

16th March, 1922

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
(Official Report)

SECOND SESSION

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1922



SINLA
SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS
1922

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TUESDAY, 28TH FEBRUARY, 1922	2617-2652
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Votable and Non-votable Heads of Expenditure.	
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill.	
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
The Hindu Coparcener's Liability Bill.	
The Married Women's Property (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill.	
WEDNESDAY, 1ST MARCH, 1922	2653-2688
Budget for 1922-23.	
Message from the Council of State.	
The Delhi University Bill.	
The Indian Finance Bill.	
The Police (Incitement to Disaffection) Bill.	
The Press Law Repeal and Amendment Bill.	
Messages from the Council of State.	
THURSDAY, 2ND MARCH, 1922	2689-2739
Governor General's Assent to Bill.	
Statement of Business.	
Governor General's Assent to Amended Standing Orders.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Establishment of Railway Industries.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Relief for Distressed Parts of Malabar.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Privy Council in India.	
Reading of Newspapers in the Chamber.	
MONDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1922	2741-2812
Oath.	
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Message from H. E. the Governor General.	
Time-limit for Speeches in Budget Debate.	
General Discussion on the Budget.	
TUESDAY, 7TH MARCH, 1922	2813-2899
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
General Discussion on the Budget— <i>contd.</i>	
Vol. II—Pt. III.	

WEDNESDAY, 8TH MARCH, 1922

2901-2914

Statements laid on the Table.
 Governor General's Assent to Bill
 The Indian Ports (Amendment) Bill.
 The Indian Official Secrets Bill.
 The Cotton Transport Bill.
 The Hindu Ceremonial Emoluments Bill.

THURSDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1922

2915-2966

Communication from Mr. Speaker.
 Business for the week ending March 13th.
 Resolution *re*: Release of Ali Brothers.
 Resolution *re*: Committee of Inquiry on the causes of the Moplah
 Outbreak.
 Resolution *re*: Committee on Railway Risk Notes.
 Resolution *re*: Re-institution of the Ports of Chittagong and
 Calcutta for the Hedjaz Pilgrim Traffic.

SATURDAY, 11TH MARCH, 1922

2967-2998

Statement laid on the Table.
 Questions and Answers.
 Unstarred Question and Answer.
 The Resignation of Mr. Montagu.
 Election of Committee on Public Accounts.
 Election of Standing Finance Committee.
 Demands for Supplementary Grants.

TUESDAY, 14TH MARCH, 1922

2999-3077

Statement laid on the Table.
 Questions and Answers.
 Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Motion for Adjournment.
 The Budget—List of Demands—*contd.*

WEDNESDAY, 15TH MARCH, 1922

3079-3144

Oath.
 The Hindu Ceremonial Emoluments Bill.
 The Budget—List of Demands—*contd.*

THURSDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1922

3145-3219

Questions and Answers.
 Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Message of Farewell to H. E. H. the Prince of Wales.
 Statement of Business.
 The Budget—List of Demands—*contd.*

FRIDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1922

. 3221-3312

Question and Answer.
 Unstarred Question and Answer.
 Bill passed by the Council of State.
 The Budget—List of Demands—*contd.*

SATURDAY, 18TH MARCH, 1922 3313-3339

Questions and Answers.
 Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Financial Adjustment between the Home Government and the
 Government of India.
 Uninterrupted sitting of the Assembly.
 Message from H. R. H. the Prince of Wales.
 The Budget—List of Demands—*concl'd.*
 Resolution *re*: Re-appropriation between Demands in the matter
 of Reduction.

MONDAY, 20TH MARCH, 1922 3391-3472

Questions and Answers.
 Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Library of the Indian Legislature.
 Motion for Adjournment.
 The Budget—The Indian Finance Bill.

TUESDAY, 21ST MARCH, 1922 3473-3553

The Budget—The Indian Finance Bill—*contd.*

WEDNESDAY, 22ND MARCH, 1922 3555-3618

Statements laid on the Table.
 Bill passed by the Council of State.
 Precedence for Finance Bill.
 Motion for Adjournment.
 The Budget—The Indian Finance Bill—*concl'd.*

THURSDAY, 23RD MARCH, 1922 3619-3677

Questions and Answers.
 References to Proceedings in another place.
 Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Statement of Business.
 Resolution *re*: Election by Indian Legislature of Representatives of
 India to Imperial and International Conferences.
 Resolution *re*: Measures for increasing Cotton Cultivation in
 India
 Resolution *re*: abolition of Posts of Divisional Commissioners.
 Resolution *re*: Measures for providing cheap and speed-justice in
 India.
 Resolution *re*: Appointment of Council Secretaries.

SATURDAY, 25TH MARCH, 1922

PAGE
3679-3722

- Message from the Council of State.
- Election of Public Accounts Committee.
- Election of Standing Finance Committee.
- The Indian Merchant Shipping Bill.
- The Indian Ports (Amendment) Bill.
- The Cotton Transport Bill.
- The Press Law Repeal and Amendment Bill.
- The Indian Official Secrets Bill.
- The Criminal Tribes (Amendment) Bill.
- Resolution *re*: India's participation in the British India Exhibition.
- The Hindu Coparcener's Liability Bill.
- Resolution *re*: Message of Regret at the Resignation of Mr. Montagu.

MONDAY, 27TH MARCH, 1922 3723-3769

- Statements laid on the Table.
- Questions and Answers.
- Unstarred Questions and Answers.
- Election for the Public Accounts and the Standing Finance Committees.
- The Ranchi Mental Hospital Bill.
- The Criminal Tribes (Amendment) Bill.
- The Cantonments (House Accommodation) Amendment Bill.
- Resolution *re*: Adoption of Railway Finance Committee's Proposals.

TUESDAY, 28TH MARCH, 1922 3771-3850

- Questions and Answers.
- Present Position as regards Burma Reforms.
- Unstarred Questions and Answers.
- Motion for Adjournment.
- Governor General's Assent to the Indian Finance Bill.
- The Hindu Ceremonial Emoluments Bill.
- The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill.
- The Charitable and Religious Trusts (Amendment) Bill.
- Message from the Council of State.
- Resolution *re*: Appointment of Council Secretaries.
- Motion for Adjournment.
- Prorogation of the Session.

APPENDICES 1-25

Vernacular Speeches and Translations.

INDEX 1-131

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 16th March, 1922.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber at Eleven of the Clock. Mr. President was in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

MILITARY TRAINING FOR INDIAN OFFICERS.

282. * **Bhai Man Singh** : (a) Will the Government be pleased to state what effect has been given to the Resolution No. 7 of this Assembly on the Esher Committee Report (as amended by the amendment moved by Mr. W. C. Renouf) passed on the 28th March, 1921, during the last Delhi Session ?

(b) How many Indian officers have been given the King's Commissions ?

(c) How many candidates have been selected for training at Sandhurst ?

(d) How many of the officers and the candidates mentioned under (b) and (c) are Sikhs ?

Sir Godfrey Fell : (a) The attention of the Honourable Member is referred to the reply given on the 6th February, 1922, to Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer's starred Question No. 147.

(b) 38 Viceroy's commissioned Indian officers have been granted permanent King's Commissions, while 355 have been granted Honorary King's Commissions.

(c) 34 Indians have been selected for admission to the Royal Military College, Sandhurst.

(d) 13 of the Indian officers who have been granted permanent King's Commissions and 111 of those granted Honorary King's Commissions are Sikhs.

Three out of the 34 Indians selected for admission to Sandhurst are also Sikhs.

COMPARATIVE STRENGTH OF INDIAN AND BRITISH ELEMENT IN INDIAN ARMY.

283. * **Bhai Man Singh** : Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the comparative strength of the Indian and the European soldiers, non-commissioned officers and officers holding His Majesty the King-Emperor's Commissions in the Indian Army in Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery and Royal Air Force, respectively ?

Sir Godfrey Fell : A statement is laid on the table showing approximately (a) the number of British troops at present serving in India, as compared with the number of Indian ranks, (b) the number of British non-commissioned officers as compared with the number of Indian non-commissioned officers, and (c) the number of Indians holding His Majesty's Commission as compared with the number of British officers, serving in the Indian Army, in

the Cavalry, Infantry and Artillery. There are no Indian officers or combatant other ranks in the Royal Air Force. In this connection, the attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the replies given to Questions Nos. 632, 633 and 415 asked on the 28th March, 1921, and the 21st September, 1921, respectively.

Statement showing approximately (a) the number of British troops serving in India as compared with the number of Indian ranks in the Indian Army; (b) the number of British non-commissioned officers as compared with the number of Indian non-commissioned officers; and (c) the number of Indians holding His Majesty's Commission as compared with the number of British officers, serving in the Indian Army, in the Infantry, Cavalry and Artillery.

	Arm.	British soldiers.	Indian ranks.
(a) Cavalry	3,811	9,583
Infantry	33,842	103,016
Artillery	8,759	10,710
	Total	46,472	123,309
		British non-commissioned officers.	Indian non-commissioned officers.
(b) Cavalry	1,017	2,020
Infantry	5,516	17,084
Artillery	2,509	3,906
	Total	9,042	23,019
		British officers, Indian Army.	Indian officers holding His Majesty's Commissions (Indian Army).
(c) Cavalry	548	34†
Infantry	2,688	
Artillery	*	
	Total	3,236	34

* The artillery is staffed by *British Service* officers.

† There are also 18 candidates at present at the Royal Military College, Sandhurst, qualifying for the King's Commission and 33 cadets from the Indore Training College who have been granted Commissions in the Indian Army.

In addition to the above, 353 Honorary King's Commissions were granted to Indian Officers and of these 41 are still serving on the Active List.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

CERTIFICATE OF PHYSICAL FITNESS DEMANDED BY SELECTION BOARD.

302. **Rai Bahadur Bakshi Sohan Lal:** (a) Is it a fact that the candidates appearing before the Staff Selection Board were required to attach

medical certificates with their applications for admission into the Board's last examination ?

(b) Are the Government aware that every candidate had to pay Civil Surgeon's fees for getting himself examined ?

(c) Will the candidates be required to produce certificate of physical fitness again when they are made permanent ?

(d) If so, what was the object of the certificate required before their actual appointment ?

(e) Will the Government be pleased to instruct the Board not to repeat the same practice at their next examination, and also that the certificates already furnished by the candidates should hold good till they are made permanent ?

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : (a) Yes.

(b) Candidates were asked to attach to their applications health certificates from a Presidency or Civil Surgeon. The Government has no information regarding the number of candidates who had to pay fees for such certificates.

(c) It is within the power of all Departments of the Government of India to dispense with the production of a medical certificate.

(d) The certificate was demanded in the interest of the candidate on the ground that it was considered better for him to be rejected on medical grounds at the initial stage rather than after he had undergone examination.

(e) The Board decided in April, 1921, not to require medical certificates at subsequent examinations.

BUSINESS OF THE STAFF SELECTION BOARD.

303. **Rai Bahadur Bakshi Sohan Lal :** (a) Will the Government be pleased to say what is the monthly pay and duty allowance of the Secretary, Staff Selection Board ?

(b) How much time on average does he spend daily on interviews and on considering and replying to candidates' applications ?

(c) Is it a fact that the Board does not give replies to all the applications received from passed and outside candidates ?

(d) Will the Government be pleased to furnish a statement showing the number and nature of applications received by the Board from the 20th to 28th February last and how were they disposed of ?

(e) Will the Government make an announcement at an early date as to when do they intend to hold the next Upper and Lower Division test ?

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : (a) The Secretary draws an allowance of Rs. 200 per mensem. He is not a full time officer.

(b) About one hour daily interviewing and a considerable time examining and replying to applications from candidates and references from Departments.

(c) As far as possible replies are given to all communications addressed to the Board, but it is not possible with the present staff to guarantee replies to every letter. All applications, however, are considered and dealt with.

(d) 67 applications were received in the period in question and 80 letters and post-cards regarding examinations.

(e) As soon as the date for the next test has been fixed an announcement will be made, but at present Government is not in a position to make such an announcement.

DUTIES PERFORMED BY CLERKS IN ATTACHED AND SECRETARIAT OFFICES.

304. Rai Bahadur Bakshi Sohan Lal: With reference to the answers given on 6th February, 1922, by the Honourable Sir William Vincent to my Question No. 150, will the Government please lay on the table a detailed written statement showing the differences (which the Honourable Member finds it impossible to state orally) between the duties and nature of work performed by (1) Cashiers, (2) Despatchers, (3) Typists, (4) Receipt, (5) Reference, (6) Circulation and other clerks of the Attached Offices and those of the Secretariat and Army Headquarters ?

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: Government are not in a position to lay on the table a written statement giving the information asked for by the Honourable Member. Its preparation would involve an amount of labour which they are not prepared to undertake.

MESSAGE OF FAREWELL TO HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCE OF WALES.

Sir Jamsetjee Jejeebhoy (Bombay City : Non-Muhammadan Urban) : Sir, on the eve of the departure of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales from India, I am sure the House would like to convey its humble duty and regretful farewell on the termination of his first and memorable visit to this ancient land. (Hear, hear.) The vast bulk of the loyal population of India has accorded to His Royal Highness a welcome befitting his high position as heir to the Throne. We trust, Sir, that you will convey to His Royal Highness on behalf of this Assembly its good wishes and its earnest appreciation of the visit undertaken by him in order that he may know India and India may know him. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. H. S. Gour (Nagpur Division : Non-Muhammadan) : Sir, I heartily associate myself, on behalf of the other non-official Members, in the expression of loyalty and regret at the departure of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. His visit to India has been a memorable success and his departure to-morrow will be an epoch-making event, in that the Legislature which was the first to welcome him will probably be the first to regret his departure from Karachi. We, the non-official Members of the Indian Legislature, have already paid to him our humble tribute in the Imperial Capital, when he was here, and it is only befitting that we should couple that tribute with another on the eve of his departure.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, I wish to associate myself entirely with the sentiments which have been expressed by Sir Jamsetjee Jejeebhoy and Dr. Gour, and I wish to express my grateful appreciation of the good that has been done by the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales.

Chaudhri Shahab-ud-Din (East Central Punjab : Muhammadan) : Sir, on behalf of the community to which I belong, I whole-heartedly associate myself with the sentiments which have been expressed by Sir Jamsetjee Jejeebhoy, Dr. Gour and Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar (Madras City : Non-Muhammadan Urban) : Sir, I also cordially associate myself with all the remarks which have been made, and I think it is but right that we should also convey our regrets that there have been any unpleasant episodes during the visit. I hope and trust that the Government of India will take advantage of the occasion of His Royal Highness' departure from the land to bring peace to the families of thousands of people who have been sent to jail unfortunately in these cases. Sir, the nation stands solid by the Royal House (Hear, hear) and they will never swerve from their loyalty to the Throne. It has been a matter of extreme pain and regret to the thinking section of the public that there should have been any unfortunate episodes, and I think in conveying our good-will we should also convey our regrets at the episodes which have happened.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary (Calcutta : Non-Muhammadan Urban) : Sir, I desire to associate myself with the sentiments which have been expressed this morning about Indian feeling towards the Prince of Wales on the eve of His Royal Highness leaving our shores. It was Calcutta's proud boast that the visit there was as successful as it could possibly have been, and His Royal Highness expressed himself sincerely pleased about the reception. We all share in the regrets that the visit should not have been as successful everywhere, and let us hope His Royal Highness fully realises the situation and recognises its difficulties and makes due allowance for them.

Mr. C. W. Rhodes (Bengal : European) : Sir, on behalf of the non-official Europeans in this House, I also beg to associate myself with everything that has been said. The Throne is above party or politics, and we all unite in wishing His Royal Highness God-speed on his way. (Hear, hear.)

Bhai Man Singh (East Punjab : Sikh) : Sir, on behalf of the Sikh community I most heartily associate myself with all the remarks which have been made by the previous speakers.

Beohar Raghubir Sinha (Central Provinces : Landholders) : Sir, on behalf of the landholders, I also associate myself with what has been said by the previous speakers in favour of bidding farewell to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales on the eve of his departure from India.

Mr. President : I take it that it is the unanimous desire of the House that I should despatch to His Royal Highness an appropriate message of farewell from this Assembly. (Applause.)

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent (Home Member) : Sir, I should like to make a statement of the business which is to come before the Assembly next week.

On Monday and Tuesday, the 20th and 21st of March, there will be a motion that the Finance Bill be taken into consideration, and it is hoped that we will be able to proceed to further stages in regard to this Bill on those dates.

[Sir William Vincent.]

On Wednesday, the 22nd of March, if the Merchant Shipping Consolidation Bill is passed by the Council of State on the 16th, it will be taken into consideration and passed, if this Assembly approves of it.

On this day the Indian Ports (Amendment) Bill, consideration of which was adjourned on the 8th, may be taken into further consideration; and the Official Secrets Bill may also be taken a further stage.

There will also be a motion that the Cotton Transport Bill be circulated for opinion. On this day the Criminal Tribes (Amendment) Bill and the Cantonments House Accommodation Bill may be introduced if ready by that time.

In addition to the above legislative business there will also be on this day election of members of the Standing Finance Committee and the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: Sir, may I inquire from the Honourable the Home Member if he can now allot a day for the discussion of Mr. Samarth's Resolution in regard to Mr. Montagu?

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: Until we get on further with this debate on Demands, I can make no statement.

THE BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—*contd.*

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. President: The question is:

'That a sum not exceeding Rs. 76,77,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1923, in respect of 'General Administration.'

Mr. M. G. Mukundaraja Ayyangar (Madura and Ramnad *cum* Tinnevely: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I beg to move:—

Sumptuary Allowance of the Governor General. 'That the provision of Rs. 40,000 for Sumptuary Allowance of the Governor General be reduced by Rs. 100.'

If Honourable Members will kindly turn to page 32 of the blue book for Demands, they will see an item of Rs. 40,000 under the head 'Sumptuary Allowance of the Governor General', and another item for Rs. 1,56,000 under the head of expenditure from Contract Allowance. It is not my object in moving this motion and in referring to the sum of Rs. 1,56,000 under the head 'Expenditure from Contract Allowance', that the household of His Excellency should be starved, nor is it my desire, Sir, that His Excellency the Governor General should be prevented from keeping a hospitable table for the distinguished and honoured guests of His Excellency. Sir, believe me when I say that nothing is further from my thoughts than that. But my object in moving this motion is to obtain some information as to what exactly is the difference between Sumptuary Allowance and Expenditure from Contract Allowance, and what is the sort of expenditure each of these two demands is intended to cover. Further, I venture to think that it will also be useful for this House to know the class of persons benefited by His Excellency's hospitality at the expense of the poor Indian tax-payer. (Hear hear.)

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey (Finance Member): The Honourable Member has stated that it is not his intention to criticise the provision which is made for the Sumptuary and Contract Allowances of His Excellency the Governor General; it is only to obtain from me certain information on the subject.

With regard then to his first question as to the difference between the Contract and Sumptuary Allowances, I may say that the Contract Allowance is an audited allowance for certain specified heads of expenditure connected with the maintenance of the Viceregal establishments among which are included stable contingencies, stationery, wages of certain household servants, pensions for the same, liveries, lighting and fans, motor cars, advertisements and library. That, as I said before, is audited expenditure. The expenditure classified as Sumptuary Allowance is a lump grant for His Excellency's entertainment expenditure. That is not audited.

The Honourable Member asked me further what class of persons benefit by the hospitality of His Excellency the Governor General. I do not believe that it will be the desire of the House that I should give any answer to such an inquiry.

Mr. M. G. Mukundaraja Ayyangar: Sir, in view of what the Honourable the Finance Member has said, I beg to withdraw my motion.

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala (Burma : Non-European) : Sir, I beg to move :

2nd Personal Stenographer to the Governor General. 'That the provision of Rs. 6,000 for a 2nd Personal Stenographer to the Governor General be reduced by Rs. 100.'

This motion is among a series of motions standing against my name, with reference to this particular grant. The object of these motions is not retrenchment, you will be glad to hear, but to bring under some sort of review the general administration of the Government of India during the last 12 months, especially with reference to the Government of India Act. It is my purpose to point out how this Act has in practice been worked, and whether the kind of constitution that it was intended by Parliament that we should have has in practice been given to us, judging from the way in which the Government of India Act has been administered. This has become all the more necessary because of the recent pronouncement of the Prime Minister in one of the debates in the House of Commons recently, that if there is a failure of these Reforms that failure should not in any way be made attributable to Parliament or to the Government of India. Under these circumstances, we want to prepare ourselves to meet that argument in advance and to point out that if the Reforms become a failure, and some people think there are indications to some extent that they are tending to become a failure, that that failure should be made attributable to Parliament or to the Government of India and not to this House or to the people of India (Hear, hear). The Government of India, as we all know, consists of the Governor General in Council, and it is therefore appropriate for us to examine how the authority of the Governor General has been exercised under the Government of India Act. Now I beg the House to remember that, when I refer to the Governor General, I am not making any reference at all to the distinguished statesman who happens to hold in his hand the destinies of this country, but only wish to discuss the

[Mr. P. P. Ginwala.]

Governor General as he appears in the Government of India Act. I shall give one or two reasons why I feel that the Governor General, whether in his legislative capacity or in his executive capacity, is encroaching upon the privileges of this House.

Mr. President : Is the Honourable Member moving the reduction of the provision for a 2nd Personal Stenographer to the Governor General?

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : Yes, Sir. I will tell you why. Have you read the footnote, Sir?

Mr. President : Does the Honourable Member draw no distinction between a Personal Stenographer to the Governor General and the Governor General?

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : I am trying to point out that a 2nd Personal Stenographer has been found necessary owing to the pressure of work, and I say that this pressure of work is due to his exercising more powers than the Government of India Act allows him to exercise.

Mr. President : I fear the Honourable Member will have to exercise his ingenuity a little further before I can rule him in order.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : Sir, my contention is this, that the Governor General is exercising powers at present under the Government of India Act which he is not intended to exercise, and that is the reason for the increase of his work.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey : I would like to be allowed to ask the Honourable Member whether he thinks the Governor General exercises those powers through his 2nd Personal Stenographer?

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : Well, yes. He uses his Stenographer to pass orders on files with which he has to deal. As I say, it is a contravention in my opinion of the Government of India Act.

If you like, Sir, I shall convert it into a reduction of Rs. 100 on the whole grant.

Mr. President : The Honourable Member cannot embark upon a constitutional discussion on a motion to reduce the pay of a Personal Stenographer by Rs. 100; that is perfectly clear.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : My contention is this: that, as I have pointed out, this additional Stenographer is required for this purpose and I want to point out to the House that if he did not create this additional work, this additional Stenographer would not be necessary.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent (Home Member) : Sir, it is the misfortune of the Home Member to have to do any work that cannot be definitely allocated to and accepted by some other Department. For this reason only it is my business on the present occasion to defend the grant, which really concerns His Excellency's personal establishment. But I must confess that, when I saw notice of a reduction in the grant for the pay of a second Stenographer, I little expected that we should have an attack of the character now delivered

on the exercise of certain functions by His Excellency; and I think the House will agree with me that, if it was proposed to make an attack of that kind it ought to have been done in a more open and frank manner than has been adopted. The Honourable Mover said that I should be glad to hear that he did not propose to cut the pay of the officer or to effect any retrenchment. Well, Sir, it is a matter of complete indifference to me whether the pay of this unfortunate second Stenographer is cut or not, though such a reduction would certainly be an unreasonable act on the part of this Assembly. Again, Sir, I submit it is not reasonable to connect a demand for reduction of this nature with the Reforms or the failure of the Reforms, and I shall simply explain why in fact this extra Stenographer is necessary. The fact is that it is His Excellency's pleasure to shun delights and live laborious days and make others do so. I am one of those who suffer, but I am fortunately of a vigorous constitution. . . .

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : Is the Honourable Member replying to my case? I have not finished this point.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : Sir, I am also fortunately in a position to pass on my work to other people, at least a great deal of it, and do as much as I can in that way. The first Stenographer unfortunately was not in a position to do that; he had nobody under him and he broke down under the burden of work which His Excellency laid on him. His Excellency works early and late, the work of Stenographer under him was too much for one man, and so we had to put an extra man to help him; and I trust that the House will accept that as a reasonable explanation of the demand which the Government is now making.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : I was saying when I was precluded from alluding to it by the Chair, I was just showing in what way the work has increased at all. My Honourable friend has already replied

Mr. President : The Honourable Member is proceeding on an entirely improper course. I gave him one hint, but if he persists, I must ask him to desist altogether.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : Well, Sir, I will continue my argument now. It is my purpose to show, Sir, under this amendment that the Governor General in Council have abdicated their authority in favour of the Governor General by allowing him to legislate by Ordinance when they ought to have legislated by Bill; and I am glad this objection was taken by my Honourable friend opposite, the Honourable Sir William Vincent, because it just shows that if they can they will shut out this discussion. In fact, I expected an objection from the Honourable the Home Member, but I am going to defeat him by arguing the same point under some other head. Now, Sir, in this country legislation is expected to be initiated and carried through by the Governor General in Council

Mr. F. McCarthy (Burma : European) : What is the motion before the House, Sir, may I ask?

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : The motion is :

‘ That the provision of Rs. 50,100 for miscellaneous contingencies under sub-head Executive Council be reduced by Rs. 100. ’

I should like to take this together with next motion, *viz.*

‘ That the total demand under sub-head Executive Council be reduced by Rs. 100. ’

Mr. President : The Honourable Member can only have one reduction at a time and I should like him to explain to me what his intentions are.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : I shall take this one then. Now, Sir, as I say, the Governor General in Council have abdicated in some directions their legislative authority in favour of the Governor General ; and I will refer the House first of all to the Martial Law Ordinances in Malabar. I do not .

Mr. President : Order, order. Is ‘ Martial Law Ordinances ’ one of the Miscellaneous Contingencies ?

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : It was a very miscellaneous one indeed, Sir . . .

Mr. President : I admire the Honourable Member’s persistence, but it is entirely out of order.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : All right, Sir. I will withdraw this motion and proceed with the next one.

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : Now, Sir, I purpose I may continue my argument on those lines, because my motion is :

Executive Council. ‘ That the total demand under sub-head Executive Council be reduced by Rs. 100. ’

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey : May I rise to a point of order, Sir. That sub-head consists of three items, one of which is non-votable ; the other refers to travelling and other allowances and the third to miscellaneous contingencies. The motion in regard to the third has already been withdrawn, and I put it to you that the only other demand which can be discussed is simply that of travelling and other allowances.

Mr. President : No part of the vote has yet been put to the Assembly and therefore both Travelling Allowances and Miscellaneous Contingencies are open. The Honourable Member is entitled to move the reduction in the total demand ; but when he tells me that he proposes to proceed with his previous argument, I must warn him again.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : Now I want to know whether it is possible for us under any of these motions—of course the others are ruled out of order—to bring under review the conduct of the Executive Council with reference to the Government of India Act. It is a question of principle which, I submit, can be raised on a motion for reduction ; and that is my purpose and I am trying to point out how the Government of India Act has been administered by the Executive Council. I say, Sir, that this House is entitled to express its opinion as to the manner in which the Executive Council has carried on the administration of this country with reference to the Government of India Act.

Mr. President : The Honourable Member, I think, is endeavouring to draw an analogy between the procedure under which the Executive is criticised in the Imperial Parliament and the procedure under which it is criticised in this House. The procedure under which it is criticised in the Imperial Parliament is by a motion for reduction of a Cabinet Minister's salary. Those items are non-votable here and it is, therefore, not open to Members of this House to adopt that procedure; but there is a very liberal provision made under the Resolution procedure under which—I do not say it is always possible—but at all events it is possible for Honourable Members to criticise the action of the Executive in almost every matter of public policy excepting those relating to Foreign States. Therefore, the Honourable Member is taking the wrong method in attempting to raise an issue of this kind on this motion.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : This is a constitutional method, though it may not be in your opinion the best method, Sir; because, if we want to form an opinion as to the manner in which the Executive Council as a body have administered the Government of India Act, I see no other way in which it can be done except during the discussion of the Budget. Of course, the procedure by Resolution I am familiar with.

Mr. President : The Honourable Member knows perfectly well that the tail does not wag the dog; and if he attempts to drag in the constitutional position of the Viceroy by a reduction in the post of a Stenographer, he knows that he is out of order.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban) : Will you permit me, Sir? This is a motion under the Demand for Grant on account of travelling allowances and other allowances for the Executive Council of the Governor General. Sir, the object of this motion is to raise a discussion. You yourself have suggested, Sir, that if you want to bring the administration of a Department into discussion on a Budget grant like this, the proper way to bring it is by moving a nominal reduction of the grant in order to raise a discussion on the subject. It is in that view, Sir, that this motion has been made by making a nominal reduction of Rs. 100. I wish to submit to you, Sir, that reduction in the travelling allowances of these gentlemen who form the Executive Council will be a right method of bringing their administration into discussion, for we think they do not deserve the travelling allowances by the way in which they have administered the affairs of this country. It is in this manner, Sir, that we propose to bring this matter into discussion.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : May I explain, Sir, that the grant for travelling allowances to which the Honourable Member refers does not relate to the travelling of Members of the Executive Council.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar : I know they travel.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar (Madras: Nominated Non-Official) : There is also the pay of the officers.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural) : There are also the contingencies. I may mention that the object of my friend, Mr. Ginwala, was to move a nominal reduction with a view to question the procedure of passing Ordinances when this House was sitting. That is one of the questions. Another question is

Mr. President : I may point out that the Honourable Member must take the usual way of moving a Resolution. As I have pointed out, if the

[Mr. President.]

salaries of the Members of the Executive Council were votable, then of course they would be responsible in respect of that matter to the Governor General in Council who again would be responsible to this House, and the subject could be brought before this House in that way. It can be brought before this House in another way, namely, by a Resolution, but unless their salaries come under the head 'Miscellaneous Contingencies', I do not see how this subject can be discussed. But since their salaries are non-votable, it is not right for the Honourable Member to bring forward such an issue now, and I must rule the question out of order. A vote for travelling allowances or for miscellaneous contingencies in the case of travelling allowances, is for journeys which have not yet been undertaken. The Honourable Member can only refer to journeys which have actually been undertaken during the previous year in order to suggest that they shall not be undertaken in the future.

Dr. H. S. Gour (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, with due deference to what has fallen from the Chair, may I point out that the correct parliamentary procedure just now described by you as obtaining in the House of Commons is that whenever a question is raised which is intended to criticise a particular Department on the day when the House goes into committees and passes estimates, a motion is made for the reduction of a nominal sum from his salary, which is the prospective salary. Now, by the same analogy, travelling allowance is a prospective travelling allowance, and I venture to think as a pure matter of law that if an Honourable Member here desires to criticise the conduct of the Members of the Executive Council, it is open to him to ask for a reduction of a nominal sum from his prospective travelling allowance exactly in the same manner as a Member of the House of Commons would be entitled to criticise the conduct of a Minister by moving for a reduction of a small sum from his prospective salary. I, therefore, venture to submit that it is perfectly open to Mr. Ginwala to criticise the conduct of the Members of the Executive Council by moving for the reduction of their prospective travelling allowances.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: Sir, I want to point out that the responsibility of the Executive Council is a collective responsibility, and therefore, if we refer to contingencies which cannot be allocated to any particular Member, in my view it is competent to move a general reduction under the head of Contingencies and question the course adopted by the Executive Council in respect of certain functions which, we maintain, are exercisable by us and us alone. One of these is that, when the House is sitting, no Ordinances should be passed. I do not wish to be obstructive in this matter. I mentioned also to the Honourable the Home Member once before that in some Ordinances we have noticed that they carry with them an Indemnity clause. My view of it is that an Indemnity Bill can only be passed by the Legislature and that it would not be sufficient to embody an Indemnity clause in an Ordinance

Mr. President: To what item does the Honourable Member address his arguments?

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: The total demand.

Mr. President: I may point out that this is not an item in the vote on which it is relevant to raise that issue. Travelling Allowances and Miscellaneous Contingencies are not a peg on which to hang an attack on the Governor General in Council.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : Sir, may I know what these Miscellaneous Contingencies consist of? I should like to have a tabulated list to find out whether they come under this category.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : It is largely expenditure incurred in journeys by Honourable Members of the Executive Council.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : I should like to know how the Rs. 50,000 is made up.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : That is how it is made up. It is expenditure incurred by Honourable Members on their tours.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey : May I make the point quite clear, Sir? Members of the Executive Council do not draw any travelling allowance. The expenditure that is incurred is for the haulage of their saloons and in some cases for the travelling of their chaprassis and so on. Therefore, it would not be possible to put that expenditure down under the head 'Travelling Allowances'; it has been put down under the head 'Miscellaneous Contingencies'. That is the only explanation. The whole of the expenditure is incurred purely on the travelling of Members of the Executive Council.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar : Sir, may I point out that it would be perfectly germane to this view, namely, that if the travelling allowances had been utilised in the proper manner in which they should have been utilised, the Members of the Executive Council would have learnt what the feeling in the country is and they would have better governed the country. Undoubtedly, they would have travelled in the way they should have, and if they had collected proper information, they would have been in a position to better govern the country than they have done. At present, we see that they have been neglectful of their duty, and consequently we ask for an opportunity to discuss this matter in considering the question of travelling allowances and contingencies.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : I only wish to make it clear that, so far as Malabar is concerned, I did what I could. I did go down to the areas affected.

Mr. J. Chandhuri : Is the journey to Malabar included?

Mr. President : The Honourable Member is well aware that there have been several discussions relating to the question of principle which moved the Honourable Member to undertake that journey. As far as I can see the only thing to criticise would be the actions of the Honourable the Home Member in his public capacity while on a journey.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : Do I understand that contingencies refer only to travelling allowances? Can we have detailed particulars?

Now, Sir, as I say, this demand under contingencies is for the travelling allowances of the whole body known as the Executive Council. They travel for, I suppose, administrative purposes, and not for enjoying themselves. Therefore, this House is entitled to say what it thinks, and what opinion it has formed as to their general administration,—whether it is represented by mere travelling or sitting in this House or sitting in the offices. Now, Sir, as my Honourable friend, Mr. Chandhuri, pointed out, one of the things that we object to with reference to the Executive Council is this allowing of the issue of Ordinances under extraordinary powers conferred on the Governor General under the Government of India Act rather than under the Legislative authority conferred on this House and which authority is held by this House.

Mr. President : If the Honourable Member can show me in any way how expenditure on travelling allowances of the Executive Council or of anybody else is connected with the issue of Ordinances, then I will let him go on.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : If they had travelled—if the Honourable the Home Member had gone earlier to Malabar, probably the issue of this Ordinance might not have been necessary.

Mr. President : It is not for the Chair to enter into the merits of the question, but I may remind the Honourable Member that this House, I think by a unanimous vote, did not ask for the withdrawal of martial law from Malabar.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : I am not referring, Sir, to the application of martial law at all. All I say is that the method which the Governor General followed would have been affected. If the Honourable the Home Member had gone earlier to the spot and made inquiries, no emergency of that nature would have arisen. That is my contention. He will then have realised that it may have been necessary for him to come to this House and ask for ordinary legislation instead of allowing the Governor General to exercise his extraordinary powers. Now, Sir, my objection is this. The first Ordinance was issued on the 20th August last year

Mr. President : The Honourable Member must be finally ruled out of order. I cannot allow this discussion to go on.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : Can I, Sir, discuss the general administration ?

Mr. President : The Honourable Member has moved a reduction in the total demand for the Executive Council.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : The first point I like to raise with reference to the general administration is that, if you look at the Budget as it is presented, you will find how these votable and non-votable items are placed in the Budget. The point is that they have not tried to give effect to the general view of the country and to the intention of the Government of India Act that, as far as possible, votable items ought to be increased and non-votable items diminished, in this way that they should not increase posts or continue to increase posts which remain non-votable under the Government of India Act. An examination of the Budget will show that even where posts need not have been non-votable, they have been made non-votable. I will just ask you to look at this. No doubt, Sir, the pay of the Members of the Executive Council is made non-votable by Statute, but I do not find any authority in the Statute to say that all the Secretaries under these Departments need be occupying posts which are non-votable. If the Government of India Act was worked by the Government of India in the sense in which it was intended it should be worked, we should have seen some endeavour made by the Government of India to introduce the principle by which some of the Secretaries sitting on those benches might have been excluded from the non-votable list and by that means some sense of responsibility might gradually have been introduced even on those benches.

Mr. President : I think that again, as the Honourable Member is aware, this is a matter which should be brought up by a direct motion in the form of a Resolution. The Honourable Member is dealing with one of the fundamental questions of policy under the Government of India Act. He is not entitled to bring it in by a side wind.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : This, of course, is one more argument, Sir, as to the kind of rules that we have got. A procedure has been given to us by which a most essential discussion on the most essential issues connected with the administration of this Government cannot be discussed on the floor of this House. A stronger argument cannot be advanced in support of the statement that your Reforms have been a failure than the scene which has been enacted in this House this morning. We are brought here and told that we have come to co-operate with the Government but, when we want to criticise them, they take shelter behind the provisions of a Statute or the rules enacted by the same Government whose policy we want to criticise.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey : I rise to a point of order, Sir. Is the Honourable Member justified in saying that the Government of India are taking shelter behind your ruling?

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : Please don't misunderstand me. I entirely submit to the opinion of the President. I say, Sir, that the constitution is worked in such a way that it is possible for the President to give the ruling that he has given just now. That is my complaint. We are not here to discuss any question of general policy at all. We must submit to whatever they allow us to discuss, and we should not discuss anything more. If that is the kind of function which we are expected to perform, I submit, Sir, that there is much force in the statement that the Reforms have been a total failure. It is no good our trying to cut down 5 per cent. here and 5 per cent. there. We are interested far more in the question of general policy than in any mere arithmetical figures. If this ruling, based as it is, Sir, on these rules, is correct, it comes to this that we are here merely to examine figures and to cut them down here and there, but that we are not at liberty to discuss the principles which lie buried under those figures. Resolutions are of no weight at all for discussing questions of policy as a whole. Besides, a Resolution is a mere recommendation to the same Governor General in Council whose policy we now wish to criticise in this House. This is the only way in which this House can express an opinion which might have some effect. If we move a Resolution, it is a recommendation to the same body and it is of no use at all. Our experience has shown that Resolutions carry little weight,—Resolutions which are in the nature of recommendations. Unless this House has this power of expressing an opinion in this form, I do not see, Sir, how we can be said to take any part at all in advising the Government of India on important questions of policy.

I want to refer to one other point which may have been permissible. Our contention here in this House is that the Executive Council as a body, in their military policy, have surrendered themselves to the military authorities and that they have accepted the principles from the military authorities to which the whole of this country legitimately objects. Are we not to discuss that here on the floor of this House and to point out to you what the people seem to think of these principles which you have blindly accepted from the military authorities? We were told here the other day in this House, and it was accepted by the Finance Member on behalf of the Government, that the Army in this country was maintained on two principles. One of them was defence against foreign aggression, and the second one was the preservation of

Mr. President: Order, order. I have been reluctant to interrupt the Honourable Member, but he is persistently ignoring the ruling given from the Chair. The Honourable Member knows perfectly well that opportunities for discussion on the matters which he has raised have previously arisen, can now arise and will arise in the future, but not on motions of this kind; and therefore I ask him to bring his remarks to a close.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: In that view I will only say that it is futile for us to try to discuss any question of general policy on a general issue of this sort and we shall be driven apparently to methods which I do not think will expedite the business of this House.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru (Law Member): I should not have interfered in this debate, but it is because of a constitutional issue which has been incidentally raised by my Honourable friend, Mr. Ginwala. As a constitutional lawyer, Mr. Ginwala, I should think, will agree with me that it is the business of every Government to act in accordance with the law (*Mr. Ginwala*: 'Yes') and if there is any grievance against the law there are other methods for agitating that point of view,—I am referring to Mr. Ginwala's reference to the Secretaries. I will only remind Mr. Ginwala of certain provisions of the Government of India Act and I will tell him that, so long as the provisions of the Government of India Act stand on the Statute Book, it is the duty of Government to act in accordance with them. Now, section 98 of the Act provides:

'Subject to the provisions of this Act, all vacancies happening in any of the offices specified or referred to in the Third Schedule to this Act, and all such offices which may be created hereafter shall be filled from amongst the members of the Indian Civil Service.'

The Third Schedule to the Government of India Act specifies the offices which are reserved to the Indian Civil Service. Now, so far as those offices are concerned, I think they can only be filled in the manner in which the Government of India Act requires them to be filled. As regards the question of the salaries, I will only invite the attention of Mr. Ginwala to the provisions of section 67A (3). It will be within the recollection of Mr. Ginwala that he himself raised this question about votable and non-votable items and this question was discussed and could have been discussed at greater length if he had liked under that section, but unfortunately, or fortunately, the decision of the Law Officers of the Crown went against him. Therefore, I submit that, so long as the provisions of the Government of India Act are what they are, it is not open to the House to challenge the Government of India for appointing the gentlemen who occupy the position of Secretaries to Government, or, for the matter of that, putting their salaries on the non-votable list. That is a point which I ask Mr. Ginwala and his supporters to bear in mind.

Mr. N. M. Samarth (Bombay: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I have one small difficulty in connection with the construction of the Act. I am fully aware of section 98 of the Government of India Act which refers to Schedule III. I would ask that Schedule III of the Act of 1919, or the Act of 1915 as amended by the Act of 1919, be compared with Schedule III of the Act of 1915. It will be found that, under the Act of 1915, several offices were reserved to the Indian Civil Service which are taken away

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is entering into the merits. I allowed the Honourable the Law Member to make an explanation why certain items do not appear which Mr. Ginwala wishes to appear. I will not allow the Honourable Member (Mr. Samarth) to proceed on the question of

merits of the constitutional issue raised. The Honourable Member knows quite well that there are opportunities for raising questions of this kind.

Mr. N. M. Samarth : I am not raising a constitutional issue. I will only ask a question whether the Government of India Act of 1919 is adhered to in regard to the reservation of only those smaller number of offices which have been reserved under the Act of 1919 to the Indian Civil Service. Under the Act of 1915, there was a larger number of offices reserved to the Indian Civil Service, and I wish to know if even at present these offices are still reserved to the Indian Civil Service or not. For instance, in the Act of 1915 the offices reserved to the Indian Civil Service were Secretaries, Joint Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries, and Under Secretaries of the several Governments in India except Secretaries, Joint Secretaries, Under Secretaries in the Army, Marine and the Public Works Departments. The Act of 1919 changed it into offices of Secretaries, Joint Secretaries and Deputy Secretaries, omitting Under Secretaries, in every Department except the Army, Marine, Education, Foreign and Political and Public Works Departments. Now, I want to ask, Sir, and get information as to whether or not this Act of 1919 has been given effect to, the letter of it has been followed or not, or whether Government are still continuing to the Indian Civil Service the appointments which have been taken away from the Indian Civil Service by the Act of 1919.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey : I think that the Honourable Member will agree that he has put a somewhat strained interpretation on these two Schedules. The original Act reserved certain appointments to the members of the Indian Civil Service. The effect was that no officer not belonging to that service could be given such an appointment save under the exceptional sanction of the Secretary of State provided for under another section. The Act of 1919 removed a number of those appointments (such as Under Secretaries) from the list, and the consequence is that we are at liberty to appoint to those posts gentlemen who do not belong to the Indian Civil Service. It is perfectly true that in many cases they have been filled up from members of the Indian Civil Service though not in every case, but the difference between the two Schedules is simply this, that whereas under the former schedule we had no option and had to appoint members of the Indian Civil Service, now we have that option, and when suitable members of the other services come forward we can appoint and do appoint them.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar : I support this motion for reduction by Rs. 100 on the sole short ground that the Executive Council have not taken steps to give this Assembly an opportunity to discuss their administration on a vote for a demand for salaries and other supplies.

Mr. President : The question is :

‘That the total demand under sub-head Executive Council be reduced by Rs. 100.’

The Assembly then divided.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru : I rise to a point of order. It has been brought to my notice that one Honourable Member of this House voted on the other side under a misapprehension. Is there any way of correcting that mistake ?

Dr. H. S. Gour : What is the nature of the ‘misapprehension’? Many more Members may have voted on the other side under a similar misapprehension.

Mr. President : A Member who votes under a misapprehension is entitled to have his vote corrected, if he brings it to the notice of the Chair

[Mr. President.]

before the Division is closed. In this case the Lobby in which the Honourable Member had voted was closed, and therefore the list had been taken away and brought to the table. It raises an awkward question, because the transfer of his vote will mean that one side will win and the other side will lose; whereas if the division is allowed to stand, the votes are equal.

It is a proper Parliamentary practice that an Honourable Member voting under a misapprehension is allowed to correct his mistake, provided he brings it to the notice of the Chair before the division is closed. Therefore in this case I think the Honourable Member is entitled to have his vote transferred.

The Division was declared as follows :

AYES—47.

Abdul Majid, Shaikh.
Abdul Rahman, Munshi.
Agarwala, Lala G. L.
Agnihotri, Mr. K. B. L.
Ahmed, Mr. K.
Asjad-ul-lah, Maulvi Miyan.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. G. M.
Ayyar, Mr. T. V. Seshagiri.
Bagde, Mr. K. G.
Bajpai, Mr. S. P.
Bhargava, Pandit J. L.
Bishambhar Nath, Mr.
Chaudhuri, Mr. J.
Das, Babu B. S.
Ginwala, Mr. P. P.
Girdhardas, Mr. N.
Gour, Dr. H. S.
Gulab Singh, Sardar.
Ibrahim Ali Khan, Lieutenant Nawab M.
Iswar Saran, Munshi.
Jatkar, Mr. B. H. R.
Kamat, Mr. B. S.
Latthe, Mr. A. B.
Mahadeo Prasad, Munshi.

Manmohandas Ramji, Mr.
Man Singh, Bhai.
Misra, Mr. B. N.
Misra, Mr. P. L.
Mudaliar, Mr. S.
Mukherjee, Mr. J. N.
Mukherjee, Mr. T. P.
Nag, Mr. G. C.
Nand Lal, Dr.
Nayar, Mr. K. M.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Pyari Lal, Mr.
Rangachariar, Mr. T.
Reddi, Mr. M. K.
Schammnad, Mr. Mahmood.
Shahani, Mr. S. C.
Singh, Babu B. P.
Sinha, Beohar Raghbir.
Srinivasa Rao, Mr. P. V.
Subrahmanayam, Mr. C. S.
Subzposh, Mr. S. M. Z. A.
Thackersey, Sir Vithaldas D.
Yamin Khan, Mr. M.

NOES—49.

Abdul Quadir, Maulvi.
Abdul Rahim Khan, Mr.
Aiyer, Mr. A. V. V.
Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
Barodawala, Mr. S. K.
Bijlikhan, Sardar G.
Bradley-Birt, Mr. F. B.
Bray, Mr. Denys.
Bryant, Mr. J. F.
Chatterjee, Mr. A. C.
Clarke, Mr. G. R.
Cotelingham, Mr. J. P.
Crookshank, Sir Sydney.
Dalal, Sardar B. A.
Dentith, Mr. A. W.
Faridoonji, Mr. R.
Fell, Sir Godfrey.
Gajjan Singh, Sardar Bahadur.
Habibullah, Mr. Muhammad.
Hailey, the Honourable Sir Malcolm.
Hullah, Mr. J.
Hussanally, Mr. W. M.
Innes, the Honourable Mr. C. A.
Jamnadas Dwarakadas, Mr.
Jejeebhoy, Sir Jamsetjee.

Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Kabraji, Mr. J. K. N.
Keith, Mr. W. J.
Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.
McCarthy, Mr. F.
Mitter, Mr. K. N.
Nabi Hadi, Mr. S. M.
Percival, Mr. P. E.
Ramayya Pantulu, Mr. J.
Rao, Mr. C. Krishnaswami.
Renouf, Mr. W. C.
Rhodes, Mr. C. W.
Samarth, Mr. N. M.
Sapru, the Honourable Dr. T. B.
Sarfazak Hussain Khan, Mr.
Sarvadhikary, Sir Deva Prasad.
Shahab-ud-Din, Chaudhri.
Sharp, Mr. H.
Spence, Mr. R. A.
Vincent, the Honourable Sir William.
Waghorn, Colonel W. D.
Wajihuddin, Haji.
Way, Mr. T. A. H.
Webb, Sir M. dePomeroy.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: May I rise to a point of order, Sir? Can a vote be transferred in this way even if that gentleman has done it in consultation with any other Member of this House? Supposing an Honourable Member votes in the wrong lobby and he is afterwards spoken to by another Member of the House who is interested and he has voted in the other lobby, will this rectification still hold good?

Mr. President: The point which the Honourable Member has raised appears to me to be a hypothetical one. Did the Honourable Member himself vote under duress?

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: May I know the name of the Honourable Member who thus changed his vote?

Mr. President: The name of the Honourable Member is Haji Wajih-ud-din.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: I do not know, Sir, if he voted under a mistake because I happened to have a talk with him after the vote.

Mr S. C. Shahani (Sind Jagirdars and Zamindars : Landholders) : And I also happened to have a talk with him.

Mr. B. S. Kamat (Bombay Central Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, I beg to move :

One Ceremonial Officer. 'That the provision for one Ceremonial Officer under Legislative Assembly. sub-head 'Legislative Assembly' be omitted.'

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: My next motion is for a reduction of Rs. 100 on this point. If this motion is carried, I presume my motion does not come at all?

Mr. President: The procedure is that the larger reduction precedes the lesser.

Mr. B. S. Kamat: The motion which I am bringing forward is to cut out the provision of Rs. 3,000 in the next year for the salary of the Ceremonial Officer for this House. I may assure this House, Sir, that in bringing this motion I am not raising any subtle constitutional point, a discussion of which we endured just now. But I am simply bringing forward a motion of a utilitarian character based on grounds of economy and retrenchment. I am doubtful whether we should have at the cost of Rs. 250 a month a Ceremonial Officer for this Assembly. I am aware that in India we are all prone perhaps to a little vanity and a sort of decoration, to have chaprassis and patawalas hovering around us right from the highest officer down to the smallest Tahsildar. In fact, as an illustration, I can say that, as soon as we step into this Imperial Secretariat building, we find a host of chaprassis and jamadars loitering about in the corridors against whom we stumble and who sometimes jostle us about. Well, that being perhaps the feeling in India, it is natural for those who initiated this idea to have the post of a Ceremonial Officer, and they fixed his pay at Rs. 250 a month for this luxury and for this dignity for us. This appointment, Sir, could be justified on two grounds in the opinion of those who believe in this appointment. Firstly, perhaps, they might be thinking that this is a very close imitation of the practice in the House of Commons to have some such officer. If that is the justification, I think we are imitating the House of Commons in the minutest detail and in a very wrong manner. There are other ways of imitating the

[Mr. B. S. Kamat.]

practices and traditions of the House of Commons and I think we can turn our attention to better purposes so far as imitation of the House of Commons goes. I for one do not see any necessity for such an imitation at all. I do not think the Upper House has any corresponding Ceremonial Officer to usher in any particular individual there at all. Neither do I know that the Provincial Councils in India have imitated the House of Commons and have any such Ceremonial Officer.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas (Bombay City : Non-Muhammadan Urban) : There are two chobdars in Bombay.

Mr. B. S. Kamat : Therefore, I do not see why we should have an officer here on Rs. 250 a month. We know there is a practice to usher in on big occasions like Durbars distinguished individuals or the principal individual of the show through men who are called chobdars. Even in the case of district Durbars, I believe we all know that there is some old tradition of having the chobdar as an emblem of dignity. My friend, Mr. Percival, who is conversant with these Durbars of the Chiefs and zamindars in the Deccan, can corroborate my statement. These chobdars are in receipt of a salary of about Rs. 30 or Rs. 40. I therefore think that if you indulge at all in this luxury and dignity, this purpose can be served at a cost of not more than Rs. 30 or 40 a month. That being the case, I do not think this item of Rs. 250 a month is justifiable at all. The second justification which some people might give for this appointment is probably this, that in the House of Commons the Sergeant-at-Arms is sometimes found useful in case of very grave disorder. Perhaps in a similar contingency—a very unpleasant contingency indeed—when there is a similar grave disorder in this House, we might have to requisition the services of an officer like the Ceremonial Officer. My reply to this is that even in that case, namely, grave disorder, I believe the function which the Ceremonial Officer on Rs. 250 a month can perform can equally be performed by an ordinary chobdar on Rs. 30 or 40. I therefore think that this amount of Rs. 250 a month can safely be eliminated and we can have instead, if at all we want any emblem of dignity or decoration for this House, an ordinary man from the existing staff converted into a chobdar. If we can effect this economy, Sir, this amount of Rs. 250 or at least the major part of it, say Rs. 200, could be devoted for other good objects and that is the reason why I have brought forward this motion. This amount of Rs. 200 could, for instance, be devoted for the amelioration of the social amenities of the Members of this House [Laughter]. For instance, we may have a Reading Room. We can contribute Rs. 200 out of this Demand for various periodicals and magazines of a political nature or of scientific information from different parts of the world for the reading of the Members. For instance, we can have periodicals and magazines of the Liberal Party in England, of the Conservative Party or of the Labour Party and also similar magazines from South Africa, New Zealand and other parts of the world so as to keep ourselves in touch with them and to know what other Dominions are doing in the other parts of the Empire. That is one illustration of how this amount of Rs. 200 could be more advantageously devoted for a better purpose. I therefore think, Sir, purely on practical grounds of retrenchment to which we have been preaching to the Honourable the Finance Member for the last few days, that this sum of Rs. 200 can be spent for better purposes. Lastly, let me assure him that this

motion is not directed against the holder of particular post but against the post itself.

Mr. R. A. Spence (Bombay : European) : Sir, the Mover of this motion has taken out of my mouth several things that I was going to say ; but I do rise to oppose this motion for reasons affecting the dignity of this House. (Hear, hear). I think that it is a wise provision that we should have the services of a Ceremonial Officer and, in the lamentable contingency referred to by the Mover of this motion, I would ask Honourable Members whether they would like to be removed from this House by a chobdar. (Laughter). I consider that the social amenities of this House would be better served by their not being removed by a chobdar than by this motion being passed.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru : I shall very briefly state the history of the appointment of this officer. Almost immediately after the commencement of this Assembly last year, the matter attracted the notice of the Honourable the President of the Assembly, and the President expressed his opinion that it was very necessary that we should engage the services of a Ceremonial Officer who would act as the Usher of the House and be the actual bearer of messages from this House to the other House. Accordingly, we were at pains in finding out an officer who would know both English and Hindustani and who had been accustomed to ceremonial functions. It was quite obvious that the ideal chobdar, so dear to the heart of my Honourable friend Mr. Kamat, would not answer the purpose. Therefore, the names of several Indian military officers were suggested to the President and to us, and, ultimately, the choice fell on a distinguished officer of the Army (Hear, hear) who had rendered signal services to the Crown and to the country during the war (Hear, hear) and who had retired after a very successful career in the Army. (Hear, hear.) Accordingly, the present incumbent, Risaldar Suraj Sing Bahadur, was appointed to this office, and we certainly feel, at any rate some of us feel, that he has added to the dignity of the House on ceremonial occasions. (Hear, hear.)

There is only one word more and I will finish. The salary which we are giving him is by no means one which even Mr. Kamat would characterise as extravagant. He gets only Rs. 200 a month and second class travelling allowance between his place and Simla or Delhi. I had hoped that the case for economy which my friends on the other side of the House were putting up (*Cries from the Democratic Party* : 'No, no ; we have not got any such motion'), anyhow, which some of my friends on the other side of the House were putting up was very much stronger than this. Let us economise by all means, but let us not degenerate into a cheese-paring policy. (*Cries of 'Vote, vote,' and 'Withdraw.'*)

Mr. Abdur Rahim (North-West Frontier Province : Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, I have much pleasure in opposing this motion. The Honourable Mover has, I think, been unkind to us. In my part of the country a chobdar is a man employed for lifting tents. (Laughter.) What next will he have for us? Moreover, I must inform this Honourable House that we must have some retired military officer who has done service to the country and to His Majesty the King. This officer is not a luxury and, even if his allowance is raised, I think it will be more dignified for the House to have him than to have a chobdar. We must have more dignity attached to us, and for this reason, I oppose the motion.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : I am sorry that even on the Opposition Benches there should be a gentleman with so little imagination as Mr. Kamat. (Laughter.) The reason why I brought my motion was, first of all, to compliment the Finance Department on the rigid economy which they have practised in our Department, and to draw the attention of the House to the fact that there is no Department of the Government of India which is run so economically, almost so parsimoniously as our House is run. If you look at your establishment, Sir, you find it consists of yourself, a Deputy President, a Ceremonial Officer and 142 Members. That is all the establishment at your disposal, and rather than remove the Ceremonial Officer, Sir, we would have welcomed a little more pomp and ceremony in the performance of your duties. We should have welcomed a mace, a real mace, which might be used on many occasions (Laughter) ; for instance, this morning we very nearly came to a situation when something more might have been required and used with advantage. If the Honourable the Home Member came forward with a proposal for the purchase of a red despatch box, the Democratic Party, I am sure, would vote him a grant for that purpose in order that his dignity might also be increased. But the point to which I want to draw your attention is this. I do not see where our establishment comes in. Who is your Secretary? Who performs all the work that has to be performed for this House? Sir, we are entitled to expect that you should be master of your own house. (Hear, hear.) You should have your own establishment on any scale that you think befits your dignity as the President of the Parliament of India. I feel that the whole of this establishment should be placed under your control from the Secretary downwards and that this Department should have nothing whatever to do with any Department of the Government. (Hear, hear.) And, if such a proposal is made, either by the Finance Department or by yourself, if you would take the trouble to make it, I am certain that every Member in this House, in spite of this clamour for retrenchment, would support it wholeheartedly, in order that we might really raise the dignity of this House and with that your own Sir. We should then feel that we were at last in one place where our rights were not interfered with by anybody else and where we had our own way in the conduct of the business of this House. I do not intend to divide the House on my motion, I move it merely to bring this important factor to the notice of the House and particularly to your own notice, so that you may take such action as you think fit hereafter to have your own establishment for the conduct of our business.

Dr. H. S. Gour : Sir, I heartily support the remarks made by Mr. Ginwala and I entirely oppose the motion as moved by Mr. Kamat. (Hear, hear.) The object of a Ceremonial Officer is, as was pointed out by the Honourable the Law Member, an object with which we are in entire sympathy. His presence adds to the dignity of the House and to the weight of your authority (Hear, hear) and, in the course of time, when we shall be the recipients of a mace, which, I understand, is in course of transit, the duties of the mace-bearer and the Ceremonial Officer will become even more imposing. But the object with which Mr. Ginwala gave notice of his motion is the object of strengthening the Legislative Assembly by providing it with a suitable office and office staff.

At present we borrow everything from the Legislative Department. We, I submit, as the Parliament of India, cannot long subsist upon these charity doles. Our Secretary is under the Legislative Department ; our Deputy is

under the Legislative Department ; everybody else is under the Legislative Department. Even the Members are under the Legislative Department now.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated : Labour Interests) : We are not under the Legislative Department.

Dr. H. S. Gour : Who draws your travelling allowance ? To whom do you go for information ?

Dr. Nand Lal (West Punjab : Non-Muhammadan) : We are not under the Legislative Department.

Dr. H. S. Gour : My friends rightly object and resent their subordination to the Legislative Department. We want to have a Member's Office, a Members' staff, all under your control, and we want, Sir, that the Indian Legislative Assembly should be self-contained. Now, I ask the Honourable the Finance Member whether this cannot be done without encumbering the finances of the country with further increases of staff and salaries. I submit that by a suitable transfer from one Department to this Department of the Legislative Assembly, the necessary improvements may be made.

Mr. R. A. Spence : ' A rose by any other name would smell as sweet.'

Dr. H. S. Gour : I also suggest that it would facilitate the work of the Members of this Assembly, because the votes of all those officers would be placed on the Budget and they would be under your direct supervision and control. Members at present labour under a great disadvantage. Thanks to the good offices of the Honourable the Home Member, we have been provided

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : The Law Member.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru : Would the Honourable Member kindly repeat what he said ? (Laughter.)

Dr. H. S. Gour : I say, thanks to the good offices of the Honourable the Law Member, we have been provided with a suitable library (Loud Laughter); but we want, Sir, something more than a library. We want a Librarian of the Assembly, and we want some clerks, and we also want a sort of ' Information Bureau ' where we can collect materials for our speeches, statistics and information for which we have to rely at present upon the courtesy of other Departments.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas : And upon our imagination.

Dr. H. S. Gour : The Honourable Member suggests that some of us draw upon imagination, which he himself so often uses with such great effect. (Laughter.) Now, Sir, these are the plain facts, and I, therefore, ask that while Mr. Kamat may be pleased to withdraw his motion, our motion may be accepted by the Government who should see their way to provide the Assembly with a suitable office and staff by transferring officials from other Departments to a self-contained Department under the President of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. S. C. Shahani : Sir, I also rise to associate myself with what has fallen from the lips of my Honourable friend, Mr. Ginwala. I am strongly opposed to what has been said by my Honourable friend, Mr. Kamat, who has sought to make out that a Ceremonial Officer embodies a sense of vanity.

[Mr. S. C. Shahani.]
on the part of the House. I have understood the word 'Vanity' differently. So far as I see, a Ceremonial Officer for the House embodies a very ordinate and appropriate sense of the power and authority which this House possesses.

Mr. N. M. Joshi : I move that the question be now put.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru : Sir, in view of the remarks which have fallen from my friends Mr. Ginwala and Dr. Gour, I should like to make a few observations with regard to the desire to have a separate establishment for the Legislative Assembly. The very first thing to which I will invite the attention of the House is that the legislative bodies cost us something like Rs. 7,38,200, as will appear from page 32, excluding Council Reporters, Secretaries and Printing. Now, so far as the point of a separate staff for the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State are concerned, there are just one or two points of view which should be placed before the House. The two Houses meet here for certain parts of the year, and then we have what I may call, from the point of view of the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State, the slack season. Now it will be difficult to keep a whole-time officer of the status and pay of the Secretary occupied all the year round. What is he to do during the time when the two Houses are not sitting? The work of the two Houses begins to flood into my Department nearly two months or a month and a half before the meeting of the two Houses. Now, if this House decides to have a separate Secretary and a separate staff altogether, well, it must find the money. Personally speaking, I feel that it would be a relief to some of the officers of my Department, but I beg the House to remember the state of our finances at the present moment, and also the more important fact that it was impossible in the beginning to separate the Legislative Department from the Legislative Assembly, the two are so closely connected with each other. Matters of legislation have got to go to the Department over which I have the honour to preside, and I venture to think they will have to go even in the future. And then you will also be pleased to bear in mind that you will have to provide a separate staff not merely for this House but for the other House also. There may grow up a similar desire in the other House.

Dr. H. S. Gour : We can have one staff for both Houses.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru : What I would, therefore, suggest to Dr. Gour and Mr. Ginwala is that it would be better if they were to wait until this question is examined thoroughly and we see what the practical difficulties are and to what extent we can give effect to this desire. I would, therefore, suggest to Mr. Ginwala and Dr. Gour that they might express their views in writing to me, on this matter so that we may examine them from the financial point of view and also from the point of view of the practical work of the Department, and if we find that it is practicable to give effect to their views, I can assure Mr. Ginwala and Dr. Gour that no one will be more willing to meet their wishes than myself. But more than this I cannot definitely say at the present moment. I hope, therefore, I have given an explanation of the position as it stands.

Dr. H. S. Gour : Sir, may I just suggest to the Honourable the Law Member to appoint a small Committee to go into this question.

(Honourable Members : We don't want a Committee.)

Mr. N. M. Joshi : A Committee consisting of Dr. Gour and Mr. Ginwala !

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : I move that the question be now put.

Mr. President : The matter in the last resort concerns the President, because if the Assembly chooses to set up an establishment of its own, it must of necessity be placed under the authority of the Chair. This question engaged my attention the moment I undertook the duties of my office. I found it convenient, however, to leave the matter as I found it on taking office, because the officers of the Legislative Department met my wishes in every possible way (Hear, hear), and I have no desire whatever during the first year of my office to disturb the existing arrangements. On principle, I endorse entirely what has been said by Mr. Ginwala, Dr. Gour and Mr. Shahani. I consider and I have put it on record already—that this House ought to have an establishment of its own.

Late last autumn I considered the question without consulting other persons and I came to the conclusion that it would be unwise in the existing state of the public finances for me to make proposals which might impose a burden upon the tax-payers of this country.

There is one further consideration which, I think, we might bear in mind. We are here in a temporary condition ; and it might well be found that, when the Indian Legislature is housed in its permanent home in the new Capital, an establishment could be set up which would serve the needs of both the Houses in a way which such an establishment could not do in the present circumstances. I am prepared to give the House an undertaking that during the course of the summer I shall examine the question thoroughly in consultation with my friend, the Honourable the Law Member, and that if we find ourselves in a position to make definite proposals we shall then consult the Assembly. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. B. S. Kamat : In view of better things to come, I ask for leave to withdraw the motion.

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri : Sir, I was asked by some of my friends in this House to move this motion :

<p>Conveyance allowance of Members of Legislature.</p>	<p>‘That the provision for conveyance allowance of Members of the Legislative Assembly and Council of State be reduced by Rs. 43,000 and Rs. 32,500, respectively.’</p>
--	---

They were kind enough to think that, if I moved this motion it would not be liable to misinterpretation or any uncharitable construction. It relates, I may tell the House, to motor haulage account and not to the conveyance charges of the Members of the Assembly who have to reside at Raisina. I find that under Contingencies, motor haulage account has come up from Rs. 85,000 to Rs. one lakh ; and I find also that the expenditure under Contingencies in the matter of motor haulage in respect of Members of the Council of State has been put down at Rs. 40,000. This, I believe, is a new addition. Now, it is said that we are always ready to pick holes in the pockets of others ; but I think this motion will show that we are not

[Mr. J. Chaudhuri.]

reluctant to pick holes in our own pockets as well, if we can effect an economy. There have been certain complaints made and it is desirable that I should bring those matters to the notice of this House. I have been told that some Members both of this House and of the other House had only attended certain meetings for the purpose of attending certain ceremonials in connection with the Prince's visit and they have absented themselves since then and they have been granted motor haulage allowances. Of course, it is for the House to decide and it is for me to draw the attention of the House. This matter may be left to the Finance Committee and I do not wish to press it, but I should give the figures as I have calculated them. There are on an average not more than 100 Members present in this House. If we allow them each daily conveyance allowance of Rs. 5, it works to Rs. 150 per month and for 100 Members it works out to Rs. 15,000 and for three months Rs. 45,000. If Members would club together, they could hire motors in Delhi for three or two of them (Hear, hear), and they can cover that within their conveyance allowances. I only put that for the consideration of the House. Then, there are some Members who live in Delhi and who do not get any conveyance allowance. If a uniform allowance were paid to all Members, whether they reside in Delhi or not, it would be fair to all Members alike. Now, when Members go up to Simla they do not get any rickshaw allowance. Simla is a very expensive place and some of the Members have brought it to our notice that during September when it rains it is not very comfortable for them to come from Longwood Hotel to the Assembly Chamber and go back. So, if we are to provide for that, we must effect economy in other directions, and I must say also, that those gentlemen who bring down their motors do not gain anything by it, because they are out of pocket; in fact they cannot cover their own expenses out of the allowance of Rs. 75 they get. For the upkeep of their motor car they have to spend about Rs. 250 a month; so it is not a gain to them, while the haulage of motor car from distant parts of India costs a good deal of money to the State. If two of them will club together they can hire a motor car for Rs. 500 a month. That is my suggestion; I do not wish to press it before the House; but since we have been trying for economy in every direction I felt that we should draw the attention of the House to this wasteful motor haulage account as well.

There is another point. I do not know if any Legislature of any other country allows allowance to Members for such purposes. . . .

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Do they come two thousand miles?

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: I know that India is a country of distances and I also appreciate the fact that we who are political undesirables, have got a segregation camp at Raisina and we have to come six miles to Delhi and go back six miles; but, all the same, if this conveyance allowance were allowed to all Members, I calculate that an actual expenditure of Rs. 45,000 will cover the expenses under this head. So far as the Members of the Council of State are concerned, those who live in Metcalfe House do not require any conveyance allowance. Further, if Members of the Assembly who live in Delhi do not get any conveyance allowance, there is no reason why Members who live in Metcalfe House should be allowed any conveyance allowance or motor haulage charges or Rs. 75 per month for petrol. I have mentioned that some Members of this House, as well as

of the other House, came up here to attend ceremonials and they have not attended to their duties and they have charged for motor haulage both ways. That I consider is wrong and we should not only criticise the Government for extravagance but we should also criticise ourselves for extravagant expenditure. Members are aware that there is a rule that, if we absent ourselves for 15 days from this Assembly or from the other House, we are not entitled either to travelling allowances or any allowance. So I would suggest—I am not going to press this to a division, but I am only drawing the attention of the House to it—that Members who do not attend the sittings of either this House or of the other for 15 days should forego their motor haulage allowance. That would serve the purpose of ensuring better attendance in both the Houses, and it has been a standing complaint in the other House that Members are very remiss in attending the meetings of that House.

Mr. President: Order, order. The Honourable Member may criticise the Members of this House. The other House will look after itself.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: My apology for alluding to that is, Rs. 40,000 has been put under the votable head on account of allowances. I do not mean anything personal, but I thought it to be my duty to draw the attention of this House to this. When we are out for retrenchment and economy, I should ask the Members to consider this question seriously for themselves. I do not expect an immediate decision, but I hope they will at least refer this matter either to the Finance Committee or to the Retrenchment Committee.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru: Sir, I desire to congratulate my Honourable friend, Mr. Chaudhuri, on this supreme act of self-sacrifice (Hear, hear), and I sincerely hope and trust that the Democratic Party of which he is such a distinguished Member (*A Voice*: 'He is sitting among the Members of the National Party') will warmly endorse his pious wish. So far as the attitude of the Government is concerned, I may frankly say that I prefer to leave this matter entirely in the hands of the House (Hear, hear). The position is that these figures which are before you in this document may have to be supplemented later on when there is a demand for chauffeurs and cleaners of motor cars.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: What about the leakage of tyres?

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru: Well, it is for the House itself to illustrate effectively that economy like charity begins at home.

Dr. H. S. Gour: Sir, my friend in closing his speech said that his sole excuse for bringing forward this motion before the House is economy. He then pointed out that economy would be best served by increasing the daily motor allowances of the Members in Delhi.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: No, no, I did not say that.

Dr. H. S. Gour: He pointed out that there was no reason

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: I did not say that. .

Dr. H. S. Gour: He pointed out that there was no reason why Members who reside in Delhi should be refused a daily motor allowance which was given to those residing in Raisina. But my friend's memory is proverbially short (Laughter). He forgets. He makes a statement one moment and contradicts it the very next (Laughter), and that is characteristic of his entire speech. He told us first that the Finance Committee should apply their super-axe to the motor haulage allowance of piquant Members who came here—let me remind my friend—at great personal inconvenience and spent their time for the purpose of doing homage to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. I am certainly not one of them (Hear, hear). I came here at the commencement of the term and am here upto date so that I can make these remarks with impunity. Those Members of the House who came here in connection with the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales are as much entitled to their haulage allowance as my Honourable friend or myself or any other Member, and I submit, on principle, it would be wrong, it would be egregiously wrong, if a few Members of the Finance Committee were to bring these Members to book and say, 'How many days have you been here; let us look at the attendance roll; oh, you have been here for 6 days only and your travelling allowance cannot be admitted; Oh, you have been here for 8 days, and your travelling allowance is admitted.' Does my friend desire that any Member of this House should be subjected to this abject and humiliating treatment? I submit not.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: I never said that.

Dr. H. S. Gour: That is my friend's denial No. 2. He says that he did not say that, but very presently he will deny every word of his speech.

Then, Sir, he passed on to the next question. He said that the interests of true economy demanded that Honourable Members who go up to Simla and who suffer intolerable inconvenience of having to cover the distance either on foot or in Indian rickshaws from the Longwood Hotel to the Council Chamber should not be denied a fair conveyance allowance, and that, he said, was in the interests of true economy (Laughter). Now, Sir, that is a statement with which I heartily agree.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: No, I never said that.

Dr. H. S. Gour: My Honourable friend ejaculates once more and says that he did not make that statement. Denial No. 3. Then my friend went on to put forward a most absurd and impossible proposition as to why the Members should not club together and hire a motor car. But does my friend forget that Members do not all live together and that they value their time far more than, I presume, my Honourable friend does. You cannot wait for the convenience of four other passengers. It may be that your engagement lies in one direction and the engagements of other Members may be in other directions. How can we all club together? My Honourable friend surely never thought out the real purport of his speech, and what was underlying it I fail to understand. I think, Sir, that this motion deserves to be unanimously rejected.

Munshi Iswar Saran (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhammadan-Urban): Sir, I venture to think that my Honourable friend Mr. Chaudhuri's proposition has not received the consideration which it deserves. (Hear, hear.) Dr. Gour in his usual

Mr. N. M. Samarth : Ponderous style.

Munshi Iswar Saran : Style has tried to make fun of this proposition, but I shall ask the House, if I may, for a moment to consider the serious aspect of it. It is no good our trying to cut this Department by 20 lakhs and that Department by 15 lakhs, but, when it comes to our own allowance, we start advancing all sorts of arguments (Hear, hear). Will the House remember what the Honourable the Law Member said on behalf of Government that charity begins at Home? Quite right he was, and I hope my Honourable friends in this House will bear that in mind while approaching this question. Sir, if I might be forgiven a personal remark, I shall say that last year when

1 P.M. it was moved that the allowance of the Members of this House should be increased, I raised my voice of protest, and to-day I say that this motion should be carried, though I do not accept nor do I agree with the statements and the reasonings which have been advanced by my Honourable friend, Mr. Chaudhuri. What I say to the House is this. Are we going to make a poor exhibition of ourselves? Let it not be said that when the question is about our own allowance, we do not reduce it, but where it is a question of reducing the allowance of these unhappy men (Laughter), we are eager, we are anxious to reduce it. We quote political economy, the procedure of the House of Commons, and the constitutional laws even of Timbuctoo in order to cut down the demands of Government, but as regards the reduction of any allowance of ours, if any one has the temerity to advocate it, we try to howl him down and ridicule him. I beg most earnestly my Honourable friends to carry the motion which has been proposed by my friend.

Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam (Madras ceded districts and Chittor : Non-Muhammadian Rural) : Sir, my friend, Mr. Chaudhuri. is not an accomplished buffoon. He is too serious for this Assembly or any other place. This is his misfortune. If he talks, he talks in the most serious manner so that even a cause which has got a sufficient strength on its own merits sometimes loses its force. His sole point, put in that modest and halting manner, was simply this. Here is a large sum of money which you can save if you cut down this complicated allowance to Members for bringing their own motor cars. These haulage allowances and haulage charges make a large amount. That is in regard to men who bring cars from long distances. Then you have got certain daily allowances, and he says that there is no uniformity, no consistency, in the manner in which those allowances are given. That position may be right or wrong. When we want money for ourselves, we may look at the point from one particular point of view. But there is absolutely no reason whatever for the manner in which Dr. Gour sought to show up Mr. Chaudhuri. Last year the same matter was discussed, but it was based solely on the ground of equality of status between the two Chambers. That was the basis on which the whole of the discussion was carried last year,—not on the ground that the allowances which were originally fixed for the Members of this House were insufficient or that Members of this House desired more—not on any of those grounds of Rs. 45,000. Equality of status was the sole ground on which that motion was put. Mr. Chaudhuri says that the figures may be examined, and if the figures show that it does not amount to much, well, his motion would have done good. But I entirely dissociate myself from that flippant manner in which his remarks have been treated, and I associate myself with my friend, Munshi Iswar Saran, that there is a good deal of

[Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam.]

substance in the motion which has been moved and it has to be examined on its own merits. Rightly the Honourable the Law Member has said that this is a matter for yourselves. It is a matter for yourselves to vote your own money, or money over which you have a certain amount of control, and he very adroitly said that they will have nothing to do with it and that it is none of their business. So the Assembly should proceed to examine now or at a future moment the merits of the proposal that has been brought by Mr. Chaudhuri.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: Sir, I only want to make one point clear. If this motion proceeds to a division, the Members of the Executive Council will not vote ; other officials will be free to vote and speak as they like. I do not propose to speak or vote on the motion myself.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, I have got complete sympathy with the principle of the motion of my Honourable friend, Mr. Chaudhuri, and so I propose to speak in favour of his motion. As regards the practice of it, I feel some difficulty, and, therefore, I must seriously consider whether I should vote in favour of it or not, because I am one of those people who enjoy the most benefit of the haulage in getting free rides throughout the season. But, Sir, while speaking on this motion I wish to emphasise the absurdity of the conveyance allowances rules. Is motor haulage a conveyance allowance or not? If it is a conveyance allowance, it must be given according to the rules of the conveyance allowance. But we find that the conveyance allowance rules do not apply. I shall give an instance. My Honourable friend, Abdul Majid, from Delhi does not get any conveyance allowance, because he does not come from Raisina but comes only from Delhi city. But people living in Metcalfe House who have to come only a few yards to the Council Chamber, get the motor haulage (*A Voice* : 'And the allowance') as well as Rs. 75 a month as an allowance with the railway fare of their chauffeur and cleaner. Sir, this is obviously absurd, and I do not know why, even after the Honourable Member from Delhi had asked for that allowance, that allowance was refused to him. Sir, this only shows the attitude of the Government towards those who do not have influence to give them trouble. Government only go on heaping money upon those who have got money. They give an allowance to those who have motor cars and refuse the allowance to the poor men. Sir, I hope Government will seriously consider this point. It may be a small matter. I believe it is a small matter even from the financial point of view. It does not affect very much the financial position of my Honourable friend from Delhi, but it ought to matter to Government who ought to be equal to all people. On this motion I do not wish to speak any more, but I will also add my desire for some conveyance allowance at Simla in spite of the proposals for economy (*Laughter*) that are being made. Sir, I do not wish to speak any more except to remark that there was some reference made to the equality of status between the other House and this House. May I also remind those Members that there should be equality of status between those Members who cannot afford to keep a motor car and those Members who can keep a motor car?

Sir Godfrey Fell (Army Secretary): Sir, I should just like to be clear upon one point, with reference to what fell from my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi. In his impassioned appeal for equal treatment by Government.

of all classes, made with reference to the sad case of the Honourable Member for Delhi, does he include, in the class of persons who ought to receive a conveyance allowance, those unfortunate individuals who sit upon these Benches? For they receive no conveyance allowance at present.

Mr. N. M. Joshi : I would include them.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru : Sir, there are only one or two remarks which I would like to make at this stage. In the first place, my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, was not right in saying that those who live in Metcalfe House receive any conveyance allowance. That is not the fact. Everybody receives the haulage allowance, but those who live in Raisina also get the conveyance allowance. As regards the inequality of the rule in relation to a particular Member of this House, my attention has been drawn to it by several Members of this House. I have been considering the rule for some little time and I will have to put myself in touch with the Finance Department. I can only promise that I shall go through the rule very carefully and if I can do anything

Mr. N. M. Joshi : Change the rules.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru : . . . to restore equality, to use the words of my friend, Mr. Joshi, I shall be very glad to do so. But it will take some time and I shall have to obtain the consent of the Finance Department.

Mr. N. M. Joshi : Change the rules.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar : Sir, I want to treat this motion with that respect and seriousness which is due to an Honourable colleague of mine belonging to my Party. I strongly oppose the motion made by my Honourable friend, Mr. Chaudhuri, and I am not ashamed to say that I do so for personal reasons also. I have got accustomed to drive in motor cars, unfortunately or fortunately. I make some sacrifice in coming all the way from Madras to Delhi, and I think the success of this Assembly, of a Central Legislature like this, demands that you must be able to induce people to take all this trouble to come to this distance. They have to come here and sit for months together, away from their homes, away from their business. To expect them to live in a style of clubbing together in an ekka or a tonga or even in a motor car is really asking of human nature too much. The attitude taken up by the Government to-day is characteristic of their general attitude in regard to the administration of the country. (Laughter.) I cannot help regretting the way in which I say the matter has assumed importance; otherwise I would not have intervened in this debate. Probably some of us, even with this petty allowance which we get, have to spend a great deal more out of our pockets for a decent living in these far-off lands (Hear, hear).

The conveyance allowance which we get hardly suffices to meet our actual expenses. I know that in my own case, living as I do probably in an antiquated orthodox fashion, I have to indent on people here and there for my food on the way or send in advance the servants to have my food cooked.

Now is it a pleasure to have cars brought here? Sir, last time when I brought my car down here I lost two tyres. (Laughter.) But may I be permitted to mention in this humorous mood that the railway wagons behaved rather in an awkward fashion, and the railway wagons travelling from Madras to Delhi .

[Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

have to change at various junctions. Then the knocking about which my car gets both on the upward and on the downward journey are the Government going to compensate me for all that? Is the country going to compensate me for all that loss? (*Mr. Samarth*: 'Your constituency may'.) It is certainly the constituency that has to pay. If you want us to do work, by all means we are prepared to sacrifice what is unavoidable, but surely to make sacrifice by bringing motor cars at our own cost or depending upon the whims and fancies of the motor drivers in Delhi is asking too much. Now, only the other day I had not my car here. I had taken it to Hardwar and I could not bring it back in time. So I had to rush from the station to the Assembly and I had to pay Rs. 3 for this short distance. Now, do you expect me, for instance, when I have to make my motions here once or twice a day, to be confined in my house? I want to see Delhi, I want to call on my friends for lunch, tea, or dinner, and do you expect me to get on without a car? Is this a serious proposal which my friend, Mr. Chaudhuri is making to the House? Certainly not. I quite see that they have got some grievances. Those who have put forward this motion have, under the guise of this motion, brought forward certain grievances of their own and I do join them in imploring the Government to take serious notice of those grievances. I quite see that it is idle to expect in Simla to go about without a rickshaw. I tried it at the cost of my health. (*Laughter*.) I cannot walk uphill as Honourable Members on the side of Government can. I am not accustomed to Simla. They are born and brought up in Simla, but I was not brought up in Simla. (*Laughter*.) Therefore, I say that if we have got particular grievances, by all means bring them forward. I quite agree that people in Delhi should have some conveyance allowance so as to enable them to attend the meetings, and I fail to see the reason of the rule which prohibits it. I do think that this motion deserves better treatment at the hands of Government than it has met with. I say it should be treated more seriously and I therefore ask the House, apart from the humorous aspect of it, to treat the motion seriously and reject it.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : I move that the question be now put.

Mr. President : The question is :

'That the provision for conveyance allowance of Members of the Legislative Assembly and Council of State be reduced by Rs. 43,000 and Rs. 32,500, respectively.'

The Assembly then divided as follows :

AYES - 31.

Abdul Majid, Shaikh.
Abdul Quadir, Maulvi.
Ayyar, Mr. T. V. Seshagiri.
Bagde, Mr. K. G.
Bajpai, Mr. S. P.
Bhargava, Pandit J. L.
Bryant, Mr. J. F.
Chaudhuri, Mr. J.
Cotelingham, Mr. J. P.
Dalal, Sardar B. A.
Das, Babu B. S.
Dentith, Mr. A. W.
Faridoonji, Mr. R.
Iswar Saran, Munshi.
Jamnadas Dwardkadas, Mr.
Jatkar, Mr. B. H. R.

Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Kabraji, Mr. J. K. N.
Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.
McCarthy, Mr. F.
Nag, Mr. G. C.
Percival, Mr. P. E.
Ramayya Pantulu, Mr. J.
Renouf, Mr. W. C.
Rhodes, Mr. C. W.
Samarth, Mr. N. M.
Singh, Babu B. P.
Spence, Mr. R. A.
Subrahmanayam, Mr. C. S.
Way, Mr. T. A. H.
Zahiruddin Ahmed, Mr.

NOES—36.

Abdul Rahim Khan, Mr.
 Ahmed, Mr. K.
 Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
 Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.
 Asjad-ul-lah, Maulvi Miyan.
 Ayyangar, Mr. M. G. M.
 Barodawala, Mr. S. K.
 Bijlikhan, Sardar G.
 Bradley-Birt, Mr. F. B.
 Clarke, Mr. G. R.
 Crookshank, Sir Sydney.
 Gajjan Singh, Sardar Bahadur.
 Ginwala, Mr. P. P.
 Gour, Dr. H. S.
 Gulab Singh, Sardar.
 Habibullah, Mr. Muhammad.
 Hussanally, Mr. W. M.
 Ibrahim Ali Khan, Lieutenant Nawab M.

Jejeebhoy, Sir Jamsetjee.
 Latthe, Mr. A. B.
 Mitter, Mr. K. N.
 Mukherjee, Mr. J. N.
 Mukherjee, Mr. T. P.
 Nabi Hadi, Mr. S. M.
 Pyari Lal, Mr.
 Rangachariar, Mr. T.
 Rao, Mr. C. Krishnaswami.
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Mr.
 Sarvadhikary, Sir Deva Prasad.
 Shahani, Mr. S. C.
 Sharp, Mr. H.
 Sohan Lal, Bakshi.
 Srinivasa Rao, Mr. P. V.
 Subzposh, Mr. S. M. Z. A.
 Webb, Sir M. dePomeroy.
 Yamin Khan, Mr. M.

The motion was negatived.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Twenty-Five Minutes Past Two of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Twenty-Five Minutes Past Two of the Clock. Mr. President was in the Chair.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: With reference to what happened this morning, Sir, we have been considering during the lunch interval whether you will allow a discussion on the General Administration, at least under Motions 187 and 188. This information we want in order to guide ourselves in our conduct in respect of these motions. I also wish to inform you, Sir, that under the head 'Army Department' there is a motion of Mr. Ginwala No. 174 to reduce the demand by a nominal sum. We want to raise the question of military expenditure under that head and I wish to know whether you will be pleased to allow us to do so.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member has not given me notice that he desired to raise this point. I shall give him an answer later. Meanwhile, there are other motions on the paper and they should first be taken into consideration.

Dr. Nand Lal: Sir, I rise to move the following motion.

Pay of officers, Foreign and Political Department. 'That the provision of Rs. 3,18,890 for pay of officers under sub-head 'Foreign and Political Department' be reduced by Rs. 2,00,000.'

Sir, you will be pleased to see Demand No. 13, General Administration, under sub-head 'Foreign and Political Department' and then you will kindly turn to page 35 where it is given 'Foreign and Political Department—pay of officers.' The item which I am bringing within the purview of the debate is given in the last column and amounts to Rs. 3,18,890. Now, Sir, if my information is correct that the Ruling Chiefs in India are directly connected with the Imperial Government, then the official Members will also

Mr. R. A. Spence: Sir, I rise to a point of order. The Honourable Member is moving his motion to reduce 2 lakhs from the sum of Rs. 3,18,890. But the votable items only come to Rs. 1,27,850.

Dr. Nand Lal: My learned friend, I am sorry, had not sufficient time to total them up and I say this with due deference to him. In the first place, it is nowhere given what part of this demand, which is alluded to by my humble self, contains non-votable item.

Mr. R. A. Spence: Please see page 35. The items in *italics* are non-votable.

Dr. Nand Lal: That is the pay of establishment. I am referring to the pay of officers.

Mr. R. A. Spence: So am I.

Dr. Nand Lal: I believe, Sir, you have ascertained whether the submission which has already been made by me is correct or otherwise. According to my way of calculation it is correct, but according to the way in which my learned friend, Mr. Spence, has calculated it, it is not correct. However, resuming my argument, I submit, if the information which I have is correct, why should India incur expenses for that connection which is not, as I hear, direct? Therefore, the whole of this money, which has been asked, should not be allowed. In any case, the amount, which I have proposed to be deducted, may be deducted. This House knows full well that there is a great financial embarrassment. This is not an occasion for the Government of India to think of its grandeur or to think of advertising that the Foreign and the Political Department spends so much. It is the time when economic principles should be observed very seriously. With these few remarks I submit this question before the House and trust that they will give it full consideration and their acceptance. And so far as the official Members are concerned, I am sure they will accede to certain points so far as this reduction is concerned. I am not referring to the details because I do not think it is proper for me to go into them. It is a question of a specific reduction and, therefore, I have simply alluded to that particular point alone.

Mr. President: Before I put the question, I may say that the point raised by the Honourable Member from Bombay (Mr. Spence) appears to me to be well taken. The amount under the item 'Pay of Officers, Foreign and Political Department,' which can be reduced by this House is less than two lakhs of rupees. The Honourable Member would, therefore, have to move for a reduction of less than two lakhs.

Dr. H. S. Gour: In that case may I be permitted to move my motion which is in order?

Mr. President: There are several reductions that take priority over Dr. Gour's motion, because they refer to particular items. He refers to the whole vote. I understand that the item referred to by the Honourable Member behind him (Dr. Nand Lal) refers to the pay of the officers in the Department.

Four motions for reduction in particular items under the sub-head 'Foreign and Political Department' were not moved.

Dr. H. S. Gour : Sir, the proposition which I wish to place before the House is :

General reduction.

‘That the demand under sub-head ‘Foreign and Political Department’ be reduced by 1 lakh.’

Honourable Members will see that the Foreign and Political Department administration costs Rs. 10,42,000. Now, this Foreign and Political Department is a combined Department, and yet Honourable Members will find from the latest Quarterly Civil List of the Foreign and Political Department and also from the details given at page 35 that there are two Secretaries, two Deputy Secretaries, one Under Secretary, one Assistant Secretary and a very large number of other officers and Attachés in this Department. Over and above that, the Foreign and Political Department of the Government of India absorbs something like 193 pages of this Quarterly Civil List.

Now, Sir, the first point I wish to make in this connection is the large number of officers under these two Departments, and I venture to submit that these two Departments have grown in strength and volume with the progress of years, and it lies on those who are responsible to reply on behalf of the Government to show what justification there is for this huge and costly establishment.

My second submission is that, going through this long list of officers and employees of the Foreign and Political Department, I find, and lament to find, that the whole *personnel* is non-Indian. With one or two exceptions the persons employed in these two Departments are persons other than Indians.

My third point is as regards pay. I wish to know, Sir, whether these ceremonial officers of the Foreign and Political Department, who ornament these two services, are not officers whose pay might be reduced.

Lastly, Sir, I come to a topic which will save the country not lakhs of rupees but something in the neighbourhood of a crore and a half to two crores of rupees. That is an item with reference to the administration of the North-West Frontier Province.

Honourable Members will remember that last year my esteemed friend, Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, moved a Resolution in this House for the judicial amalgamation of the North-West Frontier Province with the Province of the Punjab. That Resolution was opposed on behalf of the Government but was eventually carried by the vote of this House. I wish to know what action has been taken in response to the strongly expressed desire of this House, as embodied in that Resolution. Now Sir, Honourable Members will remember that the North-West Frontier Province costs this country an ever increasing sum of money. Will the Honourable Members be surprised to hear that in this year there is a deficit of nearly 2 crore of rupees? If the Honourable Members will turn

Mr. Denys Bray (Foreign Secretary): I rise to a point of order. Is the Honourable Member in order in discussing the North-West Frontier Province under the head of Foreign and Political Department? It is a separate Demand in itself.

Mr. President : Looking at the character of the Demand No. 46, clearly that is the occasion to raise the question of the North-West Frontier Province.

Dr. H. S. Gour : Might I point out, Sir, that I thought over that question very closely. The House will find that all this North-West and the other Frontier Provinces are distributed over several heads of account (*vide* Demand 46, column 3 of the Demand Book), and here we find in the Foreign and Political Department, pages 148 onwards, the North-West Frontier expenditure table. The result is that the vote on the North-West Frontier Province is not only covered by item No. 46 but also by the item under discussion and, therefore, I am entitled to raise that question here.

Mr. President : It will be more appropriate to raise it under the North-West Frontier Province, where there is a direct vote for the administration of that province. (*Cries of 'Withdraw, withdraw.'*)

Dr. H. S. Gour : Very well, Sir, I shall raise this question there—when Demand No. 46 comes up for the vote of the House. (*Mr. N. M. Samarth :* 'If it does at all'.) My friend, Mr. Samarth, is perfectly right in saying that perhaps long ere that the guillotine will be applied and I shall be deprived of the right of addressing this House (*A Voice :* 'Whose fault') on a motion which would economise to the extent of two crores of rupees (*Mr. R. A. Spence :* 'Retrench in speech-making') in the full expenditure of this House. I therefore submit that, though not directly, I am entitled to address the House on the subject of the North-West Frontier Province in connection with this motion, because the House will observe that all the charges for the Secretaries in the

Mr. Darcy Lindsay (Bengal: European) : I rise to a point of order. Is the Honourable Member in order in referring to Secretaries? I thought they were non-votable subjects. The items are all in italics.

Dr. H. S. Gour : But the hill journey allowances are not in italics.

Mr. President : I must remind the Honourable Member of what I said just now. The substantive issue must be raised under Demand No. 46 and it is in the Member's own hands to decide how much time is to be spent on each item. (*Cries of 'Withdraw, withdraw.'*)

Well, Sir, before we pass on, I simply wish to mention in this connection incidentally, here we find that a very large sum of money is to be spent on temporary establishments. Assistant Secretary Rs. 12,000, a new post.

Mr. R. A. Spence : Never mind.

Mr. N. M. Samarth : Leave that to the Retrenchment Committee.

An Honourable Member : It is non-votable.

Dr. H. S. Gour : I suggest, Sir, that, so far as the Foreign and Political Department of the Government of India are concerned, it requires retrenchment and drastic retrenchment. I may not be in order in dealing with the specific points upon which the Government of India must address itself, but I make bold to say that this House will press for a reduction of the vote on the ground that the Foreign and Political Department of the Government of India needs drastic and immediate retrenchment. I, therefore, Sir, move my motion.

Mr. President: The question is :

'That the demand under sub-head 'Foreign and Political Department' be reduced by 1 lakh.'

Dr. H. S. Gour: It is only 10 per cent. . . .

Mr. Denys Bray: I really feel, Sir, at a great disadvantage. The Honourable Dr. Gour has spoken in very emphatic terms and made a most emphatic demand for reduction. But, as far as I was able to follow the Honourable Member, he gave me no arguments to refute. He made general charges only—charges that this inflated Department is spending enormous sums. I rather expected the Honourable Member to justify these charges by drawing a picture of the enormities of what he calls a 'combined Department'. And what I want to impress upon the House is this: we may be combined for purposes of economy, but in reality we are not one, but two. There are two distinct Departments grouped under this head. There is the Political Department with its Political Secretary and his Deputy, dealing, as its primary function, with the Government of India's relations with the Indian Chiefs. There is the Foreign Department, with its Foreign Secretary and his Deputy, dealing with India's relations with Foreign Powers. Now, if I understood my Honourable friend, Dr. Nand Lal, aright in that oration of his which was cut unexpectedly short, he seemed to attempt to prove this proposition—that, as the Indian States were now in direct relations with the Government of India, those Indian States should have the privilege of paying the expenditure incurred over it. A curious argument, Sir. Still more curious will it appear when you turn from the Indian States to the Foreign Powers. Does the Honourable Member really think that Afghanistan, Tibet, Persia and the rest are going to pay us for the privilege of having direct relations with us?

Now Dr. Gour spoke, and spoke truly, of the expansion of this Department. With the progress of time, it has of course expanded. Does Dr. Gour think that India is the only country that has been developing? Does he think that those countries on our borders have stood still all these years? Or does he think that within India British India only has advanced, has developed, has an evolution before it? Take the Reforms, and the implications of the Reforms. Let the Honourable Member read Chapter X of the Reforms Report. Let him think for a moment of the extra work which is placed upon the Political Department in connection with the Reforms, in connection with the gradual evolution of the Indian States in connection with the Reforms. Let him remember the Chamber of Princes, of which the Political Secretary is also the Secretary. Let him consider the work thrown upon the Departments in the preparation of the Agenda, involving as it must do careful analysis of the pros and cons and of those past precedents, more dear to the political side of the Department than the side that I myself more immediately represent. Let him remember also how the Indian Chiefs are now coming more and more into direct relations with the Government of India. Take the Punjab States, for instance. They are now directly under the Government of India. In regard to the Madras Chiefs, the transfer is approaching completion. As regards Bombay, the matter, I understand, is still under somewhat lively debate. And let him think also of the change that has been brought about by the transfer of the Capital of India to Delhi. As far as the Chiefs are concerned, Delhi is the political centre of India. Its greater accessibility has meant a great

[Mr. Denys Bray.]

increase of work on the political side. Chiefs, who used in the olden days of Calcutta to come in their ones and twos, now come to Delhi in their battalions. This alone involves an increase in the volume of work.

So far I have spoken of the work on the political side—that side of the Department of which I myself have no personal knowledge. Herein I am the spokesman merely of the Political Secretary, with whom the Foreign Secretary has far fewer dealings, far fewer points of contact, than with any of my colleagues here present. On the Foreign side, I propose to say very little. I have already pointed out the fact staring you in the face, that India cannot advance without paying the bill. She is for instance a member of the League of Nations. Does the Honourable Member really think that India is going to have the honour and glory and advantages of belonging to the League of Nations without having to pay any of the expenses connected therewith, or doing any of the work thereby thrown upon her?

Mr. N. M. Samarth : What about the rights of the Indian Member of the League?

Mr. Denys Bray : I stand up for those rights. Your Foreign Secretary always will. The Honourable Member recited the vast number of officers we have got. Now, I put it to the House : on the political side we have one Political Secretary and one Deputy Secretary ; on the Foreign side we have one Foreign Secretary and one Deputy Secretary. But for the purposes of economy these two Departments, though essentially distinct in their functions, are housed together, share the services of certain junior officers of whom there are two, one Under Secretary and one Assistant Secretary, and share also the general office establishment.

I will not recite the various duties which the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretary perform ; I will simply point out that the term Assistant Secretary is a term long used in our Department, and denotes in our Department something quite different from an Assistant Secretary under the reformed office procedure. But this Department, or rather these two Departments have one other thing in common. Secretaries of other Departments have their Honourable Member here to whom they can turn whenever necessary. We have not. Our Honourable Member is His Excellency the Viceroy. A very great privilege this, a very stimulating privilege, but clearly one which imposes an extra burden on the Foreign and Political Secretaries. For we cannot turn to our Honourable Member at any hour of the day on each and any case. Untiring though he is, even His Excellency cannot cram more than 24 hours into the day's work. It is therefore incumbent upon us to refer to our Honourable Member on matters of major and urgent importance only. This alone, I suggest, is one very obvious explanation, one cogent explanation of the growth of these two Departments. For the days when Lord Curzon was not only Foreign Member but also, if I may judge by the files and notes he has placed on record, his own Foreign Secretary,—those days are gone. With the increasing burden on His Excellency the Viceroy, the burden on the Department which I have the honour to represent has increased out of all knowledge.

But before I sit down, I want to say just one word about the office establishment which has been called into criticism. I am very proud to have worked with that office establishment. It is doing work which in England would be

performed by comparatively highly paid clerks in many cases by clerks in the first division. That work has been performed by them in a way which commands my admiration and the admiration of every officer who has served in our Department. Their sense of public duty is beyond all praise of mine. Upon them devolves work always hard and very often of the greatest secrecy. They have always done that work without complaint and they have never belied the trust that has been reposed upon them.

Munshi Iswar Saran: Sir, I had expected that my Honourable friend, Mr. Bray, would give some explanation in regard to a point distinctly made by my Honourable friend, Dr. Gour. Dr. Gour pointedly asked as regards the Indianisation of the Foreign and Political Service. I am surprised that my Honourable friend, Mr. Bray, made no reference to it and I think he was right

Mr. Denys Bray: May I do it now?

Munshi Iswar Saran: May I do it on your behalf? If my Honourable friend, Mr. Bray, will trust me, I will give an answer so far as it can be gathered from official records. The situation stands thus. It was last year that a notice was given for the moving of a Resolution in regard to the Indianisation of the Foreign and Political Services. That Resolution was disallowed by the President as well as by His Excellency the Governor General in Council. Then an opportunity was taken in the Budget debate last year to raise this question and a statement was made by the then representative of the Foreign and Political Department. I shall not quote the words. I hope most of my Honourable friends here remember it; we were told that a scheme was being prepared and that scheme would satisfy the aspirations of India. After that my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, put a question in the Simla Session and the Honourable the Home Member then said that a scheme was being prepared. Now, we find that on the 2nd of September, 1921, a communiqué was issued by the Government of India in which this much-expected scheme was announced. What do we find in that communiqué? If I may say so without any disrespect, it opens beautifully, and, if my tribute of admiration for the officer who drafted it is worth anything, I shall certainly pay it. Mark the way in which it opens:

‘With the approval of His Majesty’s Secretary of State for India it has been decided to introduce a substantial Indian element into the Foreign and Political Department of the Government of India.’

When I read these words, I thought our woes were at an end. But when I had finished reading this communiqué, the hope created by the opening words entirely vanished. You get a lot of information as to how the recruitment is to be made; but most significantly there is no announcement, there is no indication as to how many Indians would be taken into these departments year after year. At the tail end of this communiqué we have been told that four Indians have been taken this year. Now, Sir, we are very grateful; I suppose the Government expects us to be grateful; so personally I shall be intensely and profoundly grateful for the appointment of these four Indians in the Foreign and Political Department. (Hear, hear.) But there is one question which I wish to ask. What about the announcement or statement made by the representative of the Foreign and Political Department last year during the Budget debate? I ask them to produce this scheme.

[Munshi Iswar Saran.]

Where is the scheme which would satisfy the aspirations of Indians? Where is the scheme, I repeat? Do we know, as a matter of definite information, how many Indians would be taken into this Department year after year? I say, Sir, and I say deliberately, that the Government of India have not treated us well in not making any definite announcement on this question about which most of us feel very keenly. How do matters stand, Sir? There are 140 officers sanctioned for the Foreign and Political Department; about 34 of them are military officers; and the rest are members of the Civil Service. I do say that, if the Government of India have not given us the number in their communiqué of the 2nd September, 1921, let them give it now. Let them tell us here and now; let my Honourable friend, Mr. Bray, tell us now how many Indians are going to be taken into the Foreign and Political services year after year. If Government imagines that the sort of scheme that they have framed will satisfy us, then they are grievously mistaken. If they really imagine so, then let me express my amazement at the simplicity of the Government of India. They know very well that what we want to know is the number of Indians that will be taken into these services every year and on this point, as I have already stated, the communiqué is utterly silent.

There is only one other remark that I wish to make. My Honourable friend, Mr. Bray, has given us an exhaustive list of all the causes that have led to an increase of the expenditure and the staff of the Foreign and Political services. My only surprise is that he did not drag in the great war and the rise of prices. The rest he has mentioned. Delhi has been made the capital, and what he has said is that large battalions of Indian Princes come here and perhaps upset their work. Otherwise, I fail to see what connection there is between the visit of this battalion of Princes and the enormous increase in expenditure and in the staff. Be that as it may, just at present, my grievance is that this Department has been and is even now practically closed to Indians. (Hear, hear.)

One word more, Sir, and I have done. We have been told in very high places that these Honourable Members are our trustees. I shall only beg our trustees to consider whether they should manage the trust property in a way that the beneficiaries are perpetually kept out of many of the benefits arising therefrom. (Laughter.) It is a peculiar trust; it is a trust, Sir, which in a court of law would not take two minutes to get upset. But I suppose if we attack this theory of trust, we are considered to be unreasonable and are perhaps regarded as extremists. But may I say that it was a distinguished Englishman who, about two years ago, exploded this theory of trust? But I shall accept this theory of trust, and, as a perpetual beneficiary, I appeal to my trustees to so manage the trust that some of the beneficiaries might be able to get some employment in this Department which exists for the good of the beneficiaries.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: Sir, I do not wish to press my motion:

'That the provision of Rs. 58,100 for three Solicitors under the sub-head 'Legislative Three Solicitors Legis- Department' be reduced by Rs. 20,000.'
lative Department.

I only wish to draw the attention of the Honourable the Law Member to the fact that formerly there was one Solicitor employed, and now in his

place there are three Solicitors. I don't want to press it, but I want the Honourable the Law Member in the interests of economy to look into the matter and curtail the expenditure under this head.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru : Sir, there is only one statement that I should like to make with regard to this branch of my Department. I am afraid that my Honourable friend, Mr. Chaudhuri, is under a great misapprehension when he says that formerly there was only one Solicitor employed. The fact of the matter is that there was a firm of Solicitors in Calcutta which used to do the work of the Government of India, and they used to send a representative during the Delhi Session and a representative during the Simla Session, and we used to pay them a considerable sum of money. If my Honourable friend wants the figures, I am prepared with the figures also.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri : I want economy.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru : Then, in accordance with the Report of the Crown Law Officers' Committee, we decided to appoint separate Solicitors. Now we have engaged the services of Colonel Dunlop, a leading Solicitor of Bombay, and also of another Solicitor. The other Solicitor is a man with English training, and now we have got a third Indian Solicitor. I am afraid my Honourable friend does not know—I have gone through the figures—that the number of cases which are usually referred to this Branch is very much larger now than it used to be before, our biggest clients being either the Army Department or the Department which deals with stores and supplies. Now, one of the Solicitors has gone on leave, so that the work of the branch is being carried on now by two Solicitors only. I am not prepared to say nor do I see that there is not enough work for all the three. But I am prepared to say that, so far as the amount of work is concerned, it has considerably increased, and in addition to the actual number of files that are referred to them, there is a considerable amount of opinion work which they have got to go through across the table. A number of people connected with various Departments come to them and take their opinion at the table. Then there is a certain amount of work of which no record is kept, because it is of a confidential character, and I am excluding it from the ordinary routine work. These are the facts with regard to this Branch.

I will only add one thing more. I am sure that a distinguished Member of this House, who belongs to that branch of the profession, will bear me out that it is impossible to get Solicitors at very much cheaper rates.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri : I may mention that the Calcutta Corporation employs a Solicitor who does all the work for the Corporation and yet he is paid only Rs. 1,500. I would only ask that, when the present member is going on leave, and if it is possible to manage the business with two members, the Honourable the Law Member will consider the question whether the establishment may not be reduced.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru : I make no such promise. I am speaking very frankly. I hope it will be conceded even by Mr. Chaudhuri that the Government of India is at least bigger than the Calcutta Corporation.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri : Not in the matter of claims and counter claims, other disputes and law-suits. But I would not press my motion, Sir. I leave it to the Law Member and the Retrenchment Committee.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : Sir, I shall only take up two minutes. I want to know why in this Department there is no more Indianisation than there appears to be. This is not a

Department in which the Government of India can say that they cannot find competent Indians to employ, nor is it a Department in which there is any bar under the third Schedule to the Government of India Act to which reference was made this morning by my Honourable friend, the Law Member, opposite. That Schedule says that, if one of the appointments is held by a member of the Indian Civil Service, the other appointments need not be held by members of that Service. In this case, if a Deputy Secretary was a member of the Indian Civil Service, then all the other appointments can be held by Indians. I should like to know why no attempt has been made to organise the Department on that basis.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru : Sir, the only reply that I have got with regard to this matter is this.

Mr. President : Order, order. Does the Honourable Member move a reduction?

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : Yes, Sir.

Mr. President : The question is:

'That the votable portion of the demand for Rs. 8,07,900 under sub-head 'Legislative Department' be reduced by Rs. 100.'

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru : What I will remind my Honourable friend opposite is that it is not correct to say that there are no Indians in the Department which I have the honour to preside over. There is one Deputy Secretary who is a member of the Bar and there is an Indian Solicitor in the Solicitor's branch, with regard to whom, my friend, Mr. Chaudhuri, is anxious that there should be reduction.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri : I have not spoken against any particular person. I am for the wholesale Indianisation of this Department as there is no dearth of able and qualified lawyers in India.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru : As a matter of fact, there is no statutory bar to Indians being appointed in my Department. But it will be remembered that Indians can only be appointed when there are vacancies.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : Make vacancies.

The Honourable Dr. T. B. Sapru : I refuse to be a party to anything of the kind. I refuse to create vacancies when the creation of such vacancies will be an act of injustice to the officers who are serving under me and no officers of Government have done better or rendered more loyal service than those who are associated with me.

(A Voice: 'Promote them'.)

The motion was negatived.

Dr. Nand Lal : Sir, in the interests of the motion which is going to be moved on behalf of the Democratic Party, I withdraw.
Pay of officers, Education Department. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: Sir, I would only draw attention to the Education Department where there is a much larger scope for retrenchment than is indicated in my motion. That is the object of my motion. I reserve my remarks when I speak on the general demand.

One Registrar and three Superintendents, Education Department.

Temporary establishment, Education Department.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: Education is a transferred subject, and the duties . . .

Mr. W. M. Hussanally: The Honourable Member must move his motion before he speaks on it.

Mr. President: I will point out to the Honourable Member from Karachi that there is this question before the House already.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: I move, Sir :

‘That the provision of Rs. 1,500 for Temporary Establishment under the sub-head ‘Education Department’ be reduced by Rs. 500.’

I only move it, Sir, for raising a debate and offering my suggestions with regard to the Department. This Education Department, and indeed the bulk of its work, has been transferred to the provinces. Formerly the Education Department used to have Local Self-Government, the Universities, primary education and secondary education under it. Now, the whole of that has been decentralised. Still, we have the Education Department and the Educational Commissioner’s Department. My suggestion is that, now that they have been relieved of a great deal of work, they might be amalgamated and considerable retrenchment might be made with regard to these Departments. In saying so, I express my appreciation of the services that have been done during the transitional period by Mr. Sharp. A great deal of work has been done by him in connection with the University Commission and during the period of transition owing to the introduction of reforms. But I would suggest that it is time for retrenchment and that a great deal of retrenchment can be effected in these two Departments by amalgamating the two Departments. In that way, the Departments may be run under one Secretary. I also wish to mention another fact. I have seen that a member of the Indian Civil Service has been gazetted to succeed Mr. Sharp in the Department. I do not object simply because he is a member of the Civil Service, within the ranks of which many men of high educational qualification may be found, but I think it is not fair to the Members of the Educational Service. I only draw attention to these, and I would leave the curtailment of expenditure with regard to these two Departments to the Retrenchment Committee. But I invite the attention and co-operation of both the Finance Minister and the Education Member with regard to my motion.

The Honourable Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi (Education Member) : Sir, apparently, even what in democratic language are called ‘the nation-building Departments’ are not to escape the pruning knife of the Democratic Party.

Mr. N. M. Samarth: Perhaps also of the National Party.

The Honourable Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi: I only wish that my Honourable and learned friend, Mr. Chaudhuri, had first ascertained for himself what actually the Department which he was pleased to call the Education .

[Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi.]

Department does consist of. In the first place, perhaps, he is not aware that the Department of Education, as it was called before last year, is now the Department of Education and Public Health. In addition to the various branches denoted by Public Health and Education, it deals with a large number of subjects, which, in spite of the introduction of the Reforms Scheme, are still central subjects. The House will permit me to mention that our Department deals with the following central subjects :

Port Quarantine, Marine Hospitals, Copyright, Central agencies and institutions for research, Ecclesiastical Department, Archæological Department, Zoological Survey, Census All-India Services, Bacteriological Services, foreign pilgrims, central Universities—formerly there was only one and now there are three—Imperial Library, Imperial Museum, Records and Imperial War Museum.

It is quite true that the following subjects with which we deal are transferred subjects, namely, Local Self-Government, Public Health and Education. But my Honourable friend perhaps is not aware that, even before the introduction of the Reforms Scheme, these three subjects were provincial subjects. (*Mr. N. M. Samarth*: 'But not transferred subjects.') May be. That only means that they were formerly controlled by the Executive Government, and are now controlled by the Ministers. That, to a certain extent, and not a very large extent, believe me, has made slight difference in the amount of work which comes up here in regard to these three subjects. But you must remember that while there has been some diminution of work in so far as these three subjects are concerned, there has from the 1st April last year been transferred to this Department the Civil Medical Administration which before that date was under the charge of the Home Department, so that, after the introduction of the Reforms Scheme the subject of Civil Medical Administration has been added to this Department. With what result? Let me give the House a few figures and you will then see whether any difference at all has been made, so far as the actual amount of work is concerned between what we used to have to deal with before the introduction of the Reforms Scheme and subsequent to its introduction. In the year 1920, the receipts in this Department amounted to 12,042. In the year 1921, the year after 12,146. The issues in 1920 amounted to 8,919 and in 1921, to 9,380. (*Mr. N. M. Joshi*: 'What are these figures about?') I am giving the figures relating to the work which we have had to deal with during the year 1920, taking the year previous to the introduction of the Reforms Scheme, and the year 1921, taking the year after the introduction of the Reforms Scheme, in order to show to you that the work with which we have now to deal since the introduction of the Reforms Scheme and the addition of the Civil Medical Administration to this Department is more than the work which we had to deal with prior to the introduction of the Reforms Scheme. (*Mr. Rangachariar*: 'How many of these are 'I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter and to state that it will receive due consideration?') It should further be remembered that during the last year we have dealt with the Civil Medical Administration only for nine months, for that branch was transferred to us from the 1st April. The House will, therefore, be in a position to judge whether, during the current year, when we shall have to deal with that branch of the work for full twelve months the work will not be still higher than it was during the last year. Apart from this, I would ask the House further to remember that, even with

regard to the three subjects which, under the Reforms Scheme, have become transferred subjects, there are provinces other than the Governors' Provinces whose work is still under the direct control of the Government of India even in those three Departments.

Now, to deal with all this work we have in my Department only one Secretary, one Deputy Secretary, and one Assistant Secretary. So far as the Secretariat goes, therefore, you will see that this Department is perhaps the most economically worked Department in the Government of India (Laughter and Hear, hear), and from my past experience of two years and eight months I can assure the House that, but for the fact that my Honourable friend, Mr. Sharp, the Secretary in this Department, is a confirmed bachelor and therefore devotes the whole of his time to the work of this Department (Hear, hear, and Laughter), it would perhaps have been difficult for these three officers only to deal with the volume of work which flows to this Department. I may mention that of these three officers of the Secretariat two are Indians, namely, the Deputy Secretary and the Assistant Secretary. (*Mr. Rangachariar* : ' It does not matter who they are.) I am perfectly sure that the Democratic Party would not like to turn out any of these Indian officers. (*Mr. Rangachariar* : ' If they are superfluous'.)

My Honourable friend, Mr. Chaudhuri, mentioned the fact that Mr. Sharp's successor was to be a member of the Indian Civil Service. It is quite true that the officer who has been selected to succeed him is a member of the Indian Civil Service, but I can assure the House that he has not been selected because he is a member of the Indian Civil Service. In my judgment, and I say it in all seriousness, in order to make the Reforms Scheme a success, it is essential that as Secretaries to the Government of India officers should be appointed who are in entire sympathy not only with the letter but also with the spirit of the Reforms. I may assure the House that the officer who has been so selected to succeed Mr. Sharp is, to my personal knowledge, imbued with that very spirit. In the second place, let me mention this fact that he may not be a member of the Educational Service, but he is an educationist in the best sense of the term. He is a distinguished graduate of the Cambridge University and for his brilliant career at the University he was selected Fellow of his College. He has for a long number of years been an active worker in the affairs of the Punjab University. After the passing of Lord Curzon's Act a Committee was appointed in the Punjab to revise the rules and regulations of the Punjab University and he was a member of that Committee.

Recently a Committee was appointed in the Punjab to consider the bearing of the Sadler Commission's Report on the state of things in the Punjab and to devise schemes of reforms in connection with that University. He, I believe, is Chairman of that Committee. I believe the majority of the Members of the Democratic Party are well acquainted with the spirit in which the affairs of the Education Department are administered; and I can assure them that the selection has been made not for the reason that the officer happens to be a member of the Indian Civil Service that undoubtedly he happens to be—but for other reasons.

Mr. P. L. Misra (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions : Non-Muhammádan) : Could you not find a Member of the Indian Educational Service for this post ?

[Mr. J. Chaudhuri]

to him at present but when I come to deal with that Department I shall offer suggestions to relieve his Department of a great deal of work because the bulk of the function of the Medical Department are now provincialised. So I do not say anything more in this connection but wish to confine myself to this motion. I raise this point for the purposes of debate and I press the view that these two Departments should be amalgamated and retrenchment effected in these two Departments by amalgamation and reorganisation and not for mere nominal reduction.

Mr. S. C. Shahani : Sir, in this connection I should like to know what the duties of the Educational Commissioner are? I understand that .

Mr. President : This item refers to the temporary establishment and not the Educational Commissioner.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. B. S. Kamat : Sir, I beg to move :

Revenue and Agriculture Department. 'That all votable items under sub-head 'Revenue and Agriculture Department' be omitted.'

With reference to this motion, Sir, the object which I have in view is to elicit an expression of the opinion from Government whether, in view of the fact that now we have in the provinces an Agriculture Department well-equipped, it is necessary also to have a duplication of certain officers in the Imperial staff.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma (Revenue and Agriculture Member) : Sir, I am glad I have been given this opportunity of explaining the working of this Department, its ideals and the scope of its activities in the near future with a view to dissipate the impression that, now that the Reforms Scheme has been introduced, considerable retrenchment in the activities of this Department, which is being carried on practically with the same staff, as before the war can be effected. The question that has been pointedly put is whether, in respect of agriculture proper, it is necessary to have at Pusa a staff which may be said to be a re-duplication of the staff which is existing in the provinces. I would point out that the object of the staff at Pusa is somewhat different from the objects for which the staffs in the various provinces have been recruited. It has been realised for a very long time that, inasmuch as agricultural improvement and agricultural research are mutually interdependent upon, the Government of India should make itself responsible for carrying on research on a scale which may not be attempted and which cannot possibly be attempted in the provinces, and coupled with that object there has always been the idea to impart in agriculture the highest education that is possible anywhere and that is a task which, it has been urged for a long time, can properly be undertaken by the Government of India. Of course, in course of time, it may be found that the provinces and the Provincial Governments are desirous of undertaking this whole burden and of relieving the Central Government of their functions. I think, when such a time comes, the Central Government will have no objection whatsoever to retire from the position which they feel they have to occupy at the present

moment. But I would suggest that, inasmuch as the question of food production is one of the most vital problems that we have to tackle, I do not think any money should be grudged upon the development of the activities of a Department upon which the future resources of the country would be so largely dependent. It is with the object of improving the agricultural resources that at Pusa a Research Institute has been established, which has been able to achieve some remarkable results in the way of research proper. But I may add that we hope very shortly to institute a course of training in higher agricultural education in Pusa. We hope, if possible, to undertake it partly this year, so that it may not be necessary to send all our youth abroad for the purpose of training in higher education in agriculture. It is necessary that we should have an efficient staff not only of research workers but of assistants also to enable them to undertake the dual duties of research and educational work. It is partly with this object that the staff is being recruited and the buildings are being constructed, and I hope that this House will not stand in the way of the development of this Department.

Then, with regard to the Department as a whole, because this motion seems to contemplate a very wide scope, I may be permitted to state in a few words that the Revenue and the Public Works Departments, have, with a view to all possible economies being effected in the work of all the Departments of the Government of India, had added to their work business which has been transferred from the Commerce Department. The Revenue Branch deals now with the whole subject of Indian Emigration hitherto dealt with in the Commerce Department. I may remind Honourable Members that here we are dealing with a vast subject in which the interests of about a million people abroad are involved, a million people inhabiting more than 33 countries, and I may assure the House that, during the next few months, the work of the Department would be enormously increased because we have to prepare, under the new Emigration Act, notifications in respect of the many countries with regard to which emigration has been temporarily prohibited. It is with reference to this work that an Assistant Secretary is badly wanted, and the existing officer is shown on the Revenue side, and it is in regard to him that a Resolution has been put forward here. It is impossible, I think, even with the economies that we may effect by an amalgamation of the several branches to be able to carry on the work efficiently unless some temporary staff is added to it. I may submit, Sir, that my experience of the Department, both before the introduction of the Reforms Scheme and subsequently is that with regard to essential matters we are getting practically the same work as heretofore for the simple reason that, even previous to the Reforms, it is only the larger aspects of policy that were considered by the Government of India. Take, for instance, Land Revenue. We have to deal now with very contentious Bills and all these Bills come up to us for scrutiny. It may be that we have not the same say now as we had before but still we have got to do this scrutiny work. What has added to the work of this Department is the addition of Posts and Telegraphs, with reference to which I need not say much at present. Therefore, the addition of the Emigration Department and of Posts and Telegraphs is more, I think, than the staff of these two Departments combined can cope with. I hope, therefore, that this explanation will show that, whatever economies can be effected have been properly kept in view in organising these two Departments and in taking on additional work in the manner I have pointed out.

Sardar Bahadur Gajjan Singh (Punjab : Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, I rise to give my whole-hearted support to the views expressed by the Honourable Member in charge of the Department of Revenue and Agriculture. In fact, my complaint is that the most important industry of India has for so long been neglected. We all know that India is essentially an agricultural country. 75 per cent. of the population live upon agriculture or live upon those who live upon agriculture. If we compare the efforts of the Government of India with the efforts of the rest of the world, I think, we will be justified in saying that almost nothing has been done to develop agriculture here. If we just compare the figures of Canada, Java and Australia with agricultural results in India, the state of things will appear to be simply deplorable. We have got a lot of land, we have got canals ; our land is not bad, but Government has not been spending comparatively anything to improve agriculture. There are no research institutes worth the name. Take one instance, that of the sugar-producing countries such as Java and others. Their produce of sugarcane is, I understand, four, five or even ten times that of our produce. The same is the case with cotton and other agricultural industries. It is perfectly clear that the fault does not lie with the cultivator ; he has not been helped, much less encouraged by the State. I am sure that, if the Government of India were to pay attention to this most essential reform, not only would the cause of discontent disappear, but the country's wealth would be considerably increased and they would better be able to bear the burden of such heavy taxation as we are face to face with to-day. I wish that the Government of India could spend more and more and more money upon this agriculture. Therefore, Sir, I submit that this House should unanimously vote for any expenditure under this particular head, which, it is my painful duty to point out, has so far been neglected.

Mr. B. S. Kamat : Sir, I wish to withdraw my amendment after the explanation given by the Honourable Member in charge.

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : I beg to move the next motion :

'That the votable portion of the demand for Rs. 2,68,480 under sub-head 'Army Department—Pay of Officers' be reduced by Rs. 100.'

Sir, the object of this amendment is to bring under discussion what purpose this Army Department serves so far as we are concerned.

4 P.M. I have always thought that, when there is a difference likely to arise between two Departments, we maintain one Department as a sort of watch-dog over the other Department, and I should have thought that, under ordinary circumstances, this Civil Department of the Army would protect us in some way or other against the Military Department of the Army. But I find, Sir, that the Civil Department, as it is represented in this House, has placed itself entirely at the mercy of the Military Department, which is not represented in the House for the moment. (Hear, hear.) We should have expected that that part of this Department which is supposed to look after our interests, would have done something to try and reduce this military expenditure against which we have been crying for generations past, and to meet the wishes of the whole country which has been resenting the scale on which the Army in India has been maintained. But we heard the Honourable Member for the Army in this House the other day, and I could see no distinction whatever

between the Army as it is represented by him and as it is represented by his Chief, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief. (Hear, hear.) I do not see why he should come to this House and ask us to support his Department, which is kept up, not for the purpose of helping us in any way, but for the purpose of coming in our way on every possible occasion. I could understand, Sir, the Department coming to the House and saying : ' Here we are trying to reduce the military expenditure of the other Department over which you have no check '. But a Department which comes here and supports that other Department has, I say, no right to expect support, so far as we are concerned. They have also accepted the principles on which that army is maintained. What are the principles on which they say they maintain the Army? The first, of course, is defence against foreign aggression. We have nothing to say against that. But the other principle is that of maintenance of internal peace and order. Now, Sir, this House and this country will not accept that as a principle upon which the maintenance of an Army can be justified. The maintenance of internal peace and order in the country is the proper function of the police, and, if such a doctrine as this were accepted in your country, I do not know what your country would say to those who preach it. You have got to look at your history and see what that doctrine of the maintenance of internal peace and order in the country by an Army meant. It cost at least one crowned head and many precious lives to vindicate the principle that an Army is not to be maintained for internal purposes. And you find every year in your own country an Act, the first line of which says :

' Whereas the maintenance of an Army in times of peace is illegal ; It is hereby enacted etc.'

Now, Sir, you say that the Army is to be maintained for internal order. We deny that principle. But I am willing to assume for the sake of argument that you have to keep some sort of a force for internal purposes. No doubt, circumstances unfortunately have arisen now and again when the use of superior force has been necessary. I say if the use of such a force is necessary, I expect this Department anyhow to divide the Army into two, that portion of it which is required for internal purposes and the other required for external defence. I expect them to convert the former into a police force; and to bring that question before this House by placing such a force upon the ordinary estimates from year to year, from time to time, as it is done in your own country. That is a thing which has never been suggested at any time by this Civil side of the Army Department, for which we are asked to vote this large sum of money. (Hear, hear.) I say that, so far as that Department is concerned, it had better be abolished. It does not help us in the least. It does not throw any light on the manner in which they spend the money or the manner in which they maintain the Army. Once a year, for two days, a discussion is allowed as a matter of course . . .

Mr. N. M. Samarth : An academic discussion.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala : And the military authorities get up and explain to us what they are about, and we are then expected to reply to that within the space of 2 hours which are left to us, ordinarily speaking, after the Army side of the question has been represented. That, I submit, is not the way in which that Department should treat us in this House; and, as I submit, Sir, unless this Department is prepared to divide the Army into two, and to put that portion of it which is required for internal purposes on the estimates,

[Mr. P. P. Ginwala.]

we shall refuse to grant them any sum of money (Hear, hear) ; because, from our point of view, it is a Department which has miserably failed in their duty ; and what is more, I do not blame the Army Department alone because I understood the whole of the Government accept that same principle. We shall deal with the rest of the Government in their turn, but, so far as this Department is concerned, I should like to know from it what it has done to deserve any support from this House, and why it comes and says that any money should be voted by this House in order that, in combination with the Military authorities, our military expenditure may be increased from year to year. I now, therefore, commend this motion to the consideration of the House.

Sir Godfrey Fell : Sir, I confess that I have been taken somewhat aback by this attack of my Honourable friend, Mr. Ginwala, and I still feel some doubt as to his intentions. I am not sure whether the Assembly is being asked to pass a vote of censure upon myself, a vote of censure upon the Army Department, which I have the honour to represent here, or a vote of censure upon the whole of the Government of India.

Dr. H. S. Gour : Divide it among yourselves equally.

Sir Godfrey Fell : Thank you. I understand from my Honourable friend's speech that the *gravamen* of the attack upon my Department is that it fails to protect the Legislative Assembly against the Military authorities

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar ; To protect the country.

Sir Godfrey Fell : That it fails to look after the interests of the taxpayer ; and that, when I have the presumption to address this Assembly in the course of the Budget debate, I actually speak more or less on the same lines as His Excellency the Army Member. I am somewhat surprised at an accusation of this sort being made by the Member of a Party which has already established a reputation for party discipline (Laughter), but I ask my friends, the Democratic Party, in all seriousness, whether they expect me to come here and to say that the Government of India strongly disapprove of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief ; that the Military authorities are unconscionable in their extravagant demands ; that we have done our best to keep them in order, but that we are sorry to say we have failed—we will try to do better next time. Is that really the way in which the Assembly considers that the Secretary in a Department should speak on behalf of that Department in this House ?

Then, I will ask Mr. Ginwala what he knows of the working of the Army Department.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri : We get no opportunities of knowing.

Sir Godfrey Fell : The Honourable Member says that no opportunities are given. Can the Honourable Member give me any instance in which I have failed to give this Assembly information which can properly be given ? I am not aware of any. As to the working of the Army Department, if the Assembly care to hear about it, I can read them quite a lot. I have here a list of the functions of the Army Department, covering about 20 double lines of

print. I shall be pleased to read it out, if the Assembly wish to hear. Perhaps they would rather not.

The Honourable Member in moving this motion went further and said that the Army Department came in their way on every occasion, and was always, as I understood him to say, defending another Department. Now what is the position of the Army Department? The Army Department is the Department of the Government of India which is concerned with all military and marine matters. It is a small Department consisting of a few officers and about 100 clerks. All the correspondence of the Government of India in connection with defence matters, all questions of military policy, have to be dealt with by this Department. Every order relating to military expenditure or military policy has to be issued by this Department. It also has to administer the Royal Indian Marine; it is closely concerned with the Ecclesiastical Department and the Indian Medical Department, and various other matters too numerous to mention here. The soldiers who form Army Headquarters work under the orders of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief as Commander-in-Chief, and have a dual function. On the one hand, they have to advise the Government of India, through the Commander-in-Chief, on large questions of policy; on the other hand, they execute, under the orders of the Commander-in-Chief, certain functions of administration in relation to the Army in India, for instance, in such matters as the location of units, the distribution of troops, the movement of troops by sea and land, training, discipline and so on. In all these matters they have to perform certain important administration and executive functions.

The functions of the Army Department and Army Headquarters are quite separate; the views of the soldiers reach the Government of India through the filter of the Army Department; and I defy my Honourable friend, Mr. Ginwala, to say what effect that filter may have upon the opinions expressed by the staff at Army Headquarters. He cannot possibly know to what extent these questions of policy may have been influenced by the views of the Army Department.

The next point the Honourable Mover took, Sir, was that the maintenance of law and order is not a function of the Army Department and should be performed by the police. I am under the impression that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, speaking the other day in this Assembly, said that he would be only too glad if these functions could be handed over to the Police. But I have here, Sir, a Resolution in connection with the Esher Committee debate last year. This was the Resolution, which was moved by Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer and adopted by the Assembly a year ago :

'That the purpose of the Army in India must be held to be the defence of India against external aggression and the maintenance of internal peace and tranquillity.'

Has the Assembly changed its mind on this rather important question in the course of one year? I pause for an answer.

Mr. N. M. Samarth : I will give it.

Sir Godfrey Fell : As long as that Resolution stands, I think that the Government of India are entitled to take the view that one of the functions of the Army in India is the maintenance of internal peace and tranquillity.

Another complaint that the Honourable Member made surprised me somewhat. He said that the Army Department never throws any light

[Sir Godfrey Fell.]

upon the manner in which the money is spent in connection with the defence of the country. Now, Sir, Honourable Members who desire information about the expenditure of the Government of India have generally to find it for themselves in one of those voluminous books which are issued by the Finance Department at Budget time. Last year, shortly after I became Secretary in the Army Department, knowing that military matters were a sealed book to many Members of the Assembly and that great interest was likely to be taken in it, I went to considerable pains to prepare a memorandum in which I compared the scale of pre-war expenditure with that proposed for the current year. This year again, in spite of considerable pressure on my time, I have prepared another memorandum which compares the actual expenditure of the current year with the Budget figure, and also compares the Budget of the current year with the Budget proposed for next year. I should like to remind the Assembly that, so far as I know, mine is the only Department which has done this, and that there is no obligation whatever on my Department to prepare such a memorandum. It has been voluntary attempt on my part to assist Honourable Members to understand a somewhat complicated and technical subject, and to state the facts in the clearest and simplest language possible; and I am surprised that, instead of evoking any expression of gratitude, I have heard, for the second time in this Assembly, a grudging reference to these memoranda and a complaint of the inadequacy of the information they contain. (*A Voice*: 'Not against you'.)

I am dealing now merely with a motion to reduce the Army Department grant by Rs. 100. I understand, from a remark of one of the Honourable Members, that this may be regarded as a vote of censure to be equally divided between myself, the officers of my Department and the Government of India. In this case I cannot speak for the Government of India, that is, the Members of the Executive Council. As regards myself, I am indifferent; but I should like to say a word in defence of the officers of my Department who, though very few in number and though extremely hard worked, have always given me the most loyal and efficient assistance.

Mr. N. M. Samarth : Sir, I do not understand that the object of the Mover of this motion is to pass a vote of censure on any individual officer. I think I am speaking the mind of every non-official Member here when I say that every one of them has admiration and respect for the work which the Honourable Sir Godfrey Fell has been doing. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, let none think that this is going to be a personal matter or a matter of personal censure. It is merely a question of policy, and, as the Honourable Member knows, this House is restive and resentful that it has not got any vote on the Military Budget and this is only an expression of that opinion, as I understand it. As regards the function of the Army, I question the propriety of the words 'maintenance of law and order' which were used. Restoration of peace and tranquillity is a different thing altogether; it means repressing or suppressing disorder and restoring order; that is the function of the Army. But the maintenance of law and order is the function of the civil authorities and not the function of the Army. The Army does not step in unless and until the civil authorities become powerless to maintain it; and if the Honourable Member refers to the report of the Police Commission—which I have not got before me, but if my memory stands me in good stead—there is a paragraph in that report as to the functions of the Army and the

armed police and they say that it is not the function of the Army to step in unless the civil power has become impotent and unable to maintain law and order; and they go further and say that it is the duty of the Local Governments and provincial Governments to spend enough money to have efficient armed Police for the maintenance of law and order, which is not the function of the Army. It is not right for the Local Government or any Government, for the matter of that, to make the Army do a thing which they really hate. So far as my memory goes, that is the sum and substance of what the Police Commission have recommended. That being so, I say that if the Local Governments have been negligent of their duty in not having armed Police suited to their local conditions and requirements, this Government should insist upon that being done; but that is no justification for having a large number of troops for internal security that this Army Department maintains. It is a wrong conception of the duty of the Army upon which the total strength of the internal security force is maintained; and that is the *gravamen* of the charge, and let not the Honourable Member think that the passing of this vote means, as I say, any censure upon the Department or upon any person connected with the Department. It is indicative, as I say, of the feeling of this House that it is a pity that they have to vote taxation upon a basis which takes away from their purview nearly 50 per cent. of the central revenues.

Sir Montagu Webb (Bombay: European): Sir, I should like to say a few words in connection with the motion before the House. There is no doubt whatever that the amount which we have been asked to provide this year for military expenditure, over sixty eight crores, is very heavy, heavier in fact in my opinion than this country can continue to bear with safety. (Hear, hear.) Look at it how we may, the percentage of military expenditure to that of the total expenditure is somewhere in the neighbourhood, I calculate, of 35 per cent; and I am convinced that a percentage of that character, if it continues, must mean the paralysis of the activities of Government in many other Departments. (Hear, hear.) What this country needs at the present moment is to save all that it possibly can, first of all to repair the wastage of war, secondly to repay floating debt and build up its arrested development and thirdly to carry forward that progress in various Departments upon which it has set its heart. I am convinced myself that that further progress cannot be made unless the proportion of money allotted to military expenditure be reduced. Now, I do not wish there should be any mistake in what I am saying. I do not advocate at this moment any reduction in the strength of the army. I entirely disagree with my friend, the Mover, that the army is not necessary in India in connection with the maintenance of internal peace and order. I think that a military force must be kept, and is kept in all countries, to assist the Civil power in times of danger. But I do think this; I do think there are directions in which economies in military expenditure might be effected, possibly by a reconsideration of matters of policy, certainly—by a cutting down of military office establishments, and certainly by a more effective management of the Supply and Transport services. It was only a few days ago that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief stated, I will read his exact words:

‘When the internal situation is quiet, when a united India can show that her loyalty and devotion to the British Empire are beyond question, and when those who ought to know better cease to stir up racial animosities, I shall be prepared to consider reductions in the Army’

[Sir Montagu Webb.]

Well, I take it that we are moving now in the direction of a more settled condition and of a more peaceful state of affairs. (Hear, hear.) I think, therefore, that we can reasonably look forward before very long to a reduction in the actual numbers of the numerical strength of the Army. I am not pressing for that now, because it is a technical matter, on which I have not the necessary knowledge to enable me to speak; but I do wish to join in with those expressions of the House for economy which we have already heard, I wish to associate myself with the feeling that the scale of military expenditure is too heavy and that the attention of the Government should be directed to reducing that expenditure. If any assurance of that kind were forthcoming from Government that this could and would be done, I feel certain that this House would raise no objection to the passing of the Demands for Grants in their present form. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Abdur Rahim : Sir, I was very much surprised to hear the criticisms that were levelled by various Members against the Army. I am sorry, Sir, when the general discussion took place, I was not present here. But I would appeal to the Honourable Members of this House that they should seriously consider whether this military expenditure is not necessary, and we can do without it. I do not know if all Honourable Members are aware of the fact that it was only yesterday that serious disturbances took place on the Frontier. What assurance have they got that there will not be another disturbance? It was only a few weeks ago that we signed the Peace Treaty with the Amir of Afghanistan. The Bolsheviks are still busy in hatching their conspiracies in Kabul—thanks to the Political Department we have checked their progress for the present.

Another thing is—I am sorry that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief is not present here to-day,—I would tell one thing to the House, and they would be surprised to hear it. I think it was only a short time ago that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief had an interview with press representatives, and he explained to them that in the independent territories the people have got 1,30,000 up-to-date European made rifles, in addition to their own Pass made rifles. I can say with authority, Sir, that the number of their own Pass made rifles which are in no way inferior to European rifles and which can be equally used for the purpose of destruction, is more than 5 lakhs in the independent territories. I make this statement with authority and I challenge any Member of this House, civil or military, to come forward and rebut it. Well, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief will have to supply troops against the offensive in case all the independent tribes should rise at one and the same time. I shall be the first man to suggest that as much money as possible must be saved under ordinary circumstances, but, at the same time, I must say that the military people are treated worse than people who are sentenced to death. I may tell the Assembly that there is a Jail custom that anybody who is sentenced to death is given an option to eat anything he likes one day before he is hanged. I am afraid these members grudge these soldiers even that unpleasant privilege. The question is whether the military expenditure about which much has been said here is spent for the use of the military people or for the private purposes of anybody else, or whether these sums are spent in constructing roads for taking munitions and for making provision in order to enable the military people to fight in a better manner. I am sorry to see, Sir, that such a criticism should be levelled against the

Army, that such a feeling should exist against the Army. The thing is, we must give the military people due credit. I was surprised to see my Honourable friend, Mr. Ginwala, moving this motion, because he has much to do with the handling of the new Democratic Party, and I think he will be in a position to say how much difficulty he has got to approach each and every Member. So, in the same way, all those officers, who have to control these troops and discontented soldiers have to face the same unpleasantness and anxiety. Such remarks as are made in this House have a very undesirable effect on the soldiers. I come from a part which has contributed not a little to supply men, and I am proud to say that we have given a good many soldiers in the last war, and they all cry out and say : ' Oh, look at the Government, we all fought for this country and the result is that, whenever we want anything, they say, they have no money.' We may differ in other matters, but, as far as the Army is concerned, I think our sole prestige, our sole dignity, our sole safety depends on the Military Department, and I think it should be the sacred duty of each and every Member to see that the Military Department is not starved, because with a true sense of citizenship—I am sorry I cannot say what should be the functions of the military men—I think, being a Pathan myself, the duty of a military man is to strive to fight and to kill, and be killed. (Laughter.) I say this much that no Member in this House will say that any soldier in the Army has refused to do so, and I think it is due to these military officers that we won the last war (Hear, hear), it is due to them that India has got her proud right to be represented in the League of Nations. With these remarks, Sir, I oppose this motion, and I would request my Honourable friend, Mr. Ginwala, to withdraw it

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas : I am sure, Sir, that the Government of India realise that it is their attitude on this question which is largely responsible for the attitude which the non-official Members of this House are taking up. (Hear, hear.) What response had we to the numerous appeals that were made almost unanimously by this House to the Members of the Government of India ? (Hear, hear.) These appeals were made not only inside this House, but they were made throughout the length and breadth of this country, and both European as well as Indian non-official opinion expressed itself very strongly against this heavy expenditure that is mercilessly thrown on this poor country. Sir, what response had we from the Government of India, I ask ? His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, in words which we certainly very strongly resent in this House, made it absolutely clear to us that it was not possible for him to bring about a state of affairs so as to effect reduction in military expenditure ; and it was not merely the considered opinion of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief as a soldier. I could understand that opinion if it came from one who was a soldier if he did not give it on behalf of the Government of India. The Honourable the Finance Member, speaking at the end of the debate, made it quite clear to us that it was not merely the considered opinion of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, but it was the considered opinion of the Government of India and of his colleagues and that every one of them thought that it was not possible to reduce the military expenditure. Sir, if this is the attitude of the Government of India, I think the Government of India can well understand that this House which is composed of men who can hold their own against any other nation, is certainly not going to put up light-heartedly with the attitude which the Government of India have taken up in this matter. (Hear, hear.) Sir, my Honourable

[Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas.]

friend, Mr. Samarth, has already made it clear, and I entirely agree with him, that the attitude of this House does not mean any censure on those who are engaged in the work of the Army Department.

But it is a condemnation—and I want to be very clear about it—it is a condemnation of the attitude that the Government of India have taken on the question. (Hear, hear.) Sir, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief told us that, until wise men in this country took upon themselves not to bestir people, until a better condition prevailed, it was not possible to reduce the military expenditure. Sir, let me assure you, if the Government of India want to help Members of this House and sensible men in the country who think—and I can assure the Government of India that there is a large and overwhelming majority of men who are convinced—that the progress of this country and the future prosperity of this country depends entirely upon its willingness to co-operate with Great Britain, if the Government of India want to help our work, they cannot do it by the attitude that they take up, but by putting confidence in us, by taking us into their confidence, and allowing us to co-operate with them, in criticising them and in having a voice in the military expenditure that should be thrown on this country. Sir, with these words, I support the motion that has been moved by Mr. Ginwala.

Dr. H. S. Gour : Sir, if I intervene in this debate, I do so for the purpose of replying to some of the arguments advanced by the Honourable Secretary of the Army Department. I voice, Sir, the feelings of the non-official Members of this House when I say that we feel ourselves in an awkward position, having to find the money when we have no voice in the spending of it. But that is not all. Our point of view was brought home last year by the Honourable Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer who categorically challenged the point of view of the Esher Committee by pointing out that the object of the Army of India was not to advance the Imperial policy, but purely local defence. I ask the Honourable Secretary of the Army Department whether the organisation of the Army in India is not subservient to the Imperial policy. He will no doubt say: 'It is not'. But I ask him this question: 'Is he prepared to lay on the table the correspondence that must have taken place between the Government of India and the Secretary of State upon this huge and appalling sum which is charged to military expenditure? Is he sure that the War Office is not dictating the policy of the Government of India in matters military?'

Sir Godfrey Fell : Sir, I can answer my Honourable friend's question at once. The Assembly heard a week ago from His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief that there is no truth whatever in the idea that the War Office dictates the military policy of the Government of India.

Dr. H. S. Gour : So much the worse, Sir, for the Military Department. If the policy of the Military is merely to beat off the border marauders and to preserve internal peace, then I see no necessity for that extravagant expenditure and the latest equipment with which this Army is provided. We were told by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in a speech delivered elsewhere that out of the total sum of 63 crores budgeted for on account of military expenditure, about one-third is spent upon troops engaged for the maintenance of internal peace and order, that about one-third of the troops are kept for the defence of the frontiers and that

the remaining third are of what are called the covering troops. Now, Sir, I ask the Honourable the Secretary of the Army Department, how is it that these internal troops which are merely maintained for the purpose of doing Police work are not kept on a Police footing? How is it, I ask, that they are equipped and armed exactly in the same manner as if they were ready to take the field against a first class European foe? I submit, Sir, that the duty of maintaining internal peace and order is a duty which is not cast upon the Imperial Army. It is the duty and primary function of the police. I further submit, Sir, that it is a duty which the citizen army in all countries is expected to discharge. I, therefore, venture to think that the explanation given for keeping up this huge army in India, that it is for the purpose of maintaining internal peace and warding off external aggression, cannot hold water. We have been told by one of the Honourable Members of this House that the North-West Frontier tribes are in possession of a large number of muskets or guns. If the whole of this Army organisation in India is for the purpose of warding off these frontier raids, then, I submit, that it has singularly failed in its object. The object, I submit, is not for the purpose of coping with the frontier troubles.

Lastly, Sir, I submit that the main crux of the whole question lies, as stated by the Honourable Sir Montagu Webb, in the question of costs. Can India bear this crushing burden? I have no doubt, Sir, that this House will unanimously, by giving its vote in support of this motion, declare and say 'No.'

Mr. K. Ahmed (Rajshahi Division: Muhammadan Rural): I move, Sir, that the question be now put.

Mr. B. S. Kamat: With reference to the statement just made by Sir Godfrey Fell in reply to Dr. Gour, I hope I shall be given an opportunity to challenge that statement.

Chaudhri Shahab-ud-Din (East Central Punjab: Muhammadan): Sir, a part of what I had intended to say has been anticipated by my learned friend, Dr. Gour, in what he has just said. I will simply try to amplify the point of view which he has put forward before this Honourable House. We have been repeatedly told that one-third of the Army is kept, and consequently one-third of the expenditure is incurred, for maintaining internal peace and order, while one-third is kept to protect India from external aggression, and the remaining one-third is kept on the borders of India to protect the peaceful subjects of the North-West Frontier Province from the raids of Afridis, Waziris and other independent tribes. Let me for the sake of argument accept this division as perfectly sound and correct. Let me also assume for the sake of argument, nay, let me admit as a matter of fact that there is unrest in India. There can be no two opinions that peace and order are absolutely necessary and should be maintained at any cost. Yet, I join issue with those who maintain that nothing but a regular Army, equipped with up-to-date inventions and machinery can maintain peace and order. May I ask how many times during the past five years, despite the fact that unrest has been at its zenith during that period, has the Military been actually employed in maintaining peace and order? Is it not a fact that generally, and almost invariably in all cases, with the exception of a few that can be counted on the finger, it is the Police which has coped with the situation and have maintained peace and order without any difficulty? Now, let me push this argument a little further. Where one constable of Police costs,

[Chaudhri Shahab-ud-Din.]

say Rs. 30, a member of the regular Army costs three times, nay five times that amount. If I am not mistaken in my calculations, the exact ratio is 5 to 27. Then I ask the Member in charge of the Army Department or the Member who represents that Department, why we should not employ constabulary instead of soldiery for maintaining internal peace and order. Constabulary can do the same duty and serve the same purpose as soldiery. This argument I venture to think is unanswerable. It may be said that the Police may not be able to cope with a situation and there may be occasions when the regular Army may have to be employed. Let me grant this for a moment. Yet, the army which is intended for guarding the country against external aggression can be requisitioned in cases of emergency, as that Army cannot be supposed to be always busy against an external enemy, nor are the Frontier people so turbulent as to give us trouble constantly. A treaty of peace has been signed with Afghanistan. The Bolshevik terror is yet very far off and we should not be afraid of it especially when the Frontier people are not giving us trouble every day. In these circumstances, is it preposterous for me to suppose that, in case of need, that is if and when the Police fail or are found to be insufficient to maintain internal peace and order,—is it preposterous to suppose that we may then draw upon these two-thirds who are maintained for protecting us against external aggression or for guarding us against the Frontier raids? Well, even supposing that, when such an exigency arises, these forces are not available for use for a long time, why can't we recruit in the course of the short space of two or three months the trained demobilised soldiers who are available in large numbers in the country at present? Why cannot we do that? Even if that be found to be impracticable, why should not we keep a reserve force in the country which may be called up in case of need? Why should we not resort to all such possible and practical schemes which have indeed been acted upon and found to be very useful in other countries? Why should we go on burdening India with a heavy taxation? Why should 35 per cent. of the whole revenue of the country be spent on the military? I venture to think, that is a question which is unanswerable and that is a position which is insupportable. I do not agree with those who say to-day or may say hereafter that the Frontier should be left to itself and that no revenues should be spent on protecting it. Those people who say so, have absolutely no knowledge of the Frontier. The Frontier has to be guarded against at any cost, at any expense. (Hear, hear.) But let us not confuse the issue. The Frontier is one thing, protection against external aggression is another, while the maintenance of internal peace and order is quite a different thing. It is this last need which, in my opinion, can very well be managed by the police. Why should the army be kept or made to perform the duty of the police? Let us police the country sufficiently, and if we yet find that we stand in need of employing now and then the regular army we can reconsider the question and, if necessary, then the country's resources might be tapped and money actually needed collected.

I have only one word more and that is with regard to Sir Godfrey Fell himself and his Department. I think his Department is indispensable. It is acting as a link between the Military Department and His Excellency the Governor General. There can be no two opinions that that Department is essential. It is a branch of the Secretariat which conducts correspondence between His Excellency the Governor General and the Military Department of

the Government of India. No censure, personal or otherwise, was intended by the Mover of this motion or by any other speaker; but, with a view to vindicate the principle that this House should be given a voice in spending the money, which it is expected to vote for and collect for the Government, and to give expression to the sense of disappointment on that score, I think the sum of Rs. 100 should be reduced. I hope the House will unanimously endorse the motion.

(At this stage Mr. Deputy President took the Chair.)

Some Honourable Members: 'I move, Sir, that the question be now put.'

Dr. Nand Lal: The Honourable Khan Sahib Abdur Rahim Khan (Cries of 'Khan Bahadur')—I beg your pardon, the Honourable Khan Bahadur Abdur Rahim Khan has said that he is a Pathan and has come from the North-West Frontier Province and that he possesses the most valuable information, and on the score of that information he has appealed to the House that the military expenditure is necessary. But I may tell him that I come from the neighbouring province and he will excuse me for making bold to say that I have studied this question very carefully and given expression to my views on this subject on various occasions previously, and that I am quite prepared to question the correctness of some of the statements made by my Honourable friend. So far as the bugbear of frontier tribes is concerned, I may tell him once for all (and I have given expression to this opinion before), that it was unreal and very much exaggerated in any case. This is the fallacy which has been troubling the military officers who have been posted there to look after the Frontier. Many raids have been committed and they go to prove the poverty of the ability of the Military Department and the administration there. So, if my learned friend says that there is justification for a Standing Army on that account, I may tell him that he will feel disappointed if he looks at the result. He is altogether wrong in his calculation. Raids after raids, so many dacoities, so many murders—these troubles could not be removed by the Military Department till now, and, therefore, we cannot entertain any hope whatsoever that the so-called Standing Army will be able to put an end to them. In so far as internal peace and order in British India is concerned, remarks have already been offered and I associate myself with them. An improvement in the Police Department will be sufficient and will meet this want, and there is no necessity for keeping a Standing Army. The money which is being spent on this Department is a very heavy figure which is appalling and the whole country feels shocked. Therefore, we, as a body, express the opinion that the Government will kindly try to see its way to reduce this expenditure. I may assure the House that there is no idea of any personal insinuation or censure against any person at all. With these few remarks, I support the motion which has been so ably moved.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: I do not wish to address the House on the question of military expenditure, as that has been debated at great length the other day, and indeed it is no part of my duty to deal with it. There is, however, one thing that, speaking as a member of the Government of India, that I want to say, namely, that I have never understood that any decision reached as to military expenditure went further than to say that the provision which was made for the Army this year could not be reduced without reducing the combatant troops and that, as it was impossible to do that this year, the expenditure for the year 1922-1923 could not be reduced—I never understood that the decision went in any way further than that.

[Sir William Vincent.]

But I want to turn to another aspect of the case, namely, the duty of the Local Governments, and it is only because some aspersions have been cast on Local Governments, and the manner in which they have performed their duty in this respect that I really have risen to speak. I believe my Honourable friend, Mr. Samarth

Mr. N. M. Samarth: I may say, Sir, that I have not cast any aspersions on Local Governments. I referred to the Police Report and said that it was the business and functions of Local Governments to have armed police

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: Sir, when I was interrupted I was just going to say that my Honourable friend, Mr. Samarth, was, as far as I could see, correct in what he had said about the Police. (Laughter.) I have also got the report of the Police Commission here. My recollection was the same as his and I have verified the facts. But as to the other point, important as he is, Mr. Samarth is not the only pebble on the beach. There are others who did reflect on the conduct of Local Governments in this matter (*A Voice*: 'No, no'), and I desire to show them what the principle accepted by Government is.

Sir, the Government of India recently issued a letter on this subject, in which it was stated that in previous discussions of this question the principle had always been maintained that the preservation of the public peace was the duty of the Police who should be able to deal promptly and effectively with local disturbances without invoking the aid of the military. Later, in the same Circular, the Government reaffirmed the principle laid down in 1879 by the Committee over which Sir Ashly Eden presided which runs as follows:

'It must be remembered, however, that though the maintenance of tranquillity and the safety of British India depend ultimately on the existence of military forces, yet the duty of preserving order and protecting property and of quelling disturbances rests primarily with the civil police.'

That is the principle we have always accepted, namely, that the duty of maintaining law and order is primarily that of the Police. When they are unable to cope with the situation effectively, then they call in the military and I think Honourable Members of this House would be astonished if they knew of the number of occasions during the present year when Local Governments have found it necessary to call in the aid of the military for that very purpose.

Dr. H. S. Gour: If your Police is insufficient, strengthen it.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: Will the Honourable Member kindly allow me to continue my speech?—I have often listened to very much longer ones from him—Sir, in that very letter we addressed to Local Governments we asked them if they would not consider this question of strengthening the Police, and I am glad to say that many Local Governments have taken this matter up. For instance, in Madras they have now 600 armed Police for Malabar alone; in the United Provinces they are recruiting a large number of armed police, about 2,000, or 2,500 I believe, and they are doing the same thing in the Punjab. Honourable Members must, however, remember that the political conditions existing at present are exceptional, and, if any of them could use their influence with some of their more extreme countrymen in this unfortunate land (*A Voice*: 'Help us to do so'), and induce them to modify their activities against Government and their efforts to create hostility

towards Government, our task would be easier. Sir, I maintain, you cannot in the present circumstances say that it is safe to rely on the Police for internal security.

Let me cite a recent case from Madras. When there was trouble down in Malabar, a regular howl there was for troops—and not for Police—and that demand continues up to this very moment. Troops there were needed purely for the purpose of maintaining internal security and in fact the number of troops maintained in Madras for this purpose is very small. In my own province again, the number of troops for internal security is so small as to be inadequate to meet any serious disturbance, and when we have had this country on the verge of serious disturbances in the past as in 1919, I can certify that many Local Governments at once made demands for additional troops in order to protect the people and keep the peace. That has been our experience. But the whole of this question of troops for internal security has been repeatedly investigated and for the moment what I only want to make clear is the respective responsibilities of the Police and the Army in the maintenance of public tranquillity, and to show that Local Governments have not been negligent of their duty in recruiting additional Police.

I also want to make another point clear, namely, that the question of military expenditure was considered by the Government of India 5 P.M. in respect of the coming year, and the decision reached affects that year and that year only.

Dr. H. S. Gour : I move that the question be now put.

Mr. Deputy President : The question is :

‘That the votable portion of the demand for Rs. 2,68,480 under sub-head ‘Army Department—Pay of Officers’ be reduced by Rs. 100.’

The Assembly then divided as follows :

AYES—60.

Abdul Majid, Shaikh.
 Agarwala, Lala G. L.
 Agnihotri, Mr. K. B. L.
 Ahmed, Mr. K.
 Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
 Asjad-ul-lah, Maulvi Miyan.
 Ayyangar, Mr. M. G. M.
 Ayyar, Mr. T. V. Seshagiri.
 Bagde, Mr. K. G.
 Bajpai, Mr. S. P.
 Barodawala, Mr. S. K.
 Bhargava, Pandit J. L.
 Bishambhar Nath, Mr.
 Chaudhuri, Mr. J.
 Cotelingam, Mr. J. P.
 Das, Babu B. S.
 Ginwala, Mr. P. P.
 Girdhardas, Mr. N.
 Gour, Dr. H. S.
 Gulab Singh, Sardar.
 Hussanally, Mr. W. M.
 Ibrahim Ali Khan, Lieutenant Nawab M.
 Iswar Saran, Munshi.
 Jamnadas Dwarkadas, Mr.
 Jatkar, Mr. B. H. R.
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.
 Kamat, Mr. B. S.
 Latthe, Mr. A. B.
 Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.
 Mahadeo Prasad, Munshi.

Manmohandas Ramji, Mr.
 Man Singh, Bhai.
 McCarthy, Mr. F.
 Misra, Mr. P. L.
 Misra, Mr. B. N.
 Mudaliar, Mr. S.
 Mukherjee, Mr. J. N.
 Mukherjee, Mr. T. P.
 Nabi Hadi, Mr. S. M.
 Nag, Mr. G. C.
 Nand Lal, Dr.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.
 Pyari Lal, Mr.
 Ramayya Pantulu, Mr. J.
 Rangachariar, Mr. T.
 Reddi, Mr. M. K.
 Rhodes, Mr. C. W.
 Samarth, Mr. N. M.
 Shahab-ud-Din, Chaudhri.
 Shahani, Mr. S. C.
 Singh, Babu B. P.
 Sinha, Babu Adit Prasad.
 Sinha, Babu Ambika Prasad.
 Sinha, Beohar Raghubir.
 Sohan Lal, Bakshi.
 Spence, Mr. R. A.
 Subrahmanayam, Mr. C. S.
 Subzposh, Mr. S. M. Z. A.
 Thackersey, Sir Vithaldas D.
 Webb, Sir M. dePomeroy.

NOES—28.

Abdul Rahim Khan, Mr.
 Aiyer, Mr. A. V. V.
 Bijlikhan, Sardar G.
 Bradley-Birt, Mr. F. B.
 Bray, Mr. Denys.
 Bryant, Mr. J. F.
 Chatterjee, Mr. A. C.
 Clarke, Mr. G. R.
 Crookshank, Sir Sydney.
 Dentith, Mr. A. W.
 Faridoonji, Mr. R.
 Fell, Sir Godfrey.
 Gajjan Singh, Sardar Bahadur.
 Habibullah, Mr. Muhammad.

Hailey, the Honourable Sir Malcolm.
 Hullah, Mr. J.
 Ikramullah Khan, Raja M. M.
 Innes, the Honourable Mr. C. A.
 Kabraji, Mr. J. K. N.
 Mitter, Mr. K. N.
 Percival, Mr. P. E.
 Renouf, Mr. W. C.
 Sapru, the Honourable Dr. T. B.
 Sharp, Mr. H.
 Vincent, the Honourable Sir William.
 Waghorn, Colonel W. D.
 Way, Mr. T. A. H.
 Zahiruddin Ahmed, Mr.

The motion was adopted.

(At this stage Mr. President resumed the Chair.)

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar : Sir, I beg to move :

General reduction. 'That the demand under head 'General Administration' be reduced by Rs. 5,43,800.'

Sir, it is a very modest proposal. This head consists of 18 Departments, as Honourable Members will see, costing over a crore of rupees and we have been very modest in our proposals. I therefore commend it for the acceptance of this House.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : I gather, Sir, that this also forms a part of the programme to reduce all expenditure by 5 per cent.

Dr. H. S. Gour : At least by 5 per cent.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : Well, Sir, in these circumstances may I say that the expenditure that seems to me to be particularly fortunate in this respect is expenditure on Legislative bodies. It does seem a little curious that every other Department should be cut, but this Assembly by a large vote should refuse to make any deduction in the expenditure on itself. The total expenditure on the Legislative body is 7 lakhs odd excluding Council reporters and Council Secretaries. And when Mr. Chaudhuri's motion was under discussion this morning, I asked my Honourable Colleague, the Finance Member whether I should be in order if I propose 5 per cent. reduction on the demand under that head. He said that I should be at once howled down. Sir, the demand for expenditure on Legislative bodies must be of a singularly deserving character and now turning to the motion directly before the Assembly, may I say that I cannot speak in regard to any other Department except the Home Department. In that Department I should have preferred to have my own retrenchment, to make a reduction of even more than 5 per cent. without any mandate from this Assembly. I have already intimated this to my Honourable Colleague, the Finance Member. Sir, if the Assembly insists on limiting the amount we are to curtail to 5 per cent. . . .

Dr. H. S. Gour : By at least 5 per cent.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : I understand that the motion says nothing about 'at least'. I shall, however, endeavour to give effect to the wishes of the Assembly and will leave other Honourable Members to speak for themselves. On behalf of other Departments, I should add that the reduction that I propose to make will not necessarily be of votable expenditure only. I expect really to save more on non-votable expenditure.

Sardar Gulab Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): Sir, I support the proposed reduction of the charges under the head of General Administration and suggest the direction in which the reductions may be effected. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the sub-head of Contingencies, exclusive of the items of postage and telegrams under it, where reduction can easily be effected.

This contingent grant I think should be and ought to be curtailed, because it seems that there is no sufficient check over it.

Sir, in supporting the motion, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the following. I will quote a few items of expenditure which, if I am not wrong, are incurred from this branch. Every year, several bicycles are purchased for the use of the office peons. Some of these are utilised for office purposes, but, at the same time, many of them, unfortunately, serve the private ends of men of the Department including even junior officers. After the use of these bicycles for five months in Delhi, they are generally not cared for or are sold off to the men of the Department at a nominal price, some times even for a trifling sum of Rs. 15 or Rs. 2). Then, Sir, durries, carpets, furniture, tapestries, curtains, coal for the office chimneys, are purchased in large numbers and quantities for offices, but they are purchased in excess of what are required solely for those Departments and show a vast wastage. Sir, though all these aforesaid items of expenditure seem to be trifling when taken separately, yet all these mickles, when collected together, will make a muckle.

There are so many items of expenditure over which, practically speaking, there is very little control, and all these items of expenditure are met from this vast sum of money granted by the House every year. By supporting the reduction of this sum, I do not mean that the legitimate expenses should not be incurred. What I object to is the extravagance and I want to stop certain wastage of public funds.

In this connection, I would urge that a proper account for the sum voted under this head should be kept and be made available to the Members of the Standing Finance Committee whenever they like to scrutinise it. If they are satisfied with the account, then I think Government can demand a further supplementary grant under this head and the Finance Committee, when satisfied, will, I think, not raise the least objection to sanctioning the money. In these days of financial stringency it is meet and proper that we should try to economise wherever possible.

Mr. W. M. Hussanally (Sind: Muhammadan Rural): I want to say only one word in connection with what fell from the Honourable the Home Member in reply to Dr. Gour in regard to this House not curtailing its own allowances. Might I remind the Honourable the Home Member that the allowance given to the Members of this House, while they remain here in Delhi, is almost a starvation allowance. Some of us who come here do so at considerable inconvenience and loss of business. (Hear, hear.) I know a few gentlemen here who could, if they remained at home, make thousands a month, whereas here they are to remain content with only a paltry sum of Rs. 20 a day. Therefore, it is not for this House to curtail any of their allowances, but rather the fat salaries drawn by the Honourable Members of the Government. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: Sir, there is only one point on which I wanted to offer some remarks. The Honourable the Home Member

[Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas.]

referred, perhaps rightly, to the reluctance on the part of the Members of this House to cut down their allowances. I am afraid he was not quite accurate when he said that by a large majority, the motion was thrown out. I might remind him that the motion was thrown out by only a narrow majority of 5 or 6 and that, because the Members of the Government did not vote. If they had voted, the motion might have been carried. However, I do want to say this in regard to our own allowances—I do not know whether I am expressing the opinion of other Honourable Members of this House—that I feel certain that there are a large majority, if not all the Members of this House, who, if it is possible for the Government to effect a 5 per cent. or more than 5 per cent. reduction in the Budget under the head of General Administration, would not mind 5 per cent. being taken off from their allowances. (*A Voice*: 'The whole'.) At the same time, Sir, I want to point out that it is neither the allowance that we get for bringing our motor cars here nor any other allowance that attracts us to be Members of this House. (Hear, hear.) If the motor car haulage were not given to us, and, if, therefore, we were to resent that treatment by refusing to come here as Members of this House, then I feel that we would hardly deserve to be Members of this House. Our membership does not depend on what the Government gives us, either a motor allowance or any thing else; it depends, Sir, entirely on our desire to do our bit for the country (Hear, hear) by using constitutional methods. (*A Voice*: 'In a spirit of self-abnegation'.) And, Sir, I want to say this. If there is any one here of opinion that we do not want to sacrifice anything from what we get—I feel we are actually making a great sacrifice,—that we are allowing something to be taken away from that sacrifice if we insist on these small things being given to us in order that we may come and enjoy our privilege as Members of this House. I repeat, Sir, that there is need for retrenchment, that it is possible for this administration to effect economy at least to the extent of 5 per cent. I am sure the Honourable Members of the Government will do their best and I am sure they will succeed, if they want to, in effecting this economy, and I want to let them understand once for all that, in effecting this economy, the Members of this House, even if it means some portion of their allowance being given up, will not stand in the way at all.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, superfluous as it may seem at this stage of the discussion, after the remarks which have fallen from the Honourable the Home Member, to say anything in support of this motion, I wish to avail myself of this opportunity for making one or two suggestions. The reason why we have been obliged to adopt this rough and ready method of proposing a reduction of 5 per cent. is because we are at a great disadvantage in criticising the estimates submitted to the House. The large majority of the Members of the House do not possess the necessary technical knowledge and the necessary acquaintance with the working of the Department to be able to offer any effective criticism, to point out where there are superfluous establishments, to point out where the wages paid are too high for the work done and to offer any criticism which can be really accepted as sound. That, I think, is a difficulty to a great extent incidental to our position. It is a difficulty which, however, I find is not confined to this House but has been experienced in the House of Commons. I find that, some time last year, a Resolution was moved in the House of Commons for the appointment of an Estimates Committee and for the appointment of an officer of experience of the House to

assist the Estimates Committee in the scrutiny of the estimates and proposals which might be submitted by the Government.

That proposal was examined at very considerable length in the House and it was eventually decided by the House to appoint an officer who was called by one Member an Examiner of Estimates. Objections were raised to that proposal by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and by certain other Members who supported the Government that it would involve the creation of a separate and costly establishment like that of the Comptroller General or the Auditor General. But eventually the House was satisfied that that proposal for the appointment of an Examiner of Estimates would not involve the creation of any elaborate or expensive Department, and it was eventually decided to appoint an officer of independence and experience to assist the House. It might, perhaps, be said that we have in the Finance Minister a gentleman who is most anxious to effect retrenchments in the estimates which have been presented by the other Departments. It is undoubtedly true, and I can say with confidence from what little knowledge I have of our present Finance Minister, that there is no one more keenly intent upon economy than Sir Malcolm Hailey. (Hear, hear.) But, at the same time, we know what importunity can be brought to bear on him by his colleagues who are in charge of the various administrative Departments. It may be that in this year they have not succeeded according to the measure of their desires; but there is the fact of importunity by the Members representing other Departments. Speaking with regard to the relations between the Treasury and the other administrative Departments in England, it was once remarked by an experienced English official of the administrative Departments: 'In small matters the Treasury bullies us; in large matters we cheat them'. That is not an experience which is likely to be confined to England. If it is possible in England, it is possible also in this country, and howsoever wakeful a watchdog, as he has been called in the House of Commons, the Finance Minister may prove to be, it is not inconceivable that his proposals may be coloured by the views of his colleagues. At any rate, the Finance Minister cannot overrule any decision of the collective Government after it has been arrived at. It is only till the collective Cabinet arrives at a decision that it is open to the Finance Minister; but once the Government has decided upon anything it is not open to the Finance Minister any longer to resist the applications which have been made to him for expenditure or for ways and means to provide expenditure. It is for this purpose that this Resolution was arrived at by the House of Commons, and I respectfully offer this suggestion for the consideration of Government at a later stage.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I am grateful for much that Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer has said. It is perfectly true that we have done our best to secure economy in the administration of the Government of India in the very difficult circumstances in which we have found ourselves for two years. I have received the greatest assistance from all Civil Departments, the greatest willingness to accept the pressure we have brought on them to cut down all new demands. I have received from some Departments in particular great great readiness to attempt actual retrenchments. We have had many suggestions. The Honourable Sir William Vincent has mentioned some in regard to his own Department. I know of other Departments which are merely waiting to collect full figures and to complete their inquiries before suggesting on their own part similar savings to us. I think the House

[Sir Malcolm Hailey.]

recognises that we, no less than they, feel the difficulty of maintaining the heavy burden of expenditure which has been forced upon us owing to prevalence of increased prices and the greatly increased cost of materials of all kinds. I do not think the House—many as are the criticisms which Members feel themselves obliged to raise against us,—the House really in its heart feels that we have been oblivious of the necessity for keeping down expenditure, and, where possible, for reducing it. (Hear, hear.) Let me assure the House once again that what we have said on the subject of the Retrenchment Committee is by no means half-hearted, and is by no means intended to camouflage the situation. We have every intention of giving that Committee as wide a scope as possible, of giving it as powerful and influential a constitution as possible, of appointing in short a Committee which will be authoritative, and not only likely to effect reductions in expenditure but also to afford to the country some guarantee that an independent and authoritative body has looked into the general scale of our expenditure. (Hear, hear.)

And now let me take this particular Grant. I would like to point out to the House one fact, namely, that this Demand which deals with the general administrative expenditure of the Government of India shows no considerable increase over the actuals of 1920-21. The House must not think for a minute that I am bringing this as a charge against the Assembly itself; but it is a fact that a large part of the increase as between 1920 and 1922 is incurred in the expenditure upon legislative bodies and the necessary increase involved in the Legislative Department on their account. I say that only by way of explanation and no more; but I wish to make it clear that with regard to our central expenditure we have certainly for the last two years shown no great tendency to increase. Well, the House wants us to show a tendency not merely to avoid increase but actually to effect decrease. (Hear, hear.) I am quite willing to call upon all my Colleagues here to join me in effecting economies on the same scale as those announced by the Honourable Sir William Vincent, and I have every hope that they will, as the result of the opinion expressed in this House and of the pressure which the Government of India itself is placing upon them, manage to effect these economies.

There are other heads of expenditure which I and some of my Colleagues have found it necessary to defend against proposals for reduction—I mean heads of expenditure which are in themselves really remunerative and where reduction would involve us in a probable loss of revenue. I feel however, and I have indeed felt for some time, that the head of the General Administration is one in which we could very justifiably proceed to effect reductions. On the part of Government, therefore, there will be no further opposition to the reduction which the House has set itself to make in regard to this Demand.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma: Sir, speaking on behalf of the Department under me, although it is impossible to indicate clearly at the present moment the lines along which retrenchment will be possible, I have a clear hope that with a few adjustments it will be possible to effect a 5 per cent. reduction.

Dr. H. S. Gour: No, no. Yours is 15 per cent.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma: Well, let us hope it will be 20 per cent. We would not object to that at all, if it can be done, but I think the 5 per cent. may be possible.

Chaudhri Shahab-ud-Din: With your permission, Sir, may I ask one thing—whether the assurance which has been so very kindly given to this House by the Honourable Members for Government relates only to this item, or to the whole Budget? If it relates to the whole Budget and we are assured that Government will make a start, I think our labours here will be shortened.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I do not think that the Honourable Member could possibly have misunderstood what I said. I said very clearly that on this particular Demand for Grant a reduction could be justifiably made. I would never attempt to stand between this House and a reduction where I myself think it was justifiable.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarakadas: I withdraw my motion.

Mr. S. C. Shahani: There are certain other motions, Sir. (Cries of 'Withdraw'.)

Mr. President: Does the Honourable Member wish to move them?

Mr. S. C. Shahani: I have got only one word to say with regard to my motions concerning the Education Department.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I move that the question be now put.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is aware that we have had several motions with regard to the Education Department. The Honourable Member must guard his own opportunity if he sends in late motions.

The question is:

'That a reduced sum not exceeding Rs. 71,33,100 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1923, in respect of 'General Administration'.'

The motion was adopted.

AUDIT.

Mr. President: The question is:

'That a sum not exceeding Rs. 72,19,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1923, in respect of 'Audit'.'

Mr. K. C. Neogy (Dacca Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I beg to move:

Establishment for quasi-commercial accounts.

'That the provision for establishment, etc., for overhauling quasi-commercial accounts of Government be reduced by Rs. 500.'

I presume that the item to which I refer relates to the visit of certain members of an English firm of chartered accountants who were engaged to overhaul the accounts of quasi-commercial Departments of the Government as also of the Army Department. If Honourable Members will turn to page 46 they will find that under Auditor-General there is an item 'Establishment, etc., for overhauling quasi-commercial Accounts of Government,' and this accounts for something like Rs. 11,000. In Simla I had some questions with regard to this matter, and it appeared that up to June 1921 a sum of Rs. 17,530

[Mr. K. C. Neogy.]

was spent upon the visit of these gentlemen to India, besides £2,211 drawn upon the Secretary of State between the 4th October, 1920, and February, 1921. This gives a total expenditure of about Rs. 50,000. Then, again, we all remember that we had to pass a Supplementary Demand for Rs. 82,000 for expenditure in England in this connection while at Simla. I want to know from the Honourable the Finance Member as to what the total cost is likely to be for this item, and what progress has been made in the work that was entrusted to these gentlemen. Then, Sir, I come to another question. I drew the attention of Government to the fact, rather I inquired if it was a fact, that the said accountants submitted bills and charged Government for various expenses of an entirely personal nature, such as cost of entertainment of friends, cost of recreation and amusements and subscription to clubs, dentist's bills, and other items of a like character. In reply, practically the whole thing was admitted by the Honourable the Finance Member; it was stated 'that the bills included Rs. 66-5-0 for entertainment of friends and Rs. 110-7-0 for subscriptions to clubs; the latter was specially permitted for purposes corresponding to the half-expired periods of subscriptions to similar clubs in England. The contract is for reasonable hotel and living expenses and I am informed,' says the Finance Member, 'that when the contract was entered into, these gentlemen were given to understand that such items would be included in that category. Now, however, that the matter has been brought to notice it has been arranged that the amount of these items shall be refunded and no further payments on account of such charges will be made.' So my next question is: 'Has that amount been refunded?' Then, Sir, I am entirely surprised that the gentlemen who were expected to improve our accounts should ever have thought it proper to submit such bills to Government; and I am more surprised to find that the Audit Department actually passed these bills, and it was left to a non-official Member of this House to draw attention to this matter, upon which the Government were pleased to state that they would take steps for the refund of this amount. In these circumstances, Sir, I intend this motion to be a motion of censure on the Department of the Auditor-General.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: The Honourable Member first asked, Sir, as to the progress of expenditure on account of the special inquiry. I may tell him that the special inquiry is now closed; and, as far as is now known, no expenditure save perhaps some small arrear adjustment will be incurred in India on this account during the coming year. If the House has any doubt whether it has obtained full value for the money expended on this inquiry I can only refer it to an opinion recently expressed to me by our Auditor-General. The House knows that our Auditor-General is not an executive officer of Government; he is an independent authority with statutory obligations towards this House and the Secretary of State. It was at his instance that we obtained from England the services of this firm of accountants. I think there is no firm in England which enjoys a higher reputation, no firm which has received greater recognition for the exceptional services rendered in connection with English accounting during the war. We were exceedingly lucky to obtain their services at the price we paid. It was necessary for us to undertake this special inquiry in order that we might obtain, what I know the House values very greatly, proper revenue and capital accounts in many of our commercial and semi-commercial departments. We are now receiving reports from the Accountants

and we shall give effect to them as rapidly as possible. As for the other small incident to which the Honourable Member referred and which we set right ourselves as soon as it was brought to our notice, does he really desire to take up the time of the House at this late hour with a discussion of a matter of that nature? It was of small financial importance; it was due purely to a misunderstanding in regard to the interpretation of the contract that was made for us in England; it was set right as soon as the mistake was discovered, and I think, that being so, it would be entirely undesirable that I should occupy the time of the House in further discussing it this evening.

The motion was negatived.

Dr. Nand Lal: Sir, in the interest of the Party to which I belong, I do not wish to move this motion :

'That the demand under the head 'Audit' be reduced by Rs. 20,00,000.'

I shall have the chance of speaking about the subject later on.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Sir, I move :

General reduction. 'That the demand under the head 'Audit' be reduced by Rs. 3,94,800.'

It is not without regret that I move this item under the head 'Audit,' as I know that Audit is an insurance against extravagance. At the same time, many of us consider there is scope for retrenchment in this Department also, and, therefore, Sir, our Party has decided to reduce it as much as possible instead of the Rs. 20,00,000 proposed by Dr. Nand Lal. We are proposing only the ordinary 5 per cent. reduction and I know, having regard to the ability of the officer who now conducts the affairs, he will accede to the wishes of this House and of the Finance Department in making this retrenchment in his Department.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, while speaking on this motion, I should like to get some information from the Honourable the Finance Member. We have got now an independent Auditor for the Government of India's accounts and I should like to know whether the military accounts of the Government of India are completely under the control of this Auditor General. As far as I can see from the Budget statement, the military accounts are not completely under the control of the Auditor General, while it is, I think, the only department which should be first brought under the control of an independent Auditor General. Sir, at present the Auditor General conducts a kind of test audit in the military accounts, and this system does not, in the first place, give the Auditor General complete control over the military accounts and in the second place, compels us to spend more money for a duplicate machinery of audit. There is the military audit, and then the Auditor General has to maintain his staff to test the audit of the Military Audit Department. I, therefore, want some information from the Government of India why the military accounts are not completely under the control of the Auditor General.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I will answer first Mr. Joshi's question. The Auditor General is by law the authority ultimately responsible for the audit of all accounts of the Government of India, both Civil and Military. In regard to civil audit he is also the administrative head of the

[Sir Malcolm Hailey.]

whole department, which is of course concerned both with audit and compilation of accounts. As regards military accounts, while he is, as I have said, ultimately responsible for the correctness of audit, he is not the administrative head of that department.

Mr. N. M. Joshi : Why ?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey : For a very simple reason. We need a separate organization for the compilation of military accounts, an organization in some respects of a different nature from that which undertakes the work of civil accounts. We have to have a large number of men doing specialised work, only partially connected with audit ; we have men attached to regimental units, others keeping arsenal and ordnance stock accounts and so on. Mainly for administrative convenience, therefore, we have placed that department under a different administrative head. But when you come to the question of audit, as I said, the Auditor-General is ultimately responsible ; any question of doubt goes to him for decision and he has his officials to carry out test audit just as is done in military accounts in England. In that respect, Sir, we work, I believe, on exactly the same lines as in England. There is no extra cost on that account, because if the Auditor-General did not maintain officers to conduct test audit, we should require a large number of men to inspect the audit offices on the military side.

Now in regard to the reduction which Mr. Rangachariar proposes, I accepted the last motion because I believed that a reduction could be carried out. (Hear, hear), and for that reason I did not desire to oppose it. But, Sir, where a reduction cannot be carried out without injury to the country and to the State, I am bound to oppose it. It is improper that I should stand here and pretend to the House, which after all must take the responsibility, that a reduction can be made without injury to this department. I have said that the Auditor-General is an independent authority. The expense of the audit department has been increased largely because we are responsible not only for central audit but for the audit of accounts of the Local Governments, and their expenditure has everywhere increased. In one province alone, I think, there has been an addition of some 8 to 10,000 Government servants in recent years. The reform scheme has added to the work both of audit (which has to watch appropriations closely) and of compilation. All this means naturally an addition to the cost of the department. Now my friends on the Standing Finance Committee, who have often heard Mr. Gauntlett on this subject, know with what scrupulous care he has put up his proposals in regard to the expenditure of his department. They know full well that all his officers have represented to him that their establishments are on the point of breaking down. They know that there are establishments which for a long time have been unable to get leave save on medical certificate, and I have seen questions asked on this subject in this House. Now are you prepared to add to that state of affairs? The Auditor-General has informed us that he cannot be responsible to this House and to the Secretary of State for the correctness of his audit unless he obtains from us a very much larger sum for additional establishment and for raising the minimum pay in certain quarters. (Hear, hear.) He has warned us of this with great seriousness, and I would ask what answer am I to make on behalf of Government, or indeed what answer can the House give to the demand of an independent audit authority

who maintains that he cannot be responsible for the correctness of audit unless he obtains a larger establishment and improved pay? We have not been able to give him what he has asked for. Let me give the figures. Rightly or wrongly, we thought it was necessary in the present state of affairs to defer these schemes of the Auditor-General. We knew there was a risk, but we decided that risk must be taken in the interests of economy. His demand amounted altogether,—and I have told the House of the scrupulous care with which these demands are presented,—to Rs. 23,42,000 increased expenditure in the coming year. Now out of that we have only been able to give him, after consulting the Standing Finance Committee, something like three lakhs. His claims are therefore unsatisfied to the extent of 20 lakhs ; but the House is asking instead for an actual reduction of 3 lakhs. In all seriousness I represent to the House that they are running a great danger in desiring that this reduction should be made. Audit safeguards expenditure. Without a proper audit your expenditure runs to waste.

I seriously and earnestly ask the House to consider the danger which would be incurred if it insisted on making this reduction.

Mr. N. M. Samarth : Sir, I strongly support the view which the Honourable the Finance Member has put forward in this connection. As a Member of the Public Accounts Committee I can say that the work of the Auditor-General, in order that it may be systematised and made useful to this House, requires more money than has been even demanded under this Demand. It is no use supporting the idea that there must be a five per cent. reduction in every Department, whatever the merits of the Department or the needs of the Department may be.

Dr. H. S. Gour : Who said so ?

Mr. N. M. Samarth : Whether it was said so or not depends upon one's own memory. It was only yesterday that this argument was urged. I submit, Sir, that the Auditor-General is under the Government of India Act a statutory authority under Section 96D and he has to proceed as an independent authority to see that no appropriations are made by any Department from one head to another beyond those sanctioned or apart from those which are sanctioned by this House, to see that the expenditure has not exceeded, and to call to book any Department which has given orders for expenditure not sanctioned by this House. All that requires more money and better staff in order that this work may be done satisfactorily, and I trust that this amendment will be rejected as being ' Penny-wise and pound-foolish '.

Dr. H. S. Gour : Sir, I am surprised that Members like the Honourable the Finance Member and Mr. Samarth should raise an issue which, I submit, is wholly irrelevant to the present discussion. We have made it abundantly clear that the 5 per cent. reduction we demand is on the aggregate of total civil expenditure amounting to Rs. 20 crores. If they can show a total reduction of at least one crore of rupees, we do not demand that there should be a reduction on every demand. I have pointed out, Sir, in my speech yesterday that in some cases there may be no reduction at all ; in other cases, the reduction may aggregate to 5 per cent., 10 per cent. or even 15 per cent. But so long as the minimum of 5 per cent. is reached on the aggregate of civil expenditure, we should be satisfied. In that view it is wholly irrelevant as to what

[Dr. H. S. Gour.]

is required in the Audit Department. (Cries of 'Oh!') I repeat it. If the Audit Department wants more money, the Honourable the Finance Member is well aware of it that he will come up with a supplementary Budget in September next and ask for more money. If he wants reappropriation, he will be entitled to do so.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: No, we can't do so under the Act.

Dr. H. S. Gour: The reduction we ask for is a reduction upon that principle—the principle which this House has, I think, accepted, and which it should not allow itself to depart from.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: (Cries of 'Withdraw.') Excuse me, Sir, I am on my legs.

As a Member of the Standing Finance Committee I want to associate myself with the tribute that my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, has paid to the work of the Auditor-General. We have had many occasions to meet Mr. Gauntlett in the meetings of the Standing Finance Committee and I think I am expressing the views of all the Members of the Standing Finance Committee when I say that he has always treated us with the utmost consideration and has placed his case before us more clearly than, I am afraid, any other officer has been able to do. I myself had given notice of an amendment, but after what has fallen from my Honourable friend on the opposite side, I am convinced that we shall not be acting in the interests of the accounts of the country if we try to make economy in this Department. I should, therefore, strongly urge upon my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar, not to insist but to withdraw his motion.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Left to himself, Mr. Rangachariar would not have moved it, but the Party by a majority had decided that that should be the course adopted. I am glad to say now that I have got the support of my Party in not pressing this motion in the hope and expectation that other Departments would show greater reduction.

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Dr. H. S. Gour: I move now, Sir, for the adjournment of this debate till to-morrow. It is now 6 O'Clock, and I think we must adjourn, till to-morrow.

Mr. President: The question is:

'That a sum not exceeding Rs. 72,19,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1923, in respect of 'Audit''

The motion was adopted.

POLICE.

Mr. President: The question is:

'That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1923, in respect of 'Police''

Dr. H. S. Gour : I move, Sir, that the consideration of this item be adjourned till to-morrow in view of the fact that it is already past 6 O'Clock.

Mr. N. M. Joshi : Let the House be adjourned now.

Mr. President : I am quite prepared to accept a motion of that kind, but I must remind Honourable Members that there is a good deal of business to be got through under Voting on Demands.

Dr. H. S. Gour : We will finish, Sir.

Mr. President : I think we might dispose of one or two of these small items. I am in the hands of the House. As a matter of fact, the adjournment lies with the Chair. If the Honourable the Finance Member is prepared to adjourn now, I have no objection. I should like to hear what he has got to say on the point.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey : Government is entirely in the hands of the House. I do not wish to have it subsequently said that we did not allow sufficient time for the discussion of each of these important matters. If the House desires to regulate its own hours in this respect, we shall not seek to interfere.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 17th March, 1922.