

If you love your country, please read this...

In UNHRC meeting held in October 2015, a [resolution against Sri Lanka named as 30/1](#) was presented and minister of foreign affairs (Mr: Mangala Samaraweera) stated that their government will give co-sponsorship to that resolution. And that can't be his personal decision. So he must have said so according to the instructions received to him. And one who instructed to do so must be a person who was in a higher rank than a minister. And that decision must be understood as the majority opinion of the figures in the past (Yahapalana) government. If not giving that co-sponsorship is an undemocratic act since it violates the collective responsibility of the cabinet.

Now, I want to pay your attention to the 16th suggestion of that resolution which is co-sponsored by Sri Lankan government.

“Welcomes the commitment of the Government of Sri Lanka to a political settlement by taking the necessary constitutional measures, encourages the Government’s efforts to fulfill its commitments on the devolution of political authority, which is integral to reconciliation and the full enjoyment of human rights by all members of its population; and also encourages the Government to ensure that all Provincial Councils are able to operate effectively, in accordance with the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of Sri Lanka;”

It's clear what was meant by “political settlement” in this sentence and I want to pay your attention to some characteristics (keeping the above suggestion by UNHRC in the mind) of the new constitution proposed by Interim report of the steering committee of the constitutional assembly appointed by that government.

1. Principle of subsidiarity, (i.e. whatever could be handled by the lowest tier should be vested in it) should be followed when devolving the political power.
2. Province should be the Primary Unit of Devolution.
3. Governor should act on the advice of the Board of Ministers other than where he/she is specifically authorized by the Constitution. Or this position should be abolished.
4. Central government will only have a power to make national policy and frameworks. (It will has all the powers regarding National security and Foreign Affairs)
5. National Policy by parliament shall not override statutes by a Provincial Council in respect of matters in the Provincial List
6. It's suggested to form a second chamber consisting 55 members, which 45 of them appointed by the provincial councils and 10 of them appointed by the parliament. And any constitutional amendment won't become a law unless it's passed by both from the

parliament and this 2 nd chamber, with special (2/3) majority, according to the proposed new constitution. When reading the debates of the constitutional assembly, it seemed to me that, it may have been suggested that to appoint 10 members to the 2 nd chamber from the provinces north and east (20 from both provinces), while the only 5 members will be appointed by other provincial councils.

7. When reviewing the powers of the president and prime minister it seemed that this is near to a nominal presidency. And he will be appointed by the parliament.
8. Prime minister-President has the powers to abolish a provincial council temporary and keep those powers in the hands of them, in a case of cessation/rebellion. This must be done on the permission of the parliament and once done it will be valid only for 6 months. After that, time must be renewed for another 6 months.

If analyzed taken together as a whole what is intended by all these recommendations is to weaken the central government extremely and giving the provincial councils maximum powers. though the recommendation identified by me as the 8th point will ensure national security, this constitution may be a green light to extremist and separatist and racist and majoritarian activities (like commemorating LTTE members not as religious act but as a political act, removing Buddha statues, Encroaching Buddhist archaeological sites.) in North and East provinces, which can't be identified as a rebellion (but will have the same effect by a rebellion to the national unity, i will call these acts as symbolic acts of rebellion). And with the emerge of Islamic terrorist groups in Sri Lanka such powers will be a great tool for them also. Even a power to create own school textbooks to the Tamils and Muslims will be sufficient to make a generation who will fight with other races in the country. Imagine what will happen if orthodox (extremist) Islamic teachings will added to the school textbooks of Eastern province. power to control Education is dangerous than giving the police powers to them. Note that Muslim mosques and Qazis have given flogging punishments to women who were being accused of adultery though adultery is not a crime. (See page 27 of [Unequal citizens](#) by Hyshama Hameen and Hassana Cegu Issadheen)

You may think I'm exaggerating things. If so it's because I'm not explaining these issues in detail. However I've previously written about this in detail. You can read [this note](#) and check the truthiness of its claims by referring the [report of the steering committee](#). If you convinced that I'm telling truth and speak logically, then you can believe me. If not please correct me, where I have been illogical. But do not argue/criticize me based on presumptions on my political affiliations. (Wicramabahu Karunaratana was my favorite politician, two years ago, But I turned away from them when I saw their fallacy.)

Former president Maithreepala Sirisena once tried to withdraw this co-sponsorship which was given to resolution 30/1 resolution by UNHRC. But opinion of the almost every legal specialist (when asked about the possibility to do so) was that after we have made such a agreement with international same government can't cancel it (it will have negative consequences to the country), but if a regime change happened then the new government can get rid of these

agreement since their view was a different one. And it should be reminded that we have not elected a new government and we have only elected a new president. So if we did not vote to politicians (and their parties) who opposed to this constitution process at the beginning, and did not elect them as two third of the parliament, we won't have a country even to live like this.

Now you know that government being elected at 2015 tried to implement a constitution which is detrimental to National Unity, National Security, and Ethnic and Religious harmony, just to satisfy International Organizations. (And they still haven't apologized about it) If you gave power to them again even after being aware about that they tried to implement (and still trying to implement) constitution which is the effect is severe than even the 1815 Udarata convention, you too will be accused of future insatiability, terrorism and conflicts which Sri Lanka will face.

You may think that I have been biased or working for a certain political party. I too had to change my previous political allegiances based on above facts.

You may wonder if I said I'm not a *Chauvin* who is fanatically appreciating GR or MR (R family). On the contrary (to what is intended by this note) politicians I hate the most are with them (yes, MR is too in my list of 'politicians I hate'). Most people are very concerned about not giving their votes to politicians who are corrupted/have a bad reputation as drug dealers, criminals, and thugs. In their attempt to avoid being elected such people as politicians, and their eagerness to vote for learned people in the election, there is a tendency to vote for groups who are doing much harm to the country than those drug dealers, criminals, corrupted and less educated politicians. Should we abandon Sovereignty, Unitary status, National Security and National Unity of the country in order to see a bunch of well educated, clean gentlemen in the parliament? Doctors amputate patients' hands/legs at some times and patients too agree, not because they love to lose their hands/legs, but because they have no other option to solve the situation. Same theory must be applied in this election. Yes! We love to elect clean and educated gentlemen for our honorable parliament. But if such gentlemen make the country insecure, then we'll denounce them and choose less civilized people (who love the country than them) instead. It's imperative to avoid losing National security, National Unity, and Unitary status of the country even by electing a criminal as our public representative. If we imagine that there's a criminal who raped my mother and killed my father and current government/parties in alliance with them gave the nominations for him, even then I'll vote for him in the election! Not because I have become so much blind follower of a party, because I want to protect the country. I don't know how many of you have the strength to take that bold step in this (2020) parliamentary election.

- Sachintha Madushan