff

that is there is over-burdened with an ever-expanding volume of work, for which, if it was indeed contemplated, it was criminal, to have such a small staff in London. If we are trying to have something in the nature of a full-fledged Legation or something like that in London, then we are up against a different problem, namely that we shall have to have such an array of Secretaries, sub-Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries, Counsellors, and the like, that we find that the expense is too terrific for a little country like this to bear.

Again, Sir, as an aspect of policy, it is clear that minds have either not been made up or have been made up independent of policy by reason of the very location of the place; the new building taken over is in Grosvenor Street, the most expensive quarter of London. What is more, as I found, the only Embassy in the whole world that has thought it worth while to bear such a heavy expense in such a quarter in London, other than our own is the American Embassy, the richest in the world.

There are a few matters of inconsiderable value regarding which I have given notice to move Amendments under other items, but I shall deal with them now. There is a lady, a highly equipped lady, one who was a teacher at Methodist College, I believe, who was sent there as Receptionist. Today, she is nothing more than a mere telephonist. Sir, when we employ people of high qualifications, we must give them at least tasks which are consonant with their qualifications. If we do not want them, let them be removed. There is a remarkable anomaly of one called a Secretary or Assistant to the Commissioner in that office, who has his own stenographer under him who is a person paid a higher salary than himself.

These are matters which, independent of the question of the necessity for this establishment, if you are having it, you should look into and introduce, some kind of order, some kind of system, and also, if I may say so, some kind of accordance of means to ends.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I feel the hon. Member for Wellawatta-Galkissa is quite justified in making the remarks he made, for the simple reason

[Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake.]
that he visited the place at a time when we were changing over from one condition to another. We had a Trade Commissioner there, but in October we shall be establishing the office of a High Commissioner there. During the interval more work has been thrust on the staff than could have been reasonably expected of them. I feel that the criticism of my hon. Friend is justified, but at the same time I do not think we are going to be in that state very long, for the simple reason that by October we shall have the required staff there and the office will be functioning properly.

I might say that, although we have obtained a house in the most expensive quarter of London, it is not our intention to compete with America or any other country. We were fortunate in getting this house at that place, at a cheaper rate than we would have got a house anywhere else. There are many things we need, but for the present we are asking only for a small staff, and as the work increases we shall gradually get more staff.

I feel that in time to come, when other duties which are being carried out by foreign departments now are entrusted to this staff and we save the commission we now pay on purchases, this will prove a good investment.

With regard to the appointment of a Deputy High Commissioner, I would point out that, though we are having a Representative in London, we do not have the Continent covered at all. The British Representatives have agreed to look after our interests for the present. There may be occasions when our Representative may have to be away in different countries. For instance, there is a UNO meeting in February which will be attended by Mr. Corea. Similarly, we might have to send someone to Geneva, and the Representative may often have to be away. Therefore, it is very necessary to have a Deputy. Apart from that, there is so much work to be done that even the staff we are providing will not be sufficient for our purpose, but we do not want to provide a large staff to start with. We want to build it up gradually.

Dr. Perera: What about the point raised by the hon. Member for Wellawatta-Galkissa of an Assistant Secretary getting less than his stenographer?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: That will be looked into.

Mr. Dahanayake: I say that the explanation given by the Hon. Prime Minister is thoroughly unsatisfactory. He cannot explain, for instance, why there should be so many as nine staff officers to supervise the work of eleven clerks. You will see, from the manner in which the cadre has been established for this new Department, that it seems quite clear that this is a creation of the Government to give posts to certain people whom they wish to transfer overseas either as a reward or for purposes of a holiday.

Now, look at it, Sir. Beginning from the High Commissioner, there is a Deputy High Commissioner, a Financial Assistant, a Trade Commissioner, a First Secretary, a Second Secretary, a Third Secretary and a Staff Officer. Just take one of them, the Financial Assistant. The post of Financial Assistant is held by an officer in Class I. of the Accountants' Service seconded for service as Assistant, Ceylon Government Representative. I know who this gentleman is. When the gentleman, who is appointed to this post of High Commissioner, was in the Auditor-General's Department, this particular officer was an assistant under him. When the Auditor-General became the Civil Defence Commissioner, he took with him this particular officer. When the Civil Defence Commissioner became Financial Secretary the same officer followed him, and when the Financial Secretary became Home Minister this particular gentleman became an Assistant Secretary. Now, that individual has gone out as High Commissioner and he takes this gentleman from the Accountants' Service as Financial Assistant.

Gate Mudaliyar M. S. Kariapper (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Home Affairs and Rural Development): You are wrong.

Mr. Dahanayake: It is not a case of one man. That one man represents a class of blue-eyed boys in the Service. I put this direct question to the Prime Minister: How did they recruit men for these various posts? How did he get the Deputy High Commissioner?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Not appointed yet.

Mr. Dahanayake: How does he propose to choose these men? That is precisely the point in the argument. You have created certain staff jobs for your blue-eyed boys. The country cannot afford to throw away money in this manner. I ask hon. Members to reject this vote entirely.

Mr. Sri Nissanka: Has the officer referred to by the hon. Member for Galle been appointed by the Public Service Commission?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: He has not been appointed. It is all in the imagination of the hon. Member.

Mr. Sri Nissanka: I understood that the man was there already.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: The Accountant is in London.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: The Accountant is there, but not the person referred to by the Member for Galle; he refers to Mr. Vairamuttu, and Mr. Vairamuttu is here.

Mr. Dahanayake: The plain question is asked whether the Financial Assistant has been appointed? According to the note in the Estimates, he has been appointed. Then how was he appointed? Who chose him? Did the Public Service Commission choose him? How did you choose your clerks, Secretaries and other staff officers, or how do you propose to choose them?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: The appointments of High Commissioners and Deputy High Commissioners will be made by me. All other appointments will be made by the Public Service Commission.

Mr. Sri Nissanka: We were thinking of the omnibus.

Mr. Dahanayake: Is it correct to say that clerks have already been appointed?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Clerks have been appointed because the Trade Commissioner's Department has been functioning for a number of years.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: I wish to ask one question in regard to that matter. Is it part of the policy of this Government, when a person in that office changes, that simultaneously the personnel of certain attendant offices shall change? I found that, with the proposed translation of Mr. Corea to another, and presumably higher sphere, and in preparation for the coming of the new incumbent of this office, certain ancillary officers also found new appointments there in this very office of the Trade Commissioner.

5.45 P.M.

Is it part of the policy of this Government to change, along with the Commissioner or Trade Commissioner of a place, the attendant personnel in certain key offices?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: That is news to me.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: I say so because I met the gentleman. He is Mr. Lionel Weerasinghe who has replaced somebody else.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: No, he has not replaced somebody else. He was sent from here for taking over the work of the Crown Agents.

Mr. Dahanayake: What is his post?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: He is the Financial Assistant. He was appointed long ago.

Mr. Sri Nissanka: I should like to ask the Hon. Prime Minister whether, under the Constitution, a High Commissioner himself is not a public servant. If so, was the High Commissioner appointed by the Public Service Commission?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: As far as the High Commissioner is concerned, whether he belongs to the Public Service of Ceylon or not, is a matter which I do not want to argue with lawyers. What is going to be done is what I just told hon. Members. The High Commissioners and the Representatives of this country will be appointed by me. All other posts will be filled by the Public Service Commission.

Mr. Keuneman: Can the Hon. Prime Minister inform us whether, in the case of those appointments which have already been made by him and the Public Service Commission—

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I have not made any appointments.

Mr. Keuneman: The Hon. Prime Minister told us that certain officers are going to be appointed by him and by the Public Service Commission. But what I should like to say is that some people have already been appointed.

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: These officers are wanted next year.

Mr. Keuneman: Will these posts be duly advertised? Will the Hon. Prime Minister give the assurance that applicants can make their applications to him for selection?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: As a matter of fact, as far as I am concerned, I can tell hon. Members this much, that no assurance are necessary, for the simple reason that I have already asked the Permanent Secretary to advertise those posts. At the same time, I should like to say that the selection of the Representatives will not be done by advertisement.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: They should have a right to appeal to the Public Service Commission.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I shall manage that.

Dr. Perera: I do not know about individual officers, but whole families have gone abroad to London. What I would like to know is whether there is

provision for a Warden for the Students' Hostel. I would like to know whether a person has been appointed, because there seems to be a lot of complaints from students in London that the most suitable person has not been chosen or is not likely to be chosen. I should like to know whether he has been chosen or not.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: No, not yet.

The Chairman: There is no post yet.

Dr. Perera: Is it proposed, in the normal way, to get this Warden also appointed through the Public Service Commission?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Yes.

The Chairman: Are there any further remarks?

Question put.

Dr. Perera: I rise to a point of Order. Are you putting the whole Vote No. 1? Because there are a number of Amendments of mine. We were discussing only sub-head 1.

The Chairman: I asked, "Are there any further remarks", but there was no answer.

Dr. Perera: That is very unfair.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 620,972 for Head 16, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put.

The House divided (under Standing Order 48): Ayes, 44; Noes, 20.

Head 16, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Vote No. 2.—Salaries and expenses of the Ceylon High Commissioner in India, Rs. 109,723.

Sub-head 1, Personal Emoluments, Rs. 77,016.

Dr. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 100 in respect of sub-head 1."

What I should like to submit to the House is this, whether it would not be better either to combine the Trade Commissioner in Bombay with the

High Commissioner in Delhi, or get rid of the High Commissioner in India altogether. I do not see the particular purpose in having two entirely different institutions. So, the Trade Commissioner in India may be brought under the High Commissioner and work may be done as in London. For instance, there are various Trade Commissioners functioning under the High Commissioner in London and, in a similar way, in India you can have the Trade Commissioner functioning under the High Commissioner instead of having two separate institutions.

Mr. Dahanayake: Why does not this High Commissioner issue an Administration Report? We want all these Commissioners and Representatives abroad to issue reports, both annually and at other times so that they may be made use of when important subjects have to be discussed. My information is that the Trade Commissioner in India does nothing except read newspapers and attend functions. If he does something substantial, he ought to be able to put it down on paper. I would insist that these Trade Commissioners and others be called upon to issue annual Administration Reports.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: Before the Hon. Prime Minister replies to the questions asked, I should like to ask a question with regard to the item, "Outfit allowance to Ceylonese Officers, Rs. 2,500." The present Trade Commissioner has been functioning in India for a couple of years now. Therefore, what is the reason for this new outfit allowance? Why is this allowance wanted for the first time this year?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Outfit allowances have been allowed here in Ceylon also.

With regard to the question that has been asked by the hon. Member for Ruwanwella regarding the Trade Commissioner in Bombay, I should like to say that he is under the High Commissioner in Delhi. My hon. Friend would realize that India is a little different and a little bigger than Ceylon—I believe he realizes that—and that the Government of India is in

New Delhi where there is not so much of trade as in Bombay. Where there is trade and trade activity, we have got to have a Trade Commissioner, and where there is the Central Government we have to have a High Commissioner.

Dr. Perera: What about Calcutta?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Calcutta may want another Trade Commissioner as time goes on.

Dr. Perera: I should like to ask a question about this overseas allowance to the Second Secretary.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: There is no Amendment of the hon. Member with regard to that item.

Dr. Perera: All these details follow from the first item.

The Chairman: What does the hon. Member want to know?

Dr. Perera: I see again that there is an overseas allowance provided for the Chief Clerk. The amount looks more like a salary. After all, India is not so far away. I do not know whether the cost of living there is so high when compared with that of Ceylon.

The Hon. Mr. A. Ratnayake: The cost-of-living index has gone up by seventy pies.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 109,723 for Head 16, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule," put, and agreed to.

Head 16, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Vote No. 3.—Salaries and expenses of the Ceylon Ambassador in the United States of America, Rs. 550,079.

Sub-head 1, Personal Emoluments, Rs. 297,579.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 100,000 in respect of sub-head 1."

Is it proposed to buy a residence for the Ceylon Ambassador in the United States of America, too? I find that

[Mr. Wilmot A. Perera.]
there is an item of Rs. 100,000 (special expenses) for furniture, &c. for the Ambassador's residence, a sum of Rs. 25,000 for his Office, and a further sum of Rs. 6,000 for his Residence. Is an office to be purchased in the United States, too, and, if so, how much is it expected to cost?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake:
The house there will cost Rs. 600,000.

Mr. Dahanayake: Sir, the country really wishes to know whether there is any justification for the establishment of a Legation in America. We propose to have an Ambassador with a Counsellor to advise him and you have given him two Secretaries and a number of clerks. On the whole it is going to cost us Rs. 650,000 a year.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake:
The hon. Member is referring to Vote No. 4.

Mr. Dahanayake: The whole position is this. It has to be granted that you need an Embassy in London because of the Government's connexion with the British Empire. But I should like to ask whether there is any special reason why we should have a Legation in America. If we go on at this rate, it may be that we would have Legations in each and every country.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake:
That is most likely.

Mr. Dahanayake: If that happens, one after the other you will be sending your hand-picked men overseas, and they will all be having cushy jobs and doing nothing. These are the days of the wireless, the radio and the radio telephone, and I see no very close alliance between Ceylon and America to make us spend so much money on a Legation there. I wish to put it bluntly to the Government and say that this post was created for a special reason. The previous holder of the post of Ceylon Government Representative in London accepted that post on the undertaking, more or less, that when he vacated the office of Minister in Ceylon, he would be kept in London for a specific number of years; otherwise, he would not have vacated his office here and taken up a

job in London. Then, suddenly, events moved very fast, and the Government thought that a certain gentleman here in Ceylon should be sent to London. The position then was that it was difficult to dislodge the Ceylon Government Representative in London. The whole game became a chess-board with the Hon. Prime Minister making the moves. The gentleman in London had to be moved somewhere else. At the same time, the Government found that his terms and conditions of service should be maintained without disadvantage to himself.

6.0 P.M.

Then, Sir, the next move on the chess-board was to create this post of an Ambassador in Washington. There is no earthly reason why we should have an Embassy, except that the Hon. Prime Minister wants to move a pawn of his on his political chess-board from London to Washington.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: It is a good move.

Mr. Dahanayake: If that is not the correct position, will the Hon. Prime Minister be frank enough to tell us what work this Ambassador and his assistants will be doing for us in future from his Embassy in Washington?

Mr. Cholmondeley Goonewardene (Kalutara): I should like to know what necessity there is for a sum of Rs. 20,000 to be provided for a motor car for the High Commissioner in America when the cost of cars is much less in America. For instance, the cost of a Packard in Ceylon is about Rs. 16,500, and the cost of a Cadillac, which is known as the American "Rolls Royce" is round about Rs. 18,000, that is because of the recent heavy import duties imposed by the Hon. Minister of Finance. The policy of the Government seems to be based on the assumption that the prestige of this country depends on the extravagant manner of living, and if that is the policy of this Government, it seems to me to be an entirely mistaken policy, and we, on this side of the House, condemn that policy.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake:
With regard to the remarks made by my hon. Friend, the Member for Galle,

I am sorry I have simply to treat with contempt the insinuations and the motives he attributed to me. There is not the slightest doubt that an Ambassador is required in America, and it is because of the fact that there is going to be such close relations between the two countries that America thought it necessary to send an Ambassador here. I wonder whether my hon. Friend would say that it is a part of a conspiracy to send my friend to England that we had made arrangements with America to send an Ambassador here, so that we can have some excuse to send an Ambassador there.

With regard to the representative in England itself, it is absolutely true that Mr. Corea had a 5-year contract to be in London as our Trade Commissioner. He was asked by me whether he would like to continue in that position or whether he would like to go to America as our Ambassador. I felt that, as he had been doing very good work in England, he would be able to render still greater service for us in America than in England. Sir, of the two places, Mr. Corea preferred America, and therefore we decided to send him there. He has not gone there as yet. He will be going there in about October. That is the position. But, of course, if the hon. Member for Galle thinks that he could make insinuations, attribute motives and cast aspersions on people who have already done yeoman service and are prepared to do yet more yeoman service as the representatives of this country, if he thinks that that sort of thing is the correct thing, well then he can continue to do it.

Then there is one thing more and that is, in regard to the need for this officer. In that respect my hon. Friend would stand to benefit more by getting some advice from his chief as to how things are done in other countries, than visiting the bazaars in the Galle town and thinking that the business in the world is carried out in the same way as it is carried out in the bazaars in the Galle town.

Mr. Dahanayake: I am really anxious to know what work this Ambassador in Washington will have. If the Hon. Prime Minister can explain to us what work this Ambassador will have, he will be able to set our minds at rest.

As things are, it seems to me that a new post has been created without much work to be done.

Mr. Cholmondeley Goonewardene: The Hon. Prime Minister has not answered my question.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: As far as the question of the car is concerned, it is only the value that has been put down. If a car can be bought cheaper than the amount provided here, we will certainly buy it at that price.

Mr. Keerthiratne: Sir, the American Ambassador will be very useful to us at this moment. Now, take the case of the Gal Oya scheme which the Hon. Minister of Agriculture has in view. We will be requiring a great deal of machinery for that purpose. At the moment we are short of machinery, and an Ambassador being appointed to America just now will be of great assistance to us in getting the machinery that we need. Then, again, take the case of the amount of textiles that we get from America. Is that not an added reason why we should have an agent there?

Dr. Perera: Sir, I am a little disappointed with what the Hon. Prime Minister said. I quite agree that Mr. Corea had made himself familiar with his work in England and did a bit of useful work. When that gentleman had done such good work in England, is there any reason why he should be suddenly shifted? I am not in a position to disclose the nature of the private talks the Hon. Prime Minister had with Mr. Corea when he was here some time back, but I do think that this was not a wise move to make, to shift Mr. Corea from London at this stage and push him on to America. He has gone voluntarily——

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Not voluntarily.

Dr. Perera: I am glad that it is not voluntarily. Perhaps there may have been a difference of opinion on that matter, as the Hon. Prime Minister knows. But what I would like to ask in this case is this. Although the hon. Member for Kegalla put it rather crudely, I do not know why, as we

[Dr. Perera.]

found under Vote 1, the work of the Crown Agents for the Colonies should be concentrated entirely in London, if in the future we hope to get so much more material from America. Why should we undertake this work? Surely, a portion of that work can be passed on to America?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: It can be.

Dr. Perera: But, then, why concentrate all our economic experts, accountants and the others in London alone? In point of fact we might have to buy more from the United States of America than from England, particularly the machinery. I do not think that is the task of an Ambassador. You might really want all your accountants and your economic experts in America than in London. I do not think it is necessary to concentrate all your efforts on merely taking over the work of the Crown Agents, as if you are going to do really all the work that the Crown Agents did in the past in London. That is the point I should like to raise.

Mr. Keerthiratne: There seems to be much talk about Mr. Corea being transferred to America. Hon. Members will realize that as the headquarters of the U.N.O. is in America, it is very necessary that we should have a first-class man there rather than in London. Our Hon. Prime Minister, therefore transferred him to America so that we may have a better man there.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 550,079 for Head 16, Vote No. 3, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 16, Vote 3, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Vote No. 4.—Salaries and expenses of Overseas Representations of Ceylon, Rs. 650,000.

Sub-head 1.—Ceylon Government Representatives in countries other than United Kingdom, United States of America and India, Rs. 300,000.

Dr. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 100 in respect of sub-head 1."

We should like to have some indication of the other representatives that the Hon. Prime Minister intends to send; for instance, what other countries has he in mind.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: We intend sending someone to Australia and Pakistan. Those are the two countries for the present, and there is still another place which we have not finally decided on.

Mr. Dahanayake: Timbuctoo also.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: The point we want to know is what are the places the Hon. Prime Minister has in contemplation other than Australia and Pakistan? Then the other point is this: what is the nature of the arrangements that he has at present with the British Embassy, Legations or Consuls abroad, with regard to commercial intelligence, business, and so on?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Our arrangement has been this: where we have no representatives and where we want the British Embassy to do some work for us, we have been successful in arranging with them to do our work.

Dr. Perera: Provide all commercial intelligence?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: It depends on the amount of work done.

Mr. S. A. Pakeman (Appointed Member): Just one question, Sir. Are those representatives who are called upon to do this work paid any sort of fees or remuneration for the work done?

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: While congratulating the British Government on its customary generosity in these matters, the point I want to know is this: India, for instance, is opening various agencies in various countries. Now, have we considered the question of whether there will not be certain advantages to us of having arrangements with them, too, because of the nature of the commercial intelligence and so on that we want?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I might mention here that recently it became necessary for us to approach India, and I daresay they came to our rescue by doing some work for us. I might also add that not only India but also Pakistan and even Burma came to our rescue.

Mr. Dahanayake: This is just the thin end of the wedge. It is just a case of appointing as many Ambassadors as there are countries in the world by and by. No details seem to have been given us as to how it is proposed to spend this Rs. 300,000, and from what we have seen of the activities in the past, the institution in London is to cost us 6 lakhs of rupees; the one in Delhi 1 lakh; the one in America 5½ lakhs of rupees; and so on. There will be as many embassies as there are countries. I think we must cry halt to this type of squandermania. There is no reason why, just because the Government believes that overnight we have turned from a Colony to a Dominion, it should send out its men to all parts of the world, unless, of course, it is for specific duties and for special purposes. There was a talk the other day, for instance, of sending a representative to Burma, another one to the Far East, and I do not mind telling the Hon. Prime Minister what is being talked of by the man in the street. It is said that every dislodged politician can find an embassy somewhere in some part of the world, and that those who serve the United National Party faithfully and well can hope, if they lose at the polls, to become Ambassadors somewhere in the world. Is that the position we are coming to? We must cry halt to this. We cannot grant you a cent of this Vote because we have not been furnished with the details.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: Why cannot we make use of the Indian and British Legations in those countries to carry out our work? Pandit Nehru himself has said that he is contemplating utilizing the services of the British Legations owing to the cost of establishing Embassies for India being so tremendously high.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: We are trying to do as much as we could. Surely, my good Friends will know that

there are more than five countries in the world.

Mr. Keerthiratne: India is almost on the brink of being involved in a war. For instance, the Arab League and Hyderabad may join hands and attack India. Therefore, if we join India at this moment, I ask, will we also not be involved in a war?

The Chairman: Is the hon. Member for Ruwanwella pressing the Amendment?

Dr. Perera: No.

Sub-head 2—Special Missions abroad, Rs. 250,000.

Dr. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 100 in respect of sub-head 2."

Can the Hon. Prime Minister throw some light on special missions abroad, as he has demanded an increase of 1½ lakhs of rupees. What special missions has he in mind?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: We have joined the World Health Organization, and we have received a number of invitations to Conferences in various parts of the world. As a matter of fact, I am inclined to think that this extra 1½ lakhs that we are asking for will not be enough. Hon. Members can just imagine to what an extent we have been recognized that even our presence has been considered to be invaluable at these conferences.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 650,000 for Head 16, Vote No. 4, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 16, Vote 4, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 17.—Police

Vote No. 1.—Salaries and expenses of the Police Department including grants and contribution to Social Welfare Institutions and cost of special services, Rs. 12,971,522.

Sub-head 1, Personal Emoluments, Rs. 7,486,303.

6.15 P.M.

Dr. Perera: There are some Amendments by the Hon. Minister.

Mr. Wickremasinghe: I move "That that Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Inspector-General of Police'."

I wish to bring to the notice of the Hon. Prime Minister that the Police chiefs in outstations, when representations are submitted to them with regard to the defects and misdoings of the Inspectors and Sergeants in charge of Police Stations in the area—

The Chairman: Is the hon. Member going to deal with Sergeants and Constables and not the Inspector-General of Police? Are you going to attack this Vote or are you going to speak about others?

Mr. Wickremasinghe: I am going to deal with the administration of the Police Department, and that was why I moved my Amendment. When representations are made, inquiries are not made properly. When a complaint is made about an Inspector, the Inspector of the neighbouring Police Station is sent to inquire into the report made against the other Inspector, and the chief Police officer of the District does not immediately attend to the complaints made. What happens when an inquiry is being made by the Inspector of the neighbouring station? All sorts of evidence is collected and everything that has got to be done to protect the other Inspector is done, and after three or four months a reply comes from the chief Police Inspector of the District, stating that there is insufficient evidence or that the evidence does not disclose a case against the Inspector, or the Sergeant or Constable concerned.

I would ask the Hon. Prime Minister, where a representation is made against an Inspector, or a Sergeant, or whomsoever it may be, who is in charge of a Police Station, to see that the chief Police officer of the District inquires into that matter immediately, and to see that, after the inquiry, if there is any evidence that the Inspector has not done the correct thing, the officer concerned is punished or adequately dealt with. When these inquiries are made by officers of the same standing as the one against whom the complaint is made, the people are not satisfied. When the Inspector of the neighbouring Police

Station comes and inquires, the complainant is not satisfied because he goes away with the idea that justice has not been done, because a friend has been sent to investigate into the offences committed by an officer.

I have submitted at least four or five petitions to the Superintendent of Police of the Matara District—they were submitted by me as they were given to me by the people—and wanted immediate steps to be taken by the Superintendent of Police to inquire into those matters, the details of which were given in those petitions. But no inquiries were held by the Assistant Superintendent of Police in that District, and replies were sent later that the evidence was insufficient. To about two or three petitions no reply has yet been sent though about three or four months have elapsed. I find, to my great regret, that when people of status are concerned—it may be simple hurt under section 314, it may be a case of insult under section 484, which could ordinarily be tried by a Village Tribunal, it may be a case of simple intimidation under section 486—the Inspector-General of Police goes from Colombo to a district to make the inquiry. I would remind him that the law is no respecter of persons. If a poor man's life is in danger, it is equally in danger as the life of a man of status. So, I would request the Hon. Prime Minister to see that, when petitions come from rural areas regarding the misdeeds of the Police, the Superintendent of Police of those areas is asked to take steps immediately, so that the poor people are given a good hearing and justice is done.

Mr. Dahanayake: I want to invite the attention of the Hon. Prime Minister particularly to one point, and that is the salary that the Government has offered to the present holder of the post of Inspector-General of Police. The salary attached to the post before the present holder assumed office was Rs. 18,600 to Rs. 20,400. The present holder of the office was a member of Class I., Grade II., of the Ceylon Civil Service. When he was appointed as the Inspector-General of Police, a special salary was attached to the holder of the post. That special salary is

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: It was decided last year.

Mr. Dahanayake: I want to know how and why this happened. The salary scale that was offered to the present holder is the salary scale that the Government offered to a Permanent Secretary. Here is the Inspector-General of Police, the head of a department, placed on a scale very much above the scales offered to all other heads of departments in Government Service, and offered a scale equivalent to the scale of a Permanent Secretary. And, Sir, on the top of such a bright and stupendous scale of salary, the present holder was knighted only the other day. Well, I suppose there are still more promotions, still greater promotions awaiting him. I was even tempted to say of the present holder, in the words of Shelley:

"Hail to thee, *Sir Richard!*
Bird thou never wert."

because he was flying higher and higher up in the air.

Now, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to discover for the House any special reason under the sun why the head of the Police Department should have been given this exceptional treatment. Is the Police Department a productive Department? Is it something that is connected with the economics of this country? Is it something that has a very big say in the welfare, in the material prosperity, of the people of this country? Or, if not, on the other hand, is the Police Department merely a set of warders and watchers, whose primary duty is to see that the law is obeyed and that there is no breach of the law on the part of the average citizen? I do not know why you have invested this particular office with such tremendous importance.

It may be that, to the minds of the hon. Members of the Government, who feel that their very existence as a power in the land is at stake, the Police Department should be there in full force and power and with possibility to shield them at a moment's notice. Is that the reason why the head of the Police Department is given a fancy salary? I cannot for the life of me discover the reason why this officer was given exceptional treatment.

We will look at it from the angle of other officers in the Service. Why is it that this particular officer is meted a special treatment and not the others? Are there no other Departments which are of greater use to the country, which are of greater importance to the people, that their heads of Departments should have been treated better. I say that this is a position which this House cannot accept. I feel that the head of the Police Department does much less service than an average Police Constable or an average village headman—if you ask me, Mr. Chairman. I feel that we should revert him to the salary that the previous holder of the office was given when he held that post.

Mr. P. Kumarasiri (Hakmana): I wish to raise one or two matters in connection with the Police Department. There is a very grave and dangerous situation prevailing in the Matara and Hambantota Districts as a result of Police assaults. According to the complaints I have been receiving during the past few months, the number of these police assaults on innocent villagers seems to be increasing.

There was, for instance, the case of the Werelle Police in the Morawak Korale where there were assaults on innocent villagers almost daily. There was a memorandum sent signed by me and two other Members of Parliament to the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs who was at that time in charge of the Police Department, and a copy of it was sent to the Inspector-General of Police and, if I remember right, another copy to the Prime Minister, too. But up to date we have not received an acknowledgment of this memorandum. Apart from making inquiries into about 24 cases of assaults, we have not yet received even an acknowledgment from either the Minister of Home Affairs or the Inspector-General of Police.

Then there was another case where the Kamburupitiya Police, in the course of a raid on a gambling den, assaulted an innocent man who had come to the co-operative stores to buy his provisions. That man was injured, and he was lying in hospital for about two weeks. I made representations to the Assistant Superintendent of Police, and up to this day I have not been informed of any inquiry.

The Chairman: Is not that enough?

Mr. Kumarasiri: Another incident was brought to my notice, from the Hakmana Police area, by a man belonging to the so-called depressed caste. Because he tiled his roof—that was the first time when a man of the depressed caste tiled the roof of his house—some members of the so-called higher caste had broken down the whole house. The incident took place about two weeks ago. Though I made immediate representations to the Assistant Superintendent of Police, no action has yet been taken into an incident which normally would have led to communal riots. But on the other hand I might mention, as my hon. Friend, the Member for Akuressa, pointed out, when the aggrieved party happens to be a Parliamentary Secretary, the Deputy Inspector-General of Police is rushed from Colombo and a Superintendent of Police is rushed from Galle; but when the aggrieved party is an innocent villager or a helpless peasant, no action is taken in spite of representations made by Members of Parliament.

The Hon. Mr. Goonesinha: No repetitions, please. I move that the Question be now put. We came to an agreement—

Dr. Perera: You came to no agreement.

The Hon. Mr. Goonesinha: We submitted a programme of work which they accepted.

Dr. Perera: Who submitted?

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: We have a Government Whip who is always trying to suppress discussion.

Mr. Cholmondeley Goonewardene: I wish to refer to the question—

The Chairman: I cannot accept the closure. I must inform hon. Members that there is an understanding come to by the hon. Members. I think the matter has been sufficiently discussed.

The Hon. Mr. Goonesinha: If they are breaking the agreement, I will throw this away and keep quiet.

Mr. Cholmondeley Goonewardene: I wish to refer to the question of entries made in Police Stations. Some time ago there was a Resolution passed by the State Council, moved by the then Member for Avissawella, but at that time the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs flouted the decision of the House. We hope that the Hon. Minister of Defence and External Affairs, who is so anxious to promote the national languages, would at least see that entries at Police Stations are made in the language in which complaints are made. We know the difficulties that people experience at Police Stations when their entries are taken down in a language that they do not understand. We also ought to know the importance of first complaints in Magistrates' Court cases. A large number of cases fail because of the defects in first complaints. We want some sort of definite assurance from the Hon. Minister as to what his policy is in regard to this matter.

6.30 P.M.

Dr. Perera: On a point of principle, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter in which I have no doubt the Prime Minister can allocate whatever Departments he likes to himself and distribute the other Departments, also as he likes—there is no doubt about that; but I think it is only fair that we should make this observation, that we know of no country where the Police Department has been associated with the same Minister who is also in charge of the Military section. There is a danger in such an event, and that is why I think that in most democratic countries the two branches are kept distinctly separate. The same Minister who gives orders to the Military should not also be responsible for giving orders to the Police.

It is more or less the recognized principle, you will find throughout the world, that the Minister of Defence who has authority over the Military Force, should not also be the Minister responsible for the Police Department.

The Chairman: There is no hard and fast rule as such.

Dr. Perera: I am only observing the general practice that obtains. I do this only because I think it is rather important that the Police, which is only

meant for internal defence, should not be militarized—should not be treated as a Military unit. That, I think, is the principle that has been observed throughout the democratic world. Therefore, I would like to make the observation that, so far as this question is concerned, I greatly regret that that principle has not been in operation in this particular case also. Whatever may be the reason because of which the Hon. Prime Minister has decided to have the Police Department under him, all that I can say is that I do wish and hope that he will, as far as is possible, keep the two things quite separate, and that he will not let the Police merely become an adjunct of the Military.

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: May I also make a few remarks?

The Chairman: As I have said previously, the Hon. Prime Minister cannot wait long—he has an engagement.

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: I shall not take long—only two minutes. Mr. Chairman, as you might be aware, in the past, particularly during the regime of Dowbiggin and Banks, recruitment to the Police was done on a communal basis.

The Chairman: That is not so now.

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: It might not have been openly stated as such, but if you study the figures, particularly the Administration Reports of Bacon, you will see that 60 Inspectors have been drawn from the Sinhalese community and 40 from the Burgher community. Now, Mr. Chairman, that policy might have—

The Chairman: Does the hon. Member mean to say that there is none from the Tamil community?

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: There is, but I only wished to draw the attention of the Hon. Prime Minister to a certain aspect of recruitment. It may have been all right, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of using the Police as machinery to cow and intimidate the people. I do not wish, Mr. Chairman, to say that we should not recruit from the Burgher community. On the

contrary, if they are the best people, let every man be recruited from the Burgher community; but we must have an assurance from the Prime Minister that, in future, recruitment to the Inspectorate—even to the higher Grades—will be only on merit. I am not making this observation on a communal basis.

The Chairman: That is how it works now.

Mr. A. Reginald Perera: No, Sir.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: I will just take two minutes on a different matter, Sir. I want to bring to the notice of the Hon. Prime Minister that the hon. Inspector-General of Police has used his powers, which he is purported to derive under Section 56 of the Police Ordinance, to impose a series of Welfare Committees upon his Force.

You see here, Sir, that the Inspector-General of Police has sought to substitute, for the old Sergeants and Constables' Association, a certain machinery of organization by parade orders. The men refused to respond. Now, under Section 56 of the Police Ordinance, he imposes a series of Welfare Committees upon them. I want to bring to the notice of the Hon. Prime Minister that I do at this stage affirm that Section 56 was obviously never meant for such a use as that. It was meant for the purpose of disciplinary control of the Force, etc., and to give the Inspector-General the rights and powers to keep control over his men. This is a method of forcing a particular method of organization on them in order to provide a basis for other Governmental schemes; and I would call upon the Prime Minister to indicate to the Inspector-General of Police that the use of powers given for one set of purposes for some other administrative purpose like this will only result in bringing that particular power and the law itself into disrepute in the very Force that is expected to enforce that power.

Mr. Kumaraswamy: May I make a few observations, Sir?

The Chairman: I said the Hon. Prime Minister must go away because he has an engagement. Do you have anything new to add?

Mr. Kumaraswamy: On some other Head.

The Chairman: About what?

Mr. Kumaraswamy: About my constituency.

The Chairman: It cannot be allowed. Hon. Members had about one and a half hours to say what they wanted.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: In regard to the question regarding complaints made to Police Inspectors and others, I might say this much, that it is very difficult for me to reply to any complaints because I am not aware of any of these facts. If I were made aware of those facts, I would be able to say whether they are true or not and what happened. But when statements are made suddenly—and I know nothing about the matters under complaint—to the effect that the Home Minister and the Inspector-General of Police have been petitioned, and perhaps the Prime Minister, too, in spite of the fact that the Prime Minister has never been approached on this question, it makes it very difficult for me to give any reply.

I can assure my hon. Friend the Member for Hakmana, however, that if there are any complaints that he has to make, I shall be very glad to inquire into them and give him a reply.

With regard to the salary of the Inspector-General of Police, I can only say that this is a question which was discussed last year and approved by this House. With regard to the appointment, I can say that it was a choice which I made, and I am happy that I made that choice. Previous to this there were two Inspectors-General—one, I believe, was Col. Halland and the other Mr. Bacon—who had been drawing almost the same salary. I even believe that Sir Herbert Dowbiggin was drawing the same salary. Well, there was a sort of feeling that we would not be able to get any one in Ceylon to fill the post with acceptance, but I can say, Sir, that we were fortunate in getting Sir Richard Aluwihare to take up this post. He only thought of the service which he was called upon to render and nothing about himself. There is not the slightest doubt that if he did not

take up this post, he would have been appointed as one of the Permanent Secretaries. He was not concerned with what he obtained, but when it was considered necessary that he should be asked to serve in any capacity, he responded without question or inquiring what salary he was going to get or what his prospects were.

I feel sure that, from the time he has been Inspector-General of Police, even my hon. Friend the Member for Galle feels safer that he did before. I remember how, times out of number, he had asked for Police protection, indicating what confidence he has in the Police Force. The very fact that he chooses to abuse the Police when he speaks about them indicates that it is only with their protection that he can even do that.

Mr. Dahanayake: Police protection is afforded under the law.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I am sure that no one who has any sense of fairness would deny that the present Inspector-General of Police has transformed a discontented and unreliable Force into one of which we are proud and one that can secure for us as much protection as we would wish to have. Today the Police Force is a loyal and good Force. Unfortunately, perhaps owing to the mischievous activities of certain people, and not due to any inherent fault in the men themselves, it may perhaps have been true that the Police Force was a little disorganized and discontented.

Mr. T. B. Ilangaratne (Kandy): What about their Union?

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: The hon. Member can have the Union; we will have the Police Force. As far as we are concerned we desire to give protection to the people, and we will give that protection.

As to why the Police Force has been brought under the Defence Ministry, Sir, I feel that it is not only the privilege or the right of a Prime Minister to allot subjects, but that it is his duty when he considers a certain Department requires special attention that he should not shirk that duty.

Dr. Perera: That is a reflection on the Minister of Home Affairs.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: It is not a reflection on the Minister of Home Affairs, though perhaps it may be a compliment to some of the individuals who are creating trouble in this country. Whatever it may be, the matter required my attention and I have used my discretion in it.

What further questions have I to answer?

Mr. Cholmondeley Goonewardene: The question of making entries at Police Stations.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: As far as that is concerned, anyone can enter a complaint in the Police Information Book in any language he likes.

Hon. Members: No, no.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: He can do so.

Mr. Dahanayake: Will you make that order tomorrow?

Dr. Perera: Will you publish that? Will you make the announcement in the papers that anybody can make their entries at Police Stations in Tamil or Sinhalese? Now it cannot be done except in the English language, and that also is done by the Sergeant.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: All right, I will look into that.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: There are two aspects to this problem—one is the right of language, and the other is the right of writing in one's own language. I myself have had the experience that, when I state that such and such a thing happened, the Sergeant changed my English—he changed my sentence.

The Chairman: I have made entries in the Police Information Book myself without having a Sergeant to do it for me.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: Well, Sir, one has the right; but it is not often that one is allowed to exercise that right.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I always was under the impression that that was what was being done.

What else is there for me to answer?

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: Section 56 of the Police Ordinance.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: With regard to Section 56 of the Police Ordinance, I must admit that I do not know the scope of the Section, but I shall certainly look into it.

The Chairman: Will the Hon. Minister of Finance move his Amendments in respect of sub-head 1?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I move, the following Amendments:

“That the Vote be increased by Rs. 2,400 in respect of sub-head 1, item Labourers (for Headquarters, etc.)’.”

“That the Vote be increased by Rs. 2,225 in respect of sub-head 1, new item ‘6 Daily-paid labourers for Police Training School, Katukurunda’.”

“That the Vote be increased by Rs. 3,000 in respect of sub-head 1, new item ‘Welfare Officer’.”

Mr. Dahanayake: What are the functions of this Welfare Officer?

The Chairman: Organizing welfare centres in the Police Department. That was recommended long ago.

Question, “That the Vote be increased by Rs. 2,400 in respect of sub-head 1, item ‘Labourers (for Headquarters, etc.)’,” put and agreed to.

Question, “That the Vote be increased by Rs. 2,225 in respect of sub-head 1, new item ‘6 Daily-paid labourers for Police Training School, Katukurunda’,” put, and agreed to.

Question, “That the Vote be increased by Rs. 3,000 in respect of sub-head 1, new item ‘1 Welfare Officer’,” put, and agreed to.

The Chairman: Amendments under any other sub-heads?

Dr. Perera: Yes, Sir, under sub-head 6.

Sub-head 4, Grants towards Social and Welfare Services, etc., Rs. 141,080.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I have an Amendment under sub-head 4. I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 17,500 in respect of sub-head 4." This reduction is due to the fact that certain grants have been transferred to the Ministry of Labour and Social Services—the grants in respect of the Child Protection Society and the Jayasekera Home.

Question put, and agreed to.

Sub-head 5, Rents of hired premises and maintenance of cattle pounds, Rs. 692,000.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 5."

This is in regard to rents of hired premises. We understand that there is a programme—a five-year plan or something—to put up buildings, but where can we get an indication as to what the priority is with regard to the stations that have been selected?

6.45 P.M.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: The information cannot be given immediately. Plans are being drawn by the P.W.D. and the land has to be acquired. Within the next three or four months I shall be able to give some idea of the work that will be done next year or the year after.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: In my constituency there is a police station at Anguruwatota where the accommodation is quite inadequate. The Inspector, a married man, is expected to live in a small room. Conditions there are quite "impossible".

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: We shall do our best.

Sub-head 6.—Miscellaneous Services, Rs. 309,110.

Dr. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 20,000 in respect of sub-head 6. The object is to delete the item, "C.I.D. Special Expenditure".

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: Why?

Dr. Perera: That is the money they ear-mark to keep track of some of the so-called "mischief-makers". Obviously, the P. M. cannot expect us to pass that vote! We must, on principle, oppose it.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: I was under the impression that they were not mischief-makers!

Dr. Perera: That is your own statement. I am merely echoing your own statement.

The Chairman: Do you press your Amendment?

Dr. Perera: Yes.

Question, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 20,000 in respect of sub-head 6," put.

The Committee divided (under S.O. 48): Ayes, 17; Noes, 40.

Sub-head 11.—Seven horses for Police Stables, Rs. 8,750.

Mr. J. C. T. Kotalawela: Under sub-head 11 I find they are providing for seven horses for the Police stables.

Sub-head 9.—10 motor cars and 200 pedal cycles (replacements) (token vote), Rs. 65,000.

Dr. Perera: Before sub-head 11, there is an Amendment in my name under sub-head 9. Why is a token vote being asked for under this sub-head?

The Chairman: Rs. 65,000 cannot be a "token" vote.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: We can make use of the savings.

The Chairman: This is apparently a re-vote.

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: We will make use of savings under the other votes.

The Chairman: It is a mistake to call this a token vote.

Sub-head 11.—Seven horses for Police Stables, Rs. 8,750.

Mr. J. C. T. Kotalawela: They want seven horses—

Mr. Dahanayake: That is for horse-play!

Mr. J. C. T. Kotalawela: In addition to the cars and cycles, they want horses——

The Hon. Mr. D. S. Senanayake: A horse is equivalent to about 12 constables when it comes to keeping order during processions, &c. I am certain that the use of these horses will be called for by my hon. Friends opposite more often than by us!

Mr. Keuneman: Why not call this a "Horse Force", instead of "Police Force"?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I move the following Amendments:

"That the Vote be increased by Rs. 2,137 in respect of New sub-head 'Compensation in respect of Requisitioned premises, 31, Main street, Trincomalee'."

"That the Vote be increased by Rs. 2,361 in respect of New sub-head 'Compensation in respect of Requisitioned premises, 38, Green road, Trincomalee'."

"That the Vote be increased by Rs. 52,000 in respect of New sub-head 'Wireless equipment for Police (Revote)'."

"That the Vote be increased by Rs. 29,500 in respect of New sub-head 'Purchase of a new motor launch'."

Amendments agreed to.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 13,036,227 for Head 17, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 17, Vote 1, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 19.—Minister of Finance

Vote 1.—Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Minister of Finance,
Rs. 182,306.

Sub-head 1.—Personal emoluments,
Rs. 142,464.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I move, "That the Vote be increased by Rs. 3,000 in respect of sub-head 1, New item, 'Allowance for Expert Assistance'."

This is to enable us to engage the services of experts when questions like Sterling assets agreements and other matters come up. There are very few officers in the Ministry of Finance who can keep in touch with international events, maintain a library and summarise agreements that other countries enter into. It may be useful if the services of certain Economists in Ceylon can be requisitioned on a small allowance—Rs. 250 a month.

Mr. Keuneman: The experts you refer to are local experts?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Yes.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: This is to enable you to spend the money whenever you feel the need to obtain expert assistance, other than that available in your own Department?

Question "That the Vote be increased by Rs. 3,000 in respect of sub-head 1, New item, 'Allowance for Expert Assistance', put, and agreed to.

Dr. Perera: Will you permit me, Sir, to relate my Amendment under sub-head 1 to the item, "Additional Assistant Secretary".

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: That was passed by the House.

Mr. Dahanayake: Will you permit me, Sir, to refer to the item "Minister of Finance".

The Chairman: We are on Head 19, Vote 1.

Mr. Dahanayake: I want to refer to the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Perera: I want some information about the Additional Assistant Secretary.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: The House passed a Supplementary Estimate about two weeks ago for an Assistant Secretary under this Head. New Departments have come into the Ministry, and that makes it necessary to appoint an extra Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Dahanayake: I wish to refer to the item "Minister of Finance".

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: Is this special officer coming over from the Education Department?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: No. This is merely an addition to the cadre. You want to know who has been appointed?

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: Yes.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Mr. T. D. Jayasuriya is coming in.

Mr. Keuneman: In regard to the item "Minister of Finance"—

The Chairman: There is no Amendment in relation to that item.

Mr. Dahanayake: May I raise a question of general policy under the item "Minister of Finance"?

Mr. Keuneman: Could the Minister tell us what has resulted from the visit of Mr. Colin Clarke, who functioned as a sort of adviser on financial reorganization under the new Constitution? Can we have an indication from the Minister as to what financial changes are to be made?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Mr. Clarke was here for three days. He has submitted a report to the Prime Minister, in which he has made some very valuable suggestions.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: Only three days?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Yes.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: He must be a genius!

Mr. Keuneman: Will that report be published?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: The Report was submitted to the Prime Minister and I must ask the Prime Minister about it.

Mr. Dahanayake: I wish now to refer to a question of general policy.

The report on the Budget leakage is out, and, according to that report, it is established that there was a leakage. I want to know whether the Minister of Finance will accept responsibility for that leakage, and, if he accepts responsibility, whether he will act as other Ministers similarly placed have acted in the past.

Dr. Perera: On a point of Order: I have discussed this matter with you, Sir, as I thought it might involve a question of privilege, and you told me that it would be better not to raise this matter at this stage.

The Chairman: The hon. Member for Ruwanwella saw me, on this subject, and he told me that he wanted to raise this question as a matter of privilege. I could not tell him then whether it was a matter of privilege—

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: If I take responsibility for the leakage, and it is mine, I shall certainly resign at once.

The Chairman: The hon. Member for Ruwanwella placed the matter before me, and I told him that at the moment I could not say whether a question of privilege was involved, but that I would look into it.

Mr. Sivapalan: Could the Minister of Finance tell us what policy he proposes to adopt in regard to the absorption of the temporary clerks into the permanent Service?

One important point I would like to stress is that by circular No. 126/47/391/47—

The Chairman: Was not that point explained in detail by the Minister?

Mr. Sivapalan: This point has arisen subsequently—

The Chairman: It was in reference to the absorption of temporary clerks—

Mr. Sivapalan: In terms of that circular a certain number of temporary clerks are not to be absorbed into the permanent service. One of the conditions laid down in the circular is that men over 40 years of age will not be allowed to come into the permanent service.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: It is a very complicated agreement that we have come to with the Temporary Clerks Association. I am not in a position to disclose all the details now, but if the hon. Member would ask a Question in the normal way, I shall file an answer.

Mr. Sivapalan: I merely want to impress upon the Minister the importance of settling one point at issue between him and the temporary clerks. I do not want him to reply now. I am not concerned so much with getting a reply from him now as with getting an assurance from him that the matter will be considered.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: The matter has been decided, and applications have been called for.

The Chairman: An agreement has been come to between the Temporary Clerks Association and the Minister.

Mr. Dahanayake: I challenge that statement: I maintain that the Temporary Clerks Association did not agree to the terms laid down by the Minister.

The Chairman: The Minister has so stated.

Mr. Sivapalan: On the 10th October, 1947, the temporary clerks were told that they would be absorbed into the permanent service if they had the minimum educational qualifications, and were under 40 years of age. That stipulation regarding age is very unfair to people who have put in ten to fifteen years of service, expecting to be absorbed into the permanent service at some point in their career. On the other hand, people with just two or three years' service are to be absorbed into the permanent service. If this distinction is

not made by the Minister, I shall be satisfied.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: These temporary clerks and employees—we have widened the term “temporary clerks” and brought in the term “temporary employees” as well—have been given the right to sit for the General Clerical Service examination on conditions they never enjoyed before.

Mr. Sivapalan: People over 40 years of age are excluded. Even men who are just ten or twelve, or fourteen days, over the age of 40, are to be excluded from the examination. These men plead that they should be allowed to sit for the examination.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: There must be some dividing line.

Mr. Sivapalan: Merely because the Government issued a circular in these ambiguous terms, these poor men should not be made to suffer—men who are just 14 or 15 days over the age of 40—and denied the rights which they enjoyed five years ago.

Mr. Ilangaratne: I wish to refer to the discrimination made as between strikers and non-strikers. I wish to bring to the notice of the Minister that this discrimination has been made in the Treasury as between those who took part in the last general strike and the non-strikers.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: With regard to temporary employees? Not now—

Mr. Ilangaratne: I happened to step into a certain office to interview the officer concerned on behalf of a certain temporary clerk, and the first question put to me was whether he was a striker or a non-striker.

The Chairman: There is a Motion on the subject being debated in this House.

Mr. Ilangaratne: The Minister of Finance appealed to me to advise Government Servants to co-operate with Government. I have had occasion to consult the clerks on that subject, and their complaint is that the Government does not go even half way to meet their requirements. Representations have been made times out of number on various subjects, and the Government takes up the attitude that it is not prepared to compromise on any issue.

7.0 P.M.

For instance, with regard to Union matters—I could read the correspondence I have with me—all correspondence has come to some abrupt end because of the attitude of the Ministry.

Then, again, the Deputy Secretary to the Treasury was asked to contribute a “Foreword” to the Union’s magazine, but he gave an abrupt “No”. A similar attitude was adopted when the members wanted to go on deputation to interview the Minister.

Unless the Hon. Minister of Finance goes out of his way to entertain them or at least goes half way to meet them, there will be no possibility of solving this problem.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: The hon. Member should not make vague statements like this. Can he not give any concrete instance? Let him mention any particular body of people who wanted to come and see me and were refused. Who were refused an interview?

Mr. Ilangaratne: The refusal may not have come from the Hon. Minister; it may have come from his Department.

Mr. Kanagaratnam: May I know what is being done with the recommendations of the Cadres Commission? I was told that some order was issued by the Treasury to send a circular to the various departments to make their report on the recommendations, but later the circular was withdrawn.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Certain circulars were withdrawn because they had been issued before the Ministers could consider the recommendations contained in the Report of the Cadres Commission. The Treasury appointed a special Committee, which went into the whole Report and made its own recommendations. Those recommendations are now being considered by my Parliamentary Secretary, a gentleman of great experience, and after they have been seen by me, they will be submitted to the Cabinet immediately the Budget debate is over.

Mr. Dahanayake: May I inform the Hon. Minister of Finance that he is labouring under a very grave misapprehension if he thinks that he has solved the problem of the temporary clerks. He has not done it, and he has not satisfied the Temporary Clerks Association.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Why?

Mr. Dahanayake: A little while ago the Hon. Minister said that he had come to an agreement with the Temporary Clerks Association. Nothing of the sort happened. The temporary clerks as a body are seething with discontent. They are disgusted with the conditions of service. They have been asked by the Hon. Minister of Finance to compete with men who are about 10 or 12 years junior to them in age and are very much more qualified. It is certainly not possible for them to compete with such men.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: May I stop the hon. Member before he commits further mistakes? The temporary clerks have not been asked to compete with anyone junior to them. They have been given a special syllabus, a special number of posts has been reserved for them, and every condition that they wanted has been granted.

Dr. Perera: There are 400 posts.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: What is the proportion of posts reserved for them?

The Chairman: Will the hon. Members let the Hon. Minister finish what he has to say?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Every condition that the temporary clerks wanted has been granted, and they have written to me saying that they agree with these conditions. I have seen their representative. I do not know whether the hon. Members are talking of some other Temporary Clerks, Association. The temporary clerks all met me and the Secretary to the Treasury, and with them the conditions were drafted.

Mr. Dahanayake: How many temporary clerks could be recruited under those terms and conditions?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Those who pass the examination will be recruited.

Mr. Dahanayake: I do not think they will pass the examination. These are men who cannot pass examinations, but who have served Government extremely well—much better than many of the Ministers—at a time when the Government were in dire need.

Mr. Keuneman: Will the Hon. Minister give an indication as to how many posts will be filled: a mere handful or a substantial number?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: 300 or 400.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: What is the total number of temporary clerks in Government Service?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: The hon. Member is setting me a mathematical problem. I can find it out and let him know.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: Are 400 posts to be filled from about 4,000 temporary clerks?

Dr. Perera: About 3,000 temporary clerks are involved.

Mr. Dahanayake: The Hon. Minister should not imagine that there is no discontent among the temporary clerks.

Mr. Sivapalan: Can the Hon. Minister state whether the age limit has been removed? The age limit at present prevents intelligent people from competing.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: The temporary clerks themselves wanted to have an age limit. Further, with regard to those clerks who may not pass the examination, they will discuss with the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Lands the question of colonization. They also realize that everybody cannot be absorbed into Government Service; only those who pass the examination will be absorbed.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: May I know from the Hon. Minister what procedure is adopted for allotting Government bungalows in Brownrigg road, and who is responsible for this work?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: There are certain officials in the Treasury who do the allotting, and my Permanent Secretary is the ultimate authority.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: I raised that question because matters have been represented to me and there is a certain amount of dissatisfaction.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: There will be dissatisfaction so long as there are a few bungalows and a large number of applicants. Before the war there were more bungalows than applicants, but today the number of applicants is far larger than the number of bungalows available.

There are certain rules drafted, and according to those rules, as far as it is humanly possible, bungalows are allotted to applicants.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: My submission is that those rules are not very strictly adhered to.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Could the hon. Member give particulars with regard to that?

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: I will, if the Hon. Minister wishes me to.

Dr. Perera: On the subject of the Clerical Services, we will be in a position to discuss the question if the Hon. Minister would be so kind as to give us tomorrow the conditions of recruitment of temporary clerks into the Government Service. Then, when we come to the Head "Clerical Service", we will be in a better position to discuss the subject.

The Chairman: Will the Hon. Minister do that?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Yes.

Mr. Dahanayake: On the question of bungalows that are available to Government Servants, I wish to point out that these bungalows are found only in the City of Colombo, and I have already made an application for Galle. I should like the Hon. Minister of Finance to consider the desirability of having a number of Government bungalows in the various provincial centres other than Colombo—otherwise the Government Servants would find it very difficult to get these quarters—so that there will be a big housing scheme for putting up about 500 to 10,000 Government bungalows in the coming years.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 185,306 for Head 19, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 19, Vote 1, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 20.—Treasury

Vote No. 1.—Salaries and Expenses of the Treasury, Rs. 1,052,213.

Dr. Perera: I have an Amendment only with regard to a sub-head lower down. After the earlier sub-heads have been dealt with, and when we reach sub-head 8, I want to make certain observations.

The Chairman: As there is no other hon. Member who wants to speak on the earlier sub-heads, the hon. Member for Ruwanwella might take up sub-head 8.

Sub-head 8.—Expenses of a Civil Servant for studying methods of organization, training and establishment work in U. K. Treasury—Rs. 8,117.

Dr. Perera: Sub-head 8, as you will see, Mr. Chairman, refers to a Civil Servant studying methods of organization. I thought the Government had already sent one person to be trained. I thought the Hon. Minister himself had got a small training when he went to England recently.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I got no training. I think I gave a little training to them. The person who went was sent with regard to the new Constitution and Administrative Changes—Mr. Wickremasinghe. I think that is a separate item dealing with Treasury work. I do not know whether we have decided to send somebody, but the Vote is included here.

An Hon. Member: Has a person not yet been appointed?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: No.

Sub-head 9.—Authority for placing order for Accounting Machines (token vote), Rs. 10.

Dr. Perera: May I enquire about sub-head 9? Why is a token vote asked for?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Certain machines are necessary for the purpose of adding, subtracting, multiplying, and so on. It was necessary to ask for a token vote, because we do not know the exact value of the machines.

Dr. Perera: Have the Government placed the order already?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: This is for the purpose of placing the order.

The Hon. Mr. Goonesinha: You cannot place the order without the money.

Dr. Perera: We do not know how much we are committing ourselves to. This is altogether a wrong procedure. I think the Auditor-General will explain the position that this procedure is all wrong. The Government must arrive at an estimated amount and then come to this House. We are committing ourselves blindfolded. We do not know how much this Vote will come to. This is thoroughly wrong procedure.

The Chairman: I know that this matter was fully discussed last year.

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: Hon. Members will find such token votes in all the Railway items. It is not possible to know the price of an engine.

Dr. Perera: That is why the Hon. Minister is running a bankrupt railway.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 1,052,213 for Head 20, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 20, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 21.—Pensions

Vote No. 1.—Pensions, Gratuities (including premature retirements, &c., payable in respect of public officers, &c., Rs. 256,500.

Sub-head 1.—Pensions, gratuities, &c., Rs. 12,975,000.

Mr. Pakeman: With regard to the question of the payment of pensions and gratuities to retired Government servants, I understood from the Hon. Minister of Finance, when he was dealing with the sterling balances agreement, that this agreement was only a temporary one. During the sterling balance talks between the Government of India and the British Government, an arrangement was made by which the pensions payable to retired Government servants resident in England were to be funded. I want to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance whether he has considered, or is considering, the funding of pensions which would be payable to those *ex-Government* servants who draw pensions and are residing in the United

Kingdom, and I should like to suggest to the Hon. Minister of Finance that funding against our sterling balances will mean considerably less work in the High Commissioner's office in London and will be easier for us. I think it is a very useful idea to deal with the matter in that way.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: We have not considered that matter. I think we will consider the matter before we discuss the sterling assets balances when the United Kingdom delegation comes to Ceylon at the end of this year.

Dr. Perera: I hope the Hon. Minister will not follow the advice that is given. I strongly oppose it.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: We will discuss the matter.

Dr. Perera: Mr. Chairman, you will notice that this year's estimate of Pensions, Gratuities, &c., is Rs. 18,884,500, whereas last year it was Rs. 20,104,344. My own experience is that annually there is a considerable rise in the amount of pensions given out. Now we suddenly see a drop, a welcome drop. Purely as a matter of information, I should like to know the real reason for this drop. Can the Hon. Minister say exactly why there is this estimated drop? It will be rather interesting to know that, because our experience in the past has been entirely different.

Mr. Dahanayake: When we pointed out to the Hon. Minister that there was a delay in the grant of pensions, the delay sometimes lasting so long as one or two years, the Hon. Minister assured us last year that he would introduce a system of granting alimentary allowances from the date of retirement to the date on which the officers would begin to draw their pensions. I want to know whether that is an established rule.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: That is now being done, and we have almost completed a new scheme whereby Heads of Departments who employ daily-paid labour, in particular, could keep with

[Hon. Mr. Jayewardene.]
them card indexes of the entire history of the persons employed, which will be checked of course by Audit, so that within a few weeks of the men's retirement, they will get their pensions. I think that will be in operation in a month or two.

7.15 P.M.

Mr. Dahanayake: That is very good news indeed. But, as a supplementary question, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister whether he has taken note of the fact that employees of local bodies, whose pensions are eventually sanctioned by the Treasury, have experienced the same very long delays, and whether he would insist on the local bodies also having some sort of card system for the expedition of the payment of pensions.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I do not know whether I have any control over local bodies, but if I have, I will certainly insist on their doing it; otherwise, you might have to ask the Minister of Health and Local Government.

Mr. Dahanayake: But it is eventually the Treasury that sanctions the payment, even in the case of employees of local bodies.

The Hon. Mr. Goonesinha: Any procedure adopted by the Central Government will certainly be followed by the local bodies.

Mr. Dahanayake: Not always.

Dr. Perera: Just one point, Sir. The other day my attention was drawn to the case of about ten women employed at the Bakeries. They were discontinued about two months ago, and they are still unable to get their contribution to the Provident Fund; it is only their contribution, mind you; the Government is not paying anything extra. These poor women got only Rs. 30 and no war allowance during the whole period, and now they are unable to get back their Provident Fund contribution.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: This was not brought to my notice.

Dr. Perera: Why not? A letter was sent to you, and I have got a reply.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: By you?

Dr. Perera: Yes.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: When?

Dr. Perera: About two months ago.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: This is the C. D. C's Bakery in Borella?

Dr. Perera: That is right; at Magazine Road.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 256,500 for Head 21, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule," put, and agreed to.

Head 21, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Vote No. 2.—Pensions to Teachers in Assisted Schools, Rs. 1,600,000.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 1,600,000, for Head 21, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule," put, and agreed to.

Head 21, Vote No. 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Vote No. 3.—War Pensions and Pensions and Gratuities to Officers and Men of the Defence Forces, &c., Rs. 8,000.

Mr. Ilangaratne: May I know whether this includes payments to people disabled overseas?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I could not follow the hon. Member, Sir.

The Hon. Mr. Goonesinha: I cannot hear the hon. Member.

The Chairman: The hon. Member wishes to know whether this applies to those who were wounded and disabled

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Yes, it does Sir.

Mr. Dahanayake: Here, again, I want to point out the inordinate delays in making the payments of gratuities and allowances. I brought a recent case to the notice of the Hon. Minister, but nothing has been done so far. The gratuities which are due to *ex*-Servicemen are not yet being paid. There is some delay somewhere, because they have applied to everybody under the sun, and they have got no relief.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I do not know about *ex*-Servicemen; I am referring to Government employees.

Mr. Keuneman: In the case of compensation and gratuities paid to people wounded or incapacitated when serving abroad, could the Hon. Minister please see that the compensation which is paid to these men also bears some relation to the type of employment which they had before they joined the army? I find, for instance, that there is a certain sum laid down for the loss of a finger. But in the case of a man who is a typist—I am thinking of a particular case—he lost two fingers and got compensation for the loss of his fingers. But in actual practice his whole trade is being ruined. A man doing unskilled work receives the same compensation, but of course he is able to carry on. So, would the Hon. Minister please also try to see, in the allocation of these things, that allowance is made for the type of occupation which the injured person carried on before he entered Military Service?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: That is really a question that should be addressed to the Hon. Prime Minister, because he is in charge of the Army and Defence. This Vote is paid out on the principles accepted by the Government. I would bring that matter to the notice of the Hon. Prime Minister.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 8,000 for Head 21 Vote No. 3, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 21, Vote No. 3, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Vote No. 4.—*Pensions, &c., to Kandyan State Pensioners, Payments under the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance, &c., Rs. 213,000.*

Sub-head 1.—*Pensions to Kandyan State pensioners, Rs. 13,000.*

Dr. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 13,000 in respect of sub-head 1."

I must insist on my Amendment, Sir, that is to reduce the amount by Rs. 13,000. This is a matter on which we have insisted, on principle, that these pensions to Kandyan State pensioners should be discontinued.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: We cannot accept that.

Dr. Perera: Why?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: You can vote against it.

The Chairman: Why not pay these poor Kandyans?

Dr. Dahanayake: Why not bring them down here and give them some decent jobs, instead of giving these young men pensions? Let them come down here. It was only the other day that certain people claimed to be the descendants of Keppitipola—

The Chairman: There are descendants.

Mr. Dahanayake: So, let us have them in Ceylon. Some of them might even join the U.N.P. and become Ministers!

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 213,000, for Head 21, Vote No. 4, be inserted in the Schedule, put, and agreed to.

Head 21, Vote 4, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Vote No. 5.—*Cost of Living Allowance to Pensioners, Rs. 7,000,000.*

Dr. Perera: With regard to this Vote—

The Chairman: There is no Amendment at all on this Vote.

Dr. Perera: You do not need an Amendment on the main Vote. On the main vote, cannot I throw out a suggestion?

The Chairman: Let us have it.

Dr. Perera: People who have got gratuities are complaining that, while the pensioners have got consideration on account of the increased prices as a result of the war, they have not received the same consideration. Those who were paid gratuities in a lump sum have received no special consideration for the increase in prices as a result of the war. It involves a small number of people, I understand, and I ask that their cases be considered.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 7,000,000, for Head 21, Vote No. 5, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 21, Vote No. 5, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 22.—Public Debt

Vote No. 1.—Interest and Sinking Fund Contributions, &c., Rs. 25,600.

Sub-head 6.—Interest on Ceylon Government Treasury Bills, Rs. 100,000.

Dr. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 1,000 in respect of Sub-head 6."

Sub-head 6 provides a lump sum of Rs. 100,000. Unless the Minister has in mind raising a large sum of money by way of Treasury Bills—

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: When you raise Rs. 10,000,000, the total interest comes to about this amount.

Dr. Perera: You do not charge 1 per cent.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: That is under Cap. 287.

Dr. Perera: Treasury Bills are only for a short period, for about three months, so that you do not charge 1 per cent. I am not insisting upon this.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: These are calculations made by the Treasury.

Sub-head 7.—Crown Agents, charges for management of Sterling Loans, Rs. 25,200.

Dr. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 25,200 in respect of Sub-head 7."

I am rather anxious to know why we should pay for the management of the Sterling Loans, as we have already sanctioned provision for the job of the Crown Agents to be taken over by the High Commissioner in England.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: That is only for the transitory period.

Dr. Perera: But you are asking for the full amount.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: If the High Commissioner takes over the work, this amount will not be spent, but we do not know when he will be taking over. As soon as he takes over, the money will be left there.

Mr. Dahanayake: I do not think the question is such a simple one. I think the High Commissioner will continue to receive the charges, because he will be doing some work in addition to his own duties, the work done by the Crown Agents. Are we to accept the position that the High Commissioner will not get a cent of these charges, once he takes over the work?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: This is money to be paid over to the Crown Agents. The High Commissioner will not get a cent of it, because he is a Government Servant.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: Under the Representative in London, the High Commissioner's Office, you have provided a special Financial Assistant to

take over the management of this matter. Will that mean that thereafter the only charge we undergo is the cost of maintaining the Financial Assistant, and so on, but that these other charges will cease to be made?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Yes.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 25,600, for Head 22, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule," put, and agreed to.

Head 22, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 23.—Currency

Vote No. 1.—Salaries and Expenses of the Currency Office, Rs. 220,647.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 220,647, for Head 23, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 23, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 24.—Loan Board

Vote No. 1.—Salaries and Expenses of the Loan Board, Rs. 16,258.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 16,258, for Head 24, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 24, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 25.—Government Stores

Vote No. 1.—Salaries and Expenses of the Government Stores Department, Rs. 883,250.

Sub-head 1.—Personal Emoluments, Rs. 470,543.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I move, "That the Vote be increased by Rs. 1,110 in respect of Sub-head 1, item 'Temporary Watchers'".

Mr. Dahanayake: Why are they going to be temporary men?

Dr. Perera: That is one of the questions I would like to ask myself. On page 62, there is provision for additional staff (temporary). I would like to know why temporary conditions continue in the Government Stores Department.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: These are people who were taken on during the emergency. The Government Stores Department did a tremendous amount of work during the war, and that work is now decreasing. Some people have already been asked to go, and these are the people who are left over. These temporary clerks will be entitled to be absorbed under the scheme that has already been formulated. They have not entered the Government Service through the proper channels, through the Government Clerical Examination, and so on. That is the only reason why they are temporary. The extra watchers were necessary so that these watchers may have an eight-hour shift.

Mr. Keuneman: Sir, under the item, "Superintendent of Stores", I want to raise another question, on the same Sub-head. There have been regular complaints, every time the Budget comes up, about the appalling conditions under which the staff of the Government Stores are working, and on each occasion appropriate regret is expressed by the Members of the Government. It is well known that certain of the clerks have contracted tuberculosis, and certain others have contracted other diseases, as a result of the thoroughly insanitary conditions prevailing there. Now, we are regularly informed that the Government is trying to do something to help these people. But I would like the Hon. Minister to tell us what has been done at least in the last year, because I remember, during the last Budget itself, the Hon. Minister expressed deep sympathy for these clerks and said that he intended to try and better their lot.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I think I answered that question when it was raised by another Member of this House by way of an oral Question. A large number of these employees have already been transferred to the "Lake-side Stores", and as a result of that,

[Hon. Mr. Jayewardene.]

the pressure in the general building has been to some extent lessened. I shall look into the balance in the course of this year.

Mr. Keuneman: May I know how many of these employees have been transferred to the "Lakeside Stores," because my information is that only a very small section has been transferred, and the main pressure is still at the general stores? If the Hon. Minister will make inquiries, he will find that the information available to him is not correct.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I will look into the question and give him an answer tomorrow.

Mr. Dahanayake: The Clerks there have another grievance. This Department is not a closed Department. The clerks working in this Department ought to be able to get normal transfers to other Departments. But it would appear that the Superintendent of Stores does not allow clerks to get transfers to other departments. There are a large number of clerks in the Government Stores who would like to obtain transfers, but whose applications have not been submitted by the Head of the Department to the proper authority. If there is one department in the Government Service which is seething with discontent it is the Government Stores, and I would earnestly request the Hon. Minister of Finance to go into this question of discontentment of the clerks in this Department.

7.30 P.M.

Mr. S. A. Silva: I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance what action he has taken on the report I made to him about the embezzlement at the Government Stores. I was told that the Criminal Investigation Department was looking into the matter. It is nearly 5 months since I brought this matter to the Hon. Minister's notice.

The other point is that, when requisitions are sent by different hospitals in the Island for equipment and linen, they are delayed for months.

When I visited the Gampola hospital during the last by-election, I found that the patients were wearing their own clothes, which were dirty. I asked the D.M.O. why linen was not supplied to the patients, and I was shown copies of requisitions which had been sent months previously. I sent a telegram to the Hon. Minister of Health then and there, and when I came down to Colombo I inquired into the matter. I was informed by the Permanent Secretary to the Hon. Minister that the linen had been despatched and that the delay was due to the Government Stores. Their excuse was that they had a large number of requisitions to deal with, and that goods were despatched in order of receipt of requisitions.

If there are a large number of requisitions to be dealt with, the Government Stores should employ more clerks and storekeepers to see that goods are despatched to hospitals as quickly as possible. The patients cannot wait for clothing till the Government Stores find time to despatch the goods.

Mr. Ilangaratne: With regard to tuberculosis at the Government Stores, I am told that three resolutions have been forwarded to the Hon. Minister of Finance in March, 1948 by the Government Stores Union. I understand that only an acknowledgment was sent on the 22nd March, and that no interview was granted to the members. This is one of the cases that I wanted to bring up in this House and press for consideration.

Major J. W. Oldfield (Appointed Member): Arising from the remarks of the hon. Member for Agalawatta, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance whether any steps have been taken to improve the organization dealing with requisitions. This is one of the matters which was stressed in the Report of the Cadres Commission, where the procedure is described as unsatisfactory to the last degree. I think there is a certain amount of criticism of this Department which is contained in that Report. There is a statement to this effect:

"In some cases checked by us, it was found that the Ledger Branch took 5 to 7 days to register and pass on the requisition. The section, on receipt of the order, appears to work on the principle that speed is undignified. . . . The Despatch Section, not to be out-done, proceeds on a slow-motion system which, in cases checked by us, meant a gap of 10 days between receipt by them of the goods and their despatch."

The result is that an urgent requisition is often not filled in less than three weeks, sometimes very much longer. If the article is not in stock, there is no limit to the time taken. The Report goes on further to state:

" . . . we do not believe that a staff which has grown used to the present dilatory methods over a series of years will be converted to a system of dealing with orders in minutes instead of weeks."

They suggest a complete re-organization.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: What has happened is exactly as the Report states, that the Government Stores has got used to Military methods and will take a little time to settle down to the normal routine of civilian life. I am glad to say that Mr. Jansz—

Mr. Keuneman: Not military, but dilatory.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Even if the hon. Member did not say that, it appears that the Government Stores has got used to military methods. Mr. Jansz, who was one of the authors of that Report, is now my Parliamentary Secretary, and I have put him specially on the work of reorganization of the Government Stores.

Major Oldfield: Did I understand the Hon. Minister to say that the Stores was changing over from military methods to civilian methods?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I said that it takes a little time to get used to civilian methods.

Major Oldfield: The Report says:

" . . . the Government Stores should be fully as efficient and just as speedy as a large Colombo shop, and nothing else should be accepted."

Mr. S. A. Silva: There is another matter that I would like to bring to the notice of the Hon. Minister.

The Chairman: Any further remarks?

Mr. S. A. Silva: Yes.

The Chairman: I thought the hon. Member had finished.

Mr. S. A. Silva: One word with regard to the way contracts are dealt with by this department. There is a contract for the supply of gunny bags for use by the Agricultural Department for the storing of paddy. There is a specific size given by the Director. But the Assistant Storekeepers get down gunny bags just in time for despatch, and they are found under-size at the other end and not up to standard. I would like the Hon. Minister to look into this matter as there seems to be some hanky-panky going on with the contractors.

Question, "That the Vote be increased by Rs. 1,110 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Temporary Watchers,' " put, and agreed to.

Sub-head 4.—Labour, Rs. 53,480.

Dr. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 4."

On the last occasion I remember the Hon. Minister undertook to give us details about the question of labour. There are permanent hands. I do not know why they are lumped like this. They should be put on their proper scales if they are going to be employed permanently.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: The hon. Member can see that the details are given on page 63.

Dr. Perera: That does not set out the wage scales. We do not know how much a person is getting. Hon. Members will see that, in the case of other departments, labourers are grouped together and given their scales.

Sub-head 12.—Purchase of one mobile crane, three lifting hoists and one travelling low bogey truck, Rs. 31,000.

Dr. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 31,000 in respect of sub-head 12.

I presume that this is a mistake for a revote.

The Chairman: It must be a revote.

Dr. Perera: I hope the correction will be made.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: It is a revote.

Mr. Wilmot A. Perera: May I raise a question on item 6, loss of stores?

The Chairman: That item has been passed. We have gone on to sub-head 12.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 885,360 for Head 25, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 25, Vote 1, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Vote No. 2.—Import of Stores and supplies by Government under Lend, Lease and Bulk Purchase Procedure for Government and Civilian needs (token vote), Rs. 1,000.

Dr. Perera: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 1,000 in respect of sub-head 1".

What is the actual expenditure to Government in this case?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I cannot give that answer at once.

Mr. Amarasuriya: I think it is a trading account. According to the description of the Vote, I think the goods are resold.

Dr. Perera: We have a new Parliamentary Secretary.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: This is only for the skeleton staff required to wind up the department.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: I was wondering because the Lend-Lease proceedings were with the American Government.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: They are over.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: Then, why are you working on a token vote?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: How else can you do it?

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: You know that the volume of work is decreasing. Surely you could place before us an estimate?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: It is not only decreasing, we are going to finish up.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: That is so. Wind it up and do not ask for a token vote.

Dr. Perera: Does that mean that this is not going to involve the Government in any expenditure at all?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Except the actual business of winding up.

Dr. Perera: Are you being recouped by the sale of the Lend Lease articles so that you would know what is the actual amount spent by Government. In the end will we be on the positive side rather than on the negative side.

Mr. Amarasuriya: Any proceeds will be credited.

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: That we understand if the hon. Member for Baddegama will understand us. The point is this. Have you got Lend Lease stores at present, and are you in the process of selling them, and is it in respect of buying or selling these stores

that you require money? You will know the amount you expect to spend, and that only the Hon. Minister of Finance and not the new Member for Baddegama can inform us.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: I understand that this money is only for salaries to clerks and a few remnants of the organization in the process of winding up. Any material or stores—

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: You are selling the old stuff?

Dr. Perera: That makes it worse. I hope the Hon. Minister will understand that, if that were so, there is no meaning in asking for a token vote. You are going to sell these articles without any cost to Government. If there is only winding up to be done, you must know the actual expenditure.

Mr. Keuneman: Why the token vote?

Mr. Amarasuriya: There is a footnote in the Estimates—"Skeleton staff required for the winding up".

Dr. Colvin R. de Silva: If there is a skeleton staff there must be a known expenditure, and why in heaven we are giving a token vote for known expenditure is a mystery that cannot be solved at this point of time.

Mr. Keuneman: Future generations will know.

Mr. Subasinghe: Even they would not.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Although the activities of the Supplies Department will cease from 1st October, 1948, we have to maintain a staff of two or three clerks of the book-keeping branch to finalize accounts. It is likely that payment on account of recoveries and sales may be made even during 1948-49, and if there is the necessity for such provision to be made, money will be required.

Dr. Perera: That means that on a balance you expect to have a positive account?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Yes.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 1,000 for Head 25, Vote No. 2, be inserted in the Schedule", put, and agreed to.

Head 25, Vote 2, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head 26.—Department of Income Tax, Estate Duty and Stamps

Vote No. 1.—Salaries and Expenses of the Department of Income Tax, Estate Duty and Stamps, Rs. 1,528,342.

Sub-head 1.—Personal Emoluments, Rs. 1,036,572.

7.45 P.M.

Major Oldfield: I move, "That the Vote be reduced by Rs. 10 in respect of sub-head 1, item 'Commissioner'."

I would like to ask the Hon. Minister whether he is prepared to consider the suggestion I placed before him during the Second Reading Debate in connexion with allowing depreciation on capital equipment and on industrial buildings, on the lines that are now granted in the United Kingdom under, I think, the 1945 Act, as it is necessary to assist industries today. That will tend to give great assistance to industrial concerns and individuals as well, and I would ask him whether he is prepared to consider making an alteration in the Income Tax Ordinance on that basis.

Mr. Dahanayake: I wish to know whether the Hon. Minister of Finance will consider the question of establishing an internal audit branch in the Income Tax Department. The necessity for an internal audit branch has been stressed by the Auditor-General, who has pointed out that, due to the absence of such a branch, the recovery of substantial sums of money has not been made. I also find that, because there is no such branch, taxpayers have been called upon to pay, all at once, arrears of amounts in respect of four or five years, which, certainly, is not fair procedure. If

[Mr. Dahanayake.]

there was an internal audit branch in the Income Tax Department, each taxpayer would know his position roughly at the end of each financial year. Therefore, it is very necessary that an internal audit branch should be established as soon as possible.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: As regards the comments made by the hon. Appointed Member (Major Oldfield) I might state that I have asked the Income Tax Commissioner to send me a full report on the working of the Ordinance, and I shall go into the suggestions he makes when that report is received. It is not possible in the Committee stage of the Budget to make such fundamental alterations in the law.

I shall also consider the suggestion of the Member for Galle.

Mr. Martensz: I would like to ask the Hon. Minister a question in regard to Assessors. Speaking last year on this item, I stressed the desirability of increasing the number of Assessors, having regard to the delay that occurs in assessment work for estate duty and income tax. The answer given, I believe by the Hon. Prime Minister, was that there were a number of officers in training. I would like to indicate the fact that, in the Estate Duty Branch of this Department, there is one officer whose duties involve some five different branches of work, with the result that a very efficient officer finds himself so over-burdened that he is unable to give all the attention required for speedy despatch of business, particularly with regard to estate duty.

I very often find executors of estates are liable to pay interest by reason of the delay that occurs in the final assessment. I am not saying this in a spirit of complaint, because I realize how extremely hard-worked that Department is, having regard to the insufficiency of staff at the Assessor level.

I notice that there is an item, "Assistant Assessors and probationers", and I would be glad to know how soon it is anticipated these Probationers will be able to function as full-fledged Assessors or Assistants.

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: The difficulty in regard to the Income Tax Department is to obtain the officers. Every officer, the Commissioner has asked for, has been provided. There has been no stinting in regard to the provision of funds. These officers have to go through a certain period of training. I cannot say exactly when the Probationers will be ready to do the actual work, but I would say that all the staff the Commissioner wants is granted.

Mr. Sivapalan: Can the Hon. Minister tell us what safeguards this Department has against approved Accountants and private auditors exploiting the public who go to them for the purpose of sending in returns?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: We have a certain list of approved auditors, and only those people are entitled to interview Assessors on behalf of clients. Others have no access to the Assessors, but if a person wants to consult anybody, whether he is an auditor or not, we cannot prevent it.

Mr. Sivapalan: Have any complaints been received against approved accountants, and have such complaints been investigated by the Department?

The Hon. Mr. Jayewardene: Certainly, if complaints are received they are investigated. Offenders are struck off the list. One has gone to jail.

The Chairman: Does the Member press his Amendment?

Major Oldfield: No.

Question, "That the sum of Rs. 1,528,342 for Head 26, Vote No. 1, be inserted in the Schedule," put and agreed to.

Head 26, Vote 1, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

8.0 P.M.

Dr. Perera: We might adjourn now, Sir. We have made good progress today. I move, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."

Question put, and agreed to.

The Chairman left the Chair to report Progress.

Committee report Progress; to sit again Tomorrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS

Resolved:

"That the Regulation for the area comprised within the administrative limits of the Municipal Council of Colombo, made by the Minister of Transport and Works under sections 82 and 174 of the Motor Car Ordinance, No. 45 of 1938, (as modified by the Proclamation under section 88 (1) of the Ceylon (Constitution) Order in Council, 1946, published in *Gazette Extraordinary* No. 9,773 of September 24, 1947), which was presented on July 27, 1948, be approved."—[*Hon. Sir John Kotelawala.*]

REGULATIONS (COLOMBO M. C. No. 2)

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: I move,

"That the Regulation for the area comprised within the administrative limits of the Municipal Council of Colombo, made by the Minister of Transport and Works under sections 87 and 174 of the Motor Car Ordinance, No. 45 of 1938, (as modified by the Proclamation under section 88 (1) of the Ceylon (Constitution) Order in Council, 1946, published in *Gazette Extraordinary* No. 9,773 of September 24, 1947), which was presented on July 27, 1948, be approved."

This is a Regulation framed under sections 87 and 174 of the Motor Car Ordinance, declaring Bullers Road as the main road where Bullers Road and Torrington Avenue intersect. It is framed at the request of the Municipal Council.

Question put, and agreed to.

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: I move,

"That the Regulation for the area comprised within the administrative limits of the Municipal Council of Colombo, made by the Minister of Transport and Works under sections 87 and 174 of the Motor Car Ordinance, No. 45 of 1938, (as modified by the Proclamation under section 88 (1) of the Ceylon (Constitution) Order in Council, 1946, published in *Gazette Extraordinary* No. 9,773 of September 24, 1947), which was presented on July 27, 1948, be approved."

This is a Regulation declaring that, at the intersection of the highways known as Galle Road and Bagatelle Road in Colombo, Galle Road shall be considered the main road.

Mr. Dahanayake: It has always been the main road.

Question put, and agreed to.

The Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala: I move,

"That the Regulations for the area comprised within the administrative limits of the Tangalla Urban Council, made by the Minister of Transport and Works under sections 125 and 174 of the Motor Car Ordinance, No. 45 of 1938, (as modified by the Proclamation under section 88 (1) of the Ceylon (Constitution) Order in Council, 1946, published in *Gazette Extraordinary* No. 9,773 of September 24, 1947), which were presented on July 27, 1948, be approved."

This is a Regulation for setting apart public stands for the use of hiring cars and for the collection of fees in respect of stand licences, etc., within the administrative limits of the Tangalla Urban Council area.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved:

"That the Regulations for the area comprised within the administrative limits of the Polgahawela Town Council, made by the Minister of Transport and Works under sections 125 and 174 of the Motor Car Ordinance, No. 45 of 1938, (as modified by the Proclamation under section 88 (1) of the Ceylon (Constitution) Order in Council, 1946, published in *Gazette Extraordinary* No. 9,773 of September 24, 1947), which were presented on July 27, 1948, be approved."—[*Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala.*]

Resolved:

"That the Regulations in respect of the highways, in the charge of the District Road Committee, Galle, made by the Minister of Transport and Works under sections 82, 83 and 174 of the Motor Car Ordinance, No. 45 of 1938, (as modified by the Proclamation under sections 88 (1) of the Ceylon (Constitution) Order in Council, 1946, published in *Gazette Extraordinary* No. 9,773 of September 24, 1947), which were presented on July 27, 1948, be approved."—[*Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala.*]

Resolved:

"That the Regulations for the area comprised within the administrative limits of the Village Committee of the Tissamaharama village area in the Magan Pattu of the Hambantota District, made by the Minister of Transport and Works under sections 125 and 174 of the Motor Car Ordinance, No. 45 of 1938, (as modified by the Proclamation under sections 88 (1) of the Ceylon (Constitution) Order in Council, 1946, published in *Gazette Extraordinary* No. 9,773 of September 24, 1947), which were presented on July 27, 1948, be approved."—[*Hon. Sir J. Kotelawala.*]

**PUBLIC WORKS LOAN (1937) : NEW
POSTAL OFFICES AND POSTAL
BUILDINGS**

Island', a purpose mentioned as item 30 in the first column of that Schedule."—[*Hon. Mr. Sittampalam.*]

Resolved:

"That in terms of section 6 of the Public Works Loan (1937) Ordinance (Chapter 285), this House authorises the expenditure, out of the moneys raised under the authority of that Ordinance, of a sum not exceeding Rs. 425,549 from the sum of Rs. 500,000 specified in the second column of the Schedule to that Ordinance and appropriated thereby for 'New Postal Offices and Postal Buildings in different parts of the

ADJOURNMENT

Resolved: "That this House do now adjourn."—[*Hon. Mr. Goonesinha.*]

Adjourned accordingly at 8.03 P.M. until 10 A.M. on Wednesday, August 4, 1948, pursuant to the Resolution of the House of July 30, 1948.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FIRST PARLIAMENT—SECOND SESSION

Speaker—The Hon. Mr. A. F. MOLAMURE (*First Balangoda*)

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—Mr. R. A. DE MEL (*Colombo South*)

Deputy Chairman of Committees—Mr. J. A. MARTENSZ (*Appointed Member*)

Abeygoonewardane, H. D. (*Matara*)
Aboobucker, A. R. A. M. (*Mutur*)
Amarasuriya, Mr. H. W. (*Baddegama*)
Attygalle, C. E. (*Ratnapura*)

Banda, M. D. (*Maturata*)
Bandaranaike, The Hon. Mr S. W. R. D. (*Attanagalla*)
Buddhasara, P. L. (*Polonnaruwa*)
Bulankulame Dissawa, P. B. (*Anuradhapura*)

Chandrasiri S. (*Moratuwa*)
Chelvanayakam, S. J. V., K.C. (*Kankasanturai*)

Dahanayake, W. (*Galle*)
Dasanaiké, Ivan T. (*Wariyapola*)
de Silva, Dr. Colvin R. (*Wellawatta-Galkissa*)
de Silva, G. R. (*Colombo North*)
de Silva, P. H. W. (*First Ambalangoda-Balapitiya*)
de Zoysa, G. A. W. (*Second Ambalangoda-Balapitiya*)

Ebrahim, Mudaliyar M. M. (*Pottuvil*)
Ethirmannasingham, S. U. (*Paddiruppu*)

Fernando, J. J. (*Chilaw*)
Fernando, W. Leo (*Buttala*)

Goonesekera, D. S. (*Udugama*)
Goonesinha, The Hon. Mr. A. E. (*First Colombo Central*)
Goonewardene, Cholmondeley (*Kalutara*)
Griffith, F. H. (*Appointed Member*)
Gunawardena, D. B. R. (*Kotte*)
Gunawardena, Mrs. Kusumasiri (*Avissawella*)

Herat, K. (*Nikaweratiya*)
Hettiarachchi, D. F. (*Niwitigala*)

Ilangaratne, T. B. (*Kandy*)
Iriyagolla, I. M. R. A. (*Dandagamuwa*)
Ismail, H. S. (*Puttalam*)

Jayah, The Hon. Mr. T. B. (*Second Colombo Central*)
Jayasooriya, A. P. (*Horana*)
Jayasuriya, Mudaliyar D. P. (*Ja-ela*)
Jayewardene, The Hon. Mr. J. R. (*Kelaniya*)
Jayewickreme, Major Montague (*Weligama*)

Kanagaratnam, K. (*Vaddukkoddai*)
Kariapper, Gate Mudaliyar M. S. (*Kalmunai*)
Karunaratne, D. D. (*Gampaha*)
Keerthiratne, N. H. (*Kegalla*)
Keuneman, P. G. B. (*Third Colombo Central*)
Koch, Rosslyn (*Appointed Member*)
Kotalawela, J. C. T. (*Second Badulla*)
Kotalawala, The Hon. Sir John, K.B.E. (*Dodan-gaslanda*)
Kumarasiri, P. (*Hakmana*)
Kumaraswamy, V. (*Chavakachcheri*)
Kumaravelu, K. (*Kotagala*)

Mahadiulwewa, S. H. (*Kalawewa*)
Mathew, E. W. (*Second Balangoda*)
Motha, G. R. (*Maskeliya*)

Nadarajah, K. V. (*Bandarawela*)
Nalliah, V. (*Kalkudah*)
Nanayakkara, V. T. (*Matale*)
Nugawela, The Hon. Mr. E. A. (*First Kadugannawa*)

Oldfield, Major J. W., C.M.G., O.B.E., M.C. (*Appointed Member*)

Pakeman, S. A., O.B.E., M.C., E.D. (*Appointed Member*)
Panabokke, T. B. (*Galaha*)
Peiris, M. H. (*Panadure*)
Pelpola, R. S. (*Gampola*)
Perera, A. Reginald (*Dehiowita*)
Perera, Dr. N. M. (*Ruwanwella*)
Perera, Wilmot A. (*Matugama*)
Peris, Albert F. (*Nattandiya*)
Poholiyadde Dissawa, T. B. (*Horowupotana*)
Ponnambalam, G. G., K.C. (*Jaffna*)
Premachandra, H. R. U. (*Second Kadugannawa*)

Rajalingam, K. (*Nawalapitiya*)
Rajapaksa, D. A. (*Beliatta*)
Rajapaksa, L. (*Hambantota*)
Ramalinkam, T. (*Point Pedro*)
Ramanujam, D. (*Alutnuwara*)
Rambukpota, J. A. (*Haputale*)
Rambukwelle Dissawa, H. B. (*Minipe*)
Ratnayaka, V. G. W. (*Deniyaya*)
Ratnayake, The Hon. Mr. A. (*Wattegama*)
Ratwatte, H. L. (*Mawanella*)

Senanayake, The Hon. Mr. D. S. (*Mirigama*)
Senanayake, The Hon. Mr. Dudley (*Dedigama*)
Senanayake, Mrs. Florence (*Kiriella*)
Senanayake, M. (*Medawachchiya*)
Senanayake, R. G. (*Dambadeniya*)
Silva, S. A. (*Agalawatta*)
Sinnalebbe, A. (*Batticaloa*)
Siriwardana, H. de Z. (*Negombo*)
Sittampalam, The Hon. Mr. C. (*Mannar*)
Sivapalan, S. (*Trincomalee*)
Spencer, E. E. (*Appointed Member*)
Sri Nissanka, H., K.C. (*Kurunegala*)
Subasinghe, T. B. (*Bingiriya*)
Subbiah, S. M. (*First Badulla*)
Sugathadasa, K. V. D. (*Welimada*)
Suntharalingam, The Hon. Mr. C. (*Vavuniya*)

Tenne, H. B. (*Dambulla*)
Thambiayah, A. L. (*Kayts*)
Thondaman, S. (*Nuwara Eliya*)

Vanniasingham, C. (*Kopai*)
Velupillay, C. V. (*Talawakele*)
Wickremasinghe, W. P. A. (*Akuressa*)

