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Executive summary

Even spokesmen of leading Tamil political Parties in Sri Lanka, as well as the UN-High Commissioner for Human Rights have rejected the claim of a Genocide of Tamils made in the Bill 104, tabled by MPP Mr. Thanigasalam. The accepted legal definition of Genocide is not met even with the wide distortion of facts used in these claims.

In presenting the Bill 104, the MPP falsely claims a death toll of 146,647 of the people held captive by the Liberation Tamil Tigers of Eelam (LTE) in the last days of the Eelam war in May 2009, when the figure is not more than 7000 as affirmed even recently by a British House of Lords study. The presentation falsely claims that the Sri Lankan government starved the people held captive by the LTTE. The MPP falsely claims that forced birth control measures were imposed on Tamils and that Tamil children were taken from homes where as it was the LTTE that held the Tamils by terror and took their children by force for use as child soldiers. The distorted history presented by the MPP contravenes authoritative accounts, and ignores the unleashing of violence by the separatist agenda of the LTTE, a banned terrorist organization in Canada and in most other countries. The bill attempts to give official status to a separatist agenda, importing divisive foreign politics into Canada. Contrary to the claims of Bill 104, Sinhala, and Tamil are official languages since the 1980s, and the Tamil population in Sri Lanka has thrived, as seen from its demographics and its cultural output.

If Bill 104 is passed, it causes great damage to the reputation of the legislature, and affect its credibility and standing with the public. Hence it is imperative that the bill be rejected forthwith.

If the Bill 104 is passed, it will bring into Canada the divisive separatists politics that had plagued Sri Lanka's ethnic harmony for decades and threaten reconciliation between Sinhalese and Tamil Canadians.
If the Bill 104 is passes, it becomes an affront to the aboriginal people of Canada whose pains and memories are not recognized at least in the same way.

The proposed legislation is based on falsehoods. It is *ultra vires* as its content pertains to matters outside the scope of the jurisdiction of the Ontario Legislature. **Hence the bill should be rejected in toto.**
The main claims of the Bill 104 on “Tamil Genocide Education Week” by MPP for Scarborough-Rouge.

In his oration introducing the Bill Mr. Thanigaslam says the following:

1) He says: The population of the Vanni (a wilderness part of the Northern Province where the LTTE held its people) in October 2008 was 429059. This number 429059 is mere speculation. No one except the LTTE could access the people in the Vanni. and there are NO census data. In October 2008 the Vanni was a war zone. No independent confirmation of this figure exists. And yet, the MPP gives a number accurate to six significant figures!

2) He says: The total number of people admitted to Sri Lankan government control was 282,380....That means, 146679 people were not accounted for....This number is in accordance with local estimates of the death toll. The number 282,380 independently confirmed. But the initial number 429059 is and the death toll are false. The origin of such false numbers is discussed in detail in the Marga Institute study.[https://www.scribd.com/document/132499266/The-Numbers-Game-Politics-of-Retrributive-Justice]. Latest estimates of the casualty figure by the British House of Lords, led by Lord Naseby is about 5000-7000. Seevaratnam Pulideevan of the LTTE openly admitted that placing Tamils in harm’s way as an LTTE Tactic. He stated that: “They [LTTE] hoped for a humanitarian intervention. ...He told European friends that, just as in Kosovo, if enough civilians died in Sri Lanka the world would be forced to step in”.

3) The MPP makes other charges (about food supply), child abductions and historical claims about “homelands” in the context of his Bill.

Launching a grave charge of massacres by the Sri Lankan Army via the Bill 104, as attempted here by MPP-Scarborough is reprehensible. Further evidence against the Bill 104 is given in the following pages using reports from Tamil leaders themselves, journalists and diplomats.
Rejection of a legal genocide claim even by the leading Tamil political party in Sri Lanka.

The bill 104, named “Tamil Genocide Education week Act, 2019”, tabled by MPP Vijay Thanigasalam is essentially a short copy of a bill tabled by Mr. Wigneswaran, Chief Minister of the Northern Provincial Council (NPC) of Sri Lanka, the province where there is a Tamil Majority. This constitutes 4.8% of the total population of Sri Lanka, and also 43.5%, i.e., less than half the population of Lankan Tamils. The remaining 56.5% of Tamils live among the Sinhalese (75%), and Moors (9%). Tamils grow in numbers at the same rate as other ethnics. Northern Province is a bit larger than the GTA.

The resolution, passed by the NPC wants the UN and the ICC to investigate the claim. However, Sinhalese as well as Tamil leaders rejected the resolution as being (I) divisive and contrary to ethnic reconciliation (II) not valid as the claimed acts and events did not conform with the legally accepted definition of genocide. (III) The claimed events are a massive distortion of the truth.

The leading Tamil Political party in Sri Lanka is known as the Tamil National Alliance (TNA). Its spokesman, Mr. A. Sumanthiran is the MP for Jaffna. He is also a distinguished lawyer.

Mr Sumanthiran points out the following:
NPA resolution “begins by saying what we have listed above are not recognised as genocide”. It says so. Later, at the bottom, it says “World must now recognise these also as genocide... (It) conceded that within the definition that is accepted by the world today “THIS IS NOT GENOCIDE” - Sumanthiran

The TNA spokesman declared that the Genocide claim is "FOOLISH". [TamilNet, Saturday, 19 September 2015]. Eelamists reacted by labeling Mr. Sumanthiran a “traitor” (Thurogi, தரரரகக). Mr. Thanigasalam is trying to make the Ontario legislature join in such divisive politics.
Rejection of Genocide by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR).
[As quoted by Mr. Sumanthiran, Sept. 2015]

“UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, very specifically said, with such a report full of horrors as he himself called it, he says “it hasn't satisfied the test of genocide”. He said it. When he was asked at the press conference also, he said it”. So the claim of Genocide proposed in the Bill 104 stands already rejected by Zeid R Al Hussein, the UN High Commissioner for HR, already in 2015.

Mr. Sangaree, the Leader of the Tamil United Liberation Front (TULF).
He accuses the LTTE of mass scale killings of the LTTE injured cadre during the last lap of the war.

Mr. V. Anandasangaree (often abbreviated to “Sangaree”) is the Leader of the TULF. Sangaree claims that it is the LTTE that killed or unnecessarily sacrificed Tamils, or put Tamils in harms way. The LTTE regularly culled off its own wounded. Mr. Sangaree, addressing the Annul convention of the TULF in 2008, 29th Dec. stated that: “The mass scale killings of the LTTE injured cadre by the LTTE, recruitment of child soldiers even during the last lap of the war by the LTTE, were all concealed from the voters. When some of these matters were brought to the notice of a Tamil National Alliance (TNA) Member of Parliament based in Mullaitivu, he seems to have commented that these things cannot be avoided in a war”.

When the Bill 104 claims large “death tolls of Tamils during the last stages of the war, it ignores the mass killings of Tamils by the LTTE in the last stages of the war and disingenuously implies that the Army caused all the alleged deaths. Mr. Thanigasalam refereed to alleged abduction of Tamil children by the Army, but failed to mention the mass-scale recruitment of children by the LTTE, noted here, and in reports of Human Rights groups, and in the Darusman Report.

By not drawing attention to these matters, Mr. Thanigasalam is wittingly or unwittingly concealing relevant facts from Ontario voters.
Veteran Tamil journalist DBS Jeyaraj on Tiger killings of civilians:
‘The Sri Lankan government had…declared two limited ceasefires. But the LTTE imposed further restrictions and the number of civilians coming out dropped during ceasefire days…the LTTE exploited the ceasefire in February to mount a very effective counter strike…The April ceasefire was used to construct several new “trench-cum-bund” defences.’
These bunds were also to hold people as a human shield for the LTTE. Meanwhile, the LTTE positioned its artillery and mortar assets near or in the middle of civilian concentrations. These tactics were confirmed by a range of media outlets including Reuters India in February 2009, which quoted a 74-year old Catholic nun as claiming: ‘The LTTE fired from close to civilians. We had objected, but that didn’t work.’ The LTTE wanted to create many victims, expecting foreign intervention.

In another report, Jeyaraj says,
The Army had planned out a move to take the coast and thereby “box” in the LTTE without access to the sea. For this the 55 division was to move south along the coast from Challai. The 59 division was to move north from Karaichikkudiyiruppu. Both were to link up half-way. The LTTE resorted to a cruel and inhuman stratagem by moving the civilians into this coastal strip in large numbers. If the army tried to move along the coast, large numbers of civilians would be killed or injured. It was an inhumane “human deterrent ” placed by the LTTE. The security forces were compelled to abandon the original manoeuvre. Thereafter they concentrated on the A-35 and adjacent areas in the hinterland rather than the Karaithuraipatru littoral.

This again shows that the army took significant efforts to minimize civilian losses, while the LTTE sought to increase civilian losses, during the last 6 months of the Eelam war.
On LTTE massacres of civilians during last days of the war, Dr. Rajan Hoole, in the April 2009 report of the Tamil University Teachers for Human Rights -Jaffna (UTHR-J). He pointed to conversations with civilians who fled LTTE controlled territory during the last days of the war. “The LTTE has recently started the practice of sending out teams of 6 cadres with instructions for each team to return with 30 conscripts,” Hoole wrote. “If they fail they are reportedly subject to heavy and often lethal punishment.”

The following account, given to the UTHR-J team by a civilian who fled the first No-Fire-Zone in February 2009, is a representative example of this widespread LTTE practice of killing escapees during this period, and the discipline of the soldiers:

Ganeshapillai was among civilians advancing towards the Army line in Iruddumadu. Four LTTE cadres joined the civilians and kept firing, deliberately provoking the Army. A group that had gone ahead of them had told the Army that more civilians are following along the road. The Army kept shelling but was then careful not to shell the road. As they got close, the four cadres ran back and turned into snipers. As the Army was receiving the civilians, the snipers opened fire killing four soldiers. But the other soldiers betrayed no signs of reacting against the civilians. They calmly carried their dead, loaded the civilians into tractor trailers and sent them on.

This again shows that the army took significant efforts to minimize civilian losses, while the LTTE sought to increase civilian losses, during the last 6 months of the Eelam war.

However, UTHR(J) special report No. 34 is quite critical of the government, esp. for aerial bombings and shelling that did not spare civilians.

There are many quotes showing that MPP Vijay Thanigasalam has been grossly misrepresenting facts. He is himself misled, or has attempted to mislead the Ontario Legislature by placing a bill which, if passed, would lead to great damage to the legislature, and affect its credibility and standing with the public. Hence it is imperative that the bill be rejected forthwith.
Former U.S. Ambassador to Sri Lanka, Robert Blake on the Army's Good Track record.
He noted in a confidential embassy cable (Wikileak 09COLOMBO86) to Washington on January 26, 2009 that: [the] Army has a generally good track record of taking care to minimize civilian casualties during its advances..

Then U.S. Ambassador-at-Large for War Crimes Issues
– Ambassador John Clint Williamson – On July 9, 2009:
whilst collecting information in relation to a U.S. Congressional reporting requirement, met and discussed the recent fighting in Sri Lanka with several INGO heads in Geneva, Switzerland. One of these heads was Jacques de Maio, the ICRC’s Head of Operations for South Asia. Whilst discussing potential violations of International Humanitarian Law, Jacques de Maio noted (as revealed in Wikileak 09GENEVA584):

“For example, he (Jacques de Maio) said that the Sri Lankan military was somewhat responsive to accusations of violations of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and was open to adapting its actions to reduce casualties [...] He could cite examples of where the Army had stopped shelling when ICRC informed them it was killing civilians. In fact, the Army actually could have won the military battle faster with higher civilian casualties, yet chose a slower approach which led to a greater number of Sri Lankan military deaths...

In the same cable, Jacques de Maio had this to say about the LTTE and its strategies:
On the LTTE, de Maio said that it had tried to keep civilians in the middle of a permanent state of violence. It saw the civilian population as a 'protective asset' and kept its fighters embedded amongst them. De Maio said that the LTTE commander's objective was to keep the distinction between civilian and military assets blurred”.

Compare these reports and the universally admitted fact that the LTTE had no regard for human life, and that the LTTE is widely acknowledged to cull its own injured. We again see that MPP Thanigasalam has acted irresponsibly, deliberately or naively, presenting a false picture of the last days of the Eelam war. The proposed bill is not only ultra vires, but it also brings disrepute and undermines the standing of the Ontario Legislature in the eyes of the informed public, and with informed international opinion.
Testimony of a child rescued (May 2009) from the Tiger Human Shield

An escapee child who had been studied by Dr. Daya Somasundaram for physiological trauma reports the following tale of confinement in the Puthumattalan area by the Tigers. A drawing by the child is depicted, where she has drawn herself as a yellow figure, being chased by LTTE child catchers (pillai piddikarar), drawn as black figures. She escapes them by running to hide in huts in the beach front.

“Tigers would come in vans and drag us into the van. Once inside, they would cut our hair as identification of being conscripted. ... As soon as people became aware that pillai piddikarar (child catchers-LTTE) had come, signals were passed on. Immediately we descend into kerosene oil barrels buried underground in the backyard. ... a small tube fitted for breathing. Waiting for about an hour or so till they leave is thihil (nerve-racking). We can't hear what is happening outside. Besides sweating, trembling and thinnaral (quake) inside....

The sand was hot,... We had to live amidst abductions, robberies and killings without food and clothes to wear... As I was crossing several huts,... the place was surrounded by over 20 pillai piddi karar (LTTE-child catchers)... I started fleeing. They came chasing me... I hid behind huts and ran towards Puthumattalan. My parents and sisters came there ... with 150 others we decided to go into the army area. The tigers came running on all sides (to prevent this) firing guns, shouting "dei, dei", hitting people with .. sticks...Tigers fired wildly. Parents fought against the tigers. Some were dragged away by the tigers. The struggle went on till the next morning. The army then saved us and sent us to the Vavuniya camp”.

The children and parents lived in constant terror right through out the Tiger reign. MPP Thanaigasalam's claim that the army abducted children etc., with no reference what so ever to the LTTE's well-known child recruitment programs running over decades is disingenuous and disrespectful of the Ontario Legislature and its voters.
Claim of Historical and recent Genocide vitiates by Demographic Data.

If a population is targeted by genocidal policies, this is noticeable by a marked decline in the population. We see this clearly in the population data for Canadian Aboriginals whose demographic plunged perilously in the 19th and early 20th century.

The graph below distinguishes two types of Tamils, namely, Sri Lankan Tamils (SLT), and Indian Tamils (IT). The SLT have historically held way from the IT as they were regarded as “low caste indented labour” while they themselves claimed to have a longer history in the Island. Mr. Thondaman, the political leader of the IT rejected the Separatist-Eelamist politics of the SLT and avoided the LTTE war. Mr. Thanigasalam’s narrative ignores the IT, and is mostly in regard to the SLT community. The demographics of the SLT since 1948 are shown as red lines with squares. The solid red line shows the actual SLT numbers in Sri Lanka, while the dashed red line includes those who have migrated out of the Island. It is clear that the rate of growth of the Tamil community, the Moor community, or the Sinhalese (majority) community are comparable, especially when emigration of Tamils is included (red dashed line).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Moor</th>
<th>Sinhala</th>
<th>Tamil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1047K</td>
<td>10980K</td>
<td>1887K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2062K</td>
<td>16784K</td>
<td>2510K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>1555K</td>
<td>13882K</td>
<td>2198K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td>0.77% per year per 1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike with the Canadian aboriginal population in the 19th century, the Tamil population has grown, though at a lower rate than the other two communities. The slightly lower growth rate of Tamils is a result of their higher emigration to Canada and other countries. When this is allowed for, a growth rate of 1.1±1% is obtained, being comparable to that of the Sinhalese, though smaller than for the Moors, and hence the demographic data bear testimony against a genocide claim.

*All three communities suffered deaths from the Eelam wars, while each community wishes to claim that its pains and losses are greater. Hence we do not make corrections for war losses.*

**Vibrancy of Tamil Cultural Life in the South.**
In addition of the healthy demographics of the Tamils living in Sri Lanka (their majority being in the south), we can also note their vibrant cultural and religious life, with the metropolitan area of Colombo, and its suburbs full of well attended Hindu temples with their cultural and religious festivals. There are over a dozen Sri Lankan Tamil newspapers, as well as hundreds of Tamil-language websites. Bibliometric studies (e.g., Rameshwaran 2005) have shown remarkable vibrancy centered in the Colombo metropolis. Out of 91 publications analyzed, 40% are published in Colombo. Even after the end of the war, multi-cultural Colombo continues to provide the most vibrant and nourishing ambiance for Tamil culture.

*Hence the claims of Bill 104 that “In addition, the Sri Lankan state has systematically disenfranchised the Tamil population of their right to vote and to maintain their language, religion and culture” are completely false. Tamils have*
the same voting rights as the Sinhalese or Moors and others.

When the Bill 104 states that the “Sinhala Only Act of 1956 made Sinhalese the official language of Sri Lanka”, it fails to mention that since 1987 Tamil is equally an official language.
**Historical Record and “Tamil-Homeland” claims.**

The MPP Mr. Thanigasalam, in his oration presenting the Bill 104 claims that “Prior to Independence, there were three kingdoms in the Island”.

This is nonsense. *Prior to Independence, there was only one Government - the British Government, and not three kingdoms.* There was only one kingdom even when the British captured the North. When the British captured the Northern Peninsula, it was actually under the King of Kandy. Captain Percival who lived in Jaffna during the early decades of the 19th century gave detailed demographic data in his chronicles [Robert Percival, (1765-1826). *An Account of the Island of Ceylon, containing Its History, Geography, Natural History, with the Manners and Customs of its Inhabitants; to which is added, the Journal of an Embassy to the Court of Candy*]. The account shows that the Moors were the majority community in the Northern province at the time of the British takeover, while the Tamils and Sinhalese were the other two important ethnic groups. The Moors & Sinhalese were driven out by the LTTE.

The place names in the northern peninsula are largely of Sinhala origin, as recorded by many early Tamil historians, British antiquarians, Civil Servants, as well as modern Tamil Historians like Dr. Karthigesu Indrapala. Historians working for the Tamil nationalist, Eelamist (separatist) program have attempted to paint a different picture. The snippet of “history” given by MPP Tanigasalam is based exclusively on the re-written history of the Eelamist political program, and ignores mainstream history as seen in, say the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, or in Prof. K. M de Silva's “*History of Sri Lanka*” (Penguin). As G. G. Ponnambalam, the founding leader of the Tamil Congress used to say, the “homeland” of the Tamils is everywhere in Ceylon”, and not just in the North or the East.

Minorities in many countries are often subject to harassment by the dominant community, as seen even today in the USA where most prisons are occupied by black people, and how they are harassed, arrested and even shot with little reason on America's highways, public places and even inside homes. They have been subject to lynchings and racists discrimination even after the end of Jim Crow Laws. However, this cannot be equated to Genocide. In fact, the situation of the Tamil community in Sri Lanka has never been as remotely as dismal as that of the American Black population.
However, the Tamil community itself has its own internal, unwritten “Jim Crow laws” that discriminate against the so-called “lower castes”, while elite land-owning and professional “Vellalar” caste enjoyed high privileges and power over the majority community under Colonial rule, and until the 1950s. Even though a “sinhala government” had legislated against caste discrimination in 1957, “low-caste” Tamils could not use drinking water wells, enter temples, ride in the front of buses, have higher education, or even wear clothes covering the upper body. Low caste Tamils were accused of being collaborators of the government and hung on lamp posts and killed by the LTTE leader. Sebastian Rasalingam, a distinguished Tamil political commentator has discussed these issues with first hand knowledge of caste discrimination [http://www.srilankaguardian.org/2011/07/keeping-tamil-culture-and-uprooting.html].

The Sri Lankan Tamils, owed its hegemony over the Majority to Colonial patronage. However, universal franchise reversed matters and the majority community began to assert itself, especially after independence in 1948, and with the displacement of English by the Majority language, Sinhala. Language legislation and anti-caste legislation came in simultaneously and angered the Tamil community elites. Their program of separation to carve out an exclusive ethnic state for themselves named Eelam in the North, while living in the “Sinhalese South”, drew strong resistance from the Majority community and the Muslims, creating ethnic tensions and riots that finally led to the armed uprising of the LTTE, supported by wealthy Tamils and Expatriate Tamils. Unfortunately, as confirmed by writes like Sebastian Rasalingam, and D. B. S. Jeyaraj, The LTTE killed more Tamils than all of Lanka's kings and Governments since historical times [Sebastian Rasalingam: http://federalidea.com/focus/archives/201]
Adequacy of the food supplied to the people held by the LTTE.
The people of the Vanni were corralled into a tightly protected area and access was
difficult and dangerous. Food, medications were provided by the Lankan state as a
humanitarian gesture (even though the LTTE was running a hostile separatist *de facto*
state), recognizing that the Tamil people are Sri Lankan people.

International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) was present throughout the
period considered, and suspended operation only on the 15th of May 2009, when
most civilians escaped the LTTE and took army refuge. The government had
issued the ICRC 534,227 metric tons of food and medicine to the conflict zone.
There were also UN/World Food Program (WFP) convoys providing food and
medicine, and the UN-Darusman report mentions 7,435 metric tons of food
delivered over 5 months, but omits the 534,227 tons from ICRC. By ignoring these
facts, the UN-Darusman-report gives an erroneous picture.

*Vijay Tanigasalam also claims that not enough food was supplied and uses this
to support claims of genocide.* Is the food provided insufficient? A measure of
food needs accepted by the UN can be obtained from the UN-run Dadaab and
Kakuma refugee camps in northern Kenya: It has ~535,000 refugees, and was
supplied 10,000 metric tons/month by UN/WFP (this was prior to a 20% cut in
November 2013). This suggests that the 300,000-hostage population held by the
LTTE would need 5610 tons/month, or about 28,400 tons for 5 months.

Hence, using UN/WFP food-supply rates, roughly four times the amount of
supplies typically given in UN refugee camps have been provided by the Sri
Lankan government via the ICRC, and the UN/WFP combined. So the MPP
Thanigasalam's claim that hostages were provided insufficient food to cause a
genocide is false.
The Death Toll in the Vanni from various studies and claims.

Many researchers have estimated the “Death Count”, as critically evaluated by Prof. Gerald Peiris (Island, 7-02-14), the author of the book “Twilight of the Tigers” (Oxford, 2009). The falsifications and of “war crimes” shown in the widely distributed movie from BBC Channel-4 by Callum Macrae been discussed in detail in ENGAGE SRI LANKA (2013) Corrupted Journalism, Channel 4 and Sri Lanka, www.engagesrilanka.com. Many of the killing sequences are cold-blooded killings by LTTE Cadre (revealed by their not wearing boots, as done by the Army). The victims are Sri Lankan soldiers. Original clips of these movie sessions, where the killers sepak Tamil have been identified. In the movie, the opposite is claimed and the Army is blamed. Civilians were extensively used by the LTTE for fighting, and hence the term “civilian” is ambiguously used.

Source and date Civilian deaths comment

Lord Naseby study (2019) 5000 - 7000 UK House of Lords, Hansaard


UN Country Team (2009) 7740 Early Jan -13 May 7737. An extra 10,000 were tentatively added for 13 May to 19th but untenable according to Indian journalist Reddy’s spot report.


Darusman Report to UN (2011) 40,000 Report not ased on country visit or research, says civilian deaths “could have been as high as 40,000. A second report raised it to 70,000.

Vijay Thanigasalam (2019) 146,547 In his oration at the second reading of the bill 104 MPP for Scarborough Rouge gives this highly exaggerated number. If 147,000 were killed, two to three times this number, e.g., 300,000 should have been found injured. Only about 18,000 injured were found among a total of about Civilian 300,000 held captive.
Recommendation on Bill 104 to the Standing Committee

We have examined the content of Bill 104, and found that its claim of a Genocide of Sri Lankan Tamils is *ultra vires*, erroneous, and already rejected by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, as well as by many Tamil Leaders in Sri Lanka. The other claims, about casualty numbers, supply of food to the Tamils held hostage by the LTTE, etc are also unfounded. The attempt to use the Ontario Legislature to consolidate the accusation of a grave crime against the Sri Lankan state without an investigation, and exceeding the mandate of the legislature, are an affront to the Ontario legislature. The proposed “Tamil Genocide Education week” that ignores and competes with the plight of Canada's aboriginal people is an affront to them. The very nature of the bill, importing divisive politics of the MPP's homeland into Canada is a threat to ethnic reconciliation in Canada.

*We submit to the standing committee that the Bill 104 be rejected in toto.*