

29th March 1946

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

Official Report

Volume IV, 1946 *81x1/73*

(15th March to 30th March, 1946)

FIRST SESSION

OF THE

SIXTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1946



PUBLISHED BY THE MANAGER OF PUBLICATIONS, DELHI, INDIA
PRINTED BY THE MANAGER GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI, INDIA
1947

xi
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

President

THE HON. MR. G. V. MAVALANKAR.

Deputy President

SIR MUHAMMAD YAMIN KHAN, M.L.A.

Panel of Chairmen

MR. K. C. NEOGY, M.L.A.

SYED GHULAM BHIK NAIRANG, M.L.A.

MR. P. J. GRIFFITHS, M.L.A.

Secretary

MR. M. N. KAUL, BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

Assistants of the Secretary

MR. M. V. H. COLLINS, M.B.E.

MR. A. J. M. ATKINSON.

MR. S. DAS.

Marshal

CAPTAIN HAJI SARDAR NUR AHMAD KHAN, M.C., I.O.M., L.A.

Committee on Petitions

SIR MUHAMMAD YAMIN KHAN, M.L.A., (*Chairman*).

SYED GHULAM BHIK NAIRANG, M.L.A.

SRI SRI PRAKASA, M.L.A.

MR. T. CHAPMAN-MORTIMER, M.L.A.

SARDAR MANGAL SINGH, M.L.A.

CONTENTS

Volume IV—15th March to 30th March 1946

Friday, 15th March, 1946—		Pages			Pages
Members Sworn		2451	Election of Members to All-India Council for Technical Education		2849
Starred Questions and Answers		2451—76	Election of Members to Central Advisory Board of Education in India		2849
Unstarred Question and Answer		2476	Election of Members to the Advisory Board of Archaeology		2850
Short Notice Questions and Answers		2476—85	Election of Members to Standing Committee for External Affairs Department		2850
Election of Members to Standing Committee for External Affairs Department		2485—87	The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider—not concluded		2850—82, 2862—78
The Railway Companies (Substitution of Parties in Civil Proceedings) Bill—Introduced		2487—88	The Transfer of Property and Succession (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee		2862
Indian Companies (Amendment) Bill—Introduced		2488	Motion for Adjournment re Maladministration of Delhi Police Department resulting in a Strike by a large number of Policemen—Negatived.		2878—94
Banking Companies Bill—Introduced		2488			
Indian Coconut Committee (Amendment) Bill—Introduced		2488			
Transfer of Property and Succession (Amendment) Bill—Time Extended for the Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee		2488			
Indian Income-Tax (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee		2489—2502			
Tuesday, 19th March, 1946—			Tuesday, 26th March, 1946—		
Member Sworn		2503	Starred Questions and Answers		2895
Starred Questions and Answers		2503—48	Unstarred Question and Answer		2895
Unstarred Questions and Answers		2548—49	Motion for Adjournment re Honourable Dr. N. B. Khare's appeal to Government to raise the South African Indian Question before the Security Council of the U. N. O.—Disallowed		2895—99
Statements laid on the table		2549—62	Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded		2899—2950
Short Notice Questions and Answers		2562—68			
Motion for Adjournment re Inability of peasants in Jubbulpur to harvest their Winter Food Grain Crops owing to restrictions imposed by Food Grains Control Order—Withdrawn		2568—70			
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded		2570—2601	Wednesday, 27th March, 1946—		
Wednesday, 20th March, 1946—			Member Sworn		2951
Starred Questions and Answers		2603—47	Starred Questions and Answers		2951—3024
Unstarred Questions and Answers		2647—51	Unstarred Questions and Answers		3024—26
Short Notice Question and Answer		2651—53	Short Notice Question and Answer		3026
Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded		2653—87	Indian Finance Bill—Motion to consider adopted		3027—36
Thursday, 21st March, 1946,			Discussion on consideration of the clauses not concluded		3037—59
Starred Questions and Answers		2689—2715	Statement of Business		3059—60
Unstarred Questions and Answers		2716—17	Thursday, 28th March, 1946,		
Short Notice Question and Answer		2717—18	Starred Questions and Answers		3061—91
Hindu Women's Right to Separate Residence and Maintenance Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee		2719	Unstarred Question and Answer		3091—92
The Hindu Marriage Disabilities Removal Bill—Time extended for the presentation of the Select Committee		2719	Protective Duties Continuation Bill—Introduced		3092—98
Estate Duty Bill—Introduced		2719	Indian Finance Bill—Passed as amended		3092—3128
Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded		2719—55	Friday, 29th March, 1946,		
Friday, 22d March, 1946—			Members Sworn		3131
Member Sworn		2757	Starred Questions and Answers		3131—68
Starred Questions and Answers		2757—81	Unstarred Questions and Answers		3168—66
Short Notice Questions and Answers		2781—88	Inaction re Removal of Sections 111 to 121 of Government of India Act		3166
Indian Finance Bill—discussion on the motion to consider not concluded		2788—90	Demand for Supplementary Grants—Railways		3166—97
Motion for Adjournment re Maladministration of Delhi Police Department resulting in strike by a large number of Policemen—Postponed till Monday next		2790—92	Saturday, 30th March, 1946—		
Monday, 25th March, 1946—			Member Sworn		3199
Starred Questions and Answers		2819—47	Motion for Adjournment re Tribal raid by Waziri Outlaws—Withdrawn		3199
Unstarred Questions and Answers		2848	Removal of Sections III to 121 of Government of India Act.		3199—3201
The Income-Tax (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee		2848	Protective Duties Bill—Introduced		3201
Election of Members to Standing Committee for Roads		2848—49	Indian Soldiers (Litigation) Amendment Bill—Introduced		3202
			Demands for Supplementary Grants		3202—23 3223—57
			Hindu Marriage Disabilities Removal Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee		3223

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Friday, 29th March, 1946

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Mr. G. V. Mavalankar) in the Chair.

MEMBERS SWORN:

- Mr. Bernard Christopher Allen Cook, O.B.E., I.C.S., M.L.A. (Government of India: Nominated Official);
Mr. Charles Frederick Victor Williams, I.C.S., M.L.A. (Government of India: Nominated Official); and
Mr. Madapusi Viraragavachari Rangachari (Government of India: Nominated Official).

STARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(a) ORAL ANSWERS

EMIGRATION OF INDIANS TO AVOID FAMINES

1378. *Seth Govind Das: (a) Will the Food Secretary be pleased to state if it is a fact that the Famine Enquiry Commission had expressed that an ultimate decrease in the rate of population is not only desirable but extremely necessary to avoid famines in India in future?

(b) If so, do the Government of India intend to accept and act according to the recommendation and report of the Famine Enquiry Commission?

(c) If so, what arrangements do Government propose to make for the emigration of Indians to other countries of the Commonwealth which are very sparsely populated?

(d) Do they also contemplate to send the demobilised Indian soldiers to such other countries?

Mr. B. R. Sen: (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). The Government of India agree with the Famine Enquiry Commission that we are not at present justified in depending on Emigration as a means of influencing population growth. No recommendation was made by the Commission on this point, but in considering the general question of settlement of Indians overseas due attention will be given to the view expressed by the Commission that Emigration of Indians to sparsely populated parts of the Commonwealth would help to relieve the pressure of the population on land in India.

(d) No proposal is at present under consideration in regard to sending of demobilised Indian soldiers to other countries.

Seth Govind Das: Will Government be prepared to consider if a scheme is put forward before them to send our population to East Africa which is the nearest colony to India?

Mr. B. R. Sen: That question should be addressed to some other department.

Mr. Manu Subedar: What arrangements have been made with regard to the cultivation of lands in the Andamans where, I understand, enormous waste lands are available?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I have no information on that point.

Seth Govind Das: Is the Honourable Member aware that in East Africa also there are enormous lands for cultivation and if emigration is opened to that country a great amount of land can come under cultivation for the good of the inhabitants of that country as well as the persons who are sent on emigration?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I shall take note of what the Honourable Member has said.

INDIAN FOOD DELEGATION TO LONDON AND WASHINGTON

1379. *Seth Govind Das: Will the Food Secretary be pleased to state:

(a) the names of those non-officials who were requested to accompany the Honourable Sir Jwala Prasad with the Indian Delegation to London and Washington; and

(b) the names of such non-officials who refused to go with such a Delegation, and the reasons conveyed by them, if any, for the same?

Mr. B. B. Sen: (a) and (b). It is not in the public interest to disclose this information.

Seth Govind Das: Will the Honourable Member be pleased to say how the public interest is going to be affected by certain information disclosed with respect to my question?

Mr. B. B. Sen: I have nothing more to add.

Sri S. T. Adityan: What is the reason for not giving the information? The Honourable Member has not given the reason.

Mr. President: He has. He has said that it is not in the public interest to give the information.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: Will the Government of India take strong measures against those non-officials like my Congress friends who refused to co-operate in such a vital issue as the food crisis.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Will co-operators be rewarded?

MEMBERS OF CENTRAL FOOD ADVISORY COUNCIL

1380. *Seth Govind Das: Will the Food Secretary please state:

(a) the names of the members of the Central Food Advisory Council;

(b) their qualifications; and

(c) the total annual expenditure of this Council with special reference to the salary they get?

Mr. B. B. Sen: (a) and (b). A statement giving the names and qualifications of the members of the Central Food Advisory Council is placed on the table of the House.

(c) The total expenditure of this Council amounted to Rs. 13,337 in 1944-45 and Rs. 6,206-14-0 in 1945-46. No salary is paid to the members. Besides Railway fare they get a daily allowance of Rs. 20 and conveyance allowance of Rs. 5 per day for the period the Council is in session.

List of Members of the Central Food Advisory Council
Names

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| 1. Khan Bahadur Abdul Momin, C.I.E., M.L.C. | } | Representatives of Producers and Land-lord. |
| 2. Syed Aizaz Rasul, M.L.A. | | |
| 3. Nawab Major Jamshed Ali Khan, M.B.E. | | |
| 4. Sir Williams Roberts, C.I.E., M.L.A. | | |
| 5. Raja Sahib of Jahangirabad. | | |
| 6. Sir Datar Singh. | | |
| 7. Sardar Vivek Singh. | | |
| 8. Ch. Mukhtar Singh. | | |
| 9. Sir Mani Lal B. Nanavati. | | |
| 10. Mr. Ivor Bull, M.B.E. | | |
| 11. Mr. B. Ramchandra Roddy, C.B.E. | } | Representative of Chambers of Commerce. |
| 12. Hon'ble Mr. H. D. Townend
(Associated Chamber of Commerce). | | |
| 13. Mr. Gurusharan Lal,
(Federation of Indian Chamber of Commerce). | | |
| 14. Mr. Fazalbhoy I. Rahimtoola, C.I.E., J.P. | } | Representatives of Trade. |
| 15. Sir Purshotamdass Thakurdas, C.I.E., M.B.E. | | |
| 16. Mr. D. P. Khaitan, M.L.A. | | |
| 17. Sardar Santokh Singh, ex-M.L.A. | | |
| 18. Mr. Mohd. Hussain Hashim Premji. | | |
| 19. Mr. C. W. Tosh. | | |
| 20. Mr. Hussainbhoy A. Lalljee. | | |

21. Mr. G. D. Puri (Impl. Bank).	}	Representatives of Banks.
22. Mr. S. R. Jariwala (Central Bank).		
23. Prof. L. C. Jain, M.A., Ph.D., D.Sc. (Econ.).		Economist.
24. Col. R. H. Zaidi, C.I.E.	}	States Representatives.
25. Mr. Narayar Iyer.		
26. Mr. K. F. Haider.		
27. Mr. Mir Akbar Ali Khan, Bar.-at-Law.		
28. Dr. W. R. Akroyd.		Dietician.
29. Dewan Bahadur Sir T. Vijayaraghavacharya, K.B.E.	}	Leaders of Public Opinion.
30. Dewan Bahadur Sir Gopaldaswami Ayyangar, C.S.I., C.I.E.		
31. Hon'ble Pandit H. N. Kunzru.		
32. Sir Shanmukham Chetty, K.C.I.E.		
33. Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon, M.L.A.		
34. Mr. Naville Wadia.		
35. Sir Madhorao G. Despande.		
36. N. R. Sarkar, Esq.		
37. Begum J. A. Shah Nawaz, M.B.E.	}	Women's Representatives.
38. Rani Phul Kumari (of Sherkot), M.B.E.		
39. Prof. G. D. Parikh.		Labour Representative.
40. Mr. N. C. Mehta.		Representative of Trade.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that apart from the representatives of the big landholders there is not even one representative of the actual kisans or peasants and also of agricultural labour on this Council?

Mr. B. R. Sen: The Honourable Member can go through the list first and see whether his statement is correct. If it is correct, then I am quite prepared to consider the question of the inclusion of some representatives of producers.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: Is it not a fact that the member's attention was drawn to this in the Advisory Council?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I do not remember it, speaking subject to correction.

Seth Govind Das: In view of the fact that the zamindari system is going, will Government consider the question of having kisans and labour represented on this committee?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I am quite prepared to consider this. In fact, there should be a representative of kisans and I shall go into this.

Sreejut Rohini Kumar Chaudhuri: Have all the provinces been represented on the Council?

Mr. B. R. Sen: The representation is not on a provincial basis.

Shri Sri Prakasa: Is it not a fact that working on this Council will involve greater labour for the kisans than working in the fields?

Babu Ram Narayan Singh: Is Bihar represented on this committee?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I have said that this committee has not been constituted on the basis of provincial representation. It is based on the representation of interests.

CONTRACT WORKS GIVEN BY HORTICULTURAL DIVISION, CENTRAL P. W. D.,
NEW DELHI

1381. ***Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer:** Will the Honourable the Labour Member kindly place on the table of the House a comparative statement showing the

amount of contract works given by (i) tenders and (ii) work orders, separately, to Muslims, Hindus and Scheduled Caste Contractors in the Horticulture Division of the Central P.W.D., New Delhi, during the period from 1st November, 1943, to the 28th February, 1946, by the present Superintendent, Horticultural Operations, New Delhi?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: The information asked for is not readily available and the time and labour involved in collecting it would be incommensurate with the value of the result.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: What are the reasons why the information is not readily available?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: It is not available in the form in which my Honourable friend wants it.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is any effort being made to give additional opportunities for scheduled caste contractors to have their share?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: They can get their share in accordance with the rules laid down.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: There are only very few from the scheduled castes, because they are so poor.

MUSLIM HORTICULTURAL SUBORDINATES IN CENTRAL P. W. D.

1382. ***Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer:** (a) Will the Honourable the Labour Member kindly state if it is a fact that three B. Sc. Muslims were appointed in the Central P.W.D. as Horticultural Subordinates on the 28th February, 1945, 19th March, 1945, and 23rd May, 1945, but they were not given charge of Sections till the 28th November, 1945?

(b) On what duties were they put during the intervening period?

(c) If they were not required for specific work expected of them, why has public money to the amount of Rs. 5,000 been wasted in this way, who is responsible for that and what action do Government propose to take against the officer concerned?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). As the men were fresh from college and had no practical experience, they were given preliminary training as probationers before being placed in formal charge of sections.

SCALES OF PAY AND INCREMENTS TO CHOWDHRIES AND ASSISTANT CHOWDHRIES IN HORTICULTURE DIVISION

1383. ***Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer:** Will the Honourable the Labour Member kindly state the scales of pay and increments allowed to Chowdhries and Assistant Chowdhries in the Horticulture Division?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: The scales of pay with rates of increments are as follows:

Chowdhries—Rs. 20—1—35—2—55 (for old entrants).

Rs. 25—1—45 (for new entrants).

Assistant Chowdhries—Rs. 20— $\frac{1}{2}$ —30 (for old and new entrants).

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What is the particular post of a Chowdhri?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: A sort of head *mali*.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Do Government expect a Chowdhri to live on Rs. 20 a month in the present day living conditions?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: They get dearness allowance also

Mr. Manu Subedar: What do they get? Rs. 14 or Rs. 8? How much?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: I have not got the information with me.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Will the Government go into the question as to whether industrial class Government employees can really exist on the pay they are getting?

Prof. N. G. Ranga:

How much are the *malis* paid?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: I want notice.

APPOINTMENTS MADE BY SUPERINTENDENT HORTICULTURAL OPERATIONS, CENTRAL P. W. D.

1384. ***Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer:** Will the Honourable the Labour Member kindly state, community-wise, *vis.*, Hindus, Muslims, Other Minority Communities and Scheduled Castes, the number of persons appointed by the present Superintendent, Horticultural Operations, Central P.W.D., New Delhi, from the 1st November, 1943, to the 28th February, 1946, as clerks, chowdhries, assistant chowdhries, lorry-drivers, fitters, time-keepers and mechanics?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: A statement is laid on the table.

Statement showing the number of persons appointed by the Superintendent, Horticultural Operations, New Delhi from 1st November 1943 to 28th February 1946.

	Hindus	Muslims	Schedule Castes	Other Minority Community
Clerks	9	2		1
Chowdhries	1		
Assistant Chowdhries	1			
Lorry Drivers	2			
Fitters	2	1		
Time Keepers	1	1		...
Mechanics	1

MUSLIM OFFICERS IN LABOUR DEPARTMENT

1385. ***Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer:** (a) Will the Honourable the Labour Member please state if it is a fact that in the Labour Department the Secretary, Joint Secretary and the Deputy Secretary are all Hindus? Does the Honourable Member propose to appoint a Muslim Officer in charge of the staff in that Department? If not, why not?

(b) How many subordinates in the Central Public Works Department were promoted as Sub-Divisional Officers during the last five years? Are there any Muslims? If so, how many, and in what proportion?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: (a) No. The Secretary is a European and there are two Muslims, one *ex-officio* Joint Secretary and one Deputy Secretary. These two officers also deal with staff questions. The latter part of the question does not arise.

(b) During the last five years 385 subordinates were promoted as S.D.Os., out of which 56 were Muslims. This works out to 14.5 per cent.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: When will the Honourable Member consider the appointment of an Indian Secretary to this Department, in view of the fact that for a number of years past there has been no Indian Secretary in this Department?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: This is a matter which rests with the Selection Committee.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Who selects the Secretaries of Departments?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: I want notice.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is there a selection committee which deals with this question?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: There is a committee to which the matter must be referred and the selection is made only from an approved list.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: Does it mean that the Honourable Member has no hand in the appointment?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: Not until there is a vacancy, I am sure.

ERECTION OF NEW SUGAR FACTORIES IN BOMBAY PRESIDENCY

1386. *Sjt. B. S. Hiray: (a) Will the Honourable the Food Member be pleased to state whether there is a move to allow the erection of new Sugar Factories in India; if so, how many in India and how many out of them in Bombay Presidency?

(b) When are these new factories expected to start construction and working?

(c) In what district and talukas and villages of Bombay Province these new Sugar Factories are contemplated to be erected?

(d) What are the names of the persons who have approached Government with the proposals for the erection of new Sugar Factories in Bombay Presidency?

(e) Will Government give preference to small producers of sugar cane if they form a Co-operative Body to erect and run a Sugar Factory?

(f) Do Government propose to take special measures for fostering such Co-operative Institutions of small producers for erecting and running the Sugar Factories?

Mr. B. R. Sen: (a) and (c). The Sugar Panel appointed by the P. & D. Department has just submitted its report on this point and the matter is under the consideration of Government. Meanwhile permission to set up six new factories has been given but none of them is in Bombay Presidency.

(b) The new factories are expected to start construction as soon as they are able to import machinery from abroad and obtain essential materials such as iron, steel and cement.

(d) No person has approached Government with such proposals.

(e) and (f). These would be matters for the Provincial Government to consider.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: May I know where these factories are proposed to be located?

Mr. B. R. Sen: One in Hyderabad, one in Travancore, one in Bihar, one in North West Frontier Province, one in Madras and another in Baroda.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Are Government taking any shares in these companies?

Mr. B. R. Sen: Not that I am aware of.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What control do Government expect to exercise over these factories?

Mr. B. R. Sen: The Provincial Governments exercise certain controls under the Factories Act and other Acts.

Mr. Manu Subedar: On what basis were these locations selected? What is the principle of selection of these six places to the exclusion of many others, including the Bombay Presidency?

Mr. B. E. Sen: The main idea was better distribution of factories all over India.

Shri Sri Prakasa: Is it not a fact that Government decided not to give factories to some provinces, but to concentrate them in some other provinces?

Mr. B. E. Sen: The whole question has been gone into by a committee set up by the Planning and Development Department and their report is just to hand. They have made certain recommendations which are under examination by Government.

Diwan Chaman Lall: May I know whether one of the recommendations is that Government should take some part in the running of these factories?

Mr. B. E. Sen: I have not myself seen the report, so I am not in a position to give any reply to this question.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Then before this matter of policy has been decided Government gave permission to start these factories?

Mr. B. E. Sen: Permission has been given to six factories on the basis that there should be proper distribution of sugar factories in India and that is also the point of view accepted by the Planning and Development Department.

Diwan Chaman Lall: May I know whether the Honourable Member has understood my question? Before the matter of policy has been decided, whether it should be state owned, state controlled, or private owned by shareholders, how is it that permission has been given to start these six factories?

Mr. B. E. Sen: I am not sure that that particular point has been referred to that committee set up by the Planning and Development Department.

Mr. Manu Subedar: In view of the fact that there is grave discontent with regard to the location of factories not only in sugar but in other matters, will Government bring this matter up for discussion before the House to decide the whole basis and policy on which new locations of industries are to be permitted?

Mr. B. E. Sen: I am not in a position to give any reply to this question, but I shall undertake to examine this.

Sreejot Rohini Kumar Chaudhuri: In view of the fact that there is not a single sugar factory actually working in Assam, do Government propose to give special consideration to applications from Assam.

Mr. B. E. Sen: So far as I am aware the Committee of Planning and Development Department has included Assam in the recommendations for new factories.

Seth Govind Das: In view of the fact that popular Ministries are going to come into existence in various provinces, will the Planning and Development committee see that no fresh licenses are given to any industries till the recommendations of these Provincial Ministries are received?

Mr. B. E. Sen: I am not in a position to answer that question.

Diwan Chaman Lall: There is a little mistake. Which of the two statements of the Honourable Member is correct? Is it that he has not seen the copy of the report and the recommendations or the second one where he says that in the recommendations Assam is included?

Mr. B. E. Sen: Both are correct.

Mr. President: Next question.

SUGAR FACTORIES IN BOMBAY PROVINCE

1387. *Sjt. B. S. Hiray: Will the Food Secretary be pleased to state:

- (a) how many Sugar Factories there are in the Bombay Province;
- (b) their Capital outlay;
- (c) their gross earnings and the operating ratio;
- (d) the percentage of profit they make;

(e) the total production of sugar per year; and

(f) whether in view of the huge profits the Sugar Factories are making it is proposed to continue the protection? .

Mr. B. R. Sen: (a) Ten.

(b) to (d). The information is not available.

(e) About 75,000 tons sugar was produced in Bombay Province in the year 1944-45 and about 72,000 tons is the estimated production for 1945-46.

(f) The question of protection will doubtless be considered by the Tariff Board in due course.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: With reference to the answer to parts (b) to (d), the Honourable Member said, the information is not available. Is it not a fact that all these factories have to submit their annual reports to the Sugar Technological Institute at Cawnpore?

Mr. B. R. Sen: The information is not readily available to us. If the Honourable Member wants the information, I can go into it. I understand some of this information is regarded as confidential, and cannot be disclosed.

Mr. Manu Subedar: What steps are Government taking in order to get the price of sugar reduced in view of the heavy profits which the sugar factories have made and in view of the removal of E.P.T.?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I am not sure that it is the general opinion that sugar industry has made large profits. It is possible that in the Bombay presidency where the factories own their own agricultural land for growing sugar cane, the profits are higher than other areas. But as a general proposition I do not think his views are supported by the opinion in the country.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: With reference to the reply of the Honourable Member that the information is confidential, may I point out that the information asked for here is capital outlay in the Bombay presidency, not in one factory, but all the factories in existence in Bombay presidency and this information can never be confidential because these companies are limited joint stock companies and the information is readily available to the Government and it is sent by each factory to the Government. Will the Government place this information in the Library of the House?

Mr. B. R. Sen: This information is probably equally available to the Honourable Member. One of the items on which information is sought in the question is "their gross earnings and the operating ratio". I do not think these are matters which we can disclose to the House.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: The information is available to me and not to the Honourable Member who put down this question.

Maulana Zafar Ali Khan: Will the Honourable Member be pleased to state how many sugar factories there are in the Punjab and what their annual produce is?

Mr. President: I do not think that arises out of the question. Next question.

SUGAR FACTORIES IN BRITISH INDIA AND INDIAN STATES.

1388. ***Sjt. B. S. Hiray:** Will the Food Secretary be pleased to state:

(a) how many Sugar Factories there are in British India and the Indian States;

(b) the total production of sugar per year in British India and States separately; and

(c) whether the present sugar production is not sufficient to meet the normal demands of the country?

Mr. B. R. Sen: (a) British India—139, Indian States—19.

(b) A statement is laid on the table of the House.

(c) No, Sir.

Statement showing the total production of sugar in each year from 1942-43 to 1945-46

	British India	Indian States	Total
	(Tons)	(Tons)	(Tons)
1942-43	9,93,148	81,604	10,74,752
1943-44	11,00,537	1,24,700	12,25,237
1944-45	8,56,361	1,15,601	9,71,962
1945-46 (Estimated).	8,25,000	1,00,000	9,25,000

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that the Government of India Resolution in the Planning and Development Department lays down the policy that should be followed by Government in various departments in regard to the development of new industries and also further development of existing industries?

Mr. President: How does that arise out of the question and answer given?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: My point is, why is it that the Government of India do not take any action at all in trying to effect a certain amount of control over the management as well as the profits of these sugar factories? The Honourable Member said earlier that they do not propose to have any control at all

Mr. President: That is with reference to the previous question, and no supplementary question can now be asked on that.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Keeping that in mind, what I wish to ask is this. Since they are going to have new factories in addition to those that are already there, why is it that the Government of India do not try to gain some control over the new factories?

Mr. President: I do not think it arises; the question only asked for information.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: With reference to part (c), is it a fact that in 1939 and 1940 there was over-production of sugar in this country and Government imposed an import duty on foreign sugar?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I shall require notice of that question.

Mr. Manu Subedar: In view of the fact that sugar interests expressed very grave dissatisfaction at Government's undertaking not to export any sugar from India and that there was a surplus at one time, will the Honourable Member tell us whether Government maintain a machinery for constantly revising the prices of foodgrains in favour of the consumer?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I am sorry I could not follow the question.

Mr. Manu Subedar: If the sugar produced is adequate why are not the prices brought down? That is the question.

Mr. B. R. Sen: I have said that the sugar produced in this country is not adequate; it falls far short of the demand. The demand in the country is estimated at 15 lakhs tons while the production last year was 9.7 lakh tons. This year the production is estimated at something less than 9.7 lakh tons. So there is a gap still to fill.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Are Government examining the possibility of controlling the whole of this industry,—taking charge of the management of the industry?

Mr. President: That question does not arise.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: The Honourable Member says he is not quite sure that they are making sufficient profits and he is not sure of the amount. So Government should take over this industry and then run it.

Mr. President: Where does the question of profits come here?

Mr. B. E. Sen: He is referring to the previous question.

Mr. President: Next question.

SENIORITY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS FOR PURPOSES OF ALLOTMENT OF GOVERNMENT RESIDENCES.

1389. *Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: (a) Will the Honourable the Labour Member be pleased to state if it is a fact that during the period of emergency certain offices of the Central Government (Secretariat and Attached Offices) were moved from Delhi/Simla to outstations, for want of office accommodation?

(b) Is it a fact that the staff on return with the offices have not been allowed to count their previous service for purposes of entitlement to Government quarters on the ground that they moved to a station other than Delhi/Simla and that in their cases their seniority for entitlement to accommodation was reckoned from the date of subsequent arrival at Delhi?

(c) Is it a fact that the Secretariat staff working at Calcutta have been allowed to count their previous service for purpose of seniority for accommodation?

(d) If so why has this sort of discrimination between the staff of the Secretariat and Attached Offices in regard to allotment of residential accommodation been made?

(e) Are Government aware that these people have been penalised for no fault of their own in regard to allotment of quarters, as they had to move under orders of the Labour Department in the interest of the State?

(f) Do Government propose to consider the desirability of restoring the suspended liens in respect of these individuals and allot them accommodation according to their date of joining offices at Delhi/Simla?

The Honourable Dr. B. E. Ambedkar: (a) Yes.

(b) The correct position is as follows:

Some of the staff were allowed to count their previous service if the period of absence from Delhi was not more than one year and if they hold liens on Government residences in Delhi. This qualifying period was subsequently reduced to a maximum of six months.

(c) Yes, but only the staff posted in a Secretariat Department at Calcutta or transferred from a Secretariat Department in Delhi/Simla to a Secretariat Department in Calcutta prior to April 1st, 1945.

(d) There has been no discrimination between the staff of the Secretariat and attached offices except in the case of Calcutta where a Branch Secretariat of a Government of India Department was located and transfers between the Headquarters and the Branch Secretariat were frequent. With the issue of the revised rules, this concession has been withdrawn w.e.f. 1st April, 1945 and persons transferred to a Secretariat Department at Calcutta after this date are not allowed to count their previous service for allotment in Delhi.

(e) Government are aware that some officers have been prejudicially affected by the Rules—but this is inevitable in the working of Rules designed formally to secure the efficiency of administration by reducing movements to a minimum.

(f) Government do not propose to alter the rules in this respect.

SUPPLY OF MATERIAL TO SARDAR SOBHA SINGH TO BUILD QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI.

1390. *Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: (a) Will the Honourable the Labour Member please state whether it is a fact that Sardar Sobha Singh was given material by Government to build quarters in New Delhi?

(b) What is the cost of the material supplied, and under what arrangement?

(c) How many flats has he built? What is the rent of each flat, how many of these flats are occupied and how many are empty?

(d) Are Government granting any subsidy? If so, in what manner and where it is granted to the said Sardar Sobha Singh?

The Honourable Dr. B. E. Ambedkar: (a) I presume that the Honourable Member refers to the residential flats on the junction of Cornwallis Road and Hamayun Road, New Delhi, built by S. B. Sir Sobha Singh. If so, the reply in the affirmative.

(b) The cost of material supplied is about Rs. 1½ lakhs. The contractor is to bear the entire cost of the material supplied to him.

(c) The number of flats so far constructed is 72. There are two types of flats; a two-bed-room flat and a single bed room flat. The rent of the former has been provisionally fixed at Rs. 220 p.m. and of the latter at Rs. 175 p.m. Provisional rent has been fixed as complete information about the cost of construction has not been supplied by the landlord. Out of the 72 flats, Government have taken over 65 flats of which 59 are already occupied and 6 have been allotted to officers on the waiting list.

(d) No.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Why have Government a soft corner for this prince of contractors Sardar Bahadur Sir Sobha Singh?

The Honourable Dr. B. E. Ambedkar: I do not see any soft corner here.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that they have been favouring him in preference to so many other contractors?

The Honourable Dr. B. E. Ambedkar: Not at all, Sir.

EXPORT OF WHEAT TO BURMA.

1391. *Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will the Food Secretary be pleased to state:

(a) if Government have decided or propose to export wheat to Burma; if so, in what quantities; and

(b) why Government export wheat to Burma even when India is faced with a food famine?

Mr. B. E. Sen: (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

PROCUREMENT AND PRESERVATION OF FOODGRAINS

1392. *Seth Govind Das: Will the Food Secretary kindly state:

(a) whether Government have considered the advisability of consulting or enlisting the service of Indian experts for larger procurements of foodgrains and proper preservations of grains for enhancing or protecting the quality of foodgrains;

(b) if not, whether Government propose to secure the services of experienced cultivators and reputed dealers to advise Government on the methods of preservation to prevent wastage;

(c) the estimated total approximate quantity of grains that get spoiled in this country due to rats, etc., and due to ill-preservation; and

(d) whether Government propose ensuring safeguards against that wastage by requisitioning expert advice from people of experience?

Mr. B. R. Sen: (a) The general question of procurement of foodgrains was fully discussed in 1943 by the Foodgrains Policy Committee on which important non-official opinion was represented. For the conservation of foodgrains during storage, trained staff have already been appointed, who work in collaboration with other technically qualified staff employed in Provinces and States.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) The annual losses in storage on account of insects, rodents and other causes are estimated at about $3/3\frac{1}{2}$ million tons a year.

(d) Government have already appointed technical staff and taking action to reduce losses in storage.

Seth Govind Das: With reference to part (a) of the question, may I know if representatives of all the provinces were present when the question of procurement was considered?

Mr. B. R. Sen: Representatives of most of the provinces were present.

Seth Govind Das: Was there any representative from Central Provinces?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I cannot recollect straight-off; but it was a very well represented committee.

Seth Govind Das: Does the Honourable Member know that grain is preserved in different ways in different provinces and particularly in the Central Provinces no technical help is given to cultivators to preserve their grain?

Mr. B. R. Sen: It is correct that conditions of storage vary from province to province. But the question asked here is whether Government have taken up the question of giving technical advice for the improvement of storage conditions, and I have replied that this has already been done.

Dr. Sir Zis Uddin Ahmad: If $3\frac{1}{2}$ million tons of foodgrains were spoiled by insects and other causes, what is the percentage of loss?

Mr. B. R. Sen: It is about 5 per cent.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Is it a fact that they would be able to save these $3\frac{1}{2}$ million tons of grain wasted in this fashion if Government were to provide grain elevators throughout the country?

Mr. B. R. Sen: Grain elevators may help to some extent, but it is not possible to save the entire quantity, because the wastage is due to various causes.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Is it a fact that if grain elevators were provided for the peasantry in the grain growing areas all the grain that is harvested would go straightaway into these grain elevators?

Mr. B. R. Sen: The Honourable Member raised this question on some other day also and the reply was that Government were considering the question of construction of silos for this purpose.

Seth Govind Das: Is the grain wasted in military storage also included in the grain that has been wasted last year?

Mr. B. R. Sen: This is a figure which has been given to us by the Agricultural Department and this represents the normal losses in this country.

Seth Govind Das: Does it include the losses which the military stores have suffered during the last year?

Mr. B. R. Sen: Not specifically. But the losses suffered by the Military form a small part of the total losses.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Why will not Government construct one grain elevator as an experiment?

Mr. B. E. Sen: The Government have already constructed godowns in several parts of the country.

Mr. Mann Subedar: Elevators?

Mr. B. E. Sen: That is under consideration.

Seth Govind Das: Has any grain godown been constructed in the Central Provinces?

Mr. B. E. Sen: Several godowns.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is Government examining the utility of the traditional methods of the Kisans in storing the grain in the earth and specially in straw-stores?

Mr. B. E. Sen: I think the idea is that we should go in for more scientific storage than what has been the practice in this country.

ORDERS FOR SUPPLY OF ACCESSORIES FOR TRACTORS.

1393. *Sri S. T. Adityan: (a) Will the Agriculture Secretary please state whether Government are aware of the news sent by *Reuter* from London on the 11th March, 1946, as to the non-availability of accessories to be used with the tractors ordered from America, and the reasons therefor;

(b) why the order for accessories was not placed with the American firms at the same time as the order for the tractors was placed with the American firms;

(c) why the order for accessories was placed in England when the order for the tractors was placed in America;

(d) the date fixed for the delivery of accessories;

(e) whether Government propose to consider the advisability of claiming damages from the manufacturers of accessories for failure to deliver the goods ordered in a reasonable time; and

(f) what arrangements, if any, Government have made for obtaining the necessary accessories from other quarters before the monsoon?

Sir Pheroze Kharegat: (a) Yes, Sir; but the news item referred to is incorrect. The facts are mentioned in a press note issued on the 13th March and have been given in reply to Question No. 1266, asked by Mr. Vellingiri Gounder, on the 27th March.

(b) Orders were placed with firms in the United States of America for the supply of 189 heavy ploughs and with the United Kingdom for another 133. This represents the maximum quantities available from each of these sources.

(c) The firms manufacturing ploughs are usually quite different from those making tractors. Ploughs are being secured from wherever they are available and manufacturers in the United Kingdom, United States of America and Canada have gone out of their way to co-operate and meet our requirements.

(d) The ex-factory deliveries are spread over the period April-December, 1946.

(e) There is a penalty clause in each contract with every manufacturer whether in the U. K., U. S. A. or Canada. As it is expected that deliveries will materialise according to contract it is hoped there will be no occasion to have resort to the penalty clause.

(f) Orders for all our requirements of accessories have already been placed with Manufacturers in the U. S. A., Canada and the United Kingdom. But no country is in a position to supply them before the monsoon. The Government are also examining the possibility of manufacturing parts of tractor-drawn implements in India.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Why is it that no effort is being made to import these things from Soviet Russia?

Sir Pheroze Kharegat: I am afraid, Sir, the chances of importing anything from Soviet Russia at the present time are nil because the Soviet Union has suffered very considerable losses itself and their first need will be to replenish their own losses and meet their own requirements.

Seth Govind Das: Why is it not considered feasible to prepare these accessories, especially small accessories like crushing machines and cutting machines, in the Ordnance factories in India?

Sir Pheroze Kharegat: That, as I said the other day, is already being explored. We are in negotiation with the military authorities in order to see what can and what cannot be manufactured in Ordnance factories in India.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: How many of these tractors are proposed to be used by Government on their farms?

Sir Pheroze Kharegat: All the tractors that are being imported will be used by Provincial Governments or by the Central Government. Most of them will be used in connection with the eradication of Kans and other deep-rooted weeds that are a hindrance to agricultural production.

Sri S. T. Adityan: Is there any chance of getting any of these ploughs before the monsoon?

Sir Pheroze Kharegat: We will not get a single plough before the monsoon. The earliest we can expect to get them is July.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: Before the commencement of the third war or after that!

(At this stage Babu Ram Narayan Singh rose in his seat.)

Mr. President: Order, order. This question has been replied to many times before in this House.

RECRUITMENT AND EMPLOYMENT OF GORAKHPUR LABOUR IN COAL MINES

1394. ***Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** Will the Honourable the Labour Member be pleased to refer to his answer to the 1st portion of part (a) of unstarred question No. 31, dated the 11th February, 1946, and place on the table the Auditors' report for the financial year 1944-45 on the expenditure incurred on account of the recruitment and employment of Gorakhpur Labour in coal mines?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: A copy of the audit report has been called for from the Deputy Director, Labour Supply (Coal) and will be placed on the table of the House when it is received.

TERMS OF CONTRACT WITH RATIONING ADVISER TO GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

1395. ***Pandit Mukut Bihari Lal Bhargava:** Will the Food Secretary please state:

(a) the terms of contract with the Rationing Adviser to the Government of India and in particular the increase in his pay since he joined the Government of India;

(b) his qualifications;

(c) his experience, if any, of Indian diet, eating habits, etc.;

(d) if it is a fact that the present contract is renewable for another two years; if so, whether Government intend to renew it;

(e) if Government are aware that the Rationing Adviser has not introduced any original scheme or idea in the rationing system, and that he merely copies

what Bombay has so successfully done before his arrival in India; if not, whether Government will please enumerate the achievements of the Rationing Adviser; and

(f) how many visits he has paid to Bombay since he joined the Government of India and the purpose of each?

Mr. B. E. Sen: (a) The present terms of contract entered into with the Rationing Adviser are:

(1) Period—three years commencing from 1st June, 1944; this may be extended on same terms and conditions by another two years by mutual consent of the parties.

(2) Pay—Rs. 2,850 p.m. plus S.O.P. £13-6-8 p.m.

(3) Leave is regulated by the Model Leave Rules.

(4) Benefits of contributory provident fund @ 1/12 of pay.

(5) Free medical attendance and treatment as for a Secretary of State Officer.

(6) Free 1st class passage to U. K. on the expiry of his term. He first joined the Food Department on the 14th May, 1943, on a six months contract on a salary of Rs. 2,500 p.m. This period was extended in three instalments up to the 31st May, 1944, and the pay raised to Rs. 2,800 p.m. since the 1st June, 1944.

(b) He was employed with the Ministry of Food in the U. K. He was Divisional Food Officer, London, and his services were lent to the Board of Trade to organise Fuel Rationing.

(c) He was in India previously for about six years. He has had ample opportunities of familiarising himself with Indian food and diet habits in the course of his present duties.

(d) Yes. The question of renewal of his contract will be considered next year.

(e) No. The Rationing Adviser had much to do with the perfecting of the Bombay Rationing Scheme, the basic features of which were supplied by the Ministry of Food, London. He has helped all other rationing authorities in working out rationing schemes applicable to their areas.

(f) He has paid eleven visits to Bombay since he joined the Food Department. These visits were in connection with advisory work and for holding consultations with the Provincial authorities on urgent matters connected with Rationing, Milk Priority Schemes, inauguration of Industrial Canteens, School Feeding Schemes, Nutrition Organisation, and similar matters initiated by the Rationing Adviser, including the periodical holding of Course of Instructions on Food Control and Rationing to Officers from all Provinces and States.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: Will the Honourable Member see that his contract is not renewed and that an Indian is appointed at the time of renewal?

Mr. B. E. Sen: I have said that the contract provides for renewal by mutual consent at the expiry of three years.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Is there a notice clause in the contract?

Mr. President: Order, order. That question does not arise.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: Will the Honourable Member consider the desirability of taking legal advice of the Legislative Department of terminating the contract by giving three months notice?

Mr. B. E. Sen: I do not see why we should take up that attitude with regard to an officer who has served us well.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: We want an Indian.

Mr. President: That is a matter of opinion.

Diwan Chaman Lall: What was the actual pay of this gentleman when he was acting as Food Adviser in London?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I must ask for notice.

Diwan Chaman Lal: Was his pay less than £100 a month?

Mr. Manu Subedar: Is there a notice clause in the contract so that if Government wants to send him away for any reason they can give him notice?

Mr. B. R. Sen: No, Sir.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Are there any efforts being made to see that an Indian is being trained so that an Indian can take his place.

Mr. B. R. Sen: For the last two years, we have been trying to get an Indian officer who will take his place, but all the trained Indian officers are under Provincial Governments who are unable to spare any of them.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Why is not the Central Government training one of their officers?

Mr. B. R. Sen: - We are trying our very best to get an officer to replace him when his time comes to retire.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: Usually in such agreements, while employing officials of this character, there is a clause about the termination of agreement. If so, why was there no such clause when employing this man?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I should ask for notice of this question.

Sri S. T. Adityan: The Honourable Member said that he had opportunities for studying Indian diet. Did he actually utilise the opportunities?

Mr. B. R. Sen: Yes, Sir, he has.

QUALIFICATIONS OF RATIONING ADVISER TO GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

1396. *Pandit Mukut Bihari Lal Bhargava: (a) Will the Food Secretary please state whether the Rationing Adviser to the Government of India has ever studied any rural part of India? If so, what is his scheme for rationing that area?

(b) Is it a fact that, of late, he has taken on himself to advise on schemes for the nutrition of people?

(c) What qualifications, if any, he has got in that line?

(d) Are Government aware that much better qualified Indians are available on a much less pay?

(e) Do Government propose to give an assurance that his present contract will not be renewed?

Mr. B. R. Sen: (a) Yes. The schemes depend upon the circumstances in the areas concerned and take the form of either statutory rationing or informal rationing or controlled distribution.

(b), (c) and (d). No; he was called upon to take up Nutrition work on the administrative side.

(e) The renewal of his contract would depend upon the circumstances prevailing at the time of the expiry of his present term in May 1947.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Are the Government having any Indian who is competent to advise him in regard to rural areas and the diet of the rural folks?

Mr. B. R. Sen: There are several Indian officers working with him who are competent to advise him on all aspects of Indian habits and Indian ways of life.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: If this gentleman does not know Indian habits of life, then why is it that he is retained here?

Mr. B. R. Sen: He knows the Indian habits: he has had plenty of experience in India.

Seth Govind Das: Does he take Indian diet or Western diet?

Mr. President: Next question.

QUOTAS OF FOODSTUFFS SANCTIONED FOR QUARTER MASTER GENERAL IN INDIA

1397. *Pandit Mukut Bihari Lal Bhargava: Will the Food Secretary please state:

(a) whether any check is applied by his Department to the utilisation of quotas of foodstuffs sanctioned for the Quarter Master General in India;

(b) if the reply to (a) is in the negative, how does he make sure that foodstuffs are not exported outside India under this guise; and

(c) if he has any method or means of scrutinising the indent of the Defence Services?

Mr. B. R. Sen: (a) No, as the actual utilisation and physical verification of stocks is properly the concern of the War Department and its finance officers.

(b) The Food Department receives a monthly statement of exports for Indian forces overseas in Middle East and Ceylon. No statement for export to the South East Asia Command which began with the reoccupation of Burma is received, but arrangements are now in force that the demand for troops in this area also is separately stated.

(c) The annual indent is carefully considered at a meeting of the Food and War Departments, with their Finance officers and is reviewed for adjustment every quarter.

APPOINTMENT OF EUROPEAN AS DIRECTOR OF INSPECTION AND STORAGE IN FOOD DEPARTMENT

1398. *Pandit Mukut Bihari Lal Bhargava: (a) Will the Food Secretary please state if it is a fact that a European gentleman has recently been appointed as Director of Inspection and Storage in the Food Department?

(b) If so, what are his qualifications, academic and technical, for the duties he is expected to perform?

(c) What was his pay while in the service of the Kashmir State, and what is his pay now under the Government of India?

(d) Are Government aware that he is neither an entomologist nor has he any other technical qualifications, whatsoever?

(e) Are Government aware that his appointment resulted in the reversion of two Indian Officers who were in every way much better qualified than the present incumbent? If not, will he please give a comparative statement of the qualifications of the three Officers?

(f) Are Government aware that much better qualified Indians from outside were also available for the post? If so, what are the reasons for not appointing them?

Mr. B. R. Sen: (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) As Director of Civil supplies, Kashmir State, Capt. Wreford acquired practical experience of storage and inspection work.

(c) His pay under the Kashmir Government was Rs. 1,500 per month. His present pay under the Government of India is Rs. 2,500 per month exclusive of pension.

(d) Yes.

(e) His appointment resulted in the reversion of two Indian Officers, neither of whom was considered to be of sufficient status and administrative experience to hold the combined post of Director of Storage and Inspection. A statement showing the qualifications of the three officers is laid on the table of the House.

(f) There was one Indian Officer who was considered suitable for this post. Efforts were made to secure his services but the Department concerned would not spare him.

*Capt. R. G. Wreford—**Mr. K. R. Sontakay—**Mr. T. M. Gurbaxani—*

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>1. Retired from the Indian Army and entered the Kashmir State Service in 1922.</p> <p>Since then held several responsible posts with distinction.</p> <p>3. At the time of joining the Central Government he held the post of Director of Civil Supplies, Kashmir Government. He was mainly responsible for successfully tackling the food problem in that State.</p> <p>4. He has acquired wide and intimate knowledge of the food problems and especially in matters of inspection and storage of food-grains. He was responsible in designing by himself a special type of granary for bulk storage of grains in Kashmir.</p> <p>5. He has acquired thorough practical experience in the work connected with the food administration.</p> | <p>1. M.Sc.—Zoology with Entomology.</p> <p>2. Post Graduate training in Entomology at the Imperial Agricultural Research Institute, Pussa.</p> <p>3. Served as Lecturer in Entomology at the Agricultural College, Nagpur and subsequently appointed Entomologist to Government of C.P.</p> <p>4. Held the post of Deputy Director of Storage, Department of Food, Government of India and also officiated as Director of Storage. At present he is holding the post of Deputy Director of Storage.</p> | <p>1. B.A.</p> <p>2. Held the post of Secretary, Karachi Indian Merchants Association, Karachi, prior to joining the Food Department as Deputy Director of Purchase (Foodgrains) in 1944. He officiated as Director of Insp. for about six months and on his reversion was appointed Under-Secretary in the Storage and Inspection Branch of the Food Department.</p> |
|---|--|---|

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: May I know why Rs. 1,000 more was sanctioned to him as pay when the gentleman was getting a pay of only Rs. 1,500 per month in Kashmir? What was the need for this increase?

Mr. B. R. Sen: This post of Director of Storage and Inspection is an important one. We spent at least six to eight months trying to get an Indian officer. We had one Indian officer in mind who was engaged in a commission. He held out some hope of joining us but ultimately he decided not to come. We approached the Agricultural Department asking for names of suitable officers. They suggested one name. This officer also was employed in some branch of work and ultimately he was also not available. As the matter was being delayed, on the report of one of our officers we selected this man. We have also had reports about his work in the Kashmir State. He was not willing to come for less than Rs. 2,500 and therefore we had to offer him that pay.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: May I know why this post was not advertised?

Mr. B. R. Sen: These posts, in the emergency of wartime and in the conditions arising from the war, had not been filled by advertisement but we selected them from among suitable officers who were available.

Seth Govind Das: Now that the war is over will the Government see whether there are any provisions in their agreement to give them notice? If so, notice should be immediately given to them.

Mr. B. R. Sen: I want to make it clear that we have no intention of dispensing with the services of officers whom we have already engaged and whose work we have found satisfactory.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: What is the opinion of this expert about the loss of 3½ million tons of food-grains? What steps have been taken to prevent that?

Mr. B. B. Sen: It will take many years to prevent a wastage of 3½ million tons.

Mr. Manu Subedar: In view of the opinion expressed in this House against the employment of non-Indian personnel in the Food Department, may I know whether Government will go into this issue and try to restrict or curtail the number in future of British employees?

Mr. B. B. Sen: I can assure the House that the Food Department as well as other Departments of the Government try to engage Indian officers. As far as possible they give preference to Indian officers. But in posts which require certain technical or administrative experience, it has not been found possible to get suitable Indian officers. There are Indian officers but those officers are required by the Provincial Governments who are not in a position to spare their services.

Mr. Manu Subedar: May I know why Government have departed from the salutary practice that where a person with a certain type of experience is not available in India amongst their own officers they will invite an expert for a matter of few months only and associate with him one of their own smartest officers so that in the limited time available he will qualify himself in the work to replace the foreign expert? May I know why, as disclosed in these two cases, the Food Department had brought these experts giving them a higher salary than what they were getting before and making the posts permanent?

Mr. B. B. Sen: These posts are not permanent posts. The Food Department itself is sanctioned from year to year.

Mr. Manu Subedar: If that were so, why did the Food Department enter into a contract for three years with these men?

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: On orders from Whitehall.

Mr. B. B. Sen: These officers are appointed on a contract, which provides for notice from either side. But we do keep on the officers whose work is found satisfactory and who are suitable.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: May I know what definite steps are being taken by this Department in order to see that it does not become a bottomless sink for British officers?

Mr. B. B. Sen: If the Honourable Member will scrutinise the list of officers in the Food Department he will find that the number of British officers is gradually getting less and less and the number now is very small indeed.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: May I know from the Honourable Member for what period these two Indian gentlemen worked? The Honourable Member said that their work was not satisfactory.

Mr. B. B. Sen: I did not say that their work was not satisfactory. What I said was that they were not considered to be of sufficient status and administrative experience. These two officers were appointed as Deputy Directors in the Storage and Inspection Branch and when they were asked to act as Directors they were told that they would act till a permanent man was appointed and we spent months trying to get an officer to take the place.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: May I know whether it is not a fact that the officer who was appointed from Kashmir had only a limited experience of six or seven months in Kashmir and that he had no further training in the kind of work that he was entrusted with?

Mr. B. B. Sen: That was not our information?

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: What was your information?

Mr. B. B. Sen: I have given the information in the statement which I have placed on the table of the House.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: In view of the general feeling in this House over appointment of non-Indians to such posts, will the Honourable the Food Secretary give an assurance on the floor of the House here and now that in future no appointments will be given to Non-Indians?

Mr. B. B. Sen: I am not in a position to give a categorical assurance like that.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: Who then is in a position to do so?

Mr. President: Next question.

Diwan Chaman Lal: On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member said that he has placed a statement on the table of the House giving the qualifications of this officer. May I know whether it would not be more convenient and whether the President would not order that when a statement of an important nature like the present one is placed on the table of the House a copy of it may previously be handed over to the questioner?

Mr. President: I will consider that point.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: If the statement is a short one may I ask why the Honourable Member has not read it to the House, especially when it is such an important one?

Mr. B. B. Sen: The statement is not a short one. It is a very long one.

Mr. President: Short or long, it does not matter.

REGIONAL FOOD COMMISSIONER, NORTH WEST REGION

1399. *Pandit Mukut Bihari Lal Bhargava: Will the Food Secretary please state:

- (a) if Government are aware that the Regional Food Commissioner, North West Region, has always been a European Officer; if so, the reasons therefor;
- (b) if Government are aware that many Indian Officers, qualified in every way and some of them retired Deputy Commissioners and other high Revenue and Executive Officers were available; if so, the reasons for ignoring them;
- (c) the experience, if any, in matters of food of the present incumbent and his immediate predecessor;
- (d) the reasons for preferring military officers for this post;
- (e) if Government are aware that the present incumbent has no knowledge at all of Indian diet, and eating habits, etc.;
- (f) the pay of the present incumbent and his immediate predecessor; and
- (g) the reasons for not appointing officers on a much less pay when other Regional Food Commissioners are getting less than Rs. 3,000 per month each?

Mr. B. B. Sen: (a) Yes, Sir. The most suitable men were selected.

(b) No Sir. Better Indian Officers were not available.

(c) Neither of these officers had previous experience in food matters but both of them had considerable administrative experience.

(d) This post has not always been held by military officers. It so happened that suitable military officers were available.

(e) No, Sir.

(f) The pay of the present incumbent is Rs. 2,550/-p.m. inclusive of pension. His immediate predecessor used to get Rs. 4,000/- per mensem inclusive of pension.

(g) There is no fixed scale of pay for the Regional Food Commissioners. The pay of each Regional Food Commissioner is fixed in relation to his emoluments before appointment.

Mr. Mannu Subedar: Is the Honourable Member aware that the regional food commissioner for Bombay was an experienced coal Manager and that he knew nothing either about Bombay or about food when he was appointed?

Mr. B. R. Sen: He worked for over a year and the Bombay Government were of opinion that he served both Bombay and other provinces extremely well.

Mr. Manu Subedar: May I make it clear that I have nothing against the man himself—he is otherwise a good man. I was only referring Government to his absolute lack of the knowledge of Bombay geography and of the habits of the people, and certainly he knew nothing whatever about the food of the people. Is that so or not?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I do not agree with the views expressed by the Honourable Member.

REQUISITIONING OF CERTAIN WHEAT PRODUCING LAND IN NANGALARAYA IN DELHI PROVINCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MILITARY GODOWNS

1400. *Sri E. Venkatasubba Reddiar: Will the Food Secretary be pleased to state:

(a) if it is a fact that about 86 bighas of land, on which wheat is being grown in Nangalaraya in the Delhi Province was ordered to be handed over to the Government for the construction of military godowns;

(b) if this fact was brought to his notice by the villagers through the village Panchayat of Nangalaraya; if so, the steps taken by him to make the land available again for growing wheat;

(c) the average quantity of wheat that was produced from these lands; and

(d) if it is a fact that these lands will now yield diminished supply of wheat?

Sir, I find part (d) of the question has not been properly printed. What I intended to say was that the supply of wheat would be diminished by the handing over of these lands to the military. It should read: "If it is a fact that the assignment of these lands would diminish the supply of wheat."

Mr. B. R. Sen: My reply will cover that also.

(a) to (d). There was a project to instal certain oil tanks and the original site selected was at Nangalaraya near Delhi Cantonment. Subsequently, however, owing to the project being reduced in size it was found possible to site it on Government owned land on which there is no cultivation

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Are we to understand that this land is now free from interference?

Sri E. Venkatasubba Reddiar: Will the assignment be resumed next year?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I cannot say about the future.

UTILIZATION OF MOLASSES IN SUGAR FACTORIES

1401. *Sjt. B. S. Hiray: Will the Food Secretary be pleased to state:

(a) how many tons of molasses in the various Sugar Factories in India are utilised for by-products;

(b) how many tons of it are not utilised for useful purposes;

(c) whether Government have any scheme to utilise the same for useful purposes; and

(d) whether it is a fact that Government do not provide sufficient facilities to the various Sugar Factories to utilise the molasses for useful purpose?

Mr. B. R. Sen: (a) and (b). Out of the total production of nearly 400,000 tons molasses about 150,000 tons are utilized for the manufacture of Spirit and Alcohol. Some quantity is also utilized for fuel in boilers, tobacco curing, manuring, manufacture of Food Yeast and crude sugar (*Khand*).

(c) The matter is under consideration of the Government of India who are awaiting the final report of the Sugar Panel set up by the Planning and Development Department.

(d) No.

Mr. Manu Subedar: In view of the fact that molasses was exported from India before the war to the United Kingdom and was being worked up there, but was not worked up here in this country, will Government now take steps to see that all of it is utilised in India instead of any of it being wasted?

Mr. B. R. Sen: That is what the Government are trying to do.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What is the answer to part (d)? Does that mean that Government does give facilities to the various factories to utilise the molasses?

Mr. B. R. Sen: Yes; that is the reply.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What are the facilities provided?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I should like to have notice.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: Does the Honourable Member know that the Sugar Factory Association at their meeting at Cawnpore had raised a note of protest that Government were not providing them with enough facilities for disposing of all these molasses?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I must plead guilty—I have not seen that; but in any case what Government are trying to do is to give all facilities for utilisation of molasses in this country.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What is the nature of those facilities? If you cannot give all the details, he can at least give an indication.

Mr. B. R. Sen: If the Honourable Member will put down a question, I shall try and give a reply.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, that is indicated in the question—"whether it is a fact that Government do not provide sufficient facilities to the factories". The Honourable Member is therefore expected to know about this.

Mr. B. R. Sen: I have given a reply already.

Mr. President: If the Honourable Member wishes to know the nature of the facilities in detail, he must put down a question to that effect.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Have Government considered the bearing of this question of utilisation of molasses on the ultimate reduction of the price of sugar for the consumer in this country and also the necessity of importing less petrol from outside, if the industrial spirit which can be manufactured in this country can be used?

Mr. B. R. Sen: Yes; these are very important considerations which have no doubt been taken into account by the committee.

Babu Ram Narayan Singh: What is the amount of molasses which are never used for any purpose at all?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I have given some figures in reply to parts (a) and (b). The total production is nearly 400,000 tons, of which 150,000 tons are now utilised for the manufacture of spirit and alcohol. Some quantity is also utilised for fuel in boilers, tobacco curing, manuring, manufacture of Food Yeast and crude sugar. But I cannot give the exact quantities.

Babu Ram Narayan Singh: Can any manure be made out of the molasses?

Mr. B. R. Sen: That is rather a technical question; if the Honourable Member will put down a question, I will try to give an answer.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: The Honourable Member is aware that from 1932 onwards, for the last 14 years, we have been pressing every year that something ought to be done to utilise these molasses and Government have always evaded replying, saying that they are investigating this thing and that thing. Fourteen solid years have passed and nothing has yet been done.

Mr. President: What is the question?

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: Is the Honourable Member aware that the total production of molasses in Java is being utilised there?

Mr. B. R. Sen: I fully agree that we must make full use of the molasses in this country. It is possible that Government in the past have not dealt with the matter in the way they might have done; but a committee was set up to go into this whole question; the report is, I believe, just submitted, and the whole matter will be gone into and a decision will be taken for proper utilisation of the molasses.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: Any possibility of any expert being imported from England for this purpose?

Mr. B. R. Sen: The possibility is not excluded.

PROPER WAGES TO INDIAN EMIGRANTS TO BURMA

1402. *Seth Govind Das: Will the Secretary for Commonwealth Relations please state:

(a) whether the Government of India have concluded any agreement with the Government of Burma for good wage standards of Indians in that country and for other good conditions of their living;

(b) whether Government's attention has been drawn to press reports specially to that of Mr. Mani of Nagpur, who returned from Malaya and Burma regions lately, to the effect that the wages and conditions of living of the Indian workers is deplorable; and

(c) whether they propose to ensure the conclusion of a proper agreement on these issues before allowing Indians to migrate to Burma?

Mr. R. N. Banerjee: (a) No.

(b) Yes.

(c) This matter is receiving Government's attention.

Seth Govind Das: Is it not a fact that the condition of Indians in Burma is very bad at present and that is the reason why Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was not allowed to visit Burma?

Mr. R. N. Banerjee: No.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that the Burma Government has issued a press communique to warn prospective Indian emigres to Burma against the possibility of providing them with adequate housing or food?

Mr. R. N. Banerjee: The communique which the Honourable Member has in mind only states that abnormal economic conditions still continue to prevail in the country and that the Government of Burma are not in a position to afford any assistance in respect of accommodation, transport, etc., and that Indians, particularly those who want to proceed there to revive their pre-war interests can go more or less on their own responsibility.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What steps are Government taking to bring this to the notice of our own Indians who are thinking of going to Burma, especially labourers?

Mr. R. N. Banerjee: The Department have given wide publicity to these communiques from time to time, and further publicity will also be given.

Diwan Chaman Lall: What does the Honourable Member mean by the Government giving close attention to this matter in answer to part (c)?

Mr. R. N. Banerjee: Government have in mind the desirability of arriving at an agreement. Negotiations have been pending for some time.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Are they proceeding? What does my Honourable friend mean by 'pending'?

Mr. R. N. Banerjee: They are proceeding; but we have yet to know the final decision of the Government of Burma.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Has a draft agreement been sent to them?

Mr. E. N. Banerjee: Yes; a draft agreement is under consideration.

Seth Govind Das: Will Government allow certain prominent Indians to go there and see the conditions of Indians there and suggest to Government certain means as to how to improve those conditions?

Mr. E. N. Banerjee: Many Indians who had interests in Burma before the war have already gone there.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: Why was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru not allowed to go there?

Mr. President: That does not arise out of this.

HEAVY STAMP DUTY ON BONDS RE CERTAIN MALABAR PRODUCTS

1403. *Sri E. Venkatasubba Reddiar: (a) Will the Honourable the Commerce Member please state if it is a fact that Malabar products, such as timber, coir, coconut, tiles, etc., were being exported in country crafts to various centres for a long time past?

(b) Is it a fact that up to 1942 there were no restrictions on the export of any articles for trade purposes, except the observance of the usual Customs rules?

(c) Is it a fact that in 1943, for the first time, new rules were passed according to which shippers had to execute a bond on a stamp paper worth Rs. 7-8-0 for each consignment and that merchants who were regular shippers were allowed to execute a continuity bond on a Rs. 10 stamp paper which was valid for three years?

(d) Is it a fact that the rules have now been revised under which every shipper is required to execute a bond on a stamp paper of Rs. 7-8-0 for each and every shipment irrespective of the value of the cargo?

(e) Is it a fact that fresh orders are under contemplation increasing the value of the stamp duty to Rs. 20 for each shipment?

(f) Is it a fact that the system of executing bonds was introduced during the war time to prevent smuggling?

(g) In view of the fact that war has ceased, will Government consider the advisability of restoring the old practice of unrestricted export of articles subject only to the usual Customs rules?

The Honourable Dr. Sir Azizul Huque: (a) Government are aware that the commodities are exported in country crafts.

(b) to (e). The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the reply given on 12th March, 1946, to starred question No. 895, by Sri M. K. Jinachandran.

(f) and (g). The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the reply given on the 12th March, 1946, to starred question No. 894, by Sri M. K. Jinachandran.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: What is the fact; has he withdrawn the insistence upon getting the bonds executed?

The Honourable Dr. Sir M. Azizul Huque: No. It has not been withdrawn. These bonds were introduced with a view to avoid goods being sent beyond the destination for which they were intended and the destination of goods to unauthorised destinations on a large scale and jettisoning of cargo was taking place; and with a view to check this matter, also prevent the violation of export regulations, these things have had to be introduced.

(Some Honourable Members rose to put questions)

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

(b) WRITTEN ANSWERS

APPOINTMENT OF RETIRED INCOME-TAX OFFICERS AS MEMBERS OF INCOME-TAX TRIBUNALS

1404. *Seth Govind Das: Will the Honourable the Law Member kindly state:

(a) whether Government are aware that retired Income-tax Officers have been taken as members of Income-tax Tribunals to hear appeals;

(b) whether Government are aware that such appointments of retired Income-tax Officers defeat the purpose and essence of Income-tax Tribunals; and

(c) whether the Government of India propose rectifying the defect in future and not to appoint retired Income-tax Assistant Commissioners or Officers in Tribunals?

The Honourable Sir Asoka Roy: (a) One appointment only of a retired Income-tax Officer to be an Accountant Member of the Income-tax Appellate Tribunal has been made on the authority of the proviso to sub-section (3) of section 5A of the Indian Income-tax Act.

(b) Certainly not. If the Honourable Member will refer to the debate which took place in this House on the 10th December, 1938, he will find that while Government disclaimed any intention of using the proviso in question for the purpose of packing the Tribunal with serving or retired officers of the Income-tax Department, they made it abundantly clear that such appointments were designed to be made on suitable occasions and that the House fully accepted this position. I may add that the one relevant appointment has proved a conspicuous success.

(c) Does not arise.

VISITS OF OFFICERS AND STAFF OF NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT DATE AT NIGHT

1405. *Sardar Mangal Singh: (a) Will the Health Secretary please state if Government are aware of the general complaint of Government servants in New Delhi against the officers and staff of the New Delhi Municipal Health Department who visit their quarters at bed time for sanitation enquiries?

(b) Are Government aware of the considerable harassment and inconvenience caused to the inmates of Government quarters by such visits so late in the night?

(c) Is this practice authorised under any of the Municipal bye-laws? If not, what action do Government propose to take against the persons responsible for the violation of bye-laws?

Mr. S. H. Y. Oulsnam: (a) No.

(b) No complaint of this nature has ever been received.

(c) Under sections 205 and 211 of the Punjab Municipalities Act, 1911, municipal officers are authorised to enter buildings for the purpose of inspection only between sunrise and sunset. It is reported that these provisions are being observed.

DETERIORATION OF SANITARY CONDITIONS IN NEW DELHI

1406. *Sardar Mangal Singh: (a) Will the Health Secretary please state if Government are aware that sanitary conditions in New Delhi have deteriorated for some time past?

(b) Are Government aware that some Sanitary Inspectors themselves infringe Municipal bye-laws by keeping their cattle on road-side for commercial purposes, instead of keeping them in cattle-byres?

(c) Are Government aware of the most insanitary conditions prevailing in Municipal cattle-byres which are entrusted to local contractors?

(d) If the replies to (a), (b) and (c) above be in the affirmative, what are the reasons for allowing such conditions to continue?

Mr. S. H. Y. Oulsnam: (a) No. The sanitary conditions have been well maintained in spite of a large increase in population during the war period and shortage of materials.

(b) No.

(c) No. These cattle byres are kept quite clean.

(d) Does not arise.

ALLOTMENT OF CATTLE BYRES IN NEW DELHI TO *Gowalas*

1407. ***Mr. Krishna Chandra Sharma:** (a) Will the Health Secretary please state the total number of stalls in the various cow-byres in New Delhi and the number of stalls at present rented to the ministerial and inferior staff of the Government of India and its Attached Offices, and to *gowalas*, and the Municipal employees, separately?

(b) Is the total number of stalls sufficient to meet the requirements of all those who apply for them? If not, what procedure is adopted in making allotment between the ministerial staff and others?

(c) Are Government aware that under the existing practice, a large number of stalls are being allotted to *gowalas*, peons, etc., who keep cattle for commercial purposes?

(d) Are Government aware that the cattle-byres were constructed mainly for the use of *bona fide* cattle-owners among the ministerial staff of the Government of India and its Attached Offices and not for any commercial purposes?

(e) Are Government aware that, since the work of allotment of byres has been entrusted to the New Delhi Municipal Committee, the number of the ministerial staff keeping cattle has decreased and that those of *gowalas*, peons, etc., has increased? If so, will Government consider the advisability of taking back the work of the allotment of all cattle-byres from the New Delhi Municipal Committee, leaving only the work of sanitation to that body?

Mr. S. H. Y. Oulsnam: Information has been called for and will be furnished to the House when received.

PERMISSION TO KEEP MILCH CATTLE IN CERTAIN GOVERNMENT QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI

1408. ***Mr. Krishna Chandra Sharma:** Will the Health Secretary please state:

(a) if Government are aware of the great difficulty in obtaining pure milk and butter in New Delhi; if so, the steps Government propose to take to remove this hardship; and

(b) whether Government will consider the advisability of permitting the tenants of 'C' and 'D' type Government Orthodox Quarters to keep their milch cattle in their premises. pending the adoption of measures by Government for the supply of pure milk and butter?

Mr. S. H. Y. Oulsnam: (a) There are a number of excellent dairies in New Delhi selling milk and butter of quality. In addition eleven milk depots have been provided in different convenient localities within New Delhi Municipal limits, under the Milk Supply Scheme and these are being run under the supervision of the Public Health Department of the New Delhi Municipal Committee.

A scheme has been prepared by the Agriculture Department for the improvement of the milk supply of Delhi as part of the post war development programme.

(b) No. The matter has been carefully considered by the New Delhi Municipal Committee, which found that cattle could not be kept in hygienic conditions in the courtyards of 'C' and 'D' type orthodox quarters. The Government of India are advised that the keeping of cattle in such quarters would lead to the breeding of flies and the spread of disease.

SUPPLY OF ESSENTIALS AND OTHER FACILITIES TO WORKERS IN MICA MINES AT HAZARIBAGH

1409. *Sjt. Seth Damodar Swroop: Will the Honourable the Labour Member please state:

(a) if Government are aware that there is no proper arrangement of water for the workers in the Mica mines at Hazaribagh and that no medical aid is available for them in spite of the fact that the area is a well-known epidemic place;

(b) if Government are aware that though the cost of living has increased from six to nine times, no dearness or any such allowance is being paid to the workers and that there is no proper arrangement for sale of rice and other foodgrains at control price at a time when foodgrains have almost disappeared from the market; and

(c) whether Government are aware that the Sub-Divisional Officer of the place has ordered the sale of rice at the rate of two seers and four chataks per rupee while the control price is three seers and eight chataks per rupee?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: (a) Water supply arrangements are not satisfactory and the medical aid now given is not adequate and there is scope for improvement which the Government of India hope to undertake shortly by means of Legislation.

(b) So far as Government is aware, in some cases wages have been increased to include the dearness allowance while some important concerns are paying dearness allowance in addition to wages.

Proper arrangement for sale of rice and other food grains at controlled price is a matter for the Provincial Government, and I would suggest the Honourable Member takes up the matter with the Provincial Government.

(c) Here again the matter is for local authorities and Provincial Government.

GRIEVANCES OF WORKERS IN MICA MINES AT HAZARIBAGH.

1410. *Sjt. Seth Damodar Swroop: Will the Honourable the Labour Member please state whether Government are aware that the money paid by the Joint Mica Mission was never distributed amongst the workers in the Mica Mines at Hazaribagh?

(b) Are Government aware that the factory rules and regulations are mostly disregarded by the Mica Mines Companies and that the highly objectionable and illegal practice of deducting one anna per rupee from the workers' wages in the name of *Dastoori* is openly prevalent there?

(c) Are Government aware that because of the grievances referred to above the Mica Mazdoor Sangh has been forced to give a clear notice of strike; if so, what steps Government are intending to take to satisfy the workers' demands and avert the danger of a strike?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: (a) It is not clear what the Honourable Member is referring to. If the reference is to the additional cost allowance

on the price which the Joint Mica Mission was paying to the suppliers; I may inform the Honourable Member that the distribution of the allowance was purely a matter between the employers and the workers.

(b) The Factories Act and the Payment of Wages Act do not apply to Mica Factories. The prevalence of the illegal practice referred to by the Honourable Member has been brought to Government's notice. The practice will, I think, disappear if the Government's proposal to bring mica under Central Control materialises and the Mica Enquiry Committee's recommendations in this respect are implemented.

(c) Yes. The matter is under investigation.

BAN ON GIVING WORKS TO CONTRACTORS RELATED TO EMPLOYEES OF CENTRAL P. W. D.

1411. *Babu Ram Narayan Singh: (a) Will the Honourable the Labour Member please state the circumstances which led to the issue of the Labour Department Circular Memo. No. M.S. 21, dated the 14th November, 1944, prohibiting the award of works to contractors whose relations are working as officers, etc., under the Central Public Works Department?

(b) Is he aware that this circular has caused great discontent and hardship to many highly reputed and old-established contractors?

(c) Do similar orders exist in any other Department of Government? If so, will he place a copy of such orders on the table of the House?

(d) Was the Legal Department of the Government of India consulted before the Labour Department issued these orders? If so, what was their opinion?

(e) Cannot the purpose of the orders be served if a relation of a contractor who happens to work in the same Division is transferred to some other Division or other station? If not, how?

(f) Will he please consider the advisability of cancelling these orders? If not, what are the reasons?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: (a), (b), (c), (e) and (f). The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the reply given to starred question No. 1143, on 21st March, 1946.

(d) No. It is purely an administrative matter.

REVISION OF ALLOTMENT RULES OF GOVERNMENT ACCOMMODATION

1412. *Babu Ram Narayan Singh: (a) Will the Honourable the Labour Member please state when the present allotment rules regarding allotment of residences in New Delhi during the war are to be revised so as to provide for change of residences within the same class or group as was permissible under the former allotment rules, since the war is now over?

(b) Is he aware that some of the allottees who have not been fortunate to get quarters according to their choice are, much to their dissatisfaction, forced to continue in their present quarters?

(c) Is he also aware of the fact that under the existing rules, senior officers moving down from Simla have been at a disadvantage as compared with the junior officers stationed here in securing allotment of quarters?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: (a) The question of the desirability of the revision of the present allotment rules will be taken up shortly, when the question of making provision in the rules for change of residences will also be examined.

(b) That is a matter of opinion.

(c) Yes, in a few cases senior officers have been at a disadvantage but that is no sufficient reason for disturbing a large number of officers who are already in occupation of these quarters.

LOSS OF REVENUE DUE TO ALLOTMENT OF LOWER CLASS ACCOMMODATION TO HIGHER PAID SERVANTS

1413. *Babu Ram Narayan Singh: (a) Will the Honourable the Labour Member please state the number of officers residing in lower type of clerks quarters in New Delhi but who are entitled to the allotment of (i) bungalows reserved for officers drawing Rs. 600 per mensem or more, (ii) 'A' and (iii) 'B' class quarters intended for officers drawing less than Rs. 600 per mensem?

(b) Is he aware of the fact that Government are losing a good amount in the shape of rent by not providing these officers with the class of accommodation to which they are eligible or even lower than that?

(c) What steps does he propose to take to avoid this loss of Government revenue, and are there any proposals to build more quarters of the higher class?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: (a) (i) 98, (ii) 57, (iii) 138.

(b) Government are not losing. Officers occupying lower type of quarters are paying the maximum rent and no quarters are lying vacant.

(c) *Part I.*—Does not arise.

Part II.—The matter is under consideration as part of the general proposal for the provision of more residential accommodation for officers..

EXPENDITURE INCURRED ON ANNUAL REPAIR OF CERTAIN ROADS IN D. I. Z. AREA

1414. *Babu Ram Narayan Singh: (a) Will the Health Secretary please state how much expenditure has been incurred during the last five years on the annual maintenance and special repairs of service roads in front as well as in the rear of the quarters in the D. I. Z. area in New Delhi?

(b) Is he aware that despite the repairs carried out during the last five years their condition has not much improved?

(c) What steps does he propose to take to improve them?

Mr. S. H. Y. Oulsnam: Information has been called for and will be furnished to the House when received.

SUPPLY OF UNFILTERED WATER IN QUARTERS IN D. I. Z. AND MINTO ROAD AREA IN NEW DELHI

1415. *Babu Ram Narayan Singh: (a) Will the Honourable the Labour Member please state whether there has been any proposal for the installation of pipes for the supply of 'unfiltered water in the courtyards of the Orthodox quarters in the D.I.Z. and Minto Road areas in New Delhi?

(b) Is he aware of the fact that gallons of filtered water are being wasted every day in every quarter in the washing of floor, W.C., watering of flowers, plants or vegetables and in the sprinkling of water on the *khus ki tatties* during the hot weather?

(c) In view of the approaching hot weather will he please consider the advisability of installing the unfiltered water supply in the quarters, in the wider interest of service and economy? If not, why not?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: (a) Yes.

(b) No. A bend and a gland cock are provided on the hydrants of unfiltered water at convenient places near these quarters at the beginning of every summer season to enable the occupants to draw unfiltered water and I do not think that the consumption of filtered water for these purposes during the remaining part of the year is excessive.

(c) No. The Government have already considered this suggestion very carefully in the past and dropped it mainly on account of the excessive expenditure involved.

NON-PROMOTION OF CERTAIN QUALIFIED EXECUTIVE ENGINEERS, etc., WORKING AS SUB-DIVISIONAL OFFICERS AND OVERSEERS

1416. *Babu Ram Narayan Singh: (a) Will the Honourable the Labour Member please state whether he is aware that there is a shortage of Engineers for filling up the posts of Executive Engineers and Superintending Engineers in the Central Public Works Department both in the Buildings and Roads and in the Electrical Branches?

(b) Is he aware that there are many foreign qualified and experienced Engineers working as Sub-Divisional Officers and even overseers who are not being promoted to hold Divisional charge or higher because they are yet junior to unqualified subordinate Sub-Divisional Officers and others?

(c) Is he also aware that Government are sending students for overseas studies to make available foreign qualified hands to fill up higher appointments?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: (a) Yes.

(b) There are some foreign qualified Engineers in the Central Public Works Department who have not yet been promoted to Divisional or higher charges, because they are either still junior to other qualified Engineers in the Department or are unfit for such promotion.

(c) Yes.

NON-PROMOTION OF CERTAIN QUALIFIED EXECUTIVE ENGINEERS, etc., WORKING AS SUB-DIVISIONAL OFFICERS AND OVERSEERS

1417. *Babu Ram Narayan Singh: (a) Will the Honourable the Labour Member please place on the table of the House a list of foreign qualified and experienced Sub-Divisions Officers with full qualifications and total experience and length of service of each and their respective date of appointment in the Central Public Works Department?

(b) What is the number of officers appointed directly as Executive Engineers or Superintending Engineers since 1940?

(c) While making appointments mentioned in part (b) were the cases of each of the individuals mentioned in reply to part (a) considered for such appointments? If not, why not?

(d) Will he, in future, kindly consider the desirability of promoting such Sub-Divisional Officers to the rank of Executive Engineers before recruiting men from outside? If not, what are the reasons?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: (a) A statement is laid on the table.

(b) Superintending Engineers—Nil.

Executive and Electrical Engineers—28.

(c) With the exception of those mentioned below, the cases of all the others were duly considered.

(1) Mr. B. S. Krishnaswami He is a temporary Subordinate, while all the others promoted as Executive Engineers are either permanent subordinates or gazetted temporary engineers.

(2) Messrs. A. K. Sen and Naqir Hussain Their cases have not yet come up for consideration as they are not sufficiently high up in the seniority list, all those so far promote as Electrical Engineers being senior to them.

(d) No such undertaking can be given, as the officers mentioned in the reply to part (a) are either inexperienced or are unfit for Divisional charge.

List of Foreign Qualified Sub-Divisional Officers in the Central Public Works Department.

Serial No.	Name	Date of appointment in Central PWD	Qualifications	Previous experience, if any
I.—ENGINEERING SIDE				
1	Mr. N. N. Mehta	17-9-1935	B.A., B.Sc. (Eng.), Sheffield A.M.I.E.	
2	„ Gurbachan Singh	5-3-1942	B.Sc., (Civil) Edinburgh.	15 months' apprenticeship in Central Public Works Deptt. 12 years as Superintendent, P.W.D., Kheotri State.
3	„ R. R. Tomar	18-5-1942	Diploma Holder of Battersea Polytechnic, London.
4	„ B. S. Krishna-swami.	13-6-1942	B.Sc., (Eng.), Rangoon (Burma).
5	„ S. V. Subbarao	20-7-1942	B.A., B.Sc. (Hons) Civil Engineering, (Edin.).	1 years' previous experience.
6	„ A. K. Das	1-1-1943	B.Sc., Civil Engineering, (Edin.).	
7	„ M. Rahman	19-4-1943	B.Sc., (Delhi); B.Sc., (Civil), Durham.	Has had some experience with a firm in England.
8	„ Abdul Ghafar	11-2-1942	B.Sc., Civil Engineering (Edin.).
9	„ Mohd. Shaffi	15-3-1944	C.E.(Bristol).
10	„ Narinjan Singh Bisarkhi	4-4-1944	B.Sc., (Civil), Glasgow (Edin.).	15 years' experience in M. E. S., etc.
11	„ S. A. Hakim	30-8-1944	Rasul Overseer; C.E. (Shaffield), A.M.I.E. (Ind.), C.I.S.E. (London).	15 years' in Punjab P.W. D. and 8 years' District Board Service.
II.—ELECTRICAL SIDE				
12	Mr. B. K. Mazumdar	4-5-1942	Diploma in Mech. and Elec. Engineering from Farady House, Electrical Engineering College, London.	Served for 2 years as Apprentice Engineer to Messrs. Crossley Bros., Ltd., Manchester and Southern Elec. Buildings, London. 3 years' term with the Calcutta Supply Corporation.
13	„ M. N. Dutt	23-9-1942	B.Sc., (Glasgow)	Has had some previous experience. Details not available.
14	„ A. K. Sen	13-3-1943	Do.
15	„ Nasir Hussain	1-5-1945	B.Sc., AMIEE (London)

PREPONDERANCE OF MUSLIMS IN CERTAIN SECTIONS OF HEALTH DEPARTMENT

1418. *Babu Ram Narayan Singh: (a) Will the Health Secretary please state the number of appointments of Assistants and Clerks which have been made in each grade of his Department since it has been formed, and how many of these have gone to Hindus, Mohammedans and Sikhs in each grade?

(b) What is the total strength of the General Section of the Department and how many of them are Hindus, Mohammedans and others in each grade?

(c) Who is responsible for looking after the proper representation of each community's claims in each Section, and by whom are allocations of individuals in each Section made?

(d) What are the special circumstances for giving more than twentyfive per cent. representation to the Muslims in the General Section, and under whose orders has the Section been made a preserve Section for the Mohammedans?

(e) Does he propose to see that due representation is allowed to each community in each Section? If not, why not?

Mr. S. H. Y. Oulsnam: (a) 17 Assistants or grade "A" clerks and 24 grade "B" clerks have been recruited since the formation of the Department. Of the 17 Assistants 9 are Hindus, 5 Muslims, 2 Sikhs and 1 Christian. Of the grade "B" clerks 12 are Hindus, 8 Muslims, 3 Sikhs and 1 Scheduled Castes man. One of the Muslims has been transferred to another office.

(b) The total sanctioned strength of the General Section is 1 Superintendent, 6 Assistants or grade "A" clerks and 5 grade "B" clerks. The present composition of the section is:

Hindus—2 grade "B" clerks.

Muslims.—1 Superintendent, 5 Assistants or grade "A" clerks, and 2 grade "B" clerks.

Others.—1 Assistant or grade "A" clerk and 1 grade "B" clerk.

(c), (d) and (e). The orders relating to communal recruitment do not apply to particular sections within a Department and postings to different sections are made in accordance with requirements of official work. Steps are being taken, however, to secure a more balanced representation of the various communities in the General Section.

TERMS OF APPOINTMENT AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE OF MINISTERIAL STAFF
APPOINTED BY SUPERINTENDENT, VICEREGAL ESTATES

1419. *Sardar Mangal Singh: Will the Honourable the Labour Member please place on the table of the House a sample copy of the terms of appointment and conditions of service offered to the ministerial staff appointed directly by the Superintendent, Viceregal Estates, for specific duty in Simla and or Delhi prior to the 14th July 1936?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: No particular form was prescribed for sending out offers of appointment to the staff. A copy of one of the appointment letters issued during this period is laid on the table.

Copy of letter No. 1031-M, dated the 25th/26th February 1920 from the Military Secretary to His Excellency the Viceroy, Delhi to the Superintendent, Viceregal Estates.

Your letter No. 279-M, dated the 20th February, 1920.

I sanction the appointment on probation for 6 months of Lala Dewan Chand as Store-keeper, Viceregal Estates, Simla, on Rs. 50-5-70, with effect from the 1st January 1920 vice S Amir Chand resigned and also authorise the recovery from him of Rs. 350 of his security deposit at Rs. 10 a month.

The agreement bond is returned herewith.

REVISION OF ALLOTMENT RULES OF GOVERNMENT RESIDENCES

1420. *Sardar Mangal Singh: (a) Will the Honourable the Labour Member please state whether it is a fact that an officer who is transferred from Delhi to Simla or a Secretariat Department at Calcutta after the 1st April 1945, on re-transfer to Delhi, loses the benefit of his previous service, and has to earn his seniority afresh for the purpose of allotment of quarters?

(b) What object has been achieved by not giving to such officials, seniority from the original date of qualifying posting *vis-a-vis* those who have remained on duty in Delhi, when transfers are ordered in the interest of public service?

(c) As the situation with regard to residential accommodation is acute, and the persons affected are those who have put in quite a number of years in Government service and have large families, does the Honourable Member propose to examine the necessity of rescinding this decision?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: (a) Yes.

(b) The object aimed at was to give relief to relatively junior people whose stay in Delhi had been continuous and who had suffered more from the rigours of the Delhi housing conditions than offices stationed in Simla or Delhi.

(c) The Rule will be re-examined when the general revision of the Allotment Rules is undertaken.

**PERMISSION TO BUILD MORE SUGAR FACTORIES IN CERTAIN CANAL IRRIGATED
DECCAN AREA OF BOMBAY PROVINCE**

1421. *Sjt. B. S. Hiray: Will the Honourable the Labour Member be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that canals in the Deccan area of the Bombay Province were constructed for protective purposes;

(b) whether it is a fact that the same purpose is served, if not, whether Government propose to extend the areas under Sugar Factories for sugar cane crop;

(c) how many acres of land are irrigated by Canal water in this area, and how many of it are utilised by Sugar Factories for their purposes; and

(d) whether Government propose to allow the construction of more Sugar Factories in this area? If not, why not?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: The information has been called for from the Government of Bombay and will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

**MANUFACTURE OF STARCH FOR TEXTILE PRODUCTS FROM TAMARIND IN PLACE OF
MAIZE.**

162. Prof. N. G. Ranga: (a) Will the Food Secretary be pleased to state if he has received any representation from Pectin and Starch Products of Calcutta in January 1946, suggesting the manufacture of starch needed for textile product out of tamarind seed instead of as at present out of maize, and also drawing Government's attention to the researches of Dr. S. Krishna and Dr. W. A. J. Macmillan, who have approved of the use of tamarind seed pectin instead of Carbo Hydro starches?

(b) (i) How much of maize is now being consumed by the Licensed Starch Factories and (ii) how many of them are there in India? Is it not a fact that licences have been granted to some of the factories as late as January 1946?

(c) Why the Conference suggested by the above mentioned Company between Government consumers, manufacturers and the Scientists has not so far been

convened in order to examine the possibility of economising the use of maize by the starch factories and instead utilising tamarind for starch purposes?

(d) Do Government propose to explore every possible avenue of economising the use of foodgrains for non-food purposes?

(e) Will Government consider the advisability of exploring at least now the possibility of utilising tamarind seeds instead of maize and thus saving all the maize that is being now used for manufacturing starches for human consumption?

Mr. B. E. Sen: The question should have been addressed to the Honourable Member for Industries and Supplies. It has accordingly been transferred to the List of questions for the 5th April, 1946, when it will be answered by the Honourable Member for Industries and Supplies.

AGRICULTURAL LABOUR IN DHARWAR DISTRICT (BOMBAY PROVINCE) NOT ALLOWED TO REMOVE PADDY FOR THEIR EARNING IN KIND

163. Sardar N. G. Vinchoorkar: (a) Is the Food Secretary aware that paddy is grown in the Dharwar District, Bombay Province, in Dharwar, Kalghatgi, Bankapur, Hangal and Hirekerur Talukas?

(b) Are Government aware that people from outside come to these Talukas and do agricultural labour and are paid in kind?

(c) Are Government aware that these labourers are not allowed to take home their paddy, which is their earning in kind, under the orders of the Collector and District Magistrate, Dharwar?

(d) If the reply to (c) is in the affirmative, do Government propose to modify these orders to enable the agricultural labourers to take home their earnings in kind?

(e) If the reply to (c) is in the affirmative, are Government aware that this will adversely affect the growth and yield of the paddy crops in these areas and thus defeat the objects of the "Grow More Food" Campaign?

Mr. B. E. Sen: (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Yes. The agricultural labourers are paid their wages partly in kind.

(c) The quantity of rice and paddy allowed to be transported to other talukas is restricted to the requirements of an average family for a year according to the current ration scale. Rice is not the normal food of labourers in many Talukas and Government have noticed that large quantities of rice have been transported in the name of fictitious labourers for sale in the black-market due to the shortage of rice in non-paddy-growing Talukas.

(d) and (e). Do not arise.

PLANS FOR UTILIZATION OF WASTE LANDS IN GUJRAT, DECCAN AND KARNATAK FOR GROWTH OF FOOD CROPS

164. Sardar N. G. Vinchoorkar: (a) Will the Agriculture Secretary be pleased to state whether there are any waste lands belonging to Government which can be brought under cultivation in Gujrat, Deccan, and Karnatak in the Bombay Province? If so, how much is it?

(b) Have Government any plans about utilizing the same for the growth of food crops?

Sir Pheroze Kharegat: (a) The area of the Government waste lands in the districts of Gujrat, Deccan and Karnatak is as follows: Gujrat—112221 acres, Deccan—152971 acres, Karnatak—30000 acres.

(b) These lands are being leased out rent free on annual leases to cultivators and ex-servicemen wherever it is possible to grow food crops.

DESIRABILITY OF EXTENDING CONCESSIONS ENJOYED BY STAFF OF VICEREGAL ESTATES, SIMLA, TO STAFF OF SIMLA CENTRAL DIVISION OF CENTRAL P. W. D.

165. Sardar Mangal Singh: With reference to the reply to part (b) of unstarred question No. 136, answered on the 9th April, 1945, regarding the desirability of extending to the ministerial and inferior staff of the Simla Central Division, the same concessions as are enjoyed by such staff of the Viceregal Estates, Simla, will the Honourable the Labour Member please state whether any decision has so far been arrived at? If so, will he please place a copy of the orders issued on the subject on the table of the House?

The Honourable Dr. B. R. Ambedkar: A copy of the orders embodying the final decision arrived at in the case is laid on the table.

Copy of letter No. E-6, dated the 6th December 1945 from the Assistant Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Labour, New Delhi, to the Additional Chief Engineer, Central Public Works Department, Western Zone, New Delhi.

SUBJECT:—Grant of compensatory allowances to the staff of the Simla Central Division and of the Rent Control Office of the Central Public Works Department at Simla.

Reference your letter No. 01171-E, dated 7th June, 1944. The Governor-General in Council sanctions the grant of 'Compensatory allowances to the non-gazetted staff of the Simla Central Division and of the Rent Control Office of the Central Public Works Department at Simla at the rates shown below:—

(a) *Non-gazetted Ministerial and Technical staff, other than inferior servants.*—15 per cent. of pay, subject to a minimum of Rs. 15 (fifteen) and maximum of Rs. 35 (thirty-five) per mensem.

(b) *Inferior staff.*—Rs. 2 (two) per mensem fixed.

2. These orders will have retrospective effect from the 1st July, 1945.

MECHANICAL AND TRANSPORT ENGINEER TO GOVERNMENT OF BOMBAY.

166. Sardar N. G. Vinchoorkar: (a) Has the Agriculture Secretary created a new post of Mechanical and Transport Engineer to the Government of Bombay?

(b) If so, when, and for what period?

(c) What are the duties of this officer?

(d) In what manner, particularly, are his services useful to the agriculture or in the interests of improvement of agriculture in the Bombay Province?

(e) Who is the present incumbent of this post?

(f) What are his special qualifications for the same?

Sir Pheroze Khargat: (a) No, Sir. The post has been created by the Government of Bombay.

(b) The post was filled on the 9th October, 1944, on three years' contract, terminable at six months' notice on either side.

(c) and (d). The duties of the officer appointed are to organise and supervise all work connected with mechanical cultivation in the Bombay Province.

(e) Lt. Colonel W. N. Bates.

(f) A statement of his qualifications is laid on the table.

Statement

(i) Trained as Engineering Student at Leeds University and in Commercial Workshops from 1911 to 1914

(ii) Served in the Army from 1914 to 1923.

(iii) Transferred to the R.A.S.C. in 1924.

(iv) Passed examinations for A.M.I.M.E. in 1924.

(v) Elected A.M.I.M.E. in 1925 and A.M.I.A.E. in 1932.

(vi) Inspector of Mechanical Transport, C.I.M.T. Branch, War Office, from 1925 to 1926.

(vii) Transferred to R.I.A.S.C. in 1927.

(viii) Workshop Officer Mobile Repair Unit for 4½ years.

(ix) Since 1932 has held numerous technical and administrative appointments, connected with maintenance and repairs of mechanical transport and fighting vehicles in Indian Army, including Works Manager, Heavy Repair Shop.

(x) Worked as Chief Instructor, Training Centre Army School of Maintenance and Driving, Ahmednagar and Officer-in-Charge Experimental Section of Fighting Vehicles School.

TRACTORS AVAILABLE TO AGRICULTURISTS IN NORTH, CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN DIVISIONS OF BOMBAY.

167. Sardar N. G. Vinchoorkar: (a) Will the Agriculture Secretary please state how many tractors are available to the agriculturists in the North, Central and Southern Divisions of the Bombay Province?

(b) Are they available for use to the agriculturists on hire individually or through the Agricultural Development Associations?

(c) Are there any special facilities offered, in view of the 'Grow More Food' campaign, for making the tractors available in time?

Sir Pheroze Kharegat: (a) Twenty eight tractors are at present available with the Provincial Department of Agriculture for use in the Province in addition to ten others for which suitable implements are not available. The territorial distribution of these tractors is not known.

(b) The tractors available for cultivation are being worked departmentally on a contract basis both for individual cultivators and for organisations.

(c) The Provincial Government are prepared to pay half the cost of tractor cultivation for increased food production.

INACTION RE REMOVAL OF SECTIONS 111 TO 121 OF GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT.

Mr. Manu Subedar (Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau, Indian Commerce): With your permission, may I raise a little point. On the 4th February I was moving an adjournment of this House in order to draw attention to the failure of Government to give the information which they promised with regard to the removal of the commercial safeguards sections 111 to 121 of the Government of India Act. I regret the Honourable the Planning

12 Noon. Member is not here in spite of the message I sent him. He had only taken office for a week when this question was raised and I did not therefore press him. He had undertaken that a day would be allotted for the discussion of this topic. He gave this undertaking after consulting the Honourable the Leader of the House and said that a day at the end of March or the beginning of April would be given. Now, that the Government have stretched the session by many working days, may I know which particular day the Government propose to fix for this purpose which they have promised to this House.

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall (Leader of the House): I was under the impression that the Honourable Member had informed the Honourable Planning Member that he would not press it. I would consult him and let him know.

Mr. Manu Subedar: If the Honourable Member will let this House know tomorrow, it will be all right, so far as I am concerned.

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall: I will consult the Honourable Member for Planning and Development and let the House know tomorrow.

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1945-46—RAILWAYS—*contd.*

DEMAND NO. 1—RAILWAY BOARD—*contd.*

Mr. President: The House will now proceed to consider the Demands for Supplementary Grants in respect of Railways for 1945-46. A demand for Rs. 5,15,000 under the head 'Railway Board' was under consideration the last occasion, and Mr. Ayyangar was speaking at that time.

Mr. A. C. Turner (Government of India, Nominated Official): Sir. Before Mr. Ayyangar proceeds with his speech, may I have your permission to make a brief statement. The House will remember that when on February the 28th I had moved the supplementary demand for the Railway Board, the Honourable Deputy President raised a preliminary objection concerning the manner in which provision had been made for expenditure on investment in Road services under Demand No. 12 in the current year without presenting a special memorandum to the Standing Finance Committee and without presenting a token Supplementary Demand under Demand No. 12 to this House. In deference to the wishes expressed on that occasion in this House, the matter has since been referred to the Standing Finance Committee for Railways which was provided with full details and explanations of the present position. As a result of their deliberations, the Standing Finance Committee have now recommended for the current year the following: (1) the provision of a supplementary sum of 50 lakhs under Demand No. 6-G. Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses to defray the cost of chassis purchased and bodies already commenced or completed thereon and (2) the provision of a new Supplementary Demand under Demand No. 12. Open Line Works to cover certain of the investments which had already been made this year. These fresh demands will be placed before the House today and will be for discussion here and in view of this I presume that the Honourable the Deputy President no longer wishes to press his preliminary objection.

Diwan Chaman Lall (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): May I ask what the constitutional position is? Do I take it that all this money has been spent without the sanction of this House. Is this an Excess or a Supplementary Grant? I would like my Honourable friend to explain the position to the House.

Mr. A. C. Turner: This will be a supplementary grant to cover certain items of expenditure which have been incurred and which were incurred by Government in good faith in pursuance of the mandate which they thought they had received from the House last April when the House supported the policy of Government as explained by the Honourable the War Transport Member and voted the supplementary demand of 82 lakhs.

Diwan Chaman Lall: This expenditure has already been incurred without the sanction of this House in anticipation of anything that this House might do. The demand comes in the form of a supplementary demand. It can only be an excess grant.

Mr. A. C. Turner: I think that is not quite correct. If the House did not regularize the amount during the current financial year, then it would have to come forward as an excess grant in a later year after investigation by the Public Accounts Committee. But if this House chooses to sanction this expenditure now within the financial year they are perfectly within their rights and the whole proceeding will be regularized.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Do I take it that my friend is not aware of the distinction between a supplementary grant and an excess grant. A supplementary grant is a grant regarding which this House is asked to give its sanction for future expenditure. An excess grant is a grant for which this House has given no sanction whatsoever. It has been utilised by the Department without the sanction of the House and in sack cloth and ashes they now come here to ask for the vote of the House. That is the distinction. Therefore, Mr. President, I would like a ruling from you as to whether this is a supplementary grant or an excess grant.

Mr. A. C. Turner: The difference is that an excess grant is never placed before the House for its vote in the year in which the expenditure is being incurred. It is voted in the year after that, or it may be two years afterwards. This House can however, regularize any expenditure in the current financial

[Mr. A. C. Turner]

year by a vote in this financial year. That is the distinction, which, I think, is important.

Diwan Chaman Lall: May I draw your attention to page 32, Manual of Business and Procedure, para. 166 :

"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."

It is not a question of having spent money in one year and then coming in the next budget year before the House and asking the House to validate the grant by virtue of its being called supplementary. Excess grant is a grant which, without the sanction of the House, during the financial year, the Department has utilised and having utilised without sanction of the House, then has to come to the floor of the House and demand the sanction of the House to validate that particular excess.

Mr. A. C. Turner: I think it is a question of interpretation, the meaning of this particular rule seems to me quite plain :

"When money has been spent on any service. . . . for which the vote of the Assembly is necessary during any financial year."

The point on which stress is to be laid is "for which the vote of the Assembly is necessary during the financial year". The vote of the Assembly is being asked for in this financial year. Therefore it is not an excess grant, but a supplementary grant.

Mr. President: I was just considering that the distinction lies more in "the vote of the Assembly" having been asked for or not. It is not so much with reference to the year that the distinction is made. But I would like to consider this point at greater length than now, perhaps more quietly. But I may give the House what is passing in my mind, so that I can have some help from Honourable Members in the matter of interpretation. I am inclined to think that, in cases where there is no budget grant at all and expenditure is incurred, the grant would be excess grant. Where a particular head is included in the budget estimates, money has been provided for on account of that particular head, and some expenditure is incurred on that particular head,—that is on what is sanctioned by the Assembly,—but in excess of the budget grant, then it will come as a supplementary grant. Am I right in this distinction?

Diwan Chaman Lall: May I draw your attention to May's Parliamentary Practice page 501, first para.

Mr. President: Perhaps I did not express myself very clearly. This is what I find in Rule 50, that is Para. 167. the very next para. which says:

"An estimate shall be presented to the Assembly for a supplementary or additional grant when—

(i) the amount voted in the budget of a grant is found to be insufficient for the purposes of the current year."

That is a supplementary grant.

"(ii) a need arises during the current year for expenditure for which the vote of the Assembly is necessary upon some new service, not contemplated in the Budget for that year."

This is what I expressed when I said "no budget grant". That is all I expressed.

The para. further says :

"Provided that when funds to meet proposed expenditure on a new service can be made available by reappropriation a demand for the grant of a token sum may be submitted to the vote of the Assembly, and, if the Assembly assents to the demand, funds may be so made available."

Now, the point which has been raised in this particular case appears to me to be a point not of interpretation but of understanding of parties viz., as to

how the opposition understood the particular vote and as to how the Government understood that vote. The matter would be clarified further from the Note or the Memorandum which was submitted to the Standing Finance Committee by the Government, which is attached to the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee dated 26th March 1946. The whole point is one of understanding; and I believe when the Honourable the Deputy President argued his case . . .

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar (Madras Ceded Districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadan Rural): That was not even taken up. What he said was, what the Deputy President raised as objection was, there was not even a token demand placed before the Assembly as was required by the Rules that you have just now read out. It is a new service for which there is no provision in the budget last year. Therefore there must have been a token amount, and even that was not placed before the Assembly. That was his objection.

- **Mr. President:** That was what he was urging while raising his objection. The point which I wish to make is this. When he raised that point, the Honourable the Leader of the House said, that his view was that as the Government had at that time asked whether they could go on, after the grant of 82 lakhs and odd, and they were given to understand, of course according to them, not according to the party which gave them to understand, that they might go on with the scheme, what the Government has done, that was his contention, was in pursuance of that direction of the committee that, the Government could go on.

Diwan Chaman Lall: The point is this, that a particular grant was given to the Government by the vote of this House for a particular service. The Government understood that they could spend more money in respect of that grant than that given by the House.

Mr. President: That is not the point.

Diwan Chaman Lall: If no money has been granted then they cannot spend money on new service.

Mr. President: That is the contention of one side. The contention of the other side was that this was not a new service, but their understanding is that what was included in the budget included this thing. That was how the Government understood it.

Diwan Chaman Lall: We must be quite clear in our minds before we come to any decision. Whether this grant is an excess grant or a supplementary grant, we must be clear in our mind, whether any grant has been given to the Government at all.

Mr. President: Will the Honourable Member appreciate the point which I am placing. It is not, to my mind, a question of interpretation, but it is a question as to how the parties understood the vote of the Assembly. If what the Government say they understood as correct understanding, then this will become a supplementary demand. If on the other hand, the real interpretation of the debate last year, if the vote of the Assembly last year, is what the Deputy President reached as the conclusion, then this will be an excess grant. Here the real difficulty is not to decide on the interpretation of the particular rule as to whether this grant is an excess grant or a supplementary grant; but a question of fact arises as to whether the understanding of the one party was correct or the understanding of the other party was correct. Whatever it may be, as a matter of fact there has been this understanding, and we have to take what the Government say they understood—one may not agree with them—but still, if they say, they understood this in a particular way, then we have to proceed on the assumption that, as a matter of fact they understood it that way. I may refer the Honourable Member to the Note submitted by the Government to the Standing Finance Committee, a copy of which was circulated last night. The relevant observations from that Note are in para. 2.

"At the time the budget for 1945-46 was drawn up, the probable outlay in such investments was not known so that no provision was made in the budget. In view, however, of the endorsement of the policy by the Assembly in April last and the fact that investments had been made in road services in previous years, so that the items did not in Government's

[Mr. President]

opinion constitute a new service. Government entered into certain commitments as mentioned above and made provision in the revised estimates for the expenditure of 119 lakhs which was anticipated would be incurred during the current year and of about 3.48 lakhs in the budget. The amount provided in the revised budget was found to be available by reappropriation within the grant concerned,—Grant No. 12,—so that it was not necessary to present a supplementary demand to the Assembly on that account."

That was the point of Government contention; and the Deputy President was contending that really, it was not a case for reappropriation within that budget head. Certain items of expenditure were transferred from one budget head to another budget head, so that all of it was grouped in budget head 12 and then reappropriation was resorted to. In other words, his allegation was that the Assembly was got round, this expenditure was incurred and it was not put to the vote of the Assembly.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, you have put my contention clearly before the House. At that time also I pointed out that this expenditure under head 12 could not be incurred by reappropriation unless there was a token grant passed by the House and that token grant was not taken; therefore no expenditure could be incurred without coming with a supplementary grant. The Standing Finance Committee has rectified this mistake. My Honourable friend the Financial Commissioner for Railways was not willing to accept my contention at that time, but now he agrees that it could not be made like this and the Standing Finance Committee has agreed to allow this expenditure under head 6-G which was really originally allowed by this House. Therefore there will be no appropriation from one head or the other but it is coming under the head 6-G, as has been shown in the note circulated here. This expenditure of 50 lakhs which has been allowed is a round figure though it falls somewhat short. The Committee was not in a position to know whether all the items of expenditure had been incurred during this time and therefore they allowed expenditure on only one item. But there was one clear understanding that this House does not want to reverse the policy which has been accepted for the coming year by not granting 3 crores and 48 lakhs; that is, we had shelved that matter for running the rail-road coordination scheme until it is revived later on. But there was a clear understanding that whatever Government have spent has been spent without prejudice to that decision which has been taken by the Assembly, and there will be no reversal of our policy. This has been arrived at and now the Assembly will give it. It will now become a regularised expenditure by their vote.

Sjt. N. V. Gadgil (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, on account of the passing of a supplementary grant in 1945 Government went on incurring expenditure beyond what was sanctioned and now they come for the vote of the House. This performance should not be repeated again. You might as well say that this policy of rail-road has been accepted in 1945 and therefore you may think it justifiable to incur further expenditure as you have done during the current year. There must be a clear understanding about it.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I was not a member of the Railway Finance Committee but I should like to express my opinion if I am asked to vote on this supplementary demand. This supplementary demand has been before us year after year

Mr. President: I may remind the Honourable Member that we are not dealing with the merits of the supplementary demand now. What we are discussing now is the procedure as regards the point of order raised by Diwan Sham Lal. His point was that this cannot come before the House as a supplementary demand but must come as an excess demand. If the Honourable Member has to address himself to that point. I am quite prepared to hear him. He can speak on the merits of the demand when it is discussed by the House.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: Sir, I understand the procedure to be that whenever we have any expenditure for the current year any demand in excess of the voted amount comes in the form of a supplementary demand. But when it relates to excess expenditure in the previous year and is reported by the Public Accounts Committee to be regularised it is presented in the shape of an excess demand. That has been the practice in the past and that is how I have always understood it.

Mr. President: That point has been cleared now. But it appears to me, with reference to what Diwan Chaman Lall said, that in view of the adjustments arrived at—I believe, as a matter of compromise—between Government and the Standing Finance Committee, as also in view of the fact that 50 lakhs of rupees are now added to 6-G, and the demand No. 12 is also now put before the House as a supplementary demand, the question loses all its practical importance so far as the procedure is concerned, and we need not go into the technical position now as to whether as a matter of fact this is an excess grant or a supplementary grant. So the Honourable Member Mr. Ayyangar will now proceed.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Sir, in view of the statement of the Honourable Member and in as much as this particular matter is coming under two other heads divided between 6-G and 12, I do not pursue this matter under this head.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: I think any expenditure likely to be incurred in 1945-46 can be taken up as a supplementary demand, but I have a few objections to this. A demand is made for an excess of 14 crores in the supplementary budget; that shows colossal indifference as to the way in which the budget was prepared last year. They could not foresee this expenditure of 14 crores which they are now demanding. It may be said that it may be on account of other expenditure on an approved item which is covered by paragraph 167 (i) of the manual of Business and Procedure. But this amount ought not to be very large and should not exceed two or three per cent. But if the excess is 14 or 15 per cent. it shows negligence in the Finance Department of the Railway Board.

It ought to be within certain limits.

The second thing is that it may be an entirely new item of expenditure. If it is so, then in that case, the vote of the House ought to be taken and no money ought to be spent without our knowledge. When you start a new expenditure you presuppose, and you have no right to do so, that the Assembly would agree to it. Therefore to incur large expenditure of lakhs and crores in the hope that the Assembly will agree to it is not correct. So before you take up a new service, you ought not to spend any money before taking votes.

There is a third thing: a service which has been rejected by the House. I think it is criminal to spend any money on any item which has been rejected by the vote of the House, and therefore to demand anything on any item which has been rejected is not justifiable. Therefore, I would split up the whole thing into three parts:

(a) Where the demand is for an approved service, then I will ask what percentage you are demanding over the budget for 1945-46.

(b) If you come for any demand for a new service, then I would like to know what new circumstances had happened on account of which you could not foresee such things.

(c) If, unfortunately, we have put down any expenditure on an item which has been rejected by the House, then I regret that I will not vote for it.

Mr. President: I think I have to put Demand No. 1—Railway Board to the House now.

The question is:

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 5,15,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of ‘Railway Board.’”

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: This is a motion not by the Chair. Somebody should move it.

Mr. President: It was already moved. The discussion was going on and the Honourable Deputy President was opposing it on other grounds.

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 2—AUDIT

Mr. A. C. Turner: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,53,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Audit'."

Mr. President: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,53,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Audit'."

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: on this matter I would like to say a few words. Much of this money has been paid by way of dearness allowances to employees drawing Rs. 1,000 and above. This was passed by the Standing Finance Committee last year after the budget was over. I would like to know when Government is going to stop this dearness allowance for higher salaried men. If he is not going to do so, I am against this so far as this includes dearness allowance for highly paid officers.

Mr. President: Do I take it for granted that the Honourable Member does not propose to move his cut motion?

Grant of Dearness and other allowances after the Budget for 1945-46 without reference even to the Standing Finance Committee for Railways

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Yes, I do. Sir, I move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,53,000 in respect of 'Audit' be reduced by Rs. 1,16,000."

I have already said enough about this matter. So far as employees getting Rs. 1,000 and above, no dearness allowance is necessary for them. You see there are controls. He cannot celebrate a marriage because he cannot feed more than fifty at a time. He cannot have a costly *saree* for his wife because there is no cloth. He cannot enjoy liquor because of heavy excise duty. Therefore such a man can save, whereas others have had to spend on account of the war. To people drawing over Rs. 1,000 the war has come as a boon. Let it be put a stop to. It is improper. As a protest I want that the House will agree with me and support the amendment and vote down the demand to that extent.

(At this stage Prof. N. G. Ranga rose in his seat)

Mr. President: I have yet to place the cut motion before the House. I could not catch the Honourable Member while he was moving the cut motion. He wants it reduced by Rs. 1,16,000.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Yes, Rs. 1,16,000 as an economy cut.

Mr. President: Cut motion moved:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,53,000 in respect of 'Audit' be reduced by Rs. 1,16,000."

Prof. N. G. Ranga (Guntur *cum* Nellore: Non-Muhammadan Rural): We also took exception to this in the Public Accounts Committee last year and we made it clear to Government that they should not follow this procedure and waste public money on people who really do not deserve it and are not in need of it. If I mistake not, these people, these officers also get the benefit of supplies from their various shops and other concerns by railways at no cost to Government, that is, at cost price and sometimes less than cost price. Therefore, I do not think it is necessary for us to argue this at any great length. We suggest that Government should at least for the future give up this very bad and wasteful procedure and stop all this dearness allowances for these officers who are paid more than Rs. 1,000.

Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan: So far as policy is concerned, I agree with my friend, Mr. Ayyangar, that after the Assembly did not allow this dearness allowance, it should not have been given. But there is one little difficulty. From all the money that is being spent this way in the Railway Board, my friend has only given a cut in the Audit Branch. If we only choose to strike at the Audit Branch and leave out the other bigger salaried men who are getting much more than this, then it will not be consistent with the policy which my friend wants to enunciate. Then there is another matter. The employees of the Audit Branch are not the servants of the Railway Board. The Railway Board pays an audit fee to the Auditor General in order to have the accounts of the railways checked, and if the amounts have gone up higher than naturally a higher expenditure was required. In this case it is not so much a question of dearness allowance as the fees which are payable under the rules to the Audit Department. But had my friend chosen this as a token cut on the first demand on the Railway Board to discuss the policy, or if he had reduced the whole of the supplementary grant, then it would have been possible, but here we will not achieve the object which my friend has got in mind and the best course will be, what he had done in the beginning, to invite the Honourable the Finance Member to say what is the position of the Government as to whether they agree to this dearness allowance for the future or they want to stop it now. He wants to discuss this because he has mentioned it and I hope the Honourable Member will not take objection and say that because he only wanted to discuss this and he has not said that it is for the sake of economy, therefore he will give only the appropriate reply.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: That is exactly our intention.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: Sir George Rainy when he was the Railway Member, laid before the House that the facilities which we provide for the servants of the Government of India should also be extended to railway servants.

We had practically accepted this principle. This question of dearness allowance should not be discussed only with reference to the railway employees, much less with reference only to the Audit Department. It is a general question and I think we should adopt a uniform policy in the case of the railways and other servants of the Government of India. Therefore we should allow this particular demand and give them the dearness allowance but this question should be raised as a general question of policy applicable to all the services of the Government.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Where?

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: Both of us are members of the Standing Committee and that is the place where we ought to raise this question but we ought not to bring up the Railway Department, much less one particular section of the Railway Department and apply a differential principle. Sir, I beg to support the demand.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena (Lucknow Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural)

Sir, in this connection I would like to tell my Honourable friend Sir Zia-uddin Ahmad that so far as we are concerned we want this cut to be imposed in respect of other Departments as well when the supplementary demands come up today. As regards the Railway Department I may inform the Honourable Member that there is one special reason. From the General Manager downwards every railway employee gets his articles from the railway shops, for which we are expected to provide in these very supplementary demands about 24 or 30 lakhs to cover up the loss.

An Honourable Member: Some crores.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: I want to draw the attention of the House to two other points. Firstly, this dearness allowance was given effect to from the 1st January 1945. The Government must have contemplated it long before and it was deliberately not placed before the Assembly, because Government

[Shri Mohan Lal Saksena]

must have been sure that the Assembly will not approve of it and therefore it was later on introduced and the Railway Finance Committee was not even consulted.

One more point, Sir. The other day, Honourable Members will remember, I put a question to the Honourable the Labour Member pointing out that there were employees in Government press who were drawing Rs. 13, 15 and 17 and I wanted that something should be done for them. I think my friend Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad also supported that. The Honourable the Labour Member said that nothing could be done until the commission which was inquiring into the pay of all Government servants had reported. On the one hand we find that there are employees who are literally starving and nothing is being done because a certain commission had not reported and on the other hand we find Government employees who have been drawing Rs. 1,000 and more who are not put to as much hardship as they are represented to be and so far as railway employees are concerned, they have certain extra facilities. Still the Government did not hesitate to introduce these concessions involving the exchequer to the tune of some crores.

In this connection I may also submit that our objection is to the grant of dearness allowance to officers drawing Rs. 1,000 and above. We do not object to the allowance being given to those drawing lower salaries.

Mr. President: Today is Friday and the House has to adjourn at 12-45 P.M. Before we adjourn I want to invite Honourable Member's attention to the party agreement that by 5 P.M. tomorrow we finish not only these railway grants but also the general supplementary grants. Keeping that in view Honourable Members will carry on their discussions. Otherwise we shall not have sufficient time to discuss the general supplementary demands.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: We have no knowledge of that agreement.

Mr. President: This agreement was arrived at the other day by leaders of all parties and groups. An agreement is an agreement whose sanctity cannot be broken.

The assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Quarter Past Two of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after lunch at a Quarter Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Mr. G. V. Mavalankar in the Chair).

Mr. President: I believe the Honourable Members would like their memory to be refreshed by what I stated when the House adjourned, about the agreement between the parties. There was a conference at which leaders of groups and parties were present and this was what was agreed to. I had stated that to the House some time back, and I would repeat it now just to refresh the memory of members.

I understand that all sections of the House have arrived at a general agreement on the question of the time table for the Finance Bill and the supplementary grants for railways as well as general.

The time table will be as under. Commencing from Tuesday the 19th instant, all stages of the Finance Bill will be completed by 5 P.M. on Thursday the 28th instant, and all questions then outstanding in respect of the Finance Bill will be put to the vote of the Assembly without any further discussion or any question. The railway and general supplementary demands will be taken up on the 29th instant and continued on Saturday the 30th instant, which will be a working day. The Assembly will similarly dispose of on that day all the outstanding supplementary demands by 5 P.M.

Mr. Manu Subedar (Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau: Indian Commerce): Sir, may I submit that the Government have included in the supplementary demands a demand for Rs. 4 crores for the U.N.R.R.A. This demand

was unanimously opposed in the Standing Finance Committee, and we all said it would be most improper to come to the Assembly with this demand but Government have come and most of us are anxious to discuss this highly controversial item; and if Government try by a trick of this kind to get this through, all that would be open to us would be to vote down that particular head completely without discussion; but I feel that Government ought not to do this: they should separate the demand for the U.N.R.R.A., which is not supplementary to the past year, which is a proposal for spending in future, and that they should come to us separately for it and assign a day for the discussion thereon. It is head No. 70—Miscellaneous. That is as far as I infer, because U.N.R.R.A. last year was put under Miscellaneous . . .

Mr. President: I have no indication here on the paper.

Mr. Manu Subedar: When the agreement which you read out was made, I do not think any member of a group or party—certainly not on this side—had a clear conception that Government would put in items of this kind, highly controversial and very damaging to this country; in a famine year, in a highly deficit year they propose to give away Rs. 4 crores more which will be taken mostly in the form of commodities which we need very badly in the country. I do not want to go into the merits, but I must protest against Government's inclusion of this item in which miscellaneous grants come, when the underlying basis of this understanding which was merely reached as a mutual courtesy in order to expedite the business of the House. I do not think that could be the intention of any member of this House—that this particular understanding reached merely as a matter of assistance should be utilised in order to get in a highly controversial issue like this by the back door.

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall (Leader of the House): Sir, in that connection I should like to make a statement, which I was considering making later in the day. In the statement made by me yesterday I said that a supplementary demand for a further contribution to U.N.R.R.A. in 1946-47 would be one of the subjects we will have to bring up before the House. It has since been brought to my notice that the position is, as the Honourable Member said, that there is a supplementary grant for this further contribution to U.N.R.R.A. under, I think, item No. 70; and therefore my submission was misleading, because it will in fact come up for discussion on demand No. 70 tomorrow . . .

Mr. Manu Subedar: How can it come up if the guillotine is applied?

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall: I am just explaining the position. It was not clear to me last night, when I made that statement. It is a matter on which the Government will probably accept the verdict of the House, and the point is that if the House desires a considered debate on this subject it is desirable that the House should see that there is time for it.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: That is not possible.

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall: My object in making this statement was to make the position clear to the House. This is the actual fact. This item is quite correctly included in the supplementary demand and I wish to make that clear to the House.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I wish to make one suggestion that it should be withdrawn from this list and brought in again separately so that the House will have an adequate opportunity of discussing this matter and afterwards expressing its own opinion with regard to it.

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall: Quite clearly I shall have to discuss it with the Finance Member and I shall tell the House at 5 O'clock. I have already sent a wip out to find him.

Mr. President: If the expenditure is not to be incurred or already incurred before the 31st March—may I now if it is necessary to have this demand included in the present supplementary demands?

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall: I have not got the papers in front of me, but I think you will find from the papers that it will be put into a suspense account this year to be spent next year.

Mr. Manu Subedar: The urgency of it is not on a par with the urgency of the other items. In the other items, we are required to co-operate with Government and finish the discussion before the 31st March in order to observe the legal propriety that the expenditure is sanctioned before the year expires; but in this case it is clearly a new proposal: it is a proposal to which there was considerable opposition in the Standing Finance Committee; even my friends of the European Group did not agree that the contribution should be given; and I submit that it cannot be included in the demand No. 70 in the form in which it is; and if Government put demand No. 70 *minus* this Rs. 4 crores which they had intended to give to the UNRRA, they can go through under the guillotine—we have no objection; but the other items should be provided separately and Government can bring this up separately next year.

Mr. President: That is exactly why I put the question, as to whether the expenditure had been incurred or was to be incurred before the 31st March; but if that is not so, the matter will have a different aspect. We will have the position clarified when the Honourable Finance Member comes in; we will then know what the facts are. As I find from the proceedings of the supplementary demands—"It was decided last year with the concurrence of the Standing Finance Committee to make a contribution of Rs. 8 crores to UNRRA, 110 lakhs of rupees by direct expenditure on supplies in 1944-45 and Rs. 6,90,00,000 by transfer to a special deposit account to be drawn upon as and when necessary."

Mr. Manu Subedar: No, Sir; may I mention for the information of the House that Rs. 8 crores was intended to cover three years' expenditure?

Mr. President: I am not contesting the Honourable Member's point; I am supporting that point. That appears to me to be the position under (c). Therefore I put that question about the urgency of the matter being taken up before the 31st March. But the Honourable Finance Member is not here and we will have the position clarified when he comes. I am merely referring to the agreement.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: May I know whether the demand was before the House when the agreement was arrived at.

Mr. President: I could not be sure of that. They may not have been in possession of this particular aspect.

So far as the supplementary demands are concerned, the dates of circulation are General supplementary demand No. 1, was circulated on the 28th February, No. 2, on the 4th March and other supplementary grants on the 25th March. We will have the matter clarified when the Honourable the Finance Member comes.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: We must be very careful about agreements in future.

Mr. President: That is a matter for the Honourable members. One need not bind himself to any position. The demand under discussion now is No. 2 Audit.

Mr. A. C. Turner: First of all I should like to correct one or two mis-statements which were probably inadvertently made by my Honourable friend Mr. Saksena. He first said that every one on the Railways, from the General Manager downwards is entitled to grain shop concessions. I assure the Honourable Member that that is not a fact. No one in receipt of more than Rs. 400 per month is entitled to any concession from railway grain shops. The second point he made was that the present revised scales of dearness allowance and war allowance were given with retrospective effect from the 1st January 1945 and he therefore deduced that Government must have made up their mind by that date and they had wilfully withheld this from the House and from the Standing

Finance Committee until after the session had concluded. Sir, that is quite a wrong deduction. Government had not made up its mind at all. Government's decision was taken in April, 1945, and as soon as Government's decision was taken the proposal was put before the General Standing Finance Committee of this House which approved Government's proposals and it was given effect to with retrospective effect.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: Was it not on the 12th April that the Standing Finance Committee meeting was held?

Mr. A. C. Turner: Yes.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: Is it not a fact that the Assembly adjourned on the 12th April.

Mr. A. C. Turner: I am not aware of the date.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Two days later they held it.

Mr. A. C. Turner: There is nothing to be deduced from that except that the usual practice was followed. As far as possible, we hold our Standing Finance Committee meetings outside the period when the House is sitting. I think my Honourable friend Mr. Ayyangar will support me in saying how inconvenient and difficult it is holding these meetings during the sittings of the Assembly. We have to meet either before or after the hours of business which is onerous and harassing. So that there is nothing to be deduced from the date of this meeting. The decision was not taken till April, that I can vouch for as I had to deal with this matter in another capacity.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Why was this not placed before the Standing Finance Committee for Railways. We are not guided in financial matters entirely by the Government of India, Finance Department Resolutions?

Mr. A. C. Turner: My Honourable friend has put me a question. I will reply by putting him a question. When Government have sanctioned relief for all other officials, would Mr. Ayyangar deny that relief to Railway officials?

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: I am afraid the Honourable Member has not addressed himself to the Standing Finance Committee Resolution of the 12th April 1945, where at page 5, where it refers to Central Government servants other than employees on railways. You make a distinction. Do you know that in the case of the Railways the whole procedure is different in the matter of budget, scales, service regulations and so. You yourself have made a distinction between the two services.

Mr. A. C. Turner: I notice that my Honourable friend has not answered my question, but I pass on.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: I am here to answer questions, not you?

Mr. A. C. Turner: To pass on. I think the correct view has been taken by the Honourable Deputy President and Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad, when they say that this is a matter concerning all Government servants. This audit service comes under the Auditor General of India and their allowances are those of civil as opposed to railway employees. If it is the intention of this House to withhold supplies in respect of one small section of Government servants, it is to me in deed a little surprising.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: We have cut motions for all Departments

Mr. A. C. Turner: I notice that my Honourable friend Mr. Ayyangar has a cut motion down against the first demand in the general budget on this very subject. That appears to me to be the more appropriate place at which to press such a motion. The present demand relates to a very small section of Government servants.

Mr. President: I want to be clear on one point. The Honourable Member has included the whole amount of Rs. 1,16,000 for reduction. In the course

[Mr. President]

of his speech he said he objected to the dearness allowance of persons drawing over Rs. 1,000 per mensem. Does this amount work up to the figure of Rs. 1,16,000?

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: That is my information.

Mr. A. C. Turner: This Rs. 1,16,000 contains a sum of Rs. 4,000 for ordinary allowances which has nothing to do with dearness allowance. The one lakh 12 thousand which remains is for all the Government servants under this head. It includes provision for officers drawing less than Rs. 1,000 p.m. as well as for those who draw more.

Mr. President: Does the Honourable Member wish to press it?

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Yes. I press it because it gives retrospective effect. I would like to cut out the entire demand.

Mr. President: I wanted to have clarification because the Honourable Member made that distinction in his speech. I wanted to be sure that nothing is cut out by mistake. I have nothing to say on the merits of the motion before the House.

The question is:

“That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,53,000 in respect of ‘Audit’ be reduced by Rs. 1,16,000.”

The Assembly divided:

AYES—42

Adityan, Sri S. T.
Ayyangar, Sri M. Ananthasayanam.
Banerjee, Sree Satyapriya.
Chettiar, Sri T. A. Ramalingam.
Choudhuri, Sreejot Rohini Kumar.
Daga, Seth Sheodass.
Dani, Mr. G. B.
Gadgil, Sjt. N. V.
Gauri Shankar Saran Singh, Mr.
Gole, Mr. P. B.
Gounder, Sri V. C. Vellingiri.
Govind Das, Seth.
Hiray, Sjt. B. S.
Jagannathdas, Sri.
Jhunjhunwala, Mr. B. P.
Jinachandran, Sri M. K.
Madandhari Singh, Mr.
Mahapatra, Sri Bhagirathi.
Mangal Singh, Sardar.
Manu Subedar, Mr.
Masani, Mr. M. R.

Menon, Sri A. Karunakara.
Mukhopadhyay, Mr. Nagendranath.
Mukut Bihari Lal Bhargava, Pandit.
Narayanamurthi, Sri N.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutt.
Ram Narayan Singh, Babu.
Ramayan Prasad, Mr.
Ranga, Prof. N. G.
Reddiar, Sri R. Venkatasubba.
Saksena, Shri Mohan Lal.
Salve, Mr. P. K.
Sampuran Singh, Sardar.
Satakopachari, Sri T. V.
Sharma, Mr. Krishna Chandra.
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan.
Sri Prakasa, Shri.
Sukhdev, Seth.
Swaminadhan, Shrimati Ammu.
Thakur Das Bhargava, Pundit.
Vadilal Lallubhai, Mr.

NOES—51

Abdul Hamid Shah, Maulvi.
Abid Hussain, Choudhury Md.
Ahmad Ali Khan Alawee, Raja Sir Saiyid.
Ambedkar, The Honourable Dr. B. R.
Azizul Huque, The Honourable Dr. Sir M.
Banerjee, Mr. R. N.
Benthall, The Honourable Sir Edward.
Bewoor, Sir Gurunath.
Bhattacharyya, Rai Bahadur Devendra
Mohan.
Chatterjee, Lt.-Col. Dr. J. C.
Cook, Mr. B. C. A.
Griffiths, Mr. P. J.
Guruswami, Mr. S.
Gwilt, Mr. Leslie.
Habibur Rahman, Khan Bahadur.

Harendra Singh, Sardar Bahadur Captain
Sardar.
Himmatsinhji, Col. Kumar Shri.
Hirtzel, Mr. M. A. F.
Hydari, The Honourable Sir Akbar.
Ishaq Seth, Haji Abdus Sattar Haji.
Ismail Khan, Hajee Chowdhury Mohammad.
Jaffer, Mr. Ahmed E. H.
Jeelani, Khan Bahadur Makhdum Al-Haj
Syed Sher Shah.
Kharegat, Sir Pheroze.
Krishnama Acharya, Rai Bahadur Sir V. T.
Lawson, Mr. C. P.
Mason, Mr. P.
Nairang, Syed Ghulam Bhik.
Naqvi, Mr. A. T.
Oulnam, Mr. S. H. Y.

NOES—51—contd.

Rangachari, Mr. M. V.
 Roy, The Honourable Sir Asoka.
 Rowlands, The Honourable Sir Archibald.
 Sargent, Sir John.
 Sharbat Khan, Khan Bahadur.
 Siddique Ali Khan, Nawab.
 Siddique, Shaikh Rafuddin Ahmad.
 Siddiqi, Mr. Abdur Rahman.
 Solanki, Dr. P. G.
 Spence, Sir George.
 Sri Chand, Chaudhri.

Stokes, Mr. H. G.
 Tamizuddin Khan, Mr.
 Thorne, The Honourable Sir John.
 Turner, Mr. A. C.
 Tyson, Mr. Geoffrey W.
 Weightman, Mr. H.
 Williams, Mr. C. F. V.
 Yeatts, Mr. M. W. M.
 Yasuf Abdoola Haroon, Seth.
 Zafar Ali Khan, Maulana.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,53,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Audit'."

The motion was adopted.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands (Finance Member): Sir, I understand that when I was out of the House a point was raised by the benches opposite as to the propriety of including in a general supplementary demand (No. 70) a sum of Rs. 4 crores in respect of UNRRA. I do not admit it to be in proper, particularly since I have brought it before the Standing Finance Committee; but, of course, we did not contemplate then that the guillotine procedure might have to be applied in the Assembly; and Government are extremely anxious to elicit the views of the House on the subject at greater length than merely voting on it, particularly under the guillotine procedure. I therefore propose, with the consent of the House, to move tomorrow myself for a reduction of Rs. 4 crores under this grant, leaving the subsequent point whether this contribution is to be made to UNRRA for a subsequent discussion. And if the House then approves, I will move a further supplementary grant for next year. This supplementary grant is in respect of the current year's budget. I hope that will meet the point which the benches opposite had in mind, namely, that we will not deal with the further contribution to UNRRA on the supplementary grants of this year except to have a discussion on it, and if the House approves, we will move for a further supplementary grant.

An Honourable Member: When will it come again?

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Some time later in this session.

DEMAND No. 3.—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE

Mr. A. C. Turner: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 23,27,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure'."

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 23,27,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 5.—PAYMENTS TO INDIAN STATES AND COMPANIES

Mr. A. C. Turner: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 22,22,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Payments to Indian States and Companies'."

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 22,22,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Payments to Indian States and Companies'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 6-A.—WORKING EXPENSES—MAINTENANCE OF STRUCTURAL WORKS

Mr. A. C. Turner: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 5,85,02,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works'."

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 5,85,02,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 6-D.—WORKING EXPENSES—MAINTENANCE AND WORKING OF FERRY STEAMERS AND HARBOURS

Mr. A. C. Turner: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 5,30,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance and Working of Ferry Steamers and Harbours'."

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 5,30,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance and Working of Ferry Steamers and Harbours'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 6-E.—WORKING EXPENSES—EXPENSES OF TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT

Mr. A. C. Turner: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,42,82,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Expenses of Traffic Department'."

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,42,82,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Expenses of Traffic Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 6-F.—WORKING EXPENSES—EXPENSES OF GENERAL DEPARTMENTS

Mr. A. C. Turner: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 65,06,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Expenses of General Departments'."

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 65,06,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Expenses of General Departments'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 6-G.—WORKING EXPENSES—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

Mr. A. C. Turner: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 76,59,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses'."

Mr. President: Motion moved.

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 76,59,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses'."

Irregularity in incurring expenses on purchasing chassis and building bodies

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: Sir, I move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 76,59,000 in respect of 'Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. President: What motion is it?

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: The motion of which I have given notice.

Mr. President: It is difficult for me to admit motions at the last moment.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: I got this at 12 o'clock last night.

Sri R. Venkatasubba Reddiar (South Arcot *cum* Chingleput: Non-Muham-
madan Rural): The original was for Rs. 76 lakhs.

Mr. President: The point is that the list of demands in which Rs. 76 lakhs and odd was shown, was circulated on the 27th March. That means two days before.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: No. We received it only last night.

Mr. President: The book was circulated last night.

Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: My friend does not know what it contains. This demand is about the statement as to how much they ask under each head. The explanatory memorandum was circulated only last night. That shows Rs. 76 lakhs has been spent for chassis and other bodies. He takes exception not to the entire amount but to the Rs. 50 lakhs, the details of which were not known. He is not in a position to specify his demand.

Mr. President: The book was circulated last night.

Sjt. N. V. Gadgil: In fact we agreed to discuss these demands today on the understanding that the printed list would be supplied to us. Now that they were supplied only last night, I think the standing order ought to be waived and the amendment be allowed.

Mr. President: I believe this sum of Rs. 50 lakhs was added as the result of Standing Finance Committee's compromise over the other question.

Shri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: That is on the first demand. He made a statement that we have come to some arrangement so he gives a supplementary demand under 6-G and 12 and I withdrew my remarks in view of the fact that we would have an opportunity to discuss it under 6-G and 12. So my friend is quite in order.

Mr. President: I was considering it from the point of view of waiving the question of notice.

Mr. A. C. Turner: Since the booklet only went out last night, although the actual total amount of the demand was shown in the list which went out on the 27th, I am prepared to withdraw my objection.

Mr. President: Will the Honourable Member repeat his cut motion and will he pass on the copy to me.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: "That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 76,59,000 in respect of 'Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Shri Mohan Lal Saksena]

I do not think I have to make a long speech because this has come before the House several times and as I pointed out before it must have come to the notice of the Members from the report of the *ad hoc* Committee in which the majority of the Committee were of the opinion that this was in contravention of the afore-

3 P.M. said agreement and it was irregular. The *ad hoc* Committee was not informed as to how much money was spent in pursuance of the rail-road co-ordination policy. They were told that some money had been spent. The majority of the Committee took exception and pointed out that it was irregular. But my Honourable friend, the Leader of the House, did not consider it so and he has appended a note of dissent to it. Later on this question was again taken up during the discussion on the Railway Budget and my friend Mr. Gole pointed it out and wanted an explanation on that point. You know, Sir, that in the House, even that day, it was stressed on behalf of the Government that it was not necessary for the Government to bring that expenditure as a supplementary grant. In the Railway Finance Committee, I understand, the members agreed that they were ready to pass such expenditure as had already been incurred, but from the proceedings circulated to us we find that it was not so, although we have a statement of Rs. 50 lakhs, the Oudh Roadways Limited cost us Rs. 14,75,073 for chassis, building of bodies Rs. 7,83,520 while it was not known how many bodies had been completed.

As a matter of fact, this question had been hanging fire since February and in the meantime the Government should have taken steps to get the necessary information, at least for the Standing Finance Committee of the Railways, but nothing was done.

Then we find that against the Ganges Valley Transport Company Rs. 3,17,500 is shown as cost for chassis. The estimated cost of the bodies is Rs. 1,62,500 and this expenditure was incurred before 1st September 1945. It is very strange that up till now this information could not be had, notwithstanding repeated reminders from this House to get that information.

Again we find in the case of the South East U. P. Transport Company Limited, the Rohilkhand Transport Company Limited and the Gogra Transport Company Limited that Rs. 14,35,100 has been spent on chassis and the estimated cost of bodies comes to Rs. 7,34,500 and again we are not able to know how many bodies have been completed.

In the end no notice has been given to General Motors Limited cancelling their contracts for building the bodies, and therefore it is not known to what extent our commitments to them can be reduced. I want to know why no notice was given. Is it not a fact that the Honourable the Leader of the House could give an assurance to this House that no future commitments will be made? So that was the proper time when these railways should have been asked to notify General Motors Limited and other companies which had been entrusted with building chassis bodies.

Then again I find from the Standing Finance Committee's proceedings, held on the 26th March; it is said in para. 3:

"further recommended by a majority that this money should be expended only on the chassis already purchased and on bodies either already built or in the course of building. They asked that complete information should be placed before it as soon as practicable regarding the total number of chassis purchased up to March 31st 1946."

I ask why up to the 31st March, 1946? After all in February the Honourable Member had given an assurance that no future commitments will be made. If any chassis was purchased after the 4th February, I think the Finance Committee was not justified in accepting this position that any chassis that had been purchased up to the 31st March, 1946, will be paid out of this.

I do not want to say anything more. I know that our representatives in the Finance Committee have agreed to provide for this sum of 50 lakhs. I do want that this should be recorded that the House takes strong exception to the manner in which this expenditure was incurred. The Honourable Member

has been laying great stress on the understanding. So far as this House is concerned it would be a very dangerous precedent to establish that "he can proceed to spend and spend to the tune of crores on the basis of an understanding, especially in view of the fact that not even a token demand was brought before the House and accepted. Therefore I think it is necessary that while we are going to pass the supplementary demand of 50 lakhs, this motion should be passed by the House placing on record that the expenditure incurred by the Government was not in order. Sir, I move.

Mr. President: Cut motion moved:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 76,59,000 in respect of 'Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Shri D. P. Karmarkar (Bombay Southern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir I rise to support the motion before the House moved by my Honourable friend Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena. In doing so I would like to invite the attention of the House to what I consider to be not a very accurate statement of facts as they are given in the memorandum for the Standing Finance Committee. The first paragraph incidentally says that when the supplementary demand for 82 lakhs was before the House on the 3rd April, 1945, the Honourable Member for War Transport stated in his speech that if the Assembly passed the demand the Government would assume that the House gave a general consent to their postwar policy of road-rail services investments, which he had fully explained in the course of the debate and then he would take up the matter with the Provincial Governments. Incidentally on the demand for 82 lakhs, which was relevant only with regard to some road-rail services running during the emergency wartime, what happened was this. A discussion relating to the possibilities of road-rail co-ordination policy ensued. The House very well knows that the demand was thrown out. Later on it was re-introduced and here is what the Honourable Member for War Transport said on the 3rd April, 1945:

"I trust that after hearing this further explanation the House will agree to the supplementary demand for the purposes which I have specified. With regard to the postwar policy I am satisfied that Government's policy embraces the maximum possible measure of agreement. If the House accepts the supplementary grant, Government will assume that the House gives general agreement to the policy. I shall then proceed to address Provincial Governments to urge on them the acceptance of the principles laid down where they have not already accepted them."

This was what he said and during the course of the whole debate on those two occasions, when the supplementary demand was thrown out and when the demand for 82 lakhs was accepted, on neither occasion was there any specific reference to any expenditure on these schemes. To make that clear in the course of the debate the Honourable the Deputy President in the course of his observations said:

"I agree to most of the principles he has laid down but of course details will come later on and we shall consult every now and then about the working of the details which will be placed before this House. I do not know what procedure he will adopt, whether he will place the details before this House or whether he will carry them to some other committee. As far as he has just now explained some of the matter will require further elucidation and they will be placed before the Standing Finance Committee for Railways. I quite agree with him that everything involving operating or purchase of any kind may be of locomotives or of the other materials, should go before the Standing Finance Committee for Railways. Sir, on these lines, I give my general support to the proposals which have been made."

To support further my argument that there was an implicit understanding that every important aspect of the scheme was to have been placed before the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, in the course of the discussion regarding the managing agency system the Honourable the Leader of the House observed on the same day, *i.e.*, 3rd April 1945:

"This principle (that managing agency should not be encouraged) is fully accepted by Government, but it is possible that certain Provincial Governments or certain railways may have already gone so far with negotiations with road transport interests that they are to a large degree committed to a managing agency. I undertake, however, that any case remaining open will be specifically placed before the Standing Finance Committee for Railways for their approval before an agreement is finalised."

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar]

There he has said very clearly that every important aspect relating to the road-rail co-ordination would be placed before the Standing Finance Committee for Railways and certainly any financial aspect of it should have at least come before the Standing Finance Committee and nothing of the kind has occurred with regard to this scheme. All of a sudden in one of the meetings of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways this 118 lakhs was casually mentioned. Under the circumstances, I do not want to attribute motives behind what has happened, it is an irregularity of a very serious nature. With these observations I support the cut motion before the House moved by my friend Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena.

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall: May I ask which is the cut motion moved?

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Under 6G. Provision of Rs. 6,00,000

Mr. P. B. Gole (Berar: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I wish to support the motion. The Honourable the War Transport Member has issued a white paper regarding the progress of road-rail co-ordination. With regard to the expenditure in U. P., explanation of which has been given now we find that 50 lakhs have been spent for the purchase of chassis and for building bodies thereon. I refer you to the paragraph regarding the progress of the road-rail co-ordination as stated in the white paper. I find in that paragraph the progress which the railways have made regarding participation in this road-rail co-ordination. I would read to you this small paragraph regarding the progress of road-rail co-ordination in the U. P.

"The U. P. Government are anxious to see road transport fostered in the public interest with a minimum of delay and they accept co-ordination with railways on the basis of financial fusion as the best method of developing rationalised transport in the province."

"Their policy which has been notified in a press communique favours the formation of tripartite companies with the shareholding divided between operators, Provincial Governments and the railways in the ratio of 49, 5 and 46 per cent. The new companies are to give preference to existing operators and their staffs in the matter of employment, and the existing operators will be permitted to invest to the extent of existing or potential interests in road transport up to the maximum of Rs. 10,000 per stage carriage permit and Rs. 7,500 for a public carrier permit."

But so far as the investment by the railways is concerned, I do not find any mention made in this white paper which was issued to the House; and later on an *ad hoc* committee was appointed; and during the discussions in the *ad hoc* committee, no mention was made about the purchase of chassis or the building of bodies on the chassis. As I said, up to that time, the position was that the railway was to purchase shares in these transport companies; and Government was to purchase certain shares; and the operators were to purchase certain shares. But the purchases of chassis by the railways by way of supplementing or by way of investment in those companies was nowhere mentioned either in the white paper or in the *ad hoc* committee while the discussions about this rail-road co-ordination were going on. That is really a surprise to us, that for the first time the other day when this question about the irregular way in which Rs. 118 lakhs were spent by the Government and to which I referred in my speech at that time—of course the Honourable Transport Member said that this was all regular, but when it was again raised by the Deputy President in the Railway Finance Committee, then probably the Government seems also to have realised the irregularity and they have come up with an explanation. I want to know why up to this time this information was kept from the House or from the *ad hoc* committee or from the Finance Committee. You will see from this explanation that was given that Rs. 3,17,000 and 14,75,000 were spent before 30th September, 1945.

Mr. President: It mentions that contracts were entered into.

Mr. P. B. Gole: No. no. Before 30th September 1945. The cost of chassis, the number of chassis—they are before 30th September, 1945: that is the date; have you got the date, Sir?

Mr. President: Yes.

Mr. P. B. Gole: Therefore the Government was in possession of this information long before the white paper was issued and also long before the *ad hoc* committee was appointed. Up to the recent times, when this question about the irregularity of the expenditure of 118 lakhs of rupees was raised in the House and this question was again agitated before the Railway Finance Committee, the Government was silent about this. I really do not understand why the Government was anxious to suppress this information from the House. It was sprung as a surprise upon the House, as to the way in which Government was spending the money. Now, looking to the agreement that was arrived at in 1945 on the floor of this House, the only agreement was that there should be a rail-road co-ordination under a tripartite agreement between the Provincial Government and the railway authorities and the operators. It nowhere envisaged the idea of purchasing chassis. I am very much afraid that by doing this practically the Government is driving away the present road operators; they have got their chassis, they have their buses and they have their bodies built and these were to be taken as the capital, or by way of shares in the new companies that were to be formed. If the Government or the railway was to supply these things, I do not understand how it is possible for the road operators to apply or insist that their chassis also should be taken by way of shares. I find the whole number is 511; and if that is so, the idea of including the present road operators in the new companies that would be formed will not come into operation at all. The Government or the railway want to monopolise the whole thing; they want their share capital to be given in the form of chassis; if that was the intention of the Government, it should have been made clear to the House or at least to the Standing Finance Committee. My submission is, that really speaking this information was long withheld from the members of this House. This surely is irregular and creates a lot of suspicion about the intentions of the Government so far as the rail-road co-ordination is concerned. It is a good augury however that the Honourable Transportation Member assures us here that the Provincial Governments which would come into existence shortly will be consulted regarding the further progress of rail-road co-ordination; but before that is done, certain commitments have been made. For instance, we are asked to vote 50 lakhs of rupees which are alleged to have been spent for purchasing chassis and for the building of bodies. My view is that this is all irregular; and it has been done behind the back of this House. Therefore the cut motion moved by my friend Mr. Saksena should be passed.

Mr. M. A. F. Hirtzel (Bengal: European): Sir, on a point of information, may I ask the last speaker whether he was stating his party's policy for the nationalisation of road transport or whether I correctly understood him to stake out a claim for the small operators?

Mr. P. B. Gole: Surely I have made it clear that the agreement that was arrived at last year on the floor of the House—we stick to that agreement, and everything should have been done in pursuance of that agreement. My complaint is that that agreement remained here and was departed from out of this House; and all these actions that are being taken by Government are really not in pursuance of the agreement, but with some other object which they may have in view, to which we do not subscribe at all.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Sir, the question that my Honourable friend has put to my Honourable friend Mr. Gole makes me rise and give an explanation. I raised in the Standing Finance Committee on Railways the question of nationalising this road transport also. That is our view. My Honourable friend Mr. Gole is not away from the mark. We still stick to that policy that road transport must be state-owned completely—whether it is the Central Government or the Provincial Government or the local board or all of them, jointly or severally. Some margin, however, is to be left for existing operators. That is a small thing

Mr. M. A. F. Hirtzel: You will allow a margin for the small operator?

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Not a large margin—but an infinitesimally small margin for the small operator. The observations of my friend are really not against it. Even according to the agreements that have been entered into, the works have not been carried out. The agreement is that in the United Provinces as well as other places, the existing operators must be given a share; their bus and transport services that have been running till now must be taken over by the state on an assessed value; that must be taken to be the share value they contribute; the state or Central Government must contribute a portion and the Provincial Government another portion, if it is willing. So far, this 50 lakhs for which this demand has been made under 6-G refers to some chassis and bodies that have been built for the transport services in the U. P. It now comes to 50 lakhs; and my Honourable friend wants to know what the total share of the entire company is. The entire Province is divided into 7 regions, with 7 companies. If 50 lakhs is the contribution by the Central Government—with its contribution fixed at 46 per cent. of the capital—while 49 per cent. goes to the road operators, and 5 or 6 per cent. to the Provincial Government as we find in the white paper—if 46 per cent. of the share capital to be contributed by the Central Government comes to 50 lakhs, what is the total share capital of these companies? We have not got that figure. Does it include or does it not include the contribution made by the road operators? If we give effect to the agreement, according to the 50 lakhs that is the present demand, the road operators seem to have gone out of the picture. Have you taken them? If you have, is there any need for purchasing 500 chassis and build bodies on them? That is the account that he wants. We also wanted in the Standing Finance Committee that an account should be given actually of the chassis that have been purchased, the bodies that have been built and the bodies that are in course of construction. We want to sanction expenditure which has been incurred already, leaving it to the future Provincial Governments to continue this policy or not. For that purpose we wanted the exact figures of the chassis purchased and the bodies built. To this day we have not got that information. In the tabular statement an account has been given for 2 lakhs 10 thousand. The balance of 48 lakhs is in block account and payments will be made as and when bills are received from companies. It is legitimate for the House to inquire why the other side has not given details of the expenditure already incurred. That is all that my Honourable friend wants. This is in fact a censure motion on the Government for having spent the money in advance without sanction. The Honourable Member can have the 49 lakhs odd minus the Rs. 100. I trust that the House will vote solidly for this cut motion.

Sjt. N. V. Gadgil: In the memorandum submitted by the Government to the Standing Finance Committee it is said that in pursuance of the mandate negotiations for the formation of road motor companies were actively pursued with the collaboration of the Provincial Governments. I want to know whether in view of the verdict of the House in rejecting the grant of 3.18 crores for the next financial year, the Government still think that they have a mandate to pursue in terms of the Resolution passed in 1945. They have come back and now ask us to regularize what has been irregularly spent. That is one point.

Then the other point is this. I know they have spent some money in haste because of the commitments made. Now, instead of bringing this expenditure of Rs. 1.18 crores before the House for scrutiny and discussion, it was masked in several ways by shifting it from one demand to another and the explanation given was that the amount was met from reappropriation. After all the Government has now seen that the more regular course is to bring it before the House and secure its assent. The object of this censure motion is not to refuse the whole grant. It will have to be spent in pursuance of certain commitments but at the same time the object of the censure motion is to warn the Government that any such irregularity will not be tolerated hereafter in this House. That is the only object.

Mr. A. C. Turner: My Honourable friend Mr. Gadgil has inquired whether Government feel that they have a mandate to spend next year on such investments. I think every one will realise that the answer is 'No'. He also referred to the transfer between grants. I am afraid he has misunderstood this technical point. Government have never at any time transferred funds from one grant to another. In the Revised Estimates for 1945-46, 118 lakhs were provided under Demand No. 12 for these investments. That is the proper head for investment in these road services. As it happened, provision was possible under this Demand by reappropriation. The fact that previously provision had been made under the working expenses heads for the departmentally run services had nothing whatever to do with it. The 82 lakhs was for departmentally run services and was provided for under the working expenses heads and not under capital. The investments are met from a capital head. There has been no transfer from one grant to another. That would be irregular and in fact it is impossible to do so.

I think Mr. Gole was inquiring why the date 31st March 1946 was put in and how many chassis were purchased after the *ad hoc* Committee Report. 511 chassis are shown in this note. They were all purchased in 1945 and none have been purchased since.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: Why do you put the date 31st March 1946.

Mr. A. C. Turner: There is no particular significance in that date except that it is the end of the financial year. It does not affect the case.

Then another point was raised by my friend Mr. Gole about the contract with the General Motors. My information is that the General Motors had finished making the bodies under their contract by February. According to the information given to me no new bodies have been started by the General Motors since the time Government gave an undertaking to cease all future commitments.

Mr. P. B. Gole: Has any notice been given to them not to make further bodies.

Mr. A. C. Turner: No further contracts have been given.

Mr. P. B. Gole: Has any notice been given to cancel the contracts?

Mr. A. C. Turner: I will now deal with a few remaining points. The position was made clear this morning in the House that these commitments in regard to lorries which were intended eventually to be converted into investments under Demand No. 12 were entered into by Government in good faith, believing that they had a mandate from this House to go on with that policy. Since the debates which took place in the House on the budget demand and on the preliminary objection taken by the Honourable Deputy President when I moved the first supplementary demand, the matter has been taken to the Standing Finance Committee and Honourable Members serving on that committee will agree that they have been given all the information it was possible to secure. As practical men they have agreed that these two supplementary demands should be put before the House. That, Sir, has now been done and I submit we can do no more. It has been said that we can afford to lose Rs. 100—the amount of the cut. We may be able to afford the Rs. 100. What we cannot afford is acceptance of the censure motion implied in this cut and I sincerely hope that my Honourable friend Mr. Saksena in view of what I have said will agree to withdraw his cut motion.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: Do you realise that this is irregular?

Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan: Two points which require clarification have not been cleared. One is that one crore 88 lakhs which were provided for in this current year out of that sum is the expenditure which has been explained to be provided for under 6-G, 50 lakhs for the purchase of some trucks. One crore 88 lakhs was intended to be spent but has not been spent in full. The remaining amount 8 lakhs 83 thousand comes under Demand No. 12. I will deal with this when that Demand is reached. These two amounts combined together form a

[Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan]

portion of that item. The only expenditure which has been so far incurred is 50 lakhs which is shown under 6-G and 8 lakhs 83 thousand under Demand No. 12. By this expression that this sum has been transferred to 6-G, it is indirectly admitted that really one crore 88 lakhs should not have been under Demand No. 12, but under different heading. Therefore I do not want to go and beat about words. I quite realise that the Honourable the President has clearly set before the House the rules about this demand, that without a token grant no expenditure can be incurred. Whatever may have been the difference of opinion, in the past, it is now conceded that the Honourable Member is now trying to regularise in the light of what has been explained in this House. I think this will satisfy my Honourable friend Shri Mohan Lal Saksena. The Honourable Financial Commissioner's action speaks for itself rather than his saying that what he had done was wrong. The only thing is that we wanted an assurance and the Government's action has given that to us. Of course we in the Standing Finance Committee understood the position rightly. So far as the House is concerned, I want the Financial Commissioner to get up and say on the floor of the House that the Government stands by the position which has been admitted by it in the Standing Finance Committee. The Government has agreed to what passed in the Standing Finance Committee, and the Government agreed to the proposition which is now before the House. If that is the position of the Government, then it will satisfy this side of the House.

Mr. A. C. Turner: I am not clear as to the exact meaning of the Honourable the Deputy President's remarks just now. What is the assurance he wants from me?

Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan: I am referring to one crore 88 lakhs. Is that clear? The only point that is not clear seems to be this. I want an assurance that the Government stand by the policy which has been accepted by them in the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, that is not to incur any expenditure in the next year on the road rail co-ordination scheme except the one which has been accepted by the Standing Finance Committee, or subject to what will come up under Demand No. 12. The Government stand committed to that position. The Standing Finance Committee has not allowed to negative the policy which has been accepted by this House by cutting off the entire demand of 3 crores 47 lakhs under Demand No. 12. That is one.

Mr. A. C. Turner: It is the Government's intention not to spend anything on the scheme next year except in so far as may prove inescapable. There are certain liabilities which Government have incurred this year which may come to fruition next year and Government may be forced to assent to that expenditure, for example if Government are sued for specific performance of contract. There are certain items like these which may come forward later on and Government will not be able to avoid them. Apart from that, the Government is not going to incur any further commitments until the whole position has been discussed with the various provincial ministerial governments when they come into power. Until those Ministries have had their say, the Government will not proceed.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: Are there any other commitments which the Government expect beyond what has been placed before the Standing Finance Committee? That is my point. I do not want the House to be taken by surprise later on that they agreed to everything which the Government had done excepting those which had been brought to the notice of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways. We have been told about three or four companies in U.P., and C.P. As regards the rest we know there was no commitment. This was the position taken up by the Government in the Standing Finance Committee. I do not want that it should be interpreted later on that the House had agreed to something else by not opposing this. I want the position to be clear on that point.

Mr. A. C. Turner: The position is understood. As regards the future liabilities to which I have referred, which may mature and which Government may find it difficult to get out of

Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan: What is the nature of that?

Mr. A. C. Turner: I will explain. Government had promised to invest in certain companies, for example there is a company in South India where Government had undertaken to invest nine lakhs. Government have not made that investment. Government have since been served with a notice to the effect that the Company are going to sue Government for specific performance of the contract. When that arises next year, surely Government must be in a position to invest the amount if the suit is decreed against them.

Diwan Chaman Lal: Should not that matter come before the Standing Finance Committee? When you are faced with a demand like that, why not come before the Standing Finance Committee and place the matter before it and take its decision or take the opinion of lawyers.

Mr. A. C. Turner: That is implicit in what I have said already. It is not intended that expenditure will be incurred next year even on the inescapable items without bringing them to the notice of the Standing Finance Committee.

Mr. President: It seems there has been some confusion of "commitments" and possible claims. There are certain definite commitments made today, in the form of promise to purchase shares—e.g. Bombay Government schemes. Then the claims of other people may arise out of commitments, and the assurance, as I understand it, is that so far as commitments actually made or claims arising out of the commitments made, they will come before the Standing Finance Committee. That is how I understand the position of Government.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: I have got a copy of the arrangement that was entered into. I am afraid my Honourable friend has a little enlarged the scope, not intentionally but unintentionally. Regarding other commitments detailed in the memorandum and the disposal of the assets, the committee is of opinion that no decision need be taken at this stage, but that after the position has been reviewed in consultation with the new ministerial provincial governments concerned, the matter should be again brought before the Standing Finance Committee. Therefore, barring 50 lakhs which we are voting today, not a single pie extra should be spent unless the matter is reviewed in consultation with the provincial governments and brought before the Standing Finance Committee for railways.

Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan: Only about the disposal of these things, there will be consultation.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: So far as other commitments are concerned, it is true that Government have agreed to subscribe to some shares in some Madras company. It was pointed out to us that the Madras company had threatened to file a suit against the Government of India and that therefore the Government of India would incur a loss. I suggested that the Government of India should write back saying that the threatened suit is gladly awaited. So far as other shares in other companies are concerned, the provincial Ministries will soon function and it is for them to decide whether they will have the companies, themselves, or whether they will run them in conjunction with the Central Government and so on. Till then the chassis which you have built need not be sold away in the market. Let them be kept on. Let the position be reviewed thereafter by the Standing Finance Committee.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: Sir, I think the object of my cut motion has been served in as much as the Honourable Member has admitted that this expenditure has been regularised, and further I am glad to note that he is afraid of a censure motion. The motion has served its purpose and I beg leave of the House to withdraw it.

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

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 76,59,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 6-H.—WORKING EXPENSES—EXPENSES OF ELECTRICAL DEPARTMENT

Mr. A. C. Turner: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 52,51,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Expenses of Electrical Department'."

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 52,51,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Expenses of Electrical Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 10 A.—WITHDRAWAL FROM RESERVE

Mr. A. C. Turner: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,70,07,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Withdrawal from Reserve'."

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,70,07,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Withdrawal from Reserve'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 11—NEW CONSTRUCTION

Mr. A. C. Turner: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 12,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'New Construction'."

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 12,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'New Construction'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 12.—OPEN LINE WORKS

Mr. A. C. Turner: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 8,83,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Open Line Works'."

Mr. President: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 8,83,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Open Line Works'."

The motion was adopted.

Management of the road-rail scheme in the Central Provinces

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Sir, I move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,83,000 in respect of 'Open Line Works' be reduced by Rs. 5,73,750."

This amount of 8 lakhs under this demand relates to the shares that Government wanted to invest or say they invested in some companies which have been brought into existence under the road-rail scheme. We in the Standing Finance Committee approved of the investment in three out of the four transport companies. Two of them—the Kulu Transport Company and the Pindi-Kashmir Transport Company Ltd.—are necessary because there are no railway lines there and communication is otherwise difficult, and it is proper that Government should have invested in these companies. We straightaway approved and

sanctioned those payments. As regards the North-West Transport, Company the railway entered into a contract and agreed to subscribe to its capital so early as 1938. The amount was then showed under revenue account and now it is adjusted towards capital. Second in the list then is the Central Provinces Transport Services Limited, for which there is an amount of Rs. 5,73,750 which was paid according to Government by way of share amount to that company. My cut motion is with respect to this. I do want to cut out Rs. 5,73,750 from this demand, and the reasons are these. In the Central Provinces the whole road-rail scheme has been brought into contempt by the manner in which the Central Provinces Government unfortunately along with these persons in authority managed the road-rail scheme and tried to create monopolies in favour of Chinoy and Co., and one other company. They have almost destroyed the small operators on the road there. Over their heads two persons were brought in who before 1944, were not running any road services; they were merely dealers, one in Ford motors and the other in Chevrolet motors. They were put on the roads over the head of these operators. Licenses were not given to these operators but exclusive monopolies were given in favour of these companies. And now two companies were floated to operate throughout the entire Province and the entire road transport has been placed in their hands. Somehow agreements were entered into by the Provincial Government. The Central Government thought that the Provincial Government had got so far and it was impossible for the Central Government to withdraw from that position. However, in the Standing Finance Committee we placed one restriction, that we did not want a managing agency system. However, in as much as managing agency agreements had been entered into it was placed in the Standing Finance Committee, and we said that the terms should not be increased but should be reduced to an ordinary level. They want 20 years for managing agents and 10 per cent. of the profits to be given away to them for 20 years. Even if they are likely to be there for 20 years, that is opposed to the spirit of the Companies Act and it would be illegal and improper. That is the concession they have shown to us. They have gone to the topmost limit so far as the period is concerned. The entire transport service is to be placed in the hands of Chinoy and Co., and one other person over the entire province of the Central Provinces for a period of 20 years to be managed as they like. The other day a question was asked in this House as to the number of prosecutions for over-riding or overloading or running at high speed against the servants of Chinoy and Co., and others. Government had no figures to give except with regard to one or two companies.

Now let us see the income that they are likely to get. Originally they wanted to start the company with a capital of 10 lakhs. I shall assume that if the company is started with a small capital of 10 lakhs the person who operates it may want to be managing agent for 20 years with a profit of 10 per cent, because on 10 lakhs the outturn may be small and 10 per cent. may be reasonable. We have since raised the Rs. 10 lakhs capital to Rs. 50 lakhs. Is it not reasonable that we should ask that 10 per cent. of Rs. 10 lakhs will be more than 5 per cent. of Rs. 50 lakhs? We only wanted a reasonable reduction of the percentage of profit. The Honourable Member went directly to the Central Provinces to persuade the Government to agree to this. I want to censure that Government, but it is not open for me to do so. I shall have nothing more to do with this Chinoy. Therefore this Rs. 5 lakhs share capital shall not be subscribed to these companies. So much noise was raised in this House only on account of the Central Provinces company, and the whole road scheme has been brought into contempt.

Then as regards the fact that they have already invested money. What are we to do? As a lawyer I said to file proceedings to wind up that company and you will have no more to pay. Let us hope that the new Government which comes into existence will not have its hands tied. I believe all the sections of the House will be agreeable to the course. If any suit for damages arises, well, we shall pay compensation very happily, but we shall not have

[Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar]

anything to do with this company who are intractable, who want 10 per cent. the last pound of flesh, and who want to commit this Government to a long period of 20 years.

Sir, I move.

Mr. President: Cut motion moved:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,83,000 in respect of 'Open Line Works' be reduced by Rs. 5,73,750."

Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan: The Finance Committee has rejected this amount of Rs. 5,73,750, and the Honourable Member has brought this before this House to get the decision of the House.

The history has been fully explained by my Honourable friend, Mr. Ayyangar. It is one of the two companies which were started under the managing agency basis to which a great deal of objection was taken last year. My Honourable friend, the War Transport Member, last year had given the idea that if there were no companies he would not let any company be started on the managing agency system, but he thought that there was some discussion going on between certain companies and the Provincial Governments which might have matured to the extent that the managing agency might not be got rid of at that time. Later on, he came to know that it was these two companies in the Central Provinces, and these two companies and the C.P. Government had gone so far in their commitments, that the Government refused to give up their commitments.

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall: The Provincial Government.

Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan: The Central Provinces Government refused to give up their commitments.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Section 93 Government!

Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan: Yes, Section 93. Then my Honourable friend went to the Central Provinces and he tried to persuade the Central Provinces Government to get out of this tangle. But the Government did not like to give it up and these two companies, seeing that they had good prospects, did not like to give up the benefits they had achieved. The history is that last year it was found that the company was going to be run with a capital of only Rs. 10 lakhs. Later on they came before the Standing Finance Committee with a proposal of increasing the capital to Rs. 50 lakhs and they demanded that 20 years contract should be given. The Standing Finance Committee laid down the proposition that they agreed only (in a mild way they said it is wrong. They said it is unfortunate that the Govern-

4 P.M. ment agreed to this thing) on condition that the Central Provinces companies would agree to take 5 per cent. of the profits as their commission, and instead of 20 years contract they would agree for 10 years. Because they wanted that everybody who is running their business in the Central Provinces should be turned out and it had come to the notice of some members of the Committee that the treatment of the companies towards the bus-owners was not good, the Committee insisted on these conditions and insisted that they should comply with them. The companies did not agree to any of the conditions. One condition was that instead of cash money, they should take the assets of the bus-owners. They did not agree to this even. So no condition was accepted. From 24th July to 30th September this Committee was in existence. But of course this matter did not come before the Standing Finance Committee. Afterwards the Central Provinces Government induced the companies to remain where they were and this money was sought to be invested in the shares. When the present Standing Finance Committee came into existence, they wanted to stick to the former decision and they thought that if this company had refused to abide by the decision of the Committee and had ignored even to negotiate, and had turned down all the conditions. Then the Committee said that they were not going to invest any money. Un-

fortunately this money has already been invested and then the question before the Standing Finance Committee was what should be done with the investment already incurred. To this one of the Honourable Members proposed that the way out was to wind up this company and whatever our investment has been there, we can sell it or wind up this company one way or the other. Therefore they refused to sanction this. I think that the House will on account of the decision which they have already made—even last year they showed that no managing agency should be granted and there was no demand on behalf of the railways until the Finance Standing Committee had come to a decision and they had given their decision—support the Finance Committee in their decision.

Mr. P. B. Gole: The position has been very well explained by Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan and I wish to add one or two words for the information of the House. So far as this Nagpur Omnibus Company, is concerned, I learnt that up to the 15th March, the Central Provinces Government did not invest any money in this Company and did not purchase any shares in it. The reason was that from the balance sheet of 1944-45, it was found that they only had a profit of Rs. 25,000 on a capital of Rs. 10 lakhs, that is 2 per cent, including income-tax. Therefore the Central Provinces Government thought that investment in this company would not be in any way profitable. So they refused to invest any money. Later on I am told an expert from England came. He examined the accounts of this company and he advised that if the company were to be worked in a particular manner, then it could yield profit. The question of the managing agency of this company arose and I am told that the company's managing agents were willing to give up their managing agency provided they were paid Rs. 1,73,000. They held 547 preference shares and 4,740 ordinary shares of Rs. 25 each, and I am told that if this investment in these shares by the managing agents was paid to them, they would be willing to give up the managing agency. I do not know if any further progress has been made regarding these negotiations but if that is the state of things I do not understand why the Central Government should be in haste to invest any money in this company. If this company is not able to show any profits, if the managing agents are mismanaging the affairs of the company it is certainly not advisable for the Central Government to invest any money in this company and I do not know what the Central Government can get out of such a company. The C.P. Government are not willing to invest any money. My view is that the company should be wound up and whatever loss if any the company may suffer may be shared by the C.P. Government who have not invested any money and the Central Government.

With regard to the other company the C.P. Government has been more cautious than the Central Government. They have invested only Rs. 1,500 in that. They have purchased some 20 shares of Rs. 100 each, out of which Rs. 75 per share have been given. In view of that I do not understand the undue haste, if I may say so, of the Central Government in investing any money in this company. Where a company wants that the managing agents should exist and the company exists with the managing agents, they should carry on the work of the company. The Central Government which is really opposed to the managing agency system should not invest any money in such company. In fact the Honourable the War Transport Member went to Pachmahri to induce these companies to give up the managing agency but the managing agents were adamant. They would not forego their rights and therefore it was up to the War Transport Member to refuse to have any connection with these companies, especially when the major portion of the profit, if any, would be taken or swallowed by the managing agents of such companies.

The question really speaking with regard, to these companies is more serious so far as C.P. and Berar are concerned. These two companies want to monopolise and control all C.P. and Berar. Whereas U.P. and Bombay are divided into zones, these two companies have a practical monopoly of the roads in C.P. and Berar. I am told that the capital of these companies was

[Mr. P. B. Gole.]

raised from 10 to 50 lakhs with a view to accommodate the present operators. With the managing agents how is it possible that the present operators would be kept on the road. Our contention is that the present operators who are managing particular roads should be allowed to work on those roads. They should be admitted in the company and given shares in the company and should be given the management of the company also wherever possible.

Mr. M. A. F. Hirtzel: On a point of information, is the Honourable Member speaking as a shareholder in a company, or as a road operator or as a member of the Congress Party stating their policy?

Mr. P. B. Gole: I have absolutely no interest in any company nor am I a road operator. I do not own any company or bus. I am only interested in the travelling public and nothing else, and for that purpose all the regulations that are necessary should be enforced. But so far as these companies are concerned any kind of monopoly that is sought to be given to these companies should be discouraged and the Central Government should be the first to discourage this. Instead of that the Central Government should not have proceeded with investing in this company especially when the C.P. Government itself have not invested any money in it. I have got a letter dated 13th March, 1946, and up to that date the C.P. Government had not invested any amount. In the other company they had invested only Rs. 1,500. In these circumstances I do not understand why the Central Government have come with this demand for Rs. 5,73,000 and why the Central Government should be in so much haste. These two companies not only ought to be regularised but there should be many more companies. The C.P. should be divided into several zones in which separate operators or promoters should be encouraged to manage those roads. Instead of doing that these two companies are being given the monopoly. I think the House is perfectly justified in rejecting this demand.

[At this stage Mr. President vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan).]

Mr. P. K. Salve (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, with regard to these companies that are now in the C.P. my submission is that a very queer position is being brought about. It was given out that these rail-road schemes are going to be nationalised but our sad experience in the C.P. is that they are monopolised. The monopoly is being supported and we are now being thrown into the hands of capitalists. There were a number of road operators and they were running a very good business. There was no complaint against them and the original idea was that when these companies will be started their co-operation will be sought. But we have a regional authority in the C.P. who rides roughshod over the rights of others and in spite of demands, requests, applications and supplications by these road operators the Regional Authority has banged the door against all reasonable requests with the result that these people with all their assets and their motor vehicles have been set aside. Now the position really today is that two people who have plenty of money have come out as monopolists. They are excluding all other businessmen in motor transport. Messrs. Chinoy have exclusive business in Chevrolet cars and the Provincial Automobile Co., have exclusive business of the Ford. These two people have got their own motors and they have put them on the road. As a matter of fact if anybody is running the business it is these capitalists. It is neither the Government nor the Railway, with the result that there is a good deal of inconvenience caused to the travelling public. I have a telegram in my possession today and I want the Leader of the House to listen to this. Recently they have taken a decision that they are going to stop railway communication direct between Nagpur and Kamptee. Formerly they were running trains and all classes of people, students, businessmen, Government servants and others used them to go up and down between Nagpur and Kamptee, and in spite of the arrangement that is being made by Sir Sultan Chinoy's company to run buses they are not able to cope with the situation, and the telegram says that

these people do not find sufficient number of buses running and the timings do not suit them, with the result that this telegram sent to me by the Kamptee Railway Passengers' Association (a copy of the telegram has been sent to the War Transport Member also) says that from the 1st of April, on all-fools' day, they are going to stop these trains. I say it is unwise, for this reason, that you will be causing a good deal of inconvenience to the travelling public. Therefore in the Finance Committee of which I am a member, we said that so far as your company is concerned you had better wind it up. The scheme has not been carried out according to the wishes of the House. This company has been brought into existence, according to me, in an illegal manner; the law will never support it; and they were telling me that there may be a suit. I promise that I shall carry out the winding up proceedings without charging the Government anything; and it is possible to wind up this company without much difficulty because I understand that all the necessary parties to this transaction have not given their consent, and it is not complete and therefore this company has not been validly formed and you can wind it up very soon. That is what we placed before the Finance Committee, and by a majority it was agreed that the company should be wound up and that there should be no further commitments. Therefore, my submission is that this cut that has been brought must be supported and I therefore support it.

Some Honourable Members: The question be now put.

Mr. A. C. Turner: Sir, there are two companies in the C.P. In one, which is called the Provincial Transport Company, an investment was made last year that is not in question now. But I would like to inform the House that the managing agents that were originally in that company have been eliminated and now no managing agents will be employed in that company. As regards the second company, which is the Central Provinces Transport Services Limited, I understand that that company are prepared even now to take over the vehicles of existing operators against the call money due on shares, if the owners of the vehicles like to offer them for shares. Further in addition, the owners of vehicles will be paid goodwill to the extent of Rs. 2,000 on each permit. I think the allegations of unfair treatment of the existing operators have been exaggerated—I have mentioned two points to illustrate this. There was one other fact which I should mention and that is, the C.P. Government have invested an equal amount with ourselves in this particular company. We have divided 51 per cent. of the share issue equally between us.

Mr. P. B. Gole: May I know what was the investment made by the C.P. Government?

Mr. A. C. Turner: I have not that information with me; if my Honourable friend has it, I shall be glad to hear it.

Mr. P. B. Gole: I said only Rs. 1,500.

Mr. A. C. Turner: My information is that they have 25½ per cent. of the shareholding—the same that we have.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: They may have, but they have paid only Rs. 1,500.

Mr. A. C. Turner: Well, the proposal has been made that Government should apply for winding up the company. I am not in a position to know whether Government can legally make such an application or not; but this matter would arise in due course when the whole position is being examined in the course of discussions with the new Provincial Governments. The whole matter will come up then. It is quite clear that we cannot do anything in this financial year.

Diwan Chaman Lal: When did you make the investment?

Mr. A. C. Turner: The investment was made last October.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Of the entire sum?

Mr. A. C. Turner: 75 per cent. only has been called up. The figure of 5.74 lakhs represents the 75 per cent. which has been called up. It was invested last October. There remains the possibility of the final call of 25 per cent, which is 1.92 lakhs which may come up next year, and for which the Government should of course provide since it is a liability which may occur next year.

Diwan Chaman Lall: What is the present market value of the shares?

Mr. A. C. Turner: I am not in possession of that information. That, Sir, is the position which is before the House. The money has already been invested and the action was taken in good faith. The investment will presumably come under review, when discussions are taking place with the new Provincial Governments during the course of next financial year. Although the Standing Finance Committee did not support this provision of funds for this particular investment Government feel bound to include this amount also in the supplementary demand now put before the House. I would ask my Honourable friends on the other side of the House as practical men to support this demand for the money which has all been spent.

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,83,000 in respect of 'Open Line Works' be reduced by Rs. 5,73,750."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—74.

Abdul Hamid Shah, Maulvi.
 Abid Hussain Couhdhury Md.
 Adityan, Sri S. T.
 Ayyangar, Sri M. Ananthasayanam.
 Banerjee, Sree Satyapriya.
 Bose, Shri Sarat Chandra.
 Chaman Lall, Diwan.
 Chaudhuri, Sreejot Rohini Kumar.
 Daga, Seth Sheodass.
 Damedar Swaroop, Sjt. Seth.
 Dani, Mr. ...G. B.
 Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.
 Gadgil Sjt. N. V.
 Gauri Shankar Saran Singh, Mr.
 Gole, Mr. P. B.
 Govind Das, Seth.
 Habibur Rahman, Khan Bahadur.
 Hans Raj. Raizada.
 Hiray, Sjt. B. S.
 Ishaq Seth, Haji Abdus Sattar Haji.
 Ismail Khan, Hajee Chowdhury Mohammad.
 Jaffer, Mr. Ahmed E. H.
 Jagannathdas, Sri.
 Jeelani, Khan Bahadur Makhdum Al-Haj
 Syed Sher Shah.
 Jhunjhunwala Mr. B. P.
 Jinchandran, Sri M. K.
 Karmarkar, Shri D. P.
 Khan, Mr. Debendra Lal.
 Killedar, Mr. Mohammad M.
 Lahiri Choudhury, Srijut Dharendra Kanta.
 Liaquat Ali Khan, Nawabzada.
 Madandhari Singh, Mr.
 Mahapatra, Sri Bhagirathi.
 Mangal Singh, Sardar.
 Manu Subedar, Mr.
 Masani Mr. M. R.
 Mehr Shah, Nawab Sir Syed Muhammad.

Menon, Sri A. K.
 Mohammad Amir Ahmad, Khan Bahadur
 Raja.
 Mukhopadhyay, Mr. Nagendranath.
 Mukut Bihari Lal Bhargava, Pandit.
 Nairang, Syed Ghulam Bhik.
 Narayanamurthi, Sri N.
 Nauman, Mr. Muhammad.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C. .
 Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutt.
 Rahmat-ullah, Mr. Muhammad.
 Ram Narayan Singh Babu.
 Ramayan Prasad, Mr.
 Ranga, Prof. N. G.
 Reddiar, Sri R. Venkatasubba.
 Saksena, Shri Mohan Lal.
 Salve, Mr. P. K.
 Sampuran Singh, Sardar.
 Sanval, Mr. Sasanka Sekar.
 Satakopachari, Sri T. V.
 Sharma, Mr. Krishna Chandra.
 Sharma, Pandit Balkrishna.
 Siddique Ali Khan Nawab.
 Siddiquee, Shaikh Rafiuddin Ahmad.
 Siddiqi, Mr. Abdur Rahman.
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan.
 Sri Prakasa, Shri
 Sukhdev, Seth.
 Surjit Singh Majithia, Squadron Leader
 Sardar.
 Swaminadhan, Shrimati Ammu.
 Tamizuddin Khan, Mr.
 Thakur Das Bhargava, Pandit.
 Vadilal Lallubhai, Mr.
 Varma, Mr. B. B.
 Vijaya Ananda, Maharajkumar Dr. Sir.
 Vinchoorkar, Sardar N. G.
 Yusuf Abdoola Haroon, Seth.
 Zafar Ali Khan, Maulana.

NOES—38.

Ahmad Ali Khan Alawee, Raja Sir Saiyid.	Mason, Mr. P.
Ambekar, The Honourable Dr. B. R.	Morris, Mr. R. C.
Azizul Huque, The Honourable Dr. Sir M.	Naqvi, Mr. A. T.
Banerjee, Mr. R. N.	Oulsnam, Mr. S. H. Y.
Benthall, The Honourable Sir Edward.	Rangachari, Mr. M. V.
Bewoor, Sir Gurunath.	Roy, The Honourable Sir Asoka.
Bhattacharya, Rai Bahadur Devendra Mohan.	Rowlands, The Honourable Sir Archibald.
Chatterjee, Lt.-Col. Dr. J. C.	Sargent, Sir John.
Cook, Mr. B. C. A.	Sen, Mr. B. R.
Griffiths, Mr. P. J.	Sharbat Khan Khan Bahadur.
Gwilt, Mr. Leslie.	Solanki, Dr. P. G.
Harendra Singh, Sardar Bahadur Captain Sardar.	Spence, Sir George.
Himmatsinhji, Col. Kumar Shri.	Sri Chand, Chaudhri.
Hirtzel, Mr. M. A. F.	Stokes, Mr. H. G.
Hydari, The Honourable Sir Akbar.	Thorne, The Honourable Sir John.
Kharegat, Sir Pheroze.	Turner, Mr. A. C.
Krishnama Acharya Rao Bahadur Sir V. T.	Tyson, Mr. Geoffrey W.
Lawson, Mr. C. P.	Weightman, Mr. H.
	Williams, Mr. C. F. V.
	Yeatts, Mr. M. W. M.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a reduced supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 3,09,250 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March, 1946, in respect of 'Open Line Works'."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Satya Narain Sinha: (Darbhanga *cum* Saran: Non-Muhammadan); May I suggest that the House do adjourn now and that the other supplementary demands may be taken up tomorrow?

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall (Leader of the House): Government have no objection and take it as an augury that the House will get through the rest of the business promptly tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy President: I must inform Honourable Members that if they want to adjourn, they will be doing so at their own expense, because the guillotine will be applied at 5 o'clock tomorrow and supplementary grants have to be disposed of tomorrow. (*Several Honourable Members:* Yes, we agree).

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Saturday, the 30th March, 1946.

Copies of the Debates of the Legislative Assembly and of the Council of State are obtainable on sale from the Manager of Publications, Civil Lines, Delhi.
