

9th February 1927

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
(Official Report)

Volume I

FIRST SESSION

OF THE

THIRD LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1927



DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1927

CONTENTS—*contd.*

	PAGES.
Monday, 7th February, 1927—<i>contd.</i>	
Statement regarding the Currency Bill	532-33
The Indian Securities (Amendment) Bill—Constitution of the Select Committee	533-34
The Insolvency (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	534
The Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill—(Amendment of Article 182 of Schedule I)—Passed	535-42
The Steel Industry (Protection) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	542
Tuesday, 8th February, 1927—	
Questions and Answers	543-44
Motion for Adjournment to discuss the situation created by the Postponement of the consideration of the Indian Currency Bill—Leave granted	544-46
Election of Members to the Panel for the Central Advisory Council for Railways	546
Election of Members of the Select Committee on the Amendment of Standing Orders	546
Resolution <i>re</i> Amalgamation of the Oriya-speaking Tracts—Withdrawn	546-77
Resolution <i>re</i> Treatment of the Santhal Parganas as a backward tract—Discussion adjourned	578-87
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Postponement of the consideration of the Indian Currency Bill—Adopted	587-607
Wednesday, 9th February, 1927—	
Questions and Answers	609-12
Short Notice Question and Answer	612
Election of Members to the Panel of the Standing Committee on Emigration	612-13
Demands for Excess Grants	613-27
Demands for Supplementary Grants	627-40
Thursday, 10th February, 1927—	
Statement of Business	641
Resolution <i>re</i> Treatment of the Santhal Parganas as a Backward Tract—Adopted as amended	641-74
Resolution <i>re</i> Improvement and Expansion of Banking Facilities—Discussion adjourned	674-99
Monday, 14th February, 1927—	
Members Sworn	701
Questions and Answers	701-38
Private Notice Question and Answer	738-39
Unstarred Questions and Answers	739-45
Message from the Council of State	745
Bill passed by the Council of State	746
The Steel Industry (Protection) Bill—Discussion on the Motion to refer the Bill back to Select Committee adjourned	746-85

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 9th February, 1927.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST CERTAIN OFFICIALS OF THE BOMBAY, BARODA AND CENTRAL INDIA RAILWAY.

319. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta:** (a) What action has been taken by the Agent of the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, regarding the allegations laid by one Mr. J. N. Chinoy against Mr. E. T. Robinson, General Traffic Manager of the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, Mr. H. W. Gree, Deputy General Traffic Manager, Claims, and other officials of the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, referred to in the questions asked in the Assembly of the 3rd February, 1926, by Mr. Chamanlal and the reply of the Honourable Sir Charles Innes?

(b) Are Government aware that no legal action has up till now been taken against the said Mr. Chinoy, and if so, will Government state why?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The Railway Administration were advised by their counsel that it would be more in consonance with a due sense of proportion in matters of this character to ignore the wild allegations made by Mr. J. N. Chinoy, and therefore decided, with the concurrence of the Government of India, not to prosecute him.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Is it then the view of Government that, when the allegations are very serious, the best thing is not to take any notice of the case? Is that the attitude generally?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: No, Sir. All these cases are judged on their merits in the light of the advice given to us by our counsel. I may say that there was no doubt at all that we could have got a conviction in this matter provided publication could be proved satisfactorily, but we decided not to prosecute this gentleman because we were given to understand that his attacks were the product of a disordered imagination.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Who advised you in the matter? May we know the name of your counsel? May we also know, Sir, if a lawyer is a fit person to advise that a prosecution should not be undertaken against a man on medical grounds? Is it true, Sir, that when these serious allegations were made and when Government contemplated taking action, one of the officers suddenly left for England prior to his retirement?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: If the suggestion is that he left for England in connection with this case, it is entirely untrue.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Did he really leave for England or not before clearing up the charges made against him?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I am afraid, I do not know, Sir.

TREATMENT OF THE CHOTA NAGPUR DIVISION AS A BACKWARD TRACT.

320. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state when for the first time the Chhota Nagpur Division in the province of Bihar and Orissa was declared to be a "Backward Tract"? Is it the same period when this portion of the country was first brought into the British possession or at a later date?

(b) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table all the papers containing (i) His Excellency the then Governor General's orders calling for reports about the education and other attainments of the people of this division from the Local Government, (ii) the reports thus received in compliance therewith or submitted by them on their own initiative, and (iii) the decisions made thereon, and (iv) also the papers dealing with and fixing the various kinds of tests and standards prescribed by the Government of India or the British Parliament by which they distinguished in the past and still distinguish to-day the unfortunate people of the non-regulated districts from those of the regulated ones governed in the past and to be governed in future by laws made by the Indian Legislatures and the benevolent British Parliament?

(c) Did Government ever adopt any special measures to qualify the backward people of this division for better and more rights and privileges enjoyed by the people of regulated districts? If so, when and what? What are the results accruing from those measures? Are any of these measures in existence to-day? If so, what and where?

(d) Have Government ever made any inquiry as to the progress made by the people since then? If so, when and with what results? Have the people made any progress? If so, what? Will Government be pleased to state it with facts and figures?

(e) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table the papers, if any, dealing with the steps they took in regard to this division immediately before the last Notification No. 4-G., dated the 3rd January, 1921, declaring this division a "Backward Tract"?

(f) With a view to the growing importance of the Chhota Nagpur Division, will Government be pleased to state whether it is in their contemplation to withdraw the said notification in the near future? If not, do Government propose to consult the Local Government about this matter?

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: (a) In January, 1921. Before then it was, as it still is, a scheduled district under the Scheduled Districts Act, 1874.

(b) No.

(c) and (d). Relate to matters which primarily concern the Local Government, particularly the transferred side of it.

(e) and (f). The replies to both parts of the Honourable Member's question are in the negative.

CONVERSION OF THE DHANBAD SUB-DIVISION INTO THE DISTRICT OF DHANBAD.

321. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh:** Is it a fact that the Government of Bihar and Orissa at the instance of the Mining Association in the Chhota

Nagpur division have been in correspondence for some time with the Central Government here for declaring the Dhanbad Sub-Division with the vital part of the Hazaribagh District a separate district to be known as the district of Dhanbad? If so, will Government be pleased to lay on the table the said correspondence? Have Government arrived at any decision? If so, what?

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: There has been no such correspondence.

ELECTED EUROPEAN MAJORITY IN THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF KENYA.

322. ***Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru:** (a) Are Government aware that the European settlers of Kenya are demanding an elected European majority in the Legislature of that Colony?

(b) Have Government seen the report published recently in newspapers that, "as a result" of this demand it is "fairly certain" that the Governor of Kenya will during his stay in England discuss this question with the Colonial Office, and that the European settlers are confident that this demand will be agreed to?

(c) What steps do Government propose to take in the matter?

Mr. J. W. Bhore: (a) Government are aware that the proposal has been mooted by the leaders of the European non-official community.

(b) Yes.

(c) The matter is receiving the attention of the Government of India, who are fully alive to the issues involved.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Is it not a fact, Sir, that the European settlers in Kenya are in a numerical minority as compared with the Indians?

Mr. J. W. Bhore: I believe that is a fact, Sir.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: May I ask, Sir, whether it is laid down in the White Paper relating to Kenya that at present self-government should not be given to that Colony?

Mr. J. W. Bhore: I believe that that is so.

PUBLICATION OF THE REPORT OF THE FIJI DEPUTATION.

323. ***Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru:** (a) Now that the negotiations between the Government of India and His Majesty's Government in regard to outstanding grievances of Indians in Fiji have been concluded, when will Government publish the report of the deputation sent by them to Fiji in 1921?

(b) Considering that the negotiations were concluded in May 1926, why was not the correspondence relating to them published earlier in spite of repeated requests made in the Assembly during the last three years for being placed in full possession of all relevant facts as soon as possible?

Mr. J. W. Bhore: (a) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given by me to Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh's question No. 245 on the same subject.

(b) The correspondence was published as soon as the concurrence of the Colonial Office and the Government of Fiji was obtained.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: May I ask, with reference to the answers previously given to a similar question by the Honourable Member, whether the Honourable Sir Narasimha Sarma ever gave the Assembly an undertaking that he would soon publish the Report?

Mr. J. W. Bhore: If the Honourable Member will put down a question, I will have the necessary research made and give an answer.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: May I ask when the Government of India came to know of the opposition of the Fiji Government to the publication of the Report?

Mr. J. W. Bhore: For that question also I must have notice, Sir.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION AND ANSWER.

RELEASE OF POLITICAL DETENUS.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I beg to put a question of which I gave short notice to the Honourable the Home Member: Will the Government be pleased to state if they have taken or are contemplating any steps to give effect to the Resolution passed by this House on the 3rd February, recommending the immediate release of persons detained under old Regulations and the Bengal Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1925?

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: I stated fully in the course of the debate on the Resolution the policy of Government in regard to the release of individual detenues. We are in communication with the Government of Bengal regarding the practical steps required to give effect to that policy.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE PANEL OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON EMIGRATION.

Mr. President: I have to inform Honourable Members that the number of candidates nominated for election to the panel of the Standing Committee on Emigration is equal to the number required, and therefore I announce that the following Members are declared to be duly elected:

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas,

Khan Bahadur Haji Abdullah Haji Kasim,

Pandit Nilakantha Das,

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla,

Mr. N. M. Joshi,

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru,

Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum,

Dr. B. S. Moonje,

Mr. Ismail Khan,

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney,

Mr. Ambika Prasad Sinha,
Sir Darcy Lindsay,
Raja Ghazafar Ali Khan,
Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah,
Maulvi Abdul Matin Chaudhury, and
Mr. W. M. P. Ghulam Kadir Khan Dakhan.

DEMANDS FOR EXCESS GRANTS.

INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett (Finance Member): Sir, I beg to move that an excess grant of Rs. 14,28,692 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1924-25 in respect of the "Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department."

Sir, this excess grant and all the other excess grants which are proposed to be moved to-day were examined at considerable length by the Public Accounts Committee last summer, and Honourable Members will find in paragraphs 5 to 7 on pages 3 to 6 of the Public Accounts Committee's Report a full explanation of the reasons for the excesses in each case with recommendations for improvement on the system where such are thought desirable, ending up with the recommendation by the Assembly to agree to the excess grants. I do not know whether it is desirable to go into details of some of the technical explanations in each case, and I will for the moment not do more than move.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhamadan Rural): Sir, on the last occasion in February last year when excess grants were moved, it was understood that the occasion for the motion of excess grants was to be availed of to discuss generally the Report of the Public Accounts Committee and the suggestions and recommendations that they have made in regard to the scrutiny of the Audit and Appropriation Reports of the Government of India. My friend the Honourable the Finance Member to-day has contented himself with moving in the boldest manner he can find a motion for granting the excess under the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department. I desire to know, Sir, whether it is the intention of the Honourable the Finance Member to leave the Public Accounts Committee Report without any opportunity for discussion in this House and whether we merely come here to endorse what is an accomplished fact. The expenditure under the heads of all excess grants have actually been incurred and what we are asked to do is to regularise an admitted irregularity. Sir, if I am at liberty to discuss the points that have been raised in the Public Accounts Committee generally, not merely under all the excess grants that are to be voted by this House, but on the matters that have been dealt with in the Public Accounts Committee's Report, I have a right to complain, Sir, that the Honourable the Finance Member has allotted very little time for the purpose. Indeed, the manner in which he moved this motion made it clear that he does not expect

[Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar.]

the House nor does he want the House to discuss matters of such importance as are dealt with in the Public Accounts Committee. I find, Sir, that in the Public Accounts Committee's Report for last year, vastly more important questions than those dealt with in the previous year have been commented upon. We have instances, Sir, of cases which require very close further scrutiny and examination by the Public Accounts Committee that has been appointed for this year, cases involving extravagant expenditure, involving half a crore or one crore in some cases. We have had cases, Sir, in which questions have been raised as to the powers of various spending authorities. We have also had cases, Sir, in which the question of reappropriation from voted to non-voted heads and *vice versa* have had to be dealt with and I should have expected, Sir, the Finance Member to have given the House a proper opportunity and to have opened this motion with a general statement of what the Committee over which he presided did generally in the matter of the scrutiny of the Audit and Appropriation Report. One of the important questions, Sir, that has been dealt with in this Report is as to the powers of the Auditor General in India and his relations with the Auditor of the Accounts of the Secretary of State for India in England. I find, Sir, that the Auditor General and the Government of India in one department are practically carrying on a fight in respect of the powers vested in each as to the power to refer matters to the Secretary of State. I find also, Sir, the Auditor-General has raised the question that, in regard to the accounts of the High Commissioner for India, his powers should be statutorily defined and his relations with the Home Auditor should also be defined. These are matters, Sir, in which we think the House has every right to know the constitutional position taken by the Government of India. The Auditor-General, I find, in the course of his evidence bitterly complains that the departments true to the bureaucratic traditions, of which I find the Honourable Mr. Young, who is here, was a most tenacious advocate before the Public Accounts Committee, that the department concerned refused to make and prevented him from making a direct reference to the Secretary of State for India on a matter which is certainly very important to this House. He said that, in regard to the allowances of profit and advantage that are made to Governors and Members of Council, defined in the Statute of 1888 and continued since, these profits and advantages could not extend in respect of house rent and house rent allowances that are given to them or in the matter of electric charges and what not. There are a number of cases of this kind in respect of profits and advantages to Governors and Members of Council which, he says, are pending with him and as to which he has been unable to make a reference direct to the Secretary of State. He also says that, so far as his position is concerned, though his position is supposed to be one of independence of the Government of India and he is only subject to the control of the Secretary of State whenever he may choose to exercise it, yet he is told he cannot correspond directly with the Secretary of State on any matters on which he thinks the orders or the instructions of the Secretary of State should be available.

Then again, Sir, as regards the position of the High Commissioner of India, and the accounts that are dealt with by him; he says that it is no doubt true that in practice the Auditor of the accounts of the Secretary of State's Council has in practice been communicating with him in respect of the audit conducted in England in respect of the Home Accounts of the

Secretary of State in Council. As a matter of convention, I admit that the Home Accounts of the Government of India are generally laid before the Public Accounts Committee for perusal. I raised the question, Sir, last year as to the exact powers which the Public Accounts Committee have of perusing these reports and offering recommendations thereon. This has not been dealt with by the Finance Member or the Government. The peculiar position is, Sir, that, whereas in regard to the bulk of the finances of this country that are dealt with in this country, the Auditor-General is found to be not merely a creature of the Secretary of State but in many respects practically under the control of the Government of India; in respect of the very small part of the accounts of this country that are dealt with by the Auditor in England, his position has been, by Statute, meticulously defined to be a man of independence, who ought to be appointed every year and who corresponds in every degree to the position occupied by the Controller and Auditor-General in England, a man who could be removed only by the concurrent votes of both Houses of Parliament. Sir, we think it is high time that these matters should be properly placed before this House and be discussed and I had expected in fact that there was going to be a general discussion of this matter and I do feel still that it would be possible for the Honourable the Finance Member to give a date for the discussion of the very important questions that are raised in this Report. I feel that it would not be right for us merely to pass these excess grants in the very bald way in which he has put it. Sir, I object to the manner in which these excess grants have been brought up before this House and I do not propose to vote these excess grants unless and until we have had an opportunity of full discussion of the whole Report of the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. T. Prakasam (East Godavari and West Godavari *cum* Kistna: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, I rise to oppose this Demand. My Honourable friend, Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar, has dealt with the objections at length. I would like to confine myself to the one statement made by the Honourable Sir Basil Blackett that, "because this Demand involves some complicated working of the items, it was not worth while placing the details before this House." How can this House be expected to vote for this Excess Demand which can be criticised both with regard to the policy and the nature of its details, when the Honourable Member who rose to demand it here has not chosen to tell us the details? We are certainly sent here to understand these things and then to give a vote with regard to a Demand if we think it is proper, and I should certainly say that the course adopted by the Honourable Member is open to very serious objection. If he thought that we have all come here simply to nod our heads when it is stated in the House that this involves very complicated working out of the details, he will be very much mistaken; for, as my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar, has pointed out, it is the duty of the Finance Member to explain each item, to show how he is entitled to it, and to put the House in possession of all the details. I would appeal to the House not to pass any one of these Demands without knowing the details. It is an insult to every one of us if we are asked to vote in this manner and if we should be voting in this manner.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadian): Sir, I fully agree with the observations which have fallen from my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar. Besides going into the questions which have been raised by him, I would like to know why, when within a fortnight

[Mr. B. Das.]

hence we will have to discuss the main Budget, some of the items that have been included in the Supplementary Demands might not have been left to be considered with the main items of the Budget as they involve questions of policy and commitment of large expenditure. I would just point out one fact by way of illustrating my point. Take the Grant for Aviation.

Mr. B. K. Shanmukham Chetty (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadian Rural): On a point of order, Sir, Are we discussing Supplementary Demands?

Mr. B. Das: I am just illustrating my object. Two years ago, when the Cairo-Karachi Aviation scheme was started, we were told that India's liability would be small. Here I find

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I would ask you again on a point of order, Sir. We are discussing the excess grants and I believe the Honourable Member is interested in the supplementaries.

Mr. B. Das: Yes, Sir, I am discussing the policy and I am giving an illustration to show that the Honourable the Finance Member has not given any opportunity to the House to express its opinion on the general policy of the House on Aviation. I am taking that illustration. Here it is stated: "Subject to the question of policy involved being accepted by the Legislative Assembly before whom a separate memorandum will be laid." That is as regards the policy on Aviation. I thought that a memorandum would have been supplied to us this morning, but it is not here on the table. We are asked to give sanction to several lakhs of rupees in respect of the Security Printing Press and so on. There must be something very wrong in the Government estimates that they want so much extra money within a few months. They slyly bring in excess grants involving questions of policy. They bring before the House Supplementary Demands, both capital grants and revenue grants. I want that the whole matter should be discussed later on during the budget time and that it should not be forced out of us by Supplementary Grants. We are told that very slight excess grants are required but under the system of excess grants big policies are given effect to and we are asked to commit ourselves to things which we will not commit ourselves to if we have ample opportunity to go into those things.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I have spent several years in trying to get this House, or rather the previous House, to take an interest in the excess grants and in the Report of the Public Accounts Committee. I think the Member who spoke second, Mr. Prakasam, was not in the previous House, but those Members who were in the previous House will not have forgotten that I have more than once tried in connection with the excess grants to raise a general discussion on the Public Accounts Committee's Report and to raise an interest in the House in the sort of questions that are raised by the Public Accounts Committee and it has not been a success. The House has not desired to discuss these matters.. (Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: "Question.") I except Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar who was an extraordinarily valuable member of a previous Public Accounts Committee and I rejoice to see him a member of the present one. If I did not set out to give a full explanation of this particular excess grant and of the others when I spoke before it was for two reasons. The

first is that I doubted whether the House wished it. The second is that they have been fully examined by a Committee of this House at great length. They have been carefully gone into with witnesses and that Committee has come to certain conclusions and made a report. It has made certain recommendations for action with a view to preventing a recurrence in some cases of the causes which led to an excess grant which is always for some reason or other objectionable. It is objectionable that money should be spent before it has been voted by this House and it shows some kind of failure of system whenever there is an excess grant. The Public Accounts Committee has made its Report and has given full explanations which are amplified by the evidence which appears at the end of a volume. If there is a general desire on the part of this House on any occasion to have a discussion of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee as a whole I shall be very anxious indeed to press upon my Honourable friend the Leader of the House to give time for such a discussion. But I may say, perhaps regretfully, that this morning is the first time this Session that it has even been suggested to me that the House desires to have a discussion of the Public Accounts Committee's Report.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): The House actually discussed it last year.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: It was not intimated to me beforehand that the House would like, on the excess votes, to discuss the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, but I may say that if you, Sir, regard it as in order, I have no objection to a discussion now.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Oshetty: We have had no notice.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: We are hardly in a position to . . .

Mr. President: Order, order. The question is:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 14,28,692 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1924-25 in respect of the 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department'."

The motion was adopted.

SURVEY OF INDIA.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that an excess grant of Rs. 1,13,327 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1924-25 in respect of the "Survey of India".

This excess was due in the first place to the fact that the estimates expected certain savings which were not at the end realised and in the second place that an erroneous adjustment amounting to Rs. 42,000 was made in the estimates and had to be rectified in the following year, thus causing an excess of Rs. 42,000 in the expenditure of that year. The third was that larger expenditure took place on Survey parties working for Provincial Governments. The fourth was that less was realised from the sale of maps than was anticipated. The Public Accounts Committee examined the causes for this excess with very considerable care and the

[Sir Basil Blackett.]

general upshot of their examination might, I think, be said to have been that information as to the progress of expenditure was not sufficiently early in the hands of the responsible accounting officer. That is a subject which has been given considerable attention to by the Public Accounts Committee from the beginning, namely, the necessity that the officers responsible for keeping within the voted grant should be in a position to know the progress of expenditure. In this case there was an obvious failure of information and it was not until it was too late to ask for a Supplementary Grant that the Department discovered that it was in need of more money than had been voted. A Pay and Accounts Office, in which audit and accounts are separated, has now been established in connection with the Survey of India and we have, I think, very good reasons to share the hope of the Public Accounts Committee that better vigilance will now be exercised and that such excesses due to these causes will not recur.

The motion was adopted.

ARCHÆOLOGY.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that an excess grant of Rs. 57,702 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1924-25 in respect of "Archæology",

In this case the excess is really a matter of accounting. It was decided in the course of the year 1925-26 that the cost of upkeep of certain monuments and gardens in the United Provinces was chargeable to the Central revenues. It had been initially paid from the revenues of the United Provinces. That decision having been arrived at, it was necessary that provision should be made in the Central Budget for meeting this expenditure, and, instead of following a recommendation of the previous Public Accounts Committee that in such a case the expenditure should be repaid in the year after it had been incurred by the presentation of a supplementary estimate or out of money provided by the Assembly in the year 1925-26, the charge was written back to the year 1924-25 in which it had been incurred with the result that there was an excess over the provision for the year 1924-25 under that head and there was no opportunity of presenting a supplementary estimate before the expenditure was incurred so far as the Central Government was concerned. There was a misunderstanding as to the intentions of the Government of India in this case and in future I hope that attention will always be given to the recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee, accepted by the Government of India, that when such an adjustment has to be made it shall not be written back to the previous year but shall be chargeable to the revenue of the year in which the decision was arrived at.

The motion was adopted.

EDUCATION.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I beg to move that an excess grant of Rs. 1,546 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure

chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1924-25 in respect of " Education ".

The excess in this case is an illustration of what is rather a considerable difficulty in our accounting system. There are certain amounts of expenditure which the Government of India incur as the agent of some non-governmental authority, in this case the Rajkumar and Aitchison Colleges, and the system has been that part of the expenditure of those colleges is met out of the grant from the Government of India and the Government of India have been responsible for meeting the expenditure of these colleges as a whole and then recovering from the funds of the colleges a sum in excess of that which is provided from the pocket of the tax-payer of the Central Government: that is to say, the expenditure takes place out of Government money in the first instance, which is recouped when the receipts of the colleges come in, and, provided that the full amount is recouped less the Government grant, everything appears to be in order. But if the sum is not recovered until the year after, the Government have in fact expended a sum which has not been voted by the Assembly. But that is not the only difficulty. It is a very difficult question to answer when one is asked "Under what authority do the Government incur expenditure out of the tax-payer's pocket on account of a non-Government service in advance of the receipt from that non-Government source of the sum with which to meet that expenditure?" We have, as members of the Public Accounts Committee will remember, gone into this question at very considerable length and made certain definite recommendations. In regard to the Rajkumar and Aitchison Colleges we hope we have taken steps which will prevent a recurrence of this excess. On the more general question the further pages of the Public Accounts Committee's Report will be found to be of very considerable interest, but in this particular case we have, we hope, taken steps which will prevent a recurrence of the excess grant.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: Sir, I was interested to hear from the Honourable the Finance Member that this question of regularising the excess grants made in respect of expenditure by bodies outside governmental organisations has engaged the attention of the Public Accounts Committee, but I am still unable to see how this Government can take upon itself the responsibility of asking this House for an excess grant in respect of expenditure under any head unless the Government and this House have the authority to scrutinise the accounts of those institutions. It is not merely the case of the Rajkumar and Aitchison Colleges in which I dare say the amounts may be recovered from high personages and dignitaries who are generally the residents there. The question, as the Honourable the Finance Member stated, is one of more general importance. The Government make grants to several institutions and in respect of those institutions they provide for some sort of voice in their control, and if this policy of making grants to industrial concerns is developed so as to include the presence, for instance, of a Government director in these institutions, the matter becomes further complicated and the question to what extent the accounts or the affairs of those institutions should be subject to the audit or scrutiny of Government financial authorities is one which demands far greater attention than the Public Accounts Committee has given to it. And we feel that we in this House ought not to be called upon to make a grant in respect of any matter where it is an excess on the accounts of those bodies unless we have an opportunity to scrutinise those accounts and find out

[Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar.]

for ourselves that that excess has really and justly occurred. By way of analogy I may say that it is not merely in respect of the accounts of the Central Government but in Provincial Governments also, a good deal of laxity prevails in this matter. I can mention to the Honourable the Finance Member an instance in Madras in which the Local Government without rhyme or reason and without any provision in the rules thought fit to advance to a statutory body outside the Government, namely, what is known as the Endowments Board under the Religious Endowment Act in Madras, some money for them to carry on their administration when the Act under which they were constituted was still reserved and was undergoing re-examination at the hands of the Legislature, the Governor and the Governor General. They found that the Act was treated as null and void and that the income which they had expected to derive by reason of the statutory power which they had to levy that revenue could not come to them because the persons assessed contested the legality of the levy in a court of law, and the whole machinery was upset with the result that that institution went without funds and as the Ministry there had set up that organisation, they went out of their way to make a certain loan to them out of the Provincial Advances and Loans Account. I claim that the Local Government has no power to make any advance out of the Provincial Advances and Loans Account except under the four classes specifically described in the Provincial Loans and Accounts Resolutions. What is the position of the Government when it makes advances to an institution which might expend it extravagantly and of whose solvency we have no idea? It may or may not be able to repay the sum. I think all these cases raise a very general question which requires much closer scrutiny than what may possibly be given by the Public Accounts Committee at its sittings comprising a few days. I hope, therefore, that the Government will declare its policy on this matter so that the House may have an opportunity of discussing it.

Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum (North-West Frontier Province: Nominated Non-Official): As one interested in education, may I ask the Honourable the Finance Member just a small question, Sir, namely, whether it was the lack of applications for further grants that has brought about such a small demand for extra grants before the House or whether there were any strict instructions issued to the education authorities of the minor administrations under the Government of India, which prevented them from submitting more applications for further grants with the result that this demand for an extra grant has been reduced to Rs. 1,546. I see that even the Department of Archaeology, which is only meant for digging out old ruins and graves, has received Rs. 57,000 extra, while Education, which is the most important subject, has not come up with a larger demand than Rs. 1,546 only.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I think the answer to my friend Sir Abdul Qaiyum's question as to why Education does not get more than Archaeology is that in Education we are concerned with the training for the future, whereas Archaeology is concerned with the past. This is an excess grant that is entirely concerned with the past. Therefore, one is glad to see that in so far as the two of them have sinned, the sin of the future is less than the sin of the past. The amount of an excess grant is

obviously not a guide to the total amount that is spent in a particular service.

On the general question raised by Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar, it is a very interesting one, though I am not quite sure that it arises directly out of this case. The position in this case is simply that certain receipts did not come in until after the end of the year, so that there was an excess in the amount of the actual expenditure over the amount of the Government grant by this small sum of Rs. 1,500. That sum came in the year after. So there was no final excess taking the two years together over the amount granted by the Assembly in the amount that was actually spent. But the difficulty was that the Government were as a matter of fact spending money as agents, which had not been voted by the Assembly, in the hope of recovering it later, and it is a very doubtful question, I think, whether that is a desirable position, whether the Government ought to be in the position of having money to spend, other than the money voted for the purpose. On the question of the scrutiny of the accounts the position that the Government are inclined to take is this—that when a large grant, which is a large proportion of the total sum available for expenditure by a particular institution or body, is given from the pocket of the Central taxpayer, then either the accounts of that body should be audited by the Auditor General or their accounts should be available for the inspection of the Auditor General and printed together with the Public Accounts Committee Report, or, at any rate, the department of the Government which is concerned with the grant to that body should be in a position to satisfy itself fully that the institution is being properly run and that the amount is being properly expended and should be in a position to answer any questions that may be put to it by the Public Accounts Committee or by the House when there is any doubt on that subject. Obviously you do not want to overload the accounts with the accounts of all the Universities in the country and of the enormous number of bodies in the country to whom the Government may be making comparatively small grants. It must be a question of degree but that a certain scrutiny ought to be maintained by or on behalf of this House over the expenditure of bodies which receive grants is, I think, a broad principle that no one would question. The doubt is as to the extent of the scrutiny.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: On a point of information, Sir. I want to know from the Finance Member whether the recoveries from these Rajkumars are always equal to the advances made or does this House contribute towards the education of the Rajkumars and they willingly accept the tax-payers' money.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: It is perfectly clear in this case that the whole amount in excess is recovered after the event. There is no question of ultimate charge on the tax-payer. It is merely a question between one year and another.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 1,546 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1924-25 in respect of 'Education'."

The motion was adopted.

CIVIL VETERINARY SERVICES.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I move that an excess grant of Rs. 13,395 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1924-25 in respect of "Civil Veterinary Services".

The excess in this case is explained on page 4 of the Public Accounts Committee Report as due to various small adjustments and also to the action of the officer concerned in spending money in March without sufficient authority, on which the Public Accounts Committee made some not very complimentary remarks. Another point of some interest which arises in this case is that this is in a sense a technical excess. The Government of India in the Finance Department provided out of its reserves a sum sufficient to meet this excess but the Public Accounts Committee had taken the view in the report for a previous year, and it had been accepted by the Government of India, that the fact that the Finance Department has a reserve out of which to meet unexpected excesses of expenditure in various directions does not override the general rule of appropriation that the Government ought not to spend money on any particular voted service in excess of the sum voted for that particular service. Those who are interested in this subject will see in paragraph 12 of the Public Accounts Committee's Report a full discussion of that particular point which, owing to questions as to the exact meaning of the Government of India Act, is still *sub judice*. We have however acted, I may say, in regard to the Supplementary Demands which will be placed before the House after these excess votes have been dealt with, on the assumption that in spite of the legal difficulties it is right that the Government should obtain from this House authority for spending on a particular voted grant the amount they require to be spent on that grant even though they may be able to meet a small excess out of their reserve.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: Sir, the Honourable the Finance Member raised in connection with this grant the question of expenditure from the reserves on which the Public Accounts Committee had bestowed attention the year before last. This matter, it was understood, was referred to the Law Department of the Government of India and I understand from the last Public Accounts Committee's Report that the Legislative Department or Law Department—whatever it is called—

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: The Legislative Department.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: I think it is a wrong name. That department considers that to bring up a grant again in respect of a sum spent out of the reserve which had already been voted could not be strictly legal.

There is, however, another alternative course which it was suggested the Government might take and which we indicated in the previous Public Accounts Committee, namely, to establish a kind of Civil Contingencies Fund, not exactly subject to the vote of the Legislature, except on one occasion, and that that Civil Contingencies Fund should operate as a kind of reservoir into which these sums, as and when they are voted by the Assembly, will be paid back just as is done with a suspense account. That is, I think, a more natural way of dealing with it, for although it is true in respect of what is spent out of the Reserve, the Assembly will be called upon to vote these sums, the fact that there is a reserve which has actually been voted by the Legislative Assembly will operate as a very great temptation to incur expenditure and pressure will be brought to bear on the

Finance Department of the Government of India, not necessarily in the present Finance Member's time, but later, to incur expenditure out of this reserve, which is so much in the hands of the Government of India, to help out needy departments as and when they want money in necessitous cases. There is also one other difficulty which I feel. It is perfectly true that in respect of a voted grant, when sums which are available from a non-voted head under the same grant are brought up, we raise the question, and we said, so long as money is spent on a voted head, there must be a vote on that. But we have not dealt with the contrary case when money remaining out of a sum which has been actually voted by this House might be taken over to a non-voted head, in which case it would not come under the scrutiny of this House. Sir, this is a matter which ought to be dealt with by some definite ruling of the Finance Department.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, in regard to the Legislative Department, or the obstructive department as it is in this case, the Finance Department is very much in sympathy with these remarks of Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar. We do hold that the proper solution of this difficulty, if we can manage it, is something in the nature of a Civil Contingencies Fund, but we are up against another difficulty in that we are advised that it is *ultra vires* of the existing law, or it may be. The matter is still being examined and the results of that examination will come before the Public Accounts Committee this summer. The further question of what is to be done in cases in which there is a saving on a voted portion of the grant and a corresponding excess on a non-voted, is also dealt with, I think, in paragraph 20 of the Public Accounts Committee's Report, and that recommendation and the views of the Government of India upon it will no doubt be one of the subjects which will be further considered by this year's Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 13,395 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1924-25 in respect of 'Civil Veterinary Services'."

The motion was adopted.

CENSUS.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that an excess grant of Rs. 2,330 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1924-25 in respect of "Census".

This is another case where the excess is covered by an allotment from the Finance Department reserve and raises, I think, no new special accounting point.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadian Urban): Sir, I have great doubt whether, under rule 49 of the Legislative Rules, the excess grant can be asked for in this way. That rule says:

"When money has been spent on any service for which the vote of the Assembly is necessary during any financial year in excess of the amount granted for that service and for that year, a demand for the excess shall be presented to the Assembly by the Finance Member, and shall be dealt with in the same way by the Assembly as if it were a demand for a grant."

Therefore the excess grant, just like a supplementary grant, should be asked for during the financial year for which the grant was voted and for that year. The language is like that.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I am not a legal expert, and if that is the case, the whole of our procedure in regard to excess grants is undoubtedly irregular. An excess unfortunately, from the point of view of the law, cannot be incurred until the year in which it is incurred has come to an end. If it is also the law that a demand for an excess grant cannot be made after the end of the year in respect of which it is incurred, the *impasse* is beautifully complete.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 2,330 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1924-25 in respect of 'Census'."

The motion was adopted.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that an excess grant of Rs. 1,483 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1924-25 in respect of "Joint Stock Companies".

This I think needs no special additional explanation.

The motion was adopted.

SUPERANNUATION PENSIONS AND ALLOWANCES.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that an excess grant of Rs. 2,63,167 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1924-25 in respect of "Superannuation Allowances and Pensions".

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: What is this due to?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: The explanation of this is given in item No. 8 of the Public Accounts Committee's Report. It is undoubtedly a case where there was a failure to exchange information which was in possession of responsible authorities before the end of the year and was not brought to the notice of the authorities responsible for presenting a supplementary estimate in time to enable them to do so. It was a case which I hope our arrangements in future will do something to prevent.

Mr. M. K. Acharya (South Arcot *cum* Chingleput: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I rise to move the amendment of which I have given notice. It runs as follows:

"That the Demand under the head 'Superannuation Allowances and Pensions' be reduced to Rs. 100."

That is of course the motion. Within brackets some reasons are given. (Government's failure (1) to give proper replies to interpellations and (2) delay in adjusting figures in Demands for Supplementary Grants.) I put them down when I was asked to do so just as I felt the reasons in my mind. The first thing in there is Government's failure to give proper replies to interpellations. When the sheet containing the excess grants was put in my hand, psychologically speaking, I was smarting under what I considered the insult offered to this House and to you, Sir, when a question was asked and a reply which I considered insulting was given. When that was in my mind and I found here something in the shape of superannuation allowances and pensions to the Executive, I thought what I considered to be the offence of one member of the Government deserved to be visited upon all in whose interest these superannuation allowances and pensions are being asked for. I quite agree that will be vicarious.

punishment; and I do not propose at this moment to discuss the logical or doctrinal aspect or to say whether vicarious punishment and vicarious suffering are right or wrong.

I do not propose at this moment to discuss the wider aspects of the principle involved. A second reason therefore is also added. I
 12 Noon. propose when the regular budget is presented by means of some technical cuts to get a proper reply from Government—and from you also, Sir,—as to the manner in which questions duly admitted by you ought to be treated by the other side of the House. Therefore, that part of the question I shall not press to-day although I must again repeat there is a very real issue in my mind and I hope everybody in this House will realise as much as I realise that when questions are admitted by you we have the right to expect that they shall be answered properly.

Mr. President: I should like to know what possible connection there is between the failure of Government to give proper answers to questions and this particular supplementary excess grant.

Mr. M. K. Acharya: I am just explaining, Sir, although I do not press it, that I consider it to be a very bad piece of . . .

Mr. President: Order, order. That may be so. There are other ways in which that question can be raised, the Honourable Member will agree.

Mr. M. K. Acharya: Therefore, I will go on with the second reason given by me, namely, the delay in adjusting figures in Demands for Supplementary Grants. Now I have taken some pains to read the evidence which was given with reference to question 810 on page 150 of the Evidence volume. With respect to these superannuation allowances there is a question given and this is the answer:

"It was due entirely to the fact that we recovered less from the Commercial departments than we expected to recover on account of pensions. For the reason why we failed to provide additional funds to meet it or to ask for additional funds, I am afraid I shall have to refer to the Accountant General, Central Revenues. He was responsible for it as far as I know. He did not tell us."

And I take it that some of the questions which follow are with regard to that particular subject. The House has already heard from my friend the Honourable Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar as to the general issue—that officials should not come forward with demands for excess grants but that as far as possible these accounts should all be properly adjusted within the year under review and if necessary Supplementary Grants should be asked for in time. In this case it was a very responsible officer of Government, as noted here, namely, the Accountant General of Central Revenues, who was responsible for this laxity. Now this House has a right to expect an explanation why such a highly paid officer with the help of a huge department which must no doubt be working under him ought to have failed in adjusting these accounts properly within the year under consideration. On that ground I would press that at least one of the many items that are asked for in the Grants to-day ought to be rejected and at least on that one account, that we do expect the heads of these huge departments to be very much more prompt in the discharge of their duties.

Mr. President: What exactly is the motion which the Honourable Member is moving? Does he wish to reduce this Demand to Rs. 100 or by Rs. 100?

Mr. M. K. Acharya: To Rs. 100. It is a practical rejection of the grant.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, in the interests of those same conventions to which the last speaker attaches importance I was very glad to see that you, Sir, intervened to draw the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that this is no opportunity to discuss the failure of Members of Council and others to answer questions to the entire satisfaction of the questioner. I may leave that point, I think, where it was left by the course of the debate.

As regards the proposal that this grant should be reduced to Rs. 100, I would point out to the House that what has happened is that this money has actually been spent. If the whole of it is not voted there is a sum which has been spent which is not covered by the authority of this House. The reasons for the excess vote are in part the very reasons why this House is being asked to reject the vote, that is to say, the Government is coming forward to ask the House to grant this sum because owing to the failure of certain officers to foresee the need of a supplementary grant an excess grant has been incurred, and the Honourable Member is asking that, owing to the failure of certain officers to see in time the need for a supplementary, the House should make a cut. For the same reason, therefore, the House is being asked to make a cut and to grant the vote. The Public Accounts Committee reports quite definitely the failure. It is a failure which is regretted and it is a failure which the Committee turned its attention to remedy and which the Government of India, on the advice of the Public Accounts Committee, will continue to try and remedy so that it may not occur in future or occur less frequently. I cannot, in answer to the complaint that there has been a failure, say anything except that there has been a failure which we are trying to remedy and it is because there has been a failure that we need this money.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 2,63,167 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1924-25 in respect of 'Superannuation Allowances and Pensions'."

The motion was adopted.

REFUNDS.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that an excess grant of Rs. 1,81,548 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1924-25 in respect of "Refunds".

The explanation is given in the Report of the Public Accounts Committee. Steps have been taken to prevent a recurrence of the causes which led to this particular excess and I do not think I need take the time of the House in adding to the explanation.

The motion was adopted.

BALUCHISTAN.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that an excess grant of Rs. 1,40,783 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1924-25 in respect of "Baluchistan".

This is amply explained, I think, in the Report and in the evidence of the Public Accounts Committee. It is another case where the excess was not discovered in time to come up for a Supplementary Grant, as ought to have been done.

The motion was adopted.

IRRIGATION NOT CHARGED TO REVENUE.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that an excess grant of Rs. 80,898 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1924-25 in respect of "Irrigation not charged to Revenue".

The explanation in this case, Sir, is similar in nature to that in respect of the excess on payments for the Rajkumar and Aitchison Colleges, that is, the non-receipt by the end of the year of contributions which were only received after the year was over.

The motion was adopted.

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS.

STAMPS.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett (Finance Member): Sir, I beg to move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,68,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Stamps".

I shall be glad, Sir, to give any explanations that may be asked in respect of this Demand, the reason for which is explained in the Report of the Standing Finance Committee to which reference is made at the bottom of the page.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, with regard to these Demands for Supplementary Grants, I have got a complaint to make against the Government, a complaint which is shared by many Members on this side of the House. The list containing the Demands for these Supplementary Grants and the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee before which these Supplementary Demands were placed, were given to us only on Monday night. (*Some Honourable Members:* "Yesterday morning.") I got it late on Monday night, and I am given to understand that some Members got it only yesterday morning; and we were expected during the course of the day to go through these voluminous reports, to understand these Demands for Supplementary Grants and to hand in amendments. Even according to the rules we are, I think, expected to give two days' notice of amendments that we propose to make. It is physically impossible for us to give this notice. Under these circumstances, Sir, I protest emphatically against the way in which the Government have brought these Demands for Supplementary Grants before this House.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I am not without sympathy with the Honourable Member's complaint. We have been working under considerable difficulties this year owing to the fact that the Standing Finance Committee could not be brought together until the House had elected it. That happens every three years when there is a new Assembly. In the other years the practice is for the Standing Finance Committee to be called together early in January. It can then go through the papers put before it, discuss them, make its recommendations at leisure, and the time of the officers of the Government concerned is also a little bit easier to arrange in the interests of the Standing Finance Committee when the Committee meets before the Assembly is actually sitting. This year that

[Sir Basil Blackett.]

could not be done and it was not until last Saturday that we completed the work of the Standing Finance Committee. Every effort was made by some hard Sunday labour to get these documents into the hands of Members on Monday, and we did get it into the hands of some Members, I understand, on Monday, though some Members perhaps did not sit up so late at night as I do myself and did not receive the documents until Tuesday morning. The Government naturally in such circumstances will not raise any objection on the ground of shortage of notice to any motion for reduction. But I think the House is in a position with the very ample material before it to consider these grants now on the floor of the House and there are officers of the Government ready and in some cases no doubt anxious to give full explanation.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: May I know, Sir, why it was not possible for the Government to give us two days' time within which we could study these documents and give notice? It was quite possible for the Government to find other days.

Mr. President: The remedy is in the hands of Honourable Members themselves if they care, but if they do not choose to avail themselves of the constitutional remedy it is their own fault.

The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,68,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of 'Stamps'."

The motion was adopted.

INTEREST ON MISCELLANEOUS OBLIGATIONS.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 20,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations".

This is a case of a supplementary estimate which does not make any difference to the total Budget. The sum provided was by some error provided under the head of non-voted by mistake for voted. When that discovery was made there was obviously a shortage of Rs. 20,000 under voted and an excess under non-voted, and the Government now come before the House to ask them to regularise the position.

The motion was adopted.

STAFF, HOUSEHOLD AND ALLOWANCES OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 10,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor-General." Sir, this is another case where the provision has already been made, but under the wrong head. Only in this case the sum has already been voted by the Assembly and we are merely asking them to vote it under a different head.

Mr. M. K. Acharya: Sir, I beg to move the amendment that stands in my name:

"That the Demand under the head 'Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor General' be reduced to Rs. 100, as a protest against a building for His Excellency the Viceroy being maintained in Calcutta."

Sir, I suppose the general rule is—although I have not got a copy of the rules before me—that Demands for Supplementary Grants should be dealt with in the same way as demands for ordinary grants. I think, Sir, it would be

Mr. President: The Honourable Member need not discuss the point of order unless it is raised.

Mr. M. K. Acharya: I wished, Sir, to fortify myself against any objection being taken. However, I shall proceed. I consider that this is a relic of the old days when the Viceroy lived in Calcutta and had a big garden and house there. I really do not know whether in the changed circumstances of the latest system of administration it is necessary to maintain a huge building in Calcutta for the Viceroy to go and stay there perhaps for a week or two every year. I consider that this is a very lavish and not very satisfactory item of expenditure which is always taken from the poor tax-payer in the long run. I should very much like, therefore, that whether it is put in one account or another account it should be put into no account whatsoever. I should consider that an item like this ought to be justified on its merits. And, unless we all feel quite satisfied that this Rs. 10,000 taken from the poor tax-payer is properly spent and that it is quite necessary for the efficient administration of the country, I should be very unwilling, and I hope everybody on this side of the House at least would be equally unwilling, to vote any money, even if it be a single rupee, for any expenditure which is not absolutely necessary in the best interests of the land. I therefore move this, Sir, and I hope that on this one item at least the vote of the House will be made quite clear that in putting forth Demands for Grants before this House every care ought to be taken to avoid extravagance, because we certainly consider this a very extravagant demand in the case of a poor country like India.

Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar (Madras ceded districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I had no desire to take any part in this grant or any grant of these Supplementary Demands, but, even if I had a desire, under ordinary circumstances, I should not have selected this particular Demand for opposition, for more reasons than one. Sir, firstly, three years ago when I came to this Assembly the first lesson that I learnt was that figures of five digits in the Government of India were merely token figures used often only for rounding purposes, and as this Demand involves only a paltry sum of Rs. 10,000 I should not have thought of opposing it. Secondly, Sir, as this Demand relates to the luxuries of His Excellency the Viceroy, I should not have grudged it. But merged as our countrymen are in poverty, in misery and millions of people are starving even without a single meal in a day, we have never denied any Demand from our distinguished guest for any luxurious comforts of his. But, Sir, on this occasion I am inclined to oppose it. I oppose it, because it is wanted for the maintenance of a garden in Calcutta called Belvedere, whereas I have not seen a single tear shed over the sorrows of Belvedere from the opposite side. Sir, you have further plucked away all the finest flowers of the peoples' park all round this garden, crushed them and cast them

[Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar.]

away in Mandalay, and, Sir, you want to maintain a paradise in Calcutta. Are you justified? I do not want the Honourable the Finance Member to answer this, but I want the Honourable the Home Member who is absent or some *alter ego* of his to answer this. . . .

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I did not intervene before, but I would point out to you that this is a proposal to transfer from Demand No. 41 to another Demand a sum which has already been voted and a large part of which has already been spent. The result of its not being voted to-day would be that it would still be spent under Demand No. 41 having already been voted by the Assembly and not under the Demand proposed by Government now. Under these circumstances, I would ask you whether a discussion of the purpose for which money is required, namely, for expenditure on a garden is entirely in order.

Mr. J. M. Dunnett (Home Department: Nominated Official): May I be permitted to say, Sir, that the Leader of the House is the last Member who would show disrespect to the Chair or to this House and that he is absent on this exhilarating occasion only because he is wanted in another place.

Mr. President: Does the Honourable Member want to say anything on the point of order?

Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar: Yes, Sir. I have been arguing, Sir, that a paradise in a desert is unnecessary. If I am ruled out of order, I shall obey that ruling, and though my tongue will surrender, my heart will not.

I proceed to the next point, Sir. The Honourable the Finance Member stated that this is an item already voted under Demand No. 41, Civil Works, but the footnote shows nothing of the sort and a reappropriation has to be made from the reserve in Demand No. 72, Miscellaneous.

Sir, I have to say one word more about the suggestion that is made in the footnote, perhaps an unwise suggestion, that this item be transferred to General Administration. I consider it to be an unwise step, Sir, for the Government, and a delicate step for us. If we voted against this Demand, and if His Excellency the Viceroy has to certify he will have to say "I think that if the flowers wither away in the garden of Calcutta, the general administration of the country will come to a standstill". Sir, I do not see how the Government are justified in asking for this grant at this particular juncture, at this psychological moment, when they ought to have been gracious, just and equitable to Bengal before they made a demand on this House.

***Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer** (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhamadan Rural): Sir, I do not want to follow the line of argument of the two Members on this side of the House, but I would ask the Honourable the Finance Member if he has read the very delightful observations on the subject made by Lord Curzon in his two volumes on the Government of India. I believe, Sir, Lord Curzon was very unhappy over the derogatory position assigned to the Viceroy by transferring him during the short visits he pays in X'mas to a much minor building, while the old Viceregal Lodge is allotted to the Governor of Bengal. I think, Sir, at least to maintain the prestige of the Viceroy, that the building should

*Speech not corrected by the Honourable Member.

be abandoned. I hope the Honourable the Finance Member has read these volumes; if he has not, I hope he will read them, and that, in the light of Viceregal prestige, he will revise his attitude.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, the answer to the last question is, in the affirmative.

Mr. President: The question I have to put is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor General' be reduced to Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 10,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1927, in respect of 'Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor General'."

The motion was adopted.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, HEALTH AND LANDS.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 20,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Government of India, Department of Education, Health and Lands."

The object of this supplementary sum is to pay the expenses of the transfer of records from Calcutta to Delhi.

The motion was adopted.

SURVEY OF INDIA.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,89,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "the Survey of India."

The motion was adopted.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 18,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "the Geological Survey."

The motion was adopted.

ARCHÆOLOGY.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,21,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Archæology."

The motion was adopted.

MEDICAL SERVICES.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 17,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Medical Services."

The motion was adopted.

PUBLIC HEALTH.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 68,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Public Health."

The motion was adopted.

AGRICULTURE.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 27,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Agriculture."

Khan Bahadur Haji Abdullah Haji Kasim (West Coast and Nilgiris: Muhammadan): Sir, in supporting the grant, I wish to bring to the notice of the Government one thing. I had occasion to visit the Agricultural College at Coimbatore as an honorary visitor and I was surprised to find that there was a building under construction at a cost of four lakhs of rupees to accommodate only 160 students. I put the same question in the Madras Legislative Council and I brought it to the notice of the Government of Madras and the Honourable the Minister for Development told us that they got this grant from the Government of India. So, what I would suggest to the Government is that, before sanctioning such grants, they should go minutely into the scheme and see whether so much money is necessary for building. I would suggest, instead of spending a lot of money for building purposes, it would be better that the Government give money to encourage agriculture and for demonstration farms and grants to Local Governments.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I am not quite sure to what the Honourable Member refers. The sentiments which he expressed are such as, I think, the Government might well agree with, but I think they have nothing to do with the buildings or the expenditure for which this particular supplementary is incurred. This relates to the Sugarcane Station at Coimbatore and nothing else. I have no doubt, if the Honourable Member will speak to the Honourable Member or the Secretary in the Education Department, he will be able to carry further the very interesting point that he has raised.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 27,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of 'Agriculture'."

The motion was adopted.

AVIATION.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I beg to move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 9,96,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Aviation."

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunsru (Agra Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Aviation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

I have set this motion down, Sir, only to elicit information. We are asked to grant about 7½ lakhs for the acquisition of an airship base at Dum Dum and an aeroplane base at Rangoon.

Now, I know, that this expenditure is not real expenditure at all. It simply involves the transfer of certain plots of land from the military to the civil authorities. But, as this grant raises important questions of policy, I thought it proper to ask Government to give us further information than is contained in the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee. In a memorandum from the Indian Air Board attached to the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee of the 4th February, 1927, it is said that an air service should be started between Calcutta and Rangoon. The Air Board recommend that for this purpose Government should grant a subsidy to a company on certain conditions. In the first place, the bases should be constructed and equipped by Government; they should be leased to the company but should not be owned by them. In the second place, the company should be registered in India with a rupee capital, and, in the third place, the company should be required to afford training and opportunities for employment to Indians in all branches of its work. I want to ask Government whether they have decided that the development of Civil Aviation should take place through a private agency. Considering that railway, postal, telegraphic and telephonic communications are practically in the hands of Government I want to know why they have considered it desirable to have Civil Aviation developed not through the State but through a private agency. Secondly, if it has been decided to have an air service between Calcutta and Rangoon through the agency of a subsidised company, have Government considered the desirability of inserting a provision in the contract to be entered into between the Government and the company empowering them to take over the company after a reasonable period of time? They took such power to themselves in the contracts with certain railway companies and I think it will be agreed that such a provision is desirable in the case of a contract with an air company also should such a company be formed. In the third place I should like to know whether the second and third conditions recommended by the Air Board, i.e., the company should be registered in India with a rupee capital and that it should be required to afford training and opportunities for the employment to Indians, have been accepted by Government themselves. I dare say Government are in favour of these conditions. But at present they are contained only in the memorandum of the Air Board which is published as an appendix to the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee and these proceedings give no indication of the mind of Government themselves. I should also have asked, Sir, whether the separate memorandum which we were promised in the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee of the 4th February . . .

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: Please read that passage.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: Should I read it?

Mr. T. Prakasam: Yes, please.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: It is on page 509, Volume VI, No. 12, and runs:

"After some discussion the Committee agreed to these proposals subject to the question of policy involved being accepted by the Legislative Assembly before whom a separate memorandum on the subject would be laid when the proposals come up for their consideration."

I have been supplied, since I gave notice of this motion, with a copy of the promised memorandum.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: We have not got it.

(Several Honourable Members: "None of us have got it.")

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: I have no doubt that since I have been supplied with a copy of the memorandum other Honourable Members will also be supplied with it. At any rate, I understand that that is the intention of the Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra.

Mr. L. Graham: On a point of explanation, Sir, as regards the supply of these copies. The Deputy Secretary of the Department concerned came into the official box with a few advance copies and he asked me to circulate them to the Members who were likely to be interested.

Mr. B. Das: On a point of order, Sir. May I suggest that this Demand for Grant may be postponed till

Mr. President: That is no point of order.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: Perhaps, Sir, some of the questions that I have asked are answered in the note that has been supplied to us this morning. But as the House will understand I have had no time even to glance at the note.

The last question that I want to ask is, why this matter, involving a question of policy, even though it involves no extra expenditure and does not commit the House to further expenditure, has been brought up in the form of a supplementary estimate. Why could it not have been considered along with other questions at Budget time? I am sure it will be agreed that all important questions of policy should, as far as possible, be considered at one time. Further it is both desirable and convenient that information regarding these matters should be found in one place and should be easily available. I hope Government will be good enough to throw light on the points that I have raised. No one here will be opposed to the principle of the development of Civil Aviation; but we should certainly like to know where we stand in regard to this question both in respect of policy and expenditure.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas (Indian Merchants' Chamber: Indian Commerce): Sir, as one of the Members of the Standing Finance Committee who recommended that this matter should be put before the Assembly for the purpose of the Assembly deciding the policy I think I owe an explanation to the House at this stage. It is of course to be regretted that the Department concerned has not been able to place in

the hands of every Honourable Member a copy of the memorandum regarding the policy as promised. I, Sir, have, as a member of the Standing Finance Committee, a copy of the memorandum and, in order to show the importance of the question being decided by the Assembly before any further money is voted, I would like to read to the Assembly just a few lines from one paragraph which lays down what the future expenditure regarding Aviation is to be.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: On a point of order, Sir. If this memorandum is to be read to the House, I think it is right that copies of it should be circulated to every Member of the House, and may I point out whether on the whole it would not be better to take this grant later?

Mr. President: That is not a point of order.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: I was trying to make out, if my Honourable friend would only let me proceed further, a case that the issues involved are serious and that, in view of the fact that no memorandum giving the whole of the details is before the House to-day, the matter will have to be postponed.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: On a point of order, Sir. Can the Honourable Member read from a report which is not available to Members of this House?

Mr. President: I understand that it is going to be laid on the table in due course.

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: That is the intention, Sir

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I think the report from which my Honourable friend, Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas, was about to read, may be a slightly different one from that which is placed on the table. I do not think that the one that has been placed on the table is an exact copy, because I think it is an amplified document as compared with the one that was laid before the Standing Finance Committee.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: May I have your ruling on the question whether an Honourable Member can read from a memorandum which is not available to the Honourable Members of this House, so that we can regulate our future procedure accordingly?

Mr. President: The Government are going to lay the report on the table of the House, I understand, and also to circulate copies of that report.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: That is after the vote is taken.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is entitled to move the postponement of this debate.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: By way of a point of order?

Mr. President: Not by way of a point of order. It is within the right of every Member to move that the discussion be postponed.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: As I said, I came in possession of my copy of the memorandum in my official position as an elected Member of this House on the Standing Finance Committee and I feel it my duty

[Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas.]

to put before the House the information that I gathered on that Committee in order that I may lead the House on to the proposition that I propose to make, namely, that, until the memorandum is available to the House and the House has had the requisite time to consider the same, the consideration of this grant should be adjourned. If my Honourable friend had only allowed me to proceed he would have seen that I was going to suggest to them exactly what would be acceptable to him, that the House cannot, in the absence of the information which was submitted to the Standing Finance Committee, proceed further with this. I will therefore only read one part of paragraph 7:

"(4) Apart from these items other future expenditure must depend on the policy which may be adopted in regard to the development of civil aviation in India, *e.g.*, the formation of Indian companies and the grant of subsidies in the early years of working."

Besides this the printed memorandum has several other interesting features which show that if money is to be voted by this Assembly without their definitely knowing what it may lead to, it is possible that they may have to vote an annual expenditure which may go up to Rs. 25 or 30 lakhs in the course of a few years. I therefore feel that it is not right that this House should be asked to vote any more sums for aviation purposes until the memorandum has been made available to the House and the House has had a full opportunity to study the memorandum very carefully. I therefore suggest that further consideration of this item be adjourned.

Mr. B. Das: I rise to second the motion for adjournment put forward by my Honourable friend, Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas. We demand that the papers on Civil Aviation should be placed before the House and every facility and sufficient time should be given to Honourable Members to go through these papers and to come to a right decision on the matter. As I observed earlier in the day, Government come before the House in the shape of a small demand for a few thousand rupees even though it may involve large questions of policy and, as my Honourable friend, Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas observed, commit the House to an eventual expenditure of some 30 or 40 lakhs of rupees. In the Standing Finance Committee, of which I am not at present a member (Laughter) that does not matter, we have sent our chosen representatives to the Committee and they have to do their duty, and I am glad that Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas has brought the subject before the House. In that Standing Finance Committee we suggested that every new scheme that Government bring before the Standing Finance Committee should be brought forward as a complete scheme shewing the full financial liabilities to the tax-payers, should be approved of by the Committee and that the Committee should know to what amount they stand committed on that particular scheme. While I was a member of the Standing Finance Committee two years ago, the Cairo-Karachi scheme committed the House and the country only to the extent of a lakh of rupees. To-day it is a matter of Rs. 30 or 40 lakhs and to-morrow it may be a big aviation scheme committing the country to crores and crores of rupees just as we have investment on the railway system. I could not think of an aviation scheme unless I know whether Indians will be sufficiently employed in that service, if it is to be a private company or a public concern, whether it will be run by Indian capitalists or industrialists or

whether it will be controlled from London or Berlin and whether the particular company is entitled to such concessions. For these reasons I entirely and wholeheartedly support the motion moved by my Honourable friend, Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas, and I hope that the Government will have the good sense to accede to it.

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra (Member for Industries and Labour): Government have not the slightest objection to postponing the consideration of this particular question to a later date. It is perfectly true that the Standing Finance Committee agreed to certain proposals subject to the question of policy involved being accepted by the Legislative Assembly before whom a separate memorandum on the subject would be laid for the purpose. I understand that the Committee's decision was arrived at only a few days ago and that my Department had not the time to get that memorandum through the Press in time for circulation before this morning. A few copies were received in print from the Press this morning and I believe a certain number of Members of this House have been supplied with those copies. But I know that all the Members have not yet got the copies and I must apologise for the inconvenience which may have been caused to them in being called upon to discuss the subject without the help of that memorandum. I am perfectly willing that the discussion of the matter should be postponed. If my Honourable friend, Mr. Kunzru, in spite of that, would like to have information on the 4 or 5 points which he raised, I am quite willing to give him that information now. If, on the other hand, he would prefer that the supply of that information should be postponed until the matter comes up for discussion later on, I am quite willing to accede to his wishes.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: I would ask the Honourable Member to consult his own convenience. It is all the same to me when I get the information.

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: It is the convenience of the House. So far as I am concerned, I am quite willing to give the information here and now.

Mr. President: The original question was:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 9,96,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of 'Aviation'."

Since which the following amendment has been moved:

"That the further discussion of this motion be postponed."

The question that I have to put is that that amendment be made.

The motion was adopted.

CURRENCY.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I beg to move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,67,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Currency."

The motion was adopted.

CIVIL WORKS.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 6,67,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of

[Sir Basil Blackett.]

payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Civil Works."

The motion was adopted.

SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES AND PENSIONS.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,87,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Superannuation Allowances and Pensions."

The motion was adopted.

STATIONERY AND PRINTING.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 33,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Stationery and Printing."

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I have to draw the attention of the Member in charge to the very unsatisfactory working of the Government Central Press at Calcutta and I think this is the proper head under which I can bring to the notice of the Member in charge some of the irregularities of that department. One is, and that has been most loudly complained of, that if you ask for a particular book or particular pamphlet published by the Government which is on sale there, we sometimes get quite another book and as the V. P. P. does not disclose what the book underneath is

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I would ask whether this is in order. The provision that is required is for stationery stores. It has nothing to do with the Central Printing Press.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: The word "printing" is there. Books are printed. (Laughter.) When you open a packet you find that the book sent is altogether different. You have already sent the money. Now you have to incur further postage charges in returning the book and asking them to send you the right one.

Mr. President: I think this is too far-fetched.

The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 33,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of 'Stationery and Printing'."

The motion was adopted.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,93,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Miscellaneous."

The motion was adopted.

REFUNDS.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 21,82,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Refunds."

The motion was adopted.

NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 40,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of the "North-West Frontier Province."

The motion was adopted.

DELHI.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 18,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Delhi."

The motion was adopted.

AJMER-MERWARA.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,04,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Ajmer-Merwara."

The motion was adopted.

ANDAMANS AND NICOBAR ISLANDS.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 3,31,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of the "Andamans and Nicobar Islands."

The motion was adopted.

CAPITAL OUTLAY ON SECURITY PRINTING.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 15,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Capital Outlay on Security Printing."

The motion was adopted.

CAPITAL OUTLAY ON CURRENCY NOTE PRINTING PRESS.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I move that a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 8,31,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the expenses that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of "Capital Outlay on Currency Note Printing Press."

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 10th February, 1927.