

## STATE OF EMERGENCY

Parliament, which had been prorogued, was re-summoned by Proclamation by His Excellency the Governor-General, Sir Oliver Goonetilleke, G.C.M.G., K.C.V.O., K.B.E., as a result of a State of Emergency having been declared due to communal disturbances.

Speech made, as Prime Minister, when the House of Representatives met : 4th June 1958

The House has heard the announcement made by you, Mr. Speaker, the communication of H. E. the Governor-General on certain Proclamations that had to be made, the Proclamation declaring an Emergency under the Public Security Ordinance and certain other orders that followed it under the Navy Act, under the Air Force Act, and so on ; certain steps have had to be taken following upon the declaration of a State of Emergency.

It is my duty to explain to the House the circumstances which necessitated this step and briefly, without going into detail, to say what has happened since, up to date.

In explaining the circumstances which necessitated a recommendation by me and the Cabinet to the Governor-General, as required by the Public Security Ordinance, to declare a State of Emergency, I think it may be desirable just to give a brief history of the events that led up to this situation, purely as a background to understanding what was precisely the situation that had arisen which necessitated this step.

May I say that we, the Parliament of this country-the body in which the Government of this country functions may be tempted to say things in the heat of the moment which may be to some extent deprecatory. This is a subject on which, one may well imagine, feelings may run high. I do appeal to all those participating in this discussion here when we are meeting at a moment of great importance to this country-to all concerned, whatever section they



may belong to and whatever political parties they may belong to, to exercise restraint in this situation which may affect the trend of events in this country for some time to come. I therefore make that request, that appeal, which I am sure will be welcomed by my hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition and the Members whom he represents just as I do in regard to those on the Government side. Let us consider this position with that degree of seriousness, dignity, and responsibility which obviously it deserves. I myself intend, as far as I can, to give this House a dispassionate survey of the situation as far as facts are known to me in order to enable the House to consider the situation at least as I see it, as we see it.

I do not propose to go unduly back into history, but, as I said, I wish to consider very carefully whether I merely take up the point of the declaration of a state of emergency or the immediate circumstances out of which it arose—the present position and would go a bit beyond that point, I thought perhaps, on this occasion, it may be best—my statement is of certain importance—that I should just explain some of the background that led up to this.

As the House knows the last General Election of 1956 was fought under the stress of various strong emotions. Various issues of a very explosive nature were present in connection with the elections of 1956. Any Government that was elected to power in 1956 would inevitably have been faced with these gathering storm clouds. I say that merely to indicate the position to some critics of the Government who would say, "Oh, well it is because this Government is in power that all this trouble has arisen. Under some other Government everything would have been happy in the best of all worlds."

I do not wish to say anything that appears to be self-indication in an unfair manner. But I do say this strongly, that if a U. N. P. Government had been returned the position in this country would have been ten times worse and there would have been bloody revolution here before this. I am saying that deliberately because I know the position. We all know that any other Government that might have got into power would have also been faced with these difficulties.



I say in all humility that I do not claim that this Government is omniscient, that this Government is free of defects. I do not claim that at all. It was our misfortune that we were elected to office at such a time. Perhaps we have been able to face up to these storms, which were developing in any case before, to some little extent. It may be there were certain other possibilities, advantages. I am not saying that by way of exculpation or by way of excuse. I am just stating the position. But I think my view is not perhaps partially or altogether wrong.

Well, trouble broke out. I made a great effort to try and salvage the position-the growing efforts of extremists on both sides-by dealing with issues which were unquestionably very explosive to which others were also very vulnerable, because they were not issues that could have been handled easily ; on one side or the other, questions of race, culture and religion are issues on which mischievous persons, even those who may be bona fide utterly mistaken and fanatical-men of straw who, otherwise, do not count for anything-can still create unrest and a feeling amongst masses of people. We know from history, how such things start and we have seen the deplorable effects in many countries even amongst our own neighbours.

I thought I had succeeded in what appeared to be the impossible when after discussions with certain leaders of the Tamil community we came to an understanding. We were not allowed to rest. Frustrated and disgruntled people, the fanatical extremists, started a campaign straightway. They were most bitterly disappointed that there was a likelihood of peace obtaining in this country. All kinds of things-the details of which I need not go into-were started but they did not succeed ; for instance, from marches of would-be pilgrims to meetings and propaganda, and so on, all over the place. But the forces of evil were still too strong.

A wanton, callous and a meaningless act-I repeat those words-on the part of the Federal Party about March this year of re-starting a campaign of obliterating the Sri sign on buses started. the matter



comment why that was done ; that matter was explained earlier by me on a previous occasion in this House. I am merely stating a fact. I think, it was quite unnecessary and could have been avoided ; still, there it is. That happened. That was towards the end of March. Now that gave an opportunity for the extremists here who were hiding their heads in their dens once again to emerge into the open and carry on an anti-Sri and anti-anti-Sri campaign. We all remember that. That campaign that was carried on here disclosed a certain organization and pattern which certainly leads to the conclusion that it was not merely a spontaneous outburst of resentment by bona fide people. Though that element was there, behind that element there was definitely certain evidence of some organization and pattern and finance too. I will say how that pattern has continued in the present difficulty. Very well. Now that was also dying down-the second anti-Sri campaign was also dying down as these things do.

I pause for one moment here. The charge has been levelled against me, " Why should you not have dealt with this move at the beginning, at the start ? There was an anti-Sri campaign at the beginning, a year and a half earlier. Why did you not take action ? Why did you not use all the powers of the law ? " Maybe, that it was an error of judgment. I do not know. But I will tell the House, as I have told the House earlier, why I did not do so.

I wanted without creating or doing something to create a critical situation-that is the one that has now arisen to assuage the position in whatever way it could be so assuaged. Hence my readiness to discuss matters with certain gentlemen about last June which resulted in a certain understanding, though it may not have pleased quite one side or the other. I think, I was not mistaken, in not exacerbating and aggravating a situation earlier, while the hope existed of coming to a peaceful arrangement. If I did wrong, I plead guilty. I still feel that my judgment there was correct, but this thing that started last March again set the ball rolling.





It is a complicated picture that requires unravelling carefully. There are bona fide elements, though mistaken, who have some sort of feeling, " Oh ! our language is gone, our culture is gone, our race is gone ", and so on. There are the thugs, and others, who quietly wait behind the scene, whenever trouble arises, with no further patriotism or nationalism than the desire to indulge in a little looting. There is that element, too, intermixed.

Then there is the third and the most vicious element right at the bottom, that is not easily visible, that provides organization, planning and finance and shelters itself behind the front ranks of the nationalist fanatics who may be utterly mistaken but still to whom you can attribute at least a certain amount of bona fide mistakes, however mistaken they may be.

Well, as I said, this second anti-Sri and anti--anti-Sri campaign went on-letters were blacked out here and there -and it was dying down. Then certain incidents occurred. At that time there was no serious offence or violence. Then the position took a turn for the worse when certain incidents happened.

You will remember that an incident took place at Bogawantalawa when the police had to fire on an angry mob ; they were Indian labourers. Two persons, unfortunately, lost their lives.

I wish here to express my appreciation of the restraint with which those who were primarily concerned, acted in that connection. That was action by the Police under special circumstances. The first incident outside that took place at Kahawatte in the Ratnapura District on April 2nd where two Sinhalese were stabbed and killed by some Tamil boutique-keeper. Then, a Sinhalese man was killed in the Hatton area. But still the position had not boiled up. It was still localized and nothing of a widespread nature took place. All the tarring of letters and so on was, in the meanwhile, dying down and these incidents were localized.

Then, on April 14th, a Sinhalese man was murdered in Trincomalee. The man responsible for this was arrested and he confessed that he committed the act; At this stage things were



On May 15th a further incident occurred when two Sinhalese at Chenkaladi in the Eravur area were attacked ; one was shot dead and another seriously injured by stabbing. We do not know the reason but apparently a handbomb was thrown into the compound of a Tamil gentleman in that area ; it did not damage or injury to anyone. That was followed within a few minutes by the shooting and stabbing ; so that, apparer~tly, one is not wrong in assuming that the second act was a sort of retaliation for the throwing of the bomb. But certainly no .one was injured or any damage done.

Things then began to move fast. This news spread. The man who was shot was brought for burial to his home in Matara. Naturally, the news spread and the feeling of uneasiness grew.

In the meanwhile, on May 18th, and I specially draw attention to this because it is of some importance, Vavuniya, Padawiya and Polonnaruwa were visited by one Sirisoma Ranasinghe of a certain political party, -a man running a press in Colombo. He visited these places ~with five others with the ostensible reason of enrolling volunteers for some pi~rpose or another. In the meanwhile, unfortunately, there was the coincidence of the Federal Party's Convention which had been fixed for the 23rd, 24th and 25th May.

On May 22nd, the train coming from Batticaloa was stopped by crowds at Kaduruwela ; fortunately nothing very serious happened as the people had got down earlier.

On May 23rd, the train leaving Batticaloa was derailed two miles out of Batticaloa. A police sergeant Appuhamy and constable Pararajasingam of the Police Force died ; one civilian Sinhalese also died. There is no reason for me to surmise who did it for the purpose of this statement. These are matters that are being inquired into. The actual facts are that these people suffered. That was followed quickly on the 24th May by the shooting in the Eravur area of Mr. D. S. Seneviratne, ex-Mayor of Nuwara Eliya. The road had been obstructed and the Police party that went for the inquiry was also fired on.



On May 25th, a lorry and a car were dynamited in Eravur. In the car were two constables of the Depot Police and two or three others going with them to see some relations of constable Perera who were staying in that area. Constable Perera had taken leave and gone in that car. Some dynamite was thrown into the car and the occupants, unfortunately, were fatally injured. When all this happened, and the news spread all over, everything began to explode with a frightening rapidity.

On May 25th this news started reaching Colombo, and on May 26th and after, the position just flared up everywhere. It flared up to such an extent that the Government was satisfied that on the morning of May 27th it was absolutely necessary for the security of the State to recommend that a state of emergency be declared. The civil authorities and the Police were just unable to cope effectively with the situation that arose. This grave situation arose, and the news of these murders that took place on May 24th and May 25th generally appeared in the press throughout the country.

On May 27th, about 12 noon, a state of emergency was declared. I am sure my hon. Friends will agree-I do not think there will be any question about it-that it had become absolutely necessary to declare a state of emergency. Some Members may ask why it was not done earlier. The point is this. Naturally we do not want to take a step of this nature until the situation is such that it actually demands it.

Naturally one does not want to supersede the ordinary functions of a Government under which such a situation arose. This is a situation one could not predict from day to day. It was quite possible to believe that the thing would have just died down, but, unfortunately, one thing coming after another over those two or three days, the situation was already tense. If these things did not occur or were not generally known, I do not think it would have been beyond the civil authorities to control the situation. That was the position.

Now I take up the story from the date of the declaration of the state of emergency. Thereafter many and various incidents have occurred on both sides. Hon. Members know from history-even if they had not experienced it themselves before, they have experienced it now-how human beings, roused to frenzy by false rumour .or whatever it is, can act in almost a state of hysteresis, in a manner that is almost inconceivable in its effects. It is just the mass



running amok, as individuals run amok, if I may use that phrase. We know that happens from time to time ; it happens among all peoples throughout the world. Such a situation in fact was the situation that arose. Various things took place on both sides, to be utterly deplored by all.

I have only to point to one or two factors. I am sorry to say that in parts of the Northern and Eastern Provinces there was an ingredient of something a little bit more than people merely being roused racially or something of that sort, where people hear something happening here or there, convey exaggerated rumours and behave in that way. There appeared to be a movement, in fact, against the State, against the Government. There also, there was an interesting pattern.

In Jaffna people were dragged out of their boutiques and shops, and asked to whom the buildings belonged ; if they happened to belong to Tamil gentlemen, they were asked to show receipts, and on that being done the buildings were spared, but the things were taken out and burned; the occupiers were told, " Now, just get out of this place and do not come here again ". Certainly there were no acts of grave violence or loss of life there as there were in the Batticaloa District, the idea being, " We will drive all the

Sinhalese out ". Combined with that there were certain incidents against Government institutions, Government personnel.

The Police patrol at Pooneryn was shot at ; two people were killed, three injured. When the injured people tried to pick up the dead bodies they were shot at, and they had to go to Vavuniya, I believe, and come in sufficient force even to recover the dead bodies. Certain institutions such as Excise Stations, Customs, and so on, were either destroyed or damaged. Damage was caused to the- Airport at Kanke

santurai. Daily it was the experience that communications were cut. The telephone to the G. A., Jaffna, which was

repaired, had been cut again within ten minutes. It was the

same with other 'telephones and telegraph lines. We could hardly communicate with those areas in the situation that

arose. I think I am not exaggerating when I say that that also showed a pattern. In the Batticaloa District the main road between





Obviously this Government or any Government could not stand that, and we have had to take steps there, just as we have taken steps elsewhere to put down this violence in this way, to assert the authority of Government. We could not have allowed anarchy to prevail, in the interests of anybody concerned. In the interests of the vast masses of the people there who do not want anarchy, we could not allow that to happen.

That is the position up to date. Various incidents have occurred on both sides. Those of you who have gone to refugee camps, whether Tamil or Sinhalese, would have seen things for yourselves: The sight would have wrung the heart of any human being. We have dealt with that matter ; for those persons who wanted to go back there we have made arrangements, and the Sinhalese who were in Jaffna are being brought back. Obviously we had to do that. We could not allow people to remain against their will ; those who wanted to stay on we have encouraged to stay on, and we are ready to give them protection to do so.

, While the necessity arose to deal with this evacuee problem in that way, I do not want it to be thought-I do not think anybody in the House will agree-that there is going to be mass transfers of population. I trust the need for that will not arise in that way. That is the position about these evacuees. We could not keep them there in the camps in that condition.

Meanwhile-strange are the ways in which human nature works-there are certain people who even try to make use of the sufferings of these poor people to serve their political ends. But even in their sufferings these poor people have a sense of self-respect and they are not prepared to allow themselves to be made dupes and tools of others.

Meanwhile the community generally has rallied-all sections of people with different political opinions-in order to restore sanity and assuage this situation. They have offered to help. The trade unions made a declaration some days ago, which was communicated by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that they are urging their members to carry on their work in an effort to restore peace. It is an action which I much appreciate. All others have rallied, whether they belong to political parties or not, to save this country from the crisis to which sarr-e criminals would like to consign it.



I assure the House that the position has improved within the last week, from day to day, from a situation where we did not know when we woke up in the morning what would happen during the course of the day. I am sorry to disappoint some people by saying that the position has definitely improved. I am sorry to inform them of that fact, as also the fact that the authority of the State and the forces of peace are asserting themselves. But we must not think that everything is finished and over. The situation, though it is coming under control, is still tense. If you remove some force from one place which seems to be calm to help a certain spot elsewhere that needs it, the tendency is for some trouble to spring up in the first place.

Therefore although we will try to relax, in what areas we can, the rigours of the regulations with a view to completing eventual removal, I am sure the House will agree that it is most dangerous to run any risk of a recrudescence in a place where at the moment things appear to be calm. We cannot run that risk, nor can we run the risk of taking some action now, quite precipitately, before conditions are quite satisfactory, to withdraw this state of emergency which would enable, in another month or two, not something else on the same lines but something worse to happen.

We intend once and for all to deal with this situation in a way that will give peace to this country for years to come, and in doing so we shall deal with elements of a disruptive and extremist character on both sides who are involved in this matter. That is an assurance I give this House and this country on behalf of the Government and that is my message to the people of this country.

I am hoping that we will be able to do so at a not too distant date.

Naturally, the first blast of the storm is over. Things are calming down, but various currents are swirling beneath the surface still. I appeal to all well-meaning Members of this House, to all well-meaning citizens of this country, that we can run no risk of this country falling to bits again. This Government, as I have said before, is prepared to do justice to all sections of the people of this country. I stated that before. I repeat that statement again in all seriousness. I am hopeful that the situation, dealt with in that way, would enable us, though perhaps not immediately, to assuage feelings that are roused on both sides.



There is no reason whatsoever why the people of this country cannot live honourably together. There is no reason whatsoever why that cannot happen ; and when this situation, from the point of view of the violence of tempers, of the violence of actions that is now proceeding, ends, it will be the task of all of us to address ourselves to that very difficult work, and if we do so address ourselves. I am quite confident that it can be achieved. It must be achieved and it shall be achieved.

That is the position. I do not wish to take a long time making my speech and giving the House certain of the underlying causes. I trust this discussion will proceed with a certain measure at least of lack of personal heat and vituperation- Members referring to this incident or that which may be partially correct or exaggerated, and others referring to them all over again. We must not lose sight of the wood for the trees. We must keep in mind the real issues involved.

There may be even defects of the authorities who have acted at a time like this- I am not denying it- of authorities not having acted quite correctly. When emergencies of this nature arise, authorities are called upon to exercise their discretion. Things done here, things done there- things that had to be considered and handled tactfully, reasonably- may not be quite right. There may be things like that. But I take this opportunity of thanking all those concerned. His Excellency the Governor-General who, in the position he occupies, is naturally called upon to give a great deal of his time, has been working day and night in this matter. Members and Ministers, in whatever possible way, have been of assistance. All personnel working under great strain and stress, whether they be of the Defence Force or the Police, and the civil authorities whose task is perhaps rather nebulous, uncertain, at times like this- I thank them all for their efforts, and I trust that even out of this turmoil and suffering we will all be able to emerge once more into the clean air of peace, understanding and goodwill so that we can proceed together to perform those various tasks in the interests of all of us- of peace, economic and otherwise - that are really in the last resort the most important problems that face us today.



On the above statement being made, the situation in the country was discussed on Motions for Adjournment of the House both on the 4th and 5th June.

Speech made in winding up the debate: 5th June 1958

In a Debate, on an occasion of this nature, in a supercharged atmosphere of feelings on both sides of the House and in the very midst of a crisis which is by no means over yet, it must naturally be a difficult task for Members to participate in such a discussion. But I would like, however, to express my appreciation of the general tone of this debate and discussion—the fairly restrained manner in which speeches were made and received, which I think, is a tribute to this House.

I do not wish to go into all the byways of points raised by various Members, who were naturally entitled to refer to them if they so wished, but merely to restrict myself to the main points that some of the hon. Members have made and to the main issues arising out of this situation to which also reference was made.

I should like at the outset to deal with the remarks made by the group of Members belonging to the now proscribed Federal Party, who spoke last, namely, the hon. Member for Kankasanturai (Mr. S. J. V. Chelvanayakam), the hon. Member for Kopay (Mr. C. Vanniasingam) and the hon. Member for Vaddukoddai (Mr. A. Amirthalingam). In the first place I think they overdid the case of doves of peace cooing mildly, if I may say so, while the ferocious and wicked Sinhalese were the chief, if not the only, people to blame—That lie could be overdone, and overdone to an extent when nobody is prepared to accept it seriously. That has happened, I am sorry to say, by my Friends doing special pleading much too insistently.

What did my hon. Friend the Member for Kankasanturai, the leader of this party, say? He referred to various incidents that happened. I do not wish to go into these incidents. He referred to various incidents on both sides. When human beings have their





as I stated in my opening speech, there are depths to which they sink. That has been so throughout history in all countries, and all decent people deplore and deprecate it.

I did give a certain sequence in regard to the recent happenings. I gave that sequence chronologically and fairly, and showed that the murders started with a Sinhalese being killed at Kahawatte, followed by another Sinhalese at Hatton ; then certain incidents at Eravur ; it was what took place in this last area that created the explosion into violence in other areas. However, without going into details, all that I wish here to say in regard to the speech of my hon. Friend the Member for Kankasanturai (Mr. Chelvanayakam) is this. He is one who is quite in his own way sincere, in his own way an idealist, but having no idea whatsoever of reality and the practical side of things. Such people are capable of deluding themselves completely, capable of deluding others too. He talks of nonviolence, of a non-violent movement, non-violent satyagraha, not against the Sinhalese people, only against the Government, the Government that has now to control the Sinhalese people to save Tamils. Why is he deluding himself ? I say, and I say it deliberately, that this is one of the biggest pieces of humbug ever foisted on this country. They talk in terms of non-violence. We have heard of how their Gandhian love and non-violence had been observed by those apparently influenced by their propaganda and their teachings. Ministers who went on ordinary occasions to Mannar were stoned and treated in the most humiliating manner. At Jaffna it was the same. Even on this occasion what was their influence ? How far were they able to restrain those who, apparently, they imagine are under their influence and control, from performing every kind of outrage in Jaffna, Batticaloa and in other parts of the Northern and Eastern Provinces ? How far then, the question arises, will this easy mouthing of non-violent satyagraha which they have decided at their last convention to launch-I am not sure whether it has not in a sense already started ; it has got merged to some extent in the other incidents-remain nonviolent ? I give credit to the hon., Member for Kankasanturai that he is probably deluding himself, but as to the real meaning of these things some of his followers do not delude themselves. They know very well what they are



after ; they know very well, and I doubt very much whether my hon. Friend the Member for Kankesanturai who is their leader has any particular control over the more fanatical and violent members of his own party. I am sorry to say so, but that in fact is the truth of the matter.

Now they talk of non-violence and so on. At their last convention they decided on a certain course of action. I am reading from the speech of Mr. V. N. Navaratnam (Member for Chavakachcheri) at the convention as reported in the newspaper's : " The people were now being called upon to get ready for the supreme sacrifice, almost the only method. now open to the Tamils. The next convention of the party would be held at Mannar, and he was not sure if in the course of the impending struggle his life would be spared to attend and address that convention. Every Tamil man was a soldier in the freedom struggle and was uncertain of his life . . . . . "

This is not talk that the ordinary man will understand in some philosophical sense. They know very well that this talk of peacefulness will not be followed in fact, nor are they themselves in a position to enforce it. They know that their own followers, under the camouflage of peacefulness, are bound to indulge in an orgy of the wildest violence. It is bound to come to that. Surely we know that. I referred earlier to the speech made by the hon. Member for Batticaloa ; I quoted that in full. That is a speech made on April 6th, which appeared in the " Ceylon Observer " of April 17th.

In the speech made by Mr. C. Rajadurai, M.P.-reported on April 13th-this is what he said. This is quoted within inverted commas :

"Further, he said, that the Tamils in India, Africa, Malaya and Ceylon are struggling for freedom. But in a few days I go further and boldly say that the birth of Tamil Nad will take place and all Tamils will live peacefully under one flag."

That is the Federal flag to which the hon. Member for Kopay (Mr. C. Vanniasingam) referred so proudly-that under the Federal flag they took some people somewhere or



another. The Federal flag and Tamil Nad were explained by my hon. Friend for Kopy, not the hon. Member for Batticaloa. I come to the next point in his speech :

" Mr. Rajadurai in his speech called the attention of his audience to the fact that the Tamil people outside India are struggling for recognition of their human rights and that we in this country cannot hope to preserve our language and culture with self-respect unless we achieve an autonomous region of our own within a Federal set-up ; and he added : ` to the birth of Tamil Nad and of all Tamils through the far-flung corners of this earth living under one flag "'.

The point I want to make is this, that under this guise of doing nothing, being peaceful and everything else, there is a movement on foot to completely overturn the State: Do you think these people who talk like this will be satisfied with a Federal State ? That may be the first step only. No, I am sure that there is no Government in the world, with whatever goodwill towards the minorities, that can view with complacency such a situation ; and, as for peacefulness, I shall be prepared to place the evidence available to me before any hon. Members of this House who are interested-that will make them alter their views as to this peaceful Gandhian satyagraha movement. At their last convention they have decided to go on with it.

There is a remark made, I observe, by the hon. First Member for Colombo Central (Mr. P. G. B. Keuneman) in which he appealed to the Federal Party to give up the satyagraha movement. , One word about that. I do not, for a moment, think that it will be given up. I have to consider that that movement is, in fact, on now although their plans miscarried to this extent, that a thing they were planning after making all the necessary arrangements and timing perhaps for a month or two later has blown up prematurely by these incidents that have happened. I think that is all that has happened.

I wish to say, here and now, that the State cannot contemplate with equanimity the continuance of a position like that. We have already seen the misery and suffering that have been caused by extremists on both sides and as I said in my opening speech, the first step to be taken in this situation is to see that this type of extremism ceased



to exist, and we shall do so on both sides. That is the least that the vast majority of people of this country, even at this late hour, expect from established authority, that extremism must cease to exist on both sides. It will be done quite impartially, I can assure the House. I no more like or appreciate extremism on the part of the Sinhalese than I do on the part of our Tamil friends.

What has been happening in the last two years? Extremism in this way, chauvinism of the worst type—under whatever name of nationalism, patriotism or whatever it goes—has reached a point of insanity and other people are in an embarrassing position. For instance, I am quite satisfied that the large majority of Sinhalese—I was indeed satisfied when I went round a few months ago, a position to which the hon. First Member for Colombo Central referred people are neither fanatical nor violent. I think I am not mistaken that with reasonable steps being taken the vast majority of Tamils also want to live in peace. [An hon. Member: Peace with honour.] The hon. Member—[as some nightmare recollection of the late Benjamin Disraeli who used the term on a certain occasion.

Of course, but what is our peace with honour?

I will come to that later, as to what, in my opinion, is the solution.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition asked, "What now? What plans have you? How are you going to deal with this situation?" I will deal with that later. But I do say this, peace with honour can never be attained either on those resolutions or principles to which apparently the Federal Party is committed, because at their last convention they repeated these resolutions they had passed earlier, nor can it be reached on the views of Sinhalese extremists. No. Neither of these things will pay.

I do not wish to say anything more than that regarding the speeches of this group of Members—the hon. Member for Kankasanturai (Mr. Chelvanayakam), the hon. Member for Vaddukoddai (Mr. Amirthalingam) and the hon. Member for Kopay (Mr. Vanniasingam).

I come to the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. First Member for Colombo Central (Mr. Keuneman) and the hon. Member for Wellawatta Galkissa (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva). It is interesting to note that these hon. Members cannot conceivably be considered to have some antipathy towards or hatred of members of





Federal Party. But they were all united in their condemnation of the action of this party. Does it mean anything to my hon. Friends, the Federalists? Cannot it mean to them that their view of themselves may not, perhaps, be the true picture?

The first point my hon. Friends the L. S. S. P. and C. P. Members regret most is that as a result of all this trouble that has arisen the economic development of the country has been retarded, and so on. Of course, I grant that; I admit that situation is there. Various elements, have not made it possible for this Government with reasonable peace for a few months to address its mind to various important economic problems particularly, that face this country. I would also say in passing that, apart from these communal troubles, we have had numerous labour troubles ~ for instance, the strikes that have been called so frequently, sometimes on frivolous, even on fantastic grounds, have also contributed not a little to creating a situation for the raising of the ugly head of reaction in this country. I am very happy that my hon. Friends see that position now : the raising of the ugly serpent head of reaction. Of course, the reactionaries who thoroughly discredited themselves have astutely manoeuvred the situation, have astutely taken advantage of the situation that arose in order to get some advantage for themselves. That has gone on apace.

With regard to my hon. Friend the ~Member for Jaffna (Mr. G. G. Ponnambalam) I must say this. I listened to his whole speech and, as usual, I quite enjoyed his forensic ability and his rhetoric. What does it all come to? He started this off from 1956, of people coming and sitting on Galle Face when something happened. Now, I suppose, a Daniel might occasionally go into a lion's den and escape unscathed. But this is rare.

The hon. Members wanted to come and sit on the steps of Parliament on that day. I advised them that it was a most undesirable thing to do. Why unnecessary provocation--clearly acts of provocation--in this way? People may be there, they may be excited over this Bill,

and so on; why ask for trouble? But without



sitting on the grass meditating on their own sins or other people's sins or whatever it may be. Why do the people want to show their resentment at all ? It is easy to say that, but we who are practical men know that it is an unnecessary provocation.

There was one mistake alone I made ; that was because I did not receive information early. If I received information of that early enough, I would, most politely, have had them all removed before any trouble arose. This action was just like that wonderful Pilgrims' Progress to Kandy which was very provocative.

You see if somebody does act provocatively in that way, to then turn round and say, " I was going on a Pilgrim's Progress, pilgrims marching along " or to say, " I went there and just sat on the grass, so why on earth should people try to show violence " is hardly, I would submit, the right attitude.

In regard to this incident of sitting on the Galle Face Green, I say, if I had that information sufficiently early I would have gone and appealed to them myself and said, " Gentlemen, please don't do it.

Why do you want to be

a party to an act of provocation ? Will you kindly come and sit in my house, if you like to, and do your meditation ? Sit in my own house. " I would have done that ;

My hon. Friend the Member for Jaffna referred to the non-enforcement at the very beginning of the rule of law. It is of course, easy to pass judgment after the event. But the reason why I did not do so was that I wanted to strain every nerve to assuage this position, peacefully without adding fuel to the fire, without enabling those who were by no means heroes to have heroism thrust upon them, by my activities. I did succeed up to a point as that Pact showed. Now that was the reason.

After the event, you can say, " Well this may not have been altogether wise, the better policy would have been to come down hard at the very beginning ". But as I said I did not do that to



chance, as indeed there was, of solving this in a peaceful way, to aggravate the position beyond a point when that would have become more difficult.

The hon. Member for Jaffna also asked why Sri buses were sent to Jaffna. It was because the people were asking for new buses. These Sri buses were sent without any desire to insult or humiliate the Tamils of that area. It is true that some of my Friends had seen the Minister of Transport but they did not make a very special point of it to him, by saying, " Look here, this is an objectionable thing.

Can you do something about it ? " Then it was reported that buses were plying about quite peacefully without trouble.

My one charge against the Members of the Federal Party is that though they constantly saw me on all sorts of elementary matters, some officer being transferred here or there, it never occurred to them to have the courtesy to bring this important matter to my notice. They could have drawn my attention as Prime Minister to this matter and I could have dealt with it without much trouble. It looked to me as though they did not want to be prevented from the opportunity to indulge in that dramatic and maladroit movement of theirs. They wanted to impress, presumably, some of their followers in that area who were not very satisfied with their activities at that time. That is the only reasonable conclusion I come to on that question.

I can only say this. ~ This extremism must cease. The Government is determined to see that it shall cease. Then, the moderate opinion of most of the people in the country can assert itself ; opinion which is now silenced by this extremism of one side or the other. Moderate opinion must be given a chance of asserting itself over the extremism of both sides. I am saying ~hat without making any distinction. Then we can address our minds to the language issue, and other matters.

My hon. Friend the Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) talks of parity. The point is this. One side or the other cannot settle this dispute mutually by hoping to get 10 per cent. of what the one or the



say Sinhalese should be the only language ; others ask for parity. If the Tamil community are given the assurance by legislation that there is no idea of eliminating their language, of crushing their language out and so on in the various spheres of use to which language is generally put,

~ I do not think that a solution on those lines is going to be

I appeal to my hon. Friends that it is somewhere on those lines that the solution can be found and that it will be reasonably acceptable to a large majority of the people. Once you go working on those lines the position becomes easier. That is obviously the way of tackling this question. It will be remembered that some Sinhalese including the hon. Member for Maturata (Mr. M. D. Banda) rather poohpoohed this suggestion that I made. I followed up their meetings by meetings where we had enormous gatherings, appealing to Sinhalese nationals, the Sinhalese race at Kandy, at Matara, at Galle and so on. I explained the position and the people were satisfied. Anybody who was at any of these meetings will say so. Apparently, even the Federal Party, which is supposed to be a very extreme party, was not dissatisfied. Let us not, therefore, look at the solution of this problem on

the basis of conceding 100 per cent. here or 100 per cent. there. It must be something that reasonably satisfies the fears of both. These things can be done in a way in which certainly we can, with understanding; and friendliness and co-operation settle this question. That is the desire of all of us.

My hon. Friend the Member for Wellavatta-Galkissa (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) always eloquent, even if he is not always coherent, went off on a new line. What does he say ? The use of armed forces is bad, for the servant may tend to become the master. That was his line of thought. We all know that

things have happened like that. But surely he understands that whether it is a communist State or democratic State or any other State, occasions arise when the State is compelled in defence of the State to take certain steps and measures. That has been happening throughout history. It does not necessarily follow because the Army or the Navy has to be used against elements that are definitely against law and order and so on, that the Army or the Navy will proceed





to control the situation. Occasionally, of course, it happens when there is complete chaos, such as in France. They just could not have a Government that could last a month or two. I never could remember from moment to moment who was Prime Minister of France when I had to address the Head of that Government. The whole thing there was falling to bits. When you get that sort of a position, then, naturally, that sort of a situation arises—either of the extreme right or the extreme left. We need not take that as a general rule.

But I entirely approve of the last sentence of his speech when he said that we must have an ideal of a united people. It is the only course of sanity, it is the only course of sense, whether for the Sinhalese or the Tamil. Let us make no mistake whatsoever about it. It is so and I can assure this House of that. I myself am satisfied and convinced that, within all bounds of realism and practical possibilities of the situation, we are straining every nerve to achieve that position, and I can assure the House that no one regrets more than myself the necessity for the Government to have taken this step of declaring a state of emergency. We will try and work it as fairly and impartially as we can and make it least onerous under the circumstances, and I hope that when these difficulties cease we can go forward together in peace and contentment. Maybe a storm like this was needed. Believe me, I strained every nerve to prevent this, and I knew what would happen if a situation like this arose. Some people can learn that fire burns only by putting their fingers into the fire ; they learn only by burning their fingers. We are all burning our fingers now, and I hope that we shall be able to profit from the lesson that we are learning.

I am most grateful to the House for this discussion, for the general views expressed by hon. Members. I can assure the House that we will do everything in our power as early as possible to assuage this situation. I continue to be optimistic, even if my hon. Friend the Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) thinks that I am unduly optimistic, and I feel fairly certain that with the co-operation of all sane and well-meaning sections of our people that optimism will be amply justified.



The question was further discussed on the Debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne opening that Session of Parliament

Speech made in reply to the Debate :

4th July 1958

~ I regret that we have had to sit so long tonight in order to bring this debate to a close. Though my hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition laid emphasis on the very unfortunate but accidental fact that, when the House met at 10 a.m. yesterday, there was no quorum and, therefore, we lost yesterday's discussion, I must say that the emphasis which he laid on that fact was really not justified. However, it is in keeping with the general line of thinking of my hon. Friends of the L. S. S. P., so ably demonstrated by the hon. Member for Wellawatta-Galkissa (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) who reminded me that I had said he was always eloquent but sometimes not coherent. I hasten on this occasion to assure him that he was not only eloquent today but also very coherent, though his coherency led him only to the tragicomic anti-climax that in the Lanka Sama Samaj Party alone lay the hopes of this country. His eloquent arguments all led up purely to that. My hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition followed the same line of thinking and went round the subject, wailing and lamenting. But they are ready to embrace Mother Lanka for what it is worth. Like Barkis, they are willin'.

Now, I have always said, and I repeat, that criticism is part of the job of the Opposition. I shall consider it a very incompetent and inefficient Opposition if it were not in a position to produce criticism of anything and everything that the Government may put forward. I sometimes think that the party system of Government, in spite of the fact that it has no doubt many advantages, has a certain disadvantage when the feeling of party benefits sometimes

overshadows the national interest.

Well, that is always to be seen. The party system of Government, except on the rare occasion when the whole nation stands together, let us say when faced with war, does lead to that position. I



and, in the process, very often let party consideration outweigh the national interest-not always, of course, but there is that general tendency. We are not free from it.

Well, criticism has been levelled by my hon. Friends opposite. They referred to the facts that I mentioned during last year's debate on the Governor-General's Speech. We know that the position today is worse : the storm has burst in all its fury. Some of them mourn and lament that this Government was elected admittedly with the goodwill of so many whose expectations have been belied. Well, when this Government was elected, admittedly there were many expectations : the expectation of my hon. Friends opposite that the Government would, in a facile way, toe their line ; the expectation of extremists, on one side or the other, that the Government would toe their line. There existed various types of expectations. I feel no sense of sorrow that this Government, in making an effort quite sincerely to follow its own policy which it had laid down-and laid down prior to the elections-may have disappointed persons who, from extraordinarily opposite angles, built up various expectations. Of course, there was goodwill. My hon. Friends bemoaned the fact that we do not possess the same degree of goodwill now. There again, the people of this country, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition said, will decide that issue in due course. I face that test without any particular perturbation.

Now, when my hon. Friends opposite lament the fact that we have lost the goodwill of the people, I am sorry they are so modest that they do not explain their own contribution towards that state of affairs. They are extraordinarily modest. I will come to explain in what way their most valuable contributions have helped to produce that result, over which they shed so many crocodile tears. However, I will refer to that as I proceed to develop my argument in due course.

The discussion on the debate centred-as indeed it was expected-on the state of emergency. My hon. Friends wanted information and explanations from me on various points arising out of it. I shall try my best to deal, very briefly of course, with the points that occurred in the various speeches of which I have taken down notes. I hardly think it necessary, as I said once before when we discussed this very situation not so long ago--on the 4th and 5th of



last month-that the task, intriguing though it may be, of holding post-mortems and repeated post-mortems serves no purpose at all.

What is the use of finding out the causa causans of the trouble, who set the ball rolling, how it all began, what atrocities were committed at Eravur, Batticaloa and Jaffna, or what atrocities were committed in Colombo, Panadura, Kurunegala and elsewhere? I did try to explain on the last occasion the chain of events that occurred to lead to the immediate trouble. I do not propose to repeat it. I believe the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) was present on that occasion, though he seems to have forgotten what I said. I verified that some of the points he said he raised for the first time here with great vehemence were points I mentioned in great detail when I spoke on the 4th June, explaining why this state of emergency had to be declared, but it is interesting and important in order that we should evaluate the situation correctly with a view to understanding what indeed, realistically, should be the correct remedies.

The germs go back many years. They go back to the days when, not for the first time but on very rare occasions, I should think, in fairly recent history, the various communities of this country worked shoulder to shoulder, after 1915, in the then National Association, followed, a year or two later, by the Ceylon National Congress. How soon that unity broke up when even the very Father of the Ceylon National Congress, the respected Sir Ponnambalam Arunachalam, broke away from the Congress! On what primary issue? On the claim for a Tamil Seat for the Western Province. Even at that stage, so early, on such an issue as a Tamil Seat for the Western Province, such a great man as the late Sir Ponnambalam Arunachalam, the inspirer to a great extent and Father of the movement for nationalism and independence which was stimulated after the events of 1915, left the movement. You see how far all this goes back. I am answering the spirit of the remarks of the hon. Member for Wellavvattagalkissa (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva). I do claim-I may be wrong-that he himself does not possess a correct understanding of the problem in propounding his own theories by way of a remedy.

Very well. Then, when we came to the Donoughmore Commission where again the squabble started about seats and divisions, that Commission, as you know, rejected the





What did the Commissioners do ? They once again decided against communal representation, and in favour of territorial representation. The old man had once again got the better of the Member for Jaffna-old D. S. Well, now, that only made the position worse than ever. The Tamils felt that they had nothing like the power in the Government which they believed they were entitled to. Those were the real seeds of this 'dissatisfaction.

It had its repercussions in the public services. They did not know what reactions it would have on the almost dominant position occupied by Tamils in the public services, in almost every department. On their own merits and their achievements-they had to pass qualifying examinations and so on-they held a dominant position in the public services.

There are Tamils of merit, though looking at this House one would not think so. I fully admit it. They are very hardworking, industrious and meritorious, generally speaking.

In the meanwhile of course, you remember, in the Donoughmore days, there were boycotts. I am referring to the boycott movement. None of the Tamil Members came forward ; and finally they did come forward but always with this feeling in their minds. This is not a matter which merely came as a sort of climax to all this ; that situation was existing there-please remember that-for many years. Why do I want to go over the history of this language question once again except to say this, that our party felt believe me, I am still convinced-that the only solution was neither the point' of view of Sinhalese alone without any place for Tamil nor the position of his party to declare both as official languages.

" Why do you not solve all this ? " was the question asked. It is easy for my hon. Friend the Member for WellawattaGalkissa to say, " Make both official languages, and hey presto, the problem is solved ". No, Mr. Speaker. That is a solution which would have led to complete chaos. You cannot have, in a matter like this, one side or the other getting hundred per cent, of what they expected over the language

issue and hope that that is going to be a solution. ~hose  
are the very words I used in the previous debate. I have to repeat



claim for communal representation. Except a few Nominated Seats, they planned, in my opinion quite rightly, for territorial representation. That territorial representation, in certain instances, did help certain communities in the Northern and Eastern Provinces. Certain other seats in the other provinces helped the minorities to obtain representation, but there was always from that time a festering and growing dissatisfaction in the minds, particularly of the Tamil community, that the Constitution was such that it did not give them a fair share of the Government, in the Legislature. You talk of language as the chief trouble and as parity as the one thing that is going to solve all this. Please remember some of these facts.

Then we came on to the point when the Soulbury Commission was appointed. I remember the dramatic occasion, the melodramatic gestures, movement and actions of my hon. Friend the Member for Jaffna. He came dramatically late to the conference room to give evidence amid the cheers and applause of his countrymen, who subsequently loaded him with their opprobrium. It is all in the game of politics. I am not blaming him. He over-reached himself.

I myself at that time, I remember, before the arrival of the Soulbury Commission, held a conference amongst representative Members of the State Council-Sinhalese and various representatives of the minority communities. We did our best and came within an inch of coming to a solution where we thought we could present a united demand to the Soulbury Commission on this question of representation. My hon. Friend over-reached himself. It is so sad to think that Tamil leaders in this country in recent years have proved such bad bargainers-I should not use the word "bargainers", let me say negotiators. They over-reached themselves. They almost spoke of [representation. Mr. D. S. Senanayake](#) kept out of those discussions. That was, perhaps, either one of his good qualities or one of his defects. He was a shrewd judge of men, and he knew very well that the hon. Member for Jaffna would do the job. "D. S." thought and knew he would do it, and he kept silent. And sure enough, it happened. The hon. Member for Jaffna was not satisfied with something that had been worked out very generously by the Sinhalese at that time, and agreed to by the Muslims and others. He was not satisfied. He thought he would get more from the Soulbury Commission. He gave evidence before the Commission and entertained the Commissioners to tea and dinner at a tea estate in Balangoda and various other places.



What did the Commissioners do ? They once again decided against communal representation, and in favour of territorial representation. The old man had once again got the better of the Member for Jaffna-old D. S. Well, now, that only made the position worse than ever. The Tamils felt that they had nothing like the power in the Government which they believed they were entitled to. Those were the real seeds of this 'dissatisfaction.

It had its repercussions in the public services. They did not know what reactions it would have on the almost dominant position occupied by Tamils in the public services, in almost every department. On their own merits and their achievements-they had to pass qualifying examinations and so on-they held a dominant position in the public services.

There are Tamils of merit, though looking at this House one would not think so. I fully admit it. They are very hardworking, industrious and meritorious, generally speaking.

In the meanwhile of course, you remember, in the Donoughmore days, there were boycotts. I am referring to the boycott movement. None of the Tamil Members came forward ; and finally they did come forward but always with this feeling in their minds. This is not a matter which merely came as a sort of climax to all this ; that situation was existing there-please remember that-for many years. Why do I want to go over the history of this language question once again except to say this, that our party felt believe me, I am still convinced-that the only solution was neither the point' of view of Sinhalese alone without any place for Tamil nor the position of his party to declare both as official languages.

" Why do you not solve all this ? " was the question asked. It is easy for my hon. Friend the Member for WellawattaGalkissa to say, " Make both official languages, and hey presto, the problem is solved ". No, Mr. Speaker. That is a solution which would have led to complete chaos. You cannot have, in a matter like this, one side or the other getting hundred per cent, of what they expected over the language

issue and hope that that is going to be a solution. ~hose  
are the very words I used in the previous debate. I have to repeat



I pause here for a moment to meet one point which I have met before, which the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) made, " Why did I abrogate the Pact ? Was it because a number of Bhikkus came and performed satyagraha on my door-step and asked for a written document ? " I have explained this matter before. I repeat it now, because I do not want this misunderstanding, this misrepresentation, to continue. When that anti-Sri campaign started, I sent for the member for Kankasanturai (Mr. S. J. V. Chelvanayakam) and told him, " Chelva, you have started this. You never discussed this with me before you started it. There was no need for it. If any trouble is going to arise never ask me to intervene. Even now please call it off." He could not do it.

And what happened ? A point was reached when the Government decided that we could no longer wait, that we would have to prosecute the anti-Sri and the anti anti-Sri people although I refrained from doing so to prevent unnecessarily aggravating feelings. When that point had come I was asked to instruct the Police to prosecute those with whom I negotiated, who were in fact perpetrating acts which were a breach of the spirit of that agreement, or what was left of the agreement. That was the situa

tion that arose. When that position arose the Pact had,

in fact, been made a dead letter. It was abrogated by cer

I merely stated a fact for the benefit of these Bhikkhus which Government knew, I knew as a fact, to satisfy them I suppose, not that I was anxious to do something which would not have been done but for their sitting on my doorstep. That situation in fact had arisen. What did I say even in my broadcast on that day ? " The Pact is a dead letter but those things which this Government have considered fair and reasonable it would continue to do, Pact or no Pact ". I said that in my broadcast. That is the position. I hope that no more questions will be put about it.

With regard to the situation that arose, what is my good Friend the hon. Leader of the Opposition saying ?-I am still dealing with this emergency : " You should have taken strong action on the 24th"-or whatever the date he mentioned. " Why did you wait till the 27th ? " Certainly the hon. Leader of the Opposition said on the 4th June that





In a small country with a unitary form of Government the argument on all sides is that with the Sinhalese being 68 per cent. of the total population--I am entitled to say that ; the Sinhalese should be entitled to say that--Sinhalese should be the official language, just as much as the Tamils are entitled to say that nothing should be done to crush the Tamil language, its use, or to destroy the culture of the Tamils. Surely it is on lines of thinking like that that a solution must lie, at least an immediate solution, whatever may be the ultimate position ?

That is why we say that while making Sinhalese the official language we will give due recognition to the Tamil language for all practical purposes with the sole exception of this sentimental attachment to the idea of parity.

I myself mentioned the various lines of thinking--the four points--in this House on behalf of the Government and the Government party more than one and a half years ago. I am now twitted for delaying the introduction of the

Bill that I could have introduced. I could have introduced it then except that in between came this threat of satyagraha by the Federal Party and the discussions with them. And after all, please remember that my view of the reasonable use of Tamil was accepted by a party considered to be the most extremely chauvinistic party, the Federal Party. Please remember that they agreed to that.

Why then did I not introduce a Bill? For the simple reason that they insisted that both these Bills should be presented together--the Regional Councils Bill and this Language Bill. The Regional Councils Bill had to embody various things in the substantive legislation which we were discussing. It was a very intricate bit of legislation. The various functions of the Government that could reasonably be de-controlled, de-centralized, into the hands of the Regional Councils, had to be listed defining clearly the powers of the central Government, the powers of the Regional Council and the powers of all the other local authorities with.in the area of a Regional Council. That was not an easy job. The Federal Party insisted that both Bills must come together and indeed, except for that, the Tamil Language Bill would have been introduced one and a half years ago. I acceded to that request.

In the meanwhile all these things intervened ; that is, the anti-Sri campaign, the campaign against the letter Sri on the buses, and the anti anti-Sri campaign and all that transpired later.



I pause here for a moment to meet one point which I have met before, which the hon. Member for Jaffna (Mr. Ponnambalam) made, " Why did I abrogate the Pact ? Was it because a number of Bhikkus came and performed satyagraha on my door-step and asked for a written document ? " I have explained this matter before. I repeat it now, because I do not want this misunderstanding, this misrepresentation, to continue. When that anti-Sri campaign started, I sent for the member for Kankasanturai (Mr. S. J. V. Chelvanayakam) and told him, " Chelva, you have started this. You never discussed this with me before you started it. There was no need for it. If any trouble is going to arise never ask me to intervene. Even now please call it off." He could not do it.

And what happened ? A point was reached when the Government decided that we could no longer wait, that we would have to prosecute the anti-Sri and the anti anti-Sri people although I refrained from doing so to prevent unnecessarily aggravating feelings. When that point had come I was asked to instruct the Police to prosecute those with whom I negotiated, who were in fact perpetrating acts which were a breach of the spirit of that agreement, or what was left of the agreement. That was the situa

tion that arose. When that position arose the Pact had,

in fact, been made a dead letter. It was abrogated by cer

I merely stated a fact for the benefit of these Bhikkhus which Government knew, I knew as a fact, to satisfy them I suppose, not that I was anxious to do something which would not have been done but for their sitting on my doorstep. That situation in fact had arisen. What did I say even in my broadcast on that day ? " The Pact is a dead letter but those things which this Government have considered fair and reasonable it would continue to do, Pact or no Pact ". I said that in my broadcast. That is the position. I hope that no more questions will be put about it.

With regard to the situation that arose, what is my good Friend the hon. Leader of the Opposition saying ?-I am still dealing with this emergency : " You should have taken strong action on the 24th"-or whatever the date he mentioned. " Why did you wait till the 27th ? " Certainly the hon. Leader of the Opposition said on the 4th June that



the step taken on the 27th May should w-isely have been taken 24 hours earlier, if I understood him coirect. I do not think I understood him wrong. What was the step we took on the 27th ? We declared a state of emergency.

I think it is a great achievement in an island-wide upheaval of this nature that in fact within two to three weeks we completely brought under control violence, except for a very occasional incident here and there. I think this is a great achievement with this small cost in lives. I admit the tension still continues. I am not denying that for one moment. I think that while the rigours of the Emergency Regulations should be eased-we have done so and we are doing it where we think it necessary-the Emergency should not be completely lifted throughout the country until we are 'satisfied that there is not likely to be a recrudescence. We are not. going to take the risk of a set-back-I am sure you will agree-or of somebody starting it again. It is like somebody recovering from a disease from which he has been suffering. You do not want a relapse because that is naturally worse than the first disease itself. So that, acting with a certain measure of caution-for naturally we have to be cautious-we will preserve the condition of the emergency, but relax its rigours.

There now arises one question, namely, the duration of the emergency. How long is it going to last ? I said we want to be quite certain that no inconvenience is caused unnecessarily to the people and we have relaxed in certain directions but at the same time we do not want to remove these things completely till we are all satisfied and Parliament is satisfied that no more trouble will be feared. I do not think that situation would take long. There are still threats by the Federalists of satyagraha, and so on. Should I remove the emergency today and release the Federal Party leaders-incidentally, their D-Day is August 20th-there might still be another holocaust in this country by their starting 4 satyagraha. There shall not be an oppourtur-ity for any satyagraha in this country with all its

implications. Nor indeed is there going to .be a place for extremism from the other section.



Still we see ominous happenings in spite of the state of emergency. There are leaflets flying about the place. My hon. Friend the Member for Vavuniya (Mr. C. Suntharalingam) concentrated his speech chiefly on various pamphlets from which he quoted. What are these pamphlets? He seemed to attach a great deal of importance to them. He quoted them in extenso. I am just looking at his own quotations. He speaks of the Action Committee, Campaign of National Freedom. I wonder whether any of us know of the existence of such

a thing. Then he quotes something else under some other leaflet, and so on. It is a dangerous symptom no doubt that these things should still be going about the country. We have not yet been able to stop this because it is very cleverly done.

The hon. Member for Tavuniya read out some paragraphs from some leaflets he had, asking the Christian schools to close down, the Muslims to leave, and so on and saying, "The Prime Minister is a good Sinhalese Buddhist who will see all of you driven out". I have seen those and I have them here. They were sent to the

Christians and to the non-Sinhalese. I have also here some leaflets sent to the Sinhalese stating that I am a Tamil and that I have betrayed the Sinhalese: "Down with you. Fight for their rights."

Here is the leaflet sent to a Sinhalese gentleman in the Kandy area, four pages of cyclostyled matter sent to a fairly respectable Sinhalese gentleman of that area, attacking me right and left, that I have sold the Sinhalese to the Tamils, and heaping every kind of possible abuse on me. It is one of the terrible things I have seen-"I am a good Sinhalese and Buddhist patriot who will drive out the Tamils"-that is to the Tamils, and to the Sinhalese-"I am a Tamil who has betrayed the Sinhalese interests".

There is another one addressed to the hon. Member for Maturata (Mr. M. D. Banda) of the same variety. It might interest my hon. Friend, the Member for Maturata who is a representative of the United National Party-I am sure he will forgive me-when he comes and mouths his pious inanities, to know that I have got some here published in the official paper of the United National Party, the "Siyarata". These are not anonymous, they are very interesting.





There was one verse-here it is. This is an extract from an article by one T. B. Ehelapola in the " Siyarata " of 3rd January. I have got the Sinhalese version of it but in order that hon. Members may be able to follow me, I shall merely read a sentence in English. This is what it says:

"Therefore, the whole nation should rise up and demand in one voice that he "

that is I

" should liberate this country from the Tamils ".

There is much more to come. Then there is another, of 16th May, " Prime Minister in seven Provinces " by Gunadasa M. Seneviratne. We are coming close to the date and very close. I have got an interesting verse. This is what it says:

"The struggle should be waged by all Sinhalese to call upon Mr. Bandaranaike to resign with his henchmen in order to protect the country and save our freedom. Now the struggle should be concentrated on that. If it is not done, we shall be subjugated by the Tamils and shall live as slaves. Sinhalese awaken, rise and march forward ".

That is in the U.N.P. official paper ; the hon. Member for Maturata might know.

I am giving you the dates. Now here are verses in the " Siyarata " of 16th May 1958 by iVT. Wimal de Silva of Modera, one of their youth leaders, entitled, " Sinhalese youth rise ". Almost in every line there is the exhortation to kill the Tamils. " Do not permit it ", that is the country to be overrun, " for the sake of the nation let no one think of life, kill as many as you can and when you cannot do so, kill yourself ". In

« ~6~, e~~~~zn6~ ~6~ ~,

Then it goes on with these verses :

" 1-VI y present Mother Lanka,

Stop weeping and console yourself for a while



And the last of the quatrain-there are four verses : " Sinhalese let us  
rise,

march forward, I should say " without fear

in the name of our nation

In Sinhalese, again it is :

« ~a~€~8~ ; ~6~ ~~~ ; ~~~8~ ; ~6~ ~,

Probably, my hon. Friend the Member for Maturata may be aware that his own Leader, Mr. Dudley Senanayake, two days before the Governor-General's Speech, addressed a group of his youth leaguers and he warned them to be ready, that instructions will be coming in a few days. They must be prepared for anything. Does he know it?

These are the people who would like the country and this Parliament to believe that we are the villains, that this Government has been guilty of all these troubles, that they are saints and that everything was smiling in the best of all worlds under their regime. As to what part deliberately or inadvertently they are playing in the creation of communal feelings, it is not for me to say. That will reveal itself, I hope, before long.

Of course, there were various elements in this. There was the Federal party with their narrow views of nationalism and what they needed. Then there were the Sinhalese extremists and there were others who thought that the creation of any trouble was desirable from the point of view of party advancement, throwing discredit on the Government. There were quite a number who had their finger in this unsavoury pie. That was the position.



I must say that to my hon. Friend the Member for Wellawatta-Galkissa (Dr. Colvin R. de Silva) , the solution of this communal problem is solely dependent upon Tamil having parity or being made another official language among other things. I think my hon. Friend is sufficiently realistic to understand that this idea of one



contemplates-of course, a Ceylonese nation is what we all hope for and cherish-is one which is not so easy of achievement in fact. We have to understand the facts and deal with them with patience to create the necessary confidence out of which that one nation will arise. It is all right if you have a homogeneous nation ; but when you have as you do, in some of our Asian countries, peoples whose race, culture, religion and language differ, you cannot speak as you would speak when dealing with a Western country. For instance, the United States of America is composed of the most cosmopolitan people, drawn from all kinds of races. But above all that, they have a common nationality : they are all Americans. That is the position we should all aim at. It is easy to talk of it in our Asian countries, -but we have to bear in mind this idea of common nationhood and work towards it realistically: in other

words, create a feeling of mutual confidence. I am satisfied that fundamentally there will be no difficulty in the various sections of the people of this country living together with self-respect and with honour. I am quite satisfied about that. But the steps to be taken to achieve that are not quite so easy as my hon. Friend would have us believe, or he believes himself.

The question of fundamental rights, which does not occur in our Constitution, except, of course, in a very limited way -there is just one clause-is one of the matters that our Select Committee will consider. When these things are done, and there is no room for creating any feeling of grievance, then you gradually get this feeling of confidence. I do not hold to the view that we cannot live together as some people in despair would have us believe. I do not believe it for a moment. Those are certain of the steps we - are taking.

That is the answer as to what we propose to do. , What, pray, is the alternative ? If my friends of the U. N. P. were elected to power and Sir John Kotalawela had become Prime Minister, with the extraordinary statements made by him, I dread to think what would have happened here. Within one month of their coming into power there would have been a revolution in this country -not merely the sort of thing we had earlier where even a warship in the harbour of Colombo could not have placed sufficient distance between them and the enraged citizens. If my hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition had come into power, what would have been the situation then? He



stands by his principles. He believes honestly in parity, and he would have introduced some measures for parity. I have not the least doubt about it. Then what would have been the position? The position would have been equally serious. If he had by any chance come into power and introduced such a measure, there would have been a bigger blaze than anything we have encountered. Is not that the plain full fact? Therefore, I do contend that at this time our Government, a government like ours, was best calculated to meet the situations that arose.

I do contend—and I do not think I am overstating it—that in the circumstances in which the last elections were fought, it is only a government like our Government that might have had problems in less grave form, particularly these problems, than any other government, with the principles to which they were committed. I do not say that we have met them successfully. Do you think I feel very proud and happy that we have had all these difficulties? No, nobody regrets them more than ourselves. We are trying to deal with the situation to the best of our ability. There is no use saying, "Government failed to do it and somebody else would have done better". We have had to bear the brunt of all these storms that were brewing in 1955 or 1956.