

30th 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.

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 Answers	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—2960
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
		Discussion on consideration of the clauses not concluded	3037—59
		Statement of Business	3059—80
		Thursday, 28th March, 1946,	
		Starred Questions and Answers	3061—91
		Unstarred Question and Answer	3091—92
		Protective Duties Continuation Bill—Introduced	3092—98
		Indian Finance Bill—Passed as amended	3092—3128
		Friday, 29th March, 1946,	
		Members Sworn	3131
		Starred Questions and Answers	3131—68
		Unstarred Questions and Answers	3168—66
		Inaction re Removal of Sections 111 to 121 of Government of India Act	3166
		Demand for Supplementary Grants—Railways	3166—97
		Saturday, 30th March, 1946—	
		Member Sworn	3199
		Motion for Adjournment re Tribal raid by Waziri Outlaws—Withdrawn	3199
		Removal of Sections III to 121 of Government of India Act.	3199—3201
		Protective Duties Bill—Introduced	3201
		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

Saturday, 30th 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.

MEMBER SWORN:

Mr. Harry Greenfield, C.I.E., M.L.A. (Government of India: Nominated Official).

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

TRIBAL RAID BY NAZIRI OUTLAWS

Mr. President: I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Sardar Mangal Singh who wishes to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the tribal raid committed by a gang of Waziri outlaws on the village of Khan Khel Mandaza when one Hindu was shot dead and three persons including a woman were kidnapped. I am not clear as to how this is admissible. In the first place I want to know whether the tribal raid was within the tribal territory or within the North-West Frontier Province.

Sardar Mangal Singh (East Punjab: Sikh): Sir, I understand that Government are prepared to accept a short notice question. In view of that I do not press the motion.

Mr. President: No further consideration is then necessary.

REMOVAL OF SECTIONS 111 TO 121 OF GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall (Leader of the House): Sir, on a point raised by my Honourable friend Mr. Manu Subedar yesterday I undertook to discuss with the Honourable Member for Planning and Development the question whether a date can be allotted for a debate on the commercial safeguards. I understand the Honourable Planning and Development Member has discussed the matter with my Honourable friend opposite and the latter does not wish to press that the Assembly should continue to sit after the 18th April. He desires on the other hand to be assured that if the legislative business can be got through quickly Government will give an assurance that half a day will be allotted for discussion of this subject before the end of the session. I am glad to give that assurance and the matter will be placed on the order paper provided the state of Government business permits.

Mr. Manu Subedar (Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau: Indian Commerce): Sir, while I am glad to hear what has fallen from the Honourable Leader of the House may I point out that the intentions put into my mouth in that statement are not quite correct? What I was told was that if I wanted a day at all I would have to make the whole House sit beyond the 18th April, and I pointed out that there were many pieces of legislation and other kinds of business which were not at all of an urgent nature and could wait. But this was a question on which there was unanimity of public opinion and feeling in this country among all parties. This was a major issue so far as we were concerned and I said this could not be shunted off to beyond the 18th. But I offered to meet Government to this extent that in case they could not spare a full day we might try by arrangement among the parties to finish it in half a day. Let it be understood that this is an issue which we regard as of supreme importance; and now that the British delegation has come here, we do feel that if there is any interim Government they will not be able to carry on the industries of this country or do any planning as—in the words of Sir Ardeshir Dalal—these sections were 'hindering' any such plan or development. And I understand Sir Ardeshir Dalal resigned on this issue.

Some Honourable Members (on Government Benches): No, no.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Anyway, this was accepted by Sir Ardeshir Dalal to this extent that these sections were hindering any proper development and planning of this country's industries. We are all anxious to press for this here and now and we do not want any delay. We think it is a lot more importance than most of the Bills which are merely social reconstruction Bills and which can, if necessary, be put off till the next session. So I trust the Honourable Leader of the House will give us an early date. I thought he was going to give us a definite date today, whereas he merely renews a promise. I do feel that this is really a more serious matter than that. I can understand my Honourable friend's personal feelings in the matter, but I invite him to realise the very deep feelings with which we are looking upon this subject, and let him not introduce his own personal feelings into this matter. Let him recognise the strength of the feeling on the subject among us and let him give us a date—and a definite and early date—for this purpose. We feel deeply about it—I am sure the Leader of the House will endorse that—and we want an early discussion. We want a discussion not for the sake of discussion but we want an early deletion of these clauses which are an offence to this House and an affront to this country. We want them to go. They hurt our own self-respect and that is why we cannot regard them in the light of an ordinary piece of legislation. We want absolute priority to be given to this subject over the normal progress of legislative business some of which is capable of being postponed till the next session.

The Honourable Sir Akbar Hydari (Member for Planning and Development): Sir, may I speak a word of explanation? I feel that it was an unworthy suggestion on the part of my Honourable friend opposite that the Leader of the House was influenced by any personal considerations in this matter.

Mr. Manu Subedar: I only expressed the hope that he would not be influenced by personal considerations nor bring in his own feelings.

The Honourable Sir Akbar Hydari: I may say for the information of the House that the Honourable the Leader of the House said that he was willing to do exactly as I advised; and after our informal discussion with Honourable friends opposite it was agreed in view of the desirability of the House not sitting after the 18th, to try out the plan which the Leader of the House suggested. I can give the assurance to my Honourable friends opposite that somehow or other we will find half a day for this before the 18th. I want him to accept that assurance in the same spirit of sincerity in which it has been given.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon (Sind: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I am sorry I am unaware of the discussion that took place between Government and my Honourable friends to my right, although we on this side are as much interested in the matter as anybody else. I personally had a talk with my Honourable friend Mr. Manu Subedar and I felt that a full day would be absolutely necessary. It will not be possible to dispose of such an important issue in just half a day. I therefore agree that we must have one full day before the 18th April. The legislative business before the House is not so important that no postponement of it is possible till the next session. The Leader of the House should give us one whole day and an early day. I also suggest that the question hour may be dispensed with when this issue comes to be discussed. I support the motion of my Honourable friend Mr. Manu Subedar.

Shri Sarat Chandra Bose (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadan Urban): The demands which have been made from this side of the House, not only by Members of my Party but also by Members of the Muslim League Party, are demands which I hope will be accepted by the Leader of the House. There can be no denying the fact that the provisions to which reference was made by my Honourable and learned friend, Mr. Manu Subedar, are provisions which have eaten into the vitals of our country. Though I was at a distant place at the time, I remember the debate which took place in the House last year, and I read with very great interest what my Honourable and learned friend, Mr.

Manu Subedar, said on that occasion. The time is ripe for His Majesty's Government to declare in clear and unequivocal terms what they propose to do and what they do not propose to do, not in the distant future, but in the near future. In those circumstances, I voice the demand of the whole Opposition in asking the Leader of the House to fix a whole day for the discussion of this most important matter before the current Session comes to an end.

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall: Sir, I take the strongest exception to the unwarranted personal remarks made by my Honourable friend opposite who appears to forget that I supported Sir Ardeshir Dalal in his visit to London last year, and I should like my Honourable friend to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. Manu Subedar: Sir, may I say that I had no intention of ascribing any motive to my Honourable friend. I merely voiced my apprehension lest his personal feelings on this subject might influence him, but even if that hurts him I withdraw it.

The Honourable Sir Edward Benthall: Sir, the position is, as the House knows, that we have heavy Legislative business which Government regards as very important, and I suggested that we should see how far we can get on with it, and then, if we make good progress, allot half a day. My Honourable friends opposite are pressing for certainty on this matter and the situation as I see is this: I can definitely give an assurance that we will give half a day. If a whole day is required, then I can see no alternative to sitting on Saturday, the 6th which I think would be a burden on everybody. I do not know whether my Honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, would wish to come to a decision now or whether he would leave it to me to discuss with him which of those two courses should be followed.

Shri Sarat Chandra Bose: May I suggest that the matter be left over today in order to enable discussion to take place between myself, Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan, and the Leader of the House?

As regards the legislative programme that remains to be gone through, I shall express my own view on that matter. I have examined the legislative programme, and I do not find that there is much in it which is important, I mean important in comparison with the debate which we are asking for from this side of the House. However, I hope we shall come to a satisfactory agreement and the Leader of the House will be able to set apart a full day for the discussion of this matter.

Mr. President: So the matter ends here. The only question it appears to me now is whether the House will sit, if necessary, on Saturday the 6th, it being certain that a day will be allotted.

Shri Sarat Chandra Bose: Speaking for myself, I shall try to avoid putting my Honourable friends on all sides of the House to the inconvenience of sitting on a Saturday, particularly in this weather.

PROTECTIVE DUTIES BILL

The Honourable Dr. Sir M. Azizul Huque (Commerce Member): Sir, I move for leave to introduce a Bill to enable the immediate imposition of protective duties of customs on imported goods.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to enable the immediate imposition of protective duties of customs on imported goods."

The motion was adopted.

The Honourable Dr. Sir M. Azizul Huque: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

INDIAN SOLDIERS (LITIGATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. P. Mason (Government of India: Nominated Official): Sir, I move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Soldiers (Litigation) Act, 1925.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Soldiers (Litigation) Act, 1925."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. P. Mason: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1945-46

DEMAND No. 1—CUSTOMS

Mr. President: The House will now proceed with the consideration of the Supplementary Demands.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands (Finance Member): Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 14,99,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Customs'."

Mr. President: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 14,99,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Customs'."

Grant of War and Dearness Allowance at enhanced Rates to highly Paid Officers

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena (Lucknow Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,99,000 in respect of 'Customs' be reduced by Rs. 2,00,000."

Sir, by moving this cut I wish to discuss the question of grant of war and dearness allowances at enhanced rates to highly paid officers

Mr. President: May I take it that the first motion which also stands in the name of the Honourable Member along with Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar is not going to be moved.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar (Madras Ceded Districts and Chittoor: non-Muhammadan Rural): Yes, Sir. It is not going to be moved.

Mr. President: Before we start discussion on these cut motions, I would like to be clear on a point or two so as to enable us to define the scope of the discussion on the various motions. I find that while this motion, which has just been moved, refers to grant of war and dearness allowances to 'highly paid' officers, there are others which refer to officers 'drawing over Rs. 1,000'. There are also other cut motions which refer to 'increased dearness and war allowance'; the word 'increased' is not used in this cut motion.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: They all relate to the same.

Mr. President: Then, when the other motions are taken up, I believe the discussion that will be taking place now will not be repeated.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: Sir, as I informed the House while discussing the supplementary grants yesterday that in April last year the Standing Finance Committee passed the recommendation of the Government to grant dearness allowance and war allowance to officers drawing more than Rs. 1,000. This was done in the Standing Finance Committee meeting held on the 12th of April 1945, and the last meeting of the Assembly was held on the 10th of April.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: It was held immediately afterwards on the same day.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: In any case the fact remains that it was after the Assembly had risen that it came before the Standing Finance Committee. Now, if you refer to the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee of that day you will find it is said that this allowance is going to be given in this way: "Married officers to receive a war allowance equal to 17½ per cent. of pay up to Rs. 1,500 per mensem." Then again it is said that this was pressed by the Provincial Governments and the Secretary of State. So far as the Provincial Governments are concerned, I may remind the House that they were all mostly Section 93 Governments and so far as the Secretary of State is concerned, I do not know what were the reasons for doing so. I would like to know whether similar allowances were given to highly paid officials in England and what were the grounds on which he thought it necessary to make that recommendation. In any case, it could not have been immediately after when the Assembly was going to conclude its session that this came to the notice of the Government of India and they took a decision. It must have been before them much earlier and since these concessions involve no less than Rs. 3,95,00,000, it was not a very small sum that could have been passed without reference to the Assembly. It was necessary that a motion should have been brought before the Assembly to discuss this question whether the Assembly thought it proper that allowances should be given to these highly paid officials.

I may also point out to the House that even this year this thing is being repeated. In as much as the allowance was given with retrospective effect from 1st January 1945, and now we find that in the proceedings of the Finance Committee's meeting held on the 23rd March, that is after we had finished our voting of the demands, a proposal that these allowances should now be given with retrospective effect from 1st July 1944. Like last year the names of the Provincial Governments and the Secretary of State have again been brought in and it has been said that because they urged for it and this had to be done the Finance Committee had to approve. So personally I think even this year it should have been brought before the House. It was not brought in the present budget but it will be brought before us next year by way of supplementary demand. So, personally, I feel that this sort of procedure should not be allowed. I know the Honourable Member will rise and say but this has been passed in the budget. Certainly it has been. It was passed not because we wanted it to be passed but because we could not reach that cut motion on account of the guillotine. There were cut motions to the effect that this money should be cut down but because of the agreement and the understanding we could not reach that and as I pointed out for discussing eighty-six demands we get only four days, that comes to fifteen hours, hardly ten minutes to each demand. So I hope we will not be influenced by the argument that because it has been passed for next year we should also sanction for the current year with retrospective effect from 1st January 1945. As for the merits, as was pointed out by my friend, Mr. Ayyangar, after all on what items are they going to spend so much? They are not going to get more food-grain rations than an ordinary employee who gets Rs. 16. You will see that he gets Rs. 16 a month and living in a place like Delhi and having a big family of four or five members, he is expected to meet the increased expenditure with a sum of Rs. 16. (But here is a fraternity drawing Rs. 1,000 or more and they are supposed not to be able to meet this increased expenditure. Again, so far as cloth is concerned, it is also being rationed and there is no distinction between an ordinary employee and a highly paid employee. They get the same quantity. So far as luxuries are concerned, most of them are not available. So it comes to this that because they found an opportunity, they thought, at the back of the Legislature, they could just dole out no less than Rs. 3,95,00,000 and pass it on to these employees who were drawing

[Shri Mohan Lal Saksena]

such high salaries. So my submission is this. This supplementary demand should be rejected on three grounds:

Firstly, last year it should have been brought before the Assembly and not this way. There should have been a regular motion before the House. The House should have been taken into consultation. It could have been done easily. Instead of being brought before the Finance Committee it could have been brought to the House before the 12th April and the sense of the House could have been taken, although recommended by the Secretary of State and the Provincial Governments.

Secondly, there was no justification for giving retrospective effect not only from 1st January, but this year it is proposed to give it with retrospective effect from 1st July 1944. I want to know why. They have already spent what they had to spend. At the most it means their savings have been cut down and to make up those savings they are going to be given this extra allowance. So because, it has been given with retrospective effect, it should not be sanctioned.

Thirdly, taking into consideration along with this, the cases of those low paid officials who are getting Rs. 16, as dearness allowance, I think it is not proper that while on one hand we think Rs. 16 should be considered sufficient to meet the increased cost of expenditure on cloth and grain for an ordinary employee, no less than Rs. 263 per month is required to meet this increased cost so far as those highly paid servants are concerned.

Yesterday, the cut motion was rejected on the ground that it was not moved in respect of every demand and it had been moved only in regard to 'Audit'. That defect has been removed today and we have moved a cut motion in regard to every demand and if the House passes this I think, so far as the other demands are concerned it will apply automatically.

With these words, Sir, I move:

Mr. President: Cut motion move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,99,000 in respect of 'Customs' be reduced by Rs. 2,00,000."

Mr. Manu Subedar (Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau: Indian Commerce): I want to interpose in this to raise one small constitutional issue. When this matter was being discussed in the Standing Finance Committee, we had the problem before us of finding more money if we were to give more allowances, and when the allowances were being considered for Government employees getting less than Rs. 30, the allowance was Rs. 14, and most of us felt very rightly—and I am sure the House will agree with us that it is impossible for a man who has to bring up sons and daughters to do this on something less than Rs. 30 plus Rs. 14, which is his allowance. If the money was not there some of us would feel that if the money is not there to increase the dearness allowance to those people, faithful employees of this Government and poor men, naturally the allowances of Rs. 263 given to the top people getting more than Rs. 1,500 should be cut down. This suggestion was natural, if more money was wanted. But the official position which was then disclosed—and I am saying this deliberately in order to enable the Finance Member to clear the position—was that this was an allowance which was fixed by the Secretary of State and that we had no right to touch it. The constitutional point which I wish to raise is this: that if this were fixed by the Secretary of State and we had no right to touch it, why has the Finance Member come up for the sanction of this House in the supplementary grants which he is putting before us, and if this were not so, why were we told that it was the Secretary of State who is concerned with this? Sir, I do not mind telling the House of my retort to this official position: "All right, when the Secretary of State comes to this country I will tell him." I take this opportunity from the floor of this House to tell the Secretary of State that

this is the sort of thing which upsets us. Thousands of poor families are stranded on inflationary prices which Government have taken no steps to reduce and when consideration for them is suggested, you plead that you will give to people getting more than Rs. 1,500 a month not only an allowance of Rs. 263 a month but you will give this with retrospective effect and spend the money of this country on this purpose. I know many of these highly placed officials. I know their budgets. I know their problems. I have every sympathy with them also. But if it is a question of restricted finance, there is not the slightest doubt that the first claim is that of the poor man. If on the other hand it is a question of constitution, the sooner we get rid of this constitution the better, this constitution by which the Secretary of State dictates either to this House or to this Government (he certainly dictates to this Government, because the Secretary of State recommended this matter). My friends opposite are entirely helpless and in spite of the frequent denials of the Honourable the Finance Member that this Government is not Whitehall-controlled, that he never consults them, that they do not give him any order and that if they give him any order, he is not bound to follow it! In spite of this I repeat once again that this is a London controlled Government and we dislike this system, we dislike the interference of the Secretary of State with our affairs in any shape or form, we will not tolerate it any more and so far as this demand is concerned, if it was the Secretary of State's orders, why is it brought before this House? If on the other hand . . .

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: May I intervene for a moment, without prejudicing my right of reply? I have not brought this demand before this House because the cost is involved by the Secretary of State's decision. I have brought it before this House because the cost is involved in the Government of India's decision.

Mr. Manu Subedar: If it is the Government of India's decision, then my friend makes two groups, one group whose allowances are non-votable and the other whose allowances are votable. Is that the case?

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: That is precisely the point. I do not see why the other point is being brought in. I have not brought this before the House because of the Secretary of State's decision.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: This amounts to Rs. 3,95,00,000 in all and that is not brought . . .

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I am not sure about the Rs. 3,95,00,000.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: It is in the Standing Finance Committee proceedings.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: I will answer my Honourable friend. In the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee dated the 12th April, 1945 . . .

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Yes.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: There is a recurring expenditure of Rs. 3,95,00,000.

Mr. Manu Subedar: The explanation of my Honourable friend makes the position worse. How long are we going to stand this distinction of voted and non-voted expenditure? When these three distinguished Ministers have come here offering Independence for the taking, appealing to Indian's to take over power which, they say, they are very anxious to part with, may I ask why it has not been found possible to eliminate this distinction between voted and non-voted items of expenditure, this distinction by which certain items are reserved to the Executive and certain items are reserved for the vote of the House. The Leader of the Opposition very rightly said that we could not

[Mr. Manu Subedar]

vote money over the expenditure of which we have no proper control. I say this that the Secretary of State's interference in these matters is galling to us; it hurts our self-respect. He has thrust burdens on this country which are not justified and he has done that on their account.

I am accused frequently of raising questions of racialism. It is not racialism. What are we here for? We are here to safeguard the financial interests of our country. When we find that depredations are made over those interests by the Britishers, we are here to protest against them and until we are satisfied that no such depredations can be made, we shall go on fighting. Let the Secretary of State who is here make a note of it. Why was this heavy allowance given to those very highly paid men who are on the non-voted list? Why was it given against the declared feeling of this House, against the unanimous opinion and feeling of all parties? Why was it done, I ask

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: On a point of fact Sir, last year's committee recommended it by a large majority. The Honourable Member cannot talk for all parties.

Mr. Manu Subedar: If my Honourable friend feels that way why does he not declare that these items are non-voted. Why did he not put them to the House? I challenge him that if this decision of the Secretary of State had been brought before the House it would have been unanimously thrown out. I want him to consider the challenge and put it to his chief who is in this country now. This is the sort of thing which is galling to us. For the benefit largely of the British services these things were saddled on us in a year in which this country is carrying very heavy budget deficits. It was not appropriate on financial grounds. It was not appropriate on grounds of common humanity that faithful servants of this Government earning less than the barest minimum were given allowances which are manifestly inadequate. Can any member of the Treasury Benches get up and tell me that people can live on this money? What are you giving to these lower cadre people? Rs. 20 plus Rs. 8 allowance and Rs. 30 plus Rs. 14 allowance. Can people live on this money in these days? You know they cannot. Why don't you remedy it?

The Honourable the Finance Member has claimed for his budget great merit in so far as he has steepened the taxes on the rich. Why has he omitted to tackle on a parallel logic the question of allowances? Why has he not increased the allowances of men in the lower cadres and eliminated the allowances of men getting more than Rs. 2,000 and 3,000, men in the higher and selected services? Why not

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Nobody earning over Rs. 2,000 is eligible for the allowance.

Mr. Manu Subedar: I am asking why has he not touched the question of these allowances which is manifestly unfair and which by parallel logic is implied on the grounds which he has himself put forward with regard to the taxation of the rich and the relief to the poor. I can quote him, if he wants me to. On the grounds of relief for the poor in his budget; why not apply the same grounds to these allowances? Why are these things done? Because there is a Secretary of State. There are orders from the top. There are superior services whose personnel is largely British

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I am sorry I have to interrupt but I want to correct certain inaccuracies. I want to point out that the Secretary of State has nothing to do with dearness allowance. It is entirely a matter for the Government of India.

Mr. Manu Subedar: If my Honourable friend would be a little patient he will see the point. I am explaining why there is this distinction of higher allowances given with retrospective effect to men in the superior services who are earning high salaries. I said that is because they are superior services: they

are recruited by the Secretary of State and what is given to these superior services recruited by the Secretary of State is not votable here. Why is it not votable? Because we are working under an ancient and archaic constitution. If I am to take the speeches and the professions of the three big men who have come here and if I am to contrast them with this position, that even items like this against which the opinion of all sides of the House is very strong are still kept as nonvotable, I cannot help feeling grave disappointment. Why is not the British Government taking certain obvious steps which will reconcile the people of this country and make them feel that justice is being done, that their opinions are being respected, that their feelings and their desires are being responded to? That is the question and the constitutional issue that I have raised. We want social justice done, a phrase which fell from my friend several times in the course of the last ten days. We want social justice done also with regard to the services in the matter of these allowances and why cannot my Honourable friend give us an undertaking, an assurance that the views which we are expressing here will receive consideration?

Sir, at another time when the Secretary of State was mentioned I had to point out that very fortunately he is coming here and we would take the opportunity to tell him—and I say this is the only opportunity we will have and we are taking this opportunity—why do not these big ones also attend to the small topics which will reconcile people, as gestures of good will, on issues on which our people have felt very keenly? Why do not they give way? Never mind the large issues of independence and all that but why do they not give way in other matters? Take the commercial safeguards. Another illustration we had this morning. I do not want to repeat what I said about them; but there are issues like this, on which you will have ultimately to give way: why do you not do it with grace, may I ask, now and reconcile Indian public opinion and get that improvement of the atmosphere in India for which you have professed anxiety more than once and you have made more than one appeal in that direction? The path is clear. Let the official side choose.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, this is a very important question. We have fallen into error on account of the misuse of the words "dearness" and "war." It is exceedingly difficult to define what dearness is or what the limit of the income is up to which it should be applied. I was discussing the same question today: a man came to sell strawberries and asked Rs. 12 a seer for it. I said no, it was too much for me, I cannot afford to buy it. A friend of mine who was sitting there thought it was nothing and purchased it straightaway at that rate. To him the question of dearness did not arise; but to me it did, because I felt it. Therefore the word "dearness" as used by the Finance Member is a wrong word because it cannot be understood at what particular income the dearness would affect a person. My friend who moved this motion has given the figure of Rs. 1,000 because it is a round figure: it was the end of all counting among the Arabs. The Arabs had no word for any number beyond 1,000; counting ended there. So the word "dearness" is really a misnomer. As for the word "war" that is also a misnomer, because there is no war now, and if you say you are giving a war allowance when there is no war on, it is a misuse of the word.

My point of view is entirely different and differs from that of my friends to my right. I put it in this manner: that when we employ a person for any particular work, we guarantee a certain comfort for doing that particular work. That comfort is translated into rupees. When these salaries were fixed in order to represent a certain comfort, the rupee at that time was equal to 1/22 of a tola of gold. 22 rupees fetched a tola and that was the value of the rupee when these salaries were fixed. I say no dearness allowance, nothing whatever: give us a rupee which is equal to 1/22 tola of gold. Then I will be satisfied and there will be no difficulty of any kind. The whole question has arisen on account of the rise in prices. They have given in the explanatory memorandum all these

[Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad]

figures: the cost of living index figure has gone up to 335 now, while before the war it was 100: it is 335 in Lahore and 390 in Cawnpore—and I am surprised that it is cheaper in Bombay where the people talk so much of wealth and so on—the cost of living in Bombay is much less than in Lahore or Cawnpore. Therefore a person says that in place of the 100 rupees which you used to pay him before the war, in order to ensure certain comforts, for which he was employed, you should now pay him 335 so that he could get the same comfort. This is on account of the lowering of the purchasing power of the rupee. My friend said repeatedly that the purchasing value of the rupee has gone down to five annas, that is, one-third of what it was before. Everybody admits that and there is no difference there. The present index of prices and our own experience also prove that the rupee's purchasing value has gone down to five annas. Therefore my friend says either you raise the purchasing power of the rupee to 16 annas, instead of the present five annas, so that he could get the same comforts he got before the war for one rupee, or he has no alternative but demand that for every rupee he got before the war he should get three rupees now. Therefore there is no question of dearness or war allowance. It is simply a question of the diminished purchasing value of the rupee, which affects everybody alike, whatever his position may be. I demand that the Finance Member should take immediate steps because he is partly responsible for the lowered value of the rupee: my friends the millionaires are also responsible for this lowering of the rupee value. So either raise the purchasing power of the rupee and give me the same rupee I had before; failing that, if you determine and fix the comfort in terms of your paper rupee and determine your salaries in proportion to the rise in the index number of the living wages.

Shri Sri Prakasa (Benares and Gorakhpur Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): How am I responsible for the lowering of the price of the rupee?

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: Not you, but your friend to the right.

Shri Sri Prakasa: Mr. Vadilal?

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: This is due to compensate the people and to meet the special situation created in this country on account of the rise in living costs on account of the falling down of the purchasing power of the rupee. You must restore the purchasing power of the paper rupee or else give your wages in terms of real silver. Then we will not demand any dearness allowance and we will be satisfied. But so long as the purchasing power of the rupee is diminished and so long as I do not get the same comfort for one rupee as before, my comfort is reduced to one-third, and naturally I will demand some kind of compensation from the Finance Member to meet the economic situation, but for which he alone is not perhaps responsible. My friend pointed out that the daily allowance of Honourable members had been increase to 45 rupees. I say it is not dearness allowance, it was done because 45 rupees today are equivalent to Rs. 15 before the war: and before the war we were getting Rs. 25; so that we were actually getting much more before the war than we are getting today. This increase that you have given, therefore, is not a dearness allowance but compensation for the loss in the purchasing power of the rupee. These are the words he ought to use. Some time ago I gave notice of a resolution which unfortunately was not ballotted and did not come up for discussion—that the salary of every person in India—either Government or private service—should be trebled: every one who was getting one rupee should get three rupees

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Including the Executive Council?

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: Including every body. I wanted to move a resolution that since the purchasing power of the rupee is reduced to five annas, therefore the salaries of every person should be increased by three times. Now, I had to face certain difficulties. The greatest difficulty was my friend Mr. Manu Subedar. The moment you pass this order the inflation will be increased three

times. Not only that it will react on the prices. The logical position is to increase the salary three times all round but in practice there will be reaction. By this arrangement the purchasing power will be further reduced. We will have to increase the salary four times. We do not know what will be the position and how it will be stabilised. The price index is changing. It is 305 today and it may go down still further. We may find ourselves in the position in which we found Germany after the last war when their marks was going down every day. They had to devise a special machine in order to bring them to the standard value. The kind of relief suggested is not enough. I know something about this. I have a large staff to deal with who are demanding compensation for the fall in the purchasing power of the rupee. I find from my experience that everybody whether he is a menial or lecturer or professor is in the same boat. That is the difficulty which I had to face.

The real point is that this war allowance and dearness allowance is a passing phase. We must tackle the really important question and that is we should increase the purchasing value of the rupee. The first step in that connection is to fix up the value of the paper rupee in terms of silver and gold. I wanted to raise this question during the discussion of the Finance Bill but I had no opportunity to speak. The first thing that the Finance Member ought to do is to fix the purchasing power of the rupee in terms of gold and silver. The moment that he brings it to the pre-war value, the prices of rice, wheat, cotton and piece-goods will be fixed automatically. In this case the Finance Member alone cannot solve the problem. We want the co-operation of the big business men also. The Government itself is not entirely to blame. It also depends upon the big business men and those who deal in the black markets. They also raise the prices. If all of us co-operate and the Government also come forward and help it may be possible to reduce the price level. The question was raised to what extent it should be reduced. I admit it is not economical now to reduce and bring it to the price index before the war; it is not possible and it is not in the interests of the country because they must increase the purchasing power of the people in order to develop our industries. After a good deal of calculation I find that the prices of wheat and foodstuffs should be brought to the index of 150 compared with the pre-war and the prices of all the manufactured articles should be reduced to the value of 125 pre-war. Therefore the prices of living wages and the prices of eatables should be raised to 150, when 100 was the level before the war. The living index will probably be reduced to 135.

Prof. N. G. Ranga (Guntur *cum* Nellore: Non-Muhammadan Rural): The prices of manufactured goods must be lowered to a much greater extent than the prices of primary goods.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: The primary goods I put at 150 and the manufactured articles at 135.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I put it at 100.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: 50.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: I will have to discuss that with Mr. Ranga in the lobby and not waste the time of the House. We agree on the point that the prices of manufactured articles ought to be lower than the prices of the foodstuffs. To what extent it should be done can be discussed outside the House. We ought to increase the purchasing power of the people and to develop our industries. That is the attempt in which we should all join together. Let us not fight over dearness allowance and war allowance which are misnomers. These two words are wrongly used. We must concentrate our efforts on increasing the purchasing power of the rupee and reduce the price index. That is a question which requires a good deal of consideration. We are all agreed that the present level of 315 is too high. If you find that you cannot put it right, then the only thing is to pass an Ordinance. My Honourable friend the Finance

[Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad]

Member must say—wherever there is one rupee, read three rupees and automatically the price of the purchasing power will be increased from one to three and the question of dearness and war allowance will not arise.

Diwan Chaman Lal (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): I ask my Honourable friend Dr. Sir Zia Uddin, since he does not like the terms "war allowance" and "dearness allowance" and has given us a disquisition of a rather amateurish type on currency and the gold standard and so on and so forth. What is his plan now for the immediate present in reference to those who are starving and who are unable to carry on in present circumstances? My Honourable friend blew hot and cold. In one breath, he did not want to blame the Honourable the Finance Member but his entire speech was a condemnation of the policy of the Finance Members all these years. He said that he wanted to raise the purchasing power of the rupee, bring down the prices of commodities, manufactured goods, and primary goods. What has the Government been doing? Who has been responsible? It is my Honourable friend over there who is responsible for currency inflation. Is my Honourable friend behind me responsible for the sterling debt that has accumulated in London, for the machinery that has been installed somewhere near Nasik which goes on printing notes, whose issue has risen from 179 crores, I believe it was the figure on the 3rd September, 1939, to about 1,200 crores? It is all very well for my Honourable friend to try to utilise every opportunity in order to reflect upon the conduct of members sitting on these benches but at the same time he does not realise that the responsibility lies there. Give us the responsibility and see what happens. Take the power in your hands and see what happens. You cannot do that by voting with Government in that lobby. You can do it by getting rid

12 Noon of the gentlemen sitting on those benches. I do not know how my Honourable friend the Finance Member came to the conclusion that those who are drawing Rs. 2,000 were not affected by this. How did my Honourable friend come to that conclusion? In this report itself dated the 12th April, 1945, the figure mentioned is,—married officers between Rs. 1,500 and Rs. 2,000 per mensem with marginal adjustments

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Obviously it is absurd that one who is getting Rs. 1,900, plus allowances, should get more than the man who is entitled to Rs. 2,000. This is purely a matter of adjustment.

Diwan Chaman Lal: I am not worried about that; I say the whole thing is absurd. I am glad my Honourable friend agrees with me that the whole thing is absurd.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I do not say it is absurd. I am only challenging the statement that an officer drawing Rs. 2,000 a month was entitled to war allowance. He is only entitled to it so that he shall not draw less than one who draws a salary of Rs. 1,900.

Diwan Chaman Lal: The point is that he is entitled. My Honourable friend challenged my Honourable friend Mr. Manu Subedar's statement that a man drawing Rs. 2,000

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I was explaining how he got it.

Diwan Chaman Lal: He does get it and we are objecting to his getting it.

Then another point that my Honourable friend raised was this, that the Secretary of State has nothing whatever to do with it. Is that correct? Do I understand my Honourable friend to mean that?

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I said the Secretary of State had nothing to do with the expenditure that has been brought before the House today.

Diwan Chaman Lal: Let me draw my Honourable friend's attention for a moment to what the actual position is. If he will look at the report of the Standing Finance Committee meeting on 16th March, 1946, he will find on page 13 a statement to this effect:

"The provincial Governments and the Secretary of State feel strongly that some additional relief to Government servants is necessary, and even if the change in the price-level is not of a magnitude to justify an increase in the rates, the grant of additional relief is required and should take the form of the present rates of war and dearness allowance" etc.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Sir, may I get this perfectly clear?

We are discussing today several sums of money in supplementary demands and not a single pie of that is determined by the Secretary of State.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Yes, but my Honourable friend knows perfectly well that once the Secretary of State has granted these retrospective dearness allowances to those whose salaries are non-voted it is necessary even for my Honourable friend to follow up, and that is what my Honourable friend is doing.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Not at all; it is not necessary.

Diwan Chaman Lall: But the fact remains that the initiation took place with the Secretary of State for India and thereupon my Honourable friend had no choice but to go ahead and grant similar allowances to these people.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I did have a choice.

Diwan Chaman Lall: If my Honourable friend has a choice will he now agree to the proposition that those drawing over Rs. 1,000 and up to Rs. 2,000 a month should not come under this retrospective effect? Will he now agree that the dearness allowance should be limited only to those who ought to be assisted and not to those whose salaries are over Rs. 1,000? Will he agree to that? I pause for a reply.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I will reply to that when I come to reply.

Diwan Chaman Lall: My Honourable friend will reply to it when he comes to deal with this question.

Now my Honourable friend will see that with regard to that further statement relating to provincial Governments and the House must also take note of the fact that these provincial Governments were section 93 Governments. They were part and parcel of the scheme of the Secretary of State; and when the Secretary of State says "Yes" how dare a Governor of a section 93 province say "No"? This is a proposition which I do not think this House is likely to accept; at any rate this side of the House is not likely to accept it. On the other hand see what happens. Here we have allowances being given to people who are going to be given from Rs. 14 to Rs. 20—those who are receiving pays of Rs. 40 or less. Take the case of a man drawing Rs. 30 a month in a station called "C"—stations being divided into "A", "B" and "C", etc., Calcutta, Bombay and Delhi being "A" and others "B" and "C" and so on. In this station he will get under this scheme Rs. 14 per month. Does my Honourable friend really believe that a married man can bring up a family of three children and a wife—equivalent to four grown-ups—on Rs. 44 a month? Does he really believe that? Is there more justification for granting Rs. 263 to these married officers drawing Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 1,900 a month than there is in granting higher relief to those people who are drawing Rs. 30 per month? The lowest cost of food today to keep body and soul together—even according to Government estimates—is rupee one per day per head; a family of four would require Rs. 120. Ask those peons who are standing there round this room what their condition is today.—people who under the orders of my Honourable friend the Home Member are not even allowed to hold meetings in the grounds of the Legislative Chamber without taking special permission. Ask them what their condition is. I suggest that my Honourable friend

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer (Bombay Southern Division: Muhammadan Rural): You tell them to strike, and then their allowances will be increased.

Diwan Chaman Lal: I have never in my life—although I have had a great deal to do with labour—done anything to promote strikes. But if a strike comes I would surely welcome it if it makes my Honourable friend move in the right direction.

Sir, my Honourable friend the Finance Member should look at this from the point of view of the needs of these poor people and bring forward a scheme, not of this nature which is meant to benefit to a larger extent those with higher salaries who can well afford to live on those salaries, but something which will benefit those who are drawing these miserable pittances on which they cannot bring up their families. The time has come for my Honourable friend to revise these scales of pay of these lower paid staff immediately with the object of giving them a living wage. The time has come for that, and I do hope that my Honourable friend will take due note of the feeling evinced on the floor of this House regarding the position of this lower-paid staff.

Sardar Sampuran Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): Sir, it is necessary that we should have a standard of minimum income for a person with a family; and we should give allowances only in such cases where people do not ordinarily earn up to that minimum standard. When we go higher up to a person who is getting a pay of Rs. 1,000 a month, if the price of commodities is doubled he has still got Rs. 500 to live upon and if it goes up three times he still has Rs. 333 to live upon. I am saying this relatively to the purchasing power of the rupee. Those people who draw high salaries have, in normal times been saving and there is no reason why they should be given allowances either in the name of war or dearness. We have heard the speech of my Honourable friend Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad. We were habituated to hear such speeches from the Government Benches, speeches of this type usually come from a person who does not understand his own country, who does not understand the conditions of people who draw small salaries, whether they are peons, chaprasis or small clerks and who does not understand the conditions of millions of people living on the land and are toiling from morning till night and are yet unable to make their bare living. People who belong to such a country as ours should think twice before they can say that the purchase value of the money has gone so low that the people who are drawing Rs. 2,000 a month or Rs. 1,000 a month should also get this allowance on account of the value of money having decreased. Sir, my Honourable friend Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad has thrown certain flings at some millionaires sitting on the Opposition Benches. I agree that they do not require any sympathy from us, but simply because a man happens to be rich or simply because he is a millionaire, he does not cease to have the right to speak on behalf of the poor people. There may be people sitting on those Benches who are millionaires and I give them credit that they are at least able to appreciate the position of their poor brethren living in this country. I therefore submit that when we are considering this question of giving allowances to these high salaried people, we should keep in view that major portion of our population, I would say almost the whole of our nation, who are living on very paltry incomes and are living from hand to mouth. So many people are starving on account of the fact that they are not getting enough money to live upon. Therefore, keeping these people in view, I think we are not only justified, but I think we are morally bound to stop such allowances and try to save that money so that we may be able to provide food for those people who are not getting enough to live.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, I strongly object to this supplementary demand and I take strong exception to this for the same reasons which my Honourable friend Sardar Sampuran Singh put forward so eloquently. Only the other day, I was asking my Honourable friend the Labour Member as to how much he was paying his *malis*. The Honourable Member wanted notice as if he did not know. Then, I asked how much the Chowdries—the head *malis*—were being paid, and I was told they were being paid the magnificent salary of Rs. 30 to Rs. 40 and not more! Earlier, my Honourable friend Shri Mohan Lal Saksena asked as

to why it is that the Government of India were not thinking of raising the lowest salaries. The Honourable Member got up again and said: "Oh! these things are being discussed by a wonderful commission that the Government have appointed" and therefore they did not want to make any sort of distinction at all. When they have to make a distinction, they do not scruple about things, if only they are in favour of highly paid people. If it is a case of smaller people getting low salaries, then they strain every nerve to give evasive answers and they say 'we are considering the necessity for revising the salaries for all people taken together and then we will do something'. What do they do? What have they done in the past? In the shape of Lee concessions, they have given hundreds of thousands of rupees to the fat salaried people. In the case of the lower paid staff, they grudgingly gave one or two rupees as allowances. My Honourable friend asked the Honourable the Finance Member to imagine how it would be possible for these low paid people who are getting, including this dearness allowance, the sum of Rs. 45 a month, to live at all and maintain their family. Sir, we, as Members of the Legislature are given a combined daily allowance of Rs. 45 a day. We are getting 30 times more than these poor ill paid clerks, chaprasis, etc. We, the Members of the Assembly, know how difficult it is even with our Rs. 45 a day to live decently and save just a few rupees, to carry on public work outside. It must be possible for Honourable Members on that side also to know how difficult it must be for the ordinary folk to live on this pitiful salary, and yet the Government do not want to do enough by these people. The Government go on wasting our money on these highly paid officials. Do they need this increase? My Honourable friend Sri Ananthasayanam Ayyangar gave us a number of instances as to how these high salaried people find it difficult to spend their money upon. They squander this high salary on luxuries, thus raising up the prices. The wonderful part of it is that it is proposed to give these allowances retrospectively. I think every one of these top officials will come into possession of Rs. 5,000, Rs. 6,000 and even Rs. 10,000 per family all of a sudden. There will be ample money in their hands to waste on foreign imported stuffs.

The Honourable Sir John Thorne (Home Member): Nothing like that.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I have got here figures. The Home Member seems to be very poor in mathematics, although he is supposed to be in charge of services, their pay and allowances and so on. Here are the figures. At the rate of Rs. 263 per month, it comes to more Rs. 3,100. If these allowances are given for more than two years, then the figures go up to a huge amount.

The Honourable Sir John Thorne: No, no.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What is the use of crying out 'no, no'. You may cry 'no, no' to your own satisfaction and to the satisfaction of the subordinates in the Home Department. Fortunately we are not your subordinates. We have got facts which we place before the House and it is for the Honourable the Home Member to disprove those facts by putting counter facts. Simply running us down in a departmental fashion, saying, 'no, no' is not going to satisfy us. He cannot cow us down like this. He has failed to make us submit to him several times. He, or his successors, or the British people, if all these should try again to overawe us, it will all end in miserable failure as before. What do these fat salaried people do with the sudden fortune that will come to them in the shape of retrospective allowances? As my Honourable friend Mr. Masani pointed out the other day, they will waste this on foreign imports. The Honourable the Finance Member has now got into the habit of expressing his righteous indignation and saying, not this, not that and so on. Where else are they going to spend money? On sugar, you will not allow, on various other things, you have established controls. Then, they will have to spend on black markets. You do not ration these various other essentials for our people with the result that these rich people, now that they get this additional money, will go to the market and pay more and more and thus prevent the poor folk from getting the essentials of life. That is the consequence of the unreasonable things you are doing.

[Prof. N. G. Ranga]

Now, Sir, I come to the bigger thing. Unfortunately the Honourable the Finance Member is not present in the House and I had hoped he would listen to the few remarks that I was going to make. Here is a big list of supplementary demands. It looks more like a statement placed before the Public Accounts Committee. We are expected to go through the whole *gamut* here. In fact all the annual budget demands are here, nearly one hundred of them—including Panth Piploda, the affectionate one of Sir John Thorne. What does this long list show? It shows the utter inefficiency and complete incompetence of the Finance Department. All this time, we have been told that whenever any Finance Member was going away, he has done such and such a great thing to this country and therefore, let us congratulate him as a great man. But what do we find now? The Finance Department people have proved thoroughly incompetent and inefficient and this is proved by this long list of supplementary demands. Not one in the Finance Department could estimate the budget figures correctly in any of the Departments. Their estimates have been out of proportion. The total supplementary demands come to nearly 28 crores. That gives us nearly more than ten per cent. of the total budgetary demands that they make annually. We are asked to congratulate the Honourable the Finance Member. Here comes the Finance Member.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Yes, to receive your congratulations.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: We are extremely glad and we sincerely hope and trust that he is correct when he says he is going.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: So, do I.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: The sooner you make room for an Indian Finance Member, the better will it be because under your guidance the Department has become thoroughly inefficient and incompetent. Not that I will applaud a brown Finance Member if he presents the same list of supplementary demands as you have done. I shall criticise him in the same way as I am doing now. Why do they want to give retrospective effect? They say it is a question of justice. My Honourable friend said the other day that the Finance Member speaks with a socialist accent. It is not yet cockney enough for me to be accepted as a socialist accent. My Honourable friend added that he has got a capitalist heart. That certainly is quite correct.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I think he meant cockney accent.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: You cannot be a cockney because you are a Welshman unfortunately.

These allowances are to be given with retrospective effect to whom? To people who are getting more than Rs. 1,000 per mensem. And why do they need it?

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Everybody needs it.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Have they made out a case that they are incurring debts or that they have got to repay their debts?

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Yes, Sir.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: They waste money over drinks and playing Bridge in the Roshanara Club and the Chelmsford Club. Then the Honourable Member says that he is giving this dearness allowance in the name of justice. Very good indeed. My Honourable friends are in very great demand in nocturnal dinners and parties, but we are not here to pamper all these high-salaried people. That is why even if a case could be made out—although it cannot be made out in all fairness and justice—for these people for dearness allowance for this year, there cannot be any case whatever for giving them allowances with retrospective effect. Therefore, I say that if my Honourable friend has got any conception of justice,

it is something indeed extraordinarily unjustifiable and a thing which cannot be imagined at all, even according to capitalist standards. I think this is a wrong thing for him to do. Therefore, looking at it from whichever point of view, he should put a stop to this 'retrospective effect' anyhow.

Is it possible for him even today to come forward before this House and say 'I see the reason of your plea and therefore I am going to stop this dearness allowance'? He may say, as we were told yesterday, that there are some officers of the Railway Board who are being paid dearness allowance, and therefore you cannot afford to make any discrimination between one class of officers and another class of officers. Are we to be told that there is no discrimination in pay and allowances that are being given to different classes of officers today? Is it not a fact that the Honourable the Defence Secretary has admitted in this House that there is a difference between the pay and allowances of Englishmen on one side and Indians on the other. Yet in spite of this are the Government coming forward to equalize their pay and allowances? Of course not.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: The Indian officer gets exactly the same as British as far as war allowance is concerned.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: That is another complaint. I want the Government to lower the scale of salaries and dearness allowance and various other allowances also to all the officers—British and Indian. These people are taking advantage by bribing them and pampering them. In other words they say 'look here, we are giving you the same salaries and allowances as we are getting; so let us be common thieves in looting the Indian exchequer'. That is what they have been doing. We are against this sort of thing. Yesterday and day before when we were asking for relief for the poor, the Honourable Member was coming forward and saying 'if only I listen to you, the whole Government will go bankrupt'. When we ask for relief, he raises the bogey of bankruptcy, and when we ask for the abolition of dearness allowance, he says 'no, no' these people should be paid their dearness allowance; poor people have suffered very badly'. There is something wrong with this Government. They have got lop-sided value of things: they are suffering from jaundiced eyes and jaundiced finances and they do not know—I am sorry I must correct myself, it is not that they do not know, they do know what they are doing. They must go on subsidizing these very highly paid officers so that they may be in good humour and they may carry on their dirty work in this country. When Mahatma Gandhi was fasting, what happened? Only a few people, who were getting lower salaries, were found to protest against the Government policy, not the highly paid officers. Again, who were the people who protested against the inhuman sentence that was passed on Captain Rashid Ali? Only the poor clerks and lower gazetted staff. Why is it that the high paid officers, whether they are Hindus or Muslims, did not protest at all? It is because they are over-fed, they are over-pampered, and they are even offered bribe in regard to the past also for all the sins that they have committed against nationalism and patriotism. And my Honourable friend with an air of righteous indignation says in fairness and in justice, please co-operate with us. We are here to non-co-operate with this Government; we are here to non-co-operate with this Finance Member, and I may tell my Honourable friend that I am prepared to assess his ability properly or fully only when I see him in England. When I meet him there and if he wants me to recommend him to his own Government, I will certainly do so. But here in this country I am extremely anxious—so anxious that I am counting every hour, every minute, every second—to see the day when I can say to myself 'Thanks God, these gentlemen can no longer have a chance of sitting there and propping up our own Indian Members to make a case against us in India'. We want this Government to go. Not only that, we want these Englishmen to go. We are not here to pay any compliments to these gentlemen, and we are not here also to be complimented by these gentlemen. As you know, Sir, when the Honourable the Leader of the European Group suggested that there should be a Rowlands Committee, I made bold to say no

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: So did I.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: We do not want either Rowlands or any other 'Lands' in this country. I say that not because I am angry with my Honourable friend. I am prepared to be very friendly and chummy with him once he is in his own country. Let us then pitch our brains against one another and see who will win, but as long as he happens to be in this country, I am not prepared to grant even a pie for, whether you call it Excess Grant or Supplementary Grant or Regular Budget—not a pie. As my Honourable Deputy Leader made it clear in his speech the other day, we are in favour of throwing out the whole budget.

Sjt. N. V. Gadgil (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I hope the Honourable the Finance Member must have been convinced by the time that a sound case has been made out to revise the entire policy of salaries. He will agree with me that Indian administration is the costliest in the world. The highest paid officer in this country gets relatively more than any other highest paid officer in any other country. Similarly, the lowest paid Government servant in this country gets less than any other lowest paid servant in any other country. In the Standing Finance Committee when this question was discussed many of us brought to the notice of the Finance Member the plight of the low-paid Government servant. He promised to go into that question and in the report of the Standing Finance Committee we find that the Finance Department is going to examine the question of increasing the rates of dearness allowance to a flat rate of Rs. 25 and Rs. 22. But so far as the allowances to the high-salaried people are concerned, it is decided that they are to be paid; there is no question of their being reviewed at all. I submit, Sir, that the intention of the Government is to create a class of ultra-loyalists as a second line of defence. If that is not the intention, then apart from the fact whether the allowances are votable or non-votable, apart from the fact whether there is any constitutional issue involved, I ask one simple question of the Honourable the Finance Member—because he has expressed more than once that the salaries paid to the Indian officers are really high—does he honestly think that the officer who draws over Rs. 1,000 is one in the present circumstances who should be given extra allowances, especially in view of the fact that in this country, the poverty, according to him, is very great and whether the finances justify the grant of such allowances, and whether in granting increased allowances to these high-salaried people he is not creating what I should say an unequal society? Instead of diminishing the distance between the rich and the poor, he is becoming a party to bring about a situation just the other way. In 1924 a commission was appointed to go into the question of salaries. It was presided over by Lee. The concessions granted have come to be known as "Lee loot". Does he want that whatever concessions he has been granting to be known as "Rowlands robberies"? If he takes the poverty of this country and its finances into consideration, I am sure, in view of his often expressed opinion that the Government servants are already more than highly paid, he will refuse to grant them further allowances and will agree to this cut. In moving this cut, the object is that the low-paid servants should get the benefit. There are amendments on the various other demands to be moved hereafter, but this particular motion means censuring the policy of the Government also in so far as grant of allowances to high-salaried persons. It is economy cut in that respect also. Therefore, I support this motion.

Mr. Frank B. Anthony (Nominated Non-Official): I rise to support this cut motion and I feel that anyone who suggests the continuance of a dearness or war allowance to persons of the higher wage bracket can do so only in a spirit of irresponsibility. This House has over and over again made its opinion felt that it was not in favour of this war and dearness allowance to persons in the higher wage brackets. As my friend has remarked, it is notorious that in this country we have a notoriously top-heavy administration. Taken against the economic background of an abjectly poor country, even in peace time, we have in this

country wage levels which are out of all relation to the economic resources of this country, and now it is sought to continue these allowances to people who are already getting unduly inflated wages that are not at all relative to the economic resources of this country. I have over and over again said that it is sheer affectation for people getting Rs. 1,000 and over to say that they cannot manage. Dr. Sir Zia Uddin has said that the purchasing power of the rupee has fallen considerably, but all it has meant to the man in the higher wage bracket is an economy in his luxury. It is sheer nonsense to say that he has had to economise and honestly it is only the poor man who is today suffering not only economic privations but degradation, and it is absolutely indefensible, not only economically but morally to pay huge sums, and certainly retrospectively, to persons getting one thousand and over. I have met men who have come to this country. India is a happy hunting ground for mediocrities, particularly in the services of this country. These are men who due to the economic resources in England can never look forward to the salary that the people in this country get. You cannot, according to economists, expect to combine security with wealth. But that is precisely what you do in the higher rungs of government service in this country. People say, why are lawyers and doctors allowed to earn huge sums of money? Economically it is justified. They run risks. It is because of those risks that you have the compensating advantage. If you are successful in your line, profession or business you can earn large amounts. But not in Government service where you have a guarantee of security and as such you are not entitled to look forward to inflated wages that you get in this country. I do not think that the most senior member of the Home Civil Service, strictly speaking, gets over £1,000 to £1,500 a year.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: £3,500!

Mr. Frank R. Anthony: But what does it work out to relative to the economy of the country, in other words relative to the *per capita* income of the people? I have been reading that an Englishman earns a pound as compared with the shilling earned by a person in this country. The *per capita* income is twenty times higher than in this country and based on that consideration, the persons in the higher wage level should get one-twentieth of what they are getting. That is my whole contention. I admit that the man today getting Rs. 1,000, Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 3,000 has certain commitments, but they are in the nature of luxuries. He will have to come down in his luxuries and what I am resentful about is the attitude of the administration towards the poorer paid employee in this country. Whenever you ask for a dearness allowance, we are told it will raise all kinds of complications and the matter will have to be considered. But when it comes to giving a grant to the men in the higher wage brackets, and even paying them thousands of rupees, with retrospective effect, you do it in a cavalier manner. All your bogeys, all your theories of creating financial complications all disappear when you want to treat with these people who have really not suffered at all. When I say at all I speak in relation to the increased cost of living in this country. I would say that there is a case for the continuance of a dearness and a war allowance for the people in the lower wage brackets and if you at all want to do justice, then divert the money that is being paid to people in the higher wage brackets into making some reparation for the losses in purchasing power by the people in the lower wage brackets in this country.

Babu Ram Narayan Singh (Chota Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Here in this House, what is talked about appears to me to be all unreal. Discussion is going on against high salaries and dearness allowance. But in my mind, Sir, there are neither salaries nor allowances. All these are "*lot ka batwara*" which means "Distribution of property looted". Sir, I have already said on some other occasion that in fact there is no real government in this country. The salaries of public servants in any country in the world ought to tally with the common life of the people, with the standard of life of the people in general. Here there are some people who are getting Rs. 6,000 a month and

[Babu Ram Narayan Singh]

there are people who are getting Rs. 20 a month. Is it a kind of thing which should be allowed. Is it a thing which can be called legal or just? 80 per cent of the people of this country do not know what two meals a day mean. In my area, which is the poorest in the country, there are people who do not know what corn is for about nine months in the year. They live on leaves, roots and wild fruits. In such a country it is inconceivable to have people getting high salaries. Sometimes I do not like to speak but when I hear or see things going on, I am tempted to speak. When we consider these things seriously our blood boils. My party has taken a good stand and I hope that my friends on my left will also join us. We should never allow such additional grants. Especially supplementary grants should always be discouraged. A good Finance Member should foresee all possible expenditure in the year. Either there is a deficit or some items which were not budgeted for. Why should there be a supplementary grant? These things should be discouraged. Sir, I support the motion moved by my friend Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena and I pray that this should be passed.

Mr. Leslie Gwilt (Bombay:European): Sir, I oppose this motion. I believe I am correct in saying that in the United States or, at any rate, in some of the States the incomes of persons who pay income-tax are published. It is perhaps unfortunate that that system is not in force in this country, because we would then be able to test the sincerity of some of the remarks that have been made on the floor of this House.

The debate seems to have strayed rather far from its actual implications and had the remarks of my Honourable friends Mr. Manu Subedar and Diwan Chaman Lall not been tinged by politics I would have been more in sympathy with them. Nevertheless I join issue with them in their condemnation of the salaries and the dearness and living allowances being paid to the lower paid servants of the Government of India. It is a mystery to me how a chaprassi can live on the wages and dearness allowance that are being paid to him. This particular point was raised in the Standing Finance Committee and I think that those members who were members of it and are present here in the House will agree with me, though he could not say a great deal at that juncture, he nevertheless was in sympathy with the remarks then made on this particular point, and which I understand is under review.

It seems to me Sir, that if there is sincerity in the point of view that has been expressed by a number of members, they ought not to have accepted, some twelve months ago, an increase of 50 per cent in their daily and travelling allowances, from Rs. 30 to Rs. 45 for surely the principle implicit in their acceptance should equally apply in the wording of this cut motion.

My friend Mr. Manu Subedar represents the Indian Chamber of Commerce and on the Congress Benches there is a representative of the Millowners Association. I would like to ask those gentlemen whether in the industries of which they know something employees earning a salary of over Rs. 2,000 are not paid a dearness or living allowance?

Mr. Vadilal Lallubhai (Ahmedabad Millowners Association: Indian Commerce): We give only Rs. 50 just as a token.

Mr. Leslie Gwilt: But I think I am right in saying that there have been substantial alterations in salaries in order to make up this small token. Tatas, for instance, pay a bonus of three months' salaries. Whether a sum of money is paid by way of bonus or dearness allowance you are substantially increasing the income of the individual concerned.

I do not know a great deal about the budgets of the I. C. S. officers but I do know something about my own budget and how my expenses have increased. I wonder whether the House realises that the last Finance Member (and here the present Finance Member will correct me if I am making a mis-statement) retired with a pension which, after he has paid English income-tax, will be reduced in terms of rupees to about Rs. 650 or 700 a month. Such are the plums of office.

Sjt. N. V. Gadgil: Not bad.

Mr. Leslie Gwilt: If you are going to penalise these higher paid men and prevent them from saving I must of course assume a man is paid in accordance with his ability, if you are going to penalise these people, they are going out of Government service into industry and Government will lose them.

Shri Sri Prakasa: A good thing too!

An Honourable Member: Welcome.

Mr. Leslie Gwilt: My friend Mr. Sri Prakasa says that they will be welcome. If when the new Government comes in they bring into effect the salaries which are indicated by this cut motion I wonder what sort of problems will confront them after they have attempted to run an administration with a low paid service, after a year or so. As I said, and on these grounds I oppose this motion.

Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan (Meerut Division: Muhammadan Kural): Mr. President, there is not very much that I have to say on this motion which is before the House. I should like to explain the position of the Muslim League Party with regard to the dearness and war allowances that are paid to Government officials.

Sir, this matter of giving dearness allowance to those who were drawing a salary of Rs. 1,000 or more came up in the form of an adjournment motion in the Assembly session last year. At that time the then Finance Member promised that he would place the matter before either the House or a committee of this House before giving effect to this proposal, viz., giving a dearness allowance to those drawing a salary of Rs. 1,000 up to Rs. 2,000. The matter was placed, if I remember aright, before the Standing Finance Committee. The stand which the members of the Muslim League Party took up in the Standing Finance Committee was that they opposed the granting of dearness allowance to Government officials drawing a salary of over Rs. 1,000. And that is the position today. It is true that on account of the rise in prices of commodities every one, especially those who have a fixed income, have been very much hit. But at the same time we feel that those whose income is over Rs. 1,000 can manage it by cutting down some of the items of expenditure which are not absolutely essential. We are opposed to giving of any dearness allowance to Government officials drawing a salary of over Rs. 1,000; and in this connection I am glad that the question of increasing the dearness allowance of low paid servants has also been raised on the floor of this House, although it has really no direct bearing on the motion which the House is considering. The dearness allowance which is paid to low paid servants of the Government is indeed very little. I know that in many cases since 1937—amongst the few servants that I have, the wages have gone up by three times. In the case of Government servants, those of them who have got what they call *dast-i-ghaib* they do not bother; but the other poor fellows who have no *dast-i-ghaib* find it very difficult to live on such low wages as they are getting today. Whatever money is to be given in the form of dearness allowance should be given first to low paid servants and should certainly not be given to those who get a salary of over Rs. 1,000.

My Honourable friend Mr. Gwilt has a fling at the Members of this House by saying that they should not have accepted an increase in the daily allowance which is paid to the Members. Perhaps my Honourable friend would realise that this is the only Legislature in the world where the Members are not paid any salary; and after all, what is it, in spite of the 45 rupees which the Members get? How much does it come to in a year? Not much as the calculation will show. In my friend's own country the members of Parliament today get £600 a year and there is a clamour to raise it to £1,000 a year. I know that some of the members of my Honourable friend's party were regularly paid salaries by the associations which they were representing in the House. So, I think it was rather unfortunate that he should have brought in this argument as a justification for giving dearness allowances to those who are drawing salaries over one thousand rupees

Mr. Leslie Gwilt: If my Honourable friend will be good enough to give way for a moment, I think what I said was that if this point is pressed the logic of it should have been applied also

Mr. President: Will the Honourable Member speak a little more loudly? I could not hear him at all.

Mr. Leslie Gwilt: I think what I said in effect was that if the point which is implicit in this cut motion is pressed, then the logic of that must also apply to the travelling allowance which is paid to Members of the Assembly.

Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan: I really do not know what he means by that. All that I can say is that perhaps amongst the non-official Members in this House he will not find more than ten per cent whose income is over Rs. 1,000

An Honourable Member: Not even that.

Another Honourable Member: Some have no income at all!

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Not even Rs. 45 a month!

Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan: Therefore I do not quite appreciate his point; but at the same time I know that when this matter was discussed it was recognised that in Delhi specially—and some of the Members live in villages or small towns where the expenses are very little compared to the big cities—it was felt that on account of the increase in the cost of living if they have to live in Delhi, then it was reasonable that the allowance should be increased; and of course nobody can make a distinction that only one Member can draw so much and the other should not, because that would have been very discriminatory. But I can assure my Honourable friend that some of those who are blessed with little more favourable circumstances—to them this Rs. 45 goes away more in charity than towards meeting their expenses.

As I stated just now, the position of my party is very clear. I feel that there is no justification for giving dearness allowance to those drawing a salary of over Rs. 1,000, and there is great justification and great need that the low paid servants of government should be given an increased dearness allowance than what they have been given so far. I support the motion before the House.

Some Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

(Miss Maniben Kara rose to speak.)

Mr. President: A request has been made that the question be now put. So I have called upon the Home Member.

The Honourable Sir John Thorne: I am not in charge of the subject, but . . .

Mr. President: I have not called upon him to speak by way of reply. The Honourable Finance Member will do that; but before I put the question that the question be put, I thought he wanted to catch the eye of the Chair and I have permitted him to speak.

The Honourable Sir John Thorne: I must apologise to the lady behind me for getting in her way. I should certainly not have done so if I had known that she was going to rise.

I have a slight sense of grievance at being in the House at all this morning. When I looked at the list of business I thought I could have possibly a couple of hours in my room to get on with jobs of work which have been greatly neglected and that I would come along when some item with which I am directly concerned is reached lower down in the paper. It does seem rather odd that the Home Member should butt in on a cut motion under a head like Customs. But as it has so happened, this debate has taken a turn with which I am concerned. The Home Department is supposed to be the guardian of the conditions of service of all classes—and let me emphasise, all classes—of government servants. The emphasis very naturally this morning, has been on the needs of the lower grades; and in anything I say I do not want to be understood as in any way minimising or ignoring what has been urged on behalf of the lower paid and therefore the

are needy Members of the government services. But I must emphasise that they are not the only people to be considered and that in all grades of the Government services there is a case, and an unanswerable case, for just treatment. In a special degree the Home Department is also concerned with the Secretary of State's services—I say in special degree because that is a specific item in the business of the Home Department; but I certainly do not mean that any one in the Home Department thinks himself required or entitled to do for the Secretary of State's services anything more in the way of improvement or maintenance of the conditions of service than should be done for other classes of the services.

I have listened with some bewilderment to the course of the debate. It seemed to me to take a line of irrelevance which is remarkable even in discussions which are professedly related to finance. My Honourable friend Professor Ranga seemed to me to have achieved a height or level of irrelevance which even in the many irrelevant speeches he has made before he has never yet attained.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: The Tanjore Collector speaking?

The Honourable Sir John Thorne: He was not the only one. So far as I could follow my friends who talked about the constitution, they also were going entirely beyond anything which had a bearing on this motion.

There is no secret about the constitution. There it is in the Act. I have no doubt that my friends on the other side know as much as I do about section 314.

1 P.M. which defines the scope of the Secretary of State's control over the Government of India. That scope is very wide. It will be for my colleague to say—he has said already by way of interpellation—how far the control of the Secretary of State's services was exercised in this matter in relation to servants of the Government of India generally. But specifically of course the Secretary of State is concerned with the services which he has recruited and whose conditions of service he has laid down; and in respect to them it is known and obvious that neither the Provincial Governments nor the Central Government have an entirely free hand. I still cannot understand how it is relevant to drag in the Secretary of State's services on this motion. Still less can I understand my friend Mr. Anthony who seemed to be making some distinction between the British and Indian members of the Secretary of State's services.

Mr. Frank R. Anthony: On a point of explanation. I was making no distinction at all between the British and the Indians. I was merely talking of the relative wage scales in England and in this country.

The Honourable Sir John Thorne: The relative wage scales have nothing to do with it, unless my friend was making some racial distinction. He talked of British members of the services as people who, if they had stayed in Britain, would be receiving less remuneration than they do out here. It is an old theme and there may be something in it, but it is not relevant to this discussion. British officers, as everybody knows, are a very small minority indeed of the servants of Government whose pay is between one thousand and two thousand rupees a month, and those are the people with whom we are concerned this morning. The cut motion specifies the amount of Rs. one thousand rupees a month and above, that is to say these allowances, if the motion is accepted, would cease in respect to officers drawing Rs. one thousand and above. I have listened with some care to see why this figure was suggested. I was not in the House yesterday and I am not quite sure whether a similar motion that was moved yesterday was in identical terms. It is possible that some indication may have been given yesterday as to why this figure of Rs. 1,000 has been chosen as the limit up to which any sort of allowance should be admissible. I might tell my friends that in Britain the people who are benefited by increases in their emoluments are as high up in the scale as those getting £3,000 a year in Government service, and the pay of some of those have been increased to £3,500 a year. Nobody in India would suggest that allowances should go to anything like that height, not because people on three and four thousand rupees a month do not feel the effects of high prices. Everybody knows that every one

[Sir John Thorne]

feels the effect of high prices, but there clearly must be a limit, an arbitrary figure must be fixed somewhere beyond which it is expected that a man can draw in expenses, whether it is on luxuries or on charity or on anything else, to accord more or less with the lower value of money. The figure that was fixed for Government servants was Rs. 2,000 a month, although there are gradations up to that figure; as I say, that was an arbitrary figure, but I submit that this figure of Rs. 1,000 a month is equally arbitrary; and of this I am quite certain—that if the Government of India had fixed Rs. 1,000 as the limit for allowances, this cut demand would still be on the paper, Rs. 750 or Rs. 500 being put in instead of one thousand. (*An Honourable Member*: No.) I can say that with certainty and I do not believe that Professor Ranga who is denying it has any belief in his denial.

Now, Sir, the only other matter I want to refer to is the retrospective effect to the decision that was recently taken; and I have not noticed any particular acknowledgment of the fact that it was taken at a time when the Assembly was given a full opportunity to discuss it, instead of, as is so often suggested, that the policy of Government is to do these things after the Assembly rises.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: That portion of two crores which has to be paid has not come before the Assembly. It won't come up by way of supplementary grant till the next year.

The Honourable Sir John Thorne: It has come before the Assembly now. We are talking about it at this very moment. I hope I am not out of order in referring to it because it certainly has arisen earlier in the day. Fantastic figures were given of the actual effect in rupees of this amount. Professor Ranga, I think, suggested that some people were actually going to get Rs. 10,000 in one instalment as the effect of throwing the concession back by six months. That, of course, is nonsense. But this is all I have to say on it, that the decision of July 1944, was from the point of view of the ordinary government servant a very unfair one. I am not speaking only for the officers covered by this Cut, that is officers drawing between Rs. 1,000 and Rs. 2,000, but I am rather talking of officers of all classes. When we gave them this increase and asked them to accept it as adequate, when we told them, as we had to tell them, "well of course, what we are giving you now in July, 1944, it does not go even a small way towards meeting your needs, but you know we have to be careful about inflation", then in my experience, if there is anything that infuriated the government servant more than anything else, it was to be told that he must be worse off on account of the inflation. He said, who caused this inflation? Have I caused this inflation? Or, who has caused it? Not being a financier, I could not tell him who had caused the inflation. Anyway it was quite certain that that class of government servant had to suffer, and suffer real hardship. It is known to me that a considerable number of government servants have in the past few years even got into debt, and that is a thing with which no government servant, in ordinary circumstances, in the absence of any special bad luck, is expected to put up. It did not happen to him before the war, and it is a circumstance which is really prejudicial in the highest degree to efficiency of service. Well, Sir, that decision, as I say, was regarded, and regarded to my mind with very good reason, and the concessions that were given and against which complaints were made this morning went only so far as to repair an obvious injustice.

Some Honourable Members: The question be now put.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the question be now put."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I prefer to speak after Lunch.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Half Past Two of the Clock.

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

HINDU MARRIAGE DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL

PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I present the report of the Select Committee on the Bill to remove legal disabilities under Hindu law in respect of marriage between Hindus.

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1945-46—contd.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Sir, I doubt whether outside India there is any legislature in the world in which so much that is not germane to the motion before the House can be brought in.

Shri Sri Prakasa Do you know any country outside India like India?

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Yes, many of them. Amongst other things that have been covered in a motion for expunging a certain sum from the first supplementary demand in respect of allowances paid to officers drawing between Rs. 1,000 and Rs. 2,000 per month, many things have come in, like commercial safeguards under the 1935 Constitution Act, price-levels and the intellectual capacity of the Finance Member and reference to the predatory habits of his ancestors. In that respect my ancestors seem to resemble pretty closely those of my Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Ghani Khan.

Sir, I oppose this motion on several grounds. Firstly, because it is irrational in that it seeks to reduce the demand for a supplementary grant by two lakhs of rupees, whereas the total sum covered by the budget provision in respect of which the cut motion is moved, is only Rs. 15,000. Secondly, I want to point out that this grant of war allowance is limited to those married officers who are drawing between Rs. 1,000 and Rs. 2,000; it does not apply to single officers. Thirdly, the amount of the allowance is 17½ per cent only, whereas the cost of living is anything in the neighbourhood of 300 per cent, although I do not accept myself that the cost of living indices are entirely appropriate to the class of people we are talking about. Lastly, I doubt very much whether the officers in question are treated as favourably as the officers of big industrial firms in this country within the same salary range, where account is taken of things like salary bonuses; though these are paid out of E. P. T. and therefore, at the expense of the taxpayer; nevertheless such persons were paid increases of salary in the war period. I doubt very much whether officers of Government have been treated half as favourably as officers in the same salary range as themselves in industry.

Mr. Vadilal Lallubhai: Sir, may I say something by way of reply to that?

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I only said I doubted it; I am not making a debate about it.

Next, the officers concerned in this motion are not, except to a negligible extent, European; they are all Indian.

An Honourable Member: It is not a racial cut.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I am not raising a racial issue; I am replying to an issue raised on the other side.

Lastly, I am convinced that a high percentage of officers in this salary range have been very badly hit by the war. They are necessarily living on standards which are inelastic and cannot be completely adjusted to the very high cost of the essentials which they have to buy to maintain those standards. It is not a question of giving up the Roshanara Club or the Chelmsford Club or the I. D. G. Club or drinking less drinks or talking less betel-nuts. It is that they are committed to certain standards like children's education or housing or standards of life generally. An officer in this range cannot give up his house and live in

[Sir Archibald Rowlands]

cheaper quarters, even if he can get them. And I do not believe it is sound policy to subject officers, and; amongst them, some of the most important officers of Government to financial worries. In those conditions they cannot do their best work.

Now, Sir, before coming to my Honourable friend Prof. Ranga I want to refer briefly to two points raised respectively by my Honourable friends Mr. Saksena and Sir Zia Uddin. The point of complaint of Mr. Saksena was that this Government, following its usual custom, withheld deliberately the grant of this increased allowance from the Legislature until it had risen last year. I have no hope at all of dispelling this suspicion. The real facts are these. The decision to grant this allowance was not finally taken until the 27th March towards the end of an overcrowded session. The papers relating to the proposal were in fact circulated to the Standing Finance Committee of his House before the House rose, and it was open to the opposition, had they so desired, to have applied for a further date for discussion. In point of fact, it was taken on the afternoon of the last day of the session, as my first performance—and a very interesting one it was too. I am sorry my Honourable friend Sir Zia Uddin is not here, for I have to make two appeals to him. I hope he was not serious in proposing a reduction in the price-level of agricultural produce to 150 per cent of the pre-war level. He could not really have been serious. He suggested that wheat sold in the Punjab at Rs. 2/4 per maund before the war would be properly rated at Rs. 3/6 after the war. In my judgment, although I think the present price-level in India is too high and will have to come down, if I were to remain here, I would do everything I could to see that it did not descend to those levels.

The next appeal I wished to make to him was to expound at greater length and with greater clarity his scheme or his doctrine to which he often refers, but never really dilates upon, of using silver and gold to control the price-level. I have no doubt that when he and I have greater leisure between now and the end of the session he will favour me with his views.

And now I come to Prof. Ranga. He covered a wide field with the speed and eloquence of which he is capable. He crowded into a very brief speech the sort of speech he was entitled to make on the general discussion of the budget and on the Finance Bill. Amongst other things he passed reflections on my intellectual capacity. I do not resent that. I hope I do not rate it higher than he rates his own. One of my colleagues the other day referred to Prof. Ranga as in a state of perpetual indignation. He did not seem to like that very much and I like him so much that I do not like to offend him. Otherwise I would describe him as Mount Etna—in a state of perpetual eruption, belching forth torrents of oratorical irrelevancies. I like him so much that I am not going to say anything.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Go ahead.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: No, I have finished. There are three points, however, on which it happens we are both agreed. The first is that I should quit India as soon as he hopes that I should quit it. I am in complete agreement, and when I am in London I hope I will be enjoying a dearness allowance which will enable me to entertain my Honourable friend.

Shri Sri Prakasa: You will ask him to quit England!

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I will not; I hope he will stay there. Besides, he is much too amusing to suggest that he showed quit England!

Secondly, he raised a point which was raised by Mr. Ram Narayan Singh from Bihar, who performed with great dignity and dexterity the difficult feat of delivering his speech and eating betel-nuts at the same time! I am referring

a protest that most of them raised about the number of supplementary grants that have been presented to the House this year. I entirely share the view. I think it is absolutely offensive to all rules and to the dignity of Legislature to have brought before it on the last day of the Session about eighty supplementary demands which represent expenditure already incurred. In my judgment, supplementary demands should be very much less numerous than they have been. I can only attribute that to the war—these demands relate partly to the war period—and to the fact that the rules here require amendment. I think that a Department, as soon as it is aware that it needs to exceed the amount voted to it by the Legislature, should take the first opportunity of bringing before the Legislature a demand for further money, and I think that arrangements to that end are already in train for the future.

The last point on which I find myself in complete agreement is the belief that the pay of inferior Government servants is too low. I myself entirely share the view that the pay of some of these inferior servants before the war was quite indefensible on any standards. I have already agreed to examine the possibility of increasing the rate of dearness allowance—the existing rates—and I hope that their case will be complete in the course of a few weeks. Of course we have to consult the Provinces which are also affected. But I will give the House some idea of what is involved. Every rupee a month added to the dearness allowance will cost two crores of rupees. It is not quite as easy as all that. Nevertheless, that will not stand in the way and we have come to the conclusion that some increase is necessary. I think it is wrong that Government servants of any grade should have to rely on that insidious hand or greasy palm to which the Deputy Leader of the Muslim League Party referred this morning.

There was a suggestion in the course of the debate that the money to finance any additional dearness allowance to staff could be found by cutting out the war allowance from married officers. I do not think that could be found by cutting out from the allowance of married officers who are given 17½ per cent. in respect of increased cost of living. The House should know that the total amount involved—voted and non-voted—is only Rs 32 lakhs. I have just said that for every rupee added to the dearness allowance we require two crores of rupees. So, if the object is to find the money for dearness allowance, this cut motion will not achieve it. For all these reasons, Sir, I do hope that before we come to voting—I think I have disposed of the case in favour of this cut—all sides of the House will reconsider the motion, and the Honourable Member will withdraw it.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member has said that the amount of allowances in respect of officers drawing Rs. 1,000 and more comes to Rs. 15,000 only, while the cut suggests Rs. two lakhs. Am I right?

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: The amount involved is Rs. 15,000.

Mr. President: How does the cut stand in that light?

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: You will remember that yesterday we wanted to have figures as to how much of this amount related to the increased dearness allowance to officers drawing Rs. 1,000 and more. In the absence of exact figures we have no alternative but to make lump sum reduction. I had in view the fact that the existing concessions were about four crores and the increased concession meant another four crores. So in view of the statement of the Honourable the Finance Member, i.e., 15,000, I am ready to modify my demand.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: The total over the whole of Government is Rs. 32 lakhs, including non-voted. But on this particular subject it is only Rs. 15,000.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: There are two courses open to me. Either it should be taken as a cut motion relating to all the demands in which case we need not discuss all the other cut motions that I have moved. This two lakhs

[Shri Mohan Lal Saksena]

may be spread over, and other demands reduced accordingly. Or, we may reduce Rs. 15,000 under this demand, and in respect of others we may get the exact figures from the Honourable the Finance Member which may be inserted in the cut motions when they are moved.

Mr. President: I quite follow what the Honourable Member is suggesting. The better course would be, so far as the procedure is concerned, to reduce each demand by the figure which the Finance Member may give as regards the allowance to people drawing more than Rs. 1,000.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I cannot obviously produce the figures now for every demand.

Mr. Manu Subedar: You can reappropriate afterwards.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: May I request leave of the House to reduce this cut to Rs. 15,000.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: The object is to censure the Government for having done this. That will be achieved by merely confining the cut to Rs. 100.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: That is another question. But you will stop it in future, and also not pay two crores of rupees which Government intend giving.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: It is not Rs. two crores of rupees which is involved. Most of the money involved in these things is in respect of dearness allowance. I have just told the House that the total amount, spread over all Government servants drawing salaries between Rs. 1,000 and Rs. 2,000, is only Rs. 32 lakh.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: I would like to substitute the amount which would cover the allowance of officers drawing over Rs. 1,000, namely, Rs. 15,000. It is to that extent that we wish to show our disapproval. Therefore I beg leave of the House to amend this figure to Rs. 15,000.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Why not reduce it to Rs. 100. The object will be achieved.

Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan (Meerut Division: Muhammadan Rural): It appears to me that the object is to disapprove the action of the Government which they have taken in regard to this matter of giving dearness allowance 3. P. M. to Government servants drawing over Rs. 1,000. I think that object would be met if we reduce this grant by Rs. 100, because after all it now only amounts to a token cut. Therefore I move:

"That in the cut motion, for Rs. 2,00,000, Rs. 100 be substituted."

Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): That would apply to all the others.

Mr. President: Are the other cut motions going to be moved?

Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan: Not on this subject?

Mr. President: Therefore, the Honourable Member is now moving that amendment to the cut motion. The question is:

"That in the cut motion, for Rs. 2,00,000, Rs. 100 be substituted."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: I will now put to the House the cut motion as amended. The question is:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,99,000 in respect of 'Customs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—72.

Abdul Hamid Shah, Maulvi.	Manu Subedar, Mr.
Abid Hussain Choudhury Md.	Masani, Mr. M. R.
Adityan, Sri S. T.	Mohammad Amir Ahmad, Khan, Bahadur
Asaf Ali, Mr. M.	Raja.
Ayyangar, Sri M. Amanthasayanam.	Mukhopadhyay, Mr. Nagendranath.
Banerjee, Sree Satyapriya.	Narayanamurthi, Sri N.
Bose, Shri Sarat Chandra.	Nauman, Mr. Muhammad.
Chaman Lall, Diwan.	Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Chettiar, Sri T. A. Ramalingam.	Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutt.
Chaudhuri, Sreejot Rohini Kumar.	Rahmat-ullah, Mr. Muhammad.
Daga, Seth Sheodass.	Ram Narayan Singh, Babu.
Damodar Swaroop, Sjt. Seth.	Ramayan Prasad, Mr.
Dani, Mr. G. B.	Ranga, Prof. N. G.
Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.	Reddiar, Sri R. Venkatasubba
Gadgil, Sjt. N. V.	Saksena, Shri Mohan Lal.
Gangaraju, Sri V.	Salve, Mr. P. K.
Gauri Shankar Saran Singh, Mr.	Sampuran Singh, Sardar.
Gole, Mr. P. B.	Sanyal, Mr. Sasanka Sekhar.
Govind Das, Seth.	Satakopachari, Sri T. V.
Habibur Rahman, Khan Bahadur.	Sharma, Mr. Krishna Chandra.
Hans Raj, Raizada.	Sharma, Pandit Balkrishna.
Himmatsinhji, Col. Kumar Shri.	Siddique Ali Khan, Nawab.
Hiray, Sjt. B. S.	Siddiquee, Shaikh Rafiuddin Ahmad.
Ishaq Seth, Haji Abdus Sattar Haji.	Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan.
Jaffer, Mr. Ahmed E. H.	Sri Prakasa, Shri.
Jagannathdas, Sri.	Sukhdev, Seth.
Jeelani, Khan Bahadur Makhdum Al-Haj	Surjit Singh Majithia, Squadron Leader
Syed Sher Shah.	Sardar.
Jhunjhunwala, Mr. B. P.	Swaminadhan, Shrimati Ammu.
Jinachandran, Sri M. K.	Tamizuddin Khan, Mr.
Kara, Miss Maniben.	Thakur Das Bhargava, Pundit.
Karmarkar, Shri D. P.	Vadilal Lalubhai, Mr.
Khan, Mr. Debendra Lal.	Varma, Mr. B. B.
Killedar, Mr. Mohammad M.	Yamin Khan, Sir Muhammad.
Lahiri Choudhury, Srijut Dharendra Kanta.	Yusuf Abdoola Haroon, Seth.
Liaquat Ali Khan Nawabzada.	Zafar Ali Khan, Maulana.
Madandhari Singh, Mr.	
Mahapatra, Sri Bhagirathi.	
Mangal Singh, Sardar.	

NOES—31.

Ambedkar, The Honourable Dr. B. R.	Naqvi, Mr. A. T.
Azizul Huque, The Honourable Dr. Sir M.	Oulsnam, Mr. S. H. Y.
Banerjee, Mr. R. N.	Rangachari, Mr. M. V.
Benthall, The Honourable Sir Edward.	Roy, The Honourable Sir Asoka.
Bewoor, Sir Gurnath.	Rowlands, The Honourable Sir Archibald.
Bhattacharya, Rai Bahadur Devendra	Sargent, Sir John.
Mohan.	Sen, Mr. B. R.
Chatterjee, Lt.-Col. Dr. J. C.	Sharbat Khan, Khan Bahadur.
Cook, Mr. B. C. A.	Solanki, Dr. P. G.
Greenfield, Mr. H.	Spence, Sir George.
Gwilt, Mr. Leslie.	Sri Chand Chaudhuri.
Hirtzel, Mr. M. A. F.	Stokes, Mr. H. G.
Hydari, The Honourable Sir Akbar.	Thorne, The Honourable Sir John.
Kharegat, Sir Pheroze,	Weightman, Mr. H.
Lawson, Mr. C. P.	Williams, Mr. C. F. V.
Mason, Mr. P.	Yeatts, Mr. M. W. M.

The motion was adopted:

. **Mr. President:** The question is:

“That a reduced supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 14,98,900 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of ‘Customs.’”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 2—CENTRAL EXCISE DUTIES.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Sir, I move:

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 30,55,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of ‘Central Excise Duties.’”

Mr. President: Motion moved:

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 30,55,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of ‘Central Excise Duties.’”

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Sir, I do not want to move any cut but I would like to say a few words in regard to this demand. In my province particularly with reference to the administration of this Department I find that the offices are not properly manned. Letters addressed to these offices, the office of the Collector of Customs and the office of the Collector of Central Excise in Madras, take a number of days for a reply and the reason I understand is that they are under-manned. I know the Department itself is new but there is a lot of income to the Central Government, as much as 20 crores, from this Department and it should be better manned and administered.

There is another point which I want to mention. Those persons who are recruited as Sub-Inspectors are graduates and double graduates but the persons who are over them as Inspectors have been transferred from the Provincial Excise Department and these men have been brought up in a tradition of corruption. And when they are made to sit over these Sub-Inspectors who are young men fresh from the colleges the latter have to please the Inspectors with bottles of beer and what not. The result will be that these young sub-Inspectors will tend to become dishonest. I know definitely what is happening to a number of young men coming from Universities but unfortunately the old bandicoots of the Provincial Excise Department are kept in charge of them and they spoil and corrupt the younger section in the service. The temptation to become corrupt in this Department is very great. Every Sub-Inspector has to issue a number of licenses and with each license the applicant together with some pan and betel nut (which my Honourable friend is made to sell in Shanker's cartoon) places a five or ten rupee note. It is very difficult for the Sub-Inspector to resist the temptation or ignore it. On the one hand they have to supply the Inspector with all sorts of things and he has to maintain himself on the meagre salary of Rs. 60 a month. If you want to keep these men free from corruption you must pay them at least a salary of Rs. 100 per month. Every one has to go out for nearly 20 days in a month to check the acreage of land where tobacco is cultivated. I know of cases of young men who in their early enthusiasm have tried to discover places where illicit tobacco was kept. They have no sympathy from the villagers, who do not even give them water and when they get hold of these officers their lives are in danger. Those are the risks to which they are exposed not only in this Department but also in the Customs Department. In this situation all these people have to be taken care of. Whenever they need police assistance they should be given and the police should go to their help, because there is risk involved to their lives. I am afraid at the tail end, Madras is woefully neglected by the Honourable Member. The Departments are under-manned, the staff are very poorly paid and they are overworked. I hope Government will take proper steps in this matter and put right things.

Shri Sri Prakasa: Madras helped the British to come in.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: It will help them also to go out.

Mr. H. Greenfield (Government of India: Nominated Official): Sir, all that I need say in reply to these comments is to repeat what I told the House the other day, that we quite realise that the administration of this Department is not yet fully perfect but that we intend that it shall be so,—and that as soon as possible.

With regard to the particular points raised by my Honourable friend, I may say that all of them are already well in hand. For example, with regard to the strength of the Department, a staffing enquiry was instituted sometime ago and from the results of that enquiry we shall overhaul the establishment everywhere throughout India, strengthening and retrenching wherever necessary, and that this process will be continued, the object being to ensure that we always and everywhere have neither more nor less staff than we strictly require.

As for the conduct of the officers, I may assure the House and the Honourable Member in particular that if any complaints of this sort are made, and are supported by definite information, to the senior officers of the Department, an inquiry will at once be set on foot, and the evil, if any, will be promptly scotched.

In sum, I would like to assure the House that it is our express aim to build up a revenue service in which the country and the House can have the fullest confidence and of which it will have every reason to be proud.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, I was hoping that the Honourable Member would make a reference to the conference that they have agreed to convene between the tobacco growers and the Department. The fact is that the Honourable Finance Member has agreed to our suggestion that such a conference should be called and also the ways and means should be explored to bring the growers into greater contact with the Department in an organised manner, with their own organisations: if that is done and if in addition to that the Department is strengthened also in its personnel, I am sure that greater satisfaction can come to be given both to the Department as well as the growers of tobacco as well as betel nuts.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Yes; a conference, as my Honourable friend has said, has been called for the 5th and 6th April.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 30,55,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Central Excise Duties'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 3—TAXES ON INCOME INCLUDING CORPORATION TAX.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 17,14,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Taxes on Income including Corporation Tax'."

Mr. President: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 17,14,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Taxes on Income including Corporation Tax'."

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Sir, if any Honourable members wish to move their cuts, they will move it, without being called.

Mr. President: Very well, I will put the question. The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 17,14,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Taxes on Income including Corporation Tax'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 4—SALT.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 11,38,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Salt'."

Mr. President: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 11,38,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Salt'."

Prof. N. G. Ranga: May I ask for an assurance that in all those places from which the concessions granted under the Gandhi-Irwin pact have been withdrawn during the war, they will again be restored so that the peasants and other workers who are interested in producing salt for their own consumption and also for that of their cattle and for local trade, can be benefited?

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I do not know the particular districts to which my Honourable friend is referring; but he may take it from me that any pledge given by Lord Irwin in this regard will be fulfilled.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 11,38,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Salt'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 7—STAMPS.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 6,25,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Stamps'."

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 6,25,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Stamps'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 9—IRRIGATION, NAVIGATION, EMBANKMENT AND DRAINAGE WORKS

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,15,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Irrigation, Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works'."

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,15,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Irrigation, Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 10—INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,11,91,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department'."

Mr. President: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,11,91,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department'."

Nature of increased activities in the Department and the method adopted to meet the increased public demand for telephone service

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena (Lucknow Division: Now-Muhammadān) Rural): Sir, I have got a motion in my name, No. 3 on the Consolidated List; I move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,11,91,000 in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department' be reduced by Rs. 1,00,000."

Ordinarily I would have moved a cut of Rs. 100 only but because this supplementary demand is for Rs. 2 crores odd, I thought that a cut of even one lakh would not mean much to the Department. If Honourable Members will refer to the supplementary demand for grants memorandum, they will find that on page 7 it is given that the increased activities of this Department are responsible for the increase in the expenditure. So the House is entitled to know what those activities are and to what extent they are responsible for this increase of 89 lakhs odd. Only the other day there were questions regarding telephone connections. We know all over the country there are complaints against the telephone department; and I do not know whether the Honourable Member is aware or not but there is a lot of corruption in the telephone department. I can say from the information brought to me at Lucknow that not only are the recommendations of the advisory committee not heeded to in allowing telephone connections, but even the order of application is not taken into consideration. I do not know what are the considerations in fixing up priority as to which application is to be granted or refused; but the fact is there that those telephone connections which were taken away because of the war have not been restored. There are other applications from business houses and public men, which have not been considered, although they have been there for more than two years or so. So I would like the Honourable Member to let the House know as to the basis on which these applications for telephone connections are considered and as to how long these difficulties will continue and whether these increased activities relate to the providing of greater facilities for telephone connections in these places.

Mr. President: Cut motion moved:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,11,91,000 in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department' be reduced by Rs. 1,00,000."

Shri Sri Prakasa: Sir, I would like to add my voice to that of my Honourable friend, Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena. The Honourable Finance Member paid a very high compliment indeed to this House, of which he himself is an honoured even though a nominated member, when he said that we talked more irrelevance here than is talked anywhere else in the world. I do not know if I shall be guilty of irrelevance when I say something about the manner in which telephones were disconnected and telephones are refused to persons in need of them, and telephones were given to those who did not require them at all. Sir, I should also like the Honourable the Finance Member, to tell me whether there is any country outside India where telephones are taken away for political reasons. Here I know for a fact that telephones have been taken away in innumerable cases, simply because those who had these telephone connections held political views not in consonance with the views of those in authority. In Benares for instance, we received notices from the district magistrate in the following terms:

"Attend my office at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning and show cause why your telephone should not be disconnected."

And whether we showed cause or not, the telephones went. I want an assurance from my Honourable friend the Secretary for Posts & Air and Railway Accidents, that the telephones will not be taken off under such pretences in the future and that those that were thus taken away will be restored without delay.

Mr. Saksena has referred to corruption. It is something so prevalent that it is just as well not to refer to it again and again because it would look as if we were rubbing the thing in too much; but the fact is that when A applies for a telephone connection it is said that extra cables will have to be got, that there are not enough materials available, that the line in that particular part of the town is not working, while B in the neighbourhood gets the connection without any difficulty. What passes behind the scenes I do not know; but what appears on the surface is something that really causes suspicion. The difficulty with our Government is that they stand by the man on the spot. And so, even if facts are given to them enquiries, are made through their own subordinates.

[Shri Sri Prakasa]

I recognise that they have no other avenue for making inquiries; but I do think that in view of the general complaint of which the Government at the top is not or ought not to be ignorant, they should take some of us into confidence and not dub us all entirely as liars. It is not always necessary to uphold subordinates simply because they are subordinates.

I know that the Home Member finds it very difficult to assess the evidence between man and man. When he finds A saying something and B saying something else, he says he is not quite sure who is speaking the truth; but as magistrate, as judge and as a man of commonsense, he knows that there is very often a difference between man and man, and the evidence of one man has to be taken to be more credible than the evidence of another man. It is not enough to say: 'Sri Prakasa says this and Ram Prasad says that; and as Sri Prakasa is my enemy, I must believe Ram Prasad'. I have no doubt the Honourable the Home Member will realise that, even though it is irrelevant to the matter in hand, the statement I am making has some relation to the case of Dr. Lohia and his jailors. So far as my friend Sir Gurunath Bewoor is concerned, I should certainly like him to give us an assurance that he will see to it that political reasons do not interfere in the matter of the restoration of telephones; and that telephones are not given away uselessly to Government officials even when they do not need them and that persons who are really in need of these telephones are not deprived of them.

For instance, in Benares, there is a food office. Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors and everybody connected with this Department has a telephone. Although these men say: "we do not want a telephone; it is a nuisance in our house; and we cannot have an extra peon to look after them;—they are told: "You must have them, otherwise I cannot deprive Sri Prakasa of his telephone; and giving you a telephone will be a good excuse for not giving it to him. These things should stop. After all, my friend represents a Department that can be regarded truly as a nation building Department. He does not represent a repressive Department like the Home Member. He can understand and sympathise with our point of view; and I hope he will do it and also cure the Department, which was a Department above suspicion, of all the evils that have now come into it. If he wants extra money he must see to it that the money is properly spent. Newspapers that want teleprinters must get them; those who want telephones must get them; and these things should not be unnecessarily planted on persons who do not want them. I do hope that some assurance will be forthcoming from my Honourable friend which will enable us to withdraw the motion. We want to be assured that in future we shall have better times than we have had in the recent past.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: I rise to associate myself wholeheartedly with every word that has fallen from my friends Mr. Saksena and Mr. Sri Prakasa. I can say that the Government of India during the period of this war have considered the telephone department as their own. They did not feel that they have got to serve the public. When the war was on, telephones were indispensable and I can say from my own experience and that of others that just claims have been overlooked and telephones have been forcibly removed. My friend Sri Prakasa spoke of taking us into confidence. When this question of connection and disconnection arose, Government appointed a committee of *ji huzurs* under the presidentship of the District Magistrate to consider whose telephones were to be removed and whose retained. Those who opposed Government in political matters were the first to be deprived of their telephones. I can say from my own experience as Secretary of the Telephone Subscribers Association that a telephone of my colleague was taken away because he had the guts to oppose the Government. There is no doubt that they have behaved shabbily in this respect.

Now, they are bringing in the message rate system. I want an assurance from my Honourable friend that the message rate system is buried for ever. It is said that the meters have not arrived. I hope they won't arrive and have

gone below the sea. I hope that this system will not be introduced, I know that during the pre-war days the telephone authorities used to run to the merchants and beg of them to take the telephones. If you feel that we cannot do without them, you are sadly mistaken. We are prepared to carry on our work with the chaprasis and dispense altogether with your damned telephones.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Now that the war is over, there is every scope for extending the trunk telephone system. There are 365 districts in India and each district headquarters must have a trunk telephone connection. No district headquarters should be without this connection. That is all I have to say.

Sir Gurunath Bewoor (Secretary, Posts and Air Department): The first question that has been raised is how this extra expenditure of 2 crores 11 lakhs and 90 thousand has come to be incurred. The details were given in the memorandum to the Standing Finance Committee. They appear on pages 6 and 7 of the proceedings of the meeting on the 23rd March 1946. Briefly speaking the increased cost was due to the payment of war and dearness allowance and good conduct pay at enhanced rates which decision was taken after the Budget had been prepared. There was also an increase in pensions and there was increased expenditure on staff and payments to railways and other mail carriers as a result of growth of traffic. When we talk of increased activities, the intention was not to say that there were any new types of business, but increase in the total volume of business handled by the Department which necessitated the employment of more staff and the payment of more money to carriers of mails.

Diwan Chaman Lal: If there is increased business, what is the necessity for retrenchment?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: There has been no appreciable retrenchment in the current year. It is as a result of reduction of business in some places that retrenchment becomes necessary. So far as I am aware and according to the last figures we had, there are only a few hundreds all over India, and naturally there is retrenchment in workshops which were manufacturing material for war purposes. So far as the main staff is concerned there has been little retrenchment. Such retrenchment would be in connection with the employing of war service personnel. I do not think I need say much more about the various items. I have got here details, but I do not suppose my Honourable friend Shri Mohan Lal Saksena wants details. They are given in the memorandum to some extent.

Now, Sir, about telephones: There have been serious complaints and I recognise there is justification for these complaints. I am myself one of the biggest complainants against telephone. It is a tragedy as Mr. Jaffer said that while before the war, we used to go round begging people to take telephones in their residences, sending our Inspectors round personally to people, we are now in the unfortunate position that we cannot meet the demands which are being made by various people. As soon as army material becomes scarce, a black market arises and we get accusations of bribery and corruption and various other things. Actually I do not know to what extent there is corruption. We have had communications from various people and every complaint made has been properly attended to. I should like to mention first of all what we have done in order to meet the increasing demand. During the war we were faced with a very large demand from Government Departments including defence services. You cannot expand the telephone suddenly. The material was not in this country. Before the war we were just about meeting the public demand and then we were faced with a very huge demand due to outbreak of war. In order to meet war demand, we had to disconnect some of the existing subscribers. We had the authority under the ordinary hiring contract to disconnect subscribers after giving due notice. We certainly disliked disconnecting our old subscribers, but we had no other way. In order to stop complaints, we had

[Sir Gurunath Bewoor]

in some of the big towns advisory committees appointed, because we did not want the local Divisional Engineer to take all the responsibility for disconnecting 'A' and while leaving out 'B'.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: Who are these men on committees? They are *ji huzurs*.

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: That is a matter of opinion.

Shri Sri Prakasa: Are the recommendations of these committees attended to?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: So far as I am aware it was done. I have experience of the committee in Delhi, but I do not know how it was elsewhere.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: There is not one representative of the Telephone Association on this committee. Telephone subscribers were not recognised and they always took *ji huzurs* on these committees. It was the most illegal and wrongful act on their part to disconnect telephones. After all what does a district magistrate know. Who cares for the district magistrate.

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: The opinions of these advisory committees were taken and the telephones of certain people were disconnected.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: No use.

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: My Honourable friend Shri Sri Prakasa referred to certain connections which were taken away on the orders of the district magistrate. That was done under the Defence of India rules and the Postal Department cannot be held responsible for that. Now that war is over, the Government demand for telephones is going down slowly, but we have not yet had that large release of the number of telephones which we hoped to get from the defence services. When A.R.P. was disbanded, a certain number of telephones were released. But there are various other activities of Government and Government Departments come to us for telephones for essential services. I can assure Shri Sri Prakasa that we do not automatically accept the demand from Government departments so as to over-ride the claims of private subscribers, unless it is specifically asked for as required for essential services. Otherwise, government servants take their turn along with old subscribers.

Shri Sri Prakasa: Will the Honourable Member take it from me that the Food Officer of Benares distinctly wrote to the Department that he did not want an extra telephone for his Inspector but he was forced to keep one; and . . .

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: I am not aware of that.

Shri Sri Prakasa: . . . a non-official neighbour who happened to be the Editor of a Congress newspaper, was denied the same.

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: I am not aware of that instance. If that is so, I am sorry.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: Is the Honourable Member aware that a hair cutter in Poona got a telephone whereas the telephone of Mr. Pocha was removed because he opposed the message rate system.

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: After all hair cutters also serve a very useful purpose in the economy of the country. I do not know whether all this occurred during the period of the war or before the war.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: During the war period.

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: I am under the impression that this Association was started sometime before the war.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: During the war.

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: The present position is this. General instructions have been issued to discontinue all the advisory committees. There will be no more advisory committees so that these so called *ji huzurs* will cease to exist.

and the question will be decided by the postal authorities concerned. The second thing is that as telephones become available they are going to be made available first to subscribers whose telephones were taken away. They will be fairly high up in the order of priority. The exception is this. Government connections for essential services must take precedence over everything else.

Diwan Chaman Lall: What is my Honourable friend doing to get more material and making more telephone lines available?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: I am coming to that.

Shri Sri Prakasa: What do you mean by essential services?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: If the head of the department considers that a particular connection for one of his officers is essential the postal department has to accept that, because it cannot take any other decision owing to lack of knowledge of the essentiality of service. During the last six months we have made special exceptions in favour of elections. For example various election bodies or parliamentary committees were given preference over people who are in the waiting list. To a limited extent Doctors are given preference depending on whether there are numerous doctors already in the area or not. Then we have in certain cases given preference for newspapers and newsagents. But leaving these few exceptions, by and large those whose connections were taken away—what I call the old clients—are given preference.

Mr. Chaman Lall wants to know what we are doing to meet the large demand that undoubtedly exists. I may say straightaway that as a commercial department, the Posts and Telegraphs Department would only be too anxious to satisfy customers because we make a net income over our expenditure. Now, Sir, during the war we could not get the equipment. We had ordered a large amount of equipment before the war but all these orders were held up partly due to the diversion of the factories in England to war production and partly due to shipping difficulties. Throughout the war we have been trying our very best to get full equipment and we have not succeeded.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: Sir, may I know why orders were not placed in the U. S. A.?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: It was still more difficult to get them from the U. S. A. Also, the equipment is different.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: I want to know whether orders were placed at all?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: No, Sir, because we were aware that we could not get them; we made inquiries and found that we could not get them. In fact we had to start manufacturing in this country and we have developed a large factory in Bombay which produces manual telephone equipment.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: Is it not a fact that many of these instruments were taken by the American forces here and there would have been justification for getting material from the U. S. A.?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: I do not understand the Honourable Member's question. If he refers to the fact that the defence services taken a large number of telephones, that is true. But we manufactured for that.

At present we have planned and in some cases we have placed orders for a large number of telephone equipments. For example, for Delhi and Delhi Cantonment we have ordered 2,000 new units for replacing existing units, and 2,500 for new equipment. Similarly for Lahore and Lahore Cantonment we have ordered altogether about 3,600 equipment, for the Jheria coalfield exchanges about 1,100, for Pindi 1,000, for Allahabad 600, for Cawnpore 1,000, for Nagpur 300, Amritsar 1,500, Simla 1,700, Lyallpur 400 and Meerut 200.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: And how many for Lucknow?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: Lucknow has already been extended. What I have mentioned here are all automatic telephone equipments. So far as manual equipment is concerned we are manufacturing it in this country.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: How many for Bombay and Poona?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: We have ordered for Poona 1,350 and for Bombay we have recently placed before the Standing Finance Committee a memorandum which shows that for Bombay we have ordered 6,400, for Ahmedabad 700 and for Karachi 1,000.

Babu Ram Narayan Singh: What about Bihar?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: Telephones are ordered for exchanges and not for a province as a whole.

For Calcutta we are planning to put in automatic telephone equipment capable of taking on 50,000 subscribers as against 25,000 at present.

I just wanted to give a general idea of what the department is doing in order to meet the undoubtedly existing demand among the public; and in this connection I would draw Honourable Members' attention to the post-war plan relating to telephones in this volume a copy of which is in the Library of the House. And if any Honourable Member feels particularly interested I shall be glad to send him a copy: I am sorry I have not got enough copies to give to every Honourable Member.

Sir, in view of what I have said I hope the Honourable Member will withdraw his motion.

An Honourable Member: What about message rates?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: I do not know if it is quite relevant to deal with message rates and it is also difficult to give straightaway "yes" or "no" as a reply. It is a matter which has been examined at great length and I am quite prepared to argue it out with the Honourable Member; but I would like to say that the declared policy of the Government of India is to introduce the message rate system all over India. It is a system which is found all over the world and the Government of India have definitely decided that the message rate system should be introduced. It is the fairest system to everybody; it reduces unnecessary calling and it enables the man who wants to have a telephone as a security and convenience to have it without having to pay the high subscription which a business man who makes 300 to 500 calls ought to pay. But really Sir, this question is not relevant to the present supplementary demand and that is why I did not mention it. But I have given the position as the Honourable Member forced me to do it.

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: What about extension to the Frontier?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: That is in the plan.

Lt.-Col. Dr. J. C. Chatterjee (Nominated Non-Official). When will you exchange these antediluvian telephones in Delhi by automatic ones? I refer to those which are worked with the hand and no replies are ever received.

Mr. Ahmed E. H. Jaffer: In view of the opposition throughout India to the message rate system, will the Government of India abandon this system altogether?

Sir Gurunath Bewoor: There is no such opposition as the Honourable Member assumes. It is his assumption only.

Shri Mohan Lal Saksena: Sir, in view of what the Honourable Member has said, I do not like to press the motion.

The motion was by leave of the House withdrawn.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,11,91,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 12—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 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 on the 31st day of March 1946, in respect of 'Executive Council'."

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 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 on the 31st day of March 1946, in respect of 'Executive Council'."

The motion was adopted.

 DEMAND NO. 14—LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEPARTMENT

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,67,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1946, in respect of 'Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department'."

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,67,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1946, in respect of 'Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department'."

The motion was adopted.

 DEMAND NO. 15.—HOME DEPARTMENT

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 3,86,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Home Department'."

Mr. President: Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 3,86,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Home Department'."

*Expenditure on item D—Employment Selection Bureau and item E—1(I)
Indian Civil Service Recruitment Expenses*

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, I move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,86,000 in respect of 'Home Department' be reduced by Rs. 2,54,000."

I wish to condemn the expenditure on item D—Employment Selection Bureau, and item E.1(I) Indian Civil Service recruitment expenses.

• Sir, we are given no information in detail about these Indian Civil Service recruitment expenses, if it refers only to the additional expenses that they are going to incur or that they have already incurred during the last year in making selections that were referred to in the adjournment motion, we take very strong objection because this House has already expressed its view that the Secretary of State there and the Government of India here should not proceed with their proposed policy of recruiting a new large numbers of Europeans to the Civil Services; and although the House has condemned that policy of the Government of India and the Secretary of State, Government seem to have incurred all this expenditure, and we wish to condemn that. If on the other hand it is intended to continue this policy of Indian Civil Service recruitment as per the Government of India Act or whatever it is, I wish to tell them that they have no warrant whatsoever to proceed with that kind of policy any longer, and that they had much less warrant during last year to have incurred this

[Prof. N. G. Ranga]

expenditure, for the simple reason that the Government in England has declared its policy of abandoning its imperialistic hold over India and to transfer power to Indians. If they are really sincere in these declarations I do not see any reason why the Government of India should carry on this recruitment to the Indian Civil Service in England merely because they have been authorised to do so according to the Government of India Act. They should have taken an early occasion to have got that Government of India Act amended. That they have not done. The next thing is that they need not have given effect to that particular provision which empowers them to carry on this recruitment to the Indian Civil Service in England as well as in India. Merely because they are given power it does not mean that they should exercise their power. Therefore I have very strong objection to this particular item in this supplementary demand.

Next I come to the Employment Selection Bureau. They want to spend a lot of money on this. They give very little information in the explanatory memorandum, but on the other hand I am told that a memorandum was placed before the Finance Committee, and I find from it that this is a new section that is transferred from the Army Department. They have had what is known as 'Employment Selection Bureau' with psychological experts working the Army. Now that the Army recruitment is stopped or is suspended for the time being, they have fallen so much in love with this particular department that they have transferred it to the Home Department. Supposing it is a good thing, why should it be transferred to the Home Department? The Home Department is not a very popular department in this House; this House has expressed its want of faith and confidence in the Home Department. Of all the departments of the Government of India, the Home Department is the worst sinner so far as silence is concerned; they give so little information and they keep back so much information. In the Department itself there are so few Indians that Indians—either in private or in public—are incapable of getting any kind of information whatsoever in regard to the working of this department. Therefore supposing it is a good office, I do not want it to be controlled by the Home Department.

Let me come to the merits of the scheme itself. What is the scheme intended to achieve? They are to investigate and advise the Government of India and other authorities on the application of technical methods of selection for the purposes of recruitment to the various branches of the public services and for general employment purposes, and so on, such as suitability for industrial and vocational training, or for any particular form of employment. If it is merely intended to help Government in their selection of officers for various industrial and vocational training and such other activities, it can be contended that there is a very good case for it, because psychological experts are now said to be very good in finding out the suitability of various candidates for various technical activities as well as proficiency. But if, on the other hand, it is intended to extend its operations to any particular form of employment, and later on to try to help the Government in selecting candidates for ordinary civil employments also, I am not quite sure whether it will be a very good thing at all. Some time last year, during the session of this House, complaints were made from different parts of the House about the way in which the psychological experts are supposed to be using their talents over a number of people who were going for recruitment in the Army. Scientists themselves differ over the value of this psychological examination of various candidates. But supposing it is a good one, when is it to come in? Is it to come in in order to decide which particular candidate is the most efficient one, and therefore that particular candidate alone has to be selected by Government irrespective of the community to which he belongs. It is the agreed policy, I think, of the Government here as well as of the various Provincial Governments that several of these suppressed neglected, backward, scheduled castes and classes of people are to be given special weightage, and special preference

in selecting people for various departments. I subscribe to that principle; I am in favour of giving as much help as possible to those who otherwise do not have the same chance in competition but who are capable of satisfying these psychological experts. But if on the other hand we are going to use these experts in making a selection as between various candidates belonging to a particular community, say scheduled castes, I have no objection. If you want to select a candidate from amongst the scheduled caste candidates, then you can make use of the services of these experts in order to select a candidate who is really fit and competent. So you have got to use this machinery very carefully and very conscientiously. That much of care and that much of conscience you cannot expect to be displayed by the Home Department, and that is why I take objection to this particular new department being placed under the Home Department. I suggest that it should be placed either under the Education Department or under the Labour Department, but not at all under the Home Department.

Now, I come to the personnel of this Department. Who is the head of this Department? An Englishman—an ex-Army officer. Like this they go on creating any number of new jobs. I do not wish to go into details, but I must say that we feel very strongly about it. The other day the Food Department told us that they brought a man for six weeks to start with. . . .

Shri Sri Prakasa: Six hours!

Prof. N. G. Ranga: They tried him and he was found suitable. They kept him on for six months, then two years, and then another two years. They have now taken him on for five years. It goes on like that. In another case they have brought an English officer *via* Kashmir; it is a thin end of the wedge. In Kashmir he was found to be a competent fellow, and therefore they transplanted him in the Government of India Secretariat. He was getting Rs. 1,500 there, but here he has been given Rs. 2,500. And this wonderful gentleman was unable to accept anything less than Rs. 2,500! Some name was given to us—White or Lloyd, I do not remember what it was. We do not want Englishmen in all these key positions, and this is an important position. He is gaining experience at our cost, and after he gains all that valuable experience he will go back to his country and the benefit of his experience will be utilized by England. We get nothing at all. We want to prepare our own Indians, and I can tell my Honourable friends on the Treasury Benches that Indians in every way can beat anybody in efficiency, in competence, and in sense of responsibility. But yet we do not get these opportunities. Even when a new department is being created, I do not see any reason why an Englishman should be kept as the head of the department. Therefore, Sir, I want my Honourable friend to give us an assurance that this gentleman will be kept there—may be for a few months—until an Indian is trained to take his place. It must be the policy of the Government to see to it that the Indian is trained with the definite purpose of taking the other man's place and not that he is just being given a training. We want a definite assurance and I move my motion:

Mr. President: Cut motion moved:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 3.86,000 in respect of 'Home Department' be reduced by Rs. 2,54,000."

Does the Honourable Member stick to the figure Rs. 2,54,000?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: The figure is not so important.

Mr. President: What figure does he want it to be?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I am prepared to make it Rs. 2 lakhs or Rs. 100. Everything depends on the answer of the Honourable Member.

Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan: I simply want to say that I was one of the three who went from this House last year at the invitation of the Government of India to Dehra Dun to inspect the working of this Bureau. There were Sardar Mangal Singh, Shri Sri Prakasa and myself. The process that we saw, I can confess, we were very much struck with. A lot of candidates who came

[Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan]

from the Army before this Bureau were considered by us to be very brilliant. I and Mr. Prakasa were in one batch and Sardar Mangal Singh and another gentleman were in another batch and we were assisted by one member of the Public Service Commission each and these psychologists and psychiatrists were examining the gentlemen. We see a very brilliant man come in and we thought he should be chosen. But ultimately he began to fall down and we ourselves condemned him for the service.

Diwan Chaman Lall: How many Members of the Assembly would have passed this test?

Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan: I do not know. But we were impressed by the character of the test.

Mr. President: Order, order. Honourable Members will carry on consultation in a lower tone.

Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan: There was one gentleman who was picked to be very brilliant and he was doing well in the tests. Then there was a telephonic test and in this test this man was made to telephone to the other side and he was supposed to be the District Judge and he was going on long leave and he had to dispose of his car. He said he wanted to garage his car. He was told to phone to a motor car company: he did, and he started talking something like this: "Hello, old chap. I want to put my car in the garage." Later on the other side was tempting him and saying "Why are you putting up your car in the garage. Everybody is getting good price in the black-market for his car. Why not dispose of it." He said: "No, no. My wife likes the car very much." The other fellow replied: "The wife can be kept quite when you get such a good price." Later on he said "All right, old chap, come to dinner and if my wife is willing I will sell it off."

So the very man who was supposed to be administering against the black-market, got tempted and succumbed to the temptation.

Shri Sri Prakasa: How does the Honourable Member know that he was not ultimately appointed to the job?

Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan: I don't know. But Sri Prakasa and myself were amazed to find that he whom we considered so brilliant ultimately was found to be wanting in character and succumbed to the temptation of the black-market. So whatever may be the nature or broader policy of the Englishman or the Indian, I believe entirely in that. But I was very much struck by the method and the things which went to split up the different qualities of each man so that you could know at once who is the man who could be the best man as a public servant and who should not be admitted as a public servant. So this test as apart from the mere academic qualifications is really the proper test for the man to be a good public servant. We have seen very often that those who were very brilliant students ultimately they were not good when they came in life and people who used to play truant in their schools and colleges became really prominent figures in public life.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Like Knights of the British Empire!

Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan: Yes, some of them become Knights of the British Empire! That is how the tests were held and I thought it my duty to give this explanation to this House, because I was deputed not in my personal capacity but as a member of the Assembly along with other members, and I thought that this was the best opportunity when to do it. Sir, I resume my seat.

Shri Sri Prakasa: I should also like to say a few words. I think that the method is good, apart from the merits of the case as presented by my friend, Prof. N. G. Ranga, and it should be adopted for recruitment in the public service.

[At this stage Mr. President vacated the chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Sir Mohammad Yamin Khan)].

But I agree with Prof. Ranga that that should not mean that only one community members of which happen to pass the test should get all the jobs; and that other communities should be excluded. Some method must be found so that members of all communities get a fair chance in these tests and get a fair share of the public services. One thing I remember when you, Sir, and I saw the experiment together, and that was that in a picture test, I passed and you failed!

Lt.-Col. Dr. J. C. Chatterjee: I would like to say a few words about the psychiatrists at work on these Selection Board. In Delhi on the Army Selection Board we continually quarrelled with them because they wanted to impose their opinion as against the rest of the Board and the result was that whereas they non-co-operated with us and refused to sit with us on the Delhi Selection Board, they cut our throats at Dehra Dun and whichever candidates we sent up they sent down because there these psychiatrists had too a free hand at the final selection. I take a middle view. As an educational worker I recognise the value of the psychologist while making selections but there is always a danger that these people take too much unto themselves and my experience in Delhi was that they tended to prejudge the case of a candidate. This was a board in which there were three Europeans and one Indian member, *viz.* myself. As such it could not be a board which was in any way biased particularly in favour of these candidates. I am not a psychologist myself and therefore may be prejudiced against a psychologist but my brothers are very well known psychologists in the country. These psychologists certainly form a very valuable addition to a selection board and to this extent I do support the idea of bringing them in. You will remember last year when speaking on the very same question I raised the point that up to now or at any rate till recently most of these psychologists on the army selection boards were all Englishmen and I felt that in this matter Government had been very slow in utilising the talent that we have in this country. There are certain people in this country who have done a great deal of work in experimental psychology. At that time my remarks were addressed to the Defence Secretary and he definitely promised that he would undertake to Indianise these ranks of psychologists but I do not know what progress has been made. In spite of a certain amount of prejudice which I have against giving the psychologist a *carte blanche*, I feel that it would be a good thing to train them in this country. I also agree with Prof. Ranga to this extent that the most suitable department in which these people should be trained or the department which is best suited to take charge of this training is the Education Department. After all the Education Department has some psychology I think and they would be very much better able to train these people than any other Department.

I would like to have another assurance that a definite effort will be made to discover psychologists in this country. Psychology is a subject which is appreciated and valued by Indians more than any other nation. Every effort should be made to discover the talent in this country. There are men here who are fully capable not only of learning but of training others and every effort should be made to train these people up very quickly.

I have declared more than once that it is my view that recruitment to the public services should be on merit and on merit alone. I do not want to press that point, because it is not relevant on this occasion but I would like to modify my own view to this extent. When I say merit and merit alone I do not mean that it is merit determined by an examination test only and that no other test of character or personality or fitness for public service should be applied. I did not mean that and I do not hold such a view. What I said was that there are many systems of recruitment. Experience shows that every system has some defect or other. Some people say that selection by nomination is the best. Others feel that a purely educational or academic test supplemented by a personal interview (which is the old system by which the Civil Service was recruited) is by far the best. My own view is that in the end a competitive system really is the fairest system because it cuts out nepo-

[Lt.-Col. Dr. J. C. Chatterjee]

tism, recommendations, nominations and reservations. After that I would say that when the candidates are selected and they come up to a certain intellectual level, I have no objection to your prescribing a different intellectual level for backward classes, at that time a psychologist will be of great help to advise the board if he sits there as an adviser and not as one who largely determines the decision. I hope that these two assurances viz., that Indians would be trained for this work and Indians who are capable now would be employed and secondly that this work would be transferred to a more suitable department, would be given. The Home Department, even when my friend Prof. Ranga becomes the Home Member, is not the department suitable for selection of candidates for the Public Services. Even then, the Education Department which is a new Department and have not got very much work to do might with advantage be entrusted with this responsibility.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali (Delhi: General): Sir, may I seek some elucidation? I am feeling a little confused on this matter. The creation of the employment selection bureau, as far as I know, is still under the consideration of the Home Department. Is that not so?

The Honourable Sir John Thorne: My joint Secretary, Mr. Williams, will explain the thing presently. The Employment Selection Bureau does exist. It already exists in a partly elementary stage, and the officers concerned with it are for the moment, for the most part, employed in connection with the civil selection board.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: What I want to know is this. If I have not made a mistake, a note was put up before the Standing Committee of the Home Department and it related to the Employment Selection Bureau. I do not want to go into the details. It is as yet before the Standing Committee, which have not yet considered it. Now what is it that we are talking about? Is there an employment selection bureau in existence? If so, what is its nature and scope? How is it working and all the rest of it? Is it working under the Home Department or has it been taken over from some other Department? I want to know what exactly is the position so that one should be able to offer some remarks.

Mr. C. F. V. Williams (Government of India: Nominated Official): Sir, it is necessary to distinguish in this matter between the Employment Selection Bureau and the Selection Boards. As the House is aware these modern methods of selection have been very greatly developed during the war both in England and in India, in particular, for the selection of officers. . . .

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: May I interrupt. . . .

An Honourable Member: Don't interrupt him. He is making a maiden speech.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: We should be very glad to hear all that he has to say. At present all that I want to know is whether an employment selection bureau is actually working under the Home Department or not. If so, what exactly is its personnel and what work is it doing? That is all I want to know at present.

Mr. Deputy President: The Honourable Member will make it clear in his speech.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: The Honourable Member is now telling us what these modern methods are. We are all well aware of them. What I want to know is whether an Employment Selection Bureau is actually working under the Home Department.

The Honourable Sir John Thorne: Yes.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Then, Sir, I should just like to say a few words about it before going any further. Something has already been said about these modern methods having been developed during the last war. I have been trying to keep in touch with some of these developments, particularly through the medium of American newspapers and I believe in America these methods have

been developed to a high degree. These methods were first started and employed in industries and they were developed by industries. Eventually when the war broke out these very bureaus began to operate in relation to civil and military employments as well.

The Honourable Sir John Thorne: This was in America?

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: I believe the method was rather popular and therefore it was adopted also in England. I am not suggesting for a single second that it is not a good thing. It is a good thing. I should like to see it imported into India under favourable circumstances but there are certain difficulties which have also to be borne in mind, particularly when these methods are going to be employed in India. To begin with, the work of these specialists or the tests of these specialists cover a long period; each individual has to be tested for a number of days before they have done with him, which only means that if a large number of officers or a large number of recruits are to be examined, a small board like this will be of no use whatever. The means that we shall have to employ a large number of experts who may be able to examine the recruits or the candidates over a long period and come to their own conclusions. Personally I feel that at this time when industrialisation is in the air and when we know that industrialisation is bound to take huge strides in India, I think we ought to leave the organisation of such bureaus by the industrialists themselves. The industrialists can employ them and we can perhaps borrow their services for our purposes. At present, the industrialists would like to utilise the bureaus for their purposes. I dare say they will be prepared to pay the government for the examination of all the candidates who may come to them from these industries. But I would rather that the government subsidised such bureaus if they were maintained by industrialists, because that would be cheaper. I am looking at it from a purely economic point of view. It would be much cheaper. The actual work would then be done by these experts in an independent fashion and perhaps their advice would be of value. Today, as Prof. Ranga put it, the Home Department unfortunately is under a cloud of suspicion—rightly or wrongly—it is a fact and I am not suggesting for a single moment that the suspicion is entirely justified—it may not be justified; but there it is; you cannot get rid of it; and so long as it is under a suspicion I personally think it would be highly advisable for the government to leave this matter out and leave it to those who can organise such bureaus with equal efficiency, as far as I can judge. Now whom are they going to employ? In this case it would be a director, a chief psychiatrist, a chief psychologist, an assistant to the chief psychiatrist and an assistant to the chief psychologist. This seems to be the cadre. They may be excellent gentlemen—I have not the slightest doubt; they may be very competent and efficient; but finally the burden of the expenditure falls entirely on the taxpayer. I would prefer this burden to be shifted to some independent agency, so that they may maintain these bureaus; and if the Government of India feel that they ought to consult them in respect of their recruits they can easily send them to these bureaus where they may be tested and the results may be accepted or not accepted as the case may be by the Government of India. I do not wish to say anything more than that, but I do support the motion of my friend Prof. Ranga on the other ground as well and that ground, I think, is vital. That ground is the recruitment to the Indian Civil Service and to the Indian Police Service in England. That is a serious point. This recruitment must stop. You cannot go on talking of immediate transfer of power to India and at the same time prejudice the government that will succeed the present government in their choice of whom they are going to employ. It is quite possible that the government of free India may want some recruits from England or elsewhere—I do not know exactly what their policy will be; we cannot decide it today; and therefore since this decision is going to be taken, and since this transfer is going to take place. I personally feel that the protest of this House must be effective against any recruitment to any services in England and particularly the protest against the recruitment to

[Mr. M. Asaf Ali]

the Indian Civil Service and the Indian Police Service. On that ground I support my friend, Prof. Ranga.

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: Sir, the government have set up a bureau as a highly expert investigating and advisory body. The Honourable Member opposite has suggested that each big industrial concern might maintain a bureau of this sort. That is simply out of the question because these very highly qualified officers do not exist in such numbers. Government have had very great difficulty in finding the two experts for the bureau—the chief psychiatrist and the chief psychologist; and it is out of the question to contemplate at this stage setting up more than one highly expert body of this nature. What the government are aiming at is that these modern methods of selection which I gather are approved by my Honourable friends opposite should now be adapted to all possible civil needs, and they visualise this bureau as a source of advice, not only to Central Departments and the Federal Public Service Commission, but also to Provincial Governments and to any large industrial concern. The function of the Bureau when it is given a specific project will be to advise on the project, to work out a scheme to implement the project and then it will have to find the staff to put that scheme into operation. For instance, it has already had an inquiry about a particular selection task from Messrs. Tata and Co. That being a non-official matter, it will have to go at the bottom of the bureau's list; but when eventually the bureau are able to take it up, they will advise Tatas what staff they need to put their scheme into operation and they will offer to train that staff if Tatas want them to do so. Another function of the bureau will be on the educational side. The Education Department are very keen that these methods of selection should be applied at every stage of selection for high school education and for higher education. They have already put a specific task to the bureau, namely, the best method of selecting children at the age of 11 *plus* as it is called, for high school education.

Diwan Chaman Lall: May I interrupt my Honourable friend? Would he tell us what the number is of Indians who are going to be placed before the selection board in connection with the war reserve vacancies and what is the percentage of the others?

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: I will come to that. The question has been raised about the European officers employed in the bureau and on the selection boards. Three senior officers of the bureau itself are European officers. They are very highly qualified and it was not possible to find Indians with those high and necessary qualifications.

Lt.-Col. Mr. J. C. Chatterjee: Did you advertise or make any efforts to find suitable Indians for this work?

Mr. Deputy President: The Honourable Member is making his maiden speech. He should not be interrupted.

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: The particular vacancies to which I have been referring were not advertised because we were already aware from very sound advice that officers with these qualifications did not exist in India. I should like to tell the House that as regards the chief psychiatrist in particular there are probably not more than 10 or a dozen men in the whole world who have the qualifications which are required for this job. We could not find one in the U.K. and we had to go to the United States of America.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: How long ago did they begin to train themselves for this?

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: As regards the staff of the selection boards we have nine presidential officers. Three of them are Europeans and six of them are Indians. We have three psychiatrists, one for each board. Two are Indian officers whom we have trained ourselves and only one is a European. Of four psychological officers two are Indians and two are Europeans. The two Indians, I may say, were trained in the War Department's Directorate of Selec-

tion Personnel during the war. Out of 12 group testing officers two are Europeans and the rest Indians, and of three Secretaries all are Indians. These officers comprise the total officers staff of the three boards?

Diwan Chaman Lall: By Europeans, you mean Englishmen?

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: The training of Indians is one of the bureau's functions, to which I may say they attach very great importance. They are all enthusiasts in the bureau. They want to train Indian officers ultimately to take their place in the bureau, at any rate to train them in psychiatry and psychology and fit them for this particular method of selection which may well have a big future in India.

An Honourable Member opposite referred to the application of this method of selection to communal vacancies. I would like to explain that whatever the method of selection followed, whether it is a selection board or written examination or interviews the communal rules will apply to direct appointments.

An Honourable Member on my left referred to the importance of shall I say, of reducing or controlling the influence of the psychiatrists on the selection board. The whole board is designed to balance technical knowledge and tests on the one hand against wider experience and knowledge on the other hand. Each Board carries a President and two Deputy Presidents and those gentlemen are either men with long administrative experience in India or, in I think two cases, with some experience of public life. If the board works properly under the President, then the opinions of the psychiatrist and psychologist should be balanced against the opinions of the presidential officers.

An Honourable Member inquired as to the number of candidates for these war reserved vacancies. I would like to explain at this point how the bureau came into being and how it was placed under the Home Department. Government were faced with what they knew would be this enormous task of selection for these war reserve vacancies in the I.C.S., the I.P. and the Central and Provincial services. It turned out to be in fact a much larger task than we had anticipated. We have a total of 14,000 applications for all these various reserved vacancies.

Diwan Chaman Lall: How many of them are English?

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: There are 14,000 Indian applicants.

Diwan Chaman Lall: No English officer applying?

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: The number of European applicants is something like 700. Of the 14,000, something like 3,000 will be or have been found ineligible for one reason or another, so that it means that between 10 and 11 thousand candidates will have to be passed through these selection boards. It was the Government's original intention to use for this purpose selection boards borrowed from the War Department, but unfortunately the War Department found that it had to continue with the selection of emergency commissioned officers and so it could not lend its selection boards and we had to set about creating them ourselves. And we have very great difficulty in finding the staff for these three civil boards. But that is how the matter comes to have been handled in the Home Department and I would like to say with reference to the remarks of some Honourable Members about the proper location of the bureau, that it is not merely concerned with educational problems or with labour problems. It is also concerned with selection for the public services and from that point of view and from the point of view of consultation with the Federal Public Service Commission, the Home Department seemed to be its natural location, but as I say it grew up in the Home Department from the force of circumstances.

One other point was raised by an Honourable Member opposite and that was the period of these tests. It is true that in these tests for commissioned officers which we have broadly adapted for the purpose of recruitment to the I.C.S. and the I.P. the period of test is about 2½ days. But this period is not necessary for all tests of this kind. There are what are called intelli-

[Mr. C. F. V. Williams]

gence and aptitude tests used for testing the fitness of children for high school education and they are only a matter of two or three hours. You can vary your tests and their length according to the particular purpose which you wish to achieve.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Sir, I had no intention of intervening in this debate, but to ask a question of my Honourable friend to which he gave a reply namely that by this method the Government are going to put through 14,000 Indian officers and that 700 British officers are going to be put through tests in London.

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: Seven hundred European or British officers are being tested in London and not in India.

Diwan Chaman Lall: May I take it that my Honourable friend gives them a free passage back to England for that test?

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: They are all Service personnel and they are transported by the Services.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Specially for this purpose. I take it that an officer who is already in service and has not got out of the army yet can apply to this Selection Board for selection?

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: Yes.

Diwan Chaman Lall: I take it that at the expense of this country, 700 British officers are being exported, if I may use that expression to Great Britain to be vetted there. Is that correct?

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: They are being transported by R. A. F.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Whether by R. A. F. or not, we pay for it. If that is correct, if the Board here is good enough for Indians, why not for Europeans? Are they not good enough for Britishers?

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: It is not a question of their being good enough. The European applicants come from all over the world, from all the service theatres, some of them from Europe, some from the Middle East, some from Italy and it was decided broadly speaking that those in the Middle East and Europe should go to London for selection, and that those in India and in S. E. A. C. should be tested in India. But unfortunately we were not able to reproduce the same scale of tests in India which they were using on the London Board and therefore the Secretary of State decided that European applicants in India and S. E. A. C. should also go to London.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Because English tests are usually easier tests

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: They are if anything more difficult.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: How do you know?

Sri M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Sir, may I suggest that the Honourable the Finance Member must immediately withdraw the demand relating to U.N.R.R.A., because it is nearing five o'clock. The time will not be extended.

Mr. Deputy President: Order, order. Diwan Chaman Lall will continue his speech.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Now, Sir, I want you to take full note of this that this particular Board before which Indian officers go, 3,000 of them have not been found fit for selection.

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: Ineligible.

Diwan Chaman Lall: It is a difference without distinction. It is not a question of not fit. It means that they are not eligible for this job because they are not found fit by this Board.

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: No, Sir. The candidates have to be eligible according to three main qualifications, age, war service and education. In a good many cases, the candidates have put in applications, one would think, without reading the regulations. Anyway about one-third of them are not eligible within these three conditions.

Diwan Chaman Lall: There are yet about two thousand who are eligible from that point of view, I take it. I want to know why this particular racial discrimination was made in actually getting the British officers, in the Indian Army, Indian Navy and Indian Air Force to leave this country at Government expense to go before a Selection Board in London when you have a Board here which is going to deal with about 14,000 applicants. Is it contended that this Board in Dehra Dun neither had the time nor perhaps the inclination nor perhaps the qualification to deal with 700 Britishers? Is it or is it not a fact that the Secretary of State for India is finding it increasingly difficult to get hold of officers for the Indian Police and the Indian Civil Service? Is it or is it not a fact and my Honourable friend knows it as a fact that through this particular method my Honourable friend is going to fill up these vacancies which would ordinarily not be filled up.

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: As I said about 700 applicants are Europeans. They are being tested in London by a Board borrowed from the War Office. We do not know the results of the tests yet because they are not complete. After they have been tested in this preliminary way by the Selection Board, they will come before the final interview Board which the Secretary of State has set up in the India Office, and the Secretary of State has always emphasised—you will find it throughout these Regulations—that only suitable candidates will be appointed although these tests have been reserved for men with war service, it is subject to the consideration that suitable men will be forthcoming.

Diwan Chaman Lall: I am afraid my Honourable friend has not seen my point. We know perfectly well how suitable candidates in the past have been selected by the Secretary of State. We know perfectly well as we found this morning how suitable candidates were selected for highly remunerative posts in the Government of India. We know perfectly well the reason why this is being done. I want an answer from my Honourable friend, why was it done? How many British officers have been taken or will be taken from India at the expense of our exchequer to be vetted not by the Board in Dehra Dun but by the Board in London? Does my Honourable friend have the figures? He talks about the Middle East. Are all the officers from the Indian army?

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: No.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Is it the position that even those who are not in the Indian army are eligible to be selected? Is it not a fact that officers of the British Army for whom these reservations are not made are also seeking selection by this Board? Will my Honourable friend enlighten the House about the position? Let us know the facts. Why is my Honourable friend hesitant about enlightening the House? Are not these reservations made only for officers in the Indian army?

The Honourable Sir John Thorne: May I know whether my Honourable friend wants an answer to each question here and now in the course of cross examination or whether he is going to make his speech in order that the Government Member may reply to all the points later on?

Mr. Deputy President: I think the Honourable Member must go on with his speech and wait for the reply later on by the Honourable the Home Member.

Diwan Chaman Lall: It is rather an extraordinary position put to me. It is the duty of the Honourable Member for Government to enlighten the House. I am well within my rights before I proceed with my speech to find out the constitutional position. So far the country has been told that reservations were made for officers of the Indian Army including Indian Air Force. Now we are told that these reservations are not only for officers of the Indian army but also for officers of the British army who have got nothing whatever to do with the Indian army.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: Is it only one Honourable Member that should monopolise these questions. Every one has got the right to put questions. These cross examinations won't take us anywhere.

Mr. Deputy President: The Honourable Member Sir Ziauddin can ask questions when his turn comes to speak. But I think the Honourable Member Diwan Chaman Lall will take a long time if this cross-examination goes on.

Diwan Chaman Lall: Unless we have the facts there can be no debate.

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: I can answer that particular question of the Honourable Member. All the recruitment regulations are in this small pamphlet a copy of which is in the Library. But the position is that persons of European domicile and descent who satisfy these conditions of age, war service and education may compete for these vacancies. War service may be anywhere; might be in the Royal Navy or the Air Force, the Indian army or the British army.

Diwan Chaman Lall: The position is clear. So far the country has been told that these vacancies are reserved for officers of the Indian army. (*Voices of "No, no" from Government benches.*) Everybody has understood this. Now we come to the proposition that it is not so, that by this method my Honourable friends are wanting to recruit to the Indian Police and Indian Civil Service men belonging not to the Indian army but to the British services. And if that is the position I do not see what necessity is there to take men from the Indian theatre of war, officers belonging to the Indian army or those belonging to the Indian army serving in the middle east and sending them to London to be vetted by a board there, instead of coming before this board and taking their chance with the Indian officers. What is the reason for this discrimination? I do submit that my Honourable friend must realise that he is finding it very difficult in the conditions that prevail to get recruits for the Indian Police and the Indian Civil Service. I believe they have not been able to get their quota and I submit that this is another method of getting their full quota. I ask my Honourable friend if he has got his full quota. Advertisements were published in London; how many have they got? I believe that out of the total number they have not been able to get 25, and even out of the 25 I do not believe they have got even seven or ten in the final acceptance. I believe my Honourable friend has not got the figures.

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: That is wrong.

Diwan Chaman Lall: I may be wrong, but my Honourable friend should enlighten me as to the figures. I ask this and I want my Honourable friend to deny it that he has not been able to get his quota and this is another method of getting that quota. Sir, there is another important matter before you and so I will wind up this speech now and will take another occasion later on to deal with this matter.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: Sir,

Mr. Deputy President: I will remind the Honourable Member that the guillotine starts at 5 o'clock and the Honourable Member should not take long over any point that he wishes to make.

Dr. Sir Zia Uddin Ahmad: Sir, I thought that the Public Service Commission will make the selections from the disbanded military officers and fit them into different posts. This question was discussed and though the Public Service Commission is qualified to select suitable persons for particular posts, the process here is reversed. We have got the person and we have to find out for what appointment he is more suitable and therefore the selection board must be of a different type from the Public Service Commission. I think the type of board they have selected is most suitable to find a job for each person who has retired from the army and for whom appointment has to be found. Besides, I was also present in the meeting of the special committee of the Central Advisory Board in which their officers explained the method by which selection of candidates can also be made at the age of 11. Unfortunately the issue before the House is entirely different and that is, whether the appointments will be made in India from Indians or in England from the Britishers.

But the method of selection which has been devised by the Home Department is the only method by means of which they can fit in a particular individual to a particular post to which he is qualified. Therefore I supported this motion in the Finance Committee and I support it now.

Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan: Sir, may I ask one question? The position has been rather confused. Do I understand the Honourable Member to say that these posts are reserved for Indians and domiciled Europeans who have served in His Majesty's forces?

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: These war service vacancies.

Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan: People who have rendered war service. So it is not confined to those who have served only in the Indian army; which means that the posts are reserved for Indians and domiciled Europeans who have rendered war service.

Mr. C. F. V. Williams: Yes, war service anywhere.

The Honourable Sir John Thorne: Sir, I have just a few minutes to reply. I have felt that there has been some confusion in this debate. I cannot believe myself that the Home Department has been responsible for the confusion. My Honourable friend Diwan Chaman Lal seeks to turn this House into a law court. His method is that of a cross-examining lawyer and—I may say—a cross-examining lawyer who has not studied the case of the other side. The case of the other side lies in the Library. Questions which have confused him here are questions to which he could get an answer if only he had read the pamphlet which lies in the Library. It is not the slightest use trying to give an answer now because if he really wants an answer he can go there and get that for himself. But I quite admit that it is a little bit confusing to have these two bodies or agencies,—the Employment Selection Bureau and the Civil Selection Board. The Civil Selection Boards—I hope it is now clear—are boards set up for a special and temporary purpose, that is, for recruitment of war service candidates to a great number of posts which have been kept vacant for war service. The Employment Selection Bureau is a different matter altogether. It is a body set up and for the time being largely occupied with advising on the methods to be used by these Civil Selection Boards but with the intention of surviving and outlasting these Civil Selection Boards, and if it is successful and if it establishes its position of being set up on a permanent footing. I myself am at a disadvantage in discussing these matters. I have never seen a selection board at work and the methods of psychiatrists and psychologists and all such recruitment officers are to me a mystery. I should have liked to remedy my ignorance of these matters but it was not possible because of the sitting of the Assembly. But I have been very much interested to hear on the whole favourable accounts from those Members of the House who have seen these methods in operation.

Sir, as regards the Employment Selection Bureau, as distinct from the Civil Selection Boards, the matter for the future is entirely open, in my view, and this is the view that I have put to the Bureau. They have to attract customers. Either their methods and the purpose for which they have been set up are of use, not only to Government departments but also to industrial employers and the educational authorities throughout India or if they are not of any use they will cease to have customers and they will cease to exist. If they prove their merit for the purposes for which they have been set up they will continue to exist, but not through a fiat of the Home Department; and I for one see no reason why it should be an irrevocable decision that they are attached to the Home Department. They will continue to exist not because the Home Department so decrees but because they have proved their value and because there is a large number of people who wish to make use of their services.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, I do not wish to press it. I am not satisfied with the answer given by the Honourable Member, but we shall take another occasion to discuss it at greater length

The Honourable Sir John Thorne: Read the pamphlet first.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: . . . Sir, I beg leave of the Assembly to withdraw the motion. The motion was, by leave of the Assembly **withdrawn**.

Mr. Deputy President: Order, order. It is now 5 o'clock and I will put the remaining demands to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 3,86,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Home Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 18—LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,50,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Legislative Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 19A—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 11,56,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Department of Agriculture'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 19B—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,32,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Department of Health'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 20—DEPARTMENT OF COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,14,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Department of Commonwealth Relations'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 21—FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 3,95,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Finance Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 22—COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 4,79,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Commerce Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 23—DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 99,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of ‘Department of Labour’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 24—DEPARTMENT OF POSTS AND AIR

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 52,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of ‘Department of Posts and Air’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 25—WAR TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 32,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of ‘War Transport Department’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 26—FOOD DEPARTMENT

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 11,22,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of ‘Food Department’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 27—CENTRAL BOARD OF REVENUE

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,71,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of ‘Central Board of Revenue’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 28—INDIA OFFICE AND HIGH COMMISSIONER'S ESTABLISHMENT CHARGES

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 6,22,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of ‘India Office and High Commissioner's Establishment charges’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 29—PAYMENT TO OTHER GOVERNMENTS, DEPARTMENTS, ETC., ON ACCOUNT OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF AGENCY SUBJECTS AND MANAGEMENT OF TREASURIES

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 11,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of ‘Payments to other Governments, Departments, etc., on account of the Administration of Agency Subjects and Management of Treasuries’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 30—AUDIT

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 18,60,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Audit'."

The motion was adopted.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon (Sind: Muhammadan Rural): On a point of order. Not one of these items, except 29, has been moved by the Honourable the Finance Member.

Mr. Deputy President: The Honourable Member knows when the guillotine comes in there is no necessity. It is usual practice after the guillotine that it is not necessary for the Finance Member to move. It is moved from the Chair and the question is put straight off.

Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan: The only point that my friend wants to be made clear is whether in the case of supplementaries the guillotine can be applied because in the Standing Orders there is no mention of it. It is only in the case of the budget that the guillotine is applied. The point is only raised so that whatever is being done is in order.

Mr. Deputy President: Usually it cannot be done and the Honourable Member is perfectly right. But by agreement it can be done and it was done through agreement. When the House agreed to do this, this procedure was adopted. Otherwise there was no limit to the time.

Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan: That is all right.

DEMAND No. 31—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 3,21,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Administration of Justice'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 33—POLICE

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 20,21,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Police'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 34—PORTS AND PILOTAGE

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 3,98,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 35—LIGHTHOUSES AND LIGHTSHIPS

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 4,19,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Lighthouses and Lightships'."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: On a point of order. The Chair might some time resume its seat so that Members may go out of the House.

(At this stage Mr. Deputy President resumed his seat and Mr. Asaf Ali left the Chamber)

Mr. P. K. Salve (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): On a point of order. Can the Chair put all these together.

Mr. Deputy President: This cannot be done. Every demand must be put separately and the House will be perfectly right to throw out any of these demands. If the Chair puts the demands in a lump, then the House will be deprived of voting down any of these demands.

Mr. P. K. Salve: By agreement?

Mr. Deputy President: Throw the whole thing out?

Mr. P. K. Salve: By agreement all can be made in one lump sum.

Mr. Deputy President: If the House says that they are going to speak or reject and they want to oppose the whole thing

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: We want to reject Panth Piploda.

Mr. Deputy President: That will not be the proper procedure to put all demands atonce. We will take only a few minutes more.

Seth Yusuf Abdoola Haroon: We accept the suggestion to take all.

Mr. P. K. Salve: If the House agrees generally?

Mr. Deputy President: Unfortunately the Chair has not got the total of all the demands and therefore the total cannot be put, and by the time we total the amount, we will be able to dispose them of one by one.

DEMAND No. 38—ZOOLOGICAL SURVEY

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 32,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Zoological Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 39—GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,07,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Geological Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 40—MINES

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 20,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Mines'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 41—ARCHAEOLOGY

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,66,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Archæology'."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy President: The question is: .

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 12,86,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Meteorology'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 45—MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,09,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Medical Services'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 46—PUBLIC HEALTH

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,90,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Public Health'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 47—AGRICULTURE

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 29,59,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Agriculture'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 50—CIVIL VETERINARY SERVICES

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 4,56,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Civil Veterinary Services'."

The motion was adopted.

* DEMAND No. 51—INDUSTRIES

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 24,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Industries'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 52—SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,34,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Scientific and Industrial Research'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 53—AVIATION

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,83,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1945, in respect of 'Aviation'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 58—EMIGRATION—EXTERNAL

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,23,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Emigration—External'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 59—COMMERCIAL INTELLIGENCE AND STATISTICS

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,73,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946 in respect of 'Commercial Intelligence and Statistics'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 60—CENSUS

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 77,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Census'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 61—JOINT STOCK COMPANIES

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 26,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Joint Stock Companies'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 63—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 4,80,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 66—CIVIL WORKS

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 71,62,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Civil Works'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 68—SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES AND PENSIONS

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 9,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Superannuation Allowances and Pensions'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 69—STATIONERY AND PRINTING

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,58,25,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Stationery and Printing'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 70—MISCELLANEOUS

Mr. Deputy President: I think the Honourable the Finance Member is reducing the amount in his Demand No. 70 by Rs. 4 crores.

The Honourable Sir Archibald Rowlands: Cutting out the provision for U.N.R.R.A.

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,35,11,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Miscellaneous'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 70-A—GRANTS-IN-AID TO PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 8,00,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Grants-in-Aid to Provincial Governments'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 71—MISCELLANEOUS ADJUSTMENTS BETWEEN THE CENTRAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 18,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 74—DELHI

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 18,83,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Delhi'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 75—AJMER-MERWARA

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 11,04,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Ajmer-Merwara'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 76—PANTH PIPLODĀ

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Panth Piploda'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 76A—ANDAMANS AND NICOBAR ISLANDS

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 25,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Andaman and Nicobar Islands'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 78A—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 25,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Industrial Development'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 80A—PAYMENTS TO RETRENCHED PERSONNEL

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 25,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Payments to Retrenched Personnel'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 81—INTEREST-FREE ADVANCES

Mr. Deputy President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 7,05,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1946, in respect of 'Interest-Free Advances'."

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 1st April, 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,**
