

said that the Central Government had every sympathy with the provincial Governments. May I know whether the hon. Minister is aware that about 60,000 employees of the Bihar Government wanted to go on strike and may I know whether the Bihar Government have asked for any subsidy from the Centre for raising the pay standards of those employees?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** The State Governments ask for subsidy for many things. I do not recollect having seen any letter from the Bihar Government for this particular purpose.

**Shri Ranga:** Is it the policy of the Government to have uniform pay-scales all over India, whether the people are employed in the States or in the Union Government? Has this question even been discussed in any meeting of the Finance Minister and the financial significance of it estimated?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** The question of having a uniform policy and a decision in that regard can only apply to those people who are employed in the Central Governments. It is not possible for the Central Government to tell every State Government that they should have a uniform pay-scale, because, then the Central Government must find the money for that purpose. We have discussed this question several times in the National Development Council and as a result of our discussion last year, I think some relief was given to the non-gazetted officers in certain States and to teachers, because the Central Government agreed to share a portion of the burden that the State Governments would be incurring as a result of these discussions. There is a forum for discussing these matters, where the interaction of forces caused by some action taken by this Government or the State Governments on the rest of India is discussed. I cannot say at the present moment whether

there is any definite policy which has been decided upon and which has been accepted by all State Governments.

**Several Hon. Members rose—**

**Mr. Speaker:** Let the local Governments and the Assemblies take up this matter. We have done enough for ourselves. It is not a unitary State unless they want to make one.

#### **Mechanical Methods of Cleaning Latrines**

\*1730-A. **Shri B. C. Mullick:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to refer to item 9 on page 146 of the Report of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes 1955 Part II and state the action taken by Central Government to introduce mechanical and up-to-date methods of cleaning latrines, sewers, drains etc., throughout India in order to abolish the practice of cleaning by human hands?

**The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shrimati Ajva):** The matter primarily concerns the State Governments. The Government of India duly brought to the notice of the State Governments the recommendations (one of which related to this matter) of the "Scavengers' Living Conditions' Enquiry Committee, State of Bombay" for appropriate action on 24th September, 1955. The State Governments were again addressed on 10th October 1956 to introduce mechanical and up-to-date methods. The State Governments were also informed on 22-12-56 that financial assistance to the extent of 50% would be given by the Government of India to municipalities and local bodies for supplying wheel barrows or handcarts to each sweeper for doing the scavenging work. Schemes in this respect have been called for from the State Governments.

**Shri B. C. Mullick:** May I know whether the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes recommended to the Central Government to stop immediately the

system of carrying nightsoil on heads in baskets?

**Shrimati Alva:** Recommendations have been made in the report of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes for 1955, but I am not aware of the statement that my hon. friend has made.

**Shri B. C. Mullick:** May I know why one particular community, namely, the Scheduled Castes is bound to perform this particular job of scavenging which creates always an idea of high castes and low castes?

**Mr. Speaker:** He need not go into the question. Everybody is agreed that nobody ought to do this.

**Shri B. S. Murthy:** The question is this: whether any steps have been taken, besides merely sending a recommendation. That is the purpose of the question.

**Mr. Speaker:** Has any step been taken by the Central Government?

**Shrimati Alva:** No, Sir. We have asked the States to implement this and we have got replies from some States that they are doing so.

**Mr. Speaker:** Question No. 1730 is renumbered as 1763. Shri Sanganna.

**Shri Sanganna:** 1731.

### Buildings at Dundas Point, Nicobar Islands

\*1763. { **Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:**  
**Shri S. C. Samanta:**  
**Sardar A. S. Saigal:**

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that several buildings at Dundas Point (Port Blair) were recently sold to a monopoly firm of Nicobar Islands;

(b) if so, what were the recorded value of those buildings;

(c) at what price they were sold to the monopoly firm;

(d) whether it is also true that three plots of land at Dundas Point measuring several acres have also been given to that monopoly firm free of cost; and

(e) if so, for what purpose?

**The Deputy Minister of Home Affairs (Shrimati Alva):** (a) Nine old and dilapidated buildings at Dundas Point were sold to M/s. Akoojee Jadwet & Co., who do not hold any monopoly for trade in Nicobar Islands.

(b) & (c). Although the recorded book value of these buildings was Rs. 40,115/- the P.W.D. assessed their market value at Rs. 2,990/-. They were sold for Rs. 3,200/-.

(d) Three plots of land measuring about 8 acres were allotted to M/s. Akoojee Jadwet & Co., on usual terms under the Andaman & Nicobar Islands (Land Tenure) Regulation, 1926.

(e) For setting up an oil mill.

**Shri Sanganna:** I am not concerned with the answer that has just now been read out.

**Sardar A. S. Saigal:** I want to put a supplementary on this answer.

**Mr. Speaker:** 1730 has not been called. It has been renumbered as 1763.

**An Hon. Member:** But the reply has been given.

**Mr. Speaker:** I did not ask for the reply to be given. 1730 has not been called. It has been struck off in my copy here and renumbered as Starred Question No. 1763. I understand that this has been done because he cannot have too many questions in the same round. I passed over this question and called Shri Sanganna. He just told me that he is not concerned with it. Why did he not say "1731"?

**Shrimati A. Kale:** He said "1731".

**Mr. Speaker:** If he said it, why did the hon. Deputy Minister answer? Shri Sanganna.