



ELECTIONS—*The final moments before the counts begins.....and the results are announced.....the victorious candidate is mobbed by jubilant supporters.*

"WE THE PEOPLE OF SRI LANKA BEING RESOLVED IN THE EXERCISE OF OUR FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE AS A NATION TO GIVE TO OURSELVES... PLEDGED TO REALIZE THE OBJECTIVES OF A SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY INCLUDING THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS OF ALL CITIZENS....."

(The Constitution of Sri Lanka)

Elections, Economics and the Electorate

The Socio-Economic Forces Round the Political Stage

The general elections is a drama attracting the attention of every section of the population. Election platform rhetoric and promises span the spectrum of tragedy and comedy just as in a stage play. Occasionally election violence rears its head and tragedy becomes more than a stage play on a platform. However, the real drama occurring is in the political change in the country and here the actors are the various social groups who are wooed and whose votes are sought in, electioneering. The real drama of politics in the country is therefore in the changes taking place in these groups—how they were formed, where they are heading towards etc.—and this provides the backdrop to what is happening today

on the election stage. It is these historically formed groups that pre-set the scenes and sometimes even pull the strings as it were, of the actors on the platform. It is these groupings and their economic connections that we must first describe in any discussion on elections.

Formation of Major Groupings

Before the advent of the Portuguese and specially before the introduction of a plantation economy, Sri Lanka was an unequal feudal economy. The King and his associates obtained an unequal share of the produce of the land and lived in luxury in fine mansions whilst the mass of the peasants existed at a low level of subsistence, their standard of living symbolised by their humble houses of wattle and daub and thatch—there being a legal prohibition on the peasantry building

houses of brick and tile. Occasionally the political system—that is the system of power—built on this unequal economic system were disturbed by internal feuds and invasions from neighbouring lands. It was partly a series of such invasions that led to the shift from the classic centre of this feudal civilization which was the North Central Province to the Western coast from the period of the 13th to the 15th century.

From the 16th century specially, with the Portuguese connection, new social groupings begin to emerge. Earlier there were always groups engaged in trading (with both the East and the West) but who were largely under the jurisdiction of the local king. With the advent of the Portuguese, however, a foreign power with trading connections tied to a global economic system, with an

accumulating centre in Europe, began to have an increased impact on the country. This impact was heightened in the 19th century with the introduction of the plantation economy by the British. This foreign domination by the European power disrupted the feudal economy, introduced a capitalist economy dependent on the needs of Europe and created new social groupings based on this new economy.

The new social elements created were those allied to this new economic order. Thus a largely foreign plantation owning and export-import trade owning social grouping and a new working class centred around these activities emerged. In addition a new set of largely local entrepreneurs providing functions ancillary to the main colonial presence, (transport by carts, arrack renting etc.) emerged within the new economic system. However, the new economic system or at least its central focus did not extend to the whole-island, the classical plantation economy being an enclave economy. Yet the introduction of a money economy as well as other social changes induced by the foreign presence began basic changes in the villages outside the plantations especially from the late nineteenth century. (In the villages where the plantations were physically situated, the peasantry was pauperised due to land alienation from the 1830's and enactments like the Waste Land Ordinance of 1897; whilst their feudal overlords soon allied themselves with British interests).

The changes brought about in the villages due to British-induced commercialism included the growth of new social groupings like traders, landlords tied to a money economy (as opposed to the earlier feudal economy) and new social strata such as school teachers and village headmen. These effects of foreign rule brought other changes of a dynamic nature, as for instance the growth of rural indebtedness of very large sections of the peasantry to the middle rung social groupings like traders, teachers, small landlords etc. In the northern region some of the changes related to the spread of western education by missionary schools and the consequent absorbing of the educated Tamils into the government service, which became an important source of income for this region.

The introduction of the plantation economy and its associated political system was not unopposed. There was sometimes opposition in the central regions from some of the ruling feudal elements as well as from the displaced peasantry. In the coastal regions new economic groupings of local entrepreneurs came sometimes into conflict with the foreign entrepreneurs. The opposition in later times took the form of a cultural or religious one.

Vertical and Horizontal Social Groupings

In addition to these social groupings of principally a horizontal nature arising from pre-colonial and feudal times and from colonial times, there are other social groupings of a vertical nature such as castes which play a role in elections. The groupings we have mentioned have also not been static, some of these groupings have risen in importance and power whilst others have declined. Thus in the colonial period the feudal groupings declined in importance or changed their character; whilst in the post-independence era some of the colonial groupings declined whilst others grew in importance. Since the 1930s the creation of a new non-feudal peasantry was attempted by widespread colonisation, giving rise at the same time to a new landlord class based on hidden tenancy. The last twenty years has also seen the growth to national importance and power of some of the elements tied to the village lower middle class like teachers and small landlords. Also, since independence the importance of plantation owning groups have declined culminating in the nationalisation of estates recently.

These social groups formed during feudal, colonial and post-independence times and growing, declining and interacting with one another are the hidden actors in the election drama. Some of these groupings draw the scenarios for others to act; some lie, others believe; some tell truths believing them to be falsehoods, others tell falsehoods sincerely believing them to be truths. The changes since the introduction of universal suffrage are to be seen within these hidden dynamics.

There are two broad misleading positions about elections sometimes made, forgetting the hidden actors—

the social groupings—we have mentioned. One is that elections allow voters to change everything, which is not true. The choices they are given, the medium through which it is presented, and the symbolic language through which it is done depends on the holders of power in the different parties and their relative power as well as their relationship to the different social groupings. The other false view is that elections do not change anything. In a dynamic situation like in Sri Lanka, new social groupings have emerged and have often used the electoral machinery for changes, specially to their advantage. Again the extent and nature of these changes depend on the access of these groups to political parties that tend to speak nearest to their interests, the messages and medium they use etc. Electoral politics is a surface interaction of the relative strengths of the social groupings and the consciousness of the voters, the latter often being manipulated by the groupings having most access to creators of consciousness like the mass media. However, in a fluid class situation such as that of Sri Lanka elections can and have brought some changes, though not perhaps of a fundamental kind.

The discussions below relate largely to some of these changes.

Political Parties and Policies

The constitutional evolution of the country from 1930 onwards offers interesting insights into the social forces in Sri Lanka. The All Ceylon National League, the European Association, the All Ceylon Moors Association, and the Tamil Congress were some of these organisations which were more in the nature of communally-oriented groups than real political groupings based on class criteria, although class forces can be discerned under these labels specially as they operated under limited franchise available at that time. With the granting of universal adult franchise—Ceylon was one of the first to enjoy this in this region and elections have since been held without a break for 46 years—the need for mass parties was felt.

Further, the early thirties of the 20th century saw Ceylon in the throes of the world economic depression which was made worse by a malaria epidemic and floods. It was during

this period that Ceylonese who were returning from their studies in Britain absorbed the prevailing Marxist analysis in Europe. Under the impetus of these ideas they started the Suriya Mal campaign in 1934, against the sale of the Remembrance Day poppy, as a nationalist-inspired movement. It was mainly out of these social movements that the Lanka Sama Samaja Party was born in December 1935. It was the first Left party to be organised in the country and was the forerunner of other left parties that

followed in later years, including those like the JVP, in more recent years, which have questioned the ability of the parliamentary system to effect fundamental changes.

The Ceylon National Congress was formed in 1919 and the Sinhala Maha Sabha with the Tamil Congress were to go in for mass participation. As "constitutional" biased groups they awaited the recommendations of the Soulbury Commission which was expected to recommend cabinet govern-

ment and the "parliamentary system," for the island. The elections held in 1947 thus compelled a sense of urgency on them and hurriedly the first two organisations ventured out to woo the voter in most of the electorates while the Tamil Congress made its presence felt in the Northern region. With the inauguration of the UNP in 1946 as a merger of the Sinhala Maha Sabha and the Ceylon National Congress the leading personalities of the party worked out a programme of action. These policies came to be practised without a break till about 1953 when the first major economic crisis surfaced following a rise in the price of rice.

TABLE 1
Party Positions at General Elections, 1947-56

1947	Parties	Can- didates	Seats Won	% Seats	Votes Polled	% Votes	Votes Per Can- didate
	U.N.P.	98	42	44.2	751,432	39.81	7,668
	L.S.S.P.	28	10	10.5	204,020	10.80	7,286
	B.L.P.I.	10	5	5.2	113,193	5.99	11,319
	C.P.	13	3	3.1	70,331	3.72	5,410
	L.P.	9	1	1.0	38,932	2.06	4,326
	T.C.	9	7	7.3	82,499	4.37	9,167
	C.I.C.	7	6	6.3	72,230	3.82	10,319
	U.L.C.	2	0	0.0	3,953	0.21	1,977
	S.P.	3	0	0.0	1,393	0.07	464
	Independents	181	21	22.1	549,381	29.10	3,035
	TOTAL	360	95		1,887,364		
	Total number of votes				3,052,814		
	Percentage polled				61.3		

Elections in Sri Lanka

The General Election of 1947 which gave birth to the first Parliament of Independent Ceylon saw the emergence of what is generally known as the Right and the Left camps.

The single largest party was the UNP with 751,432 votes followed by 'others' with 554,727 (independents etc.). The left parties (if we take LSSP, CP and BLP together) polled 387,544 votes while this figure goes up to 498,706 if we include the CIC and the LP in it (see Table I). In fact some of the early commentators like Ivor Jennings called the Left the alternate government—the second largest group, which included the LSSP, CP, BLP, the LP and the CIC (largely representing estate workers).

Again in 1952 the UNP was the single largest party gaining 1,026,005 votes while the 'Left' comprising the LSSP, CP and LP collected 466,476 votes. 'Others' had stood at 554,727 in 1947 but now dwindled to 330,771; while the newcomer, the SLFP, received 361,250 votes. This trend could be seen more clearly in Table 2.

This was the situation till the watershed of 1956 when the picture changed with the entry of the new group the MEP with the SLFP as its major partner and finding the rural lower middleclass as a rallying point. It changed the complexion of the political spectrum and blurred the distinctions of Right and Left groups. As a Western commentator Woodward put it, since then every major political party has attempted to woo these newly discovered groups.

TABLE 2

1952	Parties	Can- didates	Seats Won	% Seats	Votes Polled	% Votes	Votes Per Can- didate
	U.N.P.	81	54	56.80	1,026,005	44.08	12,667
	S.L.F.P.	48	9	9.5	361,250	15.52	7,526
	L.S.S.P.	59	9	9.5	305,133	13.11	7,824
	C.P.-V.L.S.S.P.	19	4	4.2	134,528	5.78	7,080
	L.P.	5	1	1.1	27,096	1.16	5,419
	T.C.	7	4	4.2	64,512	2.77	9,216
	F.P.	7	2	2.1	45,331	1.95	6,476
	R.P.	9	0	0.0	33,001	1.42	3,667
	B.R.P.	3	0	0.0	3,987	0.17	1,329
	Independents	85	12	12.6	326,783	14.04	3,845
	TOTAL		95		2,327,626		
	Total number of votes				2,990,881		
	Percentage polled				74		

TABLE 3

1956	Parties	Can- didates	Seats Won	% Seats	Votes Polled	% Votes	Votes Per Can- didate
	U.N.P.	76	8	8.4	718,164	27.44	9,450
	M.E.P. (S.L.F.P. led)	60	51	53.7	1,045,725	39.96	17,429
	L.S.S.P.	21	14	14.7	274,204	10.48	13,057
	C.P.	9	3	3.2	119,715	4.57	13,302
	L.P.	4	0	0.0	18,123	0.69	4,531
	T.C.	1	1	1.1	8,914	0.34	8,914
	F.P.	14	10	10.5	142,036	5.43	10,145
	T.R.P.	2	0	0.0	387	0.01	194
	Independents	64	8	8.4	289,491	11.06	4,523
	TOTAL	251	95		2,616,759		
	Total number of votes				3,646,579		
	Percentage polled				71		

TABLE 4
Party Positions at General Elections, 1960-70

March 1960		Can-	Seats	%	Votes	%	Votes Per
Parties		didates	Won	Seats	Polled	Votes	Can-
U.N.P.	...	127	30	33.1	908,996	29.62	7,157
S.L.F.P.	...	109	46	30.5	648,094	21.12	5,946
L.S.S.P.	...	101	10	6.6	322,352	10.50	3,192
C.P.	...	53	3	2.0	141,857	4.62	2,677
M.E.P. (Philip Gunawardene)	...	89	10	6.6	325,832	10.62	3,661
T.C.	...	8	1	0.7	38,275	1.25	4,784
F.P.	...	19	15	9.9	176,492	5.75	9,289
J.V.P.	...	2	2	1.3	11,201	0.36	5,601
L.P.P.	...	101	4	2.6	125,344	4.08	1,241
S.M.P. (I.M.R.A. Iriyagolle)	...	40	1	0.7	24,143	0.79	604
S.L.J.P.	...	1	1	0.7	11,115	0.36	11,115
B.B.P.	...	2	1	0.7	9,749	0.32	4,875
Independents	...	167	7	4.6	270,881	8.83	1,622
Others	...	80	0	0.0	54,775	1.78	685
TOTAL		890	151		3,069,106		
Total number of votes					3,724,507		
Percentage polled					77.6		

TABLE 5

July 1960		Can-	Seats	%	Votes	%	Votes Per
Parties		didates	Won	Seats	Polled	Votes	Can-
U.N.P.	...	128	30	19.9	1,143,290	37.57	8,932
S.L.F.P.	...	98	75	49.7	1,022,154	33.59	10,430
L.S.S.P.	...	21	12	7.9	223,993	7.36	10,666
C.P.	...	7	4	2.6	90,219	2.96	12,888
M.E.P. (Philip Gunawardene)	...	55	3	2.0	102,833	3.38	1,870
T.C.	...	10	1	0.7	46,803	1.54	4,680
F.P.	...	21	16	10.6	218,753	7.19	10,417
J.V.P.	...	2	2	1.3	14,030	0.46	7,015
L.P.P.	...	6	2	1.3	29,190	0.96	4,865
Independents	...	39	6	4.0	140,522	4.62	3,603
Others	...	6	0	0.0	11,167	0.37	1,861
TOTAL		393	151		3,042,954		
Total number of votes					3,724,507		
Percentage polled					75.6		

TABLE 6

1965		Can-	Seats	%	Votes	%	Votes Per
Parties		didates	Won	Seats	Polled	Votes	Can-
U.N.P.	...	116	66	43.7	1,579,181	38.93	13,614
S.L.F.P.	...	100	41	27.2	1,226,833	30.24	12,268
L.S.S.P.	...	24	10	6.6	302,095	7.45	12,587
C.P.	...	9	4	2.6	109,744	2.71	12,194
M.E.P. (Philip Gunawardene)	...	60	1	0.7	110,388	2.73	1,840
S.L.F.S.P.	...	32	5	3.3	129,986	3.20	4,062
T.C.	...	15	3	2.0	98,726	2.43	6,582
F.P.	...	20	14	9.3	217,986	5.37	10,899
J.V.P.	...	10	1	0.7	18,791	0.46	1,879
Independents	...	96	6	4.0	237,805	5.86	2,477
Others	...	10	0	0.0	24,932	0.61	2,493
TOTAL		492	151		4,056,467		
Total number of votes					4,710,887		
Percentage polled					82.1		

TABLE 7

1970		Can-	Seats	%	Votes	%	Votes Per
Parties		didates	Won	Seats	Polled	Votes	Can-
U.N.P.	...	127	17	11.3	1,876,956	37.92	14,779
S.L.F.P.	...	105	90	60.0	1,812,849	36.63	17,265
L.S.S.P.	...	23	19	12.7	433,224	8.75	18,836
C.P.	...	9	6	4.0	169,229	3.42	18,803
M.E.P. (Philip Gunawardene)	...	4	0	0.0	46,571	0.94	11,643
C.P. (Maoist)	...	1	0	0.0	3,485	0.07	3,485
T.C.	...	12	3	2.0	115,567	2.33	9,631
F.P.	...	19	13	8.7	245,747	4.96	12,934
S.M.P. (R. G. Senanayake)	...	50	0	0.0	20,429	0.41	409
Independents	...	87	2	1.3	225,559	4.56	2,593
TOTAL		437	150		4,949,616		
Total number of votes					5,525,028		
Percentage polled					85.2		

However, those newly discovered groups have since then also not remained static, having changed their character. There is not much research done and published literature as yet on these trends in the immediate past and informed analysis must therefore await the future.

An additional measure that has remained a significant factor in the political stage ever since, was the "no-contest" agreement, signed prior to this election by the MEP and the parties of the left. The effectiveness of this measure has been witnessed in the results of all general elections from 1956 onwards. Whatever the political persuasion or party label of the various leaders, it was the behaviour of the voter (which with each election showed growing signs of maturity amidst the complexity of issues.) that has been one of the decisive factors. It is to these issues that we must turn.

Issues Since 1947

Since 1947 the votes different parties obtained have fluctuated according to the particular issues as tables 1-8 indicate. However, the figures since 1956 have to be treated with caution as electoral pacts were then entered into by the different parties (except March 1960), and the votes indicated in Tables 1-7 do not necessarily accurately reflect the true preferences of voters.

The pattern that emerges from a study of the key issues at the successive elections since 1947 indicates similarities as well as peculiar situations under which campaigns have been fought and won. Table 8 gives a summarised version of the main issues.

The issues repeat themselves but the impact and the ultimate emphasis changed from election to election. Since 1956 the elections came to be fought more on the economic front.

RURAL AND URBAN WEIGHTAGE

The economic issues that confronted the voter cut across electoral boundaries and gave flesh and blood to

TABLE 8

MAJOR ISSUES SINCE 1947

Election	Government	Opposition
1947	Stability, democratic values. ... Significance of independence. Successful negotiations with British Government. Democracy, religious freedom and anti-marxist sentiments. "Continuation of proven policies by tested leaders".	Anti-colonialism; Sentiments against foreign rule. Anti-establishment, elitist leadership, innovative policy; Radical approach to development—takeover of plantations. Departure from class rule, greater participation by workers.
1952	Almost similar issues to 1947. New leader after the death of D. S. Senanayake—continuity and sense of gratitude to him. Renewed fears of Marxist threat.	Greater criticism of the longer U.N.P. rule on lines similar to above. Divisions in the Government leadership.
1956	Nine years of achievement; Entry of Ceylon to U.N., Bandung; Greater reliance on external help; solidarity with the Commonwealth. New industries; land alienation; Gal Oya and land colonisation; Sinhala only with no unfairness to minorities. (There was a change of government in 1956).	Newly formed S.L.F.P. offering criticism in cultural sphere; Nine years of misrule and need for change; attack on leadership; Cultural vacuum created by the Government—a large number of issues under this including the Buddhist Commission report. Sinhala Only and relegation of English. Rise of the price of rice on ration criticised. Army excesses. Acceptable alternative government.
March 1960	Need to continue same policies. Criticism similar to those in 1956 and exploiting weakness of Opposition in Parliament. (UNP formed the government but lost Parliamentary majority on the Throne Speech debate).	Divisions following the death of S.W.R.D. Bandaranaike and problems of leadership. Return of Dudley Senanayake as leader. Recovery of lost ground by Opposition. Left parties specially the MEP going on their own trying to form a government. New Leader in Mrs. Sirima Bandaranaike and a united party.
July 1960	Criticising the new leader. Alleged secret pact between SLFP and FP. Overtures to the new voter. Departure from capitalism in economic sphere. (SLFP formed government)	Joint Opposition stand on many issues and no-contest pact. Highlighting waste, extravagance. Greater socialisation and levelling down of inequalities.
1965	Achievements and results of the nine-year rule, solidarity of all constituent parties in the government. Justifying moves to takeover the Press. (UNP formed government)	Burdens on the people—prices, shortages, unemployment. Criticism against the Press Bill and the presence of the LSSP in Government.
1970	New ventures in the economic sphere. Achievements in the field of industry. Active participation in Asian affairs. Programme for Youth and Educational reforms. Food drive and the proposed Mahaweli diversion, GPS increased, benefits to farmers and peasants, and salary increases to workers. Price of rice increased but one measure given free on ration. Streamlining the administrative machinery and greater efforts to decentralise. Greater powers to G.As. Paddy Lands Act updated and rural indebtedness arrested. (ULF formed government)	Criticism of nationalisation policies and lack of participation by workers, waste and corruption in State ventures. Criticism of non-alignment being more pro-Western. Alienation of youth and a new program for youth specially the graduates. Denouncing devaluation, watertax associated with Mahaweli Project. Promise of restoring second measure of rice on the ration and free mid-day meal to patients in hospitals. Denouncing arrogance of bureaucracy, waste and nepotism. High foreign debt and reliance on foreign aid by Government; OGL scheme criticised.

what constitutionalists have called the "General Will" of the people. Within the confines of this national trend there were however, the side-issues exerting a great pull on the ultimate verdict of the voter. The weightage given to the urban as well as the rural voter was of great significance in this set-up. The first signs of the emerging importance of the rural voter surfaced at the general elections of 1956 when the ruling party, up to that time the U.N.P., as well as the more urban based Left parties found a threat in the rural appeal projected by the S.L.F.P. The demarcation of electorates under various Delimitation Commissions have also taken into consideration the weightages these urban and rural voters exert in creating the "General Will".

There has been much debate on where and how greater representation should be given. For instance, commentators like A. J. Wilson felt that representation of the rural voter was too heavy. In his book *Politics in Sri Lanka 1947-1973* he states "Electoral demarcation provides a terrific weightage in representation to the rural sector as against the urban. The backward and sparsely populated areas enjoy a premium. The result is that the urban voter is placed at a disadvantage". The accuracy of this contention has been challenged, as we see later on, for the urban voter has many advantages over his rural counterpart in representing his views. Successive delimitation have also had to deal with this problem and have given greater emphasis to rural areas.

It is not possible to have an exactly equal voting strength in every electorate no matter how democratic the intention of any Delimitation Commission is. Besides, it was mandatory that due recognition be given to factors such as community or diversity of interests, geographical or physical features, rural and urban interests and general minority groups. The Delimitation Commissions since the census of 1931 have given consideration to the following:

1. Electorates within each province to be of equal strength as far as possible.
2. Weightage given to area besides the population ratio.
3. Community or diversity of interests.

Within these broad terms the electorates that were carved out have tended to produce what may be called an identical pattern of weightage since 1956 and comparison between that year and 1970, for example provides ample testimony to this fact.

TABLE 9

Seats per Voting Strength 1947-56		Number of Constituencies		
Number of Voters		1947 1952 1956		
		Over 60000 votes	0	1
Between 55-60000	"	4	7	4
Between 50-55000	"	9	3	5
Between 45-50000	"	5	4	6
Between 40-45000	"	5	10	14
Between 35-40000	"	13	14	14
Between 30-35000	"	18	14	11
Between 25-30000	"	15	11	7
Between 20-25000	"	6	8	8
Between 15-20000	"	11	8	11
Between 10-15000	"	8	10	2
Between 5-10000	"	1	4	3
Below 5000	"	0	1	1
Total		95	95	95

Table 9 gives the position of the Parliamentary seats held according to Voting Strength. The position remained the same with the new demarcation and the increase of seats from 95 to 151 which came into operation at the general election of 1960 March. The Delimitation Commission demarcating new seats in 1976 took a similar view and the same weightage between rural and urban areas continues. The number of seats were increased to 168 and the new demarcation comes into operation at the 1977 general election. (See Box)

The weightage to rural areas could also be judged by taking the voting strength at provincial level. The average voting strength per seat in the different provinces in 1956 and 1977 is as follows:

Province	1956	1977
Western	52,475	85,151
Southern	46,072	77,751
Central	27,327	59,039
Northern	32,336	60,067
Eastern	24,597	61,068
Uva	18,963	48,317
North-Western	41,204	73,105
North-Central	20,837	55,071
Sabaragamuwa	36,770	67,180

If weightage was not given on an area basis, the rural areas would be having a fewer number of seats due to the lower population in these areas compared to the urban areas. The situation has remained the same today. The Delimitation Commission of 1976 demarcated seats on the

following basis. The — W.P. 39, C.P. 24, S.P. 21, N.P. 14, E.P. 12, N.W.P. 19, N.C.P. 10, Uva 12, Sabaragamuwa 17. Total 168 seats. Multi-member seats 14; Single-member seats 154. In all there are 160 constituencies.

The pattern of demarcation existing in 1956, for example, shows the Western Province with the largest concentration of population getting about one fifth of the seats. The predominantly rural areas of the Uva, NCP, NWP, Southern and Sabaragamuwa provinces had 16 seats and the Central Province 15 seats. The breakdown is given in Table 10 at right, on page 9.

The basis of demarcation was one seat for every 75,000 of the population and one seat for every 1,000 square miles. There were 89 constituencies — one three-member, four two-member and 84 single-member constituencies making a total of 95 seats. This was to be based on the 1951 census. But within the provinces the 1946 figures were used to allocate seats in each province. The second Delimitation Commission appointed after the 1953 census ceased its work midway when in 1954 the membership of the House was for a period fixed at 105. The additional four members were to be elected by a special electorate meant for the Indian voter.

Factors that Guided the Present Delimitation

The Delimitation Commission commenting on the factors that guided it in carrying out the additional electorates stated that the sections of the law relating to delimitation found a place in the Statute Book in about 1947. At that time proposals calculated to reinforce a communal basis for elections in this country had already been modified in favour of a "territorial basis with a communal element in it". Thereafter, the abolition of the Senate, the non-continuance of appointed members in the future National State Assemblies and the consolidation of the system of party politics in the country were all trends towards the lessening of the "communal element" in the matter of representation in the legislature. If the circumstances existed it was reasonable to give weightage to any communal element but only in so far as was contemplated in the constitution. Also this was necessarily to be a transient phase, for the reason that in a Republic "pledged to

carry forward the progressive advancement towards the establishment of a socialist democracy", communal representation could not continue to be a permanent feature of its political system.

The so called "communal element" gets introduced into the scheme of territorial representation by the existence in a given area of a substantial concentration of citizens united by a community of interest whether racial, religious or otherwise but differing in one or more of these respects from the majority of the inhabitants of that area. The Commission may in its discretion make such division into electoral districts as to render possible the representation of that interest. The Commission indicated that where there was a substantial concentration of citizens united by a community of racial interest different from that of the majority, it was empowered subject to the limitations already indicated to create multi-member constituencies.

The table below shows the number of members to be elected on the basis of population and area together with the citizenship average per province under the 1976 delimitation.

BASIS OF DELIMITATION IN 1976

Province	Number of Persons	Number of Citizens	No. of Electoral Districts on the basis of 90,000 Persons	Additional Number of Electoral Districts on an area basis	Citizenship average per electoral district	No. of elected members
Western	3,404,444	3,320,873	38	1	85,151	39
Central	1,956,755	1,416,928	22	2	59,039	24
Southern	1,666,710	1,632,776	19	2	77,751	21
Northern	877,768	840,943	10	4	60,067	14
Eastern	740,335	732,811	8	4	61,068	12
North-Western	1,407,894	1,388,989	16	3	73,105	19
North-Central	553,065	550,714	6	4	55,071	10
Uva	790,368	579,809	9	5	48,317	12
Sabaragamuwa	1,313,804	1,142,060	15	2	67,180	17
	12,711,143	11,605,903	143	25	—	168

TABLE 10

Seats Per Province According to the Number of Seats

Number of Voters	Number of Seats									Total
	W.P.	S.P.	C.P.	N.P.	E.P.	Uva	N.W.P.	N.C.P.	SAB.	
Over 60,000	9									9
55 to 60,000	4									4
50 to 55,000	1	4								5
45 to 50,000		5					5			6
40 to 45,000	1	3		2			5		5	14
35 to 40,000	2	1	5	2			1		5	14
30 to 35,000		1	4	3					3	11
25 to 30,000			1		4		1	1	1	7
20 to 25,000	5				2	2	1	1		8
15 to 20,000				2	1	4	1	5		11
10 to 15,000			2				1			2
5 to 10,000			2				1			3
TOTAL	20	12	15	9	7	7	10	5	10	95

But this was not brought into operation. A special three-member electorate has been carved out—Nuwara-Eliya-Maskeliya—which now ensures one member from the estate population.

Thus the votes in some of the Central Province electorates though demarcated on the basis of population had only the citizen groups and had necessarily to be small. Thus Talawakelle in 1956 was the smallest electorate with 4,096 votes. Meanwhile, the largest at Kelaniya had 67,565 votes. The disparity was unavoidable in the absence of any provision to give the vote to the estate Indian population. It could be argued that the "pull" of each voter thus varied from electorate to electorate. Assuming that everyone voted and only two candidates contested the seat, 2050 votes would be sufficient to elect a member in Talawakelle while 33,783 votes were required to vote in a member at Kelaniya. The pull of one voter in Talawakelle was therefore as good as the pull of 16 voters in Kelaniya, according to I.D.S. Weerawardene in 1956.

The rural seats are larger in area and the voter's chance of getting to know the M.P. are less than that of the urban voter who came in contact with him more often. Urban issues also thus tend to get mirrored more often than rural ones. The extra-parliamentary pressures usually associated with trade union action, direct negotiation and the like also originated more within the urban areas. For many such reasons the rural voter had to be given special weightage. Even in the traditional rural areas of the

N.C.P., N.W.P., Sabaragamuwa, Southern and Uva Provinces the concentration of population round main cities ensured a seat for the thickly populated areas in these provinces—Kegalle, Matara, Galle, Ratnapura etc., thus giving representation once again to urban pockets in rural belts. Hence the practice of giving extra weightage to the rural voter came to be an accepted fact. Commenting on this rural vote, I.D.S. Weerawardene stated: "It is the section of the population most susceptible to the opinions of the vernacular-educated lower middle class of the Buddhist clergy, the Sinhalese teacher and the ayurvedic doctor". This pattern continued to exert its influence on the polls results during the two decades after 1956, with the rural vote moving Right or Left.

The next delimitation resulted in the increase in the total number of constituencies from 95-151. Provision was made for the increases in population between the last two censuses. The principles of demarcation

remained the same and additional seats were given for every 1,000 square miles. The comparison of the positions between 1952, 1960 and 1977 are given in Table 11 below.

The position has remained almost unchanged. In 1956, of the 95 seats to which members were to be elected, 16 in the Northern and Eastern provinces had large Tamil-speaking (Tamil and Muslim) majorities. Puttalam with a large Muslim vote returned a Muslim member while in the Colombo Central constituency with about a 50 percent Muslim vote at least one Muslim member had a chance of winning. In 73 constituencies the Sinhalese were a majority. In addition, in Nawalapitiya in the Central Province, the Sinhalese comprised nearly 49 percent of the voting strength and Tamils another 40 percent. At least about 50 percent of the voters of Colombo Central also were Sinhalese. It was argued therefore that on a language basis the Sinhalese could control about 74 of the 95 seats where members were elected. On a religious basis Muslims could control 5 seats in Colombo Central, Puttalam, Pottuvil, Muttur and Kalmunai; Hindus could control 8 seats in the Northern Province and 4 in the Eastern Province. There were Christian majorities in the Negombo, Ja-ela and Chilaw seats. Christians were the largest group, forming over 40 percent in Nattandiya in the N.W.P. and Mannar in the N.P. As between 1956 and 1970, for example, this ratio has remained almost the same but the pull exerted by minority groups had increased somewhat with Muslims getting their member in Beruwala and Christians having some influence in Wattala. In 1970 out of

TABLE 11

Demarcation 1952, 1960, and 1977

Years	W.P.	S.P.	C.P.	N.P.	E.P.	N.C.P.	N.W.P.	Uva	Sab.	Total
1952 ...	20	12	15	9	7	5	10	7	10	95
1960 ...	35	19	23	13	11	8	16	10	16	151
1977 ...	39	21	24	14	12	10	19	12	17	168

Position of S.P., N.C.P., N.W.P., Uva and Sabaragamuwa

Total Seats S.P., N.C.P., N.W.P., Uva and Sab.

Year	All Island	Sab. Provinces
1952 ...	95	44
1960 ...	151	69
1977 ...	168	79

a total of 157 seats. Sinhalese candidates won 125 seats, Tamils 18 and Muslims 8. The position in 1956 was Sinhalese 75, Tamils 12, and Muslims 7.

Weightage to Community of Interests

The demarcation of electorates took into consideration the presence of communities with similar interests ranging from religious and racial to other matters. In areas predominantly populated by the same group of communities it was easy to carve out seats for them, for example, the Tamils and Muslims in the North and East. Where these communities mingled with the majority community the position was different and safeguards were introduced for their adequate representation, for example, in the Colombo Central constituency. There was also consideration given to other communities of interest and some of the constituencies have tended to return candidates representing these interests for instance—religious and caste. Negombo is a case of the former and Ambalangoda and Balapitiya a case of the latter. In Kadugannawa a Muslim candidate was able to secure a seat in 1956 due to the fact that this was a multi-member seat and of five candidates four were Sinhalese and one was a Muslim. In 1960, 1965 and 1970 too for the same area—with the name of the constituency changed to Akurana—one Muslim candidate was returned along with one Sinhalese member. In some of the predominantly Sinhalese areas these communities with similar interests tend to have a fair pull and their support can tip the scale in favour of the winning candidate. This is so with the Muslim and the Tamil vote in a number of constituencies and the Christian vote in some of the constituencies. Even though they cannot hope for a member of their own community of interest their support can be crucial for the winning candidate.

With the presence of the multi-member constituencies this tendency to mirror parochial interests continues to show up and parties also make sure that where concentration of pressure groups exist only one candidate belonging to the group is put forward. This tends to make the voting cut across party lines and militates

against the healthier practice of voting according to party policies and broader national issues. The presence of pockets of communities with a similar background makes campaigning harder. The sociological factors associated with caste groups tend to make this a regular feature. It is true that these groups have failed to get adequate representation and this is the basis for the clamour to get electoral demarcation as a solution to their problems. An extreme example of this was seen recently in neighbouring India in the position of the Congress for Democracy led by Jagjivan Ram. In that country the defection of the CFD from the Congress Party proved a decisive factor in the ruling Congress Party defeat and illustrated the crucial role of these groups at election time.

There have also been instances of issues taking a national shape as far back as 1956, when candidates from minority groups contesting seats where the majority community predominated, have won seats against candidates from the majority community. Wategama won by the MEP candidate against the UNP candidate belonging to the majority community is an example. At Nattandiya similarly caste considerations did not prove an obstacle to the MEP candidate winning the seat against the candidate from the predominant caste. Similar instances were observed in the other elections too. By 1971, the active youth groupings were disregarding almost completely the parochial 'vertical' issues and working together more on broad social and economic 'horizontal' issues. An indication that with the increased changes in society, horizontal stratification based on class was becoming more important than vertical ones based on caste or religion.

Independents

The gradual elimination of the independent candidate is another feature in the process and over the years party considerations seem to have gained ascendancy over others. However, there are instances where candidates with a strong local bias scored over party members. These exceptions present a striking feature and most elections have been noted for the emergence of these tough and weathered brand of men who defy

all party attempts to herd them into tractable groups. R. G. Senanayake, I. M. R. A. Irriyagolla, Somaweera Chandrasiri, Mudiyanse Tennakoon, S. D. Bandaranayake, K. M. P. Rajaratne, Prins Gunasekera, W. Dahanayake are names among this category. They have sought party nominations now and then but showed a strong individuality most of the time.

Another significant feature is that where the same member has successfully retained his seat for nearly twenty years. In about 15 electorates there have not been any change of members since 1956. In three seats the sitting members have retained their seats successfully since 1948.

The Rural Vote

According to the new delimitation in Sri Lanka where 168 members are to be returned the position of the rural vote is as follows:

Of the total of 6,667,585 voters registered in the 168 electorates 5,130,152 voters are considered to be rural and coming within 130 of the 168 electorates.

Some of the electorates considered essentially rural and the number of electors are as follows:

Divulapitiya, 52,152; Mitigama, 60,810; Attanagalla, 58,236; Dompe, 57,213; Avissawella, 54,375; Homagama, 58,568; Bandargama, 57,420; Horana, 53,138; Bulathsinhala, 45,170; Matugama, 53,238; Beruwala, 54,799; Agalawatte, 54,931; Minuwangoda, 59,315; in the Western Province.

Dambulla, 46,052; Laggala, 27,057; Ratotota, 38,740; Galagedera, 31,555; Harispatuwa, 2 seats, 69,295; Pata Dumbara, 34,865; Uda Dumbara, 25,575; Teldeniya, 25,366; Kundasale, 35,074; Hewaheta, 31,716; Yatinuwara, 40,017; Udunuwara, 37,041; Gampola, 41,442; Nawalapitiya, 39,569; Nuwara Eliya, (3 seats,) 64,407; Kotmale, 30,743; Haaguranketa, 33,574; Walapane, 30,196; in the Central Province.

Balapitiya, 33,016; Ambalangoda, 39,254; Karandeniya, 34,918; Hiniduma, 47,132; Bentara-Elpitiya, 51,656; Baddegama, 50,963; Ratgama, 48,840; Habaraduwa, 48,921; Akmeemana, 43,343; Deniyaya, 40,357; Hakmana, 48,009; Akuressa, 50,778; Devinuwara, 49,897; Matara, 48,354; Weligama, 54,430; Mulkirigala, 46,551; Beliatta, 48,648; Tangalle, 46,470; Tissamaharama, 45,888; in the Southern Province.

Vaddukodal, 40,684; Kankasanturai, 43,907; Manipay, 41,373; Kopay, 41,824; Uduppiddy, 36,955; Point Pedro, 28,447; Chavakachcheri, 36,959; Nallur, 40,205; Kilinochchi, 26,670; Mannar, 31,767; Mullaitivu, 24,698; Vavuniya, 28,450; in the Northern Province.

Seruwila, 31,250; Mutur, 30,389; Kalkudah, 33,995; Padirippu, 35,909; Amparai, 49,006; Samanturai, 27,308; Kalmunai, 28,826; Pottuvil, (2 seats,) 49,691; in the Eastern Province.

Puttalam, 37,177; Anamaduwa, 38,835; Chilaw, 51,172; Nattandiya, 41,386; Wennappuwa, 46,835; Galgamuwa, 39,617; Nikaweratiya, 39,021; Yapahuwa, 43,638; Hiriyala, 45,299; Wariyapola, 36,934; Panduwasnuwara, 36,768; Bingiriya, 42,596; Katugampola, 49,269; Kuliyaipitiya, 48,552; Dambadeniya, 50,693; Polgahawela, 40,614; Kurunegala, 41,104; Mawatagama, 40,303; Dodangaslanda, 33,833; in the North Western Province.

Medawachchiya, 32,284; Horowapatana, 27,610; Anuradhapura East, 31,451; Anuradhapura West, 30,233; Kalawewa, 33,850; Mihintale, 21,914; Kekirawa, 22,077; Minneriya, 28,863; Medirigiriya, 28,674; in the North Central Province.

Mahiyangana, 23,026; Wiyaluwa, 21,301; Passara, 19,925; Hali-Ela, 24,864; Uva Paranagama, 26,908; Welimada, 28,652; Bandara-wela, 28,103; Haputale, 22,166; Bibile, 27,222; Moneragala, 28,711; Wellawaya, 30,171; in the Uva Province.

Dedigama, 50,729; Galigamuwa, 39,277; Rambukkana, 35,495; Mawanella, 41,536; Aranayake, 29,269; Yatiyantota, 38,405; Ruwanwella, 41,578; Deraniyagala, 34,648; Eheliyagoda, 43,447; Pelmadulla, 32,200; Balangoda, 41,554; Rakwana, 41,998; Niviti-gala, 39,328; Kalawana, 26,964; Kolonne, 43,367; in the Sabaragamuwa Province.

The urban voters are concentrated in the coastal belt north and south of Colombo and the suburban electorates of Dehiwela, Ratmalana, Moratuwa with about 500,000 voters. The breakdown is as follows:

Colombo North, 49,803, Colombo Central, 106,403 (three seats); Borolla, 41,634; Colombo East, 43,574; Colombo West, 37,983; Dehiwela, 45,693; Ratmalana, 43,379; Moratuwa, 64,190; Wattala, 48,749; Panadura, 59,163. The total voting strength in 1970 was 5,552,028 and in 1977 it is 6,667,585. It is interesting to compare the positions between 1956 and 1977. See Table at right.

The average increase in the voting population between 1956 and 1977 is about 30,000 per province except for the Northern province. The sharp increase in the number of voters in the Western Province is marked by the increase in the number of seats from 20 to 39 during the 21-year period and the voting average strength has gone up from 52,475 in 1957 to 85,151 in 1977. In the Eastern province, N.C.P., Uva and Central Provinces the voting strength average

Principles of State Policy

A common thread in all the manifestos of political parties fighting elections is seen in the following set of principles of State policy listed in the Constitution of Sri Lanka, though their emphasis may differ in each case.

16. (1) The Principles of State Policy contained in the sub-sections which follow shall guide the making of laws and the governance of Sri Lanka.
 - (2) The Republic is pledged to carry forward the progressive advancement towards the establishment in Sri Lanka of a socialist democracy, the objectives of which include—
 - (a) full realization of all rights and freedoms of citizens including group rights;
 - (b) securing full employment for all citizens of working age;
 - (c) the rapid development of the whole country;
 - (d) the distribution of the social product equitably among citizens;
 - (e) the development of collective forms of property such as State property or Co-operative property, in the means of production, distribution and exchange as a means of ending exploitation of man by man;
 - (f) raising the moral and cultural standards of the people; and
 - (g) the organization of society to enable the full flowering of human capacity both individually and collectively in the pursuit of the good life.
 - (3) The State shall safeguard the independence, sovereignty, unity and the territorial integrity of Sri Lanka.
 - (4) The State shall endeavour to strengthen National unity by promoting co-operation and mutual confidence between all sections of the people of Sri Lanka including the racial, religious and other groups.
 - (5) The State shall endeavour to eliminate economic and social privilege, disparity and exploitation and ensure equality of opportunity to all citizens.
 - (6) The State shall strengthen and broaden the democratic structure of government and democratic rights of the people by affording all possible opportunities to the people to participate at every level in national life and in government, including the civil administration and the administration of justice.
 - (7) The State shall assist the development of the cultures and the languages of the people.
 - (8) The State shall endeavour to ensure social security and welfare.
 - (9) The State shall endeavour to create the necessary economic and social environment to enable people of all religious faiths to make a living reality of their religious principles.
 - (10) The State shall promote peace and international co-operation.

has doubled. The provision for additional seats for every 1000 square miles has resulted in helping to keep the balance between rural and urban; if not the seats gained by the rural

Changes in Voting Strength and Number of Seats in 1956 and 1977

Province	Voting Strength increased by	Seats increased by
Western	32,676	19
Central	31,712	9
Southern	31,679	9
Northern	27,731	5
Eastern	36,471	5
North Western	31,901	9
North Central	34,234	5
Uva	29,355	5
Sabaragamuwa	30,410	7

It is interesting to see the number of seats added to each province and the changes in the average voting strength per electorate for the provinces, from the above table.

areas would have been much less. The N.C.P. however, shows a high increase in the voting strength average from 20,837 to 55,071 during this period which coupled with the additional seats on the area basis has helped the N.C.P. to double its number of seats from 5 to 10 during this period.

The N.W.P. too shows the same trend going up from 10 to 19 seats. In the Sabaragamuwa and Uva Provinces the increase in average voting strength and the number of seats seem to be the same—keeping to the 1956 position i.e. the increase in the number of voters being compensated for by the increase in the number of seats. In the Eastern province where the voting strength average had more than doubled, the gains in the number of seats has not moved up proportionately.

Provincial Voting Patterns in General Elections from 1947-1970

The tables that follow statistically indicate the number of votes and the percentage polled by various major political parties in the country at all general elections from 1947. The various socio-economic trends which prevailed during the past 30 years of parliamentary politics could also be inferred from these tables. The shift of the power structure from the urban voter to the rural voter could be gauged by comparing the percentage of votes polled by the various parties in different provinces over the 23 year period. The emergence of a politically educated electorate specially among the younger age groups becomes apparent when these tables are placed beside the demographic data. The high percentage of votes secured by various political parties in different provinces is also an indicator of their penetration into these areas and the acceptance of their political programmes by the voters.

Despite 30 years of parliamentary politics and over 45 years of universal franchise the accent and emphasis on race, religion and caste appear to be yet evident in the voting patterns.

A noteworthy feature, which could be surmised from these statistical data, is the shift from one political party to the other hoping for better living conditions and the advantages of no contest pacts and coalitions. The inability of major political parties to provide an acceptable programme to voters in the Eastern

and Northern provinces is also evident from these statistics. The gradual decline of the votes polled by the independents shows signs of political maturity among the voters.

The changing geographical dispersion of party influences can be seen on a closer examination of these tables. A swing from one party to another has been noticed at most of the past general elections. One result, as well as outcome, of this situation appears to have been the changing district political affiliations at the elections. In the last three general elections, the districts which showed the same pattern of changing political affiliation could be regarded as those contributing to the overall swing during this period. On this basis the following 8 districts contributed to the swing:—

Matale, Kandy, Nuwara Eliya, Galle, Kurunegala, Moneragala, Kegalle and Ratnapura. These 8 districts which together account for nearly 40% of the total voting strength of the island may be regarded as the "floating" or the "fickle" section of the electorate. One interpretation may be that the overall swing originates in these regions. If the same pattern persists one may say that whoever carries these districts wins the election.

These tables, intended to indicate Provincial Voting Patterns in the past General Elections were compiled by Dr. L. Dias Hewagama, Lecturer in Statistics, Peradeniya Campus, University of Sri Lanka,

Guide: Each row identifies a province while each column represents a recognized political party in the Island.

The first figure in each cage represents the total number of votes polled and the next line of figures, in brackets, represents the percentage of votes from the provincial total. The last line of figures (bracketed) denotes the votes polled as a percentage of the total polled by the particular party.

1947 Province	U.N.P.	L.S.S.P.	C.P.	Ind.	B.L.P.	C.I.C.	T.C.	Total
Western Province	236037 (42.35) (31.26)	120641 (21.65) (47.22)	23722 (4.27) (33.73)	134453 (24.12) (22.98)	42488 (7.62) (68.81)	—	—	557341 (29.57)
Central Province	96409 (31.69) (12.77)	9215 (3.29) (3.61)	11268 (3.70) (16.02)	142169 (46.73) (24.20)	1375 (0.45) (2.23)	43772 (14.39) (60.60)	—	304208 (16.14)
Southern Province	144900 (44.94) (19.19)	54238 (16.82) (21.23)	30089 (9.33) (42.78)	93199 (28.91) (15.87)	—	—	—	322426 (17.11)
Northern Province	20478 (13.80) (2.71)	11268 (7.59) (4.41)	3492 (2.35) (4.97)	35878 (24.18) (6.11)	—	—	77247 (52.07) (93.69)	148363 7.87
Eastern Province	32369 (38.45) (4.29)	—	1760 (2.09) (2.50)	44799 (53.22) (7.63)	—	—	5252 (6.24) (6.37)	84180 4.47
North Western Province	82386 (53.87) (10.91)	10410 (6.81) (4.07)	—	60129 (39.32) (10.24)	—	—	—	152925 8.11
North Central Province	21292 (63.84) (2.82)	4133 (12.39) (1.62)	—	7927 (23.77) (1.35)	—	—	—	33352 1.77
Uva Province	14243 (15.66) (1.89)	—	—	30350 (33.38) (5.17)	17883 (19.67) (28.96)	28458 (31.30) (39.40)	—	90934 (4.82)
Sabaragamuwa Province	107056 (56.02) (14.18)	45558 (23.84) (17.83)	—	38490 (20.14) (6.55)	—	—	—	191104 (10.14)
Total	755170 (40.07)	255463 (13.55)	70331 (3.73)	587394 (31.16)	61746 (3.28)	72230 (4.83)	82449 (4.37)	1884833

1952 Province	U.N.P.	L.S.S.P.	C.P.- L.S.S.P.	Ind. and Others	S.L.F.P.	F.P.	T.C.	C.P. B.L.P.	Total	
Western Province ...	303319 (42.53) (28.97)	119019 (16.69) (38.94)	60009 (8.42) (53.06)	85667 (12.01) (22.78)	145097 (20.35) (40.62)				713111 (30.65)	
Central Province ...	143925 (54.18) (13.75)	4391 (1.65) (1.44)	7981 (3.00) (7.06)	34490 (12.98) (9.17)	74854 (28.18) (20.95)				265641 (11.42)	
Southern Province ...	177397 (42.59) (16.93)	73861 (17.73) (24.17)	29227 (7.02) (25.84)	75755 (18.19) (20.14)	47447 (11.30) (13.28)			12835 (3.08) (75.54)	416522 (17.90)	
Northern Province ...	15337 (8.40) (1.46)	4562 (2.5) (1.49)	8617 (4.75) (7.62)	46447 (25.43) (12.35)		40881 (22.38) (90.18)	64512 (35.32) (100.00)	2294 (1.26) (13.50)	182650 (7.85)	
Eastern Province ...	41747 (40.99) (3.99)			55645 (54.64) (14.80)		4450 (4.37) (9.82)			101842 (4.38)	
North Western Province	139471 (54.58) (13.32)	20196 (7.90) (6.61)	6466 (2.53) (5.72)	47177 (18.46) (12.55)	42247 (16.53) (11.85)				255557 (10.98)	
North Central Province	27688 (54.35) (2.64)	3718 (7.30) (1.22)	393 (0.77) (0.35)	4781 (9.39) (1.27)	14233 (27.94) (3.98)			129 (0.25) (0.76)	50942 (2.19)	
Uva Province ...	44451 (51.35) (4.25)	16297 (18.83) (5.33)		16019 (18.50) (4.26)	7287 (8.42) (2.04)		1734 (2.00) (10.20)	781 (0.90) (100.00)	86569 (3.72)	
Sabaragamuwa Province	153717 (60.56) (14.68)	63565 (25.04) (20.80)	407 (0.02) (0.36)	10079 (3.97) (2.68)	26067 (10.27) (7.30)				253835 (10.91)	
Total ...	1047052 (45.00)	305609 (13.14)	113100 (4.86)	376060 (16.16)	357232 (15.35)	45331 (1.95)	64512 (2.77)	16992 (0.73)	781 (0.03)	2326669

1956 Province	U.N.P.	M.E.P.	L.S.S.P.	C.P.	F.P.	T.C.	Ind. and Others	Total
Western Province ...	250333 (30.38) (33.88)	272128 (33.02) (25.98)	177522 (21.54) (64.74)	45296 (5.50) (37.84)	—	—	78823 (9.56) (25.00)	824102 (31.13)
Central Province ...	133128 (43.40) (18.02)	163971 (53.45) (15.65)	1931 (0.63) (0.70)				7730 (2.52) (2.45)	306760 (11.59)
Southern Province ...	126200 (28.05) (17.08)	253396 (56.32) (24.19)		36352 (8.08) (30.37)			33979 (7.55) (10.78)	449927 (17.00)
Northern Province ...			2703 (1.38) (0.99)	32783 (16.71) (27.83)	94614 (48.23) (66.28)	8914 (4.54) (100.00)	57155 (29.14) (18.13)	196169 (7.41)
Eastern Province ...			4242 (3.74) (1.55)		48144 (42.43) (33.72)		61087 (53.83) (19.37)	113473 (4.29)
North Western Province ...	80180 (27.64) (10.85)	133509 (46.02) (12.75)	5273 (1.82) (1.92)	5284 (1.82) (4.41)			65836 (22.70) (20.88)	290082 (10.96)
North Central Province ...	23245 (31.87) (3.15)	44334 (60.78) (4.23)	4749 (6.51) (1.73)				610 (0.84) (0.19)	72938 (2.76)
Uva Province ...	31357 (32.12) (4.24)	29769 (30.49) (2.84)	27713 (28.59) (10.11)				8784 (9.00) (2.79)	97623 (3.69)
Sabaragamuwa Province	94367 (31.86) (12.77)	150407 (50.78) (14.36)	50071 (16.91) (18.26)				1328 (0.45) (0.42)	296173 (11.19)
Total ...	738810 (27.91)	1047514 (39.57)	274204 (10.56)	119715 (4.52)	142758 (5.39)	8914 (0.34)	315332 (11.91)	2647247

March 1960	Province	U.N.P.	S.L.F.P.	L.S.S.P.	C.P.	M.E.P.	F.P.	T.C.	L.S.S.P.	Ind. and Others	Total
	Western Province	354889 (34.86) (93.73)	186945 (18.36) (28.89)	174775 (17.17) (53.74)	48221 (4.74) (32.67)	134077 (13.17) (41.34)	—	—	36594 (3.59) (27.31)	82455 (8.10) (20.32)	1017956 (32.90)
	Central Province	109471 (30.40) (12.26)	104055 (28.90) (16.08)	10897 (3.03) (3.35)	12702 (3.53) (8.60)	37759 (10.49) (11.46)	—	—	30198 (8....) (22.53)	54982 (15.27) (13.49)	360064 (11.64)
	Southern Province	149541 (32.57) (16.74)	66925 (14.58) (10.34)	24450 (5.33) (7.25)	53473 (11.65) (36.23)	85828 (18.70) (26.46)	—	—	39140 (8.53) (29.21)	40738 (8.87) (9.99)	459095 (14.84)
	Northern Province	—	—	25861 (11.20) (7.95)	14915 (6.46) (10.10)	—	104941 (45.44) (59.48)	38275 (16.57) (100.00)	—	46931 (20.32) (11.51)	230923 (7.46)
	Eastern Province	10037 (4.93) (1.12)	12250 (6.02) (1.89)	1577 (0.77) (0.48)	—	4994 (2.45) (1.54)	71503 (35.13) (40.52)	—	14726 (7.23) (10.99)	88472 (43.46) (21.70)	203559 (6.58)
	North Western Province	109730 (33.09) (12.28)	127223 (38.37) (19.66)	11551 (3.48) (3.55)	10270 (3.10) (6.96)	21655 (6.53) (6.68)	—	—	7049 (2.13) (5.26)	44092 (33.30) (10.82)	331570 (10.72)
	North Central Province	25291 (27.26) (2.83)	49216 (53.76) (7.60)	5151 (5.63) (1.58)	704 (0.77) (0.48)	3492 (3.81) (1.08)	—	—	2354 (2.57) (1.76)	5348 (5.84) (1.31)	91556 (2.96)
	Uva Province	30664 (30.08) (3.43)	30489 (29.91) (4.71)	11548 (11.33) (3.55)	512 (0.50) (10.53)	5954 (5.84) (1.84)	—	—	1976 (1.94) (1.47)	20787 (20.39) (5.10)	101930 (3.29)
	Sabaragamuwa Province	103595 (34.84) (11.60)	70072 (23.57) (10.82)	59442 (19.99) (18.28)	7815 (2.63) (5.29)	30573 (10.28) (9.43)	—	—	1974 (0.66) (1.47)	23852 (8.02) (5.85)	297323 (9.61)
	Total	893218 (28.87)	647175 (20.92)	325252 (10.51)	147612 (4.77)	324332 (10.48)	176444 (5.70)	38275 (1.24)	134011 (4.33)	407657 (13.18)	3013979

July 1960	Province	U.N.P.	SLFP	LSSP	CP	MEP	FP	TC	Ind. and Others	Total
	Western Province	417151 (41.51) (36.46)	305871 (30.44) (29.92)	152902 (15.22) (67.96)	53252 (5.30) (59.03)	53228 (5.30) (49.69)	—	—	22458 (2.23) (11.04)	1004862 (33.01)
	Central Province	165752 (45.41) (14.49)	174714 (47.86) (17.09)	—	—	2939 (0.81) (2.74)	—	—	21620 (5.92) (10.63)	365025 (11.99)
	Southern Province	186488 (41.42) (16.30)	160634 (35.68) (15.71)	14907 (3.31) (6.63)	26510 (5.89) (29.38)	34826 (7.73) (32.61)	—	—	26888 (5.97) (13.21)	450253 (14.79)
	Northern Province	5790 (2.81) (0.51)	—	8715 (4.23) (3.87)	8651 (4.20) (9.59)	—	130996 (63.59) (62.01)	34946 (16.97) (86.52)	16890 (8.20) (8.30)	205988 (6.77)
	Eastern Province	37161 (18.55) (3.25)	23571 (11.77) (2.31)	—	—	3573 (1.78) (3.34)	77975 (38.92) (36.91)	5283 (2.64) (13.08)	52775 (26.34) (25.93)	200338 (6.58)
	North Western Province	130640 (39.54) (11.42)	152459 (46.14) (14.92)	—	1806 (0.55) (2.00)	2948 (0.89) (2.75)	2278 (0.69) (1.08)	—	40287 (12.19) (19.79)	330418 (10.86)
	North Central Province	31804 (35.19) (2.78)	52987 (58.63) (5.18)	5198 (5.75) (2.31)	—	221 (0.24) (0.21)	—	162 (0.18) (0.40)	—	90372 (2.97)
	Uva Province	43423 (42.48) (3.80)	42398 (41.48) (4.15)	—	—	728 (0.71) (0.68)	—	—	15666 (15.33) (7.70)	102215 (3.36)
	Sabaragamuwa Province	125957 (42.83) (11.01)	109537 (37.25) (10.72)	43273 (14.72) (19.23)	—	8353 (2.84) (7.80)	—	—	6941 (2.36) (3.41)	294061 (9.66)
	Total	1144166 (37.59)	1022171 (33.58)	224995 (7.39)	90219 (2.96)	107116 (3.52)	211249 (6.94)	40391 (1.33)	205525 (6.69)	3043832

1965 Province	U.N.P.	S.L.F.P.	L.S.S.P.	C.P.	SUN	M.E.P.	J.V.P.	F.P.	T.C.	Ind. and Others	Total
Western Province	568195 (45.07) (36.10)	377717 (29.96) (31.02)	177945 (14.11) (58.90)	41478 (3.29) (37.79)		63144 (5.01) (65.32)				32311 (2.56) (11.31)	1260790 (31.16)
Central Province	241406 (47.35) (15.34)	215878 (42.34) (17.73)			10154 (1.99) (8.07)	1048 (0.21) (1.08)				41384 (8.12) (14.49)	509870 (12.60)
Southern Province	202281 (34.02) (12.85)	164781 (27.71) (13.53)	43213 (7.27) (14.30)	62744 (10.55) (57.17)	79226 (13.32) (62.99)	18832 (3.17) (19.48)				23490 (3.95) (8.22)	594567 (14.69)
Northern Province			19128 (6.90) (6.33)	4699 (1.70) (4.28)		436 (0.16) (0.45)		134531 (48.55) (61.74)	86958 (31.38) (88.06)	31367 (11.32) (10.98)	277119 (6.85)
Eastern Province	65910 (24.54) (4.19)	32339 (12.04) (2.66)		833 (0.31) (0.76)		6677 (2.49) (6.91)		83383 (31.05) (38.26)	11788 (4.39) (11.94)	67650 (25.19) (23.68)	268580 (6.64)
North West. Pro.	232107 (51.67) (14.75)	171550 (38.19) (14.09)				2264 (0.50) (2.34)				43252 (9.63) (15.14)	449173 (11.10)
North Central Pro.	35123 (27.77) (2.23)	62731 (49.60) (5.15)			22005 (17.40) (1750)	442 (0.35) (0.46)				6162 (4.87) (2.16)	126463 (3.13)
Uva Province	49290 (32.74) (3.13)	60665 (40.29) (4.98)				183 (0.12) (0.19)	18373 (12.20) (100.00)			22054 (14.65) (7.72)	150565 (3.72)
Sabaragamu. Pro.	179765 (43.89) (11.42)	131984 (32.22) (10.84)	61809 (15.09) (20.46)		14383 (3.51) (11.44)	3659 (0.89) (3.76)				18013 (4.40) (6.31)	409593 (10.12)
Total	1574077 (38.90)	1217645 (30.09)	302095 (7.47)	109754 (2.71)	125768 (3.11)	96665 (2.39)	18373 (0.45)	217914 (5.38)	98746 (2.44)	285683 (7.06)	4046720

1970 Province	U.N.P.	S.L.F.P.	L.S.S.P.	C.P.	M.E.P.	P.P.	T.C.	Ind. and Others	Total
Western Province	657223 (40.96) (34.73)	546632 (34.07) (29.79)	256692 (16.00) (59.25)	58557 (3.65) (34.61)	46571 (2.90) (100.00)			38894 (2.42) (15.30)	1604569 (32.14)
Central Province	267385 (43.59) (14.13)	311718 (50.82) (16.99)						34260 (5.59) (13.48)	613363 (12.29)
Southern Province	269602 (38.57) (14.25)	233779 (33.45) (12.74)	85901 (12.29) (19.83)	87100 (51.48)				22560 (3.23) (8.88)	698942 (14.00)
Northern Province	10628 (3.18) (0.56)	1226 (0.37) (0.07)	2599 (0.78) (0.60)	12433 (3.72) (7.35)		159781 (47.77) (65.02)	115567 (34.55) (100.00)	32249 (9.64) (12.69)	334483 (6.70)
Eastern Province	108423 (31.65) (5.73)	79323 (23.16) (4.32)				85946 (25.09) (34.98)		68826 (20.00) (27.08)	342518 (6.86)
North Western Province	236807 (42.76) (12.51)	270194 (48.78) (14.73)						46761 (8.44) (18.40)	553762 (11.09)
North Central Province	72721 (40.69) (3.84)	104475 (58.45) (5.69)						1544 (0.86) (0.61)	178740 (3.58)
Uva Province	72811 (40.46) (3.85)	100793 (56.25) (5.49)						5575 (3.11) (2.19)	179179 (3.59)
Sabaragamuwa Province	196925 (40.50) (10.41)	186703 (38.40) (10.18)	88032 (18.10) (20.32)	11109 (2.28) (6.57)				3473 (0.71) (1.37)	486242 (9.74)
Total	1892225 (37.91)	1834843 (36.76)	433224 (8.68)	169199 (3.39)	46571 (0.93)	245727 (4.92)	115567 (2.32)	254142 (5.09)	4991798