

The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Monday the 20th March 1922, the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR AVARGAL, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

DEMAND VII—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" The amount of the grant for which I am moving, Sir, is 3.44 lakhs. It relates almost solely to His Excellency the Governor's staff and household, particulars of which are given at page 6 of the list of Demands for Grants. This shows a small sum of Rs. 4,900 under '47. Miscellaneous,' while the balance is all under '32. General Administration— Heads of Provinces'."

Motion 333.

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—" Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

333. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,800 for purchase and maintenance of pictures by Rs. 3,000.

" In making this motion, I am not unaware of the fact that His Excellency the Governor has made use of his pruning knife in several items. But here I find more provision made in this year's budget than in any of the previous years. In 1919-20 the provision made for the same item of expenditure was Rs. 251, in 1920-21 it was Rs. 818 and in 1921-22 it was Rs. 800. This year I find it to be Rs. 3,800. If this item is provided in the budget with the idea of purchasing new pictures as was suggested by one of my hon. Friends Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar in the course of the Budget discussion last year for decorating the Government House, the residence of His Majesty's representative, to furnish it with artistic pictures, then I must say that with this small sum the Government would not be able to purchase pictures of any artistic value. With these few words I move the resolution."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" We had a certain amount of discussion on a similar issue last year when Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar favoured us with his views. I do not think it is necessary to trouble him again for a further exposition on the subject of art. As I understand the issue raised, it is quite simple. With regard to the question whether there is any proposal to purchase new pictures, the answer I have to make is that this grant relates both to purchase of new pictures and to the maintenance of existing ones. You all know what pictures there are in the Government Houses and those of you who have any experience in dealing with oil paintings are aware what an amount of attention has to be bestowed on them every year. It is also the policy, and a right policy too, to add from time to time to the collection other pictures which are of special interest to the Presidency of Madras, for the additions are not made merely for the personal convenience of the Governor for the time being. I understand that an order has actually been placed in England to send out three new pictures of a definite historical interest to the Madras Presidency. These pictures are portraits of former Governors of Madras and they are expected to cost Rs. 1,000 each "

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" I have tabled a similar motion for amendment. It is not my object to cut short all pictures of value, but my proposition is this : that the Government should encourage Indian art and Indian pictures. Pictures of the famous Indian artists must

Government of Madras.

SECRETARIAT LIBRARY.

Class
No.

Ch. S. III-1—10,000—7-7-23.

[Mr. T. M. Narasimhachari]

[20th March 1922]

also adorn the palace of His Excellency the Governor. I understand from the hon. the Home Member that orders have been placed with English firms for the purchase of three pictures. No doubt the three pictures will be very valuable as being the representations of previous Governors of Madras, but that will not satisfy the Indian aspiration or the Indian sentiment. My objection is that if this provision has really been made for the purchase of Indian pictures, I should certainly have voted for it, but having been informed that this provision is intended to augment the English productions, I have very great objection for going in for them, especially this year which is very lean and in which we are very hard pressed for money. So, Sir, with these remarks, I beg to support the amendment moved by my friend Mr. Tangavelu Pillai."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"There is one aspect of the matter which has not been touched upon till now and that is whether it is right to order for things for which there is no provision in the budget. If this is permitted, I am afraid we shall all be confronted with huge expenditure incurred without due sanction by the authority and we shall be compelled of course to give our sanction which otherwise we may or may not give. I think that aspect of the matter has to be borne in mind in the discussion of this question."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"The fact that there was discussion upon questions affecting this particular point last year must have induced the hon. Members of the Government to take the sense of the House before including such items in the budget. We are somewhat handicapped now in the discussion of this item because we have been informed that orders have already been placed with a certain English firm and that those orders are likely to be executed. We will be somewhat unwilling, after orders have been placed, to ask the Government to omit this item altogether and thus place the Government in an embarrassing position. At least as a matter of future policy I would urge that before these items are sanctioned by the Council no orders should be placed for them. When orders have been placed, we find it difficult to vote for the deletion of the item. I feel it my duty to protest against the manner in which these orders have been placed for the pictures before the budget is sanctioned by the Council. If I do give my support, it is more as a sort of protest against the way in which money is being spent rather than against the expenditure of this small item."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"Sir, I am afraid I cannot possibly subscribe to the proposition that the sanction of the Legislative Council is requisite for every little item of expenditure which may be incurred by the Government. The utmost that could be asked in regard to minor items is that they should be taken collectively to the notice of the Finance Committee. It is only important schemes which need be brought specifically before this Council, not items involving such an expenditure as Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000, the purpose of which is within the recognized policy of the Government. This particular item has further been objected to, not on the score of lack of previous sanction, but on the ground that it is incumbent upon the Government of Madras to encourage Indian art. How little bearing that issue has on this item will become quite plain if I give details of the three pictures which are being purchased. It was in October last that the Military Secretary brought to the notice of Government that three valuable old pictures of former Governors of Madras were in England and that the owners

20th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

had no objection to copies being made for use in the Banqueting Hall in Madras. Obviously it would have been absurd to send an Indian artist to England to make copies of these pictures. It has been ascertained that copies prepared in England will cost Rs. 1,000 each. The particular Governors whose portraits have now been ordered for are Streynsham Master who was Governor of Madras from 1677 to 1681, Elihu Yale famed in the United States of America, who was Governor from 1687 to 1692, and either Thomas Pitt or George Morton Pitt, ancestors of the great Earl of Chatham and themselves Governors of Madras between 1698 and 1735. The action taken by Government was the result of this application from the Military Secretary acting under the instructions of His Excellency the Governor, who is most anxious that the portraits of these earlier Governors of Madras should be obtained for the purpose of completing the collection of pictures in Government House and the Banqueting Hall. A letter was addressed to the Under Secretary of State requesting him to arrange for the copying of these portraits, and I feel confident that if this proposal had been put before the Finance Committee, the reasonableness of the action taken would at once have been recognized. I cannot subscribe to the proposition that every little detail should be specifically brought before the Finance Committee. This item appeared as part of the budget which was laid before them, and if any member had required further information, the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter would have given him the information which I have now supplied."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, the hon. the Home Member has stated that he was unable to subscribe to the view that the sanction of this Council should be obtained for all items of expenditure. I may say, Sir, that we are equally unable to subscribe to the statement that he has made on behalf of the Government."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"My statement, Sir, had no reference to the powers of the Council; it was an exposition of the policy of the Government in respect of soliciting specific sanction for items of detailed expenditure."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I do not see much difference between the statement just now made and that previously made. All that we are concerned with is whether as a matter of policy the Government are entitled to incur expenditure in anticipation of formal sanction by this Council. Of course the hon. the Home Member may say that he placed it before the Finance Committee."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I did not say so."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Or he may say that it was included in the budget placed before the Finance Committee. And therefore it comes to this, that neither the Finance Committee nor this Council applied its mind to this particular item, and the fact that it was included in a budget which was placed before the Finance Committee could never be considered to be a sanction. However, Sir, I join my friend in the protest that he has made that notwithstanding our best efforts, expenditure which, though small in itself, was incurred in anticipation of sanction. There is absolutely no reason why the hon. Member should not have moved a supplementary demand for grant. In fact, when this matter was discussed among some friends of mine, I told them that the expenditure must have been already incurred and my prophecy has been fulfilled. With regard to

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [20th March 1922]

the merits of the question, I do not want to say anything. I understand from the statement made by the hon. the Home Member that these pictures were about to come to India for presentation to the Government of India, and now there is to be a purchase. While I do not object to the benefit which this Presidency is likely to derive from the portraits of Yale and Pitt, two of the earlier Governors of Madras, in that they will go to maintain continuity in the Government House, I object to it on the principle that has been spoken to by many members, and that principle is 'let the sanction of this Council be previously obtained.' I am perfectly certain that this Council is otherwise not an unreasonable body. That is all that we are praying for, and I trust the hon. the Home Member will see our exact standpoint."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"It occurs to me, Sir, that much time and energy has been spent on a small matter like this, time and energy worthy of a better cause. Here is an item of Rs. 3,800 of which Rs. 3,000 is sought to be reduced. It is for pictures in the Government House. And now we are told that we should not have begun to purchase these pictures without the sanction of this House; secondly, we are told that we ought not to go in for pictures by English artists; and thirdly, we are told that all these things should be placed before the Council at every stage. If hon. Members would kindly bear in mind that Government House is after all their House and the House of this country in which the Governor for the time being is more or less a guest, and if they would remember that Government House should be worthy, as was said in this House formerly by my friend Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar, of our country, and if they will also have some confidence in the administrative section of the Council, certainly such small matters as this need not have been pressed in discussion. With these words, I hope my hon. Friend Mr. Tangavelu Pillai will not press his motion."

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—"Mr. President, when I tabled this motion I did not know what the item was really for. If it was for the purchase of pictures, I thought that it was a very paltry sum considering the importance of Government House. Now I learn from the hon. the Home Member that the purchases have been made. But the Government relies too much on the Finance Committee and other members are not aware of what is left to the Finance Committee to decide. The Committee is more or less a secret bureau, which does not give out what has taken place therein, and we are all in the dark. Unless we know what goes on in the Finance Committee, we are not in a position to know whether these items are really required or not. With these few words and because as the hon. the Minister has remarked, we do not grudge to give our vote for even double or treble the amount, just as the Legislative Assembly without a word of protest voted Rs. 60,000 for the Right Hon. Srinivasa Sastri for his expenses in connexion with his trip to New Zealand and Australia, I don't want to press my motion. As for pictures for the Government House, if new ones are to be purchased, I am prepared to vote even Rs. 10,000, but the fact is we did not know what kind of purchase was going to be made. With these few words, I request permission to withdraw my motion."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Before formal leave is given to withdraw this motion, I should like just to say, Sir, that I find, on reference to the file of papers in regard to this matter, that the letter addressed to the

20th March 1922] [Sir Lionel Davidson]

Under Secretary of State to make this purchase and arrange for copies of these pictures was actually despatched on the 15th February last and specially mentioned that a sum of Rs. 3,000 on this account would accordingly be put before the Legislative Council. If, therefore, the Legislative Council now wish to disallow the purchase, it will be possible to cable to the Under Secretary of State and tell him that, if he has not already placed the order, the copies should not be made. I may add that the purchase and maintenance of pictures is a regular item in the budget."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"Mr. President, from the speeches of hon. Members it is clear that the debate is not raised so much on account of the provision for the purchase of pictures. But from the statement of the hon. the Home Member it is clear that an order was sent without consulting either the Finance Committee or this House. I do object to sending orders when there is no budget provision for the same. It is cutting into the fundamental principles of a budget if an order is to be given without having made sufficient provision in the budget. The Government was at liberty even in the month of October, when the subject cropped up, to make their own reappropriations, and if they found that they were not able to meet the additional expenditure, they ought to have come forward with a supplementary demand for grant. If orders are to be placed without making sufficient provision or seeing that there is sufficient provision in the budget, I think all principles of preparation of the budget and the discussion thereof will be set at naught. The hon. the Minister for Development vehemently supported the opposition without seeing what was the real objection now raised from these benches. He ought to have seen the mere principle on which the opposition is made. It was because when there was no provision in the budget, when no intimation was given even to the Finance Committee, the pictures were ordered."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I should like to say one word with reference to what the hon. Member who has just spoken has said. He says that we ought to have come forward with a supplementary demand for grant. We could not possibly come forward with a supplementary demand for expenditure which is anticipated in the ensuing year. The only thing we could possibly come forward with is a resolution that the Government be authorized to incur the expenditure. But, if the Government is never to anticipate the passing of the budget on any single item, I submit that the administration will come to an absolute standstill on the 31st of March. If we can anticipate nothing that is going to happen ten days hence, and if we cannot make any preparation of any sort for the coming year without coming before the Council, I venture to think that the administration will come to a standstill. If the hon. Member who has just spoken will examine the procedure in England he will see that the voting of the budget goes on practically throughout the year, but the great bulk of the expenditure is incurred before the money is voted at all. The Government are only too anxious to consult the Council in every possible way and I venture to state that we place everything we possibly can before the Finance Committee and that their scrutiny of the items is a very rigid one and does not deserve the aspersions cast upon them. But I really think that the Council must allow us to anticipate the ordinary expenditure for the month of April and not to ask us to come before them for their specific sanction for every possible expenditure before an order is placed therefor."

[20th March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ I wish to say one word with the permission of the House regarding the allegations made by my friend Mr. Tangavelu Pillai. I may tell my friend, as a Member of the Finance Committee, that we, the Members of the Finance Committee, are selected by this House and are creatures of this House. We are not a secret conclave and we have no right to be such. We have absolutely no right whatever to refuse any information regarding what takes place in the Finance Committee either to this House or any member thereof, and the Members of the Finance Committee do not pretend to be a secret conclave. I may tell my friend that he need have no apprehension whatever regarding anything that takes place in the Finance Committee and we are always quite ready to disclose anything that takes place there to any member of this House.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ In view of what has been said by more than one member in regard to the proceedings of the Finance Committee and in view of what I said myself the other day, that I hoped at a later stage to state how far hon. Members of this House would be in order in referring to the proceedings of the Finance Committee, I feel bound to draw the attention of hon. Members to the circumstances under which the Finance Committee was constituted. On the 1st April 1921 the hon. the Finance Member, Sir Charles Todhunter, moved the following resolution :—

“ That this Council recommends to the Government that a Finance Committee of the Council be formed consisting of nine members, of whom six shall be elected by the Council in such manner as may be prescribed by the President and the other three shall be nominated by the Governor, one of whom shall be the Finance Member who shall be the Chairman of the Committee.”

“ That resolution was passed and in pursuance of that resolution the House proceeded on the 2nd April 1921 to the election of six members to the Finance Committee. In addressing the House on that day, I said—

“ The hon. Mr. (now Sir Charles), Todhunter having moved on the 1st April 1921 with the assent of this House that this Council should recommend to the Government that a Finance Committee of the Council of nine members be formed at once, of whom six should be elected by the Council in such manner as may be prescribed by the President and the other three be nominated by the Governor, and the Government having accepted this recommendation, the Deputy President who presided over the proceedings on the 1st April 1921 directed that the election of six members be held in accordance with the regulations for election by means of the single transferable vote. Thereupon 26 members of this Council were nominated, and two of the nominees having withdrawn before election, the remaining 24 candidates were tallotted for at 5 p.m. on the 1st April 1921. The election was duly held by the Secretary as Returning Officer and the following six candidates were declared duly elected in accordance with the regulations for election by means of the single transferable vote: Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar, Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar, Mr. Abbas Ali Khan, Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar and the Raja of Runnad. In accordance with the resolution No. 17 passed at the meeting of the Council on 1st April 1921 and accepted by the Government, His Excellency the Governor has been pleased to nominate the following three persons to the Finance Committee: the hon. the Finance Member as Chairman, Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar and Dr. Gilbert Slater.”

“ It would be seen from this that the hon. Member Mr. Krishnan Nayar is right in claiming for the Finance Committee that it is an entirely subsidiary body or, as he put it somewhat forcibly, that it is a creature of the House. There can be no doubt that the hon. Member is perfectly in order in saying that. The Finance Committee has come into being because this House by a unanimous vote asked His Excellency the Governor to take steps to bring it into existence. Six members of the Committee have been elected by the House, and the other three members have been nominated by the Governor because the House had asked His Excellency to nominate

20th March 1922]

[The President]

them, and it is in accordance with the resolution of the House that the hon. the Finance Member happens to be the Chairman of that Committee.

“ Under these circumstances to say that the Committee is a body independent of the House, which is not amenable to the control of the House and all that, would be wholly out of order.

“ Now proceeding to the next point, how far hon. Members of this House would be justified in referring to or quoting from the proceedings of the Finance Committee, there has been some discussion and I fear some misapprehension also. On the 17th November 1921 there was a reference to the proceedings of the Finance Committee and then, I think, it was with regard to some papers placed before the Finance Committee by Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar. Then Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar who sat on the opposition bench said—

“ Sir, I think, the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter is referring to a paper which has not been placed before the House. I think Government Members should not refer to papers which have not been made accessible to the Members of this House.”

“ In reply, Sir Charles Todhunter said—

“ I submit that, if we are never to refer to anything that has not been placed before this House, that is placing a very large restriction upon our debates. In fact, it might involve the laying on the table any statute from which one proposes to quote. Again, I have been quoting somewhat extensively from an article in an English magazine. Does the hon. Member suggest that I should not be allowed to do that without placing the magazine upon the table?”

“ Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao said—

“ May I draw your attention, Sir, to the ruling that you have already given on such matters? When the hon. Sir Lionel Davidson was quoting from papers which were not placed before this House and which were not communicated to the Members, and when I took objection, you ruled, Sir, that it was necessary for the purpose of debate for the Government to lay on the table of this House all the papers that may be referred to and that the Government had not the right to read from papers to which the Members had no access.”

“ Then Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu interrupting said—

“ At the same time I brought to the notice of the hon. the President before the ruling was given on that day—as it is in the present case for instance—the hon. Member was only reading about what happened. It is not the case of a public paper or document that he is making use of. It is a paper containing the events of what had occurred in the Finance Committee. I do not know where the question of reading from a paper comes in.”

“ Then I said—

“ I remember the ruling that I gave.”

“ The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson then pointed out—

“ It was with regard to the Ayling Committee report, Sir. I accepted your ruling.”

“ I then added—

“ Then the hon. Sir Lionel Davidson wanted to quote from the report of the Ayling Committee and objection was taken on the ground that the report had not been placed on the editors' Table and that the hon. Members on the other side would be at a disadvantage. I then ruled that, that being a public document, it ought to have been placed on the table. The proceedings of the Finance Committee are practically proceedings of this House. If proceedings committees of this House could not be referred to in debates, then it would certainly lead to considerable inconvenience. I quite see that, whenever proceedings like that are passed, it would be to the advantage of the House if they are placed early on the table. I am not prepared to say that a Member of the Government should not quote from the proceedings of a Committee of this House. I presume that the proceedings have been printed and copies communicated to the members of the Committee. It is open to the Members of the Committee to rely on them, and other hon. Members should insist on the proceedings being placed on the table.”

“ This matter came up again on the 13th December. The point was again taken up and Mr. Krishnan Nayar said—

“ I want to say only one or two words on this resolution. There is no doubt whatever that everybody in this House, inclusive of the hon. the Finance Member, is extremely desirous of

[The President]

[20th March 1922]

effecting as much retrenchment as possible. The specific question, however, now before us is, whether we should pass this resolution recommending that a 20 per cent reduction of the expenditure should be carried out. The Finance Member has told us, Sir, that the Finance Committee is considering in detail the whole question of reduction of establishment as well as the reduction of expenditure in general. He has already quoted to the House certain figures showing how the strength of the establishment in different departments is sought to be reduced. I may also, Sir, supplement that information.

“At that stage I rose to a point of order and asked—

‘The hon. Member is presumably quoting from some public documents. Have they been placed on the table?’

“Mr. Krishnan Nayar went away from the point and said—

‘I shall not quote, Sir. I may state, Sir, that the Finance Committee is considering the whole question and we have already come to the conclusion of effecting a retrenchment of about 71 lakhs of rupees spread over this year and the next year.’

“As a matter of fact, the point of order that I raised was not exactly as to what the Finance Committee did. But a document that was intended to be read from was not before the other hon. Members who were not Members of the Finance Committee and that I thought would be rather an invidious position.

“I shall now wind up. I am concerned only with the question of order. Whether it would not be convenient if the Finance Committee's proceedings are placed on the table is a matter I am not concerned with. If the Government considered that these proceedings should be placed on the table of the House, they might do so. If any hon. Member considers that these proceedings should be placed on the table, he has got his remedy of bringing in a resolution to that effect and getting it passed. It is a Committee appointed by the House and the Committee should obey the orders of the House. But so far as references to the Committee are concerned, I cannot prevent such references, and when any such reference comes up, it would be my duty to allow it. And I am not going to over-rule such references on the ground that the proceedings had not been placed on the table. Innumerable references have been made not only by the Government but also by other members who are members of the Committee to the proceedings of the Finance Committee, and I ask what the position would be if, the moment any such reference is made, I rule it as out of order. The whole position would be utterly untenable if I do that.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“May I ask you, Sir, to tell us what exactly is meant by proceedings of the Committee?”

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“That, I fear, I am not in a position to answer just now. That question would come up when the House resolves upon having the proceedings before it. What the Finance Member wants to know presumably is whether the term ‘proceedings’ includes all the discussions of the Committee, for instance, what A said, what B said, what C said, etc., and then the conclusions that were arrived at; or is it to mean only the considered conclusions of the Committee? As I have already said, that is a point to be carefully considered, and, if at any time the House wants my advice, I should be quite willing to give it. But that point does not now arise and I would rather not pass a ruling on that just at present.

“I shall now ask if the House permits motion 333 to be withdrawn.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

[20th March 1922]

Motions 334 and 335.

The following motions were not made:—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—

334. To omit the provision of Rs. 3,800 for purchase and maintenance of pictures.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

335. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,800 for purchase and maintenance of pictures by Rs. 3,000.

Motion 336.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

336. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 83,490 for salaries of the personal staff of His Excellency the Governor by Rs. 100.

“My object in sending this motion has been two-fold. The first is to take this opportunity of thanking His Excellency for making considerable reductions so far as his personal staff is concerned. It has been said that some people who proclaim non-violent non-co-operation find that they alone follow it and not others. His Excellency was anxious that retrenchment should be made in every department to the extent of 20 per cent. But we are sorry to see that only His Excellency has acted up to that policy of retrenchment and in the other departments instead of a decrease there has been an increase of about 20 per cent.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—“In my department there has been a decrease of 17.9 per cent.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—“I can claim a similar reduction in my department to the extent of 18.5 per cent.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—“There is a reduction of one lakh in my department also, Sir.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—“The only information is with regard to curtailment—”

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“I request the hon. Member to stick to the question of the salaries of the personal staff of His Excellency the Governor.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—“I was only referring to the general reductions. With regard to the Revenue Department, several posts under it last year have now gone to the other departments and therefore a reduction could be shown.

“Sir, I maintain that so far as the whole expenditure is concerned there has been an increase in the expenses by about 20 per cent.

“Coming to this particular item, I do not know if this was placed before the Finance Committee subject to any rules that have been made. I think that this House has got the right to override even the decision of the Finance Committee. Therefore, even if this matter had been put before the Finance Committee and even if we are told that the Finance Committee has passed a resolution accepting the item, I do not think we are debarred on that account from raising that point. So I wish to

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [20th March 1922]

say a few words on this. You will see that in the budget estimate for 1921-22 a sum of Rs. 47,040 was provided for and Rs. 83,490 for 1922-23. Then the question arises as to whether such an increase in the cost of the aides-de-camp to our popular Governor was necessary."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I rise, Sir, to ask your ruling on a point of order. The item in issue is an entry of Rs. 83,490. The whole of that is non-votable with the exception of a sum of Rs. 3,840 provided for the Indian aide-de-camp and that provision is identical with the provision made for the same purpose last year. What I ask, Sir, is whether the hon. Member is in order in basing his criticisms on non-votable figures."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I noticed all that and I have therefore armed myself with an answer. The votable item is for Rs. 3,840, and therefore even if this motion to reduce it by Rs. 100 is pressed and carried, it will be perfectly in order."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member is in order when he proposes to reduce the amount of the votable item which is Rs. 3,840. Because there is scope for that reduction. I would add that he would have to confine himself to that Rs. 3,840; but he could not go on to discuss the non-votable items of one Major Rs. 10,800, four aides-de-camp Rs. 32,850, two aides-de-camp Rs. 27,600 and one Captain Rs. 8,400. These are items which could not be discussed; they are not before the House. The votable portion is only Rs. 3,840 and the hon. Member is perfectly in order in asking that Rs. 100 should be reduced from the sum of Rs. 3,840."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"The hon. the Home Member said that we had nothing to do with the other things except that one item and that reference to everything else was quite irrelevant."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Does the hon. Member contest my ruling that he should confine himself to Rs. 3,840?"

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"No, Sir, no. I was only referring to the objection raised by the hon. the Home Member."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. the Home Member raised a point of order which I have disposed of."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"All that I was saying is this. Last year the total amount budgeted for was Rs. 47,040, including this item of Rs. 3,840. For some reason or other the amount has been increased to Rs. 83,500 in the revised estimate. I was only asking whether it was necessary to have nine aides-de-camp whereas—"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"May I again ask if these references are in order?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I think the hon. Member will be in order if he contends that, in view of the fact that His Excellency has eight aides-de-camp on the non-votable list, he can dispense with the one aide-de-camp on the votable list. If that is the point, he is in order."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Therefore, I am not satisfied whether this one aide-de-camp is also necessary or whether if this aide-de-camp is to get Rs. 100 less it will not be enough. All that I say is whether having had eight costly aides-de-camp it is necessary for His Excellency to have one more aide-de-camp on Rs. 3,840, or whether one on Rs. 3,740 will not do. To come to the whole question, Sir, last year, we

20th March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

were told that in the previous years this particular expenditure came out of the Government of India and that according to the various recent arrangements made, this large expenditure had to be incurred by the Madras Government during the current year. Therefore, in view of the fact that an expenditure which was already being paid for by the Government of India was newly put for the Madras Government, I would ask if it is necessary under the circumstances to increase the charge for aides-de-camp. Of course, the usual non-co-operation may come in, but I would in anticipation of that objection submit that, so far as Their Excellencies are concerned, I do not think that any question of non-co-operation comes in, and, so far as anybody inside or outside this Council is concerned, it can be said without any fear of contradiction that Their Excellencies' popularity has increased during the year. Therefore, I submit that there is absolutely no necessity for nine aides-de-camp, unless the Government show exactly as to how the increase has been made and even in the non-votable items why the present number was not continued and whether there was any increase in their scale of pay. In that point of view and for the reason that I stated that there has been an increase under these two items of pictures and His Excellency's personal staff—I mean a general increase in these items, while there is a decrease under other items—and in view of the fact that there are a large number of aides-de-camp and that during the year the number has been increased, why should not an attempt be made by conversation with the Private Secretary to His Excellency as to any reduction in this particular item? I do not know whether we can expect any reduction in the course of the year or whether it will be increased without any reference to this Council."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I shall be happy to communicate a copy of the hon. Member's remarks to the Military Secretary to His Excellency the Governor who will no doubt give them the consideration which they deserve. But I find it very difficult to reply to the criticisms upon which this motion is based without transgressing your ruling on the question of order. If I eliminate all consideration of items classed as non-votable, I can only refer to the single entry for the allowances given to the Indian aide-de-camp which as I have already remarked are identical with the allowances given to the same officer last year. If this House desires that His Excellency should not have an Indian aide-de-camp or if it wishes to take a hundred rupees from the salary of the Indian aide-de-camp, I do not imagine that the Government of Madras need raise any particular objection to the adoption of that course."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"Mr. President, if the House will pardon a personal reference, as the son of a military man I should deprecate any reduction under this head. There is only one Indian aide-de-camp to His Excellency the Governor and that his pay should be considered excessive is to my mind unthinkable. If at all I had the power to suggest it, I would urge upon this Council that his pay ought to be much higher because he is the only officer in the Indian army that is raised to that position. Therefore, I oppose this motion."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I will only say a word or two. I think my friend Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu is unnecessarily alarmed about the pay of the Indian officer on His Excellency's staff. I do not think it is the intention of any hon. Member to reduce the pay of the Indian officer on His Excellency's staff."

[20th March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—" If I understood the whole trend of the arguments of the hon. Member Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, it was for a reduction of Rs. 100 from the pay of that officer."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I understood it in a different way. It was for the purpose of bringing the matter to your ruling that he incidentally stated that it was quite possible that the pay might be reduced by Rs. 100. I do not think I should charge him with the deliberate intention of reducing the pay of an officer attached to His Excellency. But the point still remains, consistently with your ruling, whether it is open to any hon. Member of this House, without seeking to vote on a non-votable item, to obtain the explanation of the hon. the Home Member or the Finance Member for an increase in the number of these officers. That is exactly what I am now seeking to do. We find from the figures in the last year's budget and in the present year's budget that there is an increase in the number of military officers attached to His Excellency, and what we are now seeking to do is not to vote on those items but to know what is it that has led to this increase, and that is certainly within the four corners of your ruling. It is merely an explanation that we are seeking on these items. It is certainly open to His Excellency to table any item as votable or non-votable and this Council is not concerned at all with that matter, but at the same time I think it is due to the Council, this being one of those typical items, that it should know whether an explanation can be given by those responsible for the increase, and the general question has arisen, namely, whether this Council is entitled to have any explanation from those responsible for increases in this class of officers, and I trust the hon. the Home Member or the Finance Member will tell us why there has been this increase."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" With great respect to my hon. Friend whose knowledge of constitutional law we have been accustomed in this House to hear very often about, I do not think it is possible for any hon. Member to take advantage of a motion on a votable item to elicit information on a non-votable item. Let us take the case of the High Court Judges or the pay of the Advocate-General. There is the judicial administration which will shortly come before the House. Is it open to a member of this House to question the conduct of High Court Judges, or the salary of the High Court Judges, or the conduct of the Advocate-General, or his salary, under the guise of a debate on civil justice or anything of that kind? So on this non-votable item we are not entitled to question the propriety of increasing the pay of officers whose salaries are not voted."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I may draw the attention of my hon. Friend to the procedure that is adopted in the Legislative Assembly where the military budget is submitted for discussion though the whole of it is non-votable. The question of the distinction between the votable and non-votable items has been referred to and the view taken in the Assembly—"

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" There is no diarchy there."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" My hon. Friend seems to think that in case of diarchy they can do anything."

20th March 1922]

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" There is this difference. In diarchy many items are open for discussion by the Council whereas there the whole thing is left to the Government."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I have nothing to do with the diarchy for which my hon. Friend is responsible. My hon. Friends who are sitting opposite to me are responsible for the reserved portions. I am asking them why they have budgeted for more than last year. I think it is open to me to review it. Would you tell us whether we are to consent to any increased expenditure on non-votable items without absolutely any explanation at all?"

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" May I have your ruling, Sir, whether it is open to raise questions of policy of the appointment of an Indian aide-de-camp in discussing a motion for reduction of this kind? Apart from reducing the votable item of Rs. 3,840 included in the total provision by Rs. 100 or by any figure, I wish to know whether it is not open to us to discuss the policy in regard to the position of the Indian aide-de-camp."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" That is what the House is doing and the hon. Member does not need my permission to discuss the policy underlying the motion for reduction."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I may perhaps point out, Sir, that in the Assembly when the reduction of Rs. 100 in the pay of the second stenographer of His Excellency the Viceroy was moved the policy of His Excellency with reference to the present situation was discussed."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I believe the President of the Legislative Assembly did not consider that as the correct course. In any case hon. Members would be well-advised in understanding and applying our own rules thoroughly and not make too much of an attempt to follow what is being done elsewhere. The system that we are now working is different in different places. I am not giving it as a ruling but only as a matter of advice and I think it is probable that we may work out a better set of conventions by thoroughly understanding our own rules and standing orders and adapting them from time to time to suit our own needs. So far as this thing is concerned, there can be no doubt that this one hundred rupees reduction will have to come from the sum of Rs. 3,840. But the hon. Member Mr. Ramachandra Rao says that there is an increase under the non-votable items for which no explanation is forthcoming. As no explanation is forthcoming, what the hon. Member can do is to reduce from the votable portion. The hon. Member can certainly ask for an explanation for an increase in a non-votable item. The Government are not bound to give it but the effect of it may be that as they do not give a satisfactory explanation, the House may cut down the votable item which in this case is the Indian aide-de-camp. The hon. Member, Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu, is perfectly right when he said that what we are going to vote upon is the reduction of the pay of the Indian aide-de-camp. There can be no doubt that that is the issue before the House. The hon. Member Mr. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu says that that is not the intention of the hon. Mover, but I am bound to add that what the House is going to vote upon is not the intention of the hon. Member but the motion on the paper, which is in this case to reduce Rs. 100 from that portion as is within the competence of the House to reduce, viz., Rs. 3,840."

[20th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, we are no doubt placed in an embarrassing position in coming to a definite conclusion upon the motion before the House. I wish to make a few remarks upon the policy underlying this particular appointment of the Indian aide-de-camp. I quite agree with the hon. Member Diwan Bahadur Venkataratnam Nayudu when he stated that it would certainly be undesirable to reduce the position of this particular officer or to reduce his pay when there is justification for increasing it. But what is more important in this connexion is the position in which the Indian aide-de-camp has been placed with reference to his pay and prospects. I wish to draw the attention of the Council to what appears at page 67 of the budget estimate. We find that so far as the Indian aide-de-camp is concerned, he is paid Rs. 170 plus Rs. 150, i.e., Rs. 320 either as pay plus an additional pay or pay plus an allowance. That is the position in which the Indian aide-de-camp is placed and there is the status and dignity attached to his position. In the case of other aides-de-camp, it is 700 plus 100, 900 plus 250, 950 plus 300, 750 plus 300 and the captain himself gets 700. Sir, I request this House to consider whether it is at all desirable to have an Indian aide-de-camp, whether it is justifiable to place him in this unfortunate and miserable predicament. He is given the dignity of an aide-de-camp, but considering his pay he is probably placed in the position of some one of the servants of the other aides-de-camp. That is a very undesirable position. Whatever we may do, I think, it is our duty to insist upon his position being made a little more attractive than it is at present. If it is not possible to place him in a higher position than at present, if it is not possible to place him in the same position as the other aides-de-camp, I do not think it is worth attaching any importance to his position."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"Sir, I beg to move that the question be now put."

The closure was put and carried.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I beg to withdraw my motion."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member cannot do so at this stage."

The motion was put and negatived unanimously.

Motion 337.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"I beg to make the following motion :—

337. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 9,575 for purchase of horses by Rs. 3,000.

"Sir, in the current year's budget a provision of Rs. 6,000 only has been made but we do not find any corresponding figure in the revised estimate. Apparently, the amount was not spent at all. In the budget year a provision of Rs. 9,575 has been made and that is really in excess over the previous provision by Rs. 3,575. I thought the six thousand rupees having been apparently not spent during the current year, the same amount was proposed to be spent next year. But I could not understand why a further sum of Rs. 3,575 has been provided for in excess. That is why I want this reduction."

[20th March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, it is difficult to trace out details like these at a moment's notice. But I understand Mr. Narasimhaacharlu to surmise that there has been no expenditure under this item during the current year, because there is no entry against it in the revised estimate column. The answer to that, Sir, is probably to be found in the fact that details are not given under the several sub-heads of contingencies in the revised estimate figures. If, however, the hon. Member will refer to the total figure, he will observe that the revised estimate for 1921-22 contains an entry of Rs. 64,600 which is only Rs. 27 below the figure entered in the budget estimate for 1921-22. So it is a fair inference to draw that the Rs. 6,000 provided for the purchase of horses this year have not been spent. At the same time I cannot say off-hand exactly what amount was expended. Broadly speaking, the position is that the standard equipment of horses for His Excellency's Bodyguard is 72. The Military Secretary tells me that he regards the average working life of a horse is about ten years: that is to say, it is normally a question of purchasing some seven horses every year, and in any one year there may be extraordinary casualties necessitating larger purchases. It is therefore unsound to argue that in each year only Rs. 6,000 should be spent. The amount will vary from year to year according to the circumstances. There is another factor, namely, that the Bodyguard horses are purchased from the Army Remount Depot and there has been a recent increase in the standard scale of sale prices. Thus, the increase of Rs. 3,575 complained of depends on the Military Secretary's estimate of the number and cost of the horses which it will be necessary to purchase during the coming year. That estimate is regulated by the present condition of the horses now in the Bodyguard stables and must take into consideration the revised sale prices which have been laid down by the Army Remount Depot."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"I think my position has become somewhat stronger now. If Rs. 6,000 has been spent away and if it is proposed to spend Rs. 9,575 for the coming year, I fail to see any necessity for spending over and above the usual amount."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"May I ask, Sir, if the hon. Member has taken into consideration the possibility of several horses in the Bodyguard stables dying of epidemic disease?"

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"I am not a prophet like the military people."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I am not talking only of future deaths but equally of past deaths. It is not a question of prophesying."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"In the coming year we propose to spend Rs. 9,575 and the possibilities, I take it, will refer only to the coming year. I wish, Sir, some definite statement is made about it. If they die that is a fact which must be within the knowledge of the Government department. The hon. Member cannot give us any information that horses died in large number during the past year and therefore a larger expenditure has to be incurred and he is himself not in possession of the information. Has cannot ask us to assume that more horses died or became old or decrepit and so on. Even supposing a large number of them got disabled or cast away, they must have been sold not all of them could have been shot and there must have been some receipts and these must certainly cover a certain amount of the new purchase."

[20th March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"The ordinary military procedure before pronouncing a horse to be unfit for further service is to convene a committee of competent persons including a veterinary officer to decide whether or not the horse is past service and should be cast. If it is cast, what happens as a rule is that it is sold by auction and the sale-proceeds are credited under the proper head; they are not taken as a deduction against charges. The hon. Mover has asked me to tell him specifically how many horses are wanted. From the present state of the stables of the Bodyguard, the Military Secretary, who is in charge of these matters, estimates that ten horses will be required next year. Seven of these horses represent the normal replacement for one year on the basis of a working life of ten years and a total number of 72 horses. But these are not the only horses to be replaced; there are also those which unexpectedly die or break down. Any prudent administrator of the Bodyguard stables would, I imagine, make provision for nine, ten, eleven or twelve according to the present condition of the horses in the stable."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"Am I to understand then that this increase is slightly due to the rise in the prices considering also the period in which on an average horses are expected to die or become useless?"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"It is not merely a question of replacing horses which are cast in the usual course but also horses which unexpectedly die or become useless."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 338 to 340.

12-15 p.m. The following motions were not made :—

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

338. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 9,575 for purchase of horses.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

339. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 68,202 for contingencies by Rs. 4,000.*

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

340. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,10,500 for personal staff of His Excellency the Governor and His Excellency the Governor's Bodyguard by Rs. 40,000.*

Motion 341.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

341. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,020 for Government House furniture by Rs. 18,020.*

"Sir, in the year 1919-20 a sum of Rs. 1,30,000 had been provided for the Government House furniture, in the year 1920-21, Rs. 75,883 and in the year 1921-22, Rs. 55,000. That is to say, there was a provision of about Rs. 87,000 per year on an average for the Government House furniture. So by this time the Government House must be full of very useful, very nice and very beautiful furniture. Then again, Sir, for the year 1922-23, Rs. 20,020 has been provided for the Government House furniture. Last

20th March 1922]

[Mr. U. Rama Rao]

year, Sir, when I made a similar motion, it was argued that His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales was going to visit the Government House and that it ought to be fitted with up-to-date furniture. But now that His Royal Highness has come and left our shores, I see no reason why such a big amount should be provided in the budget."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, I quite agree with the hon. Member that there is no reason why such a big amount should be provided in the budget this year. But, if the hon. Member will refer to the same sets of figures, he will see that last year Rs. 55,000 was provided, and this year the provision is only Rs. 20,020."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"It is unnecessary, Sir, when during the last three years we had been providing for this purpose about Rs. 2,61,000, which comes on an average to Rs. 87,000 per year."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I imagine, Sir, that the hon. Member assumes that this money is spent entirely on new articles. That is not the case. It is required not only for the purchase of new articles, but also for the upkeep of the furniture to a very large value which is in use in all these Government Houses, including carpets, curtains, crockery, linen and many other kinds of equipment which are liable to annual depreciation and must be kept up to reasonable standards of serviceability. What really is germane to this issue is the fact that a reduction has been made in the amount originally asked for on the basis of a five-year average since the standard scale of furniture allowance for the Government Houses is fixed on the five-year tenure of the office of Governor. The normal annual sum on this calculation is, I understand, not in excess of Rs. 20,020. Moreover, during the past two years, the Secretary of State has specifically sanctioned an extra allowance of Rs. 30,000. This year we have reverted to the normal figure of Rs. 20,020, but I am informed that it is quite likely that a proposal will have to go forward to the Secretary of State to increase the figure. It has not yet gone forward, but the information before me is that it is practically impossible to carry on with the present grant and in consequence it is equally impossible to cut it down by even one anna."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"The hon. the Home Member has just now said that the Secretary of State had allowed a sum of Rs. 30,000 for each of the last two years. But I find from the budget that a sum of Rs. 75,883 was spent under this head in 1920-21, and that in the year 1921-22 a sum of Rs. 55,000 was provided in the budget estimate and the same figure appears under the revised estimate as well for that year. If, therefore, the Secretary of State had fixed a specific sum and these sums are apparently in excess over the amount provided by the Secretary of State, may I know if the Secretary of State has since sanctioned this excess expenditure?"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"The answer to that enquiry, Sir, is that the Government of India have been addressed specifically to sanction the excess of Rs. 25,000 in the revised estimate figure over the budget provision of Rs. 30,000. I am not aware whether their reply has yet been received, but doubtless the excess was due to the exceptional provision which had to be made on account of the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales."

[20th March 1922]

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"Sir, I am not satisfied with the reply given, but anyhow, if the hon. the Home Member thinks that Rs. 20,020 is absolutely necessary to keep the furniture in good repair, I withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 342.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

342. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,53,450 for staff and household of His Excellency the Governor by Rs. 100.*

"Sir, in moving this reduction of Rs. 100, I just want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that there is no attempt made, so far as this department is concerned, to reduce the expenditure compared with what was provided for in the last year's budget. I thought, Sir, the general understanding was that we should, as far as possible, effect a saving of 25 per cent compared with the budget of the previous year. Judged by that standard, I find that whereas we provided in 1921-22 Rs. 1,68,500 for the personal staff of His Excellency, this year it is Rs. 2,10,500. Similarly under item after item we find that the necessary retrenchments have not been effected. Taking, for example, the Governor's Band, which I think is a votable item, I find that between 1917-18 and 1922-23 the amount spent has risen from Rs. 17,000 to Rs. 31,000 and odd. So also there are many other items in which I think retrenchment was possible, but has not been effected. I wish to know whether the rule regarding retrenchment by 25 per cent does not apply to this department."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"The 'rule' of endeavouring to reduce by 25 per cent may be held to apply, but whether it is possible in any particular case to apply it is a matter of fact. I presume that in this case it was not found to be possible, but I am afraid, Sir, I cannot undertake to trace back the history of the expenditure on the Band of His Excellency the Governor for a long period of years. All that I see before me at the present time is that the budget estimate for the particular item is Rs. 31,200, which is only Rs. 1,100 more than the revised estimate, and Rs. 350 more than the budget estimate for the current year. I cannot explain off-hand what the reason for these small increases is, but on the broad issue it is well worth remembering that the general tendency of prices has been to rise, and unless they fall it is not possible to reduce the outlay on particular items. I will take just one instance, the question of clothing for the bandmen. That depends necessarily on the state of the market. If the price of the materials necessary for clothing comes down, a reduction is possible, but if the market rate goes up, no reduction is possible. And I cannot deal with the general issue of whether a reduction is possible on the whole vote, unless criticism is concentrated on particular items. So far as the whole vote is concerned, I would draw the attention of hon. Members to the fact that the total figure is Rs. 2,53,450, which is nearly Rs. 41,000 less than the revised estimate figure for 1921-22 and Rs. 50,000 less than the budget estimate."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"The revised estimated figure is due to the exceptional cause of the visit of the Prince of Wales, but I think

[20th March 1922] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

the reduction was with reference to the budget of the year which is about to close. Anyhow, the hon. the Home Member has assured us that the principle of effecting economy by 25 per cent applied to this department as well, and I do not want to pursue it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 343.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

343. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 86,000 for tour expenses by Rs. 16,000.*

"Sir, for the year 1921-22 Rs. 41,000 was provided for special trains for His Excellency's own use, and Rs. 1,22,000 for haulage of his saloon carriages. Again, Sir, in the year 1922-23, in addition to Rs. 41,000 provided for special trains, another Rs. 45,000 is provided for haulage of saloon carriages. When the saloon was repaired only in the year 1921-22, I do not see why such a big amount is necessary for this year also. Again, Sir, now we have got our popular Ministers and Executive Councillors who go about all over the Presidency to get first-hand information. This being so, is there any necessity for His Excellency to go on tour as often as he used to do before? Formerly he was in charge of a particular portfolio and he had personally to go and visit particular places in order to get first-hand information. But now there are three popular Ministers and four Executive Councillors and they go on tour very often. But, as I have already said, since His Excellency is not now in charge of any portfolio at all, he need not go on tour as often as he used to do. If an occasion arises like the recent Mappilla rebellion in Malabar, or if he has to find out and know exactly about any big scheme which is in progress or under contemplation, there will of course be a necessity for His Excellency to go and inspect the places. Otherwise, there is no need at all. So, as a matter of economy, I am proposing to reduce the allotment by only Rs. 16,000."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I see, Sir, that the hon. the Mover has taken on to himself the mantle of our late talented colleague Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar who last year stated in this House that when responsible government was spreading, he would not be prepared to support a policy of more touring by the head of the province. If, Sir, under the conditions which now obtain, it is the desire of this House that His Excellency should restrict his touring, I shall be happy to take steps to see that that desire is duly brought to the notice of His Excellency in order that he may give it the consideration which it deserves. That, Sir, will not, however, cover one class of tour which it is incumbent on His Excellency to undertake; I mean when he is summoned to Simla or Delhi for the purpose of conferring with His Excellency the Viceroy."

"There is one other factor which is in itself of importance and that is that the haulage charges on the railways will, I believe, from the 1st of April next be increased by something like 50 per cent. The information supplied when a specific enquiry about this was made by the Chief Secretary was to the effect that the excess would be about 50 per cent. I do not know, Sir, if the House desires me to go any further into the details of the matter. It is a perfectly simple issue."

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[20th March 1922]

“The current year's allotment did not cover the full expenses incurred, largely for the reason that His Excellency had to go on tour once to Simla, once to Calicut and once to Delhi. And it has been announced that for reasons of economy His Excellency has abandoned his usual April tour. That, Sir, is therefore sufficient evidence of the fact that His Excellency is fully alive to the necessity of economy. Another direction in which His Excellency has shown this feeling relates to his recent visit to Delhi when he and Sir George Lloyd shared a special train, thus reducing the charges from Bombay.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“I am glad, Sir, to hear the statement made by the hon. the Home Member and it is but right, Sir, that the head of the province should set an example for all others to follow and I hope all the others will imitate the same. The only other thing, Sir, that strikes us as rather curious is that year after year the amount actually incurred under this head is always in excess of the provision made in the budget; for example in 1920 whereas the budget provision was Rs. 55,000 and odd the Government spent Rs. 84,000, in the year 1922 whereas the budget provision was for Rs. 80,000 the actual came up to Rs. 1,04,050. Last year the provision was for Rs. 1,60,000 and that was not sufficient as it came up to Rs. 1,92,000. This year the provision is only for Rs. 86,000 and I only appeal that this amount is not exceeded as it was done in the last year.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“All that I wish to say is that His Excellency and the Military Secretary will do their best to keep themselves within the provision. But as it seems clear that the increased haulage charges will have to be met, and in view of the practical experience of this year the House must not be surprised if a supplementary grant is asked for later on.”

On the assurance given by the hon. the Home Member, Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao withdrew his motion by leave of the House.

Motion 344.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

344. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 86,000 for tour expenses by Rs. 100.

Motion 345.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“I beg to make the following motion :—

345. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3.44 lakhs under Demand VII—General Administration by Rs. 100.

“This motion is one of those motions which are intended to elicit information and also to find out the intentions of Government in regard to certain matters now engaging the public attention. First of all I wish to know if there is any reduction of Executive Council members next year.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“The four Members of the Executive Council do not come under this head.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“Well, Sir, even then I should think that my enquiry is relevant under this head. I should

20th March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

like to ask the hon. the Home Member whether it is the intention of the Government to give effect to the resolution of this House in regard to the reduction of the executive council members.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“I must again, Sir, raise the point of order. The item, Executive Council, comes under the next demand. The details are given at page 7 of the printed list of demands for grants and I must decline to furnish any information at this stage, viz., on the discussion of a demand which relates only to the head of the province.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“I believe this question is also relevant in this way. The head of the Province, I think, Sir, is also in a position to tell us whether the representations of this Council in regard to this matter have been acted upon though the item comes under a later head.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I am by no means certain that the hon. Home Member can claim to be a special representative of His Excellency the Governor.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“I make no such claim, Sir.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“This demand has a number of sub-heads. The whole demand is not in discussion now. It is only the head of General Administration.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“I do not wish to pursue the matter. I will withdraw.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 346.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

346. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3.44 lakhs under Demand VII—General Administration by Rs. 100.

The motion that Government be granted a sum not exceeding 3.44 lakhs under Demand VII—General Administration was put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND VIII—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“Mr. President, I move for a grant not exceeding 2.95 lakhs for the Legislative Bodies and for the Translators' establishment in the Secretariat.”

Motion 347.

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—“I beg to make the following motion :—

347. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 for travelling allowance of non-official members by Rs. 40,000.

“My object in making this motion is not to reduce the rate of travelling allowance but to suggest to this Council whether instead of meeting every month it would not be more convenient to meet once in two months. At present, Sir, people coming from distant places like Malabar, Tinnevely and

[Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan] [20th March 1922]

South Kanara in the south and Ganjam and Vizagapatam in the north are put to great inconvenience by distant travelling. The only people that are benefited by this are the railway companies. Therefore I wish to invite the House to consider whether meetings held once in two months or once in a quarter will not be more convenient. We should be saving some money also in the shape of travelling allowance if my suggestion is accepted. Of course we may have to sit for a longer period than we are now doing. I believe it would be better, distinctly better, to continue to sit for a week or ten days and finish all items on the agenda than to allow a very large portion of it to accumulate and lapse as at present. Having made this suggestion I leave it to the House to decide one way or other."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I have tabled a similar motion by which I really mean that the members of this Council should agree to take less than what they are claiming for their travelling allowance. At present each non-official member is treated as a first class officer and allowed double first class and a daily bat'a of ten rupees. These members, Sir, may perhaps be divided into two classes; those who are of moderate means and those who are rich. The rich people would not very much mind, I think, the loss accruing to them by the proposal I am going to make, viz., that only a single first class fare and a third class fare for his servant be allowed for each member together with the usual daily allowance of Rs. 10. He would not be out of pocket in the sense that so far as actual expenses are concerned he is getting that amount out of the revenues. I think as regards the poorer people like myself, they need not be under any apprehension that they will be put to serious loss if they accept a single first class instead of a double first class. I do not know, Sir, if all of us really travel by first class and I think there are many of us who travel by the second. Personally, speaking for myself, I am constantly travelling to and fro and do considerable amount of touring in the interior and I think I shall be able to manage with a single first class and a third class. I hope the other members would see their way to accept my proposal."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I have given notice of a similar motion and I would beg the House to accept the suggestion made by Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. Otherwise if we seek the double first class, the result will be that owing to the increase of fare that has already been announced our grant for the next year will have to be increased. Therefore in anticipation of that and generally considering the circumstances of the country and the necessity that we should set an example when we always cry for retrenchment, we should be satisfied with a lesser fare and follow the example so well set up by His Excellency the Governor. We see that his expenditure for travelling proposed for next year is less than half of what he has spent during the current year and two-thirds of what had been actually spent in the previous year. Therefore at a time when the railway charges have gone up so high and at a time when His Excellency is satisfied with half the past expenditure there is no reason why we should not accept the proposal of the hon. Member. It is but fair that we should show by so doing that even in matters affecting our own interest we are consistent and carry the motion. As for the exact amount we are not sure at present. Whether we shall be able to effect any reasonable curtailment or not there will be some curtailment if we accept the policy enunciated by Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. Therefore I have very great pleasure in supporting the motion."

20th March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I had no intention to take part in the debate on this motion. But having seen the turn which the debate takes, I am inclined to say one or two words. Two things have been urged before this House, Sir, in favour of carrying out this motion. The first is the one given by my friend and colleague from Malabar Mr. Prabhakaran Tampan. He said that there is no need to have meetings of this Council every month and that if we arrange to have meetings, say, once in a quarter or once in two months the amount of money required for travelling allowance will be reduced and that the House may therefore well adopt the suggestion of having fewer meetings.

"[Having stated his subject he left the decision regarding his suggestion to the Council. Apparently, he is not very keen about the change. 12-45 p.m. That is how I understood him. I am also not very keen on the subject. But at the same time, it seems to me probable that greater convenience will be served by adhering to the present practice of having meetings every month. If we have meetings every month we have the advantage and opportunity of bringing to the notice of the Council any matter of public importance, which may all on a sudden arise for consideration. For other purposes also, I think it will be more convenient to have meetings every month than to have them once in a quarter or so. If that was the only consideration, I would not have had taken part in this debate. But my hon. Friends who followed Mr. Prabhakaran Tampan have stated that their object in moving this motion is not to have a smaller number of meetings but to reduce the rate of travelling allowance."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I did not say anything about our having our meetings once in two months or once in a quarter. I am perfectly willing to do so. Even then there is no reason why the rate should not be reduced."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" With reference to the suggestion for reducing the rate of travelling allowance, I feel it my duty to tell the House that if this suggestion of my friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar be adopted, those gentlemen of this House who come particularly from distant mufassal stations are likely to suffer and will be out of pocket. No doubt Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar was perfectly right when he stated that the whole of the double first class fare is not necessary always. As a matter of fact, Sir, some of us, when we come from the mufassal to Madras for the purpose of attending the Council, bring with us our servants and cooks; so that the double first class fare will just suffice to meet the expenditure of travelling single first class and the expenditure of our servants, inclusive of their railway fare as well as other expenditure necessary for our stay in Madras. Now, so long as we are to reside in Madras only for short periods, say for three or four days, ordinarily—though sometimes we are—we are not put to out-of-pocket expenditure, because the double first class fare that is given to us and the daily allowance will suffice for the trainage of the servants as well as other expenses that we have to incur. But when, as in the present month and in some other months, we have to stay in Madras for a pretty long period, then even the double first class fare and daily allowance are not enough for our expenditure. Of course I am not speaking for all the members. I am speaking for myself and probably for some other members also. Thus it will be a real hardship to the members if this double first class fare is reduced. For these reasons, I am afraid I must oppose this motion."

(20th March 1922)

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI :—"Sir, I support the suggestion of the mover that instead of meeting once in a month, the meeting may be held once in two months and that only for a week, and not more than a week. As regards the rates, I oppose the suggestion. Of course, there may be members who travel in second class and third class and come without any servant and take meals in a hotel and find accommodation in friends' houses and so on. When there is a short interval some may also go home and return and make profit out of it. But others stay on spending money out of their pockets. For myself, instead of one first class I generally take two second class tickets and bring two servants and sometimes three, and many others do so. Without such convenience and comfort we won't be able to regularly attend these meetings. Again we are now and then obliged to stay on for a much longer time and spend a good deal of our time here. Unless the double first class rate is continued, it might drive out many people who have to come from long distances, as many of them, who are accustomed to live on my style might feel it very difficult to pull on."

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"Mr. President, Sir, as a member who does not belong to the mufassal and one whom this motion will not affect if it is passed, I should just like to say a few words. I may say I have absolutely no hesitation in opposing this motion. Sir, with regard to our sittings I should like to say that the present arrangement seems to be the best. We are constantly in touch with the administrative machinery and it is now possible to pick out holes in it and bring it to the notice of the Government immediately. Sir, in the course of last year I think many motions for adjournment of this House were made and such things would not have been possible if we met once in two or three months. Therefore, I think that what we are now doing seems to be a healthy practice, that is, meeting every month. As regards the other question which has been raised by my friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, I should like to say that the members from the mufassal are already undergoing sacrifices by way of the fact that they are all busy men and their business is affected by their coming here. Some are lawyers and some medical men. If this motion is accepted, it will be to penalize them for doing public work. If this is passed they would often be out of pocket. Though it is not going to affect me, I should say that this will work a hardship to the mufassal members, if these rates are cut down."

Mr. AHMAD MIRAN SAHIB Bahadur :—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg leave to support this motion though I am unfortunately one of those who happen to come from remote quarters. In doing so, I should like to say a few words on the subject.

"It is our duty, Sir, to impress upon our electors, the poor ryots, that we are here to do our best for them by all possible means even by self-sacrificing to a certain extent at least. Though I quite agree that the present rate of allowance allotted for the non-official members of this House is hardly adequate to cover their actual expenditure, yet I cannot but say that the loss we sustain by the proposed reduction, i.e., by one first class and one third class fare for a servant, is not at all too much to bear, and it certainly matters very little when we compare it with the high and noble idea of self-sacrifice. Even that small loss can safely be avoided if we adopt the policy of cutting the coat according to the cloth.

20th March 1922]

[Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib]

"Hon. Members are well aware that people in many places have already begun to complain at great length that we are here only to knock off money in the shape of travelling allowance and to increase the burden of the taxpayer by fresh taxation and so on. I, therefore, think that this is indeed an opportune moment for us to show our sympathy and sincerity towards poor brethren by translating our words into action. Further, it will cause no room for any one who is anxiously waiting for an opportunity to criticise that we are always crying for economy and retrenchment all round and we hesitate to effect economy in an item which touches our pockets and that too superficially. It is admittedly far from principle and reasonableness to persuade others to do what we are not prepared to do. Under these circumstances, I strongly appeal to the hon. Members of this House to see that the motion is unanimously carried by the House and thereby to set a good example for others—I mean official members—to follow it."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya :—"Sir, we have been fighting with the executive part of the Government for the last three days to cut down expenditure in all directions. I am sorry we have not succeeded, but the tendency is there. It will ill-befit us, if we, at this stage, say that we should not ourselves be a party to that. Our hon. Friend Mr. Shanmukham Pillai has informed us that he is himself travelling in second class, and I am sure many other hon. Members of this House are travelling in second class as well. Travelling in second class means that we can save about a third of what we are getting, and with this amount and with the daily allowance of Rs. 10 that we are getting here, we can fairly get on. Therefore, I do not see why any hon. Member should object to receive one first-class and one third-class fare.

"Coming to the number of meetings we are having, I have one or two words to say. I do not find any reason why so many meetings should be held in a year. To my recollection we have had about ten meetings last year. I would very much like that we should have only about six or seven meetings in a year and prolong the number of days of a meeting. It will be better for us if we have six or seven meetings and sit together for seven or eight days at a time instead of having a number of meetings and thus save a good deal of money. I believe we are spending about 15 or 16 thousand rupees every month on average for each meeting.

"Thirdly, I have to speak something regarding the hours of attendance. I am very sorry that we are kept here like school boys from 11 a.m. to 5-30 p.m. Thus when we return home we feel ourselves exhausted, and it takes two or three hours to recoup our original strength and vigour. Hardly any time is given for us to prepare ourselves before we come here the next day to discuss 70 or 80 motions, or even 100 motions sometimes. I therefore appeal to the House and to the Government and to you, Sir, to arrange the meetings in such a way that we can meet here at 2 p.m., and sit together till 7 p.m., so that we can have sufficient time to prepare ourselves on the motions which we have to discuss here. With these I appeal to the House once more to consider whether it is not desirable for us to show a spirit of self-sacrifice and to concede to the just proposal of my hon. Friend from Bellary."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, there are two aspects of the question which are presented to the House, the first is as to the desirability of having meetings once in two months or three months instead of every month. I believe so far as that is

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [20th March 1922]

concerned, there is absolutely no room for difference of opinion if we pay due consideration to the question of effecting economy in the matter of expenditure. It is quite true that several of us from the mufassal may find it convenient if monthly meetings are arranged; but that is a matter of secondary importance when we realize that in the interests of economy and quick despatch of business, it is desirable that we should continue our meetings for longer periods and meet once in two months or three months. I am quite certain that the adoption of such a measure will entail economy to a considerable extent. Personal inconvenience apart, I request hon. Members of this Council to give due consideration to that aspect of the question.

"The second aspect which was presented to us was reduction in the scale of allowances. I give my whole-hearted support to the matter of reducing the scale of allowances, though subject to certain limitations to be kept in view. It is true, as my hon. Friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar pointed out, that if a man wishes to live well and make his own cooking arrangements and bring servants, he will certainly be out of pocket. But that ought not to be the criterion by which we ought to be guided in giving our assent to a motion of this description. I shall be very sorry indeed if the example which the Council is now called upon to set is not followed by the officials concerned. We have all along been asking for retrenchment in the matter of allowances to our officers, and we have not been so far successful in our attempts. We have only been promised some enquiry as a result of which there might be some retrenchment; but we are not quite sure to what extent reduction will be made in the scale of allowances. We are not sure whether the resolution passed by this Council to the effect that the Government should revert to the old scale of travelling allowance will be finally adopted by them or not. Consistently with our attitude and consistently with the position we have taken in asking that we should go back to the old scale of allowances, I think we should, as responsible persons, who have set the ball going, declare ourselves in favour of this motion and thus effect retrenchment in the allowances given to us. I am quite sure that some will suffer; but those who have taken it upon themselves to do public work must be prepared to sacrifice to some extent at least, if they are in a position to do so. If necessary, they must be prepared to reduce their style of living and reduce their daily expenditure. I think the other course is always open to them, if they want to choose between the two. Why I give my assent today to this motion is not because I am satisfied that the allowances are more than necessary; but it is because I feel that we must set an example. Let us try and see it done at least in the coming year. I am sure that Government officers who have all along been placed in exactly the same position as the Legislative Council Members will show the same spirit of self-sacrifice. When once they realize that the Legislative Council has been good enough, and the Government have been generous enough, in giving large increase of salaries, and when we once set the example in reducing this item of expenditure, I think our example would be followed by them. I am confident that this will lead to good results in not merely reducing Rs. 40,000 under the present head of travelling allowances of members but also several lakhs of rupees from other similar items."

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI:—"Sir, I beg to give my whole-hearted support to the motion. It is very good to sacrifice and work for the cause of the country.

20th March 1922] [Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai]

"I may also mention that we have got to support our families; and we are also responsible to the parties who engage us for cases. Therefore the question of running up and down from the mufassal to attend the meetings has to be considered. It is far better, I think, that we take the suggestion of the hon. Member Mr. Prabhakaran Tampan and see that we arrange meetings in alternate months. The meetings may continue for ten days at a time. With these few words, I heartily support this motion."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, three or four questions have been raised in connexion with this motion. One of these is the question of the duration of our meetings. I am not aware of the circumstances under which the present system of holding meetings every month has been fixed. I was absent in England at the time. I am certain that it must be on account of some representations made by hon. Members, whether official or non-official, that this system has been arranged. The question of fixing the time of meetings is, I venture to think, an essential one for consideration. At the same time I do feel that it is the general wish of many of the Members that the present system of holding meetings every month is inconvenient, and that meetings arranged for in alternate months would be much more agreeable to a large majority of us. So far as I am able to judge the present system dislocates the work of those who have to come from the mufassal. Therefore, if this motion is intended to raise that particular question, I venture to think that it cannot be properly solved by a vote under this head. All that has to be said has to be said and I am certain that you, Sir, as representing this House will do your best to devise some arrangement which would be convenient to the majority of members that come from the mufassal. Speaking for myself, I have no doubt whatever that meetings in alternate months would be much more convenient than the present system.

"Sir, in regard to the subject of travelling allowances, hon. Members have been cutting down the travelling allowances of public services. The question has come up here more than once and so far as we are concerned, I do not think anybody will take us seriously unless we set an example of economy. On the question of the present scale of allowances, several hon. Members have already spoken and I think in the present stringent circumstances, one first class and one servant's ticket ought to be considered enough. I believe in the committees appointed by the Government—the Andhra University Committee and the Education Committee—the members are paid only one first class. I do not see why that should not be adopted in the case of this Council also from the coming year. So far as the University is concerned, they generally give only one first class plus some supplementary allowance to cover extra charges. I know members are not quite pleased with the present scale and I also understand that a resolution has been brought forward in the Senate to enhance the scale of allowances. I think, Sir, that a first-class fare with Rs. 10 daily allowance and a servant's ticket ought to be quite sufficient for us. I am aware, Sir, that a daily allowance of Rs. 10 is not ordinarily enough in Madras. It does not cover the cost of living and the charges for conveyance, which alone come to Rs. 6 or Rs. 7 *per diem*. On the whole, I think, Sir, that if some such adjustment is made, it would be convenient. I do not propose to deal with the question of hours of meeting raised by my hon. Friend Mr. Biswanath Das. It is a matter on which it is possible to have a divergence of opinion. Personally I would not like to sit later than 5 p.m. and I would like to get out for a

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu [20th March 1922]

stroll after that hour. Therefore I am not prepared to subscribe to the statement that the sitting should continue from 2 p.m. to 7 p.m. I think that would be most inconvenient. Therefore my point is, whether there is a change in the system of holding meetings or not, it will be conducive to economy if meetings are held in alternate months, the meetings continuing each time for ten days. Under these circumstances whatever may be the vote on this particular motion, I am quite sure of this that it would be much more convenient to have meetings in alternate months and it is necessary to reduce the allowances to one first-class fare and one servant's ticket."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"Sir, as an official member of this House, I have no *locus standi* in speaking on this motion. But for that very reason I may perhaps claim to approach this question rather from a more impersonal point of view than some of the members who have so far addressed this House. This question of reduction in the expenditure on travelling allowances—which are necessitated by the fact that this Council sits once in a month and the members are expected to attend—has been approached from three different points of view. One, a very general question and one of great importance to the House, is whether a different arrangement can be made as to the sitting of the House so as to avoid very much travelling. That of course seems to me to be a question of the general convenience of the non-official members of the House, on which it might be very difficult indeed to obtain a consensus of opinion on an occasion like this. But I may perhaps venture to point out that there is one consideration which will have to be taken into account in any revision of the existing system and that is the preparation for the meetings of this House in order to ensure that all necessary material is put before it. It is placing a very heavy strain on the Secretariats and as to the question whether a new system in respect of the meetings of this House will necessitate any change in the working of the Secretariat, I may frankly say any addition to the expenditure on the Secretariat in order that it may adapt itself to the new system is one which will have to be taken into consideration. As regards the other direct means proposed for ensuring reduction in the expenditure, I may say that the Finance Department is very anxious to receive any assistance in any way to reduce the deficit. In England, many centuries ago, there was a system of what was called *benevolences*. They were generally called voluntary benevolences although those who contributed them were apt to regard them as of an obligatory nature. If however this House is prepared to place at the disposal of the Finance Department, benevolences—call them voluntary or call them obligatory,—I do not think the Finance Department would refuse them. The resolution, as it stands, shows one way by which such a benevolence can be affected. There is a certain amount of money which is provided in the budget for meeting the travelling allowances of members of this House. It is proposed to reduce that by Rs. 40,000. If that motion were carried, the balance at the disposal of the Legislative Council for the purpose of travelling allowances would be one lakh. If then sooner or later the expenditure amounts to one lakh, the Finance Department will be in a position to say that there is no more money and that any further travelling by members will have to be performed at their own expense or in the alternative, the Legislative Department will have to come to the Legislative Council for a supplementary grant. I may say that the Finance Department would have no reason to reject that solution of the difficulty, though I hardly think that this solution will

20th March 1922]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

commend itself to the House. The real point that has been raised is the reduction of the scale of allowances and this has centred chiefly on the allowances that are granted to members when travelling by rail. No mention has been made of journeys by roads though I think there is quite a number who reside at considerable distances from railway centres. The daily allowances which are now granted are supposed to meet the expenses of the members on boarding, lodging and conveyance charges.

"Now, the question of travelling allowances is a very complicated one.

1-15 p.m. It has been under consideration in the Madras Presidency for the last three generations, I suppose. Apparently we have never arrived at a solution which is satisfactory to everybody either to the Government or its officers or to this Council or to the members of this Council. Some say it is excessive, while others say it is inadequate. Apparently both views are represented in this Council so far as the non-official members are concerned. As regards the existing scale of two first-class fares, I may say that roughly taken it is a contract allowance. One first class is to pay for the ticket and the other for the various items of contingent expenditure. I am sure the Finance Department would disclaim any idea of wishing to effect retrenchments at the expense of the dignity or of the comfort of the non-official members of this Council. We do realize that it is not unreasonable considering that they place their services at the disposal of the State without any payment at all, that they should claim to be re-imbursed the out-of-pocket expenses which those services entail upon them. If any member is in a position to say 'I am prepared to meet my own out-of-pocket expenses,' well and good. It is open to him by refusing to accept travelling allowances, to give a *benevolence* voluntarily to the State. But the Finance Department does not consider it unreasonable that the comfort of the non-official members should be considered. They do not say that the non-official members should be able to walk from the station, should take their own tiffin carriers. It is not unreasonable that they should be refunded any charges for the carrying of baggage by railway or road.

"The only question is whether the existing allowances are necessary. May I say on this point that if we are to revert to the old scale of allowances which was preferred by one hon. Member as a desirable thing, then the allowances of the members of this Council, so far as I know, will not be affected. We regard the double first-class fare as contract allowance to cover all the incidental expenditure; it may be argued that it is too much in some cases. But the general idea in respect of travelling allowances is this: 'What you make on the swings will be lost on the roundabouts.' We do not in Finance propose to challenge the assumption that double first-class fare is a reasonable way of meeting all these incidental contingencies. But there is another consideration which involves more than the financial aspect. It is not the case that all the members of this House necessarily belong to the well-to-do classes. I think it would be a great pity from the point of view of this House if any impediment were placed in the way of able men whose means do not permit of them to make voluntary *benevolences* placing at the disposal of the State their services, or prevented them from seeking admission to this House. I think that is a consideration which ought to be borne in mind. There are members who can afford to place their time and money at the disposal of the State. But possibly there may be now, and I believe there will be more in future, members coming to this House who can afford to

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

[20th March 1922]

place only their time at the disposal of the State, but not their money as well. I can only venture to point out from the point of view of the Finance Department that if any suggestion is made by which expenditure could be cut down, we would gladly accept such a subvention. But the Finance Department, I may repeat, does not wish to do anything or to urge anything which would interfere with the convenience or the comfort or place any undue financial strain on any member of this House, either present or future."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Probably it would be convenient to remember that we are discussing on this motion the question of the rates of travelling allowance, as well as the question of the periodicity of meetings. I cannot help thinking that hon. Members will not be able to dispose of the question of rates satisfactorily on a motion framed like this. The motion is simply this: 'To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 for travelling allowance of non-official members by Rs. 40,000.' The reduction may be for any reason: it may be by reducing the rates. If I remember aright the question once came up before the House. I remember a resolution brought forward specifically for reducing the rates; that is my recollection."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"It was moved by Mr. C. V. Venkatarama Ayyangar to reduce the allotment for the travelling allowance of non-official members by Rs. 30,000. It was discussed on the 23rd March 1921."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"If any hon. Member feels that the time has come when the Members of the Legislative Council should be paid at lesser rates of travelling allowances, the most obvious course is for the hon. Member to give notice of a specific resolution recommending to His Excellency the Governor that in future the Members of this Council be paid at the lower rates. A division on such a motion will be a clear indication of the views of the House. On the other hand, in the present discussion it would not be possible for me, as the motion now stands, to put the specific question of rates to the House nor could any decision to reduce the allotment be taken as the desire of the majority of the hon. Members to reduce the rates of travelling allowance. I would therefore suggest—I do not put it wholly as a point of order—I would advise those hon. Members who are keen about reducing the rates of travelling allowance to bring that forward in the August meeting as a recommendation to the Government. Then the issue will be clear."

"In regard to the periodicity of meetings I may at once say for the information of the hon. Member Mr. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu, that at the earlier meetings of this session when he was not here I took the trouble to ask a very large number of hon. Members as to the particular periods they would like to have—whether they preferred monthly meetings, or meetings in alternate months. I am, however, free to confess, from what I gather now, that though a large number of members preferred at one time monthly meetings, they have abated in their love for that system. (Laughter.) It would probably be convenient if one of the Ministers would tell us definitely what his views are in regard to the periods at which we can conveniently meet. That would give us a definite lead. I hope the senior Minister present here would do so."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"Mr. President, in obedience to your call I shall make a short statement. But, I have had no occasion to consult my hon. Colleagues. I assume that to a large extent

20th March 1922] [Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu]

my opinion may also more or less very nearly square with that of my hon. Colleagues. On the question of the frequency of meetings, I do not suppose that Members of Government would like to have them at frequent intervals. It dislocates our work to a certain extent and very often the Secretariat is over-worked. At least for a week before the meetings we are unable to dispose of any papers because the whole Secretariat is more or less engaged in attending to the business of this Council, either in preparing answers to questions, or in collecting information for the answers. The proposal, now made, that we might meet every alternate month seems to me—I am speaking for myself only—to be very reasonable. I really do not see any objection to it."

"I hope you will allow me to add one word about the motion for reduction. If hon. Members want it, they may bring in a resolution as suggested by you. I would deprecate all idea of the reduction of rates of travelling allowances. I would like hon. Members to travel comfortably, to live comfortably in Madras and vote comfortably, so that they may not be irritated when they are dealing with questions of importance. For one thing, it is very pleasant to work with them when they have travelled comfortably. The fare for a motor-car from the house to the Council Chamber is very high. As it is, most of the hon. Members must have been spending money out of their pockets. Therefore I deprecate any suggestion for the reduction of the travelling allowance."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"So far as the rates are concerned, of course it is open to hon. Members to say that they should or should not be reduced. What I mean, is, if any hon. Member wants to reduce the rates, the appropriate course would be to bring forward a resolution to that effect. As regards the periodicity of meetings, however, it is a matter which has been engaging my consideration for the last three months. I have made inquiries, and the result of those inquiries very much tallies with what has been said by Mr. Ramachandra Rao and the hon. Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu, that as a beginning we may change the monthly meetings to meetings in alternate months. I would advise the House to try that. Let us try meetings in alternate months and see how that works. If that is the wish of the House I would certainly, when we begin the session in August, introduce the system of alternate monthly meetings. But pray remember that the volume of work to be done is the same whether you meet monthly or every alternate month, and hon. Members must be prepared to sit for longer periods at a time if they meet less frequently."

"I find that the average expenditure per monthly meeting comes to Rs. 18,000. We had eight meetings and the expenditure was 1.44 lakhs. This represents the expenditure to the end of February. The March meeting is generally the heaviest, extending practically throughout the month. That may raise the average. If therefore the hon. Members are agreed, as I see they are, that we should have meetings in alternate months, I will introduce that when we meet in August. So far as I am able to see from the figures put before me by the Secretary, you could effect a saving of about twenty thousand rupees for a certainty, if the Council meets in alternate months."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I propose, Sir, that Rs. 30,000 be substituted for Rs. 40,000."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"May I know whether by the holding of meetings in alternate months, all the work that accrues during

[Mr. T. Balaji Rao Nayudu] [20th March 1922]

the two months will be disposed of in that meeting? As it is, when we are having monthly meetings, the work is allowed to accumulate. But if we sit for longer periods and finish the business without allowing it to accumulate, there is no objection to having Council meetings in alternate months."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"That will depend entirely on the House. If the hon. members want to sit continuously and finish all the work on the agenda, it is open to them to do so. So far as I can judge from the experience of the past, the House sits on an average about four days in a month; in the case of alternate monthly meetings the House would have to sit for eight days or so."

"I understand that there is a motion to amend this motion by substituting for the figure 'Rs. 40,000' the figure 'Rs. 30,000.'"

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"The Government do not propose to reduce the rates. They will go on paying it so long as there is money. But if there is no money at a certain period, they will either stop the travelling allowance or come to the House for a supplementary grant."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"We all understand the situation. That being so, I will put to the hon. Members the motion, for the figure 'Rupees 40,000' to substitute 'Rs. 30,000.'"

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN:—"I withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The motion having been withdrawn, there is really no motion on the paper."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"What about my motion?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Yours falls through because the main motion has been withdrawn."

Motions 348 to 353.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—

348. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 for allowance of non-official members by Rs. 40,000.*

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD SADULLA BADSHA SAHIB:—

349. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 for travelling allowance of non-official members by Rs. 50,000.*

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—

350. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 for travelling allowance of non-official members by Rs. 40,000.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

351. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 for travelling allowance of non-official members by Rs. 10,000.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—

352. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for books for Council library by Rs. 5,000.*

20th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—

353. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,300 for shorthand reporters, typists and proof-readers.*

Motion 354.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

354. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,600 for deputation of the Secretary to the Council to Europe to study parliamentary procedure.*

"Mr. President, Sir, in the first place I must say that our Secretary is a very able man, and he is a great friend of mine. So any remarks that I may have to make just now have nothing to do with him personally."

"Sir, it is very often stated that the constitution that is prevalent in English Parliament would not suit Indian soil. When it is so, I do not see any reason why we should depute our Secretary to Europe to learn parliamentary procedure. Our election does not take place in the same way as parliamentary elections. The formation of the Government is not copied in the same way. There is diarchy here and there is no diarchy there. Again, Sir, the Government and Opposition here is formed not on any principle; it is formed on communal basis. And again, Sir, there is no ministerial party, because the party which belongs to the Ministers very often vote against themselves. So there is nothing to copy from the parliamentary procedure. Under the circumstances, there is no reason why we must waste this Rupees 4,600. Moreover, Sir, our three Ministers have had the advantage of having gone to England and learnt the parliamentary procedure there. Our President has gone twice, and our Leader of the Opposition has gone a number of times; and the Members of the Civil Service here who know much about parliamentary procedure can give us the benefit of their knowledge whenever necessary. Further there are books dealing with parliamentary procedure. Under those circumstances, I do not see any reason why we should depute our Secretary to go there. If at all this Council decides to send a man, it is but right that a younger man should be sent to England to learn the parliamentary procedure, so that his services may be useful to the Council for a longer time. My friend, our Secretary, is old, almost retired, and it is no use compelling him to go to England and undergo hardships there. With these words, I entirely leave the matter to the Council to decide whether we ought to depute our Secretary to England to learn the parliamentary procedure."

Mr. ABBAS ALI:—"As one of the members of the Finance Committee I gave my support to the deputation. I now doubt whether the Secretary will be able to do any useful work now in England, as the general election will take place in June and the parliamentary business will be dislocated and he will not be able to learn anything because there will be no Parliament sitting. I ask whether it is not possible to postpone the deputation to next year or to some other time when the Parliament may be sitting. We see from the papers that fresh elections are expected in the months of May and June. I doubt very much whether Parliament would be sitting then. At that time, I think the members would be enjoying themselves in country places."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Mr. President, several objections have been taken to this grant, one of them being that our constitution is not based on English lines, and there is no comparison between our conventions and the parliamentary conventions. We expect to be self-governing as

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar.] [20th March 1922]

soon as possible. People in this House do not realise the importance of the Clerk of the House in England who is an authority on all matters of procedure, even assisting the Speaker and advising members on question of order and the proceedings of the House. Here, during the time that we have had Mr. Swamikannu Pillai as our Secretary, he has done splendid work for us and he will continue to do splendid work hereafter. (Loud applause.) There is no question of age here. We have found his services invaluable and I hope he will give us his services in future also. I understand that the President is going to England and it will be a great advantage for the Secretary to go along with the President as he will have more facilities for studying the English procedure than if he went by himself. (A Member: hear, hear). That is the reason why the Government after very great consideration have sanctioned this amount in order that our present Secretary may be much more useful than he is even now. It is no use saying we can study the procedure through books. I have tried to do it and I have failed. We have now standing orders for asking questions and eliciting answers. We copied it from the English practice, but on many matters of detail even to-day I do not get any guidance as to what the English practice is with regard to notice and other matters. The traditions of the House can only be developed by a capable Clerk of the House. That is why we propose this Rs. 4,600. I hope Mr. Swamikannu Pillai won't blush, as I had to recount to the House the invaluable services rendered by him."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"As a member of the Finance Committee, I wish to associate myself with everything that has been so forcibly said by my friend the hon. the Law Member. As already stated, the Clerk in the House of Commons is a very important officer. I may supplement his remarks by saying that the Secretary to this House corresponds to the Clerk in the House of Commons. The two greatest authorities that we have had on the question of the procedure of the House of Commons are persons who were Clerks of the House. The highest and the most respected and acknowledged authority on the procedure of the House of

1-45 p.m. Commons and a person whose authority was recognized by Speaker after Speaker and who was put always on committees which had to deal with procedure of the House of Commons was Sir E. May and his book on Parliamentary Procedure is even now a standard work. Then another person who was an authority and has written an introduction to a book on the procedure of the House of Commons was also a Clerk of the House of Commons. He retired only very recently and this House may remember that at the time of his retirement the House of Commons unanimously passed encomiums on him and I believe granted him a special pension. I refer to Sir C. Ilbert. These Clerks of the House of Commons were always of immense value to the Speaker in the Chair. So that, invaluable as the services of Mr. Swamikannu Pillai have been till now, I am sure they will be more invaluable hereafter after his return from England, after a study on the spot in the House of Commons of the procedure that is followed there.

"My friend Mr. Abbas Ali said that even if Mr. Swamikannu Pillai be sent now, it was not likely that he would have an opportunity to study the procedure in the House of Commons owing to the impending general election. So far, we have no authoritative statement regarding general election. For the last one year or so we have been reading about the impending general election and the general election has not yet come. We

20th March 1922] [Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

do not know how long the existing Parliament will continue to sit and the Ministry may last. In any case, on this probable contingency of a general election taking place at the time of the Secretary's arrival in England we need not reject the certain advantage of getting the benefit of a study on the spot by Mr. Swamikannu Pillai of the procedure in the House of Commons.

"There was a suggestion that younger men should be sent for this purpose. I believe, God willing, that Mr. Swamikannu Pillai will be left to us for many more years. (Loud and continued applause) and it is certainly more advantageous to send him now than to send him a year hence, when he will be one year older (Applause). With these few words I have very great pleasure in requesting the House to reject this motion."

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"If what I understand be true, Sir, that this amount has been disbursed from the current year's revenue, what is the good of providing for this sum in the budget for 1922-23?"

The hon. MR. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"It has not been disbursed from the current year's revenue; otherwise we would have to come in for a supplementary grant."

MR. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, I oppose this motion. I cannot understand on what ground Dr. Rama Rao told us that the western constitution was not suited for us."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"I said, 'it is said'."

MR. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"If it is said so, it is a wrong notion. What is this Council for if you do not want the western constitution here? Let us go back then to our ancient system when the 'king was everything and people were nothing.' This constitution has been given to us as a step towards self-government. If we go back to our ancient system it would mean only autocracy and not democracy. So, Sir, it is better that we send our Secretary, who will give us the advantage of his age and experience, to England to study what is going on in the Parliament there so that he may rectify things here if need be.

"Moreover, as to his age, Sir, you are there as President much older than himself (Applause). You have beaten all past record and the whole Council agrees that we cannot get a better President than yourself (Loud and continued applause) Sir. Indian money is being spent for sending people all over the world—people who may or may not represent the democratic views of the country. Why should not this paltry amount be spent upon a gentleman whom we councillors here accept as an experienced and deserving man" (Applause.)?

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I am afraid that this motion has practically resolved itself into a debate on the respective ages of the President and of the Secretary. I think it is unnecessary to pursue this matter any further. I am certain that most hon. Members are agreed that Mr. Swamikannu Pillai is an experienced officer and that the experience which he will gain by his intended visit to England will be of great benefit in the working of the Council."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"I agree with Mr. Ramachandra Rao in all that he said. I have the greatest admiration for Mr. Swamikannu Pillai. He has a gigantic intellect and he is one of the best Indians that was ever

[Mr. U. Rama Rao]

[20th March 1922]

born in this part of the Presidency. My remarks have nothing to do with his abilities. The only thing is, I thought, that at this juncture it was not wise to waste this money and if the Council thinks that this item is important I have no objection to withdraw my motion."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Before allowing the hon. Mover to withdraw his motion I would like to convey the assurance to hon. Members that, as I hope to be in London for some time myself, it will be my endeavour to see that the House gets a full return for any money that it spends on the Secretary."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 355 and 356.

The following motions were not made:—

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—

355. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,41,900 for legislative bodies by Rs. 100.*

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—

356. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,41,900 for legislative bodies by Rs. 75,000.*

Motion 357.

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

357. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 59,000 for translators' department by Rs. 100.*

"My object in moving this reduction is to call the attention of the Government to the fact that Oriya does not find a place in their programme. There are translators for translating Legislative Council enactments, and various rules passed thereunder and also these translators are examiners of high grade officers for language examinations. They are also translating matters appearing in vernacular newspapers and furnishing accurate information to the Government. There are already four translators for all the languages except Oriya. Sir, this language is spoken by nearly two million or more people and I do not know the reason why the Government should not have an establishment for this vast population. I know that the translation work is being done at the Ganjam Collectorate, but the salary of the translator is such that accurate translations of things cannot be had from people who are drawing that salary and doing that work. I was once the victim of a translator in the Collectorate. He had mutilated my articles in the course of translation and placed them before the District Magistrate. As a result of this, I had several warnings for nothing from the District Magistrate. I suggest therefore that the Government should look to the wants of the Oriyas and see that a translators' department is established in Madras or better arrangements made in Ganjam. It is only to draw attention to this fact that I move for the reduction of Rs. 100."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Mr. President, I had no idea when I saw this resolution that the complaint was that we should increase the establishment of translators by adding to it an Oriya establishment. As

[20th March 1922]

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

has been said by Mr. Rath himself, it has not been found necessary to have a permanent Oriya translator here for the purpose of translating any particular Oriya document. It may be, I do not know, that the articles which my friend referred to were not translated to his taste, especially if it was in colloquial Oriya or if it was difficult for the translators to understand. There is always difficulty in translating literature, not quite so much in translating enactments. Hitherto we have found no difficulty; we have had no complaints and we did not therefore think it necessary to increase the establishment of translators by having a separate Oriya translator. When the need is found, I dare say the Government will see their way to appoint a competent Oriya translator."

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo:—"I speak of mis-translations of articles from vernacular newspapers—"

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"The Government have had no complaints whatsoever."

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo:—"Very well. I say now that such articles are not properly translated and I draw the attention of the Government to that fact. Even the printing and translation of these things are not properly done. The translator is in Ganjam. The proofs are sent to him and much delay is caused. I have also had a talk with people connected with the Government Press and I found that there is great difficulty. It is a pity that the hon. the Law Member does not see the inconvenience now caused."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"May I say again that I have had no complaints at all?"

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo:—"I now make the complaint to the hon. the Law Member and if he will promise to look into the matter I will withdraw my motion."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"I may enquire, but I cannot give any assurance. If there was any complaint, it ought to have come to us in the first instance instead of its taking the form of a motion to take away Rs. 100 from this allotment."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"I am very sorry that all the complaints and difficulties that the Oriya population are undergoing are hardly brought to the notice of the hon. Members of the Government or to this Council. The hon. the Law Member probably does not know how often the poor Telugu gentleman who is kept here to translate in the Dead Letter Office comes and worries the students of the Law College and post-graduate students to get his things translated. Probably he does not know what amount of trouble and difficulty the Oriya clients are undergoing who have the misfortune to come to the High Court."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"I have nothing to do with the Oriya translator in the High Court or what a particular translator does for getting his work done. Whether he worries the students or worries himself, if the translation is good and I get it, I do not mind."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"My point is this: if you maintain an Oriya translator here, all these difficulties will be at an end. As for the point pressed by Mr. Rath, the hon. the Law Member must realise how difficult it is for a low-paid officer to translate laws and enactments. I shall

[Mr. Biswanath Das]

[20th March 1922]

be very sorry if any racial distinction is made in this motion. What I want to impress upon the Council is the needs of the people. If you wish to carry the people along with you, you should make all necessary provision for them. It will be an evil day, however, for the people and should I say also for the Government if you deny them the bare necessities, if you will not have for them a good translator to translate the laws and enactments that are passed in this House, to give them translations of the various communiques of the Government and lastly to give them translations of all that is desired by the Government to be published. I was very sorry to hear the hon. the Law

2 p.m. Member say that he had not received any complaints. I am also sorry, Sir, that people have not yet taken into their heads to come to such a distance to make personal complaints and, if my information is correct, I am sure that the Oriya Samaj of Ganjam has time after time complained about this to the district collectors of Ganjam and has placed various representations before the Madras Government to have their grievances redressed. If the hon. Member would only look into the files, he will find that many complaints were sent and many representations made on this point."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"The previous speaker has said that complaints were made to the Madras Government. May I know when any complaint was made?"

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"If the hon. the Law Member would give me an opportunity, I will certainly tell him."

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo:—"In view of the unsatisfactory attitude of the hon. the Law Member, I do not want to press my motion, Sir, but I wish to have a resolution moved later on on the subject."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 2.95 lakhs under Demand VIII. General Administration—Legislative Bodies was put and carried.

The grant was made.

The House then adjourned for lunch at 2-3 p.m. and re-assembled at 2-50 p.m.

DEMAND IX--GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 13.26 lakhs under the head IX. General Administration—Secretariat, etc."

Motion 358.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

358. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 8,604 for steno-typist clerks (reduction in the number from 5 to 3) by Rs. 3,500.

"Sir, for making the line clear to begin with, and to avoid the risk of my intention being spoken to by others and myself not having an opportunity to say what my real intention is, I will just begin by saying what my real intention in making this motion is. This is one of those propositions where, in cases in which we cannot move any reduction in non-votable charges, we

20th March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

make motions for reductions by way of censure or to get explanations of policy. I hope, Sir, under your rulings that would be perfectly in order. So far as this particular item is concerned, it is not at all my intention to get any reduction either in the number or in the pay of these poor steno-typists. I have raised this question specifically instead of raising the question of a reduction of Rs. 100 which would be vague. I have raised this specifically with a view to show that I want to get at one important question, namely, as to whether five would be always necessary even if the number of the Executive Councillors is reduced to three. My object was only to get a statement from the hon. Members of the Executive Council as to whether there is any idea of any reduction in their number. So far as the Ministers are concerned, each Minister has got only one typist."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"I beg pardon, Sir; I have got two."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"When I said typists, I meant steno-typists."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"I have got two steno-typists" (Laughter.)

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Very well, Sir; all I can say is that there are only three steno-typists provided for in the budget for all the three Ministers."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"That is because, Sir, the clerk of Mr. Ramarayaningar is not a steno-typist."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"It may be there are other people who are clerks but who do the work of steno-typists. But so far as this Council is concerned, there are only three steno-typists according to the budget estimate for three Ministers. To come to the Members of the Executive Council five steno-typists are asked for. What I was going to say is, having regard to the policy of the Council in the light of its previous resolution regarding the reduction in the number of Members of the Executive Council from four to three, the necessity for even four steno-typists is not made out, not to speak of five steno-typists. It is a question of policy of the Executive Council. More especially, the elaborate statement of the hon. the Finance Member brushes the whole question of the Executive Council aside with only one or two lines, and it does not say anything as regards the policy of the Government on the question of the number of Members of the Executive Council. I read in the newspapers—I do not know if I may here refer to newspapers—a report on the matter, and that has not been contradicted by anybody including the Publicity Bureau. It is usual when any important statement is made in the newspapers, for the Publicity Bureau to contradict it if possible. But so far as this telegram is concerned—that is the telegram to the effect that it has been decided or practically decided to reduce the number of Executive Councillors from four to two in this Presidency—it has been published but has not yet been contradicted. And the resolution practically unanimously passed by this House was to the effect that the number should be reduced from four to three. I would not have mentioned it but for the fact that it has been authoritatively stated that one post at least would become vacant soon, if not two. Therefore it is very desirable to know as to what became of the correspondence on the points and

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [20th March 1922]

whether this resolution has been communicated and recommended to the Secretary of State. We do not want information as to whether the resolution passed by this Council was forwarded by the Government like the post office to the Secretary of State. What we want to know is whether this Government has recommended in favour of the resolution or against it, and whether there has been any further correspondence on the subject; we do not want to pry into any confidential correspondence so far as this matter is concerned. We know what the reduction of one in the number of Executive Councillors means. It means at least a saving of one lakh of rupees, taking their pay, travelling allowance, etc., and also the pay of the stenotypists. I think every Member of the Executive Council is responsible for a lakh of rupees. This motion is not due to unnecessary curiosity to elicit information. I specifically mention this point only with a view to have information about the future strength of the Executive Council, and if the explanation is satisfactory, I will withdraw my motion. It does not matter whether this proposition is voted against or withdrawn. My object is to elicit information straightly and directly from the Government as to whether any correspondence passed with their own recommendation one way or the other and whether any decision has been arrived at favourable to the resolution passed by this House, and whether these Councillors may have some hope if not to-day at least at no distant date in this year of having this number curtailed. With these few words, I beg to move this motion."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, I am sorry that I am not in a position to give the hon. Member any further information on the subject because we are still awaiting orders on the letter which we sent to the Government of India."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I wanted, Sir, two pieces of information. One was as to what was the recommendation to the Government of India. If the hon. the Finance Member says it is confidential, we cannot say anything about it. If he says no decision is arrived at, or if no decision is likely to be arrived at soon, it may be useful. We now specifically want some information. It was expected very much to be mentioned in the Financial Statement but it has not been mentioned there. We request to know something about the purport of the correspondence that has gone on till now or the opinion of the Government or the Cabinet so as to enable us and the public at large to know about the matter. So far as the Ministers are concerned, our confidence in them is so great that we can very easily say that they will be prepared to take additional work, though owing to modesty they may say 'no'. We may tell them that they have no voice in this matter and that when one or two Executive Councillor's posts may become vacant, they should be prepared to take up more work. I appeal to the hon. Member to give us some more information if possible."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I regret that I am not in a position to disclose the contents of letters written to the Government of India, nor am I able to prophesy by what time the Secretary of State will pass orders thereon."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I hope that a publication of the Publicity Bureau will soon be out in the matter. I would like to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

20th March 1922]

Motions 359 to 362.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—

359. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 7,500.

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU:—

360. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 7,500.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—

361. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 7,500.

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—

362. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 7,500.

Motion 363.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

363. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 5000.

"I will only say that the reduction will be very small and if the hon. Members of the Executive Council are only prepared to follow the example of His Excellency who seems to be giving up the special trains next year, this item of Rs. 5,000 could be saved. I would rather be glad to have their intentions than our compelling them to have them do anything. That will surely be a voluntary benevolent action on the part of the Government."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, there is another aspect of what the hon. gentleman has called voluntary benevolent action on the part of the Government, namely, that it would involve voluntary failure on the part of the Members of Council to do their duties. There are few aspects of the reforms on which so much stress has been laid as upon the necessity for the official Members of the Government to be, as the Reforms Report puts it, more vocal and to tour the country and explain the reasons underlying Government policy and action. At the same time it was pointed out that the placing of non-official gentlemen in charge of Government departments would involve their touring in order to make themselves acquainted with the machinery of those departments. For various reasons it has not been possible to fulfil this part of the scheme. If, however, we may lay claim to benevolence on the score of failure to tour, I may take a good deal of credit on that account since I have been able to make only a single tour since the reforms when I went to Calcutta with my hon. Colleagues, the Minister for Development, to represent the Madras Government at the meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce. There are numerous important schemes in connexion with harbour development which I know that I ought to inspect upon the spot, but the pressure of work at headquarters has been so great that I have up to now been unable to go out and look at them.

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[20th March 1922]

"I have one other thing to add and that is that the only tour which I have now in prospect is a visit to Simla in April and May to fight the battle of the contributions on behalf of the Council. This tour right across the plains of India at the hottest part of the hot weather is not a matter to which I look forward with any pleasure at all, and if the Council will by curtailing the allotment for travelling allowance make it impossible for me to undertake the trip, I for one shall be most grateful to them."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, there have been six motions included in the agenda for the curtailment of this item. Five of them for curtailing by Rs. 7,500 and the one moved by Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar for curtailing by Rs. 5,000. I am inclined to support the motion of Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar for it is more modest and moderate than the rest. My chief reasons are that at the time of the presentation of the budget last year we definitely understood that attempts should be made to effect retrenchment in all possible directions. And we were also informed at the time of the presentation of the budget, that there will be a reduction in the travelling allowances. It will be found, however, that so far as the provision for travelling allowance of Executive Councillors is concerned, the provision in the budget was only Rs. 23,000 and it rose up to Rs. 35,000 in the revised estimate. I would ask whether in a year when effective attempts have been made and are also being made in the matter of effecting retrenchment in the travelling allowance, it is not right to expect that the Executive Councillors will also set an example by curtailing the expenditure on travelling allowances. We find that instead of a decrease as anticipated there is an increase in this year's provision. I think, Sir, the reduction of Rs. 5,000 over this year's budget provision would still provide for an increase of Rs. 2,000 over the provision in the budget for the current year. Supposing the Government accept this reduction and agree to have the figure at Rs. 25,000, even then if there is an emergency due to any unforeseen causes which necessitates an increase in expenditure, there would be no difficulty in making such a provision."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I clear up, Sir, what appears to be a misconception? There is no question of any allowance; the amount set down in the budget represents the actual expenditure and in the case of the railway companies it is paid to them direct on presentation of the requisitions given by the Members. There is therefore no question of being able to reduce the rates. The only thing that it is possible to do is for Members of Council, when they are travelling together, as for instance to Ootacamund, to share a saloon. This, I may say, is what my hon. Colleagues did when possible last year. But I don't think the Council can ask hon. Members to dispense with their saloons when they are going on longer tours. It must be remembered that we all have a great deal of work to do which has to be attended to in the carriage and it is not possible to do that unless some reserved accommodation is given. As regards the amount set down, it will be seen that the actual money spent in 1920-21 was Rs. 32,000 and the revised estimate for 1921-22 is Rs. 35,000. The provision for 1922-23 has to include a trip to Simla and back and therefore it seems likely that we shall have to ask for not less than Rs. 30,000, but possibly more. I do certainly think it is not possible to cut it lower and as I have already pointed out, we have no balances in hand from which we could

[20th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

pay any supplementary grant that may be given and we cannot go up to the Government of India to borrow small sums from time to time to meet such grants."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I may once for all say that it is not my intention when I ask for the curtailment in travelling allowance, to reduce travelling itself. But if it is a question of rates being reduced in the case of other people, in the case of the hon. Members of the Executive Council there is no reason why the system of doubling up is not pressed more and more and I do not see any difficulty why a reserved four-seated first-class compartment should not be used. The Member can get into it and work in the few hours when he is travelling."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"That is the usual practice, Sir."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I can understand the inconvenience in the case of long trips. But for short trips as for instance from Madras to Ootacamund, why should there be a saloon? Saloons cost much more than an ordinary four-seated compartment and I think in such carriages you can have all the conveniences. There is no great danger of any secrecy being violated. I do not want travelling itself to be cut. A good deal can be curtailed if saloons are given up. It is for the sake of the lean finances that His Excellency himself has been pleased to give up his special trains and he wants only a third of the last year's expenditure and there is no reason why the Council Members should not cut Rs. 5,000 by engaging a four-seated compartment instead of saloons. I leave the question to the hon. Members of the Executive Council and have no objection to withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 364.

The following motion was not made:—

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

364. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 75,000.

Motion 365.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

365. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,000 for circulation expenses by Rs. 2,000.

"Sir, I really do not understand the meaning of this item 'Circulation expenses.' Is it the peons that take round the boxes to the hon. Members' houses or what? Formerly we had three Executive Councillors and they never used to go to office. But now these gentlemen do come to office and do their work there from 11 in the morning to 5 p.m. And therefore I do not see why this amount is put here."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"This represents the cost of the contract for a motor van which goes round to the Government Press, the Secretariat, the Board of Revenue, Government House and the houses of Members and Ministers. I am sure I am speaking for the rest of the Government also when I say that we should be glad to do the work between 11 and 5. Instead we are liable at all hours to receive special files and papers with

[Sir Charles Todhunter] [20th March 1922]

blue labels, which means that they must be taken up at once whatever we are doing and we must have transport for this. When we called for tenders there was only one tender and even this amount, I am afraid, will be raised owing to the increased taxation on motors and increased cost of petrol. The Director of Office Systems is examining the question whether anything can be done to reduce the amount. I am therefore unable to see how the amount can be reduced. It is more likely it may have to be increased."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 366.

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"I beg to make the following motion:—

366. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,22,200 for Executive Council by Re. 1.*

"I am very sorry I have to move a motion for the very purpose for which my hon. Friend Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar tabled his motion. I repeat.—"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Do I understand the hon. Member to say that the purport of his motion is the same as No. 358? In that case I apply for a ruling whether it is in order."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"There is something more than that I am just going to say if only the hon. Member had waited. I must repeat my sorrow again for the hon. the Finance Member having treated the subject very lightly and did not give us any definite answer or at least did not promise us to communicate the proceedings showing the intense feeling of the House on the subject."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"The House is in possession of its own proceedings."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"What the hon. Member wants is that the wish of the House should be communicated to the Secretary of State. I believe it has been done and the hon. the Finance Member has said so."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"In this connexion it behoves on me to express that we are not only anxious that the strength of the Executive Councillors should be reduced, but that we have also to say that their pay be curtailed."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. Do I understand the reduction of Re. 1 to be intended either to reduce the strength of the Executive Councillors or to reduce their pay? Is that the hon. Member's idea?"

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"I want that we should have an opportunity of discussing the whole subject."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member intends by his one rupee reduction of the allotment of Rs. 3,22,200, which is the total of the votable and non-votable items that a reduction should be made in the number of Executive Councillors by reducing the cadre or that their salary should be reduced. Is not that the point?"

20th March 1922]

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"My point is that we shall reduce Re. 1 from that item of grant on which this Council has got the power to do, and in so doing we shall have an opportunity of expressing the desire of the House as to the desirability of having four Executive Councillors and also the desirability of paying them the maximum of salary that has been paid under Schedule II of the Act. Further we would inform them that unless any undertaking is given we shall reduce a rupee from votable items as a sense of our disapproval."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I fear the hon. Member is out of order. The previous motion was different, where the hon. Member Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar proposed to reduce the staff of steno-typists from 5 to 3. He was in order for this reason. His point was that 'if the strength of the Executive Councillors was going to be reduced from 4 to 3 (as he believed it was going to be) then there was no need for five steno-typists'. That was why I permitted discussion on that point. Apparently the hon. Member's point is by reduction of Re. 1 under this total head to bring about a reduction in the number of the Executive Councillors from 4 to 3 or in their pay. That is the hon. Member's point."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"My point is, we shall reduce the total grant by Re. 1 from those items in which the Council has got the power to do so unless the Government give us an undertaking to respect our wishes. Such an occasion only gives this Council an opportunity of discussing the whole question and expressing our opinion on its various aspects. It being a question of total grant, I would much like to know whether this Council has got the chance of discussing this question on an occasion like this. I shall certainly submit to your ruling."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member is putting me into some difficulty. The total grant is made up of votable and non-votable items. The hon. Member admitted a few minutes after he began to speak that his motion was intended to reduce the strength of the Executive Council. How by reducing by Re. 1 the budget allotment, he aims at attaining his object, is a matter with which I have nothing to do. Why I am objecting to is on the ground of principle; the whole budget is classified into votable and non-votable items. The votable grants are entirely at the disposal of hon. Members and a certain time is allotted for them. If hon. Members, instead of distributing that time over the votable items, are going to spend it in dealing with non-votable items, in regard to which their decision really cannot be final, what I say is that their efforts will get dissipated in directions which cannot be fruitful, and as a result I think the best interests of the House would suffer. That is my point. I rather fear that if this principle which the hon. Member has enunciated, namely, that by proposing a small reduction in the total of any grant he could take power to discuss all the non-votable items in that grant, is agreed to in this instance, I fear it will lead to consequences somewhat far-reaching. I appeal to the hon. Member to consider that aspect."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"My point is this: that with due respect to your ruling I would just ask the House to reduce the total grant by one rupee on the ground that we have too many Executive Councillors and that their salaries are too high. We have expressed our disapprobation of

[20th March 1922]

[Mr. Biswanath Das]

these and if the Government would not respect this I would ask the Council to reduce the allotment."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I am much obliged to the hon. Member. The motion is to reduce the total grant of Rs. 3,22,000 by Rs. 1 on the ground that the number of Executive Councillors is excessive and that their pay is too high. That is out of order."

The motion was therefore ruled out of order.

Motion 367.

Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu then wanted permission of the House to make the following motion which stood in the name of Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar who was not in his place when called out:—

367. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,22,200 for Executive Council by Rs. 1,28,000.

The Council accorded the permission sought for.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I ask for a ruling whether this motion is in order inasmuch as it purports to reduce the total allotment by more than the amount of the votable items."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu would see that the amount of Rs. 1,28,000 by which he wants to reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,22,000 which includes a sum of Rs. 2,50,000 for the Members of the Council which is not votable is greater than the balance of Rs. 66,200 constituting the votable items which he seeks to reduce, so that the hon. Member's motion is entirely out of order."

The motion was therefore ruled out of order.

Motion 368.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"My object in sending notice of this motion was to get information as to the number of Cabinet Members and their pay; but as the hon. the Finance Member refused to be drawn into it, I do not think any purpose will be served by moving this."

The following motion was not therefore made:—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

368. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,92,000 for salaries of Ministers by Rs. 48,000.

Motions 369 to 373.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. B. T. KESAVULU PILLAI:—

369. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 18,000 for Council Secretaries by Rs. 100.

Mr. M. C. RAJA:—

370. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 18,000 for Council Secretaries by Rs. 9,000.

20th March 1922]

Rao Sahib U. BAMA RAO:—

371. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,000 for the travelling allowance of Ministers by Rs. 10,000.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

372. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,000 for travelling allowance of Ministers by Rs. 4,000.

Rao Sahib U. BAMA RAO:—

373. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,300 for circulation expenses by Rs. 1,300.

Motion 374.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I beg to make the following motion:—

374. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,51,900 for Ministers by Rs. 100.

"I think, Sir, more than one reason can be adduced for this proposition. I expected that the previous motions would come for discussion so that I might confine myself only to such of the points as had not been discussed by them. But inasmuch as the previous resolutions have not been moved, I think I have to change my plan. I think, Sir, the number of appointments on the Ministerial side is somewhat too many. I shall confine myself for the present to the appointments of Secretaries."

"Now, Sir, each of these departments under the Ministers is assisted by no less than three Secretaries. The hon. the First Minister who is in charge of the Local Self-Government Department has an I.C.S. Secretary, an I.C.S. Under Secretary and an Assistant Secretary of great experience, and I think he has also an assistant in the person of the Inspector of Local Boards and Municipalities though he goes by another name now. Similarly if you take the Second Minister, he has an I.C.S. Secretary, an Under Secretary and an Assistant Secretary. The Minister for Education is similarly helped by an I.C.S. Secretary, an Under Secretary and an Assistant Secretary. It will be observed, Sir, that none of the Executive Council Members have got in addition to these any special Secretary as the Ministers have in the person of Council Secretaries. Now, it seems to me somewhat anomalous that if the work of the Ministers is not in any sense of the word larger than the work turned out by the Executive Council Members, they should indent upon the services of more officers than are absolutely necessary for them. Taking the Development Department particularly, which is after all an infant department, I do not see any reason why he should have so many as three Secretaries. The number of superintendents in his charge is certainly——"

Mr. R. K. SRANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR:—"I rise to a point of order. The amount of Rs. 2,51,900 which my hon. Friend wants to reduce by Rs. 100 does not include the salaries of Secretaries. It includes only the salaries of Ministers and some clerks."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I am referring to the superfluity of the Council Secretaries. So I was referring to the establishment already existing with which he could certainly get on without the assistance of these extra people called 'Council Secretaries'."

[20th March 1922]

Mr. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR :—"My hon. Friend was not referring to the Council Secretaries, but he was referring to the permanent Secretaries of departments."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I understand the point to be that the Council Secretaries are unnecessary. He wants to prove it by showing that there are a number of people under other heads who could manage the whole thing without the assistance of these Council Secretaries. That is the point."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Yes, Sir. It so happens that what is clear to you is not clear to others. But anyhow, I think there will be no room for misunderstanding hereafter. Each of these departments has got three Secretaries, all people drawing very high salaries and of great experience, and there is no necessity for these Council Secretaries. After all what is the work that these Council Secretaries are doing? They are entirely concerned with the Legislative Department. That was the reply given to me in answer to my question. I think they are not treated in a way that I for my part would like them to be. They have to be trained in the work, but they are not. They are not given any Secretariat work to do, and we cannot countenance the proposition that purely for Legislative Council work there should be three Council Secretaries. If they are given Secretariat work to do then we may contend that one of the other three official Secretaries is unnecessary. But so long as these three Council Secretaries do only nominal work under each of these Ministers and have no Secretariat work to do, I do not find any necessity for their appointment."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I hoped to refer to the Joint Committee's Report, but unfortunately I have not got it before me to show that the duties which are expected of the Council Secretaries are of totally different category from those which are expected in the Secretariat. The Secretariat deals with the papers and puts them up for orders. The Council Secretaries have quite different duties corresponding to those of Parliamentary Under Secretaries in England. I do not think it is any use expecting them to take over part of the work of the ordinary Secretariat. It would create a great deal of confusion in the event of a change in the composition of the Ministry if the Council Secretaries were entrusted with the ordinary Secretariat functions. If one party went out and another came in, the Secretary of the department that is responsible for the administration would disappear with the party that went out. Thus a great deal of confusion would arise."

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI :—"The burden of our song has been all along retrenchment. In spite of so many motions tabled now we are not able to go a step further and we feel as if we are riding the Pecksniff's horse always going to go but never going. This is one item where we can effect some sort of reduction. Under any financial system and more so in these days of deficit budgets, there are two principles to be kept in view. First is whether we can do without a particular item of expenditure, and whether we have money to pay for that. Judging the appointment of the Council Secretaries on these two elementary principles, even the hon. the Finance Member has not been able to enlighten us as to the actual necessity for these people. I would submit that if we could do without them, we must

[20th March 1922] [Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai]

cut out the allotment from the budget. All this Government work was being performed before the Reforms came, by four Executive Councilors and the staff that they had. Now we have three more Ministers who divide the work along with others and they have also their other secretaries, office secretaries and other establishments. We have had no information as to the nature of the work which the Council Secretaries are expected to do and are doing. No doubt the Government of India Act makes provision for the appointment of the secretaries. By all means if we can afford to have them we may but we are suffering from want and could not afford this luxury. The deficit is staring us in our face. In these circumstances it is absolutely necessary that we should adopt the principles above mentioned and see whether we cannot do without these secretaries. It is from this point of view that I support the motion."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"I beg to oppose the motion for reduction. I cannot think that no case has been made out for the appointment of Council Secretaries. There is not the slightest need to defend particular secretaries to the Council and I oppose the reduction on the principles underlying the appointment. If it has found a place in the Government of India Act, it is because of the experience of England and other countries where they found it necessary to have for the Cabinet Ministers or people analogous to them Under Secretaries, here called Council Secretaries. In England though every department is properly organized, the Cabinet Minister at the head of each department is provided with a Parliamentary Secretary, an Under Secretary and so on. Further, the Ministry there has junior Lords of the Treasury who practically do the organizing work of the party inside and outside Parliament and the Secretary has very heavy official duties. Here they are trying to instal a new kind of political institution and the framers very wisely thought that some of the younger men belonging to the party in power should be given official training as insurance for the future of these institutions. It would be therefore highly unwise to abolish it."

The hon. Mr. P. RAMAAYANINGAR :—"Sir, I only wish to tell the hon. Members how indispensable the Council Secretaries are to the Ministers. Under the Reforms Act the position of the Ministers is unenviable. They are responsible to His Excellency the Governor and at the same time to the Legislative Council. This twofold responsibility more than doubles the Ministers' work. So far as the work connected with their responsibility to the Legislative Council is concerned it is shared between the Minister and the Council Secretary. So far as the ordinary routine office work is concerned the permanent secretary attends to it. Sir, in these circumstances it is absolutely necessary that there should be Council Secretaries to help the Ministers. As to the advantage of the appointment as a source of training to the future members, my friend, Mr. C. R. Reddi, has eloquently pointed out. In the course of events it is essential that young men should be trained so that they may be qualified to be Ministers in time to come. Sir, I do not think there is any force in the arguments advanced by the hon. Members from Bellary and Anantapur."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"Mr. President, Sir, all these days I was thinking of the conduct of the hon. Ministers and I was not able to find out the clue. To-day from the speech of the hon. Minister I am able

[Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju] [20th March 1922]

to find out the clue for so many failures on the part of the Ministry. The first thing is that they have got a double responsibility, responsibility to the Governor and responsibility to the elected members of the Legislative Council. I am not able to understand the first statement that they owe a responsibility to His Excellency. It is nowhere stated that the Ministers are responsible to His Excellency so far as I understand the constitution. His Excellency is to act with the advice of the hon. Ministers. The Ministers are to represent the views of their constituency or the views of their party but they do not owe any responsibility to His Excellency. His Excellency, as I said, has only to take the advice of the Ministers, to take it or refuse it. If the Governor takes the views, it is well and good. If he does not, it is for His Excellency to do away with the Minister or for the Minister to send in his resignation. If that is the correct principle as I understand it to be, I hope the hon. Ministers will not say that they are responsible to His Excellency at all."

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB :—"I beg to oppose the motion. As has been pointed out by Mr. C. R. Reddi the object of this provision for the appointment of Council Secretaries in the Government of India Act is to afford a training ground for young members of the Legislative Council so that they may in course of time be able to deal with the big problems of administration. The Council Secretaries are now paid only Rs. 500 and my friend Dr. Subbarayan who was a Council Secretary till now was holding that office not for the salary attached to it but for the opportunity it afforded him in making himself quite at home with the problems of administration. As this is a healthy institution I oppose the motion for its abolition."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I am sorry, Sir, that the discussion has turned upon the existence or non-existence of the Council Secretaries upon this motion for a reduction of Rs. 100. I hear a voice from the opposite side: 'What else is there?' I would remind the Council that the appointment of Council secretaries costs us no more than Rs. 18,000. Even accepting this provision for secretaries, we can still vote upon the motion before us. The only point which has been raised by means of this motion is the whole appointment and establishment of the Ministers rather than any specific question intended to reduce the expenditure. We realize the difficulties under which the Ministers are labouring and the circumstances under which they work. The system itself is a peculiar one and it is in the course of experiment. We must therefore make full allowance for the various difficulties they have to work under, difficulties created by the situation itself. Now that we are discussing the budget the only aspect which I wish the House to consider is as to the feeling in the country, the feeling in this Council and the feeling of almost all the non-official members of this House that we should effect retrenchment in public expenditure to the utmost extent possible. I have not the slightest doubt that the Ministers themselves as representing the people and the tax-payers are in their own way as anxious as anyone else to reduce expenditure to the lowest possible extent so as to satisfy the people at large. But, Sir, notwithstanding the meagre attempts made during the last two or three days since we began the voting of grants, if notwithstanding the few attempts that we are going to make in the few days that yet remain to consider this matter, I am fairly certain that we are not likely to achieve

20th March 1922] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

substantially good results in the way of effecting retrenchment of expenditure. The cry has gone all round that increase in expenditure began at the top without due consideration to the expenses of the whole machinery of administration. Retrenchment to a small extent has been effected here and there, be it in the matter of some duty allowances or be it in the matter of 2½ per cent in some branches like the forest; but we cannot satisfy the public at large by the results we are going to achieve. That is my impression even after making due allowance for the reductions that we are going to make even in the days to come, As I stated in the beginning, the hon. Ministers, I am quite confident, are equally anxious to reduce expenditure. But unfortunately owing to whatever reasons, they have not been able to show good results as they ought to have, even after we make full allowance for the difficulties of the situation, the voting upon grants which has been going on during these two or three days should have convinced every one that the complicated machinery which has led to a sort of, shall I say, combination or mutual understanding between one branch of Government and other has led to this state of things. May I draw the attention of the Council to some motions for reduction of the allotment of which notices had been given by, shall I call, the Ministerialist party, which it has been found necessary not to press to the extent they could or should have been, owing to the defects of the existing system? I frankly think that it is not due to any intention of the party to which the Ministers belong but that is due to the difficulties under which the Ministers are working. Sir, the chief difficulty is this. It has become necessary for one part of the Cabinet to co-operate with the other in various matters of administration. Their intentions apart, it has not been possible for them—probably the system is more to blame—to make reduction of grants or to press the reserved half of Government to make other reductions to the extent to which people at large, even their own constituents, would desire. This is largely responsible for our failure to effect retrenchment to a substantial extent, to the extent to which we would all desire. I may state at the same time that though the question of the Council Secretaries has been brought into prominence, it cannot be so much for the sake of expenditure that it costs us. I should say at once that the pay is far too little to be thought of. I never dreamt from the beginning of the Reformed Council that we would have Council Secretaries on a poor pay of Rs. 500. I must, in fairness, state that it should be with considerable degree of inconvenience that they must have consented to accept the office. But the hon. the Finance Member who gave us an idea of the work which the permanent secretaries have to do and the work of the Council Secretaries, has not been in a position to enlighten us as to whether, according to the original scheme of the Act, any specific duties, independent duties have been entrusted to the Council Secretaries on the lines on which the permanent Secretaries are expected to work."

(At this stage the time-limit was over and the bell was rung.)

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"A minute more and I have done."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I fear we will have to enforce the time-limits with some strictness."

The hon. Member, Mr. Krishna Rao, resumed his seat.

[20th March 1922]

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“ Mr. President, 3-45 p.m. the complaint of my hon. Friend from Nellore was that owing to certain circumstances, this Council has not been able to reduce substantially certain demands. May I respectfully submit, Sir, that the reason which he has given is not the correct one? The sole reason, at least the chief reason, was that the budget as prepared takes account only of our minimum requirements. Everything was cut down first by the departments, next by the ministers and members, then in that secret body, to call it by that name—it is no longer secret, Sir—the Finance Committee, and lastly in the Cabinet itself. That is the reason, Sir, why it is not possible for this House to cut it still further. And if my hon. Friend should think that members on this side of the House had abstained from cutting down the reserved side of the expenditure because they wanted to preserve harmony between the reserved half and the transferred half, then, Sir, I should say that it is a matter worthy of imitation by the other side. (Hear, hear.)

“ Coming now, Sir, to the Council Secretaries and to the speeches of my friends from Bellary and Anantapur and from Vizagapatam and coming lastly to my friend Mr. Narasimha Raju, may I say, Sir, that he was deploring, or rather endeavouring to discover the reasons, why there should have been so many failures on the part of the ministers and what the reasons for these failures were? My hon. Friend was not able to tell us what the failures were, but he has discovered a reason and that is an admission from my hon. Friend that there is a double responsibility imposed on us, the responsibility we owe to His Excellency the Governor and that due to this Council, but my friend thinks that we owe no responsibility at all to His Excellency. I always thought, Sir, that next to my friend who comes from the same district as myself, my friend Mr. Narasimha Raju who comes from the neighbouring district was an authority on constitutional matters and that he was well versed in the provisions of the Government of India Act. But the Government of India Act and the rules framed thereunder make it clear that we are responsible to His Excellency. For one thing we can be dismissed by His Excellency. For another thing we cannot pass anything of importance without his consent, and I would draw his attention to section 52 of the Act.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“ I have mentioned both these points, Sir, that His Excellency can dismiss them and also that His Excellency has to act in consultation with the ministers.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“ If under the Act, His Excellency has more powers than those which my friend conceives of and, if we are in any sense to abide by his advice or his orders, then, I suppose, Sir, it is rightly called a responsibility. It may be that my hon. friend's conception of responsibility is different from mine or that of my friends here; but I consider, Sir, that where we have to abide by the decision or yield to the wishes of a particular person, then a responsibility for doing so is imposed on us.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“ Sir, I have already mentioned my interpretation of the Government of India Act. It is for His Excellency to act and it is for the ministers to advise His Excellency. According to the Act, the ministers by themselves have no independent right to act.”

20th March 1922]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I very much doubt whether this general question about the constitution really arises on this motion regarding the need for Council Secretaries. I do not say that it is wholly out of order, I am not in a position to say that, but I would appeal to the House to consider that, if we are going to discuss the whole question about ministers on this small issue, it may not be able to finish within the time-limit.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“ I bow to your ruling, Sir. I was only replying to my friends on the other side, but I will not pursue it further.

“ Coming next, Sir, to my friends from Bellary and Anantapur, I think a sufficient answer has been given to them both by my hon. Friend for the University and by my friend Mr. Ramarayaningar. If hon. Members would remember what I said on the occasion of the appointment of these Council Secretaries, these Council Secretaries are expected to do three things. The first is, as has already been mentioned by my hon. Friend for the University, their employment is educational, if I may use the expression, in that it is meant for training younger members of this House for higher responsibilities; secondly, Sir, they help to keep the ministers in touch with the members of the House; thirdly, they are expected to assist us in the discharge of our work connected with the Legislative Council. May I take this opportunity of mentioning to this House that in all these responsibilities our Council Secretaries have been of immense use to all of us? (Hear, hear.) I may take this opportunity also, Sir, to mention in this House that I received equal help from my former Secretary, Dr. P. Subbarayan (Hear, hear), and if he has resigned, it was because his estate needed his presence urgently and not because of anything else or any other reason. Now, as regards the other Council Secretaries, Sir, we have been receiving from them such assistance as it was possible for them to render, or for us to receive. As for education, of course it is not for me to say how far they are being trained; but this House, if not to-day, will one day own that they are in their proper places.”

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—“ I move that the question be now put.”

The motion for the closure was put and carried.

The main motion to reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,51,900 for Ministers by Rs. 100 was then put and lost.

Motion 375.

The next motion on the agenda stood in the name of Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar and it read as follows :—

375. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 91,620 for salaries by Rs. 100.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I put that motion, Sir, simply to call the attention of the House so far as the appointment of the Special Commissioner for Malabar is concerned. His full pay seems to be non-votable and I do not know if I will be in order in moving this.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Ordinarily when a motion is in the agenda an hon. Member may go on, subject to some other hon. Member rising to a point of order.”

[20th March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I rise to a point of order, Sir. The point of order is this : that if the hon. Member wishes to discuss the appointment of the Special Commissioner for Malabar, the grant for that purpose is non-votable. I may add, Sir, that he never gave me any indication of his intention to do so."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I should like to know definitely what the point is that the hon. Member wants to raise in that motion."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Sir, my intention was simply to call the attention of the House to the policy underlying the appointment of the Special Commissioner."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Then I do not think you can go on."

The motion was not made.

Motion 376.

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—" I beg to move the following :—

376. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,512 for establishment of the Special Commissioner for Malabar Affairs.*

" Sir, my object in moving this reduction is not so much the omission of Rs. 1,512 as the abolition of the appointment of the Special Commissioner for Malabar. But that being a non-votable item, I thought a motion such as this would give the House an opportunity to express its opinion with regard to this appointment.

" Sir, in November last, when Mr. Knapp was appointed Special Commissioner for Malabar Affairs, there might have been so bad as to justify such an appointment. But now that things have quieted down and normal conditions have been restored, there is no need to continue the place and also in view of the fact that Mr. Knapp is reverting to the Executive Council when the hon. the Home Member retires, I would urge upon the Government not to appoint a new officer in his place as Special Commissioner for Malabar. What we want there is not a Special Commissioner, but two or three deputy tahsildars specially deputed for each taluk in the affected area, who will go round the villages, create a sort of confidence and sense of security among the villagers and find out the real wants of the people. They may also be authorized to receive applications for loans and suggest specific means for restoration and reconstruction. From what I have been able to gather, it is officers like this and not a Special Commissioner of the type of Mr. Knapp that we want. I therefore make this motion."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Sir, I think I may set the hon. Member's mind at rest by saying that there is no present intention of continuing the appointment. The only effect of carrying the resolution would be to deprive the Commissioner's staff of their pay till the end of March.

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 377.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

377. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,512 for clerks and peons for Special Commissioner for Malabar Affairs.*

20th March 1922]

Motion 378.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Sir, I beg to move the following :—

378. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 19,600 for an assistant secretary by Rs. 6,000.*

" Sir, after having had no reduction at all from this morning, I expect to get some reduction now. This deals with the Finance Department. My motion is to reduce the allotment by Rs. 6,000. It may be to reduce the allotment from the two assistant secretaries by Rs. 6,000 from out of their pay. If we turn to page 72 of the budget, we will find that the appointment of the Finance Secretary is a non-votable item. Then comes an assistant secretary on Rs. 1,000—50—1,200 and another assistant secretary on Rs. 500, both of these being bracketted for Rs. 19,600. Then we have got a temporary additional assistant secretary, six superintendents and so on.

" What I would say is that when we have got an able finance secretary and an able assistant secretary also and six superintendents to help him and an additional temporary assistant secretary at the time of the budget discussion, probably there is no need for another assistant secretary. Of course, if it is found necessary that temporary hands are essential, that might be provided for, I think, in ordinary circumstances either by the Cabinet itself or by the Finance Committee or by the individual members concerned. I do not think there will be any necessity hereafter for a large number of assistant secretaries to deal with every department, as the hon. the Finance Member says he does, throughout the year. Therefore, the reduction mentioned of taking away one assistant secretary out of the two permanent secretaries when there is already a provision for six superintendents to help them, is very small. It is the superintendents who practically do the whole work of the assistant secretaries. There is no necessity for duplicating these assistant secretaries throughout the year. Therefore, Sir, I think this small reduction can be made merely for the sake of reduction. I think the hon. the Finance Member will have no objection for taking away this six thousand rupees for this assistant secretary. So I move that the assistant secretary's post be abolished."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—" I am afraid, Sir, that the speech of the hon. Mover of this resolution has come as a great disappointment to the Finance Department. There were two boons which we

were anxiously waiting for at the hands of the hon. Members of this Council. One is that 'open sesame' which will open to us new methods and plans of getting wealth to supply our financial deficiencies. Next, Sir, we were anxiously waiting to hear from the hon. the Mover of this resolution a practical proposal, to enable us to reduce the work in the Finance Department so as to enable this resolution to be given effect to. But he said nothing from that point of view. He made no suggestions at all. If I may say so, the hon. Member reminded me of a gentleman—one Pharoah—of whom we read as having given instructions that his subjects should be forced to make bricks without straw being supplied and saying, 'And the tale of the bricks which they did make heretofore ye shall lay upon them! Ye shall not diminish ought thereof; for they be idle.' Now, seriously I will ask the House if a motion of this kind ought to have been so lightly moved and dealt with in such a casual manner as it has been dealt with by the hon.

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

[20th March 1922]

Mover. I think the House realizes that under the reforms the position in respect of its business has very considerably altered. There is a new centre of gravity. The financial powers given to this House have very largely superseded other means of influencing the Government. The influence which in former days were attached to resolutions of the House is now attached to the discussion on financial issues and on the budget. The influence which this House exercised then was indirect. Under the reforms financial powers have become a direct weapon which they can wield as they wish. And that altered position has necessarily been reflected in the work of the department which deals with finance. There are further two committees of this House with which the Finance Department is directly concerned. The Public Accounts Committee has not yet got the work, but we are just closing the accounts of the first year and the Finance Department have to prepare for the work which is to be put before that committee. We have also during the last few months been dealing directly and almost daily with the Finance Committee, the members of which at least, though not all the members of the House, have the same knowledge and, I am sure, they realize the immense amount of work that has been thrown upon the Finance Department in connexion with the work of their committee. Such an amount of work was quite unknown before the reforms. Now, I think, I am entitled to say this that the credit of the Madras Finance Department stands very high in India and its work would challenge comparison with that of any provincial government and even with that of the Government of India itself (hear, hear). There is no province in which more particular care is taken to enforce financial standards, financial rules and financial procedure, and there is no province in India in which budgets have been more carefully and more accurately prepared. I have heard of that fact acknowledged by great authorities, from officers who have been with the Government of India and who are in a position to speak. Now, this year we were really at one time afraid in the Finance Department that we might have a set back and that we should fail to maintain that tradition and the reputation of the department. I can only say in connexion with the budget that we are now discussing that the work of the department was finished at 2-30 a.m. on the morning of the day on which the budget was presented to this House. I would add that the work in preparation for the budget broke down entirely for the time being the health of one of those assistant secretaries whom the hon. the Mover seeks to reduce, while another assistant secretary is already feeling the strain both mental and physical to such an extent that he is seriously thinking of asking to be relieved. The fact is that the conditions under which the Finance Department has been working during the last few months have been to say the least intolerable. It is all very well to say that the pressure is confined to a particular season. There is no longer any point in that; it is no longer the case. As soon as this budget is over the whole department will have to sit down and concentrate its attention on the inevitable arrears that are accumulated owing to its energies having had to be devoted almost solely to the budget. If I may say so there is a limit to which the Council can ask either the Secretaries of Government to become slave drivers or their subordinates to overwork. The conditions in the last few months have, I am sorry to say, been closely akin to slavery. So far as I know not one clerk, not one superintendent, not one assistant secretary has enjoyed either a Sunday, a last Saturday in the month or any other holiday. Whether there were gazetted holidays or not has become a

20th March 1922]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

matter of entire indifference so far as these officers were concerned. The hon. Member who moved this motion possibly intends or expects to remain only an independent and irresponsible critic; but I would appeal to those who are more or hope to be more, is it good for the Reforms, for the administration, for the prospects of new lines of policy which may be laid down by this Council but can only be carried into effect by the hearty co-operation of the administrative services, that they should be driven to a state of sullen discontent by this continuous threat of more work and less pay coupled with the supreme and unwarranted insult 'for ye be idle'?"

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" I oppose this motion for the reduction of grant. I can bear testimony to what the hon. the Finance Secretary said as to the amount of work and the amount of straw which is required to bake a brick. For it is only to-day that I received a communication from him in answer to an enquiry I made on the 12th December as to the amount of salaries that were drawn by the various establishments in 1908-1909, 1918-19 and 1921-22. What was asked for on the 12th December they have had to prepare and finish only on the 18th of March in the midst of their multifarious duties. It shows these interesting figures of salaries and travelling allowances. In the year 1908 it was 395 lakhs; it rose to 524 lakhs in 1918-19 and in the current year it stands at 835 lakhs of rupees. It shows that while before the Reforms the levy was easier it has gone so high after that. The difference of 311 lakhs represents the price of the Reforms. So I do appreciate that they have a lot of work. Their services could be utilized in this way. Services of this kind should be rendered with much care. There is a good deal of work to be done and so we will not be justified in our policy in cutting down the salary of one assistant secretary. Under these circumstances I agree that there is a lot to be done, a lot of useful information they can give to enable ourselves to go about in such a manner that we can effect sound retrenchment."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I wish to oppose this motion Sir. I have seen something of the extreme pressure under which the Financial Department is working. For the last two or three months particularly, the whole of the Finance Department from the Finance Member downwards (I had very many opportunities of seeing the work which was being done in this section of the Secretariat) has been working day and night. It is not surprising that under this pressure of work Mr. K. Gopalakrishnayya, had to take leave for the purpose of taking rest. No doubt, it may be said and probably to some extent truly, that the pressure of work during the budget season is greater than the other seasons. But even making ample allowance for the extra pressure then, in other seasons also the pressure on the Financial section of the Secretariat is necessarily very heavy. The only amount that can be saved if this motion is carried is a comparatively paltry sum of Rs. 6,000. But the effect of the mistakes that are likely to be perpetrated in the absence of the necessary staff in the Finance Department is very great. For these reasons, Sir, I oppose this motion."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" The two assistant secretaries of the Finance Department are not engaged all the time in finance work. It is not generally known that the Finance Department is attending besides finance to other work also. An endeavour has been made to keep in the hands of the Finance Member all those things which do

4-15 p.m.

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[20th March 1922]

not involve the spending of provincial money. He is not in charge of any spending department, but he has in his hands everything of a general nature and everything in which this Government is an agent for the Central Government. That includes such sections as reorganizations of establishments, record offices, questions relating to forms, the whole of stationery and printing,—the Finance Secretary is the head of the department in the case of the Government Press—archæology, meteorology, income-tax, customs, marine, salt, posts and telegraphs, telephones and so on. The amount of work outside finance is quite sufficient to keep one assistant secretary employed all the year round though, as a matter of fact, we have to make him do some finance work as well. We really ought to have one assistant secretary for this work and another for finance work except in the budget season when we should have an additional man. I have already referred in my budget speech to the fact that, from about the 1st of October to the middle of November, we have been getting estimates from 75 heads of departments which have to be checked by the Accountant-General, the administrative departments, the Finance Department, the Finance Committee and the Cabinet. I think hon. Members will realize that from what my hon. Colleagues both in the reserved and transferred departments have said that the discussions on these estimates involve a very large amount of discussion between the Finance Department and the departments concerned. I think I have already mentioned the fact that our budget notes are printed in this little volume which runs up to 904 pages of printed matter."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I know if the document which the hon. the Finance Member refers to has been placed on the table?" (Laughter.)

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I believe the hon. Member is not quoting from it but he is simply referring to it." (Laughter.)

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"In addition to all this we have greatly improved our budget procedure in the endeavour to avoid all lump allotments, probable savings and so forth and to put down exact figures wherever we possibly can. But all this means an enormous amount of work. If we are not correct in our adjustments, we shall have to come up often for supplementary grants. Meanwhile the Finance Committee meets frequently and we have to prepare elaborate notes for them. We have given them in all information covering over 80 pages of printed matter—80 pages of calculation, not simple, straightforward writing. Any decision of that committee means not an alteration under one single head but throughout the volumes so that the clerks concerned are engaged in keeping the alteration going on right through. When we get to the stage of bringing out the budget the work increases enormously and, as Mr. Moir has pointed out it was not until 3 a.m. of the morning of the day on which the budget was presented that it was ready. I was myself here till 11 o'clock on the previous night. I can assure the Council that we are not idling away our time or living an easy life. We really cannot carry on our work if one assistant secretary is taken away. If the Council wishes to press this, all that I can say is that I will have to evolve a simpler system of procedure which will involve in our having to decline to provide a great deal of the statistical information which is now asked for and provided."

20th March 1922]

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I have got one or two words to say in reply to Mr. Moir. We must take that those days when we were not properly answered and when we were asked to look for ourselves are now gone. Our European friends like Mr. Moir must realize this and there is no use of abuse and anger. Certainly the Finance Committee is an important committee and the members of that committee are naturally expected to know about the work that is being done in that department. Those of us who are not members of the committee have also to get the information. There is no use of anybody getting angry and saying, as in the case of discussion on allowances, that we know nothing and also their saying 'we know our business better than you know and whatever you may do, we know what to do'."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I venture to say, Sir, that with reference to the question of allowances, my attitude has not been that 'we refuse information, that Members know nothing'. My attitude has been that I am willing to place before any hon. Member who will interest himself in the matter, every possible piece of information."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I am not speaking of the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter whose attitude is always conciliatory. I am referring to Mr. Moir's speech with regard to the allowances."

Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"I do not remember having said anything about allowances."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I am referring to his speech in regard to duty allowances. Anyhow so far as the present thing is concerned, I only wanted to have information as to what these people were really doing. Making bricks with straw or without straw is a matter which has absolutely nothing to do in India where bricks are made without straw and I hope Mr. Moir will adopt a new policy of following the machinery where the brick is made without straw. Every member who is here realizes his own position and responsibility and needs no teaching at all. Coming to this motion, all I can say is that I wanted information about this matter; and all the members who have spoken seem to have forgotten what I said. I said that probably at the time of the budget there may be need even for another additional assistant secretary. All that I could gather from the previous speakers is that members of the staff will be put to a considerable strain during the budget season for three months."

Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"That is not a correct interpretation of my statement, Sir. I said that the pressure did not cease with the budget season and after the budget season was over the Finance Department had to tackle the immense burden of work which had accumulated during that budget season and that it was no longer a question of heavy pressure at a certain period but a continued season of heavy pressure."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Whatever the interpretation may be, Sir, from what Mr. Moir said, I gather that somebody broke down during the finance season, that they sat till late in the night on the day previous to the presentation of the budget or that they had to work hard on the day next to that. All I want to say is that we are entitled to get information. This is the only time when we can get information unless it is by way of questions when also we may be troubling the staff. After what has been stated by the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter that there is sufficient work for the

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [20th March 1922]

secretaries, we are satisfied with it. We are completely satisfied with his attitude. All that I say is 'we entered upon the new state of things last year. After one or two years' experience, can we not try to dispense with one or two hands?' I will be the last man, especially after what has been said about the mental worry and all that, to say that we must at once take away one officer. My attitude always has been that so far as people actually in the permanent service are concerned, we should not take them away at all. I know they are all doing very good work and are ably helping the heads of the department. I never said that they must be sent away. I only wanted to know if one of these officers—temporary officers—can be dispensed with at least for a portion of the year. I once more say that the attitude of the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter has been very conciliatory but not that of Mr. Moir. With this appeal that the matter may be carefully gone into, I withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 379.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"I beg to make the following motion :—

379. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 2,400 for a temporary additional assistant secretary for four months.*

"After what has been stated on the previous amendment, I wish to know, Sir, whether the temporary additional assistant secretary for four months is really a necessary thing and at what period of the year he is generally employed."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"The temporary assistant secretary is employed for the budget season. As to the question whether he is really necessary, I can only repeat what Mr. Moir was saying. During the budget season neither he nor anybody else has been enjoying any kind of holiday, not even Sunday and the clerks and the assistant secretaries have been driven morning, noon and night."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 380 to 382.

The following motions were not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

380. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,080 for six temporary peons.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

381. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 120 for two temporary peons for four months for the temporary additional assistant secretary.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

382. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 5,198 for the temporary establishment.*

Motion 383.

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

383. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 21,800 for Director of Office Systems and establishment.*

20th March 1922] [Mr. C. Venkata Ranga Reddi]

"I suppose this costly officer was appointed for the purpose of effecting economy and efficiency in all public offices. Mr. Tottenham was appointed not long ago for the same purpose. He formulated a scheme by which some clerks and some peons were sent home from the departments and, I believe, Sir, that he also submitted a report in which he made some suggestions for cutting some more establishment. I submit, Sir, that the heads of offices may be asked to send up proposals for this purpose, for the purpose for which this officer—Director of Office Systems—is appointed. The village establishment was reduced some time ago on the recommendation of the heads of offices. There was no officer appointed specially for this purpose and any number of village talaiyaris and village headmen were removed on the recommendation of the heads of offices. May I ask the hon. Member, Sir, what this special officer has done for these two or three months? I believe he was appointed two or three months back. May I know whether he has done anything during these two or three months? May I also ask whether this officer is drawing pension and whether he is being paid Rs. 1,500 a month in addition to his pension that he is already drawing? I submit this appointment is a costly luxury and this House will be well advised not to grant this demand at all. The heads of offices can without any difficulty send up proposals not only for reducing the establishment but also for minimising correspondence in their offices."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I am very glad that the hon. Member has given me an opportunity of answering a series of questions regarding what he is pleased to call this costly luxury. I should like to say before I go any further that so far from being a costly luxury this appointment is in a very large measure one of economy as I shall proceed to demonstrate presently. Now the hon. Member asks me whether Mr. Schmidt is paid Rs. 1,500 a month in addition to his pension. That is not so. His appointment costs the Government only Rs. 875 a month. The Rs. 1,500 put down in the budget includes his pension, so that I think we have made an uncommonly cheap bargain. In the next place I should like to say that the bargain was struck after very careful examination and scrutiny by the Finance Committee."

"Now to come to the next point, the hon. Member asks me why heads of offices cannot do this work for themselves. My answer is that good office management is as much a science as surgery, or medicine or engineering, and that just as you cannot expect a good office manager to be a surgeon, you cannot expect a good surgeon to be an office manager. You cannot expect heads of technical departments to look after the management of their offices as efficiently as a special officer. In this connexion I should like to read a portion of the report of the committee which was appointed by the Government of India on office procedure in which they recommended the creation of a similar appointment at Simla. They say in paragraph 139—

'As we have already indicated we attach great importance to the appointment of an officer of suitable experience and standing as Inspector of office procedure. The post should either be a permanent one or should be continued for at least ten years. The Inspector should, we consider, be attached for administrative purposes to the Home Department, but he should be given as independent a status as possible, and should have as free access to the various departments and offices as has been accorded to this committee. If such an appointment be made, it will be possible, without risk of undue delay, to discriminate between those changes of office procedure which can and should be universally and immediately introduced and those which from their nature can only be gradually adopted owing to their dependence on other alterations of conditions which are still in the future, or which for various reasons can best be introduced gradually in one department at a time rather than simultaneously throughout the Government of India.'

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[20th March 1922]

"They go on to say that they would not trust even the heads of the Government of India Secretariat to carry out the changes in an important matter like this without the help of the special officer.

"Now, Sir, I have been asked what this gentleman has done during the short time that he has been employed. The first office that he took up was the office of the Surgeon-General. He went there because there was an urgent request for increase of staff, and as a result of his enquiry he was able to show that not only there was no need for any increase but that the staff could be reduced by Rs. 3,528 per annum. On the top of that I am credibly informed that the Surgeon-General says that since he put his office in order, he has now saved two hours a day. In other words there was a highly paid technical officer spending his time on routine because he was not trained in office procedure; but he is now able to devote his time to the administration of his department because his office has been put into good working order.

"In the Secretariat a saving of at least Rs. 3,000 per annum is indicated by a rearrangement of the central record branch which is going on now in the barracks which has been handed over to us by the military department. There has also been a saving of another Rs. 3,000 per annum by instituting a central stationery and cash department instead of having each department managing their things for itself. He has also made proposals for reducing the staff employed for conservancy and for watching the buildings. He hopes to make much reduction in the stationery use, to reduce the amount of printing by cutting out the unnecessary matter and in other ways, especially by the institution of a central despatch bureau. I might explain this as follows: When a general order goes down to all offices in the revenue department, the present practice is to send a large number of copies to the Board of Revenue, who send them to the collectors, thence to the divisional officers and thence to the tahsildars, so that the same paper goes in half a dozen covers one after another and it is forwarded by slow degrees until it reaches the last destination. What we are trying to do is—it is not at all an easy thing—to arrange a great despatch bureau from which all the printed matter will go straight into the pigeon hole of the ultimate addressees and will be despatched direct to the individual concerned once a week so that all the distribution through the various offices is avoided. This means a saving of stamp and paper and of the cost of maintaining despatching clerks all the way through.

"Another piece of work which the Director of Office Systems has in hand is the collection of books and rearrangement of the library books in all the secretariat libraries. We have a great many valuable books which, owing to want of proper arrangement, we do not properly appreciate; all the principal libraries in the headquarter offices will be overhauled by him, duplicates will be got rid of and the pick of the selection will become the nucleus of the Council library which we hope to have ready for hon. Members by the next August.

"Another important piece of work which Mr. Schmidt is taking in hand in consultation with the Consulting Architects to Government is the redistribution of Government offices. In a time of financial stringency, we have got to make the most of all our assets in brick and mortar. If we leave heads of offices or clerks to attend to this work, we will find that each

20th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

individual will get as much benefit for himself as possible. That is why we want a central authority who will go round and see that the utmost possible value is got out of every square foot of building. These officers are taking that work in hand.

"Finally I would remind the Council that for every saving of Rs. 100, the capitalised value is Rs. 18,000. In order that the Council may be satisfied that his various economy schemes are not schemes of expenditure, Mr. Schmidt is keeping an account by double entry in which he will show us every half-year what his appointment has cost us and the value of the savings effected by him. I can promise the Council that if we find that instead of saving he is costing us money, we will very soon put a stop to his appointment."

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, I am free to confess that I was one of those who thought that the appointment of Director of Office Systems was a superfluous one. But now after hearing the hon. the Finance Member, I have changed my view in the matter. It appears from what he has stated that in several offices, there is a duplication of work. There is plenty of work which can be saved and I think the officer who has been appointed specially for this work has been going about doing the work in the right fashion and has so far effected considerable economy. Inasmuch as the heads of departments are not well versed in the details of departmental management, do not know much about the nature of routine work and have neither the time nor the mental equipment to examine and find out how economy might be effected, I think it necessary that we must depute a person who has considerable experience of the details of office management and knows exactly whether a particular piece of work is superfluous or whether a particular clerk is unnecessary, to go into the whole question. I think an appointment like that of the Director of Office Systems is a desirable one and perhaps we will have to continue him for several years or until such time as he finishes his work. I therefore think that my hon. friend Mr. Venkata Ranga Reddi will be well advised in not pressing his motion. My hon. Friend will notice that the officer has done some substantial work and there seems to be every promise of his doing even more useful work hereafter."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 384 and 385.

The following motions were not made:—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—

384. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 21,800 for Director of Office Systems and establishment.*

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

385. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 21,800 for Director of Office Systems and establishments.*

Motion 386.

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

386. *To omit the allotment Rs. 9,300 for one Under Secretary.*

[Mr. Sasi Bhushana Rath]

[20th March 1922]

"Sir, the Development Department is a yet to develop or an infant department and I think an Under Secretary and so many others that have been appointed are not necessary now. The Education Minister might require all these people and the Minister for Local Self-Government might require all these officers to help him, but surely there is no need for the Development Minister to have so many hands to help him. I therefore desire that this allotment be omitted. I think this department cannot utilise the full working capacity of the three people, the Secretary, Assistant Secretary and the Under Secretary."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I suppose the hon. Member is committing a mistake in referring to the Assistant Secretary. The motion is only to omit the allotment for one Under Secretary."

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—"I have said that he has got an Assistant Secretary and therein I am, I think, quite in order."

"Under the circumstances mentioned by me, I think the Minister does not need an Under Secretary. If the hon. the Minister for Development should think it absolutely necessary, then I will not grudge his retaining the officer."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"Sir, considering that the Development Department as he put it, is yet in the early stages, there must be an impression abroad that there is not enough work for the Under Secretary and the Secretary in that department. But let me assure the House that there is enough and more than enough work for these officers. It may be that the number of files that come to me may not be as great as the number that reaches my hon. Colleagues. Hon. Members of this House will remember that there is a great difference between this department and the other departments. Whereas the other departments have got precedents, being old departments, with practical experience behind them, we find everything new in this department. We have no codes, we have no manuals, we have no rules, we have no regulations and we have no precedents to fall back upon and the result is that whenever a question arises, we have to hunt up for precedents in foreign countries. We have to read a good deal, we have to digest a good deal, in fact we have to cut our path across virgin soil and make our way through. I think these officers have got more work than they can possibly do. I will just mention a few of the duties discharged by them. The Under Secretary is in charge of forests, cinchona, agriculture, co-operation and veterinary. I may mention for the information of hon. Members that forests and cinchona are in charge of the hon. the Home Member; the other departments are in my charge. The Assistant Secretary is in charge of fisheries, industries, factories, mines and minerals, trade, etc. Thus it will be seen that the secretaries of the Development Department have got to deal with five members of the Government. In agriculture and industries, they look to me, for fisheries and cinchona they look to the Leader of this House, for trade they look to the hon. the Finance Member, for factories they look to the hon. the Law Member and for mines and minerals they look to the hon. Member to my left. The result is that these three officers have got to attend to the work of 5 members of Government. It will be noticed that no other secretaries are obliged to work for so many members. There are a number of Superintendents in the other Secretariats; but in the Development Secretariat there is only one Superintendent and the Under Secretary

[20th March 1922] [Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu]

works without even a Superintendent. Besides normal work they have to do a good deal of work by way of collecting statistical information. Hon. Members who have had occasion to see the information that we furnished to the Fiscal Commission when it arrived here will remember that the Commission was so well satisfied with the information supplied by this Government in my evidence that they openly recognized the services which this Government had rendered in furnishing them information the like of which they had not got anywhere else. Now, Sir, if any credit can be taken for it, here is a volume of printed matter containing 100 pages, the major part of which was produced by the office in addition to their regular office work. And it is the Secretary and Under Secretaries that controlled the

4-45 p.m.

work. I am perfectly willing to place it on the table, and my hon. Friend can see what amount of work it involved; and I say that this work has been done in addition to their other official work. Many hours corresponding to what others enjoy as leisure were spent by them either at the office or at my house out of office hours. To say that these officers have no work is injustice to a hard-worked and earnest set of officials."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I wish that the hon. the Minister for Development had justified his statement that all the three secretaries had more work than they could cope with by a reference to the statistics. Here is the budget from which we can have accurate information regarding the work in his and other departments. Take for example the Local Self-Government Department. There are five Superintendents and 35 clerks, whereas in the office of the Development Department there are only two Superintendents and 17 clerks. These Secretaries are placed to supervise the work of the establishment under them. Sir, a comparison of the work of the Development Department with that of the Local Self-Government Department will show that the work there is more or less half of that of the Local Self-Government Department. When that is so, is it justifiable, I ask, that he should have the same number of secretaries as the Local Self-Government Minister finds it necessary to have? I believe it was managed with a less number of secretaries last year. I think no case has been made out for the increase this year."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"These officers have been working under me from the time I took charge of the portfolio, Sir."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Even then it is an unnecessary item of expenditure. The present question, simple as it appears to be, would show what the policy of the Ministers is, whether they would content themselves with just the number of secretaries necessary for their work or whether they want the luxury of a superfluous staff, simply because it exists elsewhere."

"The amount of work done in an office can be gauged to some extent, by a reference to the work of the typists in the office. In the Local Self-Government Department they require six typists and in the Development Department three are found to be enough. The hon. Minister referred to the number of subjects dealt with by the secretaries. I am concerned with what work they do in regard to each of them. We all know how these things may be made to look on paper, though really the work done is precious little. The number

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [20th March 1922]

of files disposed of in respect of each subject may have been only two or three and yet to the uninitiated they may be made to appear to be a prodigious amount of work. The present motion is really a test as to how far the Ministers are willing to reduce expenditure when it is possible for them to do so."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I enter into this discussion by reason of the fact that the duties of the secretariat staff concerned involve also Forest and Cinchona. I may premise in the first instance that both Forest and possibly also Cinchona are expanding departments. The fact that the House has now, in dealing with the demand for forests, committed itself to a policy of development and exploitation means, I am certain, more work in the Development branch of the Secretariat. In regard to Cinchona there was until recently the possibility that the whole department would definitely be made over to the Government of India. It is a matter for regret to me that this policy of transfer has been frustrated. There are many reasons why the control of the cinchona plantation and the manufacture and sale of quinine should be in the hands of the Central Government and not controlled by Provincial Governments. However, it is no use repining. The Government of India have decided that the change in system which we in Madras advocated should not take place. It follows that the future of the Cinchona Department will, so far as the Secretariat work is concerned, rest with the Development branch and I may tell those who are interested in the matter that there are troublous times ahead. Very large issues have been kept in abeyance pending the settlement of the agency responsible for the department. One of these issues is whether or not there should be a substantial expansion of the operations for planting cinchona trees; and the examination and settlement of this question will inevitably entail hard work on the Secretariat.

" Sir, that brings me to a further point—a point which, I think, practically answers the line of criticism put forward by Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. I have said that these cinchona problems will involve hard work in the Secretariat and that developments under forests will also involve much work. Now in both these cases the work is of a class which cannot effectively be dealt with only by subordinate clerks and which must engage the close attention of men of a much higher calibre. In this respect the case differs materially from that of the Local Self-Government Department. I was Assistant Secretary many years ago in that department and later on I held the post of Secretary for nearly three years. The class of work, as I can confidently tell the House which comes to the Local Self-Government Department, includes a mass of routine. Items in regard to which the formal sanction of the Government or reference to Government is necessary come from—I do not know how many municipal councils and district boards. It was a large number in my time, but it is now considerably higher than when I was Secretary. For routine work of this kind the multiplicity of references demands a multiplicity of clerks, but the supervision of such work does not require a large staff of under secretaries and assistant secretaries. On the other hand the class of work which comes to the Development Department is different; there is comparatively little routine matter and the papers that come up involve a certain amount of hard mental labour. It is necessary therefore that the superior staff should be manned by persons who are of a calibre fit to deal with it. Much of the work which comes to the Under Secretary

[20th March 1922] [Sir Lionel Davidson]

Mr. Nageswara Rao, demands intelligence of a high order and I should be very sorry to see him replaced by a less efficient officer."

Sriman Biswanatha Das moved the closure which was carried.

The main motion was put to the vote and declared lost.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" It may be convenient if I now inform the House that precisely at 5-30 the motions that have not been moved will lapse and the demand for the grant will be put."

Motions 387 to 392.

The following motions were not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

387. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,400 for one assistant secretary.*

388. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 320 for leave allowance of one assistant secretary.*

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—

389. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for assistant secretary.*

Sriman Sasi BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—

390. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,000 for clerks in the establishment of the registrar of panchayats, etc., by Rs. 1,200.*

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

391. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,12,470 for local fund audit establishments by Rs. 100.*

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

392. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,33,960 for secretariat and headquarters establishments by Rs. 100.*

Motion 393.

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—" I beg to make the following motion :—

393. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,33,960 for secretariat and headquarters establishments by Rs. 1 lakh.*

" No reduction has been made by this House in all the previous details of General Administration, probably with a view to freely use its hands when considering this particular item. You will see from the budget for 1921-22 an allotment of Rs. 8,77,900 was provided for this item last year. This year the item is Rs. 9,39,200 of which the votable amount is Rs. 6,33,960. The difference will thus be Rs. 61,300 in excess of what was provided for in the last year's budget. The hon. the Finance Member when he presented the budget was good enough to tell us that a principle of 20 per cent reduction has been adopted in the various departments. In the Finance, the Revenue, the Development and Local Self-Government Secretariats, you will find that the aggregate is in excess of last year's expenditure by Rs. 61,300. We expected that the heads of departments in the Secretariat would set an example to the district officers to follow, namely, a reduction of 20 per cent. It is not found to be the case now,

[Mr. K. Gopalakrishnayya] [20th March 1922]

Moreover, in the course of the debate this morning we have come to the conclusion that the Legislative Council will meet hereafter once in every two months. This will remove a great strain on the Secretariat. This is one of the grounds on which the members should vote for this reduction.

"We have noticed, Sir, that the members of the Government have been working strenuously without the assistance of some of the secretaries. The assistant secretaries and the under secretaries establishment under the Ministers have been working in their own departments. I think even there you could get on to a certain extent without the assistance of some of those secretaries. Having preached to others that they should cut the expenditure in various districts, I think that it is necessary for the heads of the departments to set an example. The hon. the Finance Member was pleased to tell us that he used the pruning knife to the extent that it could go. But when he wanted to apply the pruning knife to the branches under his own supervision, I think, he roused up a nest of hornets which began to fly at his face and sting him, and he seemed to be afraid to cut a portion of the expenditure there. And then, if this is worked out it amounts only to 16 per cent reduction, whereas the hon. the Finance Member was pleased to tell others to reduce the expenditure by 20 per cent. But here my figure works out only to 16 per cent reduction. I think, we might doubtless lay our hands on the aggregate amount of six lakhs and odd and reduce it by one lakh."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, I protest against this practice of first attacking the budget in detail, picking out a number of items which hon. Members wish to have reduced and when they are satisfied that there was nothing that can be cut out under these heads of saying 'Very well, we have found we cannot make any reduction ourselves; therefore we make a lump reduction and leave it to you to settle the details'. My reply to that attitude is this:—If there is anything superfluous in the budget, cut it out, but don't come to us and say we are going to make a lump reduction and give you discretion to settle the details. It is impossible to accept a resolution of that sort."

"Again, as regards the matter of the reduction by 20 per cent, I should like again to make it clear that we did not tell the departments that they were immediately to cut down the cost of their administration by 20 per cent. We could not do that. As I said in my opening speech, we could not tell the doctors to close their hospitals or the schoolmasters to close the schools. As I have said many a time before, what we did was this: We asked the heads of the departments what they would do without if they had to cut down their administration by 20 per cent. We got a reply from the Surgeon-General, for instance, to say that that would involve closing the hospitals or making the patients pay for their diet. This we discussed in the Finance Committee when we came to the conclusion that it was impossible in this case to reduce the expenditure by anything like 20 per cent."

"The hon. Member has referred to my pruning knife, and in a very uncomplimentary way has compared my hon. Colleagues to a nest of hornets. I think the metaphor should be dealt with in another way. We may take the States as a tree, with roots, stem and branches. I put it to the Council that the roots of the tree are the departments that suck in the nourishment, the Land Revenue and Excise. The stem of the tree is the portion

20th March 1922] [Sir Charles Todhunter]

which holds up the rest, viz., law and order and the general administration. The branches and leaves are the transferred subjects, the young growth that make a great show. Now, when you want to prune a tree, what do you prune first? I take it that the first thing that you prune is the youngest growth. It may be necessary in rare cases to prune the roots, but that is a very drastic step to take. The one thing you never prune is the stem. If you do that, you cut the life out of the tree."

"Then, Sir, he has told us that this Council is going to meet hereafter once in two months. I confess that is the first, I have heard of the scheme. My own fear is that the Council will be in perpetual session when we really get going with the big Bills that we have in hand. Finally, I should like to remind him that not a little of the work, of the Secretariat office which he wishes to prune so drastically is due to the Council. If he is going to cut great pieces out of the Secretariat, all I can say is the reply, which unfortunately sometimes has to be given to questions, namely, that the Government are not in possession of the information asked for will have to be given in a great many more cases than is at present the case."

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA:—"I never expected that the tender branches would be aimed at by the hon. the Finance Member. I expected that the superfluous growths would be cut off first. But from the explanation of the hon. the Finance Member, I find it is impossible to reduce the grant any more. Therefore I beg to withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 394.

The following motion was not made:—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—

394. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 12,50,000 for Secretariat and head-quarter establishments by Rs. 100.

Motion 395.

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

395. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 28,100 for salary of Publicity officer by Rs. 16,100."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I rise to a point of order. This sum of Rs. 16,100 appears to include a portion of a non-votable item."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Mr. K. Gopalakrishnayya would notice that the sum of Rs. 28,100 comprises a sum of Rs. 24,600 which is non-votable and a sum of Rs. 1,500 plus Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 3,500 which is votable. It is obvious that a motion to cut off Rs. 16,100, while the available amount for being cut off is Rs. 3,500, is out of order. Therefore, I must rule out his motion."

The motion was accordingly ruled out of order.

Motion 396.

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

396. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 20,000.

[Mr. P. O. Etirajulu Nayudu] [20th March 1922]

"Sir, it is a well-known fact that this department is consuming a very large amount of money compared with the work turned out. So far as we are able to see, no doubt this department is serving in a way a useful purpose by compiling information received from the mufassal and distributing it to various people. But this Bureau has issued nothing special what we may call original. The Management spends also a large amount under 'other contingencies.' I do not see why such a large amount under 'other contingencies' should have been noted there. My real idea in moving this motion is to make the Publicity Board run with a cheaper agency.

"I shall just show how this department spends their money. I have with me a publication, Sir, regarding the Madras X-ray Institute newly opened in the General Hospital. This book is printed by the Government Press for the Publicity Bureau. Here, Sir, this House can see what a grand brochure this book is worthy of being presented to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. It is brought forward by the Publicity Bureau. Surely it contains useful information, but it does not require such a costly publication as this. That is why I say a lot of curtailment in expenditure from top to bottom is required. With this idea I move this motion."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, hon. Members have, I think, received copies of the Administration report of the Publicity Bureau, and if they have read that document they will have seen that the hon. Member is not correct in saying that the idea of the Publicity Bureau is to compile information received from up-country. The work of the Bureau has been fully explained there. It was fully discussed in this Council last year, as well as in the Imperial Council, and I do not think I need go into details again, but I shall be very glad to do, if any hon. Member wishes it.

"The hon. the Mover says that there is nothing original about the work of the Bureau. I think he would not hold that opinion if he had seen some of the communications that I have received on it. Not long ago I had an application from a printer and publisher for permission to publish publicity leaflets in book form on his own responsibility because he regarded it as very valuable matter. Here, again, I have an extract from the Journal of the Travancore Teachers' Association:—

'No review of recent educational work in the country can omit to notice, even briefly, the extent and value of the adult educational work which is being done by the Publicity agencies of the Government of India and the provincial administrations. The work done by the Madras Bureau deserves honourable mention. Some idea of it may be obtained by the one fact, that 16,000 leaflets were issued during the short period of twelve months.'

"Even in their speeches this morning several hon. Members have referred to the volume of good work turned out by the Publicity Bureau."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I complimented even. I spoke in favour of it last year."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"As for the appointment of a cheaper officer, all I can say is that Publicity officers are born and not made. I think the House will agree that in the two officers we have had hitherto, we have been exceptionally fortunate. For a successor to Dr. Gilbert Slater we are seeking for the best possible man. Whether official or non-official, whether European or Indian, whether high paid or low paid, we want a man who has really the qualifications for the post. The question of the appointment has been held specifically in abeyance until we are in

20th March 1922] [Sir Charles Todhunter]

possession of the views of this House upon the point. The matter will be taken up by His Excellency as soon as this debate is over. I was surprised to hear that the little pamphlet which is being circulated on the X-ray institution was too good for this House. I am sure nothing is too good for this House-(laughter). On the other hand, we have received constant complaints from the Publicity officer representing his Board to the effect that we are insisting upon his using too cheap a type of paper, which is really depreciating the value of the work of the authors which we are sending round.

"As regards the 'other contingencies' which has been criticized, that is mainly for packing cases, paper, increased postal charges, and so forth, and I can assure the hon. Member that no money is wasted in this direction. Lastly, in case of any misconception, I would say that the leaflets are the production of the Bureau as a whole, of an entirely non-official body with a non-official chairman, and that it is not our desire to use this for propaganda, but to use it for educational work and make it as far as possible representative of all bodies of men."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Mr. President, I would like to support the motion for reduction. My hon. Friend the Finance 5-15 p.m. Member told us that Publicity Officers are born and not made like poets who shine with innate glory. I wonder what these people were doing before they were appointed to this office in order to realize or exhibit the irresistible impulse attributed to them. I entirely agree that a certain amount of journalistic experience is part of the qualifications of a Publicity Officer, but I deny that it is essential to appoint such highly-paid officers for this purpose. I have myself been the recipient regularly of most of the publications of this Bureau, and I do not for one moment deny that these publications are of value. The real question is whether similar publications cannot be had at a smaller expense. I have had leaflets sent to me which might properly have been sent by the agricultural or industrial department. Anyhow, no case has been made out for having this central clearing House for information. Sir, the Publicity Bureau has also been used to some extent for the purpose of propaganda. I have no objection to this as such, but I think that any propaganda organized by the Government would not have the same effect upon the people as propaganda organized under non-official auspices. Apart from these things I certainly think that the Bureau can be run on a much more economical basis. Much money is being spent upon this and if you work out the cost of these pamphlets or leaflets, taking the entire cost of the establishment into consideration, you will find the figure to be so high that no businessman would for one moment tolerate. I therefore feel strongly that the reduction now proposed is necessary, and if there is to be a reorganization of the department by which a less expensive head could be secured for it and one good enough for the purpose though not as good as the one referred to by my hon. Friend it will serve all useful purposes."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—"I have also given notice of a motion to reduce the total demand by Rs. 20,000. I must say that I am a member of the Publicity Bureau. Still, Sir, I make this motion for this reason: that though the work done by the Publicity Bureau has

[Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai]

[20th March 1922]

some good points, yet I do believe, Sir, that in order to carry on the work which is now being done by the Publicity Bureau, a highly-paid official carrying a salary of Rs. 2,000 and odd is quite unnecessary. I submit that the hon. the Finance Member referred to the administration report issued by the Publicity Bureau. I was very sorry for that reference because the administration report by itself is not anything about which one could say a word of praise. I am afraid it is a thing which tells against the Publicity Bureau, for you will see that a good portion of the amount allotted for the Publicity Bureau is spent upon salaries and establishments, and for issuing leaflets. Out of Rs. 38,000 and odd spent for the issuing of leaflets, Rs. 7,000 go for the leaflets and the balance for postage and other things. I do not believe, Sir, that it is necessary to have a costly establishment for these things. We do not want the Publicity Bureau to go out entirely but we would like the Publicity Bureau to be remodelled as in other countries. With these words, I support the motion."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"I also wish to give my support to this motion. It is unnecessary to take up the time of the Council for any length of time in dealing with this matter in view of the discussion we had last year. We are somewhat handicapped in a consideration of this question owing to the decision of the Governor to keep the post of Publicity Officer under non-votable items, even though he is not a member of Indian Civil Service. I only mention this—of course I cannot question the ruling—to show that this is the difficulty that arises in a discussion of this question after the decision to keep that item as 'non-votable'. The acceptance of this motion indicates the view of the House that it is highly undesirable to have an officer with such a high pay as Rs. 2,000 and odd. It is impossible to believe that there is no Indian in this place who has got journalistic taste and journalistic ability and who would draw a lower pay and do the work in a satisfactory manner. We cannot therefore afford to continue the appointment on such a lavish and extravagant scale. We shall therefore reduce the amount."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I also support this motion for reduction by Rs. 20,000. I was one of those who supported the maintenance of this institution last year, and we have seen its working during the year. The hon. the Finance Member has placed the Publicity Officer along with the poet. I only hope that the wares which are issued out of his office by the Publicity Officer are not manufactured in imagination as the poet's are. However that may be, my point is not that there should not be any Publicity Officer, but the question is whether the agency cannot be carried on on much cheaper lines, and whether it is necessary to pay Rs. 2,000 to the head of that office. Of course we may be reminded that it is a non-votable item. I am not therefore asking to reduce the pay of the Publicity Officer in this Council. But I do say that we shall cut out a portion of the allotment so that other means be devised for running the agency on cheaper lines. Sir, we can run it on much cheaper lines with an officer assisted by a board of honorary workers receiving a small allowance.

"Moreover, as has been pointed out the information which is issued by this department is sometimes very belated, whereas the press

20th March 1922]

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

communiqués which the Government is issuing on important political subjects come out very promptly and the credit is due to the Government Press rather than to the Publicity Office. Under these circumstances, though we are inclined to continue the Publicity Office for some time, we do desire that it shall be run on more cheaper and economical lines and with this purpose I support it."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I also have received a copy of the administration report of the Publicity Office and the one feature of it which particularly strikes me is the reference to the work done on the initiative of that body for the contradiction and exposure of innumerable false and misleading statements which are being issued in pursuance of the non-co-operation agitation. I agree with Mr. Ramalinga Reddi as to the greater value in the popular eye of counter-propaganda coming from private sources and not directly inspired or directed by Government. I recognize that this is the case, but the great difficulty of Government is that very little of such assistance is in fact forthcoming. All the more gratefully therefore do I acknowledge the measure of assistance given to the Government by the Publicity Bureau in this matter. The news slips come from Government and are given to the Publicity Board for dissemination, but the Board often makes this material much more effective by turning it into good colloquial vernacular. For the leaflets, the Board is directly responsible and the number issued on its authority has been large. In my judgment they have been of great value in combating the more violent features of the non-co-operation movement. The administration report gives a long list of leaflets on various subjects and I should be very sorry if in the coming year there were any falling off in their number or still more in their quality. It is an exceedingly difficult matter to draw up a really effective leaflet and in the name of economy to cut short the provision for the salary of the gentleman who has to do this work is much to be regretted. I know he has the assistance of a large Publicity Board but in business of this description it is of very little use to rely on any committee for sustained and continuous work. The driving power must come from a single officer even though he has the assistance and co-operation of a Board, and you cannot, Sir, spend too great care in selecting an officer who really is competent for such a matter. We were most fortunate in the selection of Mr. Gwynn, almost equally fortunate in securing the services of Dr. Slater. If the total provision under this head is cut down it will, I fear, handicap His Excellency in making a right and wise choice. I do not wish to deprive the Finance Member of his right of dealing more fully with the financial aspects of the question, and therefore sit down, again gratefully acknowledging the assistance which the Government have received from the action taken on the initiative of the Publicity Board and the Publicity Officer in regard to the non-co-operation movement."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"In view of the proposition that the cost is such that no business man would tolerate for a moment, I will only ask whether there are not some very able businessmen on the Publicity Board."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"I move that the question be put."

[20th March 1922]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have to call upon the other hon. Members who have tabled the same motion."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" But there is the danger of 5-30 passing, Sir. That is why I proposed that the question be now put."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I am not aware of that danger."

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—" I do not propose to make any speech beyond saying that the proposed reduction would help us much in the matter of retrenchment."

The motion for the closure was put and carried.

5-30 p.m. The main motion was then put to the House and a poll taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 25. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishna Nayar. |
| 2. Dr. M. Appalaarasayya Nayudu. | 26. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |
| 3. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar. | 27. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 4. Rai Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 28. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya. | 29. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhaachari. |
| 6. Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar. | 30. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 7. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 31. Mr. Sasi Bhushana Kath Mahasayo. |
| 8. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 32. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 33. Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai. |
| 10. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 34. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 11. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 35. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 12. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 35. Mr. M. Ratnaswami. |
| 13. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon. | 37. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 14. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 38. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 15. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 39. Mr. Abbas Ali Khan. |
| 16. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 40. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib. |
| 17. Rao Sahib A. Ramayya Punja. | 41. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib. |
| 18. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddi. | 42. Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib. |
| 19. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. | 43. Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razzaq Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. Mr. A. Subbarayudu. | 44. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 21. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. | 45. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya. |
| 22. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar. | |
| 23. Rao Bahadur C. Venkata Ranga Reddi. | |
| 24. Diwan Bahadur M. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. |
| 2. " Sir Charles Todhunter. | 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 11. Mr. R. Littlehales. |
| 4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 12. Mr. E. Periyannayagam. |
| 5. " Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 13. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 6. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 14. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. |
| 7. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 15. Mr. S. Muttumanticka Achari. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 16. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| | 17. Mr. M. C. Raja. |

The motion was carried, 45 voting for it and 17 against.

Motions 397 to 407.

The following motions lapsed with the expiry of the time limit :—

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

397. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 20,000.

[20th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

398. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 20,000.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

399. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 10,000.

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

400. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 20,000.

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

401. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 20,000.

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—

402. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 20,000.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

403. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 20,000.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

404. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 1.

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—

405. To omit the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

406. To omit the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board.

Mr. V. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—

407. To reduce the allotment of 13.26 lakhs under Demand IX by 53 lakh.

The demand for grant subject to the reduction of Rs. 20,000 in regard to the Publicity Bureau was then put to the House and carried. The grant of Rs. 13.26 lakhs minus Rs. 20,000, or Rs. 13.06 lakhs under IX. General Administration, Secretariat, etc., was made.

The House then adjourned at 5-35 p.m. to meet again at 11 a.m. on Tuesday the 21st March 1922.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Tuesday the 21st day of March 1922, with the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR Avargal, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, in the chair.

I

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

[Order made by the President of the Madras Legislative Council under Standing Order No. 15—

(1) Printed copies of the questions and answers to be put and given at a meeting of the Council shall be placed on the Council table an hour before the President takes his seat.

(2) The questions shall be put and answered in the following manner:—

The Secretary shall call the name of each interpellator in alphabetical order, specify the serial numbers of his questions and make a sufficient pause to allow him or any other member a reasonable opportunity of rising in his place if he is desirous of asking a supplementary question. Supplementary questions must be put immediately after the principal questions to which they relate.]

Shooting of unarmed men and women at Minchalapadu.

1382 Q.—Mr. P. VENKATASUBBA RAO: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state the circumstances that led to the shooting of unarmed men and women at Minchalapadu; if there is any basis for the allegation that the attack on the police was under the influence of drink; whether the Government justify the shooting down of women; whether the report of the District Magistrate on the matter will be laid on the table?

A.—The hon. Member is referred to the press communiqués issued on March 2nd and March 4th.

Treatment of pilgrims at Tenali.

1383 Q.—Mr. P. VENKATASUBBA RAO: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state if the Government are aware that five pilgrims of Tenali were beaten by the police at Amraoti in Guntūr district on 23rd February 1922 and whether the Government will inquire into the matter and take necessary action?

A.—If the hon. Member will communicate to the Chief Secretary the information on which the question is based, the Government will make such inquiry as they think necessary.

Retention of punitive police.

1384 Q.—Mr. P. VENKATASUBBA RAO: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any justification for the continuance of the punitive police and the military in the district after the statement in the communiqué of the 4th March 1922 that there has been 'considerable change in the attitude of village officers and the people towards the authorities, etc.'; and

(b) whether the policy of arrests by executive officers in the district has been dictated by the Government?

A.—(a) It will be necessary to employ additional police in the Guntūr district until it can be ensured that the recent troubles will not recur. The troops will probably be removed in the near future.

(b) It is not understood what information the hon. Member wants.

[21st March 1922]

II

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

DEMAND X—CIVIL JUSTICE.

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Mr. President, I move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 45.79 lakhs for Civil Justice."

Motion 408.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"Sir, there seems to be a mistake in the motion as printed. The printed agenda shows: '408. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 98,535 for High Court Registrars by Rs. 50,000.'"

"I find from the typed copy of my original amendment which I sent to the Council office, that I did not mention this figure, Rs. 98,535. My object was to reduce this Rs. 50,000 from the lump allotment mentioned at page 86, summary."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"What is it that the hon. Member wants to do now?"

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"I want to make the motion as follows:—"

408. To reduce by Rs. 50,000 the provision made in detailed account No. 24-A. Administration of Justice, High Court, Registrar."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member may move it in that form."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I note, Sir, that the next motion apparently is what the hon. Member wants to move."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"The next motion is for omitting the lump provision on account of the revision of salaries of deputy and assistant registrars and their establishment. That is a separate heading. Now, I want to omit the words 'of Rs. 98,535' from motion No. 408, and to move the amended motion as follows: 'To reduce Rs. 50,000 from the lump provision of Rs. 7,39,900.'"

"That figure is to be found at page 86 in the summary."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I take it that the hon. Member wants, instead of the motion as on the paper, to move it in the following form: 'To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,39,900 for Registrar by Rs. 50,000.' The hon. Member can do so unless some objection is raised."

No objection having been raised, Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU proceeded :—"My object is to reduce the extra provision that is made for the next year by Rs. 50,000. In the revised estimate it will be noticed that the provision under this item was only Rs. 6,85,000. I do not understand why an extra provision is made for the year 1922-23. That is why I move that the allotment of Rs. 7,39,900 be reduced by Rs. 50,000."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Mr. President, you see how embarrassing it is for me to trace item by item the various items which make up this total without my having had the slightest inkling as to what the hon. Member wants. The motion as tabled and as I had it was 'To reduce the allotment of Rs. 98,535 for High Court registrars by Rs. 50,000.' On that basis, Sir, I had my note made up and investigated whether registrars are necessary, whether we can end those

21st March 1922]

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

registrars and carry on the work without any registrars or their establishment. You will note that Rs. 98,535 covers the Registrar of the High Court, one deputy registrar, original side, two assistant registrars, original side, one assistant registrar, appellate side, one sub-assistant registrar, appellate side, one deputy registrar, appellate side, the official referee, crown prosecutor, one editor of the Madras Law Reports and three junior reporters. To that is added a sum of Rs. 100 per mensem for the secretary to the Rule Committee. I was wondering which particular officer out of this lot could go out without detriment to the work of the office. At present, Sir, I am unable to trace item by item within the limit of time which is at my disposal and find out what these other figures represent. I have just glanced through them, and one of them at the end is printing and translation charges amounting to Rs. 1.90 lakhs as against Rs. 1.86 lakhs in the current year. My attention is drawn by the hon. the Home Member who has been good enough to look into these papers during the time I was speaking, to the entry at page 88, against copyist establishment, which also shows an increase, but I do not know what it means. We have got a budget estimate of Rs. 55,422 for printing and translation charges as well. With regard to this, all I can say is that every rupee that is paid on account of translation and printing as well as of copies is returned in the shape of income which is derived from the parties for doing that work. So, Sir, I am not in a position to make any effective answer, because I did not know what the hon. Member wanted, and all that I can say is that apparently and so far as I can see, there is Rs. 50,000 extra. But that extra expenditure is got from the parties and litigants. I am also told that the whole of the extra is non-votable."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"Sir, I quite realize that the hon. Member was somewhat handicapped by the mistake committed somewhere."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"By the hon. Member himself. That is what I was going to say, because I have now got the original of the notice sent in by the hon. Member which reads: 'To reduce by Rs. 50,000 the provision made in Detailed Account No. 24-A. Administration of Justice, High Court, Registrar at page 86'. As the hon. Member did not say from what allotment it was proposed to make the reduction, the Secretary took it to be a reduction from the allotment under the head 'Registrar'."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"No, Sir. Even that would be a mistake, because the heading is 'Registrars' and it goes from page 86 to 87."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Did the hon. Member specify the page of the budget?"

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"I specified page 86, Sir, and stated that it was at the top."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"What of course the Secretary should have done was to have got the motion ruled out of order as the mover failed to specify the allotment that he wanted to reduce. The Secretary apparently took the trouble to supply the omission on the part of the hon. Member. The hon. Member now turns round and says that this was not the motion he intended. The motion having been already made in the amended form to meet the hon. Member's wishes, he had better reply now."

[21st March 1922]

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"I thank the office for making such a mistake. Anyhow I quite see the difficulty of the hon. the Law Member. However, my object is simply this, that as there was an increased provision made this year I thought it could be reduced and wanted to find out, after getting all the particulars, how it could be reduced. I think those who are dealing with departments are better able to adjust it and distribute it than those like myself who are outside the department. Thirdly, the hon. the Law Member pointed out that in the copyist establishment there is an increased provision over the revised estimate. I submit there must be some mistake in the revised estimate figures because copyist department never varies, and in the budget estimate for 1921-22 there is a provision of Rs. 82,778, and as against that there is only a provision of Rs. 60,061 made for the budget year. The figure Rs. 13,000 in the revised estimate, I think may be due to some mistake because we find that in 1922-23, there was one superintendent who is repeated again for the budget year, as also the 3 examiners, 3 readers, 9 copyists and 2 servants. Therefore I do not at all think that for the current year there was only an expenditure of Rs. 13,000. It must be that Rs. 13,000 is not the entire amount that

11-15 a.m.

should represent the expenditure under this head in the revised estimate. Now my object is not to allow extra expenditure for the next year and it was with that object that I bring forward this motion. At the same time I am surprised to find, Sir,—of course I do not question His Excellency's order here,—that these superintendents, examiners and copyists are all put down under non-votable items."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Of course, they are all paid out of the funds that are collected by the High Court on a levy under the statutory authority."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"I beg to withdraw the motion."

The motion was then by leave withdrawn.

Motions 409 and 410.

The following motions were not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

409. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 50,000 for revision of salaries of deputy and assistant registrars and establishment.*

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—

410. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 50,000 for revision of salaries of deputy and assistant registrars and establishment.*

Motion 411.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Mr. President, the motion I beg leave to move is—

411. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 50,000 for revision of salaries of deputy and assistant registrars and establishment by Rs. 25,000.*

"On turning to page 86 of the budget estimate, hon. Members will find the following : 'Lump provision on account of revision of salaries of deputy and assistant registrars and establishment—Rs. 50,000.' Turning their

21st March 1922]

[Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

eyes lower down they will be pleased to see that there are two deputy registrars and three assistant registrars, all on an incremental time scale. And the total figure as per the budget under discussion is Rs. 98,535. But according to the revised estimate for 1921-22, the total cost is Rs. 93,000, and the House will now be pleased to perceive an excess of Rs. 5,535 over and above the revised estimate for the current year. And with respect to the Rs. 50,000 which I want to have cut down by a moiety, we have not been told how much of it is to go towards the increased salaries proposed to the deputy and assistant registrars. In the absence of any information one way or the other I take it that a decent part of it is likely to go towards the proposals to augment their salaries. If that be so, I should like to protest against that. At the bottom of page 86, five officers have been placed on the incremental scale, and so far as the House is concerned that incremental scale appears to have been saddled on us by the Public Service Commission. I remember having read in the note of the Finance Secretary, that nobody is responsible for the incremental scale except the Public Service Commission. In view of the fact that there is an incremental scale year by year there is no reason why we should further augment their salaries. I have got every sympathy for the establishment and it is my sympathy for the establishment that led me not to move for the total omission of this item altogether but only to have the item abated by 50 per cent. In view of the various figures that we are considering, in view of the disparity existing between the revised estimate and the budget estimate for 1922-23, and in view of the fact that there is an incremental scale here, there is no reason why we should give them any further now. With these words I make the motion."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Mr. President, the scale of salaries for the High Court establishments is settled under the Letters Patent by the Chief Justice, subject to the confirmation of the Governor in Council. Under the Letters Patent the Chief Justice is to fix pay which he considers reasonable. Now, Sir, in one or two of these cases an incremental scale was fixed long long ago, I believe in 1896, and there has been no recent revision and the High Court has been proposing a revision in regard to the salaries of the deputy registrar, original side, assistant registrars and the deputy registrar, appellate side and for the establishments. A great deal of correspondence has been going on between the Chief Justice and the Government and the Chief Justice finally insisted upon having the scale now accepted. Unless the Government had reason to say that it was unreasonable, his recommendations must, I consider, be accepted. The establishment has had no increase either after the Public Service Commission or the Salaries Committee sent their report on account of the increased cost of living. We have been corresponding with the High Court with regard to these matters and there is no reason why, when in every other department there has been an increase, the judicial branch alone should not have any increase. Out of the Rs. 50,000 which is provided for in the budget, not more than Rs. 5,000 will go for the gazetted officers, the rest of it is required for the establishments, viz., translators and other officers in the High Court who are doing work there, more or less technical for the purpose of enabling the judges to perform their functions properly. Now the deputy registrar's pay is Rs. 1,050 and he is paid another Rs. 100 for performing the duties of the chief clerk of the Insolvency Court. In other provinces I believe there are special officers for that purpose on heavy salaries while in Madras the

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar] [21st March 1922]

deputy registrar of the original side has to do the duties of the chief clerk of the Insolvency Court and is paid only Rs. 100. The High Court thinks that that salary is inadequate and that it should be at least Rs. 1,200. Then, Sir, with regard to the deputy registrar, appellate side, the scale now is Rs. 700 rising to Rs. 1,000. That was found again to be insufficient and the Chief Justice now insists—and when I say he insists, I do not disagree with him, for every pay proposed by him is amply deserved—on the revision of that pay too. The assistant registrar now gets Rs. 460—575. The scale now fixed by the Chief Justice is Rs. 500—30—650. And likewise in other cases also there have been proposals for increase. And as I said this would not come up to more than Rs. 5,000.”

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—“ Mr. President, the provision of Rs. 50,000 for increasing the pay of the High Court deputy and assistant registrars and establishments ought to be reduced. I think that the pay of the deputy registrar and the assistant registrars compares very favourably with the pay of officers doing similar work in the other departments of the Government. The pay of the original side deputy registrar is Rs. 1,150 and that of the deputy registrar, appellate side, is Rs. 800 to Rs. 1,150 and the present pay is, I think, about Rs. 900 and it cannot be said that the salaries are inadequate. The assistant registrars are also receiving handsome salaries and, I submit, do not require any increase. It may perhaps be that the clerks in the establishment drawing Rs. 100 and less have a hard time of it in these days of high prices. But we have to remember that the economic stress at the present time is very great and every person whether a Government servant or private individual is suffering hardships, and distress seems to be general. I want the Government to recognize that the private individual is as much entitled to the consideration and sympathy of the Government as the official. They form but component parts of the State and any attempt to benefit one at the cost of the other cannot be said to be well advised. We are faced with a deficit budget and any increase in the pay of any individual whether merited or unmerited will only stir up popular discontent and fresh taxation and increase of pay will be considered to be the first fruits of the popular Government which is said to have been introduced. I would therefore strongly deprecate the increase of salary for anybody especially in this year and I strongly support the motion for reduction.”

Sriman BISWANATH DAS MAHASAYO :—“ Sir, the hon. the Law Member was kind enough to quote certain extracts from the Letters Patent and seems to place very much emphasis on the word ‘shall’. He holds that the Chief Justice is the proper person to fix the salary as he thinks reasonable, and should I add just? Sir, if the salary that he thinks reasonable and just and necessary should be passed by this House as it comes and if this House has only to say ‘yes’ to all that he thinks reasonable, I think very little useful purpose could be served by having a discussion on the subject. But I for one should think that the onus is on the hon. the Law Member. Unless the hon. the Law Member justifies the so-called reasonable enhanced salary of the deputy registrar and such other officers, it is unreasonable for us to vote for the demand and I should frankly confess that the explanations given by the hon. the Law Member are not at all satisfactory. And I must add also in this case that the officials had their incremental salaries twice. Which one, I should like to know, is the present proposal? It also passes my comprehension why these officers kept themselves aloof from the agitation

[21st March 1922] [Mr. Biswanath Das]

that was set up for the increment of salaries of all officials. Why and how the hon. the Chief Justice did not find it his duty to recommend to the Government the necessity of enhancing the scale of salary paid to these officials last year.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ The Chief Justice has been under correspondence with regard to this matter ever since the question of raising the salary arose. It is owing to the delay in furnishing the correspondence that this trouble has arisen.”

Sriman BISWANATH DAS MAHASAYO :—“ I am very sorry the correspondence has extended over a year. However, unless satisfactory explanation is given I for one would ask the House to vote for the motion.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I am not responsible for Civil Justice now, Sir, and I do not recollect very clearly the details in regard to this case, but the broad outlines are familiar to me. They are as follow: The proposals regarding this establishment in the High Court came forward much about the same time as the proposals for the revision of other establishments. It is not the case that the clerks in the High Court kept themselves aloof from clamour in the matter of the additions to their pay. On the contrary, my recollection is that they were prominent in the forefront of the clamour for increased pay, and that an official on the High Court establishment as president of the Non-Gazetted Officers’ Association was agitating in season and out of season, sometimes without good cause, and sometimes not entirely without good cause. I do not know exactly when the application for increase of pay for this establishment reached the Government, but it certainly must have been during the time when Civil Justice was in my portfolio, and my recollection is that the greater part of the delay is the outcome of the very earnest endeavours made by Government to cut down the original proposals for increase which led to much correspondence, and delayed a settlement of this case until quite recently. The fullest details available have been placed before the Cabinet, which recognised that there was a good case, though fully alive to the very grave necessity for economy.”

“ Mr. Somasundara Mudaliyar complained that it was very hard that the benefits to these Government servants should come out of the pockets of others suffering equally with them from the economic stress of to-day. I venture to think that he overlooks one fact; namely, that higher prices press much harder on the man who is in receipt of a fixed salary than they do on one who derives his income from land. Now those who depend upon the land directly or indirectly form, I think, the bulk of the tax-paying population of the Presidency, and the landholder, the pattadar, unquestionably derives great benefit from the rise in price of the grain which is grown on his land, while the coolie who works under him derives indirect benefit in the shape of wages very frequently consisting of a definite number of measures of grain. Thus, both these classes benefit to an extent which must go far to counteract the economic hardships of the day. But there is nothing corresponding to that measure of benefit in the case of Government servants like those on the High Court establishment whose pay is fixed and has not been raised at all proportionately to the increase in the cost of living. If, Sir, this addition were disallowed—and I may draw attention to the fact that something like 95 per cent of the relief provided will accrue to the lower paid staff on the High Court establishment and not to the two or three

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[21st March 1922]

officers of the Registrar grade—if we disallowed this increase, those affected would have very just grounds for discontent on the ground of differentiation in the treatment of their case as compared with other Government servants of the same class, whose claims for additions to income were pressed to a decision at an earlier stage, whereas I venture earnestly to deprecate any differentiation.”

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ The hon. the Law Member has told us just now that out of this Rs. 50,000 only Rs. 5,000 represents the amount that is intended to go to increase the salary of these officers and that the balance of Rs. 45,000 will go towards the establishment. As far as possible, personally I am against any conflict between the High Court on the one side and the Council on the other. In view of that fact and in view of the information that has just been given to us by the hon. the Law Member that the learned Chief Justice is very keen about it I do not see my way to press this motion. I beg leave to withdraw it.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 412.

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—“ I beg to make the following motion :—

412. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,98,239 for the High Court by Rs. 1,18,000.

“ The current year's revised estimate figure was Rs. 12,21,000 whereas for the coming year it has come up to Rs. 13,39,000. However, I can only suggest to reduce only a portion of the votable items which come to Rs. 4,98,239 against Rs. 4,48,900 in the year 1921-22 according to the revised estimate. The increase is apparently due to increase of salaries and some additional expenditure, of Rs. 50,000 of which the previous speaker spoke. Whatever it may be, I submit to the House that in a year of this kind, when we are running the administration with a minus balance, I do not see any necessity for increasing the salaries of any officers. Even in the case of those officers, whose salaries have been raised already there was a resolution passed in this House that their salaries should be again reduced; at any rate the resolution was that the salaries of all officers drawing more than Rs. 500 should be reduced by a third. That resolution has not still been given effect to. The hon. the Finance Member was pleased to say that he had made a reduction to the amount of Rs. 23 lakhs in the establishment charges under various heads and that for administration of justice it was Rs. 3.55 lakhs. It may be contended that whatever is spent for administration of justice is earned by the same department. If that is so, there are several other departments like that. It cannot be said that because the department earns, the salaries of its officers should be raised to the limit of its earnings. The savings are still people's money as in the case of land revenue and other items. This year's budget debate in my humble opinion is of a lesser consequence than that of last year. It is only of a small reduction here and there. So the House should consider seriously the matter, why they cannot put off these increases of salaries till next year or until we wipe off the deficit. Till then, things may be allowed to go on as they are. So I request the House to vote for this motion for reducing by Rs. 1,18,000 the allotment for law and justice.”

21st March 1922]

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ Mr. President, I have already dealt with the question of the emergency of the revision of salaries of the judicial establishment, because they alone are now standing out of the increase sanctioned with regard to all other establishment. On the other hand, the judicial establishment should have had more favourable consideration.

“ Statements have been made in this House that if the judicial department is paying its way you ought to make really a profit out of it for the purpose of supplementing the general revenues for general purposes. In connexion with this, I wish to draw attention to a statement from a leading authority in England; we have more or less modelled our system of administration of justice on the English system. Dealing with the increase in the rates of fees levied in the Supreme Court, the English law journal says, ‘ to this increase in the Supreme Court fees no reasonable objection can be urged’; (there the increase was in some cases 50 per cent and in other cases 100 per cent); ‘ it is of course ridiculous’ (I emphasise the word) ‘ for anybody to suggest that litigants should pay their way. A man who secures an authoritative interpretation of an Act of Parliament renders more than a service to himself. The administration of justice is one of the chief functions of the State; but the deficit in the High Court owing largely to the increased salary of officials has been growing. During the past financial year it grew from £220,000 to £350,000 (that is for the High Court alone); ‘ a large part of the deficit is attributable to’ etc., etc, then, ‘ nevertheless, litigants are farther from paying their way than ever they were.’ I wanted to draw the attention of the House to that. It is considered in all civilised countries to be an elementary function of the State to administer justice and to pay for it out of the general revenue. What we get by way of fees should be merely to some extent to supplement an allotment from general revenues or to cover a deficit. On the other hand, here litigants paid under the head of court-fees, till recently, all that was necessary for the purpose of paying these establishments. There has been a deficit now, and I asked the House in consequence of the peculiar circumstances of our finances to cover all the deficit so that justice may pay its way, and the House has been good enough to grant the increase in the court-fees. There will be no justification, now for any decrease in expenditure.

“ Now, Sir, with regard to this reduction of Rs. 1,18,000, the difference between the revised estimate for 1921-22 and the budget estimate for 1922-23 is a little less than Rs. 50,000 and that Rs. 50,000 is required for the purpose of the revision I have stated. That proposition has been debated and after debate my friend Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar withdrew his resolution to reduce that sum by Rs. 25,000. Is there any justification now for bringing it again and to go further and move a reduction of Rs. 1,18,000. Is this the justice which this House is going to mete out to judicial officers?”

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—“ There is a surplus from the income. Why should not the charges be reduced and the public helped regarding litigation instead of utilizing this money for the establishment and maintenance of courts? You may take what is actually required and remit the rest so that the people may be benefited. I think I should press the motion.”

The motion was then put and declared lost.

[21st March 1922]

11-45 a.m. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu demanded a poll which was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur. | 7. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chetti- |
| 2. Dr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu | yar. |
| 3. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 8. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. |
| 4. " P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 9. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. |
| 5. " K. Gopalakrishnayya. | 10. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. |
| 6. " T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 11. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| | 12. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 20. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 2. " Sir Charles Todhunter. | 21. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad | 22. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| Habib-ullah Sahib Bahadur. | 23. Mr. S. Muttumanioka Aohari |
| 4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 24. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu. |
| 5. " Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 25. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 6. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkata | 26. Mr. K. V. Ramachari. |
| Nayudu. | 27. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 7. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 28. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 29. Sriman Sasi Dhushana Rath Mahasayo. |
| 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 30. Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai. |
| 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. | 31. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 11. Mr. R. Littlehales. | 32. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 12. Mr. E. Periyannayagam. | 33. Mr. S. Arpudasiwami Udaiyar. |
| 13. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. | 34. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampian. |
| 14. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 35. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman |
| 15. Rao Bahadur T. A. Kamalinga Chetti- | Sahib Bahadur. |
| yar. | 36. Mr. R. T. Kesavulu Pillai. |
| 16. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 37. Sir James Simpson. |
| 17. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 38. Diwan Bahadur Govindoss Chathur- |
| 18. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | bhujados. |
| 19. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam | |
| Nayudu. | |

The motion was lost, 12 having voted for and 38 against.

Mr. C. W. E. COTTON:—"I like to have a ruling, Sir, on the point whether it is open to any hon. Member to enter the House before the result of the poll is announced."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"It is certainly not open to any hon. Member to come in while a poll is being taken. But once a poll has been taken and the counting is being done by the Secretary, I do not think the Secretary is likely to be disturbed by the hon. Members coming in."

Motions 413 to 417.

The following motions were not made:—

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—

413. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,98,239 for High Court by Rs. 75,000.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—

414. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,98,239 for High Court by Rs. 10,000.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—

415. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 60,000 for fees to pleaders in civil cases by Rs. 7,000.

21st March 1922]

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—

416. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,30,000 for fees to pleaders in criminal cases by Rs. 30,000.

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA:—

417. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,56,000 for temporary sub-judges by Rs. 75,000.

Motion 418.

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU:—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

418. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,56,000 for temporary sub-judges by Rs. 35,000.

"Sir, I find that is the amount under temporary sub-judges. Last year there was no provision shown in the budget for the temporary sub-judges. But this year there is a provision of Rs. 1,56,000 out of which I propose a reduction of Rs. 35,000. It may be said that these courts are constituted simply for the purpose of clearing arrears. It may be a fact but it may also be due to other causes. Especially in a lean year like this it is highly necessary that we should reduce our expenses as far as possible. Arrears can be cleared if adjournments are not so readily granted as now and this must be insisted upon. It should also be insisted upon that these judges should attend courts more regularly and punctually. Adjournments on the slightest excuse are being granted now and when there are more courts than one it is quite natural for lawyers to ask for adjournments on various pretexts. By this reduction I do not think, Sir, the litigants or the Government will suffer. Therefore, I request this House to reduce only Rs. 35,000 from the amount provided in the budget."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Mr. President, I was unable to understand where the difference between last year and this year arose. In the last year you had the same number of sub-judges as this year. That is due to the fact that we compelled the High Court practically to reduce their needs and restrict them to the number that existed last year. In the course of last year the High Court wanted more subordinate courts to do the work and for want of funds we could not sanction it. This year again they have asked for more courts than now exist and we have said 'You must economise; we are not going to grant them'. So far as the work is concerned, the position stands thus: In 1919 there were 2,754 new suits filed on the original side, 22,864 small causes and the arrears of pending original suits were 3,259. In 1920, 2,940 suits were filed on the original side and 24,652 small causes, i.e., 2,000 more than last year, and the pendency of original suits rose to 3,872. By the courtesy of the High Court I had the figures for 1921 and the figures stand thus; last year, that is the current year, 3,506 suits were filed, that is nearly 600 beyond what was filed in 1920 and in the small causes 25,677, i.e., a thousand more than what was tried in the previous year. And the pendency at the end of this year will be 4,420, i.e., about 600 more than what it was in 1920. These courts are functioning and functioning well in the disposal of these pending suits and they have been doing most arduous work and it must be said that the value of the suits before these courts are high and they are generally much more difficult to try than suits in the other courts. I draw attention to another matter. The duration of suits last year in the subordinate courts

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

[21st March 1922]

increased from 490 in 1919 to 503 days. Sir, imagine the monstrous injustice of a suit pending for 503 days and that is only an average and yet this House requires that even the existing temporary courts should be abolished. What do you think will be done without these sub-courts for clearing up the arrears? Seeing that the file of suits is increasing year by year, what this House ought to have done is to have insisted upon my having more courts than there are now in order that the arrears may be cleared within a reasonable time and elementary justice done to the parties."

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I strongly support this motion. When this Council was voting for grants for various departments, I was wondering why the various heads of departments showed a studied disregard for the resolutions of the Council on communal representation being observed in public service. They show not only a passive defiance to these resolutions but the subordinate officials under them display an active oppression over the subordinates for whom these communal resolutions were intended. These subordinates are mostly drawn from the masses and their discontent reaches the masses easily. The embers of discontent are smouldering. These very officials who are indirectly responsible for the smouldering of these embers fan the fire when opportunity arises and inflame the masses against the Government. Thus all our troubles come. Sir, these heads of departments go against the resolutions of the Council unmindful of the fact that the Council has the control of the purse."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" I rise to a point of order as to the relevancy of this so far as the reduction of the budget provision is concerned."

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—" I am coming to it, Sir. Unmindful of the fact that we have the power of the purse, these heads of departments slight us. Let us therefore show them that we have the power to starve them. If these temporary sub-judges are not to be recruited according to the resolutions of this Council, why should we pass this grant? And of the heads of departments who disregard our resolutions, the Judicial Department comes first and the Revenue next. Now, we have some hope in the present constitution of the High Court and let us hope that they will carry out the communal resolutions of this Council to the letter. Unless these posts are recruited according to the resolutions passed in this House I will strongly support the motion."

Rao Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" Sir, I think to reduce the number of temporary courts will be only following the policy of 'penny wise and pound foolish'. My hon. Friend, Mr. Natesa Mudaliyar, is fighting very hard on communal basis. I appeal to him in the same way and tell him that the majority of litigants are non-Brahmans. Not to entertain these courts but to abolish them at once will be to postpone indefinitely the trial of these cases. That means a number of adjournments without any benefit to the litigant public. It means so much cost to the litigant public for they have to incur unnecessary expenditure at each adjournment and at the same time they do not derive any benefit out of the adjournments because the suits will not come up for trial. The sessions courts are, unfortunately, engaged in the trial of sessions cases and consequently they have no time to go into the trial of these several original suits and that is the reason why several additional temporary sub-courts have been established and I think, Sir, that in spite of the establishment of these temporary sub-courts the file has increased even

21st March 1922] [Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu]

in a light district like Cuddapah for instance. Much more will be the case with the other districts where litigation is always on the increase. Consequently, I submit, Sir, that to do away with the temporary sub-courts at present will be to indefinitely postpone the decision of these suits which would mean heavy loss to the litigants. Therefore, I submit, Sir, as I began by saying, let us not enter into this penny wise and pound foolish policy."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" Mr. President, I also rise to oppose this motion. We have just now passed an Act to increase our court-fees. Over and over again the Privy Council has stated that here in India suits are pending for an unconscionable length of time and that every attempt should be made to reduce the pendency as quickly as possible. The attention of the Government has also been drawn to the state of arrears of suits and the necessity for taking immediate steps to dispose of them was also urged upon the Government. The figures that have been quoted by the hon. the Law Member would go to show that it would be absolutely impossible for the permanent courts to get through the large arrears of work. In the district from which I come the figures for last year will show that there are yet about 310 suits pending trial, and even if a temporary sub-court is established from the 1st of April, I think it will take three or four years before the file can be brought to the normal. Not only this, the file of courts in general has been mounting up in geometrical proportion. Some ten years back, the number of suits filed in a court was only about 50 or 60 per year and it has now gone up to 300 and above in some districts. On the other hand, the Government are getting increased revenue owing to the increase in the number of suits. The number of suits has increased three or four-fold and we would not be justified in cutting down the number of courts. The pendency is so great that clients are put to very great expenses on account of the constant adjournments of suits that are made for want of sufficient number of courts. I know several cases in which parties have to bring lots of people with them, spend a lot of money, go back to their own village and again return for the next adjournment. This state of affairs ought to change and we ought to provide for a speedy disposal of cases in our courts. This cannot be done unless temporary courts are sanctioned and established whenever necessity arises. I know, Sir, there is a complaint from some quarters, and even from the legal profession, that the presiding judges can do more work than they are doing. This complaint is urged specially with reference to District Courts. The District Judge is supposed to do a multiplicity of work and the original suits are filed in subordinate courts. The Judges do not devote much time for the civil work and it is not fair to say that temporary courts should not be established owing to that."

"For these reasons, Sir, I very strongly oppose this motion."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—" Mr. President, permit me to read a few facts and figures culled from the statistics of civil courts. The hon. the Law Member has read, Sir, certain figures which will show, I think, only one side of the case. First the total number of suits instituted in the Presidency during the year 1920 was 496,433 against 511,029 suits in 1919, i.e., 14,596 less than in the previous year. Secondly, 12 districts showed a decrease: South Arcot (—7,650), North and South Malabar (—3,497) and (—6,496) respectively, Kistna (—3,003) the latter showing the largest decrease. The decrease of suits before civil courts exclusive of village courts is most

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar] [21st March 1922]

noticeable in North Malabar, the figure being (—7,159). Thirdly, in the district munsifs' courts other than those for the agency tracts 119,550 ordinary suits were instituted or 3,614 less than in the previous year. There was a decrease of 18,718 in the number of small cause suits instituted. There was thus a decrease of 22,332 in the total number of both classes of suits. These figures, Sir, disclose the desirability of the extension to some at least of the temporary courts of the policy of retrenchment which has resulted in the abolition of the following court, viz., the Additional District Munsif's Court of Kurnool, the Additional District Munsif's Court of Periyakulam and second Additional District Munsif's Court of Madura. Fourthly, Anantapur is declared to be the least litigious district, not more than one suit being filed for every 222 persons. Fifthly, the total number of appeals preferred in 1920 was 143 less than in the previous year. Sixthly, in the Special Small Cause Courts 13,602 small cause suits were filed during the year as against 14,057 in the previous year. Thirteen thousand four hundred and fifteen suits were disposed of against 14,358 in the previous year leaving a pendency of 2,156 suits at the end of the year, against 1,848 at the end of 1919. From these figures, Sir, we gather that there is a decrease in the number of suits instituted before the courts, in the number of appeals preferred and in the number of small cause suits filed, while in the matter of disposal of cases, there is no marked improvement, no progress. This naturally raises the question whether there is adequate supervision of the work of these courts, whether the inspection of these courts is satisfactory. Now, Sir, I will read from page 9 of the report,—

'The District Judges of Anantapur, Bellary, Chingleput, Coimbatore, Cuddapah, Guntur, South Kanara, North Malabar, Nellore and Vizagapatam have inspected all their courts, while the District Judges of South Malabar and Tanjore have managed to inspect ten out of their numerous subordinate courts, and the District Judge of Kistna, eight out of nineteen. The District Judges of North and South Arcot, Kurnool, Madura, Salem and Tinnevely also failed to inspect half the courts in their district. The District Judges of North Arcot, Salem and Kurnool explain that they could not inspect more owing to the pressure of Sessions work, but the other District Judges do not give any explanation. No courts were inspected in North Arcot after the institution of the new District Court.'

"From these figures, Sir, we gather that with proper supervision and more effective control it will be possible to show greater economy in this branch of civil administration of justice."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"I move, Sir, that the question be now put."

The motion for the closure was put and lost.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I am against this motion, and I shall briefly indicate my reasons. As it is, there are 20 temporary sub-courts now. In view of this Council having passed quite recently the amended Court-Fees Act, I am absolutely certain that the work of subordinate courts will show a tendency to increase at least by 40 per cent. There is nothing startling in the statement I make, and I shall be able to substantiate it by facts and figures.

"Now, as the Council is aware, so far as land suits are concerned under the existing state of things—I am not concerned with the proposed state of things—lands bearing an assessment of up to Rs. 600 on the basis indicated in the present Court-Fees Act can be adjudicated upon and suits relative thereto can be instituted in the munsif's court. Now, what is the effect of the amendment which we have recently passed? We have increased the

[21st March 1922] [Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

valuation for the purpose of court fee with the result that hereafter even suits relating to lands bearing an assessment of Rs. 300 and above will have to be instituted in the subordinate courts. The result of it will be that if we just look into the figures we find on an average each munsif's court being seized at least of ten cases a year with respect to lands bearing an assessment of over Rs. 300 and less than Rs. 600. That will represent the net saving with respect to each munsif's court under this head per year. Now, we all know that each subordinate court exercises territorial jurisdiction over at least two taluks and on an average it exercises jurisdiction over five munsifs' courts. The effect of the Court Fees Act just passed will be that it will set free on an average about 40 suits that were hitherto being filed in the munsifs' courts in the aggregate and these 40 suits will go to swell and to mount up the file of the sub-courts. Now, coming to South Arcot, the file in the South Arcot sub-court at present is about 90 such suits, but hereafter consequent upon the passing of the Court Fees Act, it is sure to go up to 130 and then there will be an increment of about 40 per cent. Now, in that state of things, is it reasonable to ask for the reduction of the number of courts ignoring the simple fact that consequent upon the passing of the Court Fees Act there will be a tendency for litigation to go up with respect to certain classes of suits and these suits instead of being instituted in the munsifs' courts will have to go up to the subordinate courts with the inevitable result that a congestion will be produced in the subordinate courts to the extent of 40 per cent? In that view of the matter, I venture to think that there is strong necessity for the retention, continuation and even, if necessary, for the permanency of these temporary sub-courts."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"The hon. the Law

12-15 p.m.

Member has entered a vigorous plea for the continuance of all the temporary sub-courts. I fully appreciate all the arguments raised by him in favour of that suggestion; but I still recognise that there is still necessity for re-examining the whole question and considering whether it is necessary to maintain all the temporary sub-courts in the Presidency. The history of this question would show that within the last few years there has been a steady increase in the number of additional courts; but we are not yet satisfied that there has been a proportionate decrease in the pendency of suits. He has drawn our attention to figures tending to show the long duration of suits and he has pointed out the monstrous injustice of perpetuating that system. We do accept that position. We do recognize that it is unfair to mete out tardy justice without an adequate conception of the necessities of each case. But I would like to know if information is available as to the exact state of litigation in each of these places before these temporary sub-courts were constituted, what the pendency of the suits is in each of these places, and whether in consequence of the introduction of these sub-courts there has been a proportionate and reasonable decrease in the pendency of suits. Such information, if compiled and made available, would help us in coming to a proper conclusion regarding this question. There is not much use in abstract reasons advanced on the footing that because there is increase in the number of courts, there will be a decrease in the pendency of suits. There will be decrease to some extent. But all that I am concerned with is whether there is a reasonable reduction in the pendency of suits as the result of the introduction of these courts. This is one aspect of the question which I request the House to

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [21st March 1922]

consider. Secondly, Sir, I am afraid that the establishment of courts would have led to an increase of litigation in various places. I would deprecate the increase of litigation to an unreasonable extent. A careful analysis should be made of the conditions prevailing in these places, though it requires some time, and we should ascertain whether it has not unnecessarily led to an increase of litigation, as the opinion of this House will depend upon a consideration of those factors. The question is whether the establishment of these courts in places where there was not clear necessity when they were started, has not led to the increase of litigation. I will give this House one or two facts which probably might serve as an illustration of the manner in which these courts were increased in some cases. I confine myself to the district from which I come. Four or five years ago when a temporary sub-court was established the then presiding judge (I am not going to mention names) who was very active and energetic, was deliberately of opinion that it was not necessary to continue the sub-court in Nellore. He stated that within a short time he hoped to clear out the arrears and pointed out the feasibility of disbanding the temporary sub-court. Time passed on. He was succeeded by another officer who thought that it was necessary to have the temporary sub-court. He consulted the Bar Association, of which I am a member, which, however, passed a resolution stating that it was not necessary to have a temporary sub-court in Nellore. The decision arrived at by the Bar Association was against the wishes of the presiding judge. I am quite alive to the fact that there is now work for a temporary sub-court. I am only mentioning it for the consideration of the hon. the Law Member so that he might examine all things carefully and come to a conclusion before saying that there is necessity to have all these sub-courts. Though it was possible for one judge to say that it was not necessary to have a subordinate court, and though the Bar Association had deliberately stated that it was not necessary, the succeeding officer was satisfied about the necessity for a sub-court. This might have been avoided, if sufficient care was taken. After the court was established, we find that the pendency has been increasing. The sessions cases take much time. The district judge is not able to do civil work. If this aspect of the question had been borne in mind in examining the necessity for these temporary courts, there would not have been such increase in the number of courts. Before I close may I refer to a discussion (which took place in this Council) on a previous occasion regarding the constitution of the High Court? In the year 1914-15, when the question of reducing the number of Judges of the High Court was specifically raised, it was specifically pointed out that the figures were all illusory, that the figures relating to pendency of suits would be varying from time to time, and that there was room for reduction."

Mr. K. P. GOPALA MENON:—"The House is aware that during the general discussion on the budget I was one of those who bitterly complained about the provision of temporary sub-courts being located in places where there was no necessity for the same. If I now support the motion of my hon. Friend it is not because of the question of communal representation or anything of that description. My own view of the matter is that in effecting a retrenchment of this kind communal representation has absolutely no place. We are now mainly concerned with the question whether or not some retrenchment can be made, and whether or not it is necessary, as Mr. Krishna Rao stated, that we should request the hon. the Law Member to make a

[21st March 1922] [Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon]

thorough investigation before recommendations for the location of temporary sub-courts are sanctioned. Speaking from my own personal experience, a few years ago before the bifurcation of the Madura district into Madura and Ramnad, we had only two sub-courts—Madura west and Madura east. Now, after the bifurcation of the district, we have got in Madura the Madura sub-court, the first additional sub-court, the second additional sub-court, and the Dindigul sub-court. Coming to Ramnad, we have got the Ramnad sub-court, the first additional temporary sub-court, the temporary sub-court, and the Sivaganga sub-court. I certainly think that this is much more than there is any need for. Whenever a district judge makes a reference to the High Court, adducing facts and figures and says 'I want one additional sub-court,' his request is granted. In the next year he may ask for another additional sub-judge and that is granted. The real point is, whether or not, before such things are granted, a careful investigation is made. In the case of my own district—I won't mention names—the tendency of the judges to hear civil appeals is absolutely dying down. They find themselves very busy with sessions work. They take up one witness and take one and a half day for his examination so much so that civil appeals are shoved upon the sub-judges, the first additional, the second additional sub-judge, and so on. I am sure if a thorough investigation is made by the hon. the Law Member he will be saving a lot of money. He should take the trouble to go to some of these districts and pay surprise visits besides examining the statistics, and see if as a matter of fact there is a necessity for another sub-judge. On the receipt of a request from a district judge a sub-judge is granted. As a matter of fact these arrears accumulate because certain district judges are doing the precious little work of 3 to 3½ hours a day. Even if another district judge succeeds and he attends court at 10 o'clock he finds that he is unable to cope with the arrears, and so he has to apply for an additional sub-judge. Therefore it is highly necessary that a thorough investigation should be made as to the necessity of having three or four additional sub-courts. To make such an investigation compulsory, it is essential that we should reduce the grant. It is only with that view that I urge the acceptance by the House of this motion."

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU:—"After what has been stated by other hon. Members it is hardly necessary for me to reiterate the facts again. By reducing this allotment no unusual misfortune will happen. All that I ask for is to reduce a certain number of officers. As I have already stated in moving the motion if the officers do their work properly there will be hardly any accumulation of arrears. I can give you one instance. While there were arrears of four or five years in Guntur, when Mr. Coleridge was put in charge he cleared the whole arrears in six or seven months. It is all in the persons whom you appoint. Government in selecting sub-judges should select really capable men who will clear the arrears soon. I therefore request the Government to accept my motion."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Mr. President; I really wish to point out that this certainly is not the moment to reduce the number of sub-judges. It is not correct to say that when a district judge or somebody else asks for a court and shows some figures the High Court grants it as a matter of course. Much less is it correct to say that the Government granted it. Whenever any court is asked for the figures are very carefully investigated—

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar] [21st March 1922]

that is the only thing by which we can go by—and when we find that the figures even by a very small extent do not justify the institution of a court we stop it.

“The real trouble about the accumulation of arrears is this: if there have been courts created for the purpose of coping with arrears as they arose, there would not have been this accumulation, for, as soon as a judge feels that the file in his court is such that he cannot with reasonable endeavour, cope with it, he must do one or other of two things: either he must try to dispose of them as quickly as possible even at the risk of doing injustice, or in helplessness he must leave the heavier cases to accumulate; and accumulated arrears pending in courts consists of suits of difficulty and these must be cleared as soon as possible.

“Portions of the administration report for the last year were read by one of the hon. Members. In it was stated that there was a diminution of some cases beyond those of the previous year. They include small cause suits and suits in village courts. It is true that there has been a reduction in the suits filed in the district munsifs' courts in the last year. The result of such reduction in the file last year was from 66,000 and odd cases in arrears pending in 1919 the number has been reduced to 62,000 and odd. We must remember that the judges have to cope with the new work that is coming in in addition to disposing of the arrears. It may be true again that in some places you do not want a court which now exists. I am carefully considering this question and if I find that in any particular place a court is not necessary, it will be shifted to some other place where there is necessity for it. It does not mean that twenty temporary courts will be sitting in the places in which they are now sitting. As soon as it is found that their presence in a particular place is not necessary, they will be shifted to places where there is accumulation of work. So far as I am able to see, I do not find any falling in the quantity of work done by the judges. As regards the quality, it is not possible for anybody here to judge. Anyhow this is not the time to make any reduction in the number of courts. For I find there has been a growing increase in the number of suits filed in the higher courts. The average, Sir, for about ten years prior to 1918 was 2,212 original suits and a number of small cause suits. In 1919 it was 2,764 original suits; in 1920, 2,940; and in 1921, 3,506. The arrears have been increasing. In 1919 there were 3,269; in 1920, 3,872; in 1921, 4,415 original suits. After all, when clients pay, we have got to provide them with courts for the trial of their cases. In these circumstances, so far as sub-courts are concerned, I do not think it will be possible to reduce their number. They are now engaged in clearing off the existing arrears. When the existing arrears are cleared, then it may be time to see whether their number may be reduced or not.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“I see from the statement made by the hon. the Law Member that there is to some extent congestion of work. But to my mind, it does not appear that the additional sub-courts are going to relieve this congestion. I think more supervision is necessary. My experience has been, Sir, in the mufassal at least, that so far as criminal and civil courts are concerned, there is more of supervision in criminal courts than there is in civil courts. Returns may be sent on the civil side also; but I doubt very much whether those returns are scrutinized with the care with which similar returns are done on the criminal side. Then, it is said that there are a number of courts in one and the same place. The

21st March 1922] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

establishment of more than one sub-court in one and the same place, so far as I can see from my experience, is never conducive to quick disposal of work. The reason is obvious. The whole of the civil work is concentrated in the hands of a few people and these gentlemen are unwilling to let go any work that comes to them, with the result that they go about from court to court asking the munsif or the judge as the case may be to oblige them by short adjournment. They may say that they have work elsewhere, or something else conveniently happens, with the result that these suits are adjourned from time to time. That is the reason why, I think, the pendency is increasing. This is not going to be avoided at all by keeping a number of courts in one and the same place. The remedy seems to be, so far as I can see, that there should be more of efficient supervision and there must be greater co-operation on the part of lawyers. Otherwise there is no hope. So the case for reduction stands good.”

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—“From the statistics read out by the hon. the Law Member, we see that there is rise in litigation. Who is responsible for this? Is it the tax-payer, the litigant, or both the bench and the bar? The bench and the bar are responsible for the increase. Such being the case, why should the tax-payer be asked to pay more on account of the additional courts?”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“The tax-payer does not pay a single pie for this. It is the litigant that pays.”

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—“If every department depends on its own income, why should there be any deficit in the budget? In supporting this motion, it is not our intention that we want to criticize upon the kind of work that is going on but to bring to the notice of the Government the irregularities and the way in which litigation is being managed. A number of adjournments are given on absolutely baseless grounds. One vakil says that he has to attend his mother's ceremony and so he wants adjournment; another says that he has to go to his father's anniversary and so he wants an adjournment. In this way litigation is postponed to suit the convenience of vakils. I and my friend Mr. Gopala Menon here bear out that we have got judges who take 5 minutes to record one sentence. In such a case how can the work be disposed of quickly? I think recently the pay of these judges has been increased from Rs. 800 to Rs. 1,200.”

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI :—“I quite agree with my friend Mr. Gopala Menon that in the south there is a general complaint that there are more additional temporary sub-courts than are really necessary. Many of them are superfluous and if a thorough investigation is made, we could reduce the number. Though some courts may be found to be necessary to relieve the congestion of the district judges, the rest might be abolished. I think some of the courts are concentrated in one place for the purpose of securing convenience to the bar and the district judges than for relieving congestion and tension. I therefore support the motion by way of bringing pressure upon the Government to make a thorough investigation that is quite necessary.”

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—“Sir, I also support the motion. There is a general impression in the country that there is not enough work for so many courts. The Finance Member told us yesterday that his officers in the Secretariat have been recently working

[Mr. Muhammad Usman Sahib] [21st March 1922]

till 2 or 3 o'clock in the night and that he himself till 11. I do not see any reason why these sub-judges should not work till 7 or 8 in the evening and dispose of their cases."

The motion was then put and a poll was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 26. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayakar. |
| 2. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankineedu Prasad. | 27. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 3. Dr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu. | 28. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. |
| 4. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 29. Mr. C. Venkata Runga Reddi. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 30. Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao. |
| 6. " P. C. Etirejulu Nayudu. | 31. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. |
| 7. " K. Gopalakrishnayya. | 32. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 8. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 33. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 34. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 10. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 35. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 11. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 36. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 12. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 37. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo. |
| 13. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon. | 38. Mr. M. R. Seturathnam Ayyar. |
| 14. Mr. K. Kandaswami Kandar. | 39. Mr. T. Sivasankaran Pillai. |
| 15. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 40. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar. |
| 16. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 41. Rai Sahib E. C. M. Mascarenhas. |
| 17. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 42. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 18. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 43. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 19. Mr. V. P. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 44. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib. |
| 20. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 45. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib. |
| 21. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. | 46. Saiyid Diwan Abdul-Razzag Sahib Bahadur. |
| 22. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 47. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 23. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddi. | 48. Mr. G. Vandanam. |
| 24. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. | 49. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya. |
| 25. Mr. A. Subbarayudu. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 12. Mr. N. Periyannayagam. |
| 2. " Sir Charles Odhunter. | 13. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 15. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. |
| 5. " Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 16. Mr. S. Muttumanioka Achari. |
| 6. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkata R. ddi Nayudu. | 17. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhaachari. |
| 7. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 18. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 8. Mr. T. F. Moir. | 19. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 20. Sir J. F. Simpson. |
| 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. | 21. Rao Bahadur T. Namburumal Chettiyar. |
| 11. Mr. R. Littlehales. | 22. Mr. T. Richmond. |

The motion was declared carried, 49 having voted for and 22 against.

Motions 419 to 424.

The following motions being identical with motion 418 fell through:—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

419. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,56,000 for temporary sub-judges by Rs. 40,000.

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

420. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,56,000 for temporary sub-judges by Rs. 35,000.

21st March 1922]

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

421. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,56,000 for temporary sub-judges by Rs. 35,000.

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

422. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,56,000 for temporary sub-judges by Rs. 35,000.

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

423. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,56,000 for temporary sub-judges by Rs. 35,000.

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

424. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,56,000 for temporary sub-judges by Rs. 35,000.

Motion 425.

12-45 p.m. Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

425. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 86,400 for temporary district munsifs by Rs. 25,000.

"The allotment for temporary district munsifs will be found in page 92 and the details for which will be found in page 93 of the budget. It may be seen, Sir, that the arguments advanced with reference to the previous motion hold good in this motion also. There are also some additional reasons in favour of this motion. We see there is provision made for 24 temporary district munsifs. There are already 144 munsifs permanent and to that number it is proposed to add these 24 temporary district munsifs. It may be seen from the statement of figures read out by my hon. Friend Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar that there has been more or less an appreciable decrease of institution of suits, though the clearance of these suits may not be so appreciable. But still so far as we take into consideration the institution of suits there is no reason why they should not be cleared as promptly as they were used to be done some years ago. Probably it may be contended for the Government that the nature of suits may be quite different from the nature of suits which used to be filed before. No doubt the point has been raised by the hon. the Law Member with regard to the quality of the business that is now turned out by the various munsifs. I think supervision may be taken to be one of the foremost causes that will accelerate business in these courts. Moreover, Sir, it will be seen that there is a tendency in the villages to put into operation the provisions of the Village Panchayat Act. If that is done several of the suits which are now filed in the munsifs' courts will go before the village panchayat courts and I think it is the ardent wish of every one of the hon. Members of this House that the village panchayat courts should become very effective and successful, and as such some of the suits will naturally be transferred from the munsifs' courts to the panchayat courts. That is one of the foremost reasons that would go in favour of the reduction of this amount.

"Then with regard to the nature of the work turned out by the munsifs' courts, I think it will have to be borne in mind that the various provisions of the Civil Procedure Code with regard to the proof of facts or documents are

[Mr. K. Gopalakrishnayya]

[21st March 1922]

not strictly adhered to. For instance, when the genuineness of a document is to be proved, that document is not ordinarily put to the opposite side for proof by way of admission under the chapter in the Civil Procedure Code which is not generally made use of. The party who wants to prove the document is put to proof and he has to call all his witnesses. Much time may be saved if the other party is confronted with the document and if he is asked to admit or deny the same. By such procedure, I think a lot of time would be saved.

"Again, Sir, because we have passed the Court Fees Act, there may be a tendency to make all these courts permanent. If we pass this grant without any reduction there may be the tendency for the Government that because the Court Fees Bill has been passed, they will get greater revenue, and so all the temporary courts may be made permanent, or at least there will be no inclination to abolish any of the temporary courts immediately. I think, Sir, that the litigious nature in man may be compared more or less with drunkenness. The greater the number of courts, the greater the tendency for litigants to rush to them. No doubt some arguments have been advanced on the basis that there are arrears of work in the various courts and that there should be increase of hands to clear them out. But I may bring to the notice of the hon. the Law Member that after a few months the tendency for some of these temporary munsifs will be to keep their work in arrears so that they may be made permanent or prolong their tenure of office. That is one of the reasons why these arrears are not properly cleared out. In order to see that these arrears are cleared out there must be a certainty that these munsifs would be made permanent, or that they would not be made permanent at all.

"Without meaning any offence to any one I mean to say that it is human tendency to keep a certain work in arrears so that a chance may be created for being made permanent. If the temporary munsifs are told that they would not be made permanent and that they should clear out arrears before such and such a time, then there will be no difficulty.

"It will also be seen that with regard to criminal courts in the district, there have been circulars from district magistrates with regard to proof of certain documents or facts, with regard to the disposal of cases, with regard to adjournments and such other things. I think that has been a more effective method in the despatch of criminal work provided that the magistrates act without detriment to their discretionary powers. Unless some such circulars or orders are issued by the High Court or by the District Judges by way of supervision with regard to proof of documents or facts, with regard to adjournment of cases, there will be a tendency for accumulation of arrears, and I believe there will be no end for the accumulation of arrears. From my personal knowledge I can say there are some courts in my district that have no work whatsoever. I may probably quote an instance—the District Munsif's Court of Nandigama which is maintained with a large establishment at a long distance from the headquarters. Neither the clients, nor the munsif, nor the vakils desire that that court should be located there. They all say that the Nandigama Munsif's Court should be abolished, and its jurisdiction given over to one of the munsifs' courts that are working at Bezwada. I presume the same thing prevails in several other courts in other districts.

21st March 1922]

[Mr. K. Gopalakrishnayya]

"Again, Sir, it will be seen that we are not furnished with any information as to when these temporary courts were established for the first time, at the time of their establishment what was the state of arrears and what quantity of work has been disposed of after the establishment of those courts. I am sure that if all these things are taken into consideration, there will be absolutely no proof of any appreciable amount of duty having been discharged by these temporary munsifs. For these reasons, Sir, I move that the allotment be reduced by Rs. 25,000."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, it is true there has been some reduction in the ordinary file of the munsifs' courts. In order to enable the existing temporary courts and the permanent courts to try and dispose of the existing arrears it will take 20 years, provided there is no more than the normal file during that period in all the courts. Whether it is just to reduce the courts now because you imagine there is no supervision or because you imagine that these munsifs are keeping up arrears with a view to their being made permanent, these are questions for the House to decide.

"Regarding the arrears, Sir, I may state, the arrears in 1919 were 62,301; in 1920 the arrears were 61,061; in 1921, the arrears were 60,077. Unless, therefore, there is a very very large reduction in the number of suits that are filed in the munsifs' courts, there is no chance of clearing the arrears within any reasonable time, even with the existing courts.

"Something was stated about these suits being taken to the village courts. I will just read to you one sentence from the Administration Report of the High Court: 'The total number of suits instituted in the village courts was 95,214 in 1920 as against 96,114 in 1919 and 107,444 in 1918. There has thus been a less resort to the village courts, and the figure is 31,745 less than the average for the past five years ending with 1918.' This is in spite of the fact that you have got to pay court fees if suits are filed in the district munsifs' courts while you have got to pay no court fees in the village courts. Until more confidence is placed in these courts by the litigants, there is no reasonable chance of there being any diminution in the file in the superior courts.

"Now, Sir, something was said about want of supervision. I think all hon. Members are aware that supervision is exercised both by the district judges and by the High Court with regard to inferior courts, such as the subordinate judges' courts and the district munsifs' courts. My hon. Friend has also stated that they do not pass any rule regarding adjournment of cases and admission of documents or facts. I may say, Sir, that as regards admission of documents or facts, it is not the High Court that has got the power but it is the pleaders that have got that power and if the pleaders are doing their duty properly, there should have been no delay in trials, and members of my tribe will, I am sure, not admit that they are not doing their duty properly. With regard to adjournment of cases, and other matters referred to I may inform my hon. Friend that almost every six months, the High Court is issuing circulars to the subordinate courts that they should not adjourn cases because vakils want them or because somebody says that he wants some witnesses to come and so on. Except where it is absolutely necessary in the interests of justice no adjournment should be granted; that I believe is the rule, and so far as the High Court is concerned, they have done and are doing everything they can possibly do and they are also seeing that their rules are enforced.

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar] [21st March 1922]

"Again, it was stated that these temporary munsifs accumulate arrears because they want to be made permanent. I submit, Sir, that that is a suggestion which is without any basis whatsoever. In justice to these hard-worked gentlemen, I must say there has been no diminution in their standard of work which I believe was fixed so early as 1904. Between that year and this, the bar has very considerably improved and with the improvement of the bar, there is more strenuous advocacy and trials are lengthened. Therefore there is no basis for the suggestion that due quantity of work is not being turned out by these munsifs. Even if we keep them at this rate, as I already said, it will take nearly 15 years to reduce the present state of arrears provided there is no increase in the normal file of suits.

"In these circumstances I see no justification whatever for the reduction. We have recently raised the court fees. The only justification for the increase in court fees is that the litigants should pay for the establishment. There was a vigorous protest both from the professional bodies and the High Court that the increase in court-fees should not be made unless it is required for the purpose of covering the deficit in judicial establishments. I said at the time of the introduction of the Bill to amend the Court Fees Act, and I repeat it now, that there is no justification for levying more court fees unless you are going to pay more for the judicial establishment. The money got from court fees should not be taken to add to the general revenues of the province. As I said before, it will be almost impossible for the Government to resist the pressure, if pressure is brought to bear on the Government to reduce the fees. The litigant public has a right to ask for a reduction in court fees if the proceeds of the fees is not fully utilized for judicial establishments."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"The hon. Member who made this motion, Mr. K. Gopalakrishnayya, said in the course of his speech that many of the arguments that had been advanced with reference to the previous resolution relating to the temporary sub-judges were applicable to the temporary munsifs also. I beg to differ from him. In the case of the temporary sub-judges it was, I think, Mr. Gopala Menon that said--and others also agreed with him--that there was a tendency in some district judges not to take up civil appeals and civil original suits for disposal. The tendency in them is to transfer such cases to the courts of sub-judges. That, I believe, was an important consideration which induced this House to vote for that reduction. That argument cannot apply to the case of the temporary munsifs at all. In their case, there is no question of the transfer of civil suits from the file of the district judges to the file of these munsifs. Personally I know from my experience that the munsifs are as a class a hard-worked and hard-working lot. It has been said that in the case of temporary munsifs there is a tendency to dispose of as few cases as possible, so that these temporary courts may be kept on. In saying this, my friend Mr. K. Gopalakrishnayya unconsciously did an injustice to this class of temporary munsifs. On the contrary, it is just the other way. These temporary munsifs know very well that their confirmation depends upon their turning out adequate work which their superior authorities periodically examine. So, the tendency on the part of the temporary munsifs is, instead of being lazy, to over-work so that they may get themselves confirmed before long. So that the argument does not hold good in the case of the temporary munsifs.

21st March 1922] [Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

"Then what is the effect of the reduction you propose. My hon. Friend wants to reduce Rs. 25,000 out of an allotment of Rs. 86,000—I am speaking in round numbers. That will mean roughly the reduction of one-third in the number of courts. The number of temporary munsifs is 24, so that, if this reduction is carried out, the result will be that about seven temporary munsifs out of 24 will disappear. This will be a very great hardship, I submit not on the temporary munsifs themselves, but upon the litigant public. My friend, the hon. the Law Member, has very aptly referred to the recent increase in the court-fees. After having increased the court-fees and after taking a larger amount of taxes by way of court-fees, if you reduce the number of temporary munsifs you will be doing scant justice to them, as reduction in the number will mean reducing the opportunity for the quick disposal of cases. Therefore, I oppose the motion for reduction."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I support the motion before the House. I want to say a word with reference to the remarks of the hon. the Law Member and Mr. Krishnan Nayar, that it is an undeserved slur cast upon the temporary munsifs when an observation was made that they are likely to do less work. I am sorry that all of them have assumed that only temporary munsifs are posted to temporary courts and the permanent munsifs to the permanent courts. But the fact is that very often temporary munsifs are posted to permanent courts and permanent munsifs to temporary courts. I do not at all say that all these district munsifs are doing less work than they ought to do. But there are several ways by which the work of the munsifs can be easily reduced. With due respect to the hon. the Finance Member, figures are not always correct and they are also sometimes misleading. The hon. the Law Member cannot justify his position by giving the total number of suits. *Ex parte* suits take very little time. The increase in the number of cases disposed of will be no indication for the work turned out by a munsif for a large percentage might have been *ex parte* cases. Some of the munsifs include the *ex parte* suits also in showing the amount of work done. In some cases they spend more time in deciding *ex parte* suits. I can understand much time being taken in the case of land suits, but in the case of bond suits, where owing to exceptional difficulties a debtor is unable to pay his debt, there is no reason why the munsif should devote much time on hearing such suits."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"The question having been raised, I should like to say that the number of contested suits disposed of has risen from 59,471 in 1919 to 62,756 in 1920. The average duration of contested ordinary suits was 328 days as against 315 days in 1919."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I am thankful for the information, Sir. The term 'contested suit' is often applied to a suit if the defendant says that he has to pay a rupee less than what the plaintiff claims, or asks for a month's time to pay up the amount.

"A lot of time is unnecessarily wasted for uncontested suits. I request the hon. the Law Member to issue a circular not to do that but to accept affidavits to serve the purpose of evidence in *ex parte* suits."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"The Law Member has no such powers, Sir."

[21st March 1922]

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ He can ask the High Court to do that. I am perfectly right in asking the hon. the Law Member to issue a circular, because he represents the judicial administration in this Council.

“ The unpopularity of the village panchayat courts also was referred to in the course of the discussion. It is very unfortunate that neither a vakil nor an agent can represent the party in the panchayat court, but he can be represented only by a relation or friend. So the unfortunate litigants who do not know to conduct cases cannot go to the panchayat courts. If any vakil or an agent cannot represent the party in such a court the number of cases in panchayat courts cannot increase. So, if a change is made, as I have suggested, there will be more suits in panchayat courts and less in the courts of district munsifs.

“ Then again there is a third point. The hon. the Law Member gave a hint the other day that he would bring in a Bill very soon by which court-fees upon suits compromised before the first hearing would be reduced. I think that such a legislation will induce many people to settle cases before the first hearing. If some such thing is done there will be a great reduction of suits.

“ Lastly, it was contended that because you have increased the court-fees you must also increase the number of courts. At the time of the introduction of the Bill it was said that because you have more courts costing more money you must have a higher court-fee. Now it is contended that because you have a higher court-fee you must have more courts. Such a thing can go on *ad infinitum*. Probably next year the hon. the Law Member may bring in a Bill to have a higher court-fee next year if the number of courts is now increased.

“ For these reasons, Sir, I support the motion for reduction.”

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—“ I had occasion to remark in connexion with some other resolution that there has been a decrease in the number of suits instituted before civil courts and the number of appeals preferred. And then my hon. Friend Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar would not permit me to quote that portion which related to the district munsifs. On page 4 of the statistics of civil courts I find the following statement :—

‘ In the District Munsifs’ courts other than those for the Agency Tracts, 119,550 ordinary suits were instituted, or 3,614 less than in the previous year; there was a decrease of 18,718 in the number of small cause suits instituted the figure being 195,415 against 214,133 in 1919. There was thus a decrease of 22,332 in the total of both classes of suits.’

“ Again, Sir, I referred to the fact that in these statistics Anantapur is referred to as being the least litigious, because it contributed the smallest number of suits (4,340) not more than one suit being filed for every 222 persons. Nevertheless we find a temporary munsif’s court has been established. It was established in February 1920. This does not look like economy. I am a layman, Sir, and I cannot pretend to any special knowledge of these matters. I have not much knowledge of law nor am I fond of going even very near a law court. (Laughter.) If the hon. the Law Member said that we must not take into consideration this slight decrease, that in spite of this slight decrease the normal work of these courts should go on, well, I do not seriously quarrel with him. I have only to tell him that these figures show that the time has come to see whether the pruning knife cannot be pushed

21st March 1922]

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

a little farther. Hon. Members will remember that we are living and working in abnormal times and under abnormal conditions. Therefore, the very fact that we are carrying on our work under abnormal conditions, I think, justifies a more careful and closer investigation into this matter. I do not wish to cast any slur upon the work done by that honourable body of district munsifs among whom I count scores of my old pupils; they are all fine fellows and I can testify to the good work done by them. What I contend is that there is room perhaps for some temporary district munsif’s courts being shifted from some districts and some few permanently closed. There are 12 districts which show a decrease. Perhaps the sum proposed by Mr. K. Gopalakrishnayya is too much, and will work hardship. But whatever it be I think by passing a motion like this this House will expedite this inquiry or investigation which is absolutely necessary. At the same time I must say I am a believer in Milton’s creed of strenuous labour. When I make that statement I do not mean to say that the district munsifs or their establishments are not applying themselves strenuously and earnestly to the disposal of cases. Nevertheless by utilizing to the full the office hours allotted for the disposal of cases and by remaining for an hour or two more on extra occasions, by bringing to bear on the task greater earnestness in view of the special nature of the times and the abnormal conditions under which everybody has to carry on his work, I think it should be possible for us to secure greater economy. Therefore, in this spirit and in none other, I support this motion.”

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI :—“ Reference having been made to the civil courts in the Anantapur district more than once, I feel 1-15 p.m. called upon to make certain observations with regard to the state of things that exists there. Three or four years ago, we had two civil courts for ten taluks. Anantapur consists of nine taluks. The Gooty court comprised the two taluks of Gooty and Tadpatri as also Adoni of the Bellary district. All the rest of seven taluks had one court at Penukonda. Now, Adoni taluk has been taken away from the jurisdiction of Gooty court, so much so, we have now three courts between nine taluks. That is rather one too many I fear.

“ Now looking at facts in their true perspective, there are more than one consideration which have to be taken into account. The co-operative movement is making rapid progress in my district, and the number of dealings that take place between the borrowers and these societies are on the increase, so much so the village money lender is resorted to less and less. Most of the litigation that arises between these societies and the borrowers are disposed of by the assistant registrars and registrars of co-operative societies, where they need not pay any court-fee and the dues are recovered under the Revenue Recovery Act. Secondly, we have lately enhanced the court-fees due on land suits. This will again lead to an appreciable reduction in the number of land suits; in consequence of all these the suits relating to lands paying more than Rs. 300 as assessment may have to go before the district court.

“ Then there is also another chance of our civil work in the munsif’s court being reduced. Considering the progress of the co-operative movement in Anantapur district there is every prospect of the village panchayat courts also increasing in popularity, and in a few years, with the advent of these institutions it is likely that much of rural litigation will be attended

[Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai]

[21st March 1922]

to by these village courts. These three considerations being taken into account, there is every prospect of litigation diminishing in munsif's court, and in this view, applying the facts particularly to the Anantapur district, I think one court is too many there. In this view, I think the temporary courts may be reduced."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—" I move that the question be now put."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have to mention to the House that at 2 p.m. this debate must cease and there will be no further discussion, and the demand, whatever it be, must be put then. The motion now before the House is that the question be put."

The motion for the closure was carried unanimously.

The main motion was then put to the House and declared carried.

The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson demanded a poll which was taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 25. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar. |
| 2. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankineedu Prasad. | 26. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. |
| 3. Dr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu. | 27. Mr. C. Venkata Ranga Reddi. |
| 4. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 28. Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao Pantulu. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 29. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 30. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |
| 7. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya. | 31. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 8. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 32. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 33. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 10. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 34. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 11. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettyar. | 35. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 12. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 36. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo. |
| 13. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon. | 37. Mr. M. R. Seturathnam Ayyar. |
| 14. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 38. Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai. |
| 15. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettyar. | 39. Mr. S. Arpudawami Udayar. |
| 16. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 40. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 17. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 41. Mr. M. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 18. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 42. Abbas Ali Khan Bahadur. |
| 19. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 43. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. | 44. Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razzaq Sahib Bahadur. |
| 21. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 45. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 22. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddiyar. | 46. Mr. G. Vandanam. |
| 23. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. | 47. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya. |
| 24. Diwan Bahadur K. Soryanarayanamurti Nayudu. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 10. Mr. C. W. F. Cotton. |
| 2. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 11. Mr. R. Littlehales. |
| 3. The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 12. Mr. E. Periyannayagam. |
| 4. The hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 13. Mr. K. K. Shanmukham Chettyar. |
| 5. The hon. Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 6. The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 15. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 7. The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 16. Mr. S. Muttumaniokha Achari. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 17. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhaachari. |
| 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 18. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| | 19. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |

The motion was carried, 47 having voted for and 19 against.

[21st March 1922]

Motion 426.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" I beg to make the following motion :—

426. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 57,960 for sarishtadar of district and sessions courts by Rs. 100.

" Sir, in the pre-reform Council, the hon. Mr. Venkatapati Razu moved a resolution that the chief ministerial officers in district courts and the district collectors' offices should be transferred once in three years. After considerable discussion that resolution was passed and in pursuance of it a Government Order was issued calling on all administrative heads to see that their chief ministerial officers are transferred once in three years. We now see, Sir, that the Government Order has been honoured more in the breach than in the observance. A question was asked in this House by an hon. Member in November as to the number of years for which sarishtadars in district courts have been allowed to remain at the same place. That is Question 1301 of the November proceedings of this House. The answer shows that one sarishtadar has stayed as many as ten years and another five years and so on. Subsequently I asked for information asking for details as to the names of the sarishtadars in the several courts and the number of years of total service they have put in. The answer was that 'Government have no information.' I then put a supplementary question whether the information could be called for. The hon. the Law Member said: 'Certainly not; there are a number of courts and we do not want to take the trouble.' I submit that the transfer of sarishtadars is in the hands of the High Court. When I raised the question as to whether the local Government could not interfere in the matter, it was said that it was not the duty of the local Government and you ruled out the question.

" The Legislative Council having accepted the principle of the resolution of Mr. Venkatapati Razu, I submit that the Government should see that the administrative heads carry out those instructions. I have also tabled a motion on this point; only for want of time it was not moved. It was one of those resolutions that could not be taken up this session. I bring this motion to draw the attention of the Government to this point and request that Government will take measures to draw the attention of the High Court and see that these sarishtadars are transferred once in three years. It will be seen that the sarishtadar is the chief ministerial officer and he has got great control over appointments and other things, so that if he continues at the same place for a number of years, a number of subordinates suffer. It may be pointed out, Sir, that the chief judicial officer is engaged so much in the disposal of judicial work from 11 a.m. to 5 p.m. and it is only at odd moments that he can attend to the administrative work. That being the case, the sarishtadar naturally has to attend to all this work and he may be tempted to abuse his powers. Hence I say that the effect of transferring the ministerial officer every three years would greatly tend to improve the administration and minimise corruption.

" But one objection which may be advanced is that in the disposal of business a new man may not be able to know the previous correspondence and so may be at a disadvantage. But there is the head clerk to help him. And the sarishtadar and the head clerk of the same place may be transferred at different periods, in which case neither of them will be at any great disadvantage in the matter of the disposal of routine work of the office.

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

[21st March 1922]

"With these words, Sir, I make this motion."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I may mention for the information of my hon. Friend the mover and also for the information of other hon. Members that we have, if I remember right, more than once drawn the attention of the High Court to the desire expressed in this Council that the District Court sarishtadars should be transferred once in three years. I may say at once that I shall be glad indeed to send in this discussion also to the High Court and also to take other steps that may be necessary. The House knows that we have no direct control over the sarishtadars and that we have no right to transfer them. We can only address the High Court and I shall do so again in regard to this matter."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—"I certainly sympathise with the hon. the Law Member when he says that he has no control over the District Court sarishtadars. So the only way in which the Council can enforce its desire is by passing this motion to reduce the grant. Anyhow I have no objection to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 427.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

427. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 80,646 for establishment of temporary sub-courts by Rs. 20,000.*

"This is consequential on the previous resolution that we accepted. We accepted that the provision for temporary sub-judges may be cut down by Rs. 25,000 and consequently when the sub-judges go, the establishments provided for them should also go. Therefore I commend this motion for the acceptance of the House."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"It may be consequential. But I think Rs. 10,000 will be the proper figure and not Rs. 20,000. I am not proposing an amendment, because I am violently against both these reductions."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I move an amendment to the effect that 'Rs. 20,000' in this resolution be substituted by 'Rs. 10,000'. The resolution as amended stands thus :—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 80,646 for establishment of temporary sub-courts by Rs. 10,000."

The amendment was accepted by the House and the motion as amended was carried unanimously.

Motion 428.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—"Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

428. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 50,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 5,000.*

21st March 1922]

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

"As the effect of a previous resolution a number of temporary sub-judges have to go. Therefore I move for a reduction by 10 per cent representing their travelling allowances. But when I gave notice of this motion I had in view the increased provision made under this head. I find, Sir, that in the budget estimates for 1921-22 the amount provided under this head was Rs. 27,000 and in the revised estimate it was Rs. 70,000. As we have decided that a few temporary sub-judges should go the reduction in this case is quite essential."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Mr. President, this small sum in the shape of travelling allowance is provided for in order to enable the district judges to do their inspection duty properly. We have a great deal of complaint about the want of supervision and want of inspection. It seems to me that the way of enforcing such inspection is not by reducing the amount available for travelling allowance. A portion of it is required for transfers of munsifs and sub-judges from one place to another and also the sarishtadars. I hope, Sir, that these sarishtadars will be transferred once in every three years as desired and I hope also that there will be more inspection. Under these circumstances Mr. Muniswami Nayudu may as well withdraw his motion and enforce the inspections and transfers."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 429.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—

429. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 10,800 for duty allowance for district and sessions judges (Provincial Civil Service) by Rs. 100.*

Motion 430.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

430. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,800 for duty allowance for district and sessions judges (Provincial Civil Service).*

"This is a duty allowance. This House has accepted the principle that the duty allowance should not be countenanced. I therefore hope that this Council would accept this motion."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Mr. President, you will see, Sir, that one portion of the duty allowance is non-votable and the House does not propose to touch it. For doing exactly the same duty the Indian officers will get Rs. 150 less. It was, I believe, after a considerable amount of pressure that these officers are getting now the same salary as the Indian Civil Service officers except, of course, the overseas pay. If the House thinks that the pay is too much and that they should have this differentiation between one and the same class of officers who are doing the same duty, then I have nothing more to say."

The motion was then put and was declared carried.

[21st March 1922]

On the motion of the hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar a poll was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 27. Mr. C. Venkata Ranga Reddi. |
| 2. Mr. V. Appaswami Vaidayar. | 28. Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao. |
| 3. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 29. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 4. Dr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayada. | 30. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |
| 5. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankineedu Prasad Bahadur. | 31. Mr. C. V. Venkataratnam Ayyangar. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya. | 32. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 7. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 33. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhaachari. |
| 8. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 34. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 35. Mr. K. V. Ramachari. |
| 10. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chetti- | 36. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| yar. | 37. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 11. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 38. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo. |
| 12. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 39. Mr. T. Sivusankaram Pillai. |
| 13. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 40. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 14. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon. | 41. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 15. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 42. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampian. |
| 16. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 43. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib. |
| 17. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 44. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib. |
| 18. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 45. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur-Rahim |
| 19. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | 46. Musahi Muhammad Abdur-Rahman |
| 21. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. | Sahib Bahadur. |
| 22. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 47. Mr. Saiyid Diwan Abdul-Razzaq Sahib |
| 23. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddi. | Bahadur. |
| 24. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. | 48. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman |
| 25. Mr. A. T. Tangavelu Nayagar. | Sahib Bahadur. |
| 26. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. | 49. Mr. G. Vandanaam. |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 7. The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. |
| 2. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. |
| 3. The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad | 9. Mr. E. Periyannayagam. |
| Habib-ullah Sahib Bahadur. | 10. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. |
| 4. The hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 11. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 5. The hon. Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 12. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam |
| 6. The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi | Nayudu. |
| Nayudu. | 13. Mr. Abbas Ali Khan. |

The motion was carried, 49 having voted for and 13 against.

Motion 431.

The following motion was not made:—

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR:—

431. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 35,02,003 for civil and sessions courts by Rs. 50,000.

Motion 432.

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

432. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 35,02,003 for civil and sessions courts by Rs. 1,53,200.

“Sir, this reduction, which I am now moving for, is exclusive of the reductions already made.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—“That cannot be.”

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—“Under this head, Sir, there are some temporary district courts in existence, one in Negapatam and the

21st March 1922]

[Mr. T. Balaji Rao Nayudu]

other in Vellore costing about Rs. 75,300. In addition to additional district and sessions courts the number of temporary sub-courts in existence is 20. The speakers of the previous motions explained to the House the undesirability of having additional courts, and added that these courts were not doing enough of work and so on. It is known to many of us that in civil courts the work is going on very slowly. My own experience is that in some courts even very trivial suits are dragged on for months together. I have heard a number of officers who have had experience of the work of the district collectors and sessions judges saying that they cannot possibly exercise the same control over civil courts as they can exercise over the executive staff or the magistracy, because the High Court wants that supervision should be carried on in a judicial manner, so as not to hurt the feelings of the subordinate judges and district munsifs. That being so, I think, that the amount of work that could be done by them would be considerably very small. Under these circumstances I submit for the consideration of the House the question of deferring the increase required by the Government for this year, i.e., Rs. 1,53,200.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—“Mr. President, we have analyzed every single item and discussed the reduction of the temporary sub-courts, a reduction in the temporary district munsifs' courts, and also a reduction in their establishments. I cannot understand what this general reduction of Rs. 1,53,200 out of Rs. 35,02,003 is meant to effect. It is stated that the district judges are not doing adequate work. I have protested against that statement and nobody has come forward to state that they are not doing the work up to the required standard. All that is stated is that in particular cases particular judges have not enough work. Having already decided to cut down the temporary allotments for sub-courts and munsifs' courts by Rs. 35,000 and Rs. 25,000 as well as the cost of their establishments, if the House is again going to reduce the allotments in a general way without any principle, then I find myself in a difficulty in answering it. The question is, do you want justice to be done? This is the minimum, Sir, which the Government thought it would be necessary to spend for the purpose of dealing out justice to the people, and this is the minimum which the High Court say they require for the purpose of doing justice. You have already cut off a portion of the allotment for temporary sub-judges' courts, you have already cut off a portion of the money allotted for the temporary district munsifs' courts, and if more cutting out is proposed under this head, I should have had some guidance as to the direction in which economy is to be effected. Under these circumstances, I strongly oppose this reduction.”

Mr. A. T. MUTTUKUMARASWAMI CHETTIYAR:—“Mr. President, Sir, on account of economy which is necessary especially with the present state of Indian finance, another form of retrenchment to which Government may well have had recourse to is the reduction in the number of sub-judges and district munsifs. There are far too many of them. At one time it used to be said that district munsifs were an over-worked lot. But I am afraid that there is too much exaggeration in this statement. Besides, they are themselves responsible for the accumulation of work in their hands. They give too many adjournments, they give too much latitude to the Bar, they make the securing of justice a costly business to the parties, besides increasing Government expenditure. This department is one in which a great deal of

[Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar] [21st March 1922]

quickening up is necessary. The lordly leisureliness of the district munsifs and the sub-judges must give place to smart intellectual grasp of facts and quick arrival at decisions. There are such judges in this country who are prompt without sacrificing justice and I do not see why these alone should not be retained. It is a pity that before the Reformed Councils have fairly begun to grapple with administrative difficulties, the judicial officers' pay has been increased considerably. With these few words, I support the motion."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, in view of the notice I have given of a motion for reducing the total allotment under this head by one lakh of rupees, I crave your permission to move an amendment to this motion, suggesting that 'Rs. 1 lakh' be substituted for 'Rs. 1,53,200', as this reduction has also been proposed under the same head. I may also state that in view of the fact that we have already reduced the allotment by Rs. 80,800, the balance to be reduced according to the present motion would come to Rs. 19,200, to make up the total of one lakh of rupees now proposed to be reduced. I wish to make a few remarks in support of this amendment, if you, Sir, will be pleased to grant me permission to move it, that is, to substitute 'Rs. 1 lakh' for 'Rs. 1,53,200'."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" As the hon. Member has not given due notice of his amendment, it is for the House to say whether he should be given the permission asked for. The motion before the House is 'To reduce the allotment of Rs. 35,02,003 for civil and sessions courts by Rs. 1,53,200'. The hon. Member's proposed amendment to that motion is to substitute 'Rs. 1 lakh' for 'Rs. 1,53,200'. It is my duty to inquire if any hon. Member objects to the amendment going forward. Does any hon. Member object?"

No member having objected, the permission to move the amendment was granted.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I do not wish to take up much time, but only wish to point out that this sum of Rs. 1 lakh will only represent a little less than 3 per cent of the total allotment for civil courts. The attention of the House has already been drawn to the various items from which retrenchment could be effected. I do not wish to affect the permanent courts, nor the pay of their establishments nor their other allowances. Even taking it out of account, we find that provision is made for Rs. 1,56,000 for temporary sub-judges, Rs. 86,400 for temporary district munsifs, Rs. 80,646 for establishments for temporary sub-courts, Rs. 75,972 for establishments for temporary district munsifs' courts, a lump provision of Rs. 40,000 for an additional district court, Negapatam, and a lump provision of Rs. 33,000 for additional sessions court, Coimbatore. All of these come up to nearly Rs. 5 lakhs, even without taking into account the permanent courts or their establishments. So, the total reduction which I propose by means of this motion is certainly very reasonable because we ask for one lakh including Rs. 80,800 already decided upon by the vote of the House, and because similar reductions have already been effected under other heads. I only desire to make a further increase to the reduction already made. I hope my friend Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu will have no objection to accept my amendment, as it is more modest than the reduction proposed by him. I only want that the proposal should be a modest one."

21st March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I presume, Sir, the effect of this amendment will be to effect a further reduction of Rs. 19,200, as the House has already agreed to reductions to the aggregate amount of Rs. 80,800. This being so I wish very strongly to oppose any further reduction in the allotment if there is any risk of its being distributed against the sessions courts, with which I am concerned as they relate to criminal justice. The present number of sessions courts is not adequate to cope with the work which comes before them. We have constantly to create additional sessions courts, and even so it is a matter of extreme difficulty to get through the criminal work on hand without causing undue hardship to those who have to face the strain of dealing with it.

"There is another point which might be taken : I refer to the establishment of the courts of special judges in Malabar. I presume the House in general is fully agreed that no time whatsoever ought to be lost in carrying through the disposal of the heavy files of criminal cases arising out of the disturbances in Ernad, Walavanad and other parts of Malabar. If any further reduction in this allotment should be applied in such a way as to check the rate of such disposal, I think it would be a matter for very grave regret."

The amendment of Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu to substitute the words 'Rs. 1 lakh' for the words 'Rs. 1,53,200' occurring in motion was put and carried.

The motion as amended read thus :—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 35,02,003 for civil and sessions courts by one lakh.

The above motion was put and carried.

On the motion of the hon. Sir Lionel Davidson, a poll was taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 27. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. |
| 2. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankineedu Prasad. | 28. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 3. Dr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu. | 29. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |
| 4. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 30. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vaidyar. | 31. Srikanth Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 32. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 7. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya. | 33. Mr. K. V. Ramachari. |
| 8. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 34. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 35. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 10. Mr. O. Ramalinga Reddi. | 36. Srikanth Sasi Bhusana Kath Mahasayo. |
| 11. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 37. Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai. |
| 12. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 38. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar. |
| 13. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon. | 39. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 14. Mr. K. A. Kandaswami Kandar. | 40. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 15. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 41. Mr. Qadir Nawaz Khan Sahib. |
| 16. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 42. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib. |
| 17. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 43. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib. |
| 18. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 44. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur-Rahim Khan Sahib. |
| 19. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 45. Munshi Muhammad Abdur-Rahman Sahib. |
| 20. Rao Sahib A. Ramayya Punja. | 46. Mr. Saiyid Diwan Abdul-Razaq Sahib. |
| 21. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. | 47. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 22. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar. | 48. Mr. G. Vandanam. |
| 23. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. | 49. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya. |
| 24. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. | |
| 25. Mr. C. Venkata Ranga Reddi. | |
| 26. Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao. | |

[21st March 1922]

Noes.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. |
| 2. „ Sir Charles Todhunter. | 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. |
| 3. „ Khan Bahadur Muhammad | 11. Mr. R. Littlebailes. |
| Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 12. Mr. E. Periyannayagam. |
| 4. „ Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 13. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. |
| 5. „ Mr. P. Ramarayanagar. | 14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 6. „ Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi | 15. Mr. S. Muttumanioka Achari. |
| Nayudu. | 16. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 7. „ Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 17. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 18. Rao Bahadur T. Numberumal Chettiyar. |

The motion was carried, 49 having voted for and 18 against.

Motions 433 and 434.

The following motions fell through as they related to the same matter covered by motion 432 :—

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

433. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 35,02,003 for civil and sessions courts by Rs. 1,00,000.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

434. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 35,02,003 for civil and sessions courts by Rs. 2,00,000.

Motion 435.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“ Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

435. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 48,000 for three judges of the Court of Small Causes, Madras, by Rs. 12,000.

“ Sir, the average number of suits instituted for the five years ending 1918 was 17,327. In the year 1919 the number was 14,621, which means that the number was reduced by 2,706. In the year 1920 the number was 14,085, which means that it was 3,242 less than the average for the five years ending 1918 and 621 less than the number in 1919. I cannot get the exact number for 1921, but I am told that it is still less. So, when the number of suits has gone down, I think it is but proper that the number of judges should also be reduced.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ Sir, I would be extremely pleased if the file justified us to reduce the number. We cannot of course discharge those who are already permanent officers. The judges of the small cause courts are also required to clear off the arrears in the city civil court when the files are heavy.

“ Unfortunately, last year, the file has shown a tendency to rise again.

In 1918 it was 13,764, in 1919 it rose to 14,621 and in 1920 it fell to 14,000. In 1921 it again rose to 15,359. There is no steady fall and it is impossible to say that the number of judges who are now permanently there is too much.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

[21st March 1922]

Motions 436 to 453.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The half a day allowed by His Excellency for this demand is now over and the following motions from 436 to 453 will go out of the agenda :—

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

436. To omit the allotment of Rs. 20,000 for revision of salaries of judges and the registrar of courts of small causes.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAB :—

437. To omit the allotment of Rs. 20,000 for revision of salaries of judges and the registrar of courts of small causes.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

438. To omit the allotment of Rs. 20,000 for revision of salaries of judges and the registrar.

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—

439. To omit the allotment of Rs. 20,000 for the revision of salaries of judges and the registrar of small cause courts.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

440. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,000 for revision of salaries of judges and the registrar, small cause courts, by Rs. 10,000.

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—

441. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,79,389 for courts of small causes by Rs. 42,100.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

442. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,79,389 for courts of small causes by Rs. 10,000.

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

443. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 45.79 lakhs by Rs. 2,50,000.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

444. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 45.79 lakhs for Administration of Justice by Rs. 100.

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

445. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 45.79 lakhs by Rs. 100.

Mr. V. P. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—

446. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 45.79 lakhs under Demand X by 5.00 lakhs.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

447. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 45.79 lakhs under Demand X by Rs. 2,50,000.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

448. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 45.79 lakhs under Demand X—Civil Justice by Rs. 100.

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

449. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 45.79 lakhs for Civil Justice by Rs. 2,50,000.

[21st March 1922]

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

450. *To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 45.79 lakhs by Rs. 100.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

451. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 45.79 lakhs for district and sessions judges by Rs. 1,000.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

452. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 45.79 lakhs for Civil Justice by Rs. 2,50,000.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

453. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 45.79 lakhs by Rs. 100.*

The question that the Government be granted a sum of Rs. 45.79 lakhs less 1 lakh under Demand X—Civil Justice was put and carried."

The grant was made.

The Council adjourned for lunch at 2-4 p.m. and re-assembled at 2-45 p.m.

DEMAND XI—CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I have the honour, Sir, to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 7.89 lakhs for Criminal Justice."

Motion 454.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

454. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 73,159 for Presidency Magistrates' Courts by Rs. 3,700.*

Motion 455.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"I beg to make the following motion :—

455. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,400 for two stipendiary first-class magistrates and establishment for Tiruppur and Paramagudi.*

"Sir, we do not clearly know what the object is of providing these two stipendiary first-class magistrates.

"There were two motions made in this House with reference to this. I believe there was a resolution passed or accepted by the Government in the old Council under which it was proposed to try stationary magistrates in place of the subdivisional magistrates who are touring, to avoid the inconvenience to the clients who had to go about in search of the magistrate. The second motion was by my friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar for the separation of judicial and executive functions. It is possible that this arrangement is suggested by the Government to try an experiment to give effect to the separation. If it is the latter, I am in full sympathy with the object itself. But I cannot see how this provision can really do anything in the way of giving effect to that resolution. I have got some information from the hon. the Home Member with reference to the work of these magistrates. I wanted to know what these magistrates were expected to do and he was pleased to send to me a copy of the Government Order which shows that these first-class magistrates will be in charge only of original cases and will try original cases as stationary magistrates; and the criminal appeals and cases under the security sections will be under the subdivisional magistrates.

[21st March 1922]

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyyar]

This was the information I was able to obtain from the hon. the Home Member with reference to these magistrates. If this is the case, it would not in any way help to realize the object of the motion I referred to, viz., the separation of the judicial and executive powers. These magistrates will be under the Collectors and will only be giving relief to the ordinary subdivisional officers who will still be in charge of cases under the Criminal Procedure Code. And further, Sir, the experiment of the separation will not have been tried properly in this way. Speaking for Coimbatore, Sir, I say these officers are simply unnecessary. There are, I believe, three tahsildars in the district invested with first-class powers and they are doing first-class magistrate's work and they are more than enough to meet the exigencies of the district. It so happens that two of them are in one division, Erode, and one is in Coimbatore. If one of the tahsildars is transferred to Tiruppur he could certainly give necessary relief to the Pollachi subdivisional officer. And then one of the other two magistrates will be at Erode itself. I believe the present proposal is to give relief to Erode and Pollachi subdivisional officers by taking away one taluk from each : Dharapuram and Tiruppur. These two taluks are, I believe, proposed to be placed under the first-class magistrate and all original cases from these two taluks will go before the stationary magistrate at Tiruppur. Now, as I say, there is a tahsildar in Dharapuram with first-class powers and he is dealing with criminal cases and if the other tahsildar from Erode or Coimbatore is transferred to Tiruppur he will be giving the necessary relief to the subdivisional magistrate at Pollachi. And if this is accepted there is absolutely no necessity for this expenditure. As I said, if this is intended as an experiment for the separation of the judicial and executive functions, it would not really do. What is wanted is a trial to be given in a different way by taking away the cases from the jurisdiction of the revenue officers and the Collector and by appointing proper judicial officers under the district judge. So, Sir, I strongly think that this expenditure is absolutely unnecessary."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Surely, Sir, the hon. Member is rather confusing 'his wishes' with the wishes of the Council when he speaks of 'our wishes' being to try development in the direction of the separation of judicial and executive functions by a system dependent on supervision by the district courts. I was under the impression, Sir—and I had the opportunity of hearing the debate in this Council—that the proposal to separate judicial from executive functions fell to the ground in this Council because a large majority of the House differed emphatically from the corollary embodied in the resolution moved that the entire control should vest in the district and sessions judge and the High Court. That at least is my impression and I mention it in order to bring out how the hon. Member is confusing his personal views with those of the Legislative Council as a whole.

"These two appointments are the direct outcome, as he has told us, of a resolution moved in this Council in November 1919 by Mr. Siva Rao, I think, who made proposals to extend the system of stationary magistrates by divesting revenue divisional officers of their magisterial functions and appointing stationary magistrates of the first class in each district with exclusive powers to try criminal cases. I must confess that I was never particularly enamoured of the proposal though there is something to be considered in it. And I think that, if I had been present during the debate, I should not have accepted the motion. But, as a matter of fact it did not

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[21st March 1922]

fall to me to deal with the resolution, for my *locum tenens*, Mr. Knapp, was then in charge. In consequence, however, of his qualified acceptance of the resolution subject to certain modifications which he indicated as necessary to convert the measure into an experiment in the direction desired, it fell to my lot to carry out the arrangements which seemed to him to be good. The idea seemed good to me also and I was ready to go on with it in consultation with the Revenue Board. A very careful examination was made of the conditions of the districts that were *prima facie* most in need of relief of the kind contemplated. This resulted in the conclusion that the districts of Coimbatore and Ramnad were in greatest need. Time does not permit of my going into the details justifying that conclusion or traversing the details adduced by the hon. the Mover.

3 p.m. "All that I can now say is that a very careful examination was made of the volume of magisterial and revenue work devolving on the various subdivisional magistrates, deputy tahsildars and sub-magistrates in the districts of Coimbatore and Ramnad as well as of other districts and the result was the proposal to which exception is now taken. It was not at all hastily worked out or given effect to in a hurry. One of the two first-class magistrates has already joined duty in Coimbatore, and for all I know, the other may also by now have joined duty in Ramnad or will shortly do so, for orders have gone to the District Magistrate to appoint a suitable person to the post and it has been intimated to him that we have included provision for the post in the budget. It will of course be quite easy to arrange for the discontinuance of either of those appointments if the House should express its desire to do so or if the Government on due consideration of this discussion desire to recede from the experiment entered into after so much and so careful deliberation. But, if I were going to remain in office, I should not consent to depart from that part of the scheme which I gather is most unacceptable to the hon. the Mover. I am personally responsible for the stipulation that these first-class special magistrates should not deal with the ordinary maintenance of the peace, for I am satisfied that I do not think that any stationary magistrate can adequately deal with that class of work. I am quite certain that in troublous times like these you cannot by sitting in your court dealing with cases that are brought to you day by day gain any adequate idea of the general condition of the parts of the district in which you have to work. The man who knows the real facts is the man who is touring in the area and he alone can know what is going on. It is he who is in a position to judge whether it is necessary to take security from persons who are disturbing or are likely to disturb the public peace, and he who ought to have general control over the magistrates in the area. He ought to deal with their calendars and he ought to hear appeals against their decisions in order that he may know what class of work is coming before them and how they are dealing with it and whether or not it is necessary to tender them advice. I entirely agree with Mr. Gopalakrishnayya who said this morning that one patent defect in the working of the civil court is the lack of personal inspection and personal supervision and that the state of magisterial courts is far better because there you have such supervision. The same point was, I think, taken by Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. It is all very well to talk of not interfering with judicial independence and of the statutory discretion of sub-magistrates; but speaking as a practical man I may tell the House that I regard much of such talk as nonsense.

[21st March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

A sub-magistrate must learn to find his footing when he first takes up office, and it is quite proper that he should receive advice on general matters, though not in regard to the disposal of particular cases. He should ask and receive instructions—'instructions' is the wrong word, for, what I have in mind is general advice—as to how to deal with classes of cases according as situation may require. The giving of such advice is one of the most important duties of a subdivisional magistrate and a district magistrate and the only way in which he can discharge it properly is by keeping in full touch with the work of the subordinate magistrates and by personally reading their calendars. I have been a district magistrate for a good while at one time or another and I made it an invariable rule personally to examine a large proportion of the calendars which came from sub-magistrates of the second and third class, and all the calendars from subdivisional and first-class magistrates. I found that this gave me invaluable insight into the character of these men and their capacity to exercise their judicial discretion wisely. I do not think I was ever so foolish as to give a magistrate orders or advice as to how to deal with a particular case. I cannot at least recollect any such case and it would have been against my principles to do so. But I remember perfectly, after a case had been dealt with, telling a magistrate that I thought he had exercised his discretion very badly in the awarding of the sentence. I am quite prepared to justify action of that kind. Supervision of this nature must continue to vest in the subdivisional magistrates and it is they who ought also to be responsible for dealing with security cases in their divisions. If the House as a whole does not want these first-class stationary magistrates subject to the limitation which I consider necessary, then I shall be quite ready to advise Government to strike out not the whole of this allotment but so much of it as is not due for the payment of charges incurred during the month of March. But I still think that these two appointments might furnish useful material towards the further consideration of the question of the separation of judicial and executive powers which I have no doubt will at some time or other come before the Government of Madras for a more detailed examination than that it has received in the past. There has indeed been some examination in the past, but not in all its details. Our idea was that these two appointments would perhaps give us further material of some value for arriving at a decision on the question how far it is possible to go in the direction of separating judicial and executive functions. For this reason I should personally regret deletion of this grant. Our orders were that after these appointments had been in force for a year, a report should be made to Government in regard to the success of the experiment."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, I really find it difficult to approve of the idea of appointing these magistrates with the limitations suggested by the hon. the Home Member. If the separation of the judicial and executive functions is to prove of real benefit in this country, there must not be such limitations as have been sought to be imposed on them in the discharge of their duties. When my friend Mr. Gopalakrishnayya, whilst speaking on a motion regarding civil justice, drew a comparison regarding the instructions issued by district magistrates in the conduct of work of subordinate magistrates and deplored the want of such an arrangement in the matter of civil courts, I felt that something wrong might come out of that statement. I had then no opportunity to

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [21st March 1922]

express my views regarding that point. But, Sir, the remarks of the hon. the Home Member have necessitated my reference to that aspect of the question. So long as the Criminal Procedure Code gives certain powers to the magistrates or other officers concerned and vests them with sufficient discretion in certain matters, it is unfair and undesirable that the district magistrate or the officer above should impose any restrictions or give any instructions, which may be construed as directions to be obeyed, in matters in which they are discharging their functions."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Member. Do I understand that it is seriously contended that the question as to what control the district magistrate should exercise over the subordinate magistrates, could be discussed, much less disposed of, on this issue? I am afraid the hon. Member is travelling very wide of the issue on hand?"

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"I shall presently point out the connexion. The hon. the Home Member referred to it as one circumstance to be considered in bringing these new stipendiary magistrates into existence and in giving them the powers—"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"May I say, Sir, that my reference was slightly due to the fact that the hon. the Mover drew particular attention to it and therefore it would be less out of order than in the case of Mr. Krishna Rao."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"If on these budget motions we are to discuss very much wider questions, the chances are that we shall not deal with those wider questions satisfactorily and that the limited time allotted to the House for dealing with the finances of the Province will be frittered away. By all means, if it is the wish of the House that it should now discuss at length the nature of the control that the district magistrate should exercise over his subordinate magistrates, and as to whether he should or should not issue instructions, and as to what he should say and what he should not say, the House may do it. But there is the chance that within the time limits imposed upon it the House will not be able to deal with the numerous resolutions on the finances of the Province which are now on the agenda."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"I quite agree with you, Sir, and I appreciate the point that has been presented. I was only going to say that we must not accept any such statements from the hon. the Home Member—not that I wanted an elaborate discussion on the matter—because it will be creating a dangerous precedent if such directions are to be issued to those officers."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"May I rise to point out that the hon. Member may well follow your ruling?"

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"It will be dangerous to allow district magistrates to interfere in such matters and give such directions. That is all that I wish to say in regard to that question."

"Now, regarding this question which has been moved by Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar, the point for consideration is that if the appointment of these magistrates is likely to be of real use in the contemplated scheme of separating the executive from the judicial functions, it will be our duty to support the retention of these magistrates. What I still find it difficult to comprehend is whether it is really calculated to effect the object we all have in

[21st March 1922] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

view. It is not really calculated to give effect to the intention or the partially expressed intention of the House—I say partially expressed because there was then a debate which cannot be considered complete—regarding the long-desired reform of the separation of the judicial and executive functions. Unless the hon. the Home Member will make further modifications in the proposals which he has made and enunciated and give them real powers in all matters coming within their cognizance and unless the experiment is tried in a way so as to be really useful and so as to serve as an example in other places, it is very difficult to vote for the retention of this provision in the budget."

Mr. K. P. GOPALA MENON:—"Mr. President, Sir, I am not prepared to enter into the discussion as to whether or not this will lead to the separation of the executive and judicial functions. But, coming as I do from Madura and having somewhat to do with the Ramnad district also, I would certainly say that there is absolutely no necessity for having a separate first-class magistrate. Paramakudi is a small town on the railway line from Rameswaram to Madura in the Ramnad district, and in the Ramnad district we have got a first-class magistrate at Ramnad, and another at Sivaganga. This being the case I doubt very much whether there is any necessity for having another separate first-class magistrate. I had occasions to go to Sivaganga and the other first-class magistrate's court very often. The present first-class magistrates can finish their work every day before 1 o'clock. As a matter of fact, in the Chettinad, the Chettis are very averse to go to criminal courts which is a well-known fact and there is a subdivisional court which has practically very little work to do on the criminal side at Devakottai."

"Added to all these, we have got another first-class magistrate for summary suits in Ramnad and Manamadurai. I should therefore think that while we are going on finding the ways and means to curtail our expenditure we must see whether there is any necessity for these officers. Of course some worthy gentleman might have moved a resolution in 1919 for some purpose or other but now it is evident there is no necessity for these officers. As I was saying the other day, as a result of the sanctioning of so many of these first-class magistrates, the district magistrates do no work on the criminal side. I know of one instance where a lawyer in Madura sought to file a bail petition in a case usually filed before the first-class magistrate at Sivakasi but the district magistrate refused to entertain the petition. If only the district magistrates find time to hear such applications for bail, it would be much convenient to the profession and to the poor client who will have to go all the way to Sivakasi. So far as the district of Ramnad is concerned, the location of a first-class magistrate's court at Paramakudi is absolutely uncalled for. And we are not rolling so much in wealth now as to see as an experiment whether the separation of judicial and executive functions is possible by having such courts. I therefore support the motion for reduction."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, I understood the hon. Sir Lionel Davidson to say that this is an experiment in the direction of separation of judicial and executive functions. But with the conditions that he has imposed upon it, I do not think this experiment will ever lead to

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [21st March 1922]

the separation of the executive from the judicial functions of the district magistrate. I am therefore of opinion that this provision is unnecessary and I urge the reduction."

Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao moved the closure which was carried unanimously.

The main motion was then put and declared carried.

The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson demanded a poll which was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 22. Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao. |
| 2. Dr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu. | 23. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. |
| 3. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 24. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 4. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya. | 25. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |
| 5. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 26. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 27. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 7. Rao Bahadur T. A. Kamalinga Chettiyar. | 28. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhaacharu. |
| 8. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 29. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 9. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 30. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 10. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon. | 31. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 11. Mr. K. A. Kandaswami Kandar. | 32. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Kath Mahasayo. |
| 12. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 33. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. |
| 13. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 34. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 14. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 35. Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 15. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 36. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar. |
| 16. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 37. Mr. A. D. M. Savotti Sahib Bahadur. |
| 17. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | 38. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib Bahadur. |
| 18. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 39. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 19. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddi. | 40. Mr. G. Vandanam. |
| 20. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar. | |
| 21. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goondar. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. |
| 2. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 11. Mr. R. Littlehales. |
| 3. The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habin-ul-Jah Sahib Bahadur. | 12. Mr. E. Periyannayagam. |
| 4. The hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 13. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. |
| 5. The hon. Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 6. The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 15. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankineedu Prasad. |
| 7. The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 16. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 17. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 18. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| | 19. Rev. W. Meston. |

The motion was carried, 40 having voted *for* and 19 *against*.

Motions 456 and 456-A.

The following motions were not made:—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—

456. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 21,600 for revision of pay of establishment in criminal courts.*

Mr. A. T. PALMER:—

456-A. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 600 for charges on account of European vagrants.*

The question that the Government be granted a sum of 7.89 lakhs after deducting the sum of Rs. 10,400 (i.e., for a grant of 7.78 lakhs) under Demand XI—Criminal Justice was then put and carried.

The grant was made.

21st March 1922]

DEMAND XII—JAILS.

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Mr. President, I move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 35.67 lakhs for Jails."

Motion 457.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

457. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 8,280 for superintendent, central jails (1 camp jail, 690—1,150).*

"I do so, Sir, only for the purpose of getting some information which would be very necessary. In page 101 of the budget this question is dealt with. Regarding the camp jails there were originally three superintendents which now becomes four with the one mentioned just above in the budget page. Reference to this in the Financial Statement at page 47 does not make matters a whit clearer. I simply want to know the policy of the Government towards the camp jails in the coming year. I referred to the page in the Financial Statement just to show that so far as this increase is concerned, it does not seem to be the idea to have more camp jails in places other than Bellary. If all these camp jails are to be in Bellary, I do not understand how there is any necessity for the increase in the number of superintendents."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"My hon. Friend is missing the whole thing. There are only five and three superintendents on various grades, five for central jails, three for district jails. I think the 'do.' in the middle column has misled him."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"The 'do.' has not misled me, Sir, but has made me ask for information. It is not explained even in the Financial Statement."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"The Finance Department will take the blame upon themselves for the 'do.'"

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I do not blame the department Sir. Much was said of the work of the Assistant Secretary of the department the other day. I will omit all my reference to that because somebody else has taken the responsibility for it. So far as the jails, the camp jails, are concerned, we are told that there are a number of cases pending in Malabar about the Mappilla rebellion and there seems to be much chance in the number of prisoners being increased without any limit. I wish to know whether it is the intention of the Government to group these prisoners at Bellary or whether it is their intention to send them to various places retaining the prisoners in Bellary only for a temporary period till arrangements are made for receiving these prisoners in other jails. If the Government agrees to the suggestion once made of releasing all prisoners under one month's imprisonment there would be a lot of jails available for imprisoning the Mappilla prisoners. It is desirable for us to know what the idea of the Government is as regards the very large number of Mappilla prisoners under trial and those already in jail. It is with that view I move for the reduction. I want the information and it is for that purpose that I move this motion."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"I hope I have made it quite clear that there is going to be only one superintendent for the camp jail at Bellary. At present—I have not got the accurate figures—there are about 4,500

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar] [21st March 1922]

Mappilla prisoners at Bellary. There are, I believe, 2,000 Mappilla prisoners distributed in the various jails. The congestion in the jails is so great that if at any moment there is any outbreak of any epidemic, the position will be extremely serious. We want, if possible, to relieve this congestion from the ordinary jails and to take the prisoners as fast as we can into the Bellary jail which is being fashioned for that purpose. It is our idea to restrict imprisonment as much as possible but that depends upon the magistrates and not upon us. It is our intention to avoid imprisoning persons if we can possibly help it and if they deserve it. If incidentally we can get some sum of money by way of fines, it is the intention of the Government to utilize it for the restoration of the Malabar district. But, as I said, the matter does not depend entirely upon us but it depends upon the magistrates and we are not inclined to give any direction or order to the magistrates. We shall, however, instruct our prosecuting agency to ask for fines in addition to imprisonment in all suitable cases wherever they think the prisoner can be allowed to be free on such payment and we propose to suspend or remit the imprisonment conditioned on good conduct. It is also our intention to carefully go through the warrants of all the Mappilla prisoners hitherto convicted and adopt a similar procedure in suitable cases. But we cannot let out persons guilty of outrages and allow them to go to places where the Hindus are even now in terrible fear of them. That, Sir, is the general position and the details have to be worked out. There are, I understand, about 15 to 20 thousand cases registered on complaints which will have to be dealt with by magistrates. How many of these persons will have to be taken into jails I am not able to say. Perhaps, I will be obliged to come before the House for a large supplementary grant in course of time. I want to mention this also to the House, that we are trying to arrange for work for the Mappilla prisoners in the various places so that we may get something out of their labour to set against the expenditure we have to incur. We have now put up an annexe to the jail at Coimbatore wherefrom my hon. Friend comes with a view to give some work there in expanding the walls of the jails and other similar work. If remunerative work is available in other places at a not prohibitive cost, it is our intention to take away these prisoners and relieve the Bellary jail as far as possible. Till all these cases are dealt with and we close the special courts of the district, it would not be possible for me to say how many exactly are the persons we will have to be provided for in the camp Jail. It has to be kept as a clearing house as far as possible. I may also say that with regard to the persons who are transported, although we were extremely anxious not to send a single person to the Andamans at the present time, it is impossible to provide accommodation for them here. We have asked therefore the Government of India to allow the Andamans to be reopened for the transportees. It is our intention later on to take back these deportees if we can make the Bellary camp jail into a permanent one, so that it may serve as a permanent penal settlement; we can provide work in large scale manufacture of *cumblies* for which we want plant and machinery. It is with a view to minimize the expenditure as far as possible that we are investigating these matters; but these provisions here in the jail budget, are the least that are required."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I thank the hon. the Law Member for his information. I wish to know whether it is not found

21st March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.]

possible to send these persons on some emigration scheme to some other parts of the country."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"That also is being considered."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 458.

3-30 p.m. Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

458. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 28,50,445 for jails and convict settlements by Rs. 100.*

"I want information on three points and only three points. The first is as regards the Mappilla prisoners. In answer to a question of mine the hon. the Law Member admitted that an unusually large number of prisoners in the Bellary jail were falling ill and the rate of mortality also was very high. Now there are over 2,000 prisoners scattered in other jails elsewhere. I would like to know whether the prisoners there are falling ill in the same way as prisoners in the Bellary jail, and whether the rate of mortality in those other jails is the same as that which obtains in Bellary. If it is not so, if the conditions in other jails are better and healthier, then I think I am entitled to ask why the Government still persist in sending prisoners to Bellary where conditions are by no means good.

"The second thing to which I should like to invite the attention of the hon. the Law Member is as to how far effect has been given to the recommendations made by the last All-India Committee for jails, and how many of those recommendations have been given effect to. Last year when about this time reference was made to that, the hon. the Law Member said that the report was just then in his hands, and that it was too early for him to have gone into the matter deeply and to make up his mind as to how or which of those recommendations were going to be given effect to. Now it is more than a year and I expect, Sir, he is in a better position to comply with my request.

"Thirdly, I wanted information last time on what terms the Indian Medical Service officers were recruited. We find from the budget that a number of Indian Medical Service officers are given certain allowances for being in medical charge of certain jails. I want to know whether these officers are or are not whole-time servants of the Government. If they are whole-time servants, why should they be paid for any work that they are asked to do in connexion with the Government jails? Last year the hon. the Law Member promised to look into the question and I would like to know, Sir, what he has got to say now at the end of the year."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Mr. President, the circumstance under which we had to make provision in Bellary for the reception of a very large number of Mappilla prisoners is well known. Even the Madras Government are unable to create jails with strong walls on all sides in two months or three months and they do not grow like Jonah's gourd in the Madras soil. I do not know whether my friend has any conception of what it costs to have really a well-organized central jail. In most of them, the walls alone cost something like a lakh of rupees. We have organized a camp central jail in Bellary which is quite handy as a camp jail and I am

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

[21st March 1922]

glad to say that the Superintendent in charge has done all that could possibly be done to make the place quite safe and healthy with the time at his disposal and the materials at hand. My friend asked what became of the prisoners in the other jails. As I have told him just now, all the jails are very much congested and if by any chance there had been an outbreak of any epidemic, the situation in those jails would have been very very serious indeed. We have to relieve congestion in those jails as soon as possible. As I have already mentioned, there was very little room in the other jails for taking in more prisoners than the normal, and we had to increase the number in almost every jail far beyond the numbers which those jails were intended to take. Then, Sir, so far as the camp jail at Bellary is concerned, there was at one time a large number of sick patients who were probably suffering from epidemic diseases. In consequence of that the Government sent in the Surgeon-General and the Inspector-General of Prisons to make a careful enquiry into that matter and on their advice we have removed a very large number of these sick patients into substantial buildings, into barracks. Now we want to remove all the prisoners now in the camp jail into these barracks before the hot season commences in Bellary, for there is no shade in the camp jail and there are not enough of huts. The immediate removal into barracks has relieved the sickness to a large extent. We have, in consequence of that sickness, been sending in a very much larger number of medical officers than is usual in a central organized jail. We have sent in ward boys for the purpose of nursing the sick persons in those barracks. We have sent an assistant surgeon with a travelling laboratory from the Guindy Institute for the purpose of making investigations on the spot. The result of our activities is there has been a considerable reduction in the number of sick patients and I am told that the matter is now well in hand; and we may congratulate ourselves on the vigorous steps taken to prevent sickness in the camp jail. That is what I have got to say, Sir, with regard to the Mappilla prisoners in the camp jail at Bellary. My friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, I believe, is a non-official visitor to that jail. He is at liberty to go and see and satisfy himself that everything that can possibly be done by us has been done. I am not sure however that I will not have to come to the House for a supplementary grant for extra expenditure which has been incurred already during this year.

"The other question, which he has asked, is with regard to the Jails Committee's report. We have passed orders on many of their recommendations and, so far as this Government can give effect to the recommendations, they have given effect to them as far as possible and almost every order has been placed on the Editors' table. I do not recollect the contents of all those orders now; but, if my friend wants, he may have them. With regard to portions of the Jails Committees' recommendations which require the sanction of the Government of India, we are awaiting their orders. Some of the recommendations will require consideration and those will be dealt with by the India Government as an all-India question. In short, the Local Government have passed orders on all the recommendations of the Jails Committee so far as it was in their power to give effect to them and so far as they thought it was desirable to do so. With regard to the recommendations made by the Committee which come under the scope of the authority of the Government of India, we are awaiting orders. To the extent to which we have already received their orders, those orders again have been placed on

21st March 1922]

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

the Editors' table. That is the position, Sir, as regards the Jails Committee's recommendations.

"As regards the allowance paid to I.M.S. officers or other officers—it is not merely the I.M.S. officers who get the allowances—it is for their being in medical charge. There is a large jail population and so far as I understand it, the pay of the I.M.S. or other civil officers is for the purpose of doing their normal work. When I accept they are full-time officers, it does not mean that they have pledged all the 24 hours of the day to the Government. Seeing that it is very hard work and that the work is more than normal, i.e., more than normal in the sense that it is done by only a certain number of these officers and not by all—the pay being fixed for the whole cadre for the normal duties—when they do abnormal duties, this charge allowance for being in medical charge is given. In some instances, as in the camp jail at Bellary, we have an independent medical officer in charge with a large number of subordinates under him. That is because the camp jail now contains about 4,500 prisoners, while the highest population in a central jail is supposed to be 1,500. That is the reason, Sir, for giving this small allowance, a medical charge allowance, which is given only in cases where the Superintendent is not himself a medical man."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I am glad, Sir, to hear what has been done for the Mappilla prisoners. I may tell the hon. the Law Member that I am not a non-official visitor of the Bellary jails and so I cannot say anything from first-hand knowledge. As regards the last point, I do not quite understand the principle underlying the grant of this allowance. The hon. the Law Member seemed to imply that inasmuch as his work in certain places is, because of his being in charge of jails, somewhat heavier than in other places, some compensation was to be given to such an officer. If that principle is adopted, I am afraid that it has to be extended not merely to the medical officers, but to officers in many other departments as well. I think it is a matter within the common knowledge of members of this House that district charges also vary as regards the quantity of work. There are some districts which are very light, while there are others which are very heavy. If we have to pay these people by reference to the quantity of work turned out, then I am afraid, Sir, we shall be going in for a very heavy bill indeed. But one thing is clear from what the hon. the Law Member said that it is within the discretion of Government to give or withhold these allowances and that by virtue of their contract they are not entitled to claim these allowances as a matter of right."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"What are the allowances that the hon. Member is referring to?"

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Charge allowances, Sir."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Some of them are votable and some of them are non-votable."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"All that I meant to say was that the hon. Member could deal with those allowances which are not in italics, but not with those which are."

[21st March 1922]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I have nothing further to say, Sir. I only wanted to draw the hon. Law Member's attention just as I did last year and I hope the matters will be looked into. I do not press this motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 459.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

459. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 35,86,445 for jails and convict settlements by Rs. 100.*

"Sir, in answer to the motion of my hon. Friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, the hon. the Law Member stated that the Government have in contemplation a new policy of letting out Mappilla prisoners on certain conditions."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"What I was saying was we are likely to let out a certain number of these Mappilla prisoners who have been already convicted on conditions. We are selecting them and we are going to instruct our prosecuting officers to ask for a fine in cases where such a punishment is suitable, and that is in ordinary cases."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Well, Sir, I do not know why my hon. Friend is objecting to my calling that a new policy. If he has any objection I do not wish to offend the Government by calling any Government policy new. Sir, I understood the hon. the Law Member to admit the inconvenience they are put to; and I understood also from his general remark about the situation in Malabar that a new policy of conciliation and a new policy of humane treatment towards persons who have been misguided—"

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"So far as I understand, Sir, it has always been the policy of this Government to give humane treatment to all."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I am not discussing the general humanity of Government. I am considering what the policy might be in the present circumstances. Looking at the changes that have been effected in Malabar, I urge, even if the hon. the Home Member desires to disown the policy, that the releasing of persons whose release is not at all dangerous to public peace is a policy which the hon. the Law Member, the Home Member and the whole of the collective Government would do well to adopt. Having said that, Sir, I wish to come to the particular point which I wish to urge in making this motion. During the last six months it is not only the Mappillas that have filled our jails but numbers of those misguided persons who in advocating the non-co-operation movement and the liquor campaign have got into jail. Many of them are very young and the hon. the Law Member and the members of Government will realise that conditions under which notices under section 108 have been issued to many of these persons at the instance of the police are such that the issuing of a notice is tantamount to conviction. Therefore, Sir, if in the present circumstances, more especially in the present circumstances of the finance of the province and in the present circumstances necessitated by the unforeseen improvement in the political circumstances, if the Government of Madras

21st March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

have no new policy I can only express my surprise. Of course my surprise is not going to bring about a new policy and that is why I am trying to persuade the hon. Member who is responsible to pause and adopt a new policy. It is only last night, Sir, that I read in the papers that a notice was being issued to a certain lady and that she had been arrested. I am perfectly certain that her conviction is a foregone conclusion."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"May I ask him to say, Sir, whether these somewhat remote issues are relevant to the matter before the House? There is another minor point of order, which is worth raising and about which I have been feeling a little doubt, as to whether, when a motion for the reduction by a nominal sum of a particular grant is moved by one hon. Member in regard to one or two specific points, it is open to other hon. Members who speak on that motion to request information on other points."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I do not think he is speaking on any motion except his own."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I am sorry I understood him as speaking on other's motion. Nevertheless may I request for the guidance of the House ruling from you on that point? Of course, it does not arise here."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"When several hon. Members have tabled separate motions, not exactly in the same terms but all suggesting nominal reductions and all for the purpose of obtaining information, the House can take the motions separately, so that each hon. Member may put his point and obtain information. In regard to the other point raised I understand the hon. Member's view to be that by the adoption of what he calls the new policy of letting off the people who are in jail he will be able to reduce the jail population. He has thus got a proposal for reducing the jail population. (Laughter.) It is relevant."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I am merely suggesting, Sir, that the hon. Member should adopt a similar policy in regard to those who are now in jail, more especially those immature young men whose antecedents are those of school boys and whose further detention in jail would certainly lead to their moral contamination. I appeal to hon. Members in charge of Government to take a humane view in the case of political prisoners, always excepting those who have been actually convicted of violence or disorderly behaviour. The general political situation has improved and I submit that there is absolutely no object in keeping these prisoners in jail except to embarrass my hon. friend Sir Charles Todhunter. He is the only person who will be embarrassed by the present policy. I do not think that peace and order will in any way be jeopardised by adopting a policy of what I might call reasonable treatment towards these prisoners. Therefore, Sir, I suggest that this question should be taken up seriously and that the Government should take up the case of those prisoners who are now in jail. Not only that, I also trust that suitable instructions such as those that are proposed to be issued in the case of the Mappilla prisoners will also be issued to the district magistrates so that there may be no more convictions. Hon. Members will see that notwithstanding the change in the situation, more especially in the northern districts, these prosecutions are still going on. Persons are being prosecuted under section 108 and I trust that the matter will be considered in a broad spirit and that the Government, instead of

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [21st March 1922]

administering the cane will now proceed to distribute the jam. I have only one other matter for consideration. Sir William Vincent made a statement in the Legislative Assembly in regard to the treatment of political prisoners. That statement I noticed only in the papers. I tried to get the authoritative statement in the proceedings of the Assembly but I have not been able to trace it. I do not think it has been reported as yet. I presume that that statement has been communicated to the local Governments. Sir William Vincent stated that it is their policy that all those who are now regarded as political prisoners should be separated from the rest of the jail population sentenced to the same penalty. I do not wish to dilate on that matter. So in addition to these two matters I also trust that whoever may be detained will not be treated as ordinary criminals who have been convicted of offences properly so called, offences against the morals or against the State, but that under the peculiar circumstances stated by the Government of India they will receive special treatment. I earnestly ask the hon. the Home Member and the hon. the Law Member to consider whether by adopting this policy they will not also be bettering the financial position of this province. I am perfectly certain that such a policy might be adopted, without any detriment to peace and order."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" Sir, the hon. the Law Member was kind enough just now to tell us that he is according very humane treatment. I am sorry to say, Sir, that the treatment accorded to prisoners in jails is not very humane. It is only a few days back that I and the hon. Member for Ganjam Mr. Rath had to represent to him the sad case of a hunger strike that is going on in the Berhampur jail. This is due to the fact that the political prisoners were not given sufficient quantities of salt."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" May I ask if we can allow the discussion which is degenerating now into a general statement of political prisoners still in jail? Increase of diet means increase of expenditure."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I understand that Mr. Das's point of view is that he is dissatisfied with the treatment accorded in this jail."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" Most dissatisfied."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" So he wants to express that sense of dissatisfaction by cutting down Rs. 100 from this allotment."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I quite see the point. But in the light of the ruling that you gave just now the hon. Member's point is out of order. Mr. Ramachandra Rao wanted the reduction on an entirely different point of view. Therefore, according to your ruling, Mr. Das is not entitled to raise that point now."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Mr. Ramachandra Rao shows dissatisfaction in one way and Mr. Das shows his dissatisfaction in another way. Mr. Ramachandra Rao's dissatisfaction may end in reducing the expenditure and Mr. Das' dissatisfaction may end in an enhancement of it. Both of them can put forward their grievances only in one way, viz., by proposing to reduce the expenditure, because no non-official member is permitted to propose an increase of expenditure. It may look a crude procedure, but it is right and it can't be helped."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" My difficulty is that I have been trying to apply to this particular case the principle which you just laid down

21st March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

a few minutes ago. I understood that your ruling was that if two different grounds of dissatisfaction were taken, they should form the subject of two different motions. Mr. Das should have tabled a motion for the reduction of the grant by Rs. 100 to express his dissatisfaction at the treatment accorded to political prisoners. Mr. Ramachandra Rao's dissatisfaction is based on the ground that the prisoners should be let out of the jail."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I must say that it would have been more convenient if they had tabled separate motions. But it is perfectly open to Mr. Das to support the hon. Member's motion for reducing the allotment on a different set of grounds. He proposes to vote for the motion though he may not agree with all the reasons given by the mover for that motion."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I mentioned specially the treatment of political offenders and the statement made by Sir William Vincent."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" While thanking you, Sir, for the wide margin that you allowed me, I should also say that a good deal of expenditure would be saved if there were no hunger strikes in jails, as you would save a good deal of correspondence, a good deal of telegrams, a good deal of work of the Publicity Bureau and sometimes Press communiqués also. In that way there would be a lot of saving."

" Sir, I think there has been a hunger strike in the Berhampur jail from 14th March. I do not know whether the hunger strike is yet over. Sir, I am very sorry to hear from my friend Mr. Rath that the hunger strike has not yet subsided. The treatment accorded to these prisoners in jails in various other ways and especially by refusing to give them their ordinary necessities of life can in no way be called a humane treatment, and the result is that many of these prisoners have lost in weight, from 8 to 5 lb. each. Well, Sir, the treatment accorded to such prisoners in other provinces, for instance, in Behar and Orissa and Bengal, is certainly humane—far better than that accorded to the prisoners in the Madras presidency. Again, the jail rules do not allow even their relatives to go and have interviews with these prisoners. Sometimes various sorts of rumours are spread and a good deal of anxiety can be saved by relaxing these jail rules and admitting public men or such other persons who are interested in the well-being of these persons to go into the jails and interview them."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Sir, I rise to say one or two words on this motion, as my friend Mr. Ramachandra Rao and my friend the hon. the Law Member referred to the release of Mappilla prisoners. Sir, I myself and my friends coming from Malabar have no objection whatever to the humane treatment of prisoners, including the Mappilla prisoners. But we the people in Malabar seriously object to the releasing of the Mappilla prisoners who have been sent to jail on conviction. My friend, the hon. the Law Member, though he represents the Government, and my friend Mr. Ramachandra Rao spoke in an airy and light-hearted manner about the releasing of these Mappilla prisoners who have been convicted by magistrates and sent to jails. As a matter of fact, I may mention to this House that a memorial, very largely and influentially signed, has been sent to the Government of India and probably to this Government also. This influentially and largely signed memorial refers to the danger of releasing Mappillas who have taken part in this serious rebellion and who have been convicted by

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

[21st March 1922]

summary courts to two years' imprisonment. It is for the Government to pass such orders as they think fit on this memorial. But I want to say this to the House, that the period of two years will soon elapse. It was only in the later stages that special tribunals with powers to inflict longer terms of imprisonment were appointed. In the earlier stages of this rebellion, summary courts and magistrates tried the cases and they had power to award imprisonment only for a period of two years, and persons who were guilty of very serious crimes have been sentenced only to two years' imprisonment, and I do not know whether my friends realise the consequences of releasing these prisoners, whose number is very large, before the period of their imprisonment has run out. In fact, my friend opposite knows and ought to know that the rebellion has not yet been completely suppressed. I may tell him from my own knowledge that if before the rebellion is completely suppressed these prisoners, who have been convicted to two years' imprisonment and more are released even on conditions, the consequences will be very serious. We are now discussing only the financial aspect of the question. Apart from all other considerations, I may warn my friend that the financial condition will be extremely serious, for the rebellion is likely to be prolonged if these prisoners are released, with the result that the army now withdrawn from Malabar will have to be sent again and this will involve extra cost. I am speaking not only on my behalf but also on behalf of my friend Mr. Tampan. The feeling in Malabar is very strong, and if these prisoners are released, the consequence both to the Government and to the people will be extremely serious. I am very anxious not to be misunderstood. We are not at all against humane treatment or considerations of humanity being extended to these Mappilla prisoners. As a matter of fact, there was a strong feeling in a section of the Malabar public with reference to the train tragedy. I am stating this only to show that the people in Malabar are not less humane than my friend here Mr. Ramachandra Rao or my friend the hon. Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar. My friend Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar says that he will be going to Malabar soon and that after ascertaining the conditions there he will release the prisoners. I give him a serious warning of the consequence that will follow if he does it. As I began, I shall end. We are not against humane treatment of prisoners, but we are against the release of these prisoners convicted by courts of law before their terms of imprisonment are over."

MR. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN:—"Sir, I want to say a few words in this connexion. It is said that these Mappilla prisoners are political prisoners. They are not political prisoners. Every one knows they were convicted for looting, robbery, murder, committing rapes and all such sorts of offences, and do not deserve the humane treatment which Mr. Ramachandra Rao proposes to accord to political prisoners. It is very easy to sit here and speak light heartedly that they may be released from the jails and so on. If you are going to release them, pray send them to the district from which Mr. Ramachandra Rao comes or to the district from which the hon. the Law Member comes and not to Malabar for some time to come at least."

RAO BAHADUR A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, I do not wish to say anything on the question of Mappilla prisoners after the statement made by my friends from Malabar. The question is no doubt one beset with complications; but still we cannot forget that even the worst offender is entitled to humane treatment to the extent to which it is possible. The other point

21st March 1922] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

which is of far greater importance is as to the manner in which it has become necessary to increase the jail population and consequently to increase the jail expenditure by more than 9 lakhs of rupees over the revised estimate. The matter which must concern every one is the manner in which large numbers of persons have been sent to the jail with the formality of a trial and with the full knowledge that the persons concerned are not going to defend themselves. It is unfortunate that the system of separation of the executive from the judicial functions is not in vogue in our country, and if it had been, the result, I venture to say, would have been different. The fact that an accused does not make a defence or that he merely files a statement does not relieve the magistracy of the responsibility of weighing evidence and sifting it with such care and circumspection, as if the case had been defended and represented by a vakil."

THE HON. SIR LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"Are we again to extend the scope of this debate to the methods adopted by the magistracy in dealing with the accused?"

THE HON. THE PRESIDENT:—"I was about to say something about that. We have been having a wide discussion, though we are concerned only with the jail administration. I may at once tell the hon. Member that the question is how people are to be treated in jail and whether they are to be let out or not. I trust the hon. Member will realise that. The circumstances under which the men are sent to the jail and how trials take place would be fit subjects for discussion if this were a vote on Criminal Administration. But this is a vote on Jails."

RAO BAHADUR A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"My next sentence would have cleared matters. My point is this: that if the magistracy had exercised its duty in spite of the fact that the accused did not defend themselves there would not have been so many convictions and there would not have been so many prisoners to be sent to the jails. That is the point to which I have been referring so far as the magistracy is concerned. Seeing that a large number of persons have gone to jails without any defence whatever, it is the duty of the Government to examine the cases independently and of their own accord and to have the advice of such non-official advisers whom they can trust and to set at liberty a large number of prisoners under the present condition of things. I know that similar motions were moved in other Councils and that the Government of those provinces took necessary steps in that direction. Though in this House a similar motion has not been made, we knowing the fate which a similar resolution on political offenders had in this House, yet it is still open to the Government even now to take lesson from other provinces, examine the convictions which have taken place during the last few months and see, if, in all reasonableness, many of the political prisoners cannot be set at liberty and whether congestion cannot be removed in jails. It is the supreme duty of the Government to do so and I believe they will do it."

"Again, my friend the hon. the Law Member has drawn attention to the fact that prisoners in jails are humanely treated. I think that instructions should be issued to all the magistrates of the districts to examine and see if it is necessary that persons should be sent to the jail under the present juncture and that distinctions made between those who can without any difficulty be set at liberty and those who cannot be so set at liberty."

[21st March 1922]

Mr. K. P. GOPALA MENON :—" Sir, if I take part in this discussion it is not because I had occasion to smell the Mappilla atmosphere 4-15 p.m. but because I had an occasion to smell some of these trials that are going on in Calicut. Our esteemed friend the hon. the Law Member has told us that there are a number of cases which are pending now and the consequence of which is a number of persons, generally called undertrial prisoners are swarming the jails. I should certainly invite the attention of the hon. Members to the fact that with greater care and with some sort of investigation we ought to be able to say whether or not against some at least of these persons absolutely false charges have been trumped up. I am prepared to quote my authority for that. It was only last month—"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Is this in order, Sir ?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Let him proceed."

Mr. K. P. GOPALA MENON :—" False cases are trumped up against some of the persons and they are kept as undertrial prisoners for three or four months and then they are let off on the ground that no case has been made out against them. Thus several people are allowed to swarm the jails without any cases against them which could be avoided by better investigation."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" May I mention, Sir, that there are only very few cases of undertrial prisoners ?"

Mr. K. P. GOPALA MENON :—" From my experience in Malabar, I may say that there are at least three to four thousand prisoners who are undertrial prisoners for the last four or five months. I can give one instance. There was a certain respectable Hindu gentleman who was charged with waging war against the King and who was remanded for a period of some months. I had the honour of defending him; a charge was framed against him and the best evidence for him was a precious document which was sent to the district magistrate and the same was filed in court. That document was nothing else than a report of the inspector of co-operative societies who was present in the place of occurrence on that day. The report of the inspector was in response to a proclamation issued by the district magistrate, stating that so and so was in his house the whole day and saw all the things. The learned judges of the special tribunal before whom the case was brought had no hesitation in throwing away that case on the ground that the whole thing was a concoction and that this report was sent two days after to the district magistrate. It was unworthy of the police to have trumped up such a case against a respectable gentleman. If only the truth had been found out, so many unfortunate people would not have been charged and they would not have been swarming the jails for three or four months as undertrial prisoners. I wish to support this motion for reduction more with a view to see that the authorities make proper investigation into matters brought to their notice. I am also prepared to give heaps of instances where the police mischief is responsible for respectable persons having been locked up in jails."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Is police mischief relevant to a motion relating to jail administration? It seems to me that it is too remote."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" No doubt the hon. Member's remarks would have been more relevant if the discussion had been on the Police. I take it that the hon. Member's point is that a large number of these people who are

21st March 1922]

[The President]

swarming the jails in Malabar are under-trial prisoners, who are there on account of reckless action on the part of the police. He says he is prepared to give specific instances to prove his contention."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I wish the hon. Member gives some of those heaps of instances from his personal knowledge. If he does so, I will undertake on behalf of the Government to cause an examination to be made of any case which *prima facie* seems to call for action. I bitterly resent any general accusation."

Mr. K. P. GOPALA MENON :—" I have first-hand knowledge about all these things and I have also made very careful investigation. But I have absolutely no grievance against A, or B or C."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" The hon. Member said he could give heaps of instances, Sir."

Mr. K. P. GOPALA MENON :—" I therefore submit, Sir, that this matter of swarming the jails with under-trial prisoners is one on which greater care should be bestowed and greater scrutiny exercised. If only the hon. Member calls for statistics of cases thrown out, he will find that a majority of the cases have all been thrown out as false or concocted ones. It is only by a vote on this motion that we can draw the attention of the hon. the Home Member to this aspect of the question. I only request the hon. the Law Member to be more merciful and humane in regard to these prisoners and I trust he will issue strict instructions to his subordinates to observe his orders to the very letter."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" Sir, it is with great reluctance that I take part in this debate. The speeches of some of the hon. Members have much disturbed the atmosphere and it seems to me that it is time somebody undertook to pour oil on the troubled waters. The question resolves itself into three aspects: first a general one pertaining to jails, second with reference to the treatment of the Mappillas and third with reference to the treatment of the political prisoners. As regards the first case I heard the amazing statement of the hon. the Law Member that for a long time and even now there has been great congestion and that the rate of mortality is high in jails and he told us as his opinion that things have improved since. But this opinion of his has not been to my knowledge fortified by any comparative statistics. It is a well-known principle that if you are not in a position to keep a prisoner in the condition to which he is entitled under the sanitary codes of the country, then you have no right to keep him there simply because he is at fault, thereby exposing him to the danger of losing his life. Well, Sir, I do not wish to labour that point at greater length. Coming to the more contentious portion of the question, namely, the Mappilla prisoners, my hon. Friends from Malabar, doubtless speaking under the strain of terrible feeling, which it is not possible for us to share in full, have informed the House that it would be a dangerous thing if these people were released soon. One of my hon. Friends was even prepared to say that they should be treated in a humane manner. Another hon. friend wanted that they should be let loose in the locality or at the door of the person who had a good word to say on their behalf. I frankly ask my hon. Friends of Malabar whether they think they can solve the problem of the Mappilla in Malabar by harbouring bitter feelings such as these. I do not for one moment mean to sit in judgment on them; I have no right to do it. They are the best judges

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

[21st March 1922]

and I beg of them to consider for one moment whether in the present state of terrible feeling they can be the best judges in the matter. If my hon. Friend Mr. Prabhakaran Tampan is to be taken at his word, which I do not suggest anybody should do and which I do not think my hon. Friend himself will ask us to do, the only solution would be either extermination of those people or extermment from Malabar."

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—" May I offer one word of explanation, Sir? The other day I stated in connexion with the discussion on Mr. Krishna Rao's resolution that we land-owners are prepared to forgive and forget. We know they are a community essential to Malabar and we have all along lived with their help."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" The Mappillas have to be there anyhow. The question is whether they have to be put out of the country or out of the world altogether. Since both these alternatives are impossible, there is nothing for us to do except to feel for them and try to alleviate their condition. The suggestion therefore is that not merely humane treatment but good treatment should be accorded to those who have not been guilty of taking part in violence of any kind. But in the case of those who, out of fanaticism or under the influence of agitators, have been led astray, we must as time and prudence permit give them a chance to retrieve their characters and lives and make them good citizens of Malabar."

" Then I come to the political question. At the last debate which took place in this House on that subject, I believe an assurance was given by the hon. the Law Member that the whole matter was under the consideration of the Government."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" No, Sir; what I stated was that I was considering every individual case of hardship."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" I see that the hon. the Law Member only promised to consider individual cases of hardship on their merits or demerits. Whatever that may mean, I was going to say that the law in England is different from that in India as regards political offenders. It is the universal desire of everybody that, so far as these matters are concerned, Indians should be treated just as people in civilized Europe are treated. I believe efforts were made or are being made to better their condition. But I do not personally care if individuals are treated better or worse than before. I would like to see that the question is lifted up to a higher plane and the whole matter is decided on the highest standards of civilization and humanity adopted in any century. The whole country is eager for a pronouncement from the Government regarding their policy in this matter. Before I conclude I would request the Government to see that in these matters they act up to the very highest standards of civilization and humanity and not to the lowest."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Sir, I have tabled a motion similar to the one which is now being discussed. What my hon. Friend Mr. Ramachandra Rao in his motion wants is that our political prisoners should be treated on the highest standards of humanity and not as criminals as they are being treated now. Of course we may have difference of opinion among ourselves on special considerations; but there it is that these people are suffering imprisonment which they think they are undergoing in the interests of the country but which others think in the interests of the maintenance of law and order."

21st March 1922]

[Mr. P. Subbarayan]

What we say is that the imprisonment should be human and should not be utilized as a matter for revenge. I think a good deal has already been said about the Mappilla prisoners. I hope our friends from Malabar will realize that the Mappillas who form a large part of the population of Malabar have so long been neglected by their Hindu brethren and therefore this trouble has arisen. If only the Hindus had cared to treat the Mappillas as human beings and not as helots on their lands as most of the landholders in Malabar have treated them, I think we might have had a different tale to tell. So much for Malabar. I hope our hon. Friends from Malabar will bear this in mind and will treat the Mappillas as human beings and not as serfs on their lands. I hope the hon. the Law Member will take into consideration the feeling that exists not only in this House but also in the country that these political prisoners ought to be treated not as criminals as they are being treated now but as political offenders."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Sir, you have more than once laid down that as a matter of courtesy financial reductions of this description should be preceded by some indication to the Government Member in charge of the nature of the points which it is proposed to raise. In this instance I am not aware of any such information having been given to the hon. the Law Member."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" No, Sir, I have had no information with regard to any of these points."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" No such information was given to me either and the least I expected was to find the debate ranging over such issues as the problem of bringing the Mappilla and the Hindu in Malabar into peaceful relations, the policy of the Government in regard to the repression of seditious agitation and the conduct of the police. I never thought that any of these points were likely to be raised on the grant for jail administration and I have had no intimation that it was the intention to do so. To that extent, Sir, I am at a disadvantage in not being able to give my considered opinion but I do hold clear views on the subject and am quite ready to give them to the Council. In the first place I repudiate altogether the suggestion that the 'political' prisoners as they are called are receiving treatment based on grounds of revenge or anything of the sort. No question of revenge, I am sure, enters into the idea of my hon. Colleague or his subordinates in charge of the jails in this Presidency. Persons are committed to jail under sentences of rigorous or simple imprisonment and it is no part of the duty of the jail officials to discriminate between different classes persons who are committed to their care to undergo such terms of imprisonment. Indeed they would be guilty of dereliction

4-30 p.m.

of duty if, in any respect, they departed from the general rules which are laid down in Jail Code for the treatment of persons sentenced respectively to simple and rigorous imprisonment. That they should deal with persons of all classes in a humane and sympathetic spirit is a recognized principle, but the principle of discriminating in favour of the so-called 'political' prisoner is not recognized either by the law or by the subsidiary provisions in the Jail Code. The question whether some such discrimination should be indicated as a general instruction to all provinces of India is, I believe, under examination in connexion with the report of the Jail Committee. This was referred to in debate on the occasion when a resolution on the subject was talked out in this House some

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[21st March 1922]

months ago. In the meantime, Sir, I cannot conceive any sufficient cause for differential treatment in favour of political prisoners; while I use the term 'political prisoner' because it has come into common parlance, I should like to say that the gentlemen who are commonly described by that appellation fall under different classes. Dr. Subbarayan has told us that these men do what they feel to be in the best interests of the country. Does he think that the paid agitator who is touring round in the Northern Circars or travelling from Guntūr to the Ceded Districts and from Aligarh down to Madras, does he think that that class of agitator, uttering any foul lies that occur to him without respect to truth, without respect to decency, does he think that the people of that class who do it for a pay of Rs. 20, Rs. 30 or Rs. 40—we know that many of these men are paid such sums and we know the stuff that they pour out before their poor deluded audiences, foul and seditious lies—does he seriously think that that class of agitator is doing what he thinks is in the best interests of the country? I appeal to this House to pronounce a judgment and I do not believe that Dr. Subbarayan himself really looks on such paid hirelings as on the same footing with the conscientious agitator who is only doing what he honestly thinks right. I recognize perfectly well that there are two types of agitators. Let me give a concrete instance; but, as my classification of concrete cases is merely based on the information before me, do not take it is of necessity accurate. I should be inclined to say that our latest guest in jail, Mr. Konda Venkatappayya, probably comes under the conscientious agitator type. If so it is right and proper that he should be sentenced to simple imprisonment. As to the other class—well, I do not want to give any specific instance of that type, but it comes before me almost every day and is really at the heart of the trouble in every district in this Presidency. Such men stir up trouble wherever they go, and it is an unfortunate fact that only too often the trouble is stirred up in districts hitherto comparatively peaceful. It is often due to the inroad of people coming from Guntūr. In the case of Muhammadan tracts I know of trouble so caused by the advent of seditious agitators from Aligarh. I will not develop that proposition any further. But it is a fact emphasized again and again by district officers in their reports to the Government. They say 'We should have been all right, if it had not been for the agitators coming from outside.' Some of them come from Cuttack in Orissa; a very large number come from Guntūr.

"Mr. Ramachandra Rao has said that now that things are peaceful we might hold out the olive branch, throw open the doors of our prisons and adopt a new policy. Is it not a little early to change? Is it wise to embark on a new policy quite so rapidly? I think not. I think that the majority of the House will agree with me when I say that any rapid change in the policy is gravely to be deprecated. I think it is a matter which the general public regard as matter for congratulation that the troubles in Guntūr district have been dealt with firmly at long last. The action taken in Guntūr has reflected favourably on other parts of the Presidency, and I think that it would be a very very grave mistake suddenly to release these gentlemen who are called political prisoners and to let it be known that the preaching of sedition is regarded with a lenient eye. A recrudescence of trouble would, I fear, be the inevitable result.

"It is suggested again that the doors of our jails should be thrown open on the mere expression of penitence by the prisoner whom it is proposed

[21st March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

to release. In cases where a frank apology is offered the circumstances are now carefully examined. But it is not always possible to accept an apology which, on the face of it, is frank. We view expressions of that description with great consideration and we do our best to let the delinquent out if he really and honestly shows signs of penitence. There is, however, a class of paid agitators whom we watch for weeks and weeks and months and months, knowing they are doing grave mischief wherever they go seeing the consequences that follow on their tours in different parts of the country, without being able to catch them out. When at last the circumstances allow us to put such men in jail, we do so if they are of sufficient importance; the moment they are caught, the moment the sentence is pronounced, and sometimes even before the sentence is pronounced, such men sometimes grovel and ask to be released, promising to give an undertaking that they will never break out into seditious speeches again."

Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasaya:—"Are there many instances like that?"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"There have been several such instances. One or two have been mentioned in the communiqués published by the Government. I can recall one particular case at this moment—"

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"The hon. the Home Member is talking about receipt of pay. I should like to ask him whether the receipt of pay as such degrades a man? A man may not be able to do it by himself. He may be conscientiously doing what he thinks right and yet he may be receiving a pay."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I wish I had in my hands the last tender of apology which reached me. It was from a wretched man who had been employed as a book-binder in the Straits Settlements. He came over to this Presidency, I think, in July or August last. The Congress Committee of the district caught hold of him and hired him for a pittance to go round preaching sedition. He said: 'I took this pay because I was in poverty; I had five souls dependent upon me; I bitterly regret that I went about saying such things; I promise I will not do so any more.' I think a man who takes payment for work of that sort is degraded and dishonoured."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"But there are other people who receive pay and conscientiously believe that they are doing the right thing by the country."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"It is quite likely there are such persons. I know of several pleaders who have suspended practice and receive a monthly remuneration of Rs. 150 for Congress work."

Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasaya:—"There are some who receive none."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"If they act from conscientious motives, I could honour and respect those who receive no pay. But those who receive remuneration for their patriotism do not gain my respect. There are, as I have said, several such. But the type I am speaking of is the man who receives pay, not for telling what he honestly believes, but for going about the country publishing foul lies. There are plenty of such people. If Dr. Subbarayan had seen anything like as much as I have of the speech-making going on in the districts, he would understand that I am

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[21st March 1922]

not exaggerating one atom. It is that type of men with whom the Government want to deal, and deal effectively. I think we are now beginning to get them well in hand, and I should regret it very much if by any sudden change in policy the idea became current that it is possible to propagate sedition broadcast in the districts without running any risks.

"Perhaps, if time permits, Sir, I may refer just for a moment to the Mappilla problem. I think that our friends from Malabar are perhaps a little unnecessarily exercised over the hon. Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar's speech on the subject. I should like to emphasize with all the power at my disposal that the exceptional treatment proposed in the case of certain classes of Mappillas will be applied in the most careful way, and will be confined to prisoners who are specially selected as deserving of such concession. Our idea is that no person should benefit in that way, who is not able to satisfy responsible officers and magistrates who know his past life and all about him. The kind of testimony we have in view is such as could be given, for instance, by Mr. Hitchcock. We are not going to release people who cannot satisfy local officers of real experience. The idea is that if a man has not been concerned in very serious crime and was a respectable person in normal times, but carried away by excitement in the first rush of the rebellion,—there are many such ordinarily respectable Mappillas—the idea is that a person of that description should be allowed under conditions to return to his home to work out by instalments a heavy fine. It is possible to commute sentences of imprisonment to fines, and we are asking the Malabar authorities to make a very careful selection from men now in jail and to send up to Government cases in which they think such commutation is possible. The procedure of the Government will then be to commute the sentence to a fine subject to the conditions that the fine must be paid up in regular instalments and the payer of the fine must conduct himself properly to the satisfaction of the local authorities. If at any time the fine is not duly paid or the conduct of the delinquent is far from satisfactory, this conditional commutation would lapse and he would go back to jail. A similar procedure is contemplated in the case of persons now under trial. We have already authorized the special tribunals in Malabar in cases where they are satisfied that this would not be inexpedient, to suspend the sentences pending conditional release. Such release has finally to be sanctioned by Government. I hope, Sir, that what I have said will re-assure residents in Malabar that there is no idea of returning dangerous Mappillas broadcast."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I did not say that we have 4-45 p.m. put them in insanitary places or in places unfit to live in. I did not say that the prisoners—we were getting them in a rush—were all put in places unsuitable for living. We had, Sir, a camp jail at Bellary in which there were the Turkish prisoners of war. It was quite as good a place as any other. But what I did say was—and I do emphasize it—that we could not have a completely organized Central Jail with all the necessary conveniences developed during the course of the last 50 years. I may say for the information of the House that the jails in the Madras Presidency were considered of all the jails in India to be the most healthy and once held the first place in that respect. Subsequently we have lost that reputation. We are trying to achieve the same position as far as we can."

21st March 1922]

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

"But the real difficulty in the case of these Mappilla prisoners is that they came in a very fatigued condition. There were a very much larger number of elderly people than in the case of ordinary convicts. Our prisons were constructed to hold about 10,000 prisoners. We could not of course foresee that we would want extra jails with all the necessary equipments for another 10,000 people and we could not keep an extra set for emergencies. We did our very best."

"With regard to the transport of these prisoners to Bellary, if they had been left in the rebellious area free it would have prolonged the misery of the Hindu inhabitants or if they had been packed in the sub-jails there, these Mappilla prisoners would have died out. Therefore I say we did our very best. We have been improving the arrangements ever since."

"Something was said in regard to the hunger strike in the Berhampur jail. Two of my friends handed to me a letter day before yesterday making certain allegations. I have sent it to the Inspector-General of Prisons for the purpose of inquiry. I have said, and I do repeat it, that I am inquiring into every case of grievance, I am inquiring into every case brought to my notice, either by representation in reputable newspapers or from responsible persons who undertook the responsibility of fathering those allegations."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mabasayo :—"Am I to understand that speedy inquiries will be conducted because any delay will cause death?"

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"There will be no causing of death because the instructions are they shall not be allowed to die. I did deal only with individual cases subject to the rules. If there is to be a change in the rules it must be by Government and not by any individual member."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I think the object of this motion has been stated in more than one form. It is to elicit from all parts of the House an expression of opinion that a more humane treatment for these prisoners is necessary and desirable, and that in the present circumstances, seeing the change in the political situation, a new policy is desirable. My hon. Friend Sir Lionel Davidson said that no notice or intention to bring up this matter has been given to Government. I admit, Sir, that it is so. But I know the readiness of my hon. Friend to meet any emergency arising out of any situation in this House. But if hon. Members require 6 months' or 3 months' or 3 days' notice, well, I think that it is not exactly my idea of what a collective Government should do. I know their difficulty. My intention is that the hon. the Home Member will summon the collective Cabinet and I hope the matter will be fully discussed and will continue to be discussed till the emergency has disappeared. I submit, Sir, that this is the correct procedure which we should establish. As to notifying the Government of our intention to bring up matters of this kind, we expect similar mutual acts of courtesy on their side. I do not wish to go into this matter at present. I had some grievances also against—I do not say my hon. Friend Sir Lionel Davidson, —but against the department."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I should like to know them."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I have some, but I do not wish to complicate the present situation by ventilating these grievances on the present occasion. Whenever we have anything new to

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [21st March 1922]

bring up, the official mind does not take in these things very quickly. You have to saturate the mind of the official if you wish to have something new which is not in the routine. Therefore, I have taken this opportunity of saying that a new policy in the treatment of these prisoners is necessary. I trust that everything that has been said to-day will be duly considered by my hon. Friends on the Government Bench and that they will try to evolve a change in their policy, if not to-morrow, at least in a few days. But I do press very insistently on them that the situation does require a change in their policy and that they would be applauded if such a step was taken, and there would be absolutely no danger to peace and order.

"I do not wish to admit all that has been said to-day, nor do I agree as to the correctness of the classification which the hon. Sir Lionel Davidson has been pleased to make regarding conscientious objectors and paid agitators and other things. I may perhaps agree with him to a certain extent, but we disagree in many things. I submit that so long as we have a Government in this country, there should be also some kind of politics, and the Government in power will have to recognize that there may be politicians in the country and there may be political agitators with whom they may not see eye to eye, but that is all the more reason for taking the political agitators and political agitation not as being necessarily antagonistic to them. I trust this matter will receive the attention of Government and that necessary consideration will be given to it.

"My hon. Friend Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar said that orders had been given that nobody should die in jails."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"As far as humanly possible, Sir."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Even as far as humanly possible, the Government may promulgate an order that nobody shall die; but whether it will be carried out is another question. It is typical of the mind of the Government to imagine that when they wish to do anything they have only to issue an order. All that I say is let them think about this matter, let them have some political imagination and resolve to meet the political situation by the exercise of their imagination and by relaxing the rules and regulations. In this new era of constitutional Government I think my hon. Friends cannot go on exactly as they have been doing hitherto by rules and regulations issued in the departments. They are here face to face with the representatives of the people to answer and satisfy the popular expression of the popular will. I trust that at least now my hon. Friend and the reserved portion of the Government will recognize that they must rise equal to the occasion and not depend upon rules and regulations. With these words, I beg to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 460 and 461.

The following motions were not made:—

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—

460. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 35,86,445 for jails and convict settlements by Rs. 4,56,000.

21st March 1922]

MR. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—

461. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 35,86,445 for jails and convict settlements by Rs. 15,000.

Motion 462.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I beg to make the following motion:—

462. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 35,86,445 for jails and convict settlements by 9 lakhs.

"My path is made more smooth and more easy by what has just passed during the discussion on the previous motion. I welcome the suggestion of the Government members that some of these prisoners are going to be released on commutation of fine and on other conditions that will certainly make the expenses of the jails much less than what it would be. I welcome also the suggestion that in future the Government would instruct the prosecution to ask for fines where they could be so asked. That also will reduce to a certain extent the amount which would otherwise be spent on diet and other necessities in the jail for the prisoners. I am neither a Mappilla nor a Malabari, and consequently I can take a detached view. I think, Sir, that the decision which the Government have come to is a sound one. It is such a conciliation and such a concession that will heal the sore hearts and will bring about speedy reconciliation between the Hindus and the Mappillas. As for the fear that the Mappillas should not be brought back to Malabar, but should be taken to Godavari and other places, I welcome them in my own district. My district is wide enough, and what with heat and what with malaria, they can live very comfortably in our district. So, I think if they are released, it will reduce the jail expenses. I think they will do no harm to my district. Surely my district is very wide and only sparsely populated. Thirdly my submission is this: If the suggestion that I have already made elsewhere be accepted, namely, that in the case of the accused under trial, if proper investigation had been undertaken, and if proper committals had been made there would have been less under-trial prisoners and consequently there would be less expenditure. We find from the comparative statement given in the Government records that the convictions are always less than about 40 per cent and that being so a greater scrutiny and investigation in the charging of cases and also in the committals will bring us a saving. Fourthly, I submit, Sir, that the time has arrived when it should be seriously considered whether it would not be desirable that some prisoners, even after conviction—I do not mean to say that all prisoners but some prisoners—should be allowed to self-diet themselves. These should be allowed to have their own diet at their own expense in jail. This will also indirectly cause a large decrease in the expenses. Very often, prisoners in jail are given diets which do not suit them and to which they are not accustomed, and they are given food cooked in such a way that it is not at all suited to their constitution. Consequently sometimes hunger-strikes take place, sometimes they are reduced in weight by 8 or 9 pounds and so forth. Sometimes also they get sickness, which means an additional expenditure on the medical establishment and medicine charges. All these expenses could be saved by allowing certain classes of prisoners their own diet. But it may be contended that it is against the Jail Code. The Jail

[Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu] [21st March 1922]

Code is a code which we ourselves have made, and as civilization advances and as we progress, it certainly behoves us to treat them in a more humane way than they are at present treated.

“It may be said, Sir, that if we allow them to have their own diet, they will lose all fears for the jail and that will in consequence, induce people to commit more crimes. I submit, 5 p.m. Sir, that it will not be so. The very idea that a man's liberty is taken away and he is confined within a certain place is degrading in itself. It is the dishonour involved in the imprisonment more than the jail diet and other things that tells upon a man and makes him penitent, and prevents him from indulging in further crimes. It is the loss of liberty that tells upon him more than the diet itself, and consequently I submit very seriously and earnestly to the consideration of the House whether the time has not arrived for allowing prisoners to have their own diet. In that way a good deal of money could be saved not only in point of diet, but also in other expenses like medicine and other things. I therefore submit that if all these suggestions are adopted I think the extra 9 lakhs that has now been provided for in the budget which is more than what has been provided in the revised estimate, could very easily be saved. I move therefore for a reduction of Rs. 9 lakhs under this head.”

The hon. MR. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“Mr. President, I thought my hon. Friend was perpetrating a joke upon the House by asking for a reduction of Rs. 9 lakhs. Nine lakhs is precisely the sum which is required for the diet of the Mappilla prisoners, for their clothing, and for their medical charges. I was wondering whether the idea of my friend was—because he has not omitted the sum required for the preservation of the camp jail or its superintendence—that these prisoners should be left in the jail, without diet, without clothing and without hospital charges. That would be a jail clearance with a vengeance. The other alternative is that every Mappilla prisoner, whether a murderer or any worse culprit, including those who may hereafter be convicted, should be let loose. If we do so, then we will have to let loose 12,000 of these prisoners to populate Cuddapah and there may be space there. My hon. Friend also gave us a hint as to how Cuddapah was going to treat these prisoners. I can conceive of only these two alternatives and the suggestions can only be taken as humorous. The suggestions that the hon. Member made with regard to the jail administration will be carefully considered. Some of these suggestions are not new, and some of them were made by the Jail Committee also, and we are earnestly trying to give effect to them. But I would draw the attention of the House that for the purpose of giving effect to these suggestions more money is required, not less. I think, Sir, it is a hopeless proposition, this reduction of nine lakhs of rupees, which is precisely what we want for the Mappilla prisoners.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“I am very much amused at the statement made by the hon. the Law Member that I was cutting a joke upon the Government. It is not my nature to have any jokes against anybody at all, and much less against the Government.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I am sure nobody has made any serious charge against the hon. Member; otherwise I would have risen to order.”

21st March 1922]

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“It was far from my intention to accuse the hon. Member of being capable of it.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“In the opening remarks, Sir, the hon. the Law Member said that I was cutting jokes upon the Government.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The hon. the Law Member would, I am sure, accept the assurance of the hon. Member to the contrary.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“Very seriously, Sir.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“To come to my subject, the hon. the Law Member told us that the suggestions could not be carried out, and that being so, Sir,—”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“I did not say so. I said ‘I will consider his suggestions very carefully’.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“Very good. I am more than satisfied, Sir. I therefore withdraw my motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 463.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

463. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 35.67 lakhs made for jails by two lakhs.

“This, I venture to submit, is a very practical proposition and the hon. the Law Member should have no hesitation in accepting this reduction in view of the general policy of retrenchment we have embarked upon since the commencement of this sitting on the 17th instant. It will be remembered that in the provision made for jails in the budget for 1922-23 there is an increase of about 9½ lakhs when compared with that of the revised estimates, and it is a serious matter for consideration whether, notwithstanding the various special circumstances which have happened during the current year, we can afford to pay such a large sum of money on this item of expenditure, and whether we can increase the expenditure to the extent of 9½ lakhs in the manner suggested. I have suggested that the sum be reduced by at least two lakhs of rupees, because I find that if some of the reforms which have been suggested, and which have also been indicated by the hon. the Law Member are to be carried out, we can hope to effect some retrenchment. While discussing the previous motion he was good enough to tell us that some measures of reform are under contemplation in the matter of the Mappilla prisoners. Let us hope that some good will come out of the investigation which has been promised and that as a result of it, it will be possible to effect savings in that direction.

“Regarding the release of political prisoners, which was suggested in the discussion of the previous motion, the hon. the Home Member only told us that it is too early. When that period comes, and when effect is given to the suggestion of this House, the release of political prisoners, after proper examination of each individual case and the circumstances attending upon his life and character, will result in retrenchment.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“I never had any idea of directing a wholesale examination of the cases of people who have been committed

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[21st March 1922]

to the prison by the order of competent courts. I did not wish to suggest in any way that any such examination by Government was possible."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Not that I said that the hon. the Home Member made any such suggestion. A suggestion was made on behalf of this House that such an examination be made, and then the hon. the Home Member said that it was too early to think of any change of policy in this direction. But, Sir, I hope, and I am confident, that the hon. the Home Member and the whole Government will carefully consider the suggestions that have been made in this respect and that they will soon find it desirable to release all political prisoners. As I am asking for a reduction in the provision made for next year, there is a sufficiently long interval for the Government to be satisfied that there is no serious political danger in the country and that there is no necessity for continuing any of these repressive measures any longer. I am confident and I can assure the House that the state of the country will justify, and will even necessitate the release of all political prisoners. These are the two directions in which, I hope, it will be possible to effect some retrenchment."

"The other suggestion is that whatever view the Government may take, whether they differ from us or not, the question of the treatment of political prisoners which has been raised in the country must be solved in a satisfactory manner. We are not satisfied with the attitude of the Government in that respect. They say they make no difference among the prisoners and that the jail rules have to be carried out in all their rigour. But we find upon a careful examination of the systems prevailing in other countries that distinction has been made in their treatment. If the Government for any reason should find it difficult to improve the present method of treatment and to give political prisoners the food to which they are ordinarily accustomed I should find no justification whatsoever for the Government not permitting them to make their own arrangement for food. They will only relieve the Government of their duty. Suppose the Government make up their mind and allow them to make their own arrangements for food and give them all necessary facilities for this purpose, subject to such sanitary or medical restrictions as are necessary—I am confident that there will be some retrenchment in the matter of expenditure and that we can save some money. Therefore I should think that so far as my motion for the reduction of two lakhs is concerned and that in the budget provision for the next year, it will be quite possible to effect a saving to that extent. The Council will not be justified in voting for an increase of 9½ lakhs over the revised estimates. If the motion is accepted—I hope the Council will be good enough to accept it—they would make provision for reasonable increase of over 7 lakhs and they would also effect a saving of two lakhs to be utilized for other important objects we have in view."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Mr. President, this is not a case where you can reduce the provision. The question is if you must have a certain number of prisoners; that does not depend upon the Government; so far as the Government are concerned they will be extremely pleased if there is to be a fall in the number of prisoners. The extra provision which has been made is entirely for the Mappilla prisoners and I have not taken into account any ordinary fluctuations in the jail population, any nor ease due to political crime or for other reasons. This is a special provision

21st March 1922]

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

which I ask the House to make for the Mappilla prisoners and which can only be an estimate. Otherwise this year's jail budget is lower than last year's budget. In the last year under 'ordinary expenditure' the amount was Rs. 20.96 lakhs and the revised estimate was Rs. 21.12 lakhs. The budget for 1922-23 is 19.63 lakhs, I am omitting the provision made on account of this large influx of the Mappilla population. Under 'jail manufactures' in last year's budget the amount provided for was Rs. 7.42 lakhs. That was reduced in the revised budget to Rs. 6.3 lakhs as we were not able to purchase a khaki dyeing plant which was necessary for supplying the Police with khaki drill. This has been reinserted and we have got Rs. 7.28 lakhs. Thus, under the 'Jail expenditure—Jail manufactures' the expenditure now is Rs. 6.28 lakhs. This includes provision for the increased work which we expect to give to the Mappilla prisoners. Therefore, there is no means of reducing this expenditure.

"Supposing that you reduce the grant, what will happen is that some time in August we will have to come before the House and ask for a larger sum by means of a supplementary demand for grant."

5-15 p.m.

We have budgeted for what we considered to be reasonable estimate of what will be required on account of the Mappilla prisoners coming into the jails. As I have already told the House, subject to conditions in suitable cases, it is our intention not to overpopulate the jails by Mappilla prisoners. Of course, we shall consider the question very carefully and my Friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar need not be in any nervous fever that we are going to let loose all the Mappilla prisoners on the country. But in spite of all that, seeing that there are about 35,000 cases entered against these persons—that is what I understand—it will be imprudent on our part not to anticipate a large increase of these Mappilla prisoners or to cut down our budget estimate under that head, more especially, as I said, as it will be necessary to see that this camp jail at Bellary is made suitable for any sudden influx we may have and also for the purpose of relieving the congestion in jails in other parts of the country. So, Sir, there is no principle in this motion as in the case of the motion for the reduction of Rs. 100 just now discussed. As I have already told the hon. Member Mr. Ramachandra Rao, we shall do everything that we can for the purpose of keeping down the jail population. We do not want to have a smaller budget provision and then come in again every time we may find it necessary. We have cut down the establishments as far as possible, or else we should have had three Superintendents and the necessary establishment in the camp jail, whereas we are now doing with one. In these circumstances, I do not think it would be proper to reduce the allotment by so much as two lakhs of rupees."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, notwithstanding the information given by the hon. the Law Member, I think it quite desirable that we should vote for this reduction of two lakhs of rupees. It will be remembered that we have in this budget stopped such important and useful works as irrigation, or the expansion of education or the expansion of industries in directions in which we all wish that expenditure should be provided for. If, as has been pointed out by the hon. the Law Member we look up something like nine lakhs of rupees for increased expenditure under jails, I am quite certain that we are doing injustice to various other useful objects which we all have at heart. If, for any reason, some tremendous accident

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [21st March 1922]

should take place in the future and unfortunate circumstances should occur and there should arise the necessity for further increased expenditure, I know the Government have got the means at their disposal of providing for any such contingency. But why should we provide for over nine lakhs of rupees under this head alone and starve other heads of expenditure? So I request this House to at least reduce this expenditure by Rs. 2 lakhs so as to make it available for other useful objects of national concern which we all have at heart."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Does the hon. the Law Member wish to say anything in reply?"

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Only one word, Sir. There is no question of option in this matter so far as we are concerned. It is a question of food or no food. It is a famine budget that we have provided for so far as the jails are concerned."

The motion was then put to the House and declared lost.

On the motion of Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo, a poll was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 20. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |
| 2. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 21. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhachari. |
| 3. Rai Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya. | 22. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 4. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 23. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 24. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 6. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon. | 25. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo. |
| 7. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 26. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. |
| 8. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 27. Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai. |
| 9. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 28. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 10. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 29. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 11. Rao Sahib A. Ramayya Punja. | 30. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 12. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddi. | 31. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib. |
| 13. Mr. A. Subbarayudu. | 32. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib. |
| 14. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. | 33. Munshi Muhammad Abdur-Rahman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 15. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar. | 34. Mr. Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razzaq Sahib. |
| 16. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. | 35. Mr. G. Vandanam. |
| 17. Mr. C. Venkata Ranga Reddi. | 36. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya. |
| 18. Diwan Bahadur B. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | |
| 19. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 11. Mr. R. Littlehales. |
| 2. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 12. Mr. E. Periyannayagam. |
| 3. The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 13. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. |
| 4. The hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 5. The hon. Mr. P. Ramarayanagar. | 15. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur. |
| 6. The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 16. Dr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu. |
| 7. The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 17. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 18. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 19. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar. |
| 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. | 20. The Zamindar of Mandasa. |
| | 21. The Rev. W. Meeton. |

The motion was carried, 36 having voted for and 21 against.

21st March 1922]

Motion 464.

The following motion which stood in the name of Dr. P. Subbarayan was not moved:—

464. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 35.67 lakhs for jails by Rs. 100.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I will now put the demand under XII. Jails. The original demand was Rs. 35.67 lakhs. Deducting the sum of Rs. 2 lakhs the reduction which has now been voted, the grant to be made will be of Rs. 33.67 lakhs."

The grant of Rs. 33.67 lakhs was accordingly made.

The House then adjourned at 5-26 p.m. to meet again at 11 a.m. on Wednesday the 22nd March 1922.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11-5 a.m. on Wednesday the 22nd day of March 1922, the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR Avargal, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

I

COMMUNICATION TO THE COUNCIL.

With reference to the answers to questions Nos. 64 and 1247 given at the meetings of the Legislative Council held on the 1st August 1921 and the 14th February 1922, respectively, the Secretary laid on the table G.O. No. 359, Revenue, dated 23rd February 1922.

II

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

DEMAND XIII—POLICE.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Sir, I rise to move a demand for a grant not exceeding Rs. 148.12 lakhs on behalf of the Police Department. The manner in which that figure has been arrived at is indicated at page 8 of the list of demands, but before we actually come to the discussion of the motions on the agenda, I should like, Sir, with your permission, to pay a tribute to the great services which the officers and the men of the Police Department have rendered to the presidency of Madras during the past exceedingly troublous year. There is no need Sir, to give detailed reasons for this public commendation; for, I think, every one in this House is well aware of the magnificent service done."

Motion 465.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

465. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 500.*

Motion 466.

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—" Before I make the motion standing against my name, I want to know from the hon. the Home Member what is meant by this duty allowance."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" The details of the allowances in issue are Rs. 100 per mensem to the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Madras City, and two allowances of Rs. 50 each for the two Assistant Commissioners. The case for these allowances depends on the additional responsibilities of the posts which these gentlemen hold and the higher cost of living in the Presidency town."

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—" Sir, I do not make the following motion :—

466. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 2,400 for duty allowance."*

The motion was not made.

Motion 467.

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—" Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

467. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 89,286 for provision made on account of additional police.*

[Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu] [22nd March 1922]

"I find, Sir, that in the budget at page 108 a sum of Rs. 89,286 has been provided for additional police in the Madras City which is made up of four sergeants, four head constables and 312 constables. I find in the note prepared by the Finance Secretary at page 48—

'The scheme for the additional police for the Madras City—item (2) above—involves the addition to the police force of four sergeants, four head constables and 312 constables, which is necessary to restore the strength to that fixed by the Police Commission in 1905. This replacement of men whose services have been dispensed with in order to provide for increasing the pay of the rest has been decided upon as a result of enquiries instituted at the instance of the Madras Disturbances Committee which drew the pointed attention of the Government to the inadequacy of the strength of the City Police.'

"There is no doubt that during the last year a situation has been created due to the labour dispute; I concede that. But I submit that simply because there was an unusual disturbance and an unusual pressure brought about partly by non-co-operation and so forth, it is not certainly correct that we should increase the police force by some Rs. 89,000. It is quite possible that if circumstances similar to this should occur in the future we have got the military stationed in the metropolis and that should be quite sufficient to cope with any such situation. If at all there is a necessity to keep a force for any such emergency, we can very well indent upon the police of the adjoining districts to help the Madras police. In a slender year like this when we have a deficit of over a crore, I think it is not a wise policy to increase the police force by Rs. 89,000 a year. I know that the hon. the Home Member at the time he introduced the budget of the Police Department, gave a compliment to the Police and I join with him in the compliment. They have done exemplary work. But that cannot be a ground for increasing the expenditure on police to that extent. I submit, Sir, that the Madras police alone costs 12.54 lakhs and the district executive police for the whole presidency comes to 135 lakhs. When this is divided among the 24 districts, we get less than 6 lakhs for each district, while Madras City alone wants more than 12 lakhs. This is a large figure, and I hope the hon. the Home Member will see his way to cut down the budget figure."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I beg to support the motion.

We see from the financial note, if I understood it correctly, that the very same increased establishment was there before and it was cut down for the purpose of increasing the pay of the remaining establishment. Well, Sir, having done that and having taken credit, probably as on several other occasions that they were able to reduce the establishment so far as the police is concerned—and they have taken the credit throughout the year practically,—now to come and say that it should be increased again is rather surprising. The only reason so far as we can understand from the note is that this is done because the committee that was appointed to investigate into the matter of labour troubles in the city of Madras has in a way led to it. So far as the labour troubles were concerned, there were two versions. One version was the version of the official committee and the only effect of that committee was to add to the burden of the tax-payer. The committee made several recommendations and we do not see much has been done so far as the other recommendations are concerned, and the only thing that has been done is to add Rs. 90,000 to the budget expenditure.

"The other version at the time was that the labour disputes had their origin not necessarily on account of political reasons but on account of

22nd March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

economic labour problems. It was incensed very much not for want of police, but on account of the police inefficiency and the unsatisfactory work of the Labour Department. The non-official committee, though not appointed by Government, consisted of some influential and leading gentlemen including three members of this Council and they made the suggestion, as it were, that the whole thing was not due to the want of sufficient police strength.

"I am afraid, Sir, Government sometimes want bricks to be made and they want to have, according to the old proverb, plenty of straw for making those bricks. We have no objection to sanction the straw, but very often it happens that the straw becomes useless when they want too much of it and sometimes some of it is rotten also, so that by having too much straw and some being rotten also, the whole thing emits bad odour. According to the non-official committee's report the trouble was due more to the inefficiency of the police and also to the trouble given by the Labour Department. All that I would say is that we have a number of troubles due to non-co-operation, labour, etc., throughout the year and practically every district will claim something to its credit. If in every district for some trouble or other this dictum of having additional police is had recourse to, I am afraid we will have to double or probably treble the police and everywhere there will be only police and no other officer. So far as the Madras City is concerned, we believe that the labour troubles are over and let us expect the present Labour Department, if it is continued, will work towards more efficiency and greater usefulness. But there is absolutely no necessity for this additional police. As for non-co-operation, the Government claim the credit of having put many of the leaders into prison and at least, so far as the intentions of the Government have been expressed, they have no idea of letting any of these out. In that case I do not see any reason why the police should be increased in Madras or elsewhere. The cost of the police has unfortunately gone up very much and I do not think it is necessary to add to it. As has been very well stated, Madras has got very strong and efficient police and we have got a large number of volunteers. Also we have got some soldiers here, and there is His Excellency's bodyguard which did so much useful work, according to the Government, in the Northern Circars recently, and there are several district headquarters from which police can be easily brought into the Madras City on a few hours' notice. In all these circumstances, it is absolutely unnecessary to have additional police stationed in Madras City in anticipation of abnormal circumstances as the labour disturbances of last year. Why should we anticipate abnormal troubles just as being afraid of occasional sickness which may or may not happen? I am most interested in this as one coming from the mufassal, because this will create a precedent, and wherever there is any disturbance at any time, either labour trouble, or any other trouble, there would be reason for increasing the police in every place. From that point of view, I think this additional police is absolutely unnecessary. But if the members from Madras and my other friends think that their original view about these labour disturbances is wrong and that it should be changed, and if they think that for the safety of this city more police are necessary, we from the mufassal will not be against it. But our fear will be that it will be creating a bad precedent for asking for additional police in every place where there may be some disturbance, real or imaginary, occasional or frequent."

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, I am not for reducing the police grant even by a single pie at this juncture. We want to increase the

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar] [22nd March 1922]

efficiency of the police in Madras both by quantity and quality. They have cut down the number of police constables and others and they have suffered the consequence. Now, we should try our best to see that the police force is increased as much as possible and Madras is made self-sufficient without waiting for forces from outside."

Mr. S. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI:—"We are trying to cut down the expenditure on police. It is the same as withdrawing protection when danger comes. Our friend, Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, says that there is no necessity for this additional police and that we can get police from outside. It is the same as going to dig a well for water when the house is on fire. We must be prepared previously for all troubles. We must anticipate danger. We cannot say that our country is settled peacefully and that for a long time we do not want police. It may be that it has subsided for a short period and for a long time to come we must have efficient police to prevent such sort of things according to the proverb 'Prevention is better than cure'. If we are already prepared, our enemies will not give much trouble, and if there is danger it can be put down in no time. We must have efficient police to protect our safety and liberty. If the door is open, it is an invitation to the thief; if it is closed, it is a prevention. With these few words, I oppose the motion."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I will begin my remarks in reply by stating that it is hardly possible, within the short limit of time allotted, to set out all the reasons which have necessitated this proposal for additions to the City Police in Madras. A detailed note on the subject was prepared for the information of the Finance Committee and laid before them—I do not know exactly when, but some time during the past few weeks—and I understand that the Finance Committee on a scrutiny of the details recognized that the proposals were a bare necessity. It has been assumed that they arise solely out of the labour disturbances last year. That is not the case. The necessity for additions to the City Police first made itself apparent during the serious looting disturbances of 1918. Since then, we have had a great deal more practical experience which has demonstrated beyond all possibility of doubt that the reduction in the strength of the City Police which was given effect to during the war was ill-advised. I do not say, Sir, that it was not a necessary measure at the time and in the circumstances, for a compelling factor was that it was found exceedingly difficult to recruit men for the City Police, and the Commissioner, Mr. Armitage, thought it better to have a smaller number of men on somewhat better pay than a nominally larger sanctioned strength up to which he was actually unable to recruit owing to lack of sufficient inducements for enlistment. That was an experiment which in the peculiar circumstances of the war it was quite right to try. But the experiment has been tried and it has failed, and the result is that we have now to restore the ordinary divisional strength of the City Police which has been proved to be a necessity. One of the reasons leading to that conclusion is the undoubted increase of grave crime; that is because there has not been an adequate number of police to perform the requisite patrol duties and prevent crime and lawlessness. The prevention of grave crime is only one aspect of the case.

"Another aspect is the necessity for a stronger armed reserve. The events of last year and of September 1918 proved that the existing armed

22nd March 1922] [Sir Lionel Davidson]

reserve police was inadequate. It has been suggested that this is not a sufficient ground for increasing its strength and that we can indent on the military forces in reserve and on men from the reserves of neighbouring mufassal districts when temporary circumstances necessitate strengthening. Now, in regard to reliance on military force, I ought to tell the House that there is no item of policy in the Military Department which has been more forcibly and more frequently impressed on the Local Governments than that they must make their own arrangements for the ordinary maintenance of peace and order and must not get into the habit of relying upon military forces to perform the duties of the police or to strengthen the police in times of emergency, unless the emergency is of the very gravest nature. Such an emergency did arise last year in this city, and in order to meet it we had immediately to raise a special force of upwards of 200 men the cost of which was in the first instance to have been levied from the locality where they were employed. That burden has, as I believe the House are aware, since been removed with the result that the general taxpayer meets the cost of measures necessitated by the disturbed condition of a small area. Not only was that temporary addition made to the staff of the city police—an addition which we now find it necessary to make permanent—but also some 300 constables from mufassal reserves were brought in as a measure of further assistance, and this at a time when it was very difficult and sometimes positively dangerous to reduce the strength of district reserves. It was a matter of constant anxiety to the Inspector-General of Police and myself to judge and decide whether it was safe to allow reserves to be brought in from particular districts or to remain longer in the city of Madras, and whether the needs of Madras or the needs of other districts were greater. We had to arrange from time to time a number of reliefs, sometimes because of the circumstances in the mufassal districts from which the additional police had been brought into Madras and sometimes for other reasons. In addition to these methods of strengthening the police force of the city of Madras, we had for a long time regular soldiers quartered in parts of the disturbed area. On one occasion, a regiment in transit from Jubbulpore to Wellington, most fortunately in transit at a critical time, was diverted by telegram to the city of Madras and brought in just when it was most urgently required.

"On another occasion, Sir, the Auxiliary Forces, to which Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar gave the old nomenclature of 'volunteers,' were requisitioned. This happened not only on one but on several occasions. The men were standing by for any emergency that might arise. These, Sir, are illustrations of the impossibility to guarantee peace and order in the city of Madras without substantial additions to the police force. Mr. Somasundaram Pillai has told us that prevention is better than cure. That is a maxim which is emphatically applicable to this case and I should not be discharging my duty to the Government and to the people if I did not give effect to it by taking steps to place the city police in a position to prevent rather than to quell disorder.

"I cannot, Sir, in the short time available attempt to traverse the criticisms that have been passed on the causes or the supposed causes of the labour disturbances in the city of Madras or discuss the findings of the Committee which sat under the presidency of Sir William Ayling and its recommendations. But this I will say that, after very careful consideration, the

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[22nd March 1922]

Government of Madras have no doubt whatsoever as to the compelling necessity for adopting that recommendation which drew pointed attention to the inadequacy of the strength of the police force in the City. We have recently, Sir, had trouble which gave me much anxiety. I refer to the threatenings of a strike of the city police. I am well aware that the trouble was due to a variety of circumstances, very largely I expect, the incessant endeavours which have been made to seduce the police from their loyalty to the *Sirkar*. I am glad to say, Sir, that a stout resistance has usually been put up against endeavours of that description. But that was only one of the factors in issue. Another factor was the undoubted feeling of the city police that too much was expected of it. I have said that it was found necessary to raise their numbers in order to provide for a proper discharge of patrol and beat duties. Now in the memorials for addition to the emoluments of the city police, particular stress was laid on the very arduous nature of the duties imposed upon them and pointed attention was drawn to the fact that four men are now expected to do the duties which formerly devolved on five. That is another ground for addition to the city police, for it is well that we should have a contented body of men at the disposal of Government for the maintenance of law and order. I cannot myself say that the city police were not to some extent justified in asking for some addition to their emoluments—though not for any great addition. That ground of anxiety has now passed away and I hope this House will not risk reviving it by insisting upon the reduction in strength proposed on this motion."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Mr. President, this is an item that concerns primarily the Madras city and two hon. Members of this House who are supposed to know more the requirements of the city than most of us are in favour of the grant being allowed. In view of that, I do not think the House will be justified in not respecting their feelings and in going against their wishes. So far as the mufassal districts are concerned, we come from a distance and what we have heard and have reason to believe might or might not be true. We have here the testimony of two members of the city as to the necessity for the provision and in that view of the matter, I earnestly request my hon. Friend, Mr. Suryanarayana, not to press his motion."

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU:—"Sir, the question, as my friend, Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar said, is one that relates to the city of Madras in the first instance although of course it has something to do with the public in so far as the general tax-payer will have to pay for it. But, if I correctly heard the hon. the Home Member, in the closing remarks, I heard him say that the demand by the existing police for an increase of their salary was causing him some anxiety. If that was so, I think that ought to be just the reason why we should not add to the police force any more."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"Sir, I gather that the hon. Member did not hear all that I said. What I said was that the unrest among the city police was to some extent attributable to the fact that an unduly large volume of work was imposed upon an inadequate number of policemen. That was one of the factors that constituted a reason for adding to the strength of the police in order that we might be able to tell them that they would not in future be expected to discharge so heavy a burden of duty as previously devolved on them."

22nd March 1922]

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU:—"Anyhow, Sir, as my hon. Friend Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar has said, since the question is one which relates to the city of Madras and since the two hon. Members from the city have expressed their opinion that the additional police will be necessary, I beg leave to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 468 to 471.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

468. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 89,286 for additional police.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

469. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 36,744 for constables by Rs. 7,500.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—

470. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 11,94,221 for Presidency police by Rs. 50,000.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

471. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,53,140 for establishment of Inspector-General of Police by Rs. 1,000.*

Motion 472.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

472. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 11,630 for establishments of Deputy Inspectors-General.*

"In this resolution, Sir, it is not my view to cut down the establishment so much as to ascertain the view of the Government so far as the deputy inspectors-general are concerned. All the four appointments given under this head are non-votable and therefore I have put in this motion for a reduction of the whole of the establishment of the deputy inspectors-general just to ascertain the view of the Government whether they think that all these four appointments are absolutely necessary."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"May I rise for a ruling on the point of order whether it is permissible to argue the merits of the appointments of deputy inspectors-general, who are non-voted officers, on the grant item referring to their establishments. We had, as a matter of fact, a regular resolution on a matter of general public interest dealing with the issue of the necessity for these posts, but that resolution has lapsed. I gather from what the hon. Mover has just said that it is his desire to elicit information and to invite discussion on the need for the posts of deputy inspector-general of police."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The appointments of deputy inspectors-general of police are non-votable, but the hon. Member, Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar's view seems to be to cut off their establishments and leave them without any office staff."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya:—"I would just say one word, Sir. Unless any information is forthcoming on the point, we for ourselves would try

[Mr. Biswanath Das]

[22nd March 1922]

to cut off the establishment and thus express our protest. That is the reason why we should request you to allow us some breadth of discussion."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member has, unintentionally of course, been most irregular in interrupting me. The hon. Member, Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar's point is that he considers the whole thing unnecessary, the deputy inspectors-general and their establishments. It is not only a question of a request for information, but the hon. Member wishes to omit that portion which is within his grasp leaving alone the other portion which he is, under the rules, debarred from attacking."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I thank you for your ruling, Sir. So far as these establishments are concerned I simply say, Sir, that we will be able to cut them down and if the House is satisfied of the absolute uselessness of these deputy inspectors-general, it can cut off their travelling allowance also along with the establishments. If the Government in their supreme wisdom refuse to act according to our wishes, by all means let them keep these persons under the punkah. We should at the outset see whether these officers are at all necessary. It has been found that so far as the city of Madras is concerned, we want additional police and probably that will be imitated in the mufassal and we may require additional police for the mufassal districts also. The last reference of the hon. the Home Member to the threatened police strike in Madras may also induce the Government to come to a decision that not only they should have a large force in Madras but also in other places also to get them to Madras if there was a threatened strike. That would mean we must have a large number of additional men everywhere with a view to minimise the evil effect of such strikes. All the credit that the Government have taken for taking away a number of constables and head constables will vanish into thin air very soon and I think we will be called upon to add to the police budget at a very early date. The attempt of the Council has been to try to cut down not the irreducible minimum but the minimum wherever it can be reduced and as the general discussion has showed it is necessary that the Government should try their best to reduce, if not altogether abolish, some of the so-called post office appointments. It does not mean, Sir, that we do not appreciate the post office itself, or say that the post office exists merely for the purpose of transferring letters but we suggest that these intermediate offices have got to justify a large expenditure and though they have got also some other work, it might very well be done by the officers just below or just above. The whole question, Sir, is this. Having a large number of efficient district superintendents of police both Imperial and Provincial and having at the head of the department a very able officer who is generally recruited from the department itself and above them all being the hon. the Home Member, is it necessary that we should have these four people just to supervise the whole department? It may be a necessary luxury at a time when we have got plenty of money but now at a time when we are on the verge of entering an insolvency court, we should see as to whether we cannot do necessities but still we should see whether we can manage without them as every domestic difficulty may induce the house-owner to do. Many of us think that without in any way impairing or affecting the efficiency of the police force, without in any way affecting the safety of the people at large and also with a view to having the additional police that may be necessary

[22nd March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

either in the Madras City or in the mufassal, it is desirable that some attempt should be made towards reduction. There are four divisions over which these four deputy inspectors-general preside and I ask the hon. the Home Member to say if the number cannot be reduced to two or three possibly by having more decentralization and giving some more powers to the superintendents and also to see whether there cannot be a reduction in their travelling allowances. My own opinion, Sir, is if we cannot entirely do away with these officers, we can at least reduce their number to two so that by the pay of these officers, by their establishments and by their travelling allowances, we will be able to have a large saving without in any way affecting the efficiency. It is in this view that I want the hon. the Home Member to consider the whole matter and say as to what the policy of the Government will be."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I have given notice of a motion to reduce the allotment for the police with a view to raise the same question, but it appears, by some mistake, in the agenda as the omission of the whole allotment. I do not know whether the mistake was due to my own office or to the Council office. My object in giving notice of that motion was to raise this same question. I should say at once, Sir, that when the Finance Committee was put to the necessity of finding ways of retrenchment, they thought that the one question which ought to be taken up and investigated was the question of the abolition of the intermediary officers between district officers and the central officers here in the headquarters. We thought that the necessity for these intermediary officers in all the departments must be considered, and I for one thought that if any one of these superior officers in any of the departments could be done away with, the first one that could easily go was the deputy inspector-general of police. The works that are now entrusted to the deputy inspector-general of police are, excepting the general supervision which every officer has to exercise, the transfer of officers between divisions, making the appointments to certain posts and the hearing of appeals. This is practically all the work that he is doing. It has been said that there has been a large increase in work in almost all departments. Very recently I had to talk to some of the heads of departments here in Madras in connexion with some motions of which I had given notice for abolition of offices in the departments of Education and the Public Works. I found that there was very much of centralization even in regard to small details. That seems to be the case in every department. Every detail regarding appointments of persons above Rs. 40 or Rs. 50, transfer of even small officers and even sanctioning very small works, have to go to the central office and much of the time of the head of the department is wasted in looking into these details instead of his time being really utilized in laying down matters of policy as it should be. So also in the case of the deputy inspector-general of police, a great deal of minor details is sent to him for orders which can very easily be entrusted to the district superintendent of police himself. In the Revenue Department where the work to be done is more complex and where the officer has very onerous responsibilities to discharge, it is not thought necessary to appoint intermediary officers between the Board of Revenue and the district collectors. But in other departments where the work cannot be said to be so complex or so responsible, intermediary officers are appointed to scrutinize the work of the officers and also, as I have mentioned, to sanction even small things. It seems to me that it is

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [22nd March 1922]

quite unnecessary to have these intermediary officers when we have got highly paid and efficient men as district officers. Where big matters of policy are concerned, papers can be sent to the headquarters, and it is unnecessary to send small things for sanction to the head of the department. So, if this decentralization is given effect to and a great portion of the work sent from the district superintendent of police is stopped, then the only matters remaining will be the hearing of appeals and the transfer of high officers from one district to another. Such matters will have to come to the Inspector-General of Police and I think arrangements could be made in his office to get through the work. That seems to me to be a possible arrangement and if that arrangement is made, there will not be any necessity for the deputy inspector-general of police. I know that a great deal will be said by the persons concerned that these officers do not only the works for the disposal of which I have proposed arrangements, but they are also exercising a great deal of supervision. If in addition to the deputy inspector-general, we had another intermediary between him and the Inspector-General of Police and another officer between the district superintendent of police and the deputy inspector-general, we can advance the same argument. I do not think, Sir, that we should attach much weight to such arguments. There is the district superintendent of police who is in charge of the whole district and there is the Inspector-General here and the latter officer can very well be entrusted with the work of supervision instead of having an intermediary officer like the deputy inspector-general of police."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Mr. President, I have given notice of a motion for the reduction of the allotment by Rs. 100, but I prefer to speak on this motion. The two members who spoke before me have given sufficient reasons for altogether doing away with all these officers. Turning to page 110 of the budget, hon. Members of this House will see what the sanctioned strength of the department is, but we are now immediately concerned with four of these appointments which will be found at the bottom of page 110. Adopting the various reasons so successfully put forward by the previous speakers, I should like to give one additional reason and that is that we should do this in order to mark our disapproval of the way in which these appointments are being made and of the utter absence of the Indian element in the cadre of these appointments. Now we have four deputy inspectors-general of police and one assistant inspector-general."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. I think the hon. Member will then be out of order; that is to say, if the hon. Member wants to knock off the establishment of the deputy inspectors-general on the ground that no Indian has been appointed to that cadre he will be out of order."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"I just wanted to raise it only as a side issue, not that it has any direct bearing on the case."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Let us confine ourselves to the main issue."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"The only effective way of our giving effect to what is passing in our mind is to cut off the establishment altogether, thus making it impossible for these officers alone to continue."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"Sir, I take it that I need not deal with Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar's point as you have ruled it out of order. I referred, Sir, to this question of the deputy inspectors-general of Police when I was speaking during the general discussion of the budget. It is

22nd March 1922] [Sir Lionel Davidson]

an issue of very considerable importance and while I quite understand the desire of the gentlemen who are interested in the topic to raise a discussion on the subject during these budget debates, I would very earnestly deprecate any idea of pressing such discussion to the stage of bringing about any radical change in the constitution of the department. Any such change, Sir, ought only to be made after very careful consideration and after a discussion in which there is sufficient time to set out the arguments for and against the existing system. I mentioned during the general discussion of the budget that there had been proposals to cut out the police talaiyaris, the sub-inspectors, the inspectors, the deputy superintendents and the deputy inspectors-general of police and I also said that all those posts formed various parts of the edifice erected on the advice of a very experienced Commission, the Police Commission, which sat in India during 1902-1905, toured all over the country, took evidence from those who were best qualified to express opinions and finally submitted a very valuable report which has been the basis of the organization of the police forces throughout India ever since. Now, one of the items particularly strongly pressed by the Police Commission was this matter of deputy inspectors-general. They drew pointed attention to this. I may quote, from paragraph 70 of the report of the Police Commission, without fear of being called to order for reading passages which have not been laid on the table of this House or are not available to the members--

"Passing now to the higher classes of inspecting officers, the Commission find that adequate advantage has not been taken of the provision of the law which permits the appointment of such deputy inspectors-general as to the Local Government shall seem fit. In all provinces these officers are too few in number. Some of their most important duties are entrusted to Commissioners and District Magistrates and many of them are entirely neglected. They are practically confined to work of a comparatively unimportant character; and their usefulness is consequently impaired. The Commission would, therefore, propose to increase their number and to place a deputy inspector-general in full administrative charge of a range comprising as many districts as he can reasonably be expected to control. This arrangement will not only lead to the maintenance of a higher standard of work among Superintendents, but also to their more cordial and intelligent co-operation with one another."

"The report then goes on to say that a special deputy inspector-general is required for administrative charge of the Railway Police and possibly also of the Provincial Criminal Investigation Department, and it is laid down that 'deputy inspectors-general should be carefully selected from among the superintendents.'"

"Sir, every Local Government has, I think, paid due regard to the considered opinion of the Police Commission in this matter. It is no longer in accordance with the facts that they are practically confined to work of an unimportant character. That is not the case. A statement of their duties will be found in the Orders of the Madras Police, Chapter VIII, which deals with the powers and duties of superior officers. This also is a published book and I may read from it. Order No. 92 says--

"The deputy inspector-general in charge of a range is a link in the chain of responsibility between the inspector-general and district officers. He should endeavour by frequent personal inspection to establish and maintain efficiency and discipline, to ensure uniformity of procedure and practice, and to secure co-operation between the police of his several districts as well as harmonious working between the police and the magistracy. He should control, instruct and advise superintendents, while being careful not to supersede them in any of their proper functions or relations to their subordinates."

"The following order gives particulars of the very large measure of administrative control which the deputy inspector-general possesses with details of his functions in respect of transfers, appointments and the hearing of appeals."

[22nd March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ I should like to know whether the police orders are available to the public. As far as I knew I had considerable difficulty in getting it.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ The book is marked—

‘ Printed by the Superintendent, Government Press—Price 12 annas.’

“ I have been particularly careful, Sir, not to quote from unpublished documents in view of your repeated rulings on the subject.

“ I cannot subscribe to Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar’s view that it is impossible to attach serious weight to the function of general supervision. On the contrary, it is a function of very greatest importance. To realise that it is only necessary to recall to the House that the police force in the Madras Presidency at the end of the year 1920 was upwards of 33,000 men. I am not quite certain of the present number, for there have been some reductions, but in any case the total figure is well over 30,000. The other day Mr. Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib, one of our members, tabled a resolution recommending the abolition of the deputy inspectors-general and a special note was prepared to enable me to deal with that resolution. I should have liked to make fuller use of that note than I can within the time now allotted to me. In the course of the examination of the functions of the deputy inspector-general of Police a reference was made to the present inspector-general, who has served as a deputy inspector-general and was once Commissioner of Police in the City of Madras, an officer to whose judgment I think most residents in the city attach considerable value. What Mr. Armitage told us was that the general public had not fully realised the amount of very important work done by these officers. He pointed out that there must be some one to enquire into the action taken by the district superintendent when objection is taken to matters arising between the district superintendent and other persons whether official or private. We have been told that there should be decentralization in the Police Department as elsewhere. I venture to ask if these very officers are not in a measure decentralising officers. Otherwise hundreds and hundreds of appeals would have to come up to the inspector-general of Police who cannot possibly spare the time for them. We have only too many instances in this House of the extent to which little matters of detail are brought to the notice of the Government and to the notice of the Legislative Council. The abolition of the post of deputy inspector-general would in reality be a measure of centralization rather than of decentralization. We have examined very fully the question of entrusting further powers to the district superintendents. This is an issue which has come before the Government again and again in my time. The only question is to what extent it is possible further to extend the functions of these officers. One main obstacle in the way of giving them fuller powers is the deep-rooted love of the people of the country for appeals, particularly in regard to instances of disciplinary action. Personally I have always thought that there should be some limitation, and I have on more than one occasion noted against the number of appeals, but my proposals were always disallowed by those responsible. That, Sir, is one reason why a deputy inspector-general is required to hear some of the appeals. Otherwise the order of the district superintendent would have to go on appeal to the inspector-general of Police who would have to be continually in his office reading these appeals and would not be able to do any inspection work. Nor

[22nd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

could he even without this appellate business possibly do the requisite amount of personal inspection throughout the presidency. He must have officers to assist him, for it is beyond question that the district superintendents of police require frequent inspection. I do not wish in any sense to suggest that the average district superintendent of police does not on the whole efficiently discharge his duties. But it is clearly necessary that there should be some one to advise him and point out where he is wrong and direct him as to the course he should pursue. My time must be up. I cannot therefore say anything more except repeat my appeal that discussions such as these in which the speeches are limited to five and ten minutes should not be utilised as a means of procuring radical changes in the organization of a great department, especially in the case of the department which is responsible for the maintenance of law and order. If I were deprived of the services of the deputy inspector-general, I could not guarantee such maintenance. And if any such measure is contemplated, it should form the subject of a separate resolution with provision for the fullest discussion.”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“ Sir, two questions have been raised in the course of this discussion : as to whether it is desirable to give larger powers to the district superintendents of police : and as to whether it is necessary to continue the existing arrangement of the deputy inspector-general of police. Attention was drawn by the hon. the Home Member to the recommendations of the Police Commission, and it was pointed out that they recommended an increase in the number of deputy inspectors-general of police for effective supervision and inspection. But it must be remembered that they were dealing with an institution which was already in existence and they were perfectly right in suggesting that so long as the institution of the deputy inspectors-general remained, it was necessary to make them really useful. It is one thing to say that it is not desirable to have an intermediary officer like the deputy inspector-general of police, and another thing to say that if that officer were to remain there must be a circumscribed area for each officer for proper supervision over the work of the district superintendents of police. In the discussion which has taken place on this question attention has been drawn to the fact that in several of the departments wherein the work is equally important there is no intermediary officer corresponding to the deputy inspector-general of Police. For instance, in the case of the Revenue Department, we have between the Collectors of districts who are exercising very important and responsible functions and the Government, only one central office, and that is the Board of Revenue. I will take it that the Board of Revenue will for the purposes of comparison correspond to the head of the department in the Police, namely the inspector-general of Police. There is no intermediary like that of the deputy inspector-general of police in that department, though the duties are even more important. I therefore suggest, Sir, that the whole matter ought to be thoroughly investigated, and that it ought to be decided whether it is necessary to retain that intermediary officer for any further length of time. So far as the Police Commission is concerned, it was dealing with an institution in existence, and it was difficult to introduce changes in the existing institutions. If to-day there is opposition to the motion on the part of the Government, it is perfectly natural that it is so on account of the fact that this system has been in operation for several years, and that it is difficult to introduce changes. You may remember that when we have all along been asking for devolution

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [22nd March 1922]

of powers on district officers, there is no sufficient justification for not trying the experiment in certain districts to start with and for not giving them larger powers than have been proposed to be given."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" May I ask if the hon. Member will be prepared to dispense with appeals ? "

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" I do not propose that appeals should be dispensed with at all, Sir I think these appeals may lie with the Inspector-general of Police. What I would suggest is that so long as it is found that this is a new machinery which is not to be found in other similar departments, it is necessary to consider whether by a further devolution of powers upon district officers this cannot be done away with. I believe that even in the case of the head of the Education Department, the Director of Public Instruction deals directly with his district officers in a number of questions from time to time. I cannot really understand why in this department in particular there should be this additional machinery. We find that the inspector-general has been given an assistant, and a deputy superintendent of police has also been placed under his charge for the purpose of superintendence. If on account of the heavy work which he will have to discharge further assistance is found to be necessary, such assistance might be given to him. But to create another intermediary officer, I submit, will not conduce to the proper working of the system."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" May I deal with one single point raised by the last speaker, that is, the question of these intermediary officers being unnecessary ? I do not wish to speak on the general question of the work done by the deputy inspectors-general, as sufficient has been said on that side of the matter by my hon. Colleague. I should however like to add to what he has said that it should be quite possible to show by reference to statistics of the appeals heard by deputy inspectors-general that, if all of them were to be concentrated in the head office you would have to add a deputy or deputies then to deal with them. If you are going to abolish the deputy inspectors-general you are going to concentrate all the appeals on the inspector-general."

" The point on which I wish to lay stress is this. It was only the other day that Mr. Sadasiva Bhat moved a resolution in this Council in which he asked us to take steps to prevent transfers from one end of the presidency to the other, and to appoint officers from within certain territorial areas and keep them there as far as possible. It was said on behalf of the Government that we would do what we could to arrange matters as he desired. But how are we to arrange the recruitment and transfer of officers within territorial or linguistic areas if we have no local authorities in control of those areas ? That seems to be one of the essentials to carry out the wish of the Council as expressed by Mr. Sadasiva Bhat. If you take officers like the sub-inspectors of police, of whom there are hundreds all over the presidency, you must have some controlling officer who is responsible for the recruitment and transfers if the matter is not to be allowed to fall into the hands of some subordinate officer to whom it may be a source of profit. Similarly, if you want to deal with the question of languages and if you want to recruit men of different languages and different castes and to see that each gets its share, you cannot do it if the whole thing is run from Madras. The hon. Member said : ' you don't have these intermediate officers in similar departments ' and

22nd March 1922] [Sir Charles Todhunter]

I was particular to ask him what are the similar departments, because that is just what we do have. That is one reason why we are not cutting out superintending engineers or deputy commissioners of salt and abkari.

" One department in which we do not make these arrangements, and which is consequently the subject of constant criticism in the Council, 12-15 p.m. is the Medical Department. I ask the Council if they wish that the sub-inspectors of police should be placed in the same position as the sub-assistant surgeons. The hon. Member stated, in answer to my request, Sir, that one of the departments which has no intermediary officers is the Revenue Department. Now, as to that what I should like to say is this : that each district is self-contained. We have a number of revenue inspectors and others there, and there is no need for the transfer of these men from one district to another. That is the reason why we do not require an intermediary officer in this particular case, though I should like to add that whether we need it or not is a moot point, and that in every province except Madras, there are intermediary officers in the shape of divisional commissioners who perform the very functions which the deputy inspectors-general of police performs in the Police Department. We have been told that the Education Department is somewhat similar. In the Education Department, however, do not inspectors of schools perform these functions ? It may be said that one of these days the inspectors will be district officers. By that time, I hope there will be so many officers in the Education Department that as in the Revenue Department, each district will be able to depend on itself. I appeal to the Council that if they really want this principle of territorial divisions and of restricting transfers to each such division, if they want this plan to be carried out in a reasonable way, then they should not cut out the only officers through whose agency we are able to carry it out."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I may say, Sir, that so far as the hon. the Home Member is concerned, he was reading from an anti-deluge report. Such reports were made from time to time either by Royal Commissions or by other commissions and were intended to place both Indians and Europeans already employed or to be employed in the Police Department and various other departments in a better position. There is absolutely no use of reading from a report like this when we are dealing with retrenchment, i.e., from a report which was primarily intended to increase the pay and the number and emoluments of various appointments."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Do I understand the hon. Member seriously to say that the report of the Police Commission was primarily intended for the purpose of increasing pay and the number of appointments ? The Commission was for the purpose of putting the Police Department in a more efficient condition."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" May I also demur to the reforms being referred to as the deluge ?"

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I maintain that the object of the report of the Police Commission was mainly to improve the status and increase the number of these officers. It may be that their object was also to increase the efficiency. Sometimes deluges are very good as they wash away useless things. Whatever that may be, I wanted to contrast the present with the anti-deluge period. We are in the process of carrying retrenchment. The complaint is that the tax-payer is now paying 3 pies

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [22nd March 1922]

where he was paying only one pie in the old days. If the Government had the courtesy of accepting the motion for appointing a retrenchment committee like the one to be appointed in the Legislative Assembly, the report of that committee will have great weight with us and I do appeal that at least hereafter a retrenchment committee should be appointed to go into the whole question. As for the edifice being properly and efficiently manned, if we go to a contractor, he will say 'the foundation is all right, but something more may be added to the arch; use a girder to make the building more beautiful and more strong. In this way every appointment from the lowest to the highest has been made by way of strengthening the edifice and any number of intermediary officers are added. So far as the police officers are concerned, what I say is, take away the powers of the intermediary officers, say the deputy inspectors-general, and transfer them, some to officers above them and some to officers below them. The difficulties are not insurmountable as they are imagined to be. As regards appeals, we know how these district superintendents of police and deputy superintendents can do this work satisfactorily. It is only in very serious cases that an appeal may come to the inspector-general.

"However, Sir, our hope does not lie in arguing out these things in a few minutes. The best thing for the Government and for the Council will be to agree to appoint a retrenchment committee to go into the various questions. I hope that if that committee is appointed good deal of the work of the Council will be reduced and motions relating to the various appointments—motions like those notice of which was given by Mr. Abdul Rahman Sahib—need not be discussed in the Council. With these words I beg to withdraw my motion".

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 473.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

473. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 21,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 2,100.*

"The provision in the revised estimate is Rs. 22,000 and the budget provision is Rs. 21,000. There is a reduction of only Rs. 1,000. If my motion is accepted, the reduction will be by 25 per cent."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I take it, Sir, that this item represents the allotment for the travelling allowances of the inspector-general of police, the deputy inspectors-general and their camp clerks. These officers take very small establishments on tour with them. The great bulk of the provision is therefore, I have no doubt, for the travelling allowance of the officers themselves. The inspector-general travels throughout the whole of the Presidency. The ranges of the deputy inspectors-general are very extensive and the journeys which they must undertake cover large distances. The provision made this year is, I see, Rs. 1,000 less than the revised estimate figure, Rs. 6,500 less than the budget figure for 1921-22 and Rs. 126 less than the actual accounts of 1920-21. A considerable portion of the travelling allowance consists in the recoupment of railway fares, and we have recently been informed of an enhancement in the railway rates. Whether that has been taken into account in the allotment of Rs. 21,000

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

put down here, I cannot positively say, and it is possible that it may not have been considered. So much as regards the adequacy of the actual figure. I shall be thankful if the amount as it stands proves to be sufficient.

"I understand that the motive underlying this motion, however, is to base a reduction of 25 per cent on the anticipation that there will be a further revision in the scale of travelling allowance. If there is any such revision, it will automatically reduce the amounts drawn by the officers concerned. But whether the inspector-general of police and the deputy inspectors-general actually received any increase in consequence of the late revision of travelling allowances, I am not quite certain. But however that may be, if the scale should be again revised and reduced, the reduction will operate automatically on any expenditure on account of travelling allowances covered by the revision.

"I come now to what really is the point of substance, as I indicated in connexion with the similar proposal to reduce the travelling allowances of district magistrates and subdivisional magistrates the other day. The House then accepted my view that the circumstances connected with the maintenance of law and order render it necessary to make exception in favour of the officers directly charged with that duty. If it is necessary to make an exception in the case of district magistrates, it is *a fortiori* necessary to make an exception in the case of police officers. For, the travelling of a police officer is dependent upon circumstances entirely beyond his control. If a grave crime suddenly occurs in a distant place, it is his duty to go there and investigate it at once. If a disturbance breaks out in one part of the Presidency, it is the duty of the deputy inspector-general of police in charge of the range to proceed to the spot at once. Let me give a particular instance. On the outbreak of the Mappilla rebellion, the deputy inspector-general, Mr. Mainwaring, was on the spot at Tirur and actually marched with Mr. Thomas to Tirurangadi leaving his orderlies and servants at Tirur. The whole of his camp fell into the hands of the rebels. That is an illustration of the imperative call upon these officers to undertake journeys at once if necessity arises. I could not possibly ask the inspector-general of police to issue any order which in the guise of curtailing the expenditure on travelling might be interpreted by the officers to whom it is addressed as an instruction not to travel to places to which their duty calls them. I look on it as a very serious matter to reduce allotments for

travelling allowances, especially in the case of police officers, unless it be on the clear understanding that the reduction shall not be converted into any instruction to restrict travelling and that the House will be fully prepared on cause shown to increase the allotments if the necessary additional funds cannot be found by reappropriation. I cannot consent to anything of the nature of instructions to the higher or the lower police officers to restrict their travelling."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"Do I understand the hon. the Home Member to say that the Government are intending to reduce the scale of travelling allowances in other departments except the police?"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I said nothing of the sort, Sir. What I stated was that if the Government, in pursuance of the examination which the hon. the Finance Member referred to in his opening statement, decide to reduce or modify the scale of travelling allowances,

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[22nd March 1922]

then any such reduction or modification would presumably apply to the police equally with other departments. As hon. Members are aware, the matter is still under examination."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I may make it clear, Sir, that in bringing forward this motion, it was not my intention that the police officers should do less of travelling now than before. This House wanted to cut down the travelling allowances to the extent of 10 per cent and we made it clear then that there must be a revision in the rates of travelling allowances that were already fixed by the Government. This House clearly expressed its views in a resolution and I only want that that resolution should be given effect to. If only the rates are revised, I think there will be no difficulty at all and the amount thus diminished will be a saving. The travelling can be done as usual. For these reasons I press my motion."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, I only want to explain how matters stand in the matter of travelling allowances. It is not at all an easy matter to carry out the revision which the House has desired. We have a note which is ready to be placed before the Finance Committee and in anticipation of the reduction that we expect to make on that note we have actually carried out reductions by 25 per cent. In this particular item the original provision was Rs. 27,500, which we reduced to Rs. 21,000: so that, if the Council wants to make another 10 per cent reduction, that would amount to 35 per cent."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I take it, Sir, that the budget provided for Rs. 27,500."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Rupees 27,500 is the original budget provision, which was reduced by the Finance Department in consultation with the Finance Committee."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Was it not the understanding that reduction by 25 per cent should be with reference to the revised estimates rather than the original budget estimates?"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, this is the first time I hear of that understanding."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I do not press my motion, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 474 and 475.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—

474. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,22,400 for police superintendence by Rs. 15,000.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—

475. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,22,400 for police superintendence.

Motion 476.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

476. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,22,400 for police superintendents by Rs. 100.

22nd March 1922]

[Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

"Sir, in making this motion I have absolutely no desire to embarrass or paralyse the Government to any extent. My only desire and my sole object was to elicit some detailed information from the hon. the Home Member as to why notwithstanding the fact that sixty years have passed since the police force was organized in this Presidency under Act XXIV of 1859, up till now no Indian was thought of in connexion with the appointments of the assistant inspector-general of police and the deputy inspector-general of police. It seems to me that time has come for the Government to reconsider their position and to try sincerely and earnestly the experiment of appointing Indians in the higher spheres of public life. These 60 years the world has seen and noticed kaleidoscopic changes with reference to the various other departments of public life. Experiments have been made in the revenue, judicial and engineering departments and they have also proved successful. Men have been tried and found not wanting, and there is absolutely no reason why the Government should not profit themselves by the experiments so far made and successfully carried out and why similar experiments should not be made in this department also. I hope and trust that sooner or later—better sooner than later—the hon. the Home Member will see his way to consider the claims of Indians favourably and also see his way to appoint at least one Indian as deputy inspector-general of police."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I very much wish that the hon. the Mover had given me previous intimation of his intention to take this point, for then I should have come fully prepared to give the necessary answer. As it is, I am compelled to trust to my memory in regard to facts and figures. I will first call the attention of hon. Members once again to the report of the Indian Police Commission. One of the terms of reference to that body in pursuance of the resolution which constituted it in 1902 desired them to inquire and report

'whether the career at present offered to natives in the police'—

in those days the term 'native' was used without any objection being taken; nobody seems then to have resented being described as a native of the country of his birth and residence as people do in these days, any more than I should resent being called a native of England or Scotland—

'is sufficiently attractive to induce the proper stamp of men to enter it; and if not, what steps can be taken to remedy this evil consistently with the recognized measure of necessity for European control in the district charges.'

"That, Sir, brings out the fact that in 1902 it was an accepted axiom that there should be European control of the district police charges. Since 1902 much water has flowed under the bridge and for a long time past provision has been made to the appointment of a limited number of Indian superintendents of police in district charges. There is specific provision for that in the Police Orders of this Presidency. There are two such appointments as will be found by reference to Police Order No. 43 which lays down that the number of deputy superintendents 'to be thus permanently promoted should not, for the present, exceed two.' That was the next stage. The third stage was in connexion with the report of the Public Services Commission which was required *inter alia* to investigate whether it was necessary to increase the number of posts of superintendents of police open to the Provincial Service, and the outcome of those enquiries

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[22nd March 1922]

was two-fold. Arrangements were made for the transfer to the Imperial Police of selected officers of the Provincial Service and in addition to this there were what I may call 'listed' appointments of superintendents: that is to say, if a man enters the Provincial Service he has two spheres of advancement. The latter, normally applicable to the experienced Provincial officer nearing the end of his service, is the post of district superintendent of police in the same service but on a special scale of pay. That is one sphere of advancement. The other sphere is open to the younger, more energetic and particularly promising deputy superintendent who is told that if specially selected he may expect a transfer to the Imperial Service. That is naturally an exceptional course and I am not quite certain whether it will be a permanent arrangement, but I do know that several young officers, men of 8, 9 and 10 years of service, have recently been brought on to the Imperial branch. I am not certain whether it is a permanent arrangement because simultaneously with this arrangement there has come into force the method of direct recruitment of Indians to the Imperial Service. Only the other day I was sitting on a selection committee which was examining a number of young Indians who sought to be appointed directly to the grade of assistant superintendents of police in the Imperial branch. We made a selection of twelve very promising young fellows and a competitive examination was held, as a result of which two of them have been selected and brought into the Imperial Service. I think they both passed their medical examination; that was the only bar which stood in their way, and as both of them called on me a few days ago, I imagine that they did pass the medical board. They were very promising young fellows and I hope they will prove an addition of strength to the department and will rise in it having due regard to the seniority of those who stand above them. That, Sir, is the direction in which the appointment of an Indian to the grade of deputy inspector-general is likely to become a practicable proposition. There is I think no chance whatever of introducing 'listed' deputy inspectors-general reserved for the Provincial Service any more than in my judgment there is a prospect of creating 'listed' conservators of forests. It is a question of technical training and administrative experience."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya :—"Is this the 'increasing association of Indians' that was declared in the preamble to the Government of India Act?"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I have just been explaining, Sir, how the increasing association of Indians with the department is being brought about. I fear the hon. Member is rather impatient. It is in the direction I have mentioned that deputy inspectors-general are likely to be found in the Indian personnel of the department, and it will probably not arise in the immediate future. There is now among the Imperial Police of the Madras Presidency a definite Indian element—I do not know the exact number—which is increasing and as time goes by, these officers will rise to such a stage of seniority that they will be entitled as a matter of course to be considered for the purposes of vacancies in the post of deputy inspector-general. I cannot say off-hand whether that prospect has been definitely recognized by the Government of India and the Secretary of State because I have not had notice of this point and I have not been able to refresh my memory by reference to the papers, but whether it is definitely

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

recognized in the resolution bearing on the subject of reconstitution of the Police department or whether it is not, that avenue is certainly likely to be opened in the future."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"The hon. the Home Member drew our attention to the Police Commission report which, if not antediluvian, is rather quite antiquated. It is a report of 1905, if I remember aright, of the materials that were collected in 1903 or thereabouts. Since then seventeen years have rolled by and the world as everybody is fully aware has been rushing along at a giddy pace and the outlook has undergone a material change and I expected quite a sympathetic answer. I only expected the hon. the Home Member to give us an assurance that he will see his way to try the experiment of having an Indian as deputy inspector-general of police. But he is inclined to think that having regard to the limitations of service, having regard to the years of service which certain incumbents or office-holders have put in, there is absolutely very little prospect of an Indian being appointed as deputy inspector-general of police in the very near future. I am really sorry for this; but however there is absolutely no reason as to why the experiments which have been made in that direction in other departments should not also be made as a tentative measure in this department as well. Far from being tempted to withdraw it, I deem it my duty to press this motion."

The motion was put and lost.

Motion 477

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—

477. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,22,400 for police superintendents by Rs. 100.

Motion 478.

12-45 p.m. Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

478. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,88,160 for deputy superintendents by Rs. 75,000.

"In tabling this motion my idea was that the intermediary posts like the posts of inspectors and deputy superintendents of police should be reduced to a great extent so that greater powers might be given to sub-inspectors.—"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Does the hon. Member think that deputy superintendents and inspectors are intermediary officers between the sub-inspector and the superintendent? That is the implication of his remark."

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—"I was exactly going to that point, Sir. It will be found in the list of motions on the budget that I have also given notice of a motion to reduce the allotment of inspectors also. I am not dealing with that point now. My view is to see a reduction made in the allotments for intermediary posts between the sub-inspectors and the district superintendents. Hon. Members are aware that we are spending in the Madras Presidency about two annas in the rupee for the police administration. In the other provinces, notably in Bengal, where

[Mr. K. Gopalakrishnayya] [22nd March 1922]

disturbances are more frequent and police aid is more necessary, they spend a much lower percentage. So far as the statistics go, we seem to be spending a disproportionately large amount for the police administration. It is rather very undesirable. Therefore I say that these intermediary officers of police inspectors and deputy superintendents might be very largely reduced in course of time. I do not mean that they can be sent away all at once; the duties may be so allocated that these men may be gradually reduced. In making another motion, my hon. friend, Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar, has given us several reasons why deputy inspectors-general are not after all so very necessary and that, though not all of them, some at least of them may be abolished. The allocation of duties may be made on the lines suggested by Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. Those suggestions hold good in the case of deputy superintendents also. Therefore I move that the allotment of Rs. 1,88,160 for deputy superintendents be reduced by Rs. 75,000."

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI:—"Mr. President, I rise to support the motion. I have also given notice of a similar motion. The sub-inspector of police with the aid of his constables is held responsible for the maintenance of peace and order in his jurisdiction. He visits every village attached to his station, detects cases, investigates them, files charge sheet and conducts prosecutions. His work is closely scrutinized and supervised by the circle inspector of police. Now the question presents itself why so many deputy superintendents should be given place in the department. Is it merely to supervise the work of those supervisors who in their turn supervise the work of a sub-inspector or to act as a signing machine? The deputy superintendent's post in the mufassal is something of the nature of a white elephant. He knows very little of the conditions that exist in the place. It passes my comprehension, Sir, why as many as 32 deputy superintendents of police consuming Rs. 1,88,160 every year should be appointed. The number may well be reduced by two-fifths, for they do nothing except form the connecting link between the district superintendent and the circle inspector without which the administration of the department may be carried on as usual."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I do not think that either the mover or the seconder can realize what the effect of accepting this motion would be. The deputy superintendents of police constitute the Provincial Police Service, and if they are annihilated the number of Indians in the superior ranks in the department will be very substantially reduced. The functions of deputy superintendents of police correspond ordinarily to the functions of the assistant superintendents of police. They hold subdivisional charges in the districts, and there is not the least doubt that there is ample employment in such charges for the present staff. The question of additions to it has, I think, on two occasions been before the Finance Committee this year or last year. The number of deputy superintendents is carefully worked out with reference to the actual charges which have to be held. They are not all subdivisional charges and the deputy superintendents form the Provincial branch of the Madras Police department. I see from the Civil List that their total number is 41; it is from this cadre that the 'listed' posts of superintendent of police are filled up, and that promising young officers are transferred to the Imperial Service. If there is any serious question as to the necessity for the number of the cadre, I can

22nd March 1922] [Sir Lionel Davidson]

without difficulty satisfy the hon. Mover and his seconder that it is in no way excessive. But with the length of time now at my disposal it is not possible to detail the necessity for the sanctioned strength. You may take my word for it that each of these officers fills a definite post which must be held by some one and if a number of them be abolished, I find it difficult to see how the work of these particular posts can be carried on."

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI:—"I should like to support this motion. The hon. the Home Member has not made it clear what kind of work these deputy superintendents are required to do in the scheme of police administration in this country. There are the sub-inspectors who investigate crime and who bring everything necessary to put up the case before the magistrate. There is the inspector of police to supervise their work and also the stations and to give them advice where necessary. For a long time we were able to do without the institution of the deputy superintendents of police. These deputy superintendents of police go to the places where they have not much to do and where these sub-inspectors have to look after their creature comforts. That is an open secret. The sub-inspector who has this trouble in his turn goes to those under him and presses them until the pressure spreads over the villagers in various ways. This thing goes on. There is also another grievance. If there is a deputy superintendent in a district, the district superintendent of police does not feel any responsibility in the administration. There were a number of complaints recently by certain villagers against a particular sub-inspector, who was said to be levying blackmail on the villagers, and to be tyrannizing over them. I had to bring it to the notice of the district magistrate and particularly requested him that the inquiry should not be by a police officer. Anyhow a deputy superintendent was sent, who went there and examined certain witnesses. Then he said there was no case without giving any reason for such an inference. There was only the endorsement that the complaint had no foundation. I had to approach the district superintendent of police, who said that the deputy superintendent had already examined the matter and therefore he would not go into the details and that was not his job. The great evil of the deputy superintendent is therefore the fact that he reduces the responsibility on the part of the district superintendent of police who seems to think that he need not bother himself about the subdivision under the charge of a deputy superintendent. This is a condition which is not desirable. The Home Member urged that this institution of the deputy superintendents supplied a stepping stone for Indians to ascend to the Imperial Service. What does the tax-payer care whether the police man belongs to Provincial or Imperial Service when the deficit budget stares him in his face? What does he care whether there is an Indian deputy inspector-general of police or a European deputy inspector-general of police? It is not for the sake of promising young men as the hon. the Home Member said that we are here, but we are here to see that the general tax-payer is benefited. When we can do without the deputy superintendents, when there are the evils I have pointed out in their retention, I do not see the fun of retaining these officers and add to our deficits. I would like to see the whole cadre abolished, but we must make small beginnings."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I want to say a few words. I am very sorry at the turn the discussion has taken.
1 p.m. Certainly, it is not correct to say that the tax-payer does not

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [22nd March 1922]

care whether an Indian or Englishman is appointed to these posts. From the financial point of view, it does matter very much. An Indian means lesser pay, lesser allowances and all those things. Even if this resolution is carried, as has been pointed out by the hon. the Home Member, the divisions will be there. The proper resolution should be to reduce the number of divisions. The only way of effecting retrenchment, if the Government would agree with this view, would be to post a number of these deputy superintendents as assistant superintendents and reduce the number of divisions, so that the assistant superintendents' divisions may be lesser in number. But the proposition as it is, if carried, will only lead to the divisions being there, the assistant superintendents being increased and the number of deputy superintendents being lessened, with the result that more costly people will be placed in the deputy superintendents' divisions. I do say that in this edifice of the Police department there are too many corner stones, and somewhere we must find a reduction, but that place I would submit is not the deputy superintendent's.

"I know, Sir, that the number of divisions, so far as the deputy and assistant superintendents' charges are concerned, have been considerably increased in recent times and the sooner the number is reduced the better. There is also one other thing. I am very sorry that Mr. Sivasankaram Pillai should have stated that the deputy superintendents are preying upon the people like sub-inspectors. He has placed the latter in the same category with the former. I know many of these deputy superintendents. Whatever the defects so far as the principle and system are concerned may be, I think many of them are honest—most of them I may say—and are doing their best. If there is anything wrong, it is the system that has to be blamed. Of course, he referred to a particular case where birds of the same feather flocked together. He said that if the police officer is told that his subordinate has done some wrong, he always presumed that the public is wrong and not the police. The same is the case with the Forest or Excise or other officers. It is very difficult to convince any higher officer that his subordinate has done wrong. On that ground alone you cannot say that the whole class should go. The number of deputy superintendents compared with that of the divisions is very small. One great reduction that could be made, I believe, is in the cadre of the personal assistants to district superintendents. I think the hon. the Home Member would show us to where the necessity for personal assistants arose. Sir, some years ago, there were no deputy superintendents as personal assistants and the whole work was done by the office manager, who was then called the headquarters inspector. It was not considered in those days necessary to have personal assistants in every district office. The Collector wanted to have a personal assistant, and so the district superintendent also seemed to require a personal assistant. Let us hope now that personal assistants to Collectors are going, these personal assistants to the district superintendents also will go away. The hon. the Revenue Member has made a very good retrenchment in that department where the personal assistants are going away. Now that the Collectors are dispensing or are compelled to dispense with the personal assistants, there is no reason why the district superintendents should not be asked to dispense with their personal assistants also. By saying that the number of personal assistants should be reduced, I do not mean that the number of deputy superintendents should be reduced. What I say is that

22nd March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

the deputy superintendents that would be relieved from the offices may be posted to divisions and thereby a reduction in the expenditure over divisions may be made."

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—"From the remarks of the hon. the Home Member, I understand he seems to have bestowed some attention in regard to the reduction of the personal assistants to district superintendents. I suppose that this will come up in the next motion. So I have no objection to withdraw this motion."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"If the specific question of personal assistants to district superintendents does not come up on a later motion, I am ready to make a few remarks about the issue now."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I understand the hon. Member Mr. Gopalakrishnayya to say that he understood that the Home Member was considering the question of the personal assistants to the district superintendents with a view to their abolition, and on that understanding he proposes to withdraw the motion. To the best of my recollection the hon. the Home Member has said nothing to that effect."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I did not say anything with regard to that. But I should like to say a few words in answer to Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar's suggestion that the personal assistants to district superintendents are not necessary. At present the duties of the deputy superintendents who are employed as personal assistants are not confined to the functions of mere office managers. Under Police Order No. 109, they 'may be assigned any duties, either office or executive, which the superintendent may find it most advantageous to have performed by them.' Sometimes they are sent out to investigate particularly involved cases, to which another senior officer cannot find time to attend; sometimes to investigate political activities of a dangerous description in a remote part of the district. They are employed in fact on any duty that the district superintendent thinks fit to assign to them, and they are of very considerable assistance to district superintendents. Mr. Thomas, whose experience of the department entitles his opinion to the greatest weight, sometime since put forward an alternative scheme for the transfer of these personal assistants to subdivisional charges. But this alternative, so far from involving a reduction in the number of subdivisions, carried with it an increase in their number. I will explain how. If in a district the superintendent himself holds what is called the main range, this means that there are tracts under his direct charge, the detailed administration of which seriously hampers the efficiency of his general supervision of the district. It was proposed that in such cases the personal assistants should be placed in direct charge of the main range which would thus become a new subdivision, thus giving relief to the superintendent. Such a change recalls to me similar changes in the Revenue department. When I first came out to this country, a revenue district was divided between the charge of the collector and the charge of the sub-collector. The head assistants and special assistants merely held portions of the collector's charge. This main division was administered by the collector with the assistance of what are now called divisional officers. The rest of the district, known as the 'subdivision' was administered by the sub-collector, and the sub-collector in those days had greater powers than the

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[22nd March 1922]

sub-collector of to-day. In course of time, it was found that the arrangement was not very satisfactory. There was friction at times between the sub-collector and the collector. The outcome of it all was that the whole district was divided into a number of divisional charges such as exist to-day held each by a divisional officer who, if a member of the Indian Civil Service, is usually called a sub-collector. That is a state of affairs which I should like to introduce also into the Police department, for I am convinced that the direct charge of all the divisions of the district ought to be in the hands of special officers, and not as at present sometimes in the hands of the officer who supervises the entire district. There is much routine which an officer of the rank of superintendent ought not to be troubled with. Now that is the direction in which I hope to see the personal assistants vanish, but their allotment to new subdivisions will not lead to any reduction in their number. During the past year alone I have received proposals for substantial addition to the number of subdivisions, which have passed the scrutiny of the Finance Committee."

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA:—"I do not want to press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 479.

The following motion was not made:—

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI:—

479. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,88,160 for deputy superintendents.

Motion 480.

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

480. To omit the allotment of Rs. 18,000 for temporary deputy superintendents.

"I wish to know whether these appointments which are only temporary cannot be abolished."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"These five temporary appointments are the appointments which I had in view just now when I said that the necessity for the creation of additional appointments had been made out to the satisfaction of the Finance Committee. I can give particulars, if desired. But I may say that the case put forward on behalf of the department was for permanent additions, and that as a matter of economy the additions sanctioned were only temporary."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 481 to 487.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

481. To omit the allotment of Rs. 18,000 for five temporary deputy superintendents.

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI:—

482. To omit the allotment of Rs. 18,000 for temporary deputy superintendents.

22nd March 1922]

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—

483. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,67,000 for salaries by Rs. 100.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

484. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,67,000 for salaries by Rs. 100.

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA:—

485. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,82,000 for inspectors by Rs. 2,00,000.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

486. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,82,000 for inspectors by Rs. 1,50,000.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

487. To omit the allotment of Rs. 14,472 for the Nilgiris reserve."

Motion 488.

1-15 p.m. Mr. W. P. A. SAUNDARA PANDIA NADAR:—"Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion:—

488. To omit the allotment of Rs. 20,344 for the punitive police, Kamudi.

"My intention at the time of tabling this motion was to get information from the hon. the Home Member whether he has given effect to the resolution which the House passed by an overwhelming majority in the Council meeting of 21st January 1922 regarding the repealing of the Government Order for the levying of punitive tax upon two of the most loyal communities in and around Kamudi. But now, I was instructed as the representative in this House of our Mahajana Sangam, which commands a vast influence with our community that the special magistrate in charge is calling on the people to pay the tax for the current year and threatens to issue distress warrants if they do not pay within a week or so. Really, Sir, this threat will be a great blow to the people when they are under the impression that this assembly of the representatives of the whole Presidency passed a resolution not to levy the punitive tax on them. If this is to be the fate of the resolutions affecting the interests of the people, I doubt very much, Sir, what benefit we are getting by resolutions of this House. This evidently shows that the Government have decided to collect the tax for the coming year. So far as I have been able to examine the budget, I cannot see in what account credit is taken for the amount that is collected as punitive tax. I shall be obliged if the hon. the Home Member will kindly enlighten me on this point."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"Will the hon. Member please repeat his point? He wants certain information but I have been quite unable to catch the exact point."

Mr. W. P. A. SAUNDARA PANDIA NADAR:—"If an additional police is necessary for that area, let the Government have it by all means. But, Sir, what I object to is the levying of punitive tax from two loyal communities by having a force of punitive police thrust on them. So, Sir, in fairness—"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I have still not caught the point, Sir."

[22nd March 1922]

Mr. W. P. A. SAUNDARA PANDIA NADAR :—"So, Sir, in fairness to the distressed condition of the people, I appeal to the hon. the Home Member to give up the punitive police altogether, which, considering the grievances that people have to undergo, is not at all necessary."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member's point is that the punitive police at Kamudi is not necessary and that the sum of Rs. 20,344 provided therefor may therefore be deleted."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"That is not asking for information. If the hon. Member really wishes to know whether the police at Kamudi are necessary, I can only repeat what I said in connexion with the resolution relating to this subject on the 21st January. I am advised that they are necessary and I do not think that in the course of the debate above referred to the necessity for the additional police was seriously disputed at all. If that is all the hon. Mover wants to know—"

Mr. W. P. A. SAUNDARA PANDIA NADAR :—"I want to know whether the Government are going to collect the punitive tax from the people."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"The answer to that enquiry is this: whether the cost of this punitive police should continue to be levied from the inhabitants of the area was a question specifically considered in full Cabinet the other day with the result that it was decided that the tax should continue to be so levied until October next."

Mr. W. P. A. SAUNDARA PANDIA NADAR :—"Do I understand the hon. the Home Member that they are not going to levy the tax from the people?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The Government, I take it, are not going to stop the levy of the tax."

Mr. W. P. A. SAUNDARA PANDIA NADAR :—"Then I insist upon a division."

The motion was put to the vote and declared carried.

The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson demanded a poll.

The polling was done and the Secretary began the counting.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I must draw the attention of hon. Members to the fact that three hon. Members came in and took their seats after the polling had begun and when it was going on. Of course their votes have not been recorded; an irregularity like that should not recur."

Mr. S. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI :—"I did not vote, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"It is not a question of voting. When once polling has begun, no hon. Member should come in till it is finished; otherwise confusion will result."

The following is the result of the poll :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 8. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyyar. |
| 2. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vadayar. | 9. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. |
| 3. Dr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu. | 10. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon. |
| 4. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya. | 11. Mr. K. A. Kandasami Kandar. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 12. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 13. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyyar. |
| 7. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 14. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. |

22nd March 1922]

Ayes—cont.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 15. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 32. Mr. P. Siva Rao. |
| 16. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 33. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahesayo. |
| 17. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | 34. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu. |
| 18. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. | 35. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 19. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 36. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 20. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddi. | 37. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 21. Mr. A. Subbarayudu. | 38. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahesayo. |
| 22. Mr. P. Subbarayan. | 39. Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai. |
| 23. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. | 40. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 24. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayakar. | 41. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 25. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. | 42. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar. |
| 26. Rao Bahadur C. Venkata Ranga Reddi. | 43. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 27. Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao. | 44. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 28. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | 45. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib. |
| 29. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. | 46. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib. |
| 30. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 47. Mr. Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib. |
| 31. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. | 48. Mr. Abdul Razzaq Sahib. |
| | 49. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. |
| 2. " Sir Charles Todhunter. | 11. Mr. R. Littlebailes. |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ullah Sahib Bahadur. | 12. Mr. E. Periyasayagam. |
| 4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 13. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyyar. |
| 5. " Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 6. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 15. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur. |
| 7. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 16. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 17. Rao Bahadur T. Namburumal Chettiyyar. |
| 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 18. Mr. A. E. Rencontre. |
| | 19. Mr. T. Richmond. |

The motion was carried, 49 voting *for* and 19 *against*.

Motion 489.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I beg to make the following motion :—

489. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 84,800 for special police by Rs. 100.*

"My reason for asking for a reduction is to draw the attention of the House to the imposition of a punitive police in Cuddapah district. I do not find any provision included in the budget itself, but in paragraph 89, page 48 of the Statement prepared by the Finance Department, I find the following is mentioned :—

"The budget estimate for 1922-23 includes provision for recoveries on account of the special punitive police sanctioned for the Godavari, Anantapur, Cuddapah and Guntur districts."

"Presumably the portion in Cuddapah refers to Rayachoti taluk. I want to know the reasons why punitive police has been imposed on that place. Is it because the people of that taluk are violent in character, or is it because of the movement to which exception is being taken now? So far as I know, Rayachoti taluk is not at all to be compared with taluks like Jammalamadugu in Cuddapah or Koilkuntla in Kurnool district. If it is said that there is non-co-operation movement there, I am afraid that is not a correct statement. Some village officers did resign, but I understand that many of them have withdrawn their resignations and re-joined their appointments.

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [22nd March 1922]

I think it is not fair that the innocent people of this taluk should be saddled with taxes for punitive police. I wish only to remind the hon. the Home Member of what he said yesterday, i.e., that some people with no responsibility whatever go about from place to place preaching mischievous doctrines, and because temporarily some people get excited, I do not think it fair that the people as a whole should be punished with taxes like this."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I may inform the House that the additional police in Rayachoti taluk of the Cuddapah district are not included in this item and the failure to remove that item is a mistake committed in the course of the preparation of the budget. But it is proposed to rectify that mistake by putting in a supplementary demand. However, I am quite prepared to briefly discuss the merits of the need for additional police in Cuddapah district now."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"If the 'additional police' in the Cuddapah district is not included in this particular grant, there is no use of discussing the merits of that additional police now; it would be out of order to do so."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Then there is now no need at all for my motion. I therefore withdraw it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 490 to 492.

The following motions were not made :—

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—
490. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 72,200 for police training schools by Rs. 50,000.*"

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—
491. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 72,200 for police training schools by Rs. 12,200.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—
492. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 13,00,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Motion 493.

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

493. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,21,06,300 under district executive force by Rs. 50,000.*

"Mr. President, at the outset, I will frankly admit that my object in moving for a reduction of this nature is not to cast any slur on the district executive police force. Nor is it my intention to express any disapproval of the way in which they have been carrying on their work. I am quite prepared to endorse the remarks of the hon. the Home Member that the rank and file and even officers have discharged their duties most satisfactorily, and have shown remarkable restraint and forbearance even under provocation, under trying conditions. If I propose for a reduction, it is with the object, first of all, of improving the efficiency of the police force as a whole, and secondly to release funds for improving the pay of the constables to keep them above want and above temptation.

22nd March 1922] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

"To take the first point, Sir, i.e., to improve the efficiency of the police force, I think it is very desirable that the higher grade officers come immediately or oftener than now in contact with all classes and conditions of people. I find a sentence in the report on the Administration of Police for the year 1920 which reads as follows :—

'In the previous year these changes were due to the grant of leave to a large number of officers and the uncertainty of the dates of return of those on leave.'

"Now this raises a suspicion and a doubt that because there are very many deputy superintendents to do a great deal of work which 1-30 p.m. would otherwise have to be done by higher officers, it is possible for a large number of the latter to go on leave."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"May I request the speaker, Sir, to refer me to the paragraph which he was quoting from?"

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—"I was quoting from the first page, Sir. In times of stress, we know that, in every country, there is a practice of officers cancelling their leave and returning to their duty. I do not say that we are in times of war, nor are we quite in times of absolute peace or at least of freedom from disquieting conditions. So I think that in addition to the many reasons which were urged by hon. Members for the reduction of the number of posts of deputy superintendents of police, we might add this, namely, that it is very desirable that the higher officers should themselves move about, check the work of their subordinates, make surprise visits, check the patrols on duty, come in contact with all conditions and classes of people which would be very useful and thus really contribute to the efficiency of the executive police force in the districts.

"Then, Sir, coming to the inspectors, I find a very startling sentence in the report—

'The prevailing opinion is that there has been a marked deterioration in the type of sub-inspectors that we now get, and the Principal of the Police Training School at Vellore has more than once reported that the cadets who have been under training in recent years are much inferior to their predecessors in mental equipment and those qualities which go to make an efficient police officer.'

"And then, Sir, comes another sentence on page 6—

'The direct recruitment of inspectors which had been stopped for some years was revived and the Government granted permission to make enlistments up to the full number admissible, the educational standard of the sub-inspectors being much below the mark.'

"The hon. the Home Member will admit that these statements place the question of inspectors and sub-inspectors on the horns of a dilemma. The inspectors are recruited and all the sanctioned appointments are to be filled up because of the inefficiency of the sub-inspectors. So that if there are inspectors; and if that number of inspectors is full, it is because the sub-inspectors now enlisted are not very efficient. If, on the other hand, conversely, the sub-inspectors are very efficient, then certainly there will be no reason why so many inspectors should be appointed. So, whatever the hon. the Home Member may say to this piece of logic now, he must frankly admit that there is a case made out for a reduction. As if this was not sufficiently serious, there comes a further startling revelation, that is—

'The Principal reports that the material received in the school is not of a very high standard and that the majority of the sub-inspectors find it difficult to pass in all the subjects, but that they were passed out well equipped with muscle and grit.'

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar] [22nd March 1922]

"In this year of grace 1922, Sir, in this enlightened twentieth century, we are told that muscle and grit take the place of intellectual qualities and mental equipment. This is, I think, a piece of grim humour. I thought that the proper place for the development of muscle and grit was not the training college, which is intended chiefly for the training of intellectual powers such as capacity for detection, but the recreation saloon of a Professor Sandow or Professor Ramamurthi or of the physical adviser of whom my friend the hon. the Minister for Education seems to be very fond. Here is a question of our having a number of sub-inspectors who are not very efficient, at least the newly enlisted among them. And because they are inefficient we have a number of inspectors appointed. And then, is there work enough, Sir, for all these sub-inspectors? We are told in that report that there has been a marked decrease in crime. The report says—

'True cases of cognizable crime under the Indian Penal Code excluding nuisances, numbered 59,109 or 8,764 less than in the previous year . . . the volume of grave crime decreased by 7,872 cases, the decrease being general and occurring under every head.'

"And the reason for this decrease of crime is given as follows:—

'Close supervision over local criminals and efficient preventive work brought about a remarkable fall in burglaries, thefts and cattle-thefts.'

"Hon. Members here will admit that those who watch criminals and do a great deal of work in detail are certainly station-house officers and head constables, men who are sprung from the people, and who know the people, and can therefore carry on the work most efficiently, the duty of the sub-inspectors being merely to prepare reports and put in the facts gathered by these men.

"And again, Sir, there is one department of crime where we expect the work of these officers to be most felt and satisfactory, and is there a justification for this increase at least on that strength, namely, that they are doing that work in a very thorough manner? We find, Sir, that—

'Although crime fell to the level of 1918, the percentage of detection was higher than that year, but lower than in 1919. The retrogression was mainly due to the marked failure in murder cases—a class of crime which is neither preventible nor easy of detection. In Nellore, out of 32 cases not a single one ended in conviction, while in Guntur the number detected was only 3 out of 27, in Bellary 5 out of 44 and in Anantapur 6 out of 50.'

"Now, Sir, here we have a class of crime which certainly threatens the peace and security of persons. We have the old proverb which says that murder will out. It is really a strange thing that now we have this mysterious process of murders somehow hushed up and we have our officers coming out with this strange announcement, devising this kind of strange explanation, that murder is neither preventible nor easy of detection. With these words which clearly point to a justification in the reduction of the number of inspectors and sub-inspectors I make this motion."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I am not concerned with the hon. Member's review of the police reports nor with his lessons in logic. If I were, I should find that there is a great deal of variation between his conclusions and his premises. As far as I understand him, he says that better detective work is needed and that the sub-inspectors are of inferior quality from which it would seem that he suggests that we should spend more on our sub-inspectors and that it is desirable that the superior officers should travel more and exercise greater check over their subordinates.

22nd March 1922] [Sir Charles Todhunter]

Therefore, the logical conclusion would seem to be a large increase in expenditure on the department. But his conclusion is that there should be a saving of Rs. 50,000 and the whole purpose of his motion seems to be, as he told us in the beginning, to spend the amount thus released on the favoured department of Education."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—"I only wanted to release the funds for increasing the pay of constables, Sir."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Well, Sir, that is the point on which I wished to speak, namely, what is to be done with the funds that are released by such motions as this. I want this Council to understand that the financial situation of the Government is desperate and is getting more desperate every day. It is not an ordinary normal year in which we have balances on hand to draw upon. Our position is that we have to go to our bankers, the Government of India, for their permission for an overdraft, and whether we shall secure that permission or not is, I venture to think, very doubtful. A telegram has just come in, which gives the result of the Legislative Assembly's voting on the Budget as having increased the deficit of the Government of India to eleven crores and 83 lakhs. Now, if we want any more funds in the course of this year, we have to get the money from them, and I put it to the Council that we are not likely to get any more money or further advances in the course of the year. I would therefore ask the House to make up their mind what is the least amount we are to spend and how we are going to secure sanction from the Government of India to spend up to that amount, and to overdraw our account up to that amount. It must not be forgotten in this connexion that a provision has to be made for village officers which is going to increase our deficit to a very considerable sum."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Order, order. I confess I do not quite see that the hon. Member is talking on the proposal to reduce the allotment for the district executive police force. That is the subject now under discussion."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I answer in one word, Sir? If the hon. Gentleman is able to save Rs. 50,000, that should go not to increase the pay of school teachers or constables, or anybody else, but to reduce the deficit." (Hear, hear.)

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I should like to have an opportunity of traversing some at least of the learned criticisms of the details of the police administration in the past year. I will begin with the closing part of Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar's criticism. I am asked why there has been a low percentage of detection and conviction in cases of murder particularly, I think, in the districts of Bellary and Anantapur. And he read several lines of paragraph 25 of the Administration Report of the Inspector-General of Police. But, Sir, he did not continue his quotation so as to include the reasons specifically mentioned for the low percentage of detection in one at least of the districts referred to. If the next sentence had been read, it would have been as follows:—"In the last-named district it is reported that the fear of reprisals deterred witnesses from coming forward to give evidence,"—a characteristic of the Ceded and some other districts in which factions and organised crime are rife. That is the

[Sir. Lionel Davidson]

[22nd March 1922]

reason why murders do not largely result in convictions in some parts at least of the Presidency. It reveals, Sir, a condition of affairs which in certain areas causes the Government and district officers very grave anxiety. It is that class of factious disorder which makes it necessary from time to time to quarter additional police in particular areas, and it is only right and proper that the inhabitants should pay for the cost. There has been at least one very bad case recently in the Anantapur district and another in the Cuddapah district. A third case is that in regard to which the Council has just light-heartedly eliminated the provision for the maintenance of special police; I refer to Kamudi. When we debated that issue at length the other day, no one really seriously contended that the additional police were not necessary there, but to-day the Council has passed a resolution which, if given effect to, will have the result of removing a much needed force of special police from the scene of a dangerously disturbed area, an area which I may say in passing is not unlikely to become the subject of more serious danger in the near future. I am told that what is known as the Nadar movement is reviving in the districts of Ramnad, Tinnevely and Madura. Evil disposed persons are going about advising the Nadars to insist

1-45 p.m.

on their admission into temples where such admission has not been customary; and there are various other forces at work linked up with the inevitable non-co-operation movement which have given us grave reason for anxiety in all these three districts. It is not exactly easy to trace a definite connexion; but I shall not be at all surprised if during the near future disturbances recur. Serious disturbances at Melur are mentioned in the paper this morning probably for similar causes, and, if they continue, it may be necessary to apply for additional police. As it is, an energetic District Magistrate has been able by means of his reserve to keep order. I make these few remarks with reference to the motion 488 which has just been passed by this House, but they are germane also to this motion, which involves a further reduction of Rs. 50,000. The House ought to think, not once but twice and more also, before it lightly proposes to remove a body of police from an area the disturbed conditions of which necessitated its entertainment. This is what has been proposed in the case of the Kamudi special police.

“Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar again cited with horror and surprise the remarks of the Principal of the Training College at Vellore in regard to the inferior material coming forward for admission to the sub-inspector class. I am not surprised, nor am I horrified; but I very much regret that the material that comes forward to-day should be so inferior. But let me tell the House what the real cause is. It is the result of one of two things; either the sub-inspector is not paid sufficiently and additional remuneration is necessary, or the incessant vilifications to which the Police department is subjected throughout the country deters young men of good family from joining the department. I am afraid, Sir, that the second reason is the stronger one and I very much regret its existence. I do wish that this House and the educated public of Southern India in general would do their utmost to abstain from and check this habit of imputing motives to the officers of the Police department and making life generally unpleasant to them. I do not for a moment say that every police officer is free from blame. But there are many many police officers who do not expose themselves to such criticisms. I do not think

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

there is any other department in the Province which is subjected to so much unfair and unreasonable criticism notwithstanding the constant endeavours of the officers and men to perform their duties to the utmost of their ability and in a spirit of zeal and devotion which is beyond all praise.

“I need not say anything further on the need for frequent travelling on the part of the higher officers and the desirability of their exercising a systematic check on their subordinate officers. I am in entire agreement with those views and I commend them to the hon. Gentlemen who at an earlier stage of these discussions were advising us to abolish the post of deputy inspector-general of police. I gather, however, that it is the intention of Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar merely to draw attention to various aspects of the administration and not seriously to move a reduction in the total amount provided for the upkeep of the department. If this is not the case, however, I must assure him that so far as the question of substantial reduction is concerned, I am absolutely at a loss to know where to apply the shears in order to cut away half a lakh of rupees.”

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—“Sir, I am sorry that the hon. the Finance Member has not quite understood my point. I say that it is possible to show a decrease of Rs. 25,000 by removing half a dozen superintendents. It is said that by this removal the amount under travelling allowance would increase. I think, Sir, this increase in the travelling allowance would not be more than what we would realise by the abolition of half a dozen posts. Two or three sub-inspectors from each district might well be taken away: we do not want so many posts. The decrease in crime and the detection of crime justifies reduction. That was my argument, Sir; but I do not propose to press the motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 494 to 501.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—

494. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,21,06,300 for district executive force by Rs. 100.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

495. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,29,47,300 for district executive force by Rs. 75,000.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

496. To reduce Rs. 1,12,000, the cost of 1,139 talaiyaris by the cost of Rs. 300.

497. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,03,283 for Criminal Investigation department by one lakh.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

498. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,03,283 for Criminal Investigation department by Rs. 100.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

499. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,15,000 for special police for Malabar by 2 lakhs.

[22nd March 1922]

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—

500. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4.15 lakhs for special police for Malabar by 1.*

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

501. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,72,91,079 for police by Rs. 100.*

Motion 502.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARIU :—“ I beg to make the following motion :—

502. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,72,91,079 for police by 3 lakhs.*

“ In view of what we just now heard from the hon. the Finance Member about a telegram that the Government have received from the Government of India, I think, Sir, that this motion ought to be carried to cover the deficit. I therefore beg to move this.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I am afraid I cannot follow the ground which underlies the hon. Mover's proposal to press the resolution. It seems to me that exactly the same grounds are enough for me to oppose the motion.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ I rather think, Sir, that the reduction of such a large sum as 3 lakhs is inexpedient. I have myself tabled a motion for the reduction of the amount by 1 lakh. I beg to know if you will permit me to move an amendment, at this stage, to this motion for the substitution of 1 lakh for 3 lakhs.”

Permission having been given for the alteration proposed, the motion as amended was debated upon.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Sir, I do beg the House not to proceed with omnibus reductions of this sort. I should like to say as regards our financial situation that our position is this. In order to carry through the year we shall have to get an overdraft on our bankers, and the limit of that overdraft will be the limit of any further expenditure which we can incur. Now, as regards these omnibus reductions, I ask the House to pause and consider what they really mean by a reduction of the sort following at the end of 50 resolutions which have either not been carried or have been withdrawn. I take it that the meaning is that the House cannot point to any specific items where reductions can be made, and if there are any specific items—(A voice : ‘ There was no time.’)

One hon. gentleman says that there was no time. I ask, Sir, has not the House been three hours less five minutes discussing and pointing out specific items in which the reduction could be made? I repeat, Sir, that if there are any specific items which the House could point to as being unnecessary it was the duty of the House to cut them out. We have put before them a budget of what we considered necessary, and we had cut out of it everything that we could cut out. The Finance Committee have gone through the budget and made their reductions, and the Cabinet have made theirs and if now this resolution is pressed, and if the Government would accept it, the Government would stultify itself. I venture to say, Sir, that it is not fair to the Government to come forward and say ‘ We have tried all the items we can

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

and have withdrawn our motions because we find these items to be necessary and therefore we mean to impose the duty on the Government to do somehow what we have been unable to do.’

“ Then again, it has been said that if we cannot do it we can come up with a supplementary grant. It is all very well to say that. But there are two things essential for a supplementary grant. We need the sanction of the House to spend the money, and we need the endorsement of our bankers on our cheque. If we had any balance, we could come forward with a supplementary grant and ask for permission to use the money, and when this House sanctioned it we could draw it. But we have no balance. We are asking our bankers to give us permission to draw up to a certain figure, and once we have got that permission we shall not be able to get further permission to draw. The House have already made several of these lump deductions, 5 lakhs under ‘ Land Revenue,’ some more under ‘ Law and Justice ’ and under other heads. The House now say, if the money left is inadequate we are to bring in a supplementary demand. If we do, the Government of India will reply that they cannot sanction odd grants like this from time to time, and that we should estimate our expenditure properly at the beginning of the year. It will be very difficult to secure the assent of the Government of India to meet the deficit that we have, without adding further to it for the purpose of a series of supplementary grants. I therefore ask the House to consider very seriously before they make this general cut. And if they do so, they cut out for good whatever sum they set down. If by any means the deficit can be reduced, nobody would be more glad than I. But as I have already stated, we have done what we can, and the Finance Committee have done what they can, and the House have added a good deal more to the reduction without indicating what items they wish us to cut out. I therefore ask them again, if they have items they object to, to cut them out themselves, but not, when they have failed to find them, to try to put the onus of doing so upon the Government.”

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“ I beg to support this proposition,

2 p.m.

and I am quite aware of the fact that the hon. the Finance Member would say that the Finance Committee has satisfied itself that it cannot be cut down further. May I point out, Sir, that the Finance Committee, as I pointed out the other day, were under the impression that there would be a reduction of 75 per cent under travelling allowances and contingencies? If that had been done it would have given us about Rs. 45 lakhs, whereas we are told in the budget statement which has been presented that what has been done under these heads is only a cutting down by Rs. 23.14 lakhs. Therefore it is that we have arrived at the conclusion, consistently with the promise held out to the Finance Committee and to the House through the Finance Committee, that further retrenchment in the way of contingencies and travelling allowances might have been done.

“ As regards the other objection that various propositions are moved and withdrawn, may I say, with all respect to the hon. the Finance Member, that out of consideration for not embarrassing the Government several of these resolutions were not pressed in the hope and belief that towards the end we might do it by an omnibus cut of one lakh which is a very low percentage and which can very well be done as has been pointed out in the course of this discussion. This has practically been going on in the Legislative Assembly

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

[22nd March 1922]

where the practice of cutting down by 5 per cent was approved and even taking a basis of 2½ per cent we should have a reduction of about Rs. 3½ or 4 lakhs in this. But having regard to the fact that the Police Department is a necessity which ought not to be reduced in the present day circumstances, we have shown due consideration and merely confined ourselves to a reduction of one lakh so that this might not embarrass the Government very much as still travelling allowances and contingencies could be cut down.

"Moreover, I wish to draw the attention of the House particularly in this debate, as this is the first time I speak on the police grant, to the policy that has been pursued by the Government with reference to the appointment of higher officers of the Police department. If the Government of this country can be carried on with a Cabinet of seven members of whom five are Indians, why in the Police department alone Indians should not be admitted to the higher posts. Among about 32 district police superintendents, there is only one Indian and out of 36 assistant superintendents and an extra temporary staff of four in Malabar, or out of 40 in all, there are only four Indians. Sir, the position is that the rawest recruit to the ranks of district superintendents of police who comes in to-day may supersede the most respected and the longest service man amongst the Indians, and the latter can only retire in the position of deputy superintendents, however respected they might be. So, in the circumstances, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the policy that is being pursued particularly in this department on which is laid the duty of finding out all that is going on underground and among the people in the dark recesses of the country. If he is an Indian officer he would have the means of going right into the midst of the people and moving among them, whereas the European district superintendent has really to rely upon the reports which are being made to him and which require a long time for verification. The district superintendent should have the opportunity of directly knowing everything as he is responsible for the maintenance of peace in the district and he should be able to get first-hand information which by the policy which has been pursued he is not enabled to do. In that way, if that policy of Indianising the police service to a much larger proportion than is the case at present is adopted, there must be a very large saving and the expenditure of Rs. 172 lakhs might have been reduced by at least one-fourth of that amount. Under the circumstances, I do say that the present policy is not the proper policy. If I am not mistaken, the Police Commission recommended the recruitment of six Indian superintendents of police, but what do we find? There is only one man out of a cadre of 32. With these observations I support the motion for reduction."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I take it that the discussion of this vote is coming to an immediate close. In fact I am not certain that the allotted time has not already expired. It is therefore in my opinion very much to be regretted that the last speaker did not choose an earlier moment for the elaboration of the criticisms to which we have just listened. I should then have had an opportunity of dealing with them. But sprung upon me as they have been at the last moment, at the very end of the vote, it is not possible adequately to meet such attacks."

The motion of Mr. T. M. Narasimbacharlu as amended, viz., to reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,72,91,079 for Police by one lakh, was put and declared carried.

22nd March 1922]

The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson demanded a poll which was taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 28. Rao Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 2. Dr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu. | 29. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |
| 3. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 30. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 4. " P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 31. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 5. " K. Gopalakrishnayya. | 32. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimbacharlu. |
| 6. " T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 33. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 7. " T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 34. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 8. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 35. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 9. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 36. Sriwan Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo. |
| 10. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 37. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. |
| 11. Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon. | 38. Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai. |
| 12. Mr. K. A. Kandaswami Kandar. | 39. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 13. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 40. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 14. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 41. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar. |
| 15. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 42. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 16. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | 43. Rao Sahib E. C. M. Mascarenhas. |
| 17. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 44. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 18. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddiyar. | 45. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 19. Mr. A. Subbarayudu. | 46. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib. |
| 20. Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 47. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib Bahadur. |
| 21. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. | 48. Mr. Saiyid Muhammad Padsha Sahib Bahadur. |
| 22. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar. | 49. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur-Rahman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 23. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. | 50. Munshi Muhammad Abdur-Rahman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 24. Mr. C. Venkata Ranga Reddi. | 51. Saiyid Diwan Abdul-Razaq Sahib Bahadur. |
| 25. Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao. | 52. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 26. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | 53. Mr. G. Vandanam. |
| 27. " M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. |
| 2. " Sir Charles Todhunter. | 11. Mr. R. Littlehales. |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-Jah Sahib Bahadur. | 12. Mr. E. Periyasayagam. |
| 4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 13. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. |
| 5. " Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 6. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 15. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai. |
| 7. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 16. Mr. S. Muttumanicka Aohari. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 17. Rao Bahadur T. Namberumal Chettiyar. |
| 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 18. Mr. A. E. Rencontre. |
| | 19. Mr. T. Richmond. |

Neutras.

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankineedu Prasad Bahadur. | 3. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. |
| 2. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 4. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya. |

The motion was carried, 53 voting for, 19 against and 4 remaining neutral.

Motions 503 to 510.

The following motions lapsed, the time allotted for the discussion of this demand having expired :—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

503. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,72,91,079 for Police by Rs. 100.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

504. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 148.12 lakhs under Demand XIII—Police by Rs. 1,00,000.

[22nd March 1922]

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

505. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 148.12 lakhs under Demand XIII—Police by Rs. 1,00,000.

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

506. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 148.12 lakhs by Rs. 1,00,000.

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

507. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 148.12 lakhs by Rs. 100.

Mr. V. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—

508. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 148.12 lakhs under Demand XIII by Rs. 10 lakhs.

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

509. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 148.12 lakhs for Police by Rs. 1,00,000.

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

510. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 148.12 lakhs by Rs. 1,00,000.

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 148.12 lakhs, with a reduction of one lakh, was then put to the House and carried.

The grant was made.

The Council adjourned for lunch at 2-10 p.m. and re-assembled at 3 p.m.

DEMAND XIV—SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENTS.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Sir, I beg to move that a sum not exceeding 49 lakh be granted for Scientific departments (other than Hydro-Electric Surveys).”

Motions 511 and 512.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—

511. To omit the allotment of Rs. 9,450 for salary and leave allowances of superintendent.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

512. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 46,164 for Provincial museums by Rs. 900.

Motion 513.

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

513. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 49 lakh under 30. Scientific departments by 100.

“ I find, Sir, at page 129 of the budget estimate, that a sum of Rs. 1,000 is provided for the Fine Arts Society and a sum of Rs. 1,500 for the Madras Literary Society. Whereas last year we had a sum of Rs. 20,000 provided for grants to local bodies for the maintenance of public libraries, there is no provision for it this year. I find from a note of the Secretary of the Finance Department that it has not been possible for the hon. Minister to make any provision in regard to these libraries on account of financial stringency.

22nd March 1922] [Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu]

When we have an allotment of 49 lakh under the head ‘Scientific Departments,’ I do not think the hon. Minister is justified in cutting down the expenditure in regard to such a useful object as the equipment of village libraries by local bodies and municipalities. I submit, Sir, last year or the year before last a resolution of this House was accepted by the Government and provision was intended to be made in the budget of 1920-21 but as the scheme was not yet ready nothing could be done. Last year, however, my hon. friend, Diwan Bahadur Ramachandra Rao, drew the attention of the House and a provision was made of 20,000 in the budget and I hoped that that provision would be continued. I see there is absolutely no reason for the omission of the provision and I wish the hon. the Minister tries to find, if not Rs. 20,000, some provision at least and continue to provide year after year to help the local bodies in equipping themselves with libraries.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Sir, no one will be more pleased than myself if I am able to make some provision to help the libraries in the villages. I know the library scheme is developing in the Telugu country and in the southern districts, and there are many workers in the cause of libraries. I had also the pleasure of presiding at one of the Libraries’ Conferences and I am much interested in the development of the scheme. It was not possible for me to obtain any help from the Finance Department with reference to this particular development. I would be very glad if I could secure in the course of the year any funds and if the head of the Educational Department was able to find anything also by re-appropriation from his budget. I am sure we shall then be able to consider such cases whether in the north or in the south as would come for scrutiny and it may be possible for us to help the libraries which are doing excellent work in some districts.”

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—“ With the sympathetic attitude taken by the hon. Minister and with the assurance given by him, I beg leave to withdraw my motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 49 lakh under Demand XIV—Scientific Departments was then put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XV—EDUCATION (EUROPEAN).

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I have the honour to move, Sir, for a grant not exceeding 9.35 lakhs under Demand XV—European Education.”

Motion 514.

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—“ Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

514. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,92,000 for the provincialization of the Lawrence Memorial school, Levedale, by 1 lakh.”

“ I do so, Sir, in pursuance of a policy which I shall try to enforce on this House and on this Government as long as I have the tongue in my mouth and voice in my throat, the policy that the Government should not saddle themselves with educational institutions if they can unless they have no other go. I do not want to enter at present into the merits or demerits of Government institutions. I shall confine myself to the motion before us. I have

[Mr. A. T. Palmer]

[22nd March 1922]

been trying to find out something about this institution, the Lawrence Memorial school at Lovedale, and I have been able to get hold of a directory of 1908. I am afraid it is an ancient book but I was able to get only that book to give me some information in regard to this institution. I was ransacking the reports of last year on the budget discussion and I could not get any information from it. The institution in question was founded as early as 1858, primarily for the benefit of European lads and girls who were left orphans and it was well supported by big people, by the Commander-in-Chief, by the Bishop of Madras and many other influential men. I think there is also a press called the Lawrence Asylum Press for the benefit of this institution. The institution has a very large staff and I have no doubt it has been doing very good work. I cannot understand what made the institution go begging to the Imperial Government. I do not know the intervening history but what I learnt was that some two years ago it was not able to manage itself and wanted the aid of the Government of India for its upkeep and the Imperial Government have taken up the institution and have placed the required funds at the disposal of the Madras Government. If, as I hear, this institution is not a burden on provincial funds, I have no complaint at all but if it is to be one of those instances, where like the camel which puts its nose first and then thrusts its whole body in, if we will have to incur greater and greater expenditure as time goes on I should certainly press this resolution."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" This institution, Sir, enjoys a recurring Imperial grant of 2·30 lakhs which has now been merged in Provincial funds. It enjoys a further income from endowments and fees of 92 lakh per annum. There is also a sum of 1·27 lakhs set apart for its benefit from an Imperial grant given towards European education some years ago which has not been expended. Finally large grants for capital expenditure have been promised by the Government of India, to an aggregate amount of, I think 3·22 lakhs. The order directing the provincialization of the school was passed only very recently and the exact details have not yet been fully worked out. That is the reason, Sir, why the provision takes the shape of a lump grant in this budget. The question of the adequacy of the lump grant has recently been under further examination and the decision arrived at in the Cabinet on Sunday last was that it is necessary to raise it from 2·92 to 3·10 lakhs, a figure still nearly Rs. 20,000 less than the proposals of the Committee which supervise the management of the institution, but generally based on the revised estimate for the current year. I do not propose, Sir, to go into the past history of the school for I think it must be well-known to the Members of this House that the school is founded in memory of the great Sir Henry Lawrence, and has been taken care of by the Government of India since his death in pursuance of a special request to that effect in his will. If any hon. Member of this House is interested in the details of the foundation of this school, he will find them in the annual reports of the institution and I may add, Sir, that having been honoured with a request to preside at the annual prize giving in 1920 I took advantage of the occasion to set out more fully the personal connexion of Sir Henry Lawrence and his family with these institutions, and the newspapers were kind enough to publish what I said for soldiers' children. If Mr. Palmer or any other gentleman wants to know the early history of the school and the circumstances under which its management has been taken over from the Government of India by the

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

Government of Madras, I shall be happy to give him full information. The matter has been under correspondence, I think, for something like three years and one of the facts which deferred the final settlement was this very question of the financial issue. The Government of Madras were anxious to ensure that the transfer should be effected without involving any additional burden on Provincial funds. The arrangements to that end underwent careful scrutiny at the hands of my hon. Colleague, Sir Charles Todhunter. I cannot go into the details at this moment but I may assure the House that they are generally satisfactory and that so far as the allotment for the next year is concerned every penny of it can be met from funds placed at the disposal of the Government of Madras by the Imperial Government."

Mr. T. RICHMOND :—" Sir, I must admit I was considerably puzzled and to some extent alarmed when I heard the hon. the Mover

3-15 p.m. saying that he was going to enforce some policy on this House so long as he had any voice in his throat. I must admit after hearing the hon. Sir Lionel Davidson that I was surprised why the hon. the Mover should have gone for information to an old edition of the Lawrence Asylum almanac. I however have some personal knowledge of the institution which I know has been doing very useful work and I think it was a very proper step on the part of the Government to have made this provision."

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—" I did not question that, Sir. I request permission to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 515.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

515. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 50,400 for building grants to non-Government secondary schools by Rs. 25,000.*

" The reason, Sir, why I gave notice of this motion was this. While the provision made in the next year's budget for building grants to European non-Government secondary schools is Rs. 50,000, the provision for building grants to other schools, which are very large in number is only Rs. 10,800. It seems to me, Sir, that considering both the importance and the number of the other institutions concerned, it requires an explanation, and a satisfactory explanation too, as to why Rs. 50,000 should be provided for the European schools and Rs. 10,800 only for all the other schools together. If there is a satisfactory explanation for that, I do not want to press the matter further."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" There is a quite satisfactory explanation, Sir. The principle relating to the entry of these grants is identical with that which has been applied in the case of building grants to non-European schools. I understand from my hon. Colleague the Minister that the total sum under that head will shortly be raised by 5½ lakhs. The principle is that building grants should next year be given only in cases where there has been a direct or indirect promise to find funds in the case of works already started and in progress. Now of this Rs. 50,400, all but Rs. 6,400 relates to one institution, the St. George's Homes at Kaity. The building operations there have been going on under the direct supervision of the Public Works Department whose services have been lent free of

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[22nd March 1922]

the usual percentage contribution for the last two or three years. I am told the buildings are likely to be completed before the close of this month, but the actual amount due cannot be paid until later. The sum in question is Rs. 44,000 and this will leave a balance for building grants to other European schools of only Rs. 6,400."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"I am glad to hear, Sir, that 5½ lakhs is going to be provided for schools, other than European schools, for building grants. So, I do not press this motion."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"May I ask the hon. the Minister, Sir, where that 5½ lakhs is to be found in the budget?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"It is not to be found in the budget. In relation to an interpretation of an order in Council, viz., whether specific promises were made with reference to the allotments that were made for 1921-22, the Finance Department naturally raised an objection that no grants should be given unless there was a specific promise. In accordance with that ruling of the Finance Department, the head of the Education Department, the Director of Public Instruction, was obliged to surrender about Rs. 5½ lakhs. When the matter came up before the Government, they reconsidered the whole matter and said that in the case of buildings already in progress, the amount might be reallocated. So, a reallocation was made by the Government of the 5½ lakhs that was surrendered on account of the rule and a liberal construction has now been put upon it by the Government."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Does it mean that my hon. Friend is making a supplementary grant by allotting this amount for building grants for 1922-23?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Yes, it will be taken credit of." The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 516.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

516. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,75,000 for boarding grants by Rs. 50,000.*

"Sir, this motion also has been tabled to show the disparity that exists in the allotment made for European education and for the education of the other people. The boarding grant that is provided in the budget for the year 1921-22 for European schools was Rs. 1,22,500, whereas in the revised estimate for 1921-22 there is a provision of Rs. 1,75,000, which is about Rs. 50,000 over and above the budget estimate for the year. On the other hand, turning to page 140 we find that the budget estimate for hostel grants for the old year was Rs. 37,000, while in the revised estimate it has gone up to Rs. 57,000. But in the budget estimate for the next year there is absolutely no provision whatever for hostel grants. It seems to me, Sir, that it is a matter requiring the scrutiny of the House, and I think that this matter of providing such a large amount for European education and leaving nothing at all for any other education should again be explained; and if a satisfactory explanation will be forthcoming, I do not intend to press my motion."

[22nd March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"The explanation, Sir, in this case is eminently satisfactory. I do not propose to enter into any comparison with the provision made for hostel grants in a branch of the educational budget which is not under my control. That is a matter with which my hon. Colleague, the Minister for Education, will deal. But I do proceed to justify the provision made for boarding grants next year, and I propose to cite as my first witness the hon. Mover himself; for, I find that his name comes as 23rd in a list of not less than 62 persons who, on the 24th March last year, voted in favour of entering in this year's budget a sum of Rs. 70,000 for the purpose of revising the rates of boarding grants in European schools. That lump sum of Rs. 70,000 is shown at page 136 under the budget estimate for 1921-22, and if Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyyar will add that on to the figure in the budget estimate at page 137, he will find that the total budget estimate for these boarding grants during the current year comes to Rs. 1,92,500. He will thus find that the revised estimate shows a saving of Rs. 17,500 and that the provision for the coming year's budget is identical with the revised estimate."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"May I ask the hon. the Minister for Education whether any sum has been provided for hostels attached to Indian educational institutions and whether he will please make a statement on the subject?"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, is that inquiry in order at this stage? I imagine that any inquiry regarding hostel grants under the transferred budget should be made in the course of the discussion of that grant."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The point raised by the hon. the Home Member is this: As the Council is at present dealing with European education, any enquiry which the hon. Member may have to make of the Minister in regard to non-European education will not be in order in this discussion. Will the hon. Member explain how such an inquiry is relevant to the consideration of the present motion? Of course any inquiry the answer to which would be relevant for disposing of this motion would be justifiable. But the hon. Member has not yet told us why he wants the information now."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"May I ask, Sir, whether the item under discussion at present is votable or not? Before giving our votes in regard to this grant, we would also like to know the reason for the disparity in the treatment meted out to the hostels attached to other schools."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"Last year when this motion was before the House some hon. Members made remarks to the effect that if boarding grants are made by the State for one class of people there should be provision made for such grants to other classes of people as well. That is perhaps what is at the back of my hon. Friend Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi when he raised the point and asked the hon. the Minister for Education whether any grant is going to be provided for Indian orphans also. If we could have information on this point, we will be better able to make up our mind in giving our vote."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, the question of general policy as to whether the State should commit itself to boarding grants was raised last year and I should be surprised if any inquiry as to whether this system of allotting public funds for the boarding charges

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

[22nd March 1922]

of students should be considered irrelevant. I think that on this question of providing funds for the boarding of students, however necessitous, some amount of criticism was levelled as to the consequences of such a step. Therefore my hon. Friend Mr. Ramalinga Reddi is perfectly right in raising the question as regards the treatment of other classes of orphans. My hon. Friend feels that if this is allowed to one class of children it is perfectly natural to raise the question whether as a policy it should not be extended to all. That is at the back of my hon. Friend's inquiry and I trust, Sir, that even last year apprehensions were raised as to whether in our educational expenditure we should go so far as to commit ourselves to paying for board of children and if so how far we should go. That is the point of the inquiry and that is the reason why my hon. Friend has put that question. I do not wish to raise any other question except the question of the policy involved."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"I think, Sir, it is a very legitimate question in considering this matter. We regret we are unable to make any provision in the case of Indian students, because the demand was not pressing. We thought that if there were to be pressing demands in this matter we might be able to provide by reappropriation of grants. That is the situation. No doubt as the hon. Members of Council will see there is a large boarding grant for European schools. But pressing demands not having been forthcoming from other quarters, we thought we could provide for these at a later stage and therefore the amount is not put down in the budget. However, if there should be any pressing demand we are prepared to meet it."

Sriman SASTI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasaya :—"Are we to understand that there had been no applications forthcoming from the Indian institutions?"

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—"May I say, Sir, that I caused inquiries to be made with regard to this question? Various applications were submitted to me, I had them under my investigation and the question was submitted to the Government for their orders. Government are at the present moment still considering the question as to whether boarding grants should be granted to the applicants and if so under what conditions. When those conditions are laid down, then Sir, and only then can we make some provision in the budget. As the hon. the Minister has pointed out the amount that has been demanded for the coming year will be comparatively small and from the relatively large amount of the educational budget it may be found quite possible to obtain the money required by reappropriation although it is very difficult at this time of the year to point out any definite reappropriation from which the amount may be met."

"There is one other point. There appears to have been some confusion with regard to the hostel grants and the boarding grants. Hostel grants for which budget provision is made in the educational budget are grants which are made for the purpose of building hostels for students. They are therefore of the nature of a capital charge. Boarding grants on the other hand are grants made to help to meet the recurring charges that are incurred in the maintenance of these pupils in educational orphanages."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—"May I elicit, Sir, some information in regard to certain points connected with this subject? The first point is: What are these boarding grants for? Are they only messing charges; or do they include other charges, such as maintenance of dormitories,

22nd March 1922] [Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu]

tuition fees, etc.? Are all these included in this comprehensive term of boarding? Secondly, I wish to know whether the hon. the Home Member can state, approximately, the total number of children that are benefited by this grant. Thirdly whether this help is by way of grant-in-aid to private institutions to supplement their contributions; or does it cover the total boarding charges? These are the three points on which I wish to have information."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—"I should very much like to have notice of these questions so that I may have before me to present before this Council absolutely accurate figures. I regret that I cannot state the exact number, but if my hon. Friend will give me notice or ask either publicly by an interpellation or demi-officially, I shall furnish the information. I may say, Sir, that on account of the children for whom grants are received the managements receive the grants-in-aid of their expenditure under rules as specifically laid down in the code. A specific grant is made in aid of boarding charges. This amount does not cover the total charges. It is given in aid of the boarding charges. I refer the hon. Member to the code of regulations for European schools under which I am compelled to administer orders of Government."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—"If I speak on this motion it is not with an idea of cutting down any of these grants allotted for the purpose of feeding the Anglo-Indian children. It is only to draw the attention of the hon. the Home Member to the speech which he made during the last year's budget when this very same question was discussed in this Council and to the very carefully worded promise which he held out on that occasion. He stated in the course of the debate that an examination would be made of the case for giving grants for similar institutions for destitute orphans of the Indian community and held out that promise as an olive branch. In the course of that debate I even told the hon. the Home Member that I would give the names of institutions where Indian orphans and Anglo-Indian orphans are maintained and where the same conditions under which the Anglo-Indian orphans are maintained do prevail. Further, Sir, I may go to the extent of saying that in the same school both these orphans are being maintained but only the Anglo-Indians are paid by Government and the Indians are not paid. I may remind the hon. the Home Member that last year when the hon. the Home Member was in Ootacamund I brought one or two instances of this kind where the Indian orphans are housed under similar conditions as those of European orphans. All these things I brought to his notice and I do not know whether he remembers them."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Yes."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—"Thanks. He was good enough to promise me consideration. Now I hear from the Director of Public Instruction that an investigation has been set afoot and they are trying to do the work. For the last one year nothing has been done. That is the complaint we here make on behalf of the poor Indian orphans. We do not want to cut down the grants of the Anglo-Indian orphans. But I would like that at least the half-hearted promise of the Home Member in dealing with this case is fulfilled. I submit, Sir, there would have been no difficulty if the Government had really wanted to carry out the promise. If surely the hon. the Director of Public Instruction had only taken a little more care and a little more zest

[Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai] [22nd March 1922]

surely he would have found out that there are so many orphanages in which the Indian orphans are maintained in the same conditions as these Anglo-Indian orphans. So far as the point raised by Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu is concerned I can state from my own personal knowledge that the amounts granted to the Anglo-Indian orphans do not exactly cover the charges but they go even beyond them. In all these matters, Sir, it is too late for the Government to say after one year, 'we have tried, we have not been able to do anything in the matter'. I was sorry to hear from the hon. the Home Member and the hon. the Director of Public Instruction that the demand was not pressing."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Pressed."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—" Yes. Exactly."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—" I do not remember saying that the demand was not pressing. What I said is, if I remember right, that there was not a great demand, that is to say, the number of Indians who satisfied the conditions was not so great as the number of Anglo-Indians. That is the point."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—" Thanks. Probably the hon. the Director of Public Instruction does not know that half of the boarding institutions in which Anglo-Indian orphans are maintained contain Indian orphans also."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—" I am aware that they maintain a large number of Indian orphans."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—" If he was aware of the fact what is the meaning of the investigation that is being made for the last year. That is the question I put to the hon. the Director of Public Instruction. Now, I will take the correction of the hon. the Home Member that these demands were not pressed. What could these institutions do? They send up applications. They bring it to the notice of the Government. Does the hon. the Home Member or the Director of Public Instruction expect these managers to be dinning them day in and day out with letters and correspondence. If that is the way in which they are going to interpret, all that I can say is that the Government is not doing its duty. I wish now at least, Sir, the Government will wake from its stupor and distribute the grants with justice and equity. I am not here to say that these demands ought to be cut down."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I find myself, Sir, enjoying the full benefits of diarchy, for a reserved allotment is being attacked on the ground that it is not supplemented by transferred allotment for similar purposes (laughter). But I do think that Mr. Arumainatham Pillai is unduly distressed. It is perfectly true that in the debate last year—though I did not give any specific assurance—I did indicate a disposition to cause an inquiry to be made. And, as a matter of fact, I did direct that attention should be drawn to the question of boarding grant for Indian orphanages and ask that investigation should be put in hand. But the further pursuit of that inquiry devolved on the Ministry for Education. In the earlier stages this was in the hands of our late lamented colleague Mr. Subbarayulu Reddiyar and it is only recently that the matter has come before Mr. Patro. Investigations and changes of this description do take a certain amount of time and we cannot expect changes in the rules to be brought about immediately. It is possible that this particular change might have

[Sir Lionel Davidson] 22nd March 1922]

been carried out more expeditiously and I for one should not have had the least objection to this being done. But it is necessary to examine what the practical financial effect of such a change would be and such an examination does take time. I was glad to hear Mr. Arumainatham Pillai say that he did not wish on the score of delay in dealing with the case of Indian orphanages to move for any reduction in the grant for Anglo-Indian orphanages which are dealt with under this head. Most of Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu's inquiries were really answered in the opening paragraphs of my speech on the resolution about this matter on 24th March last—

'These grants,' I said then, 'are not given indiscriminately to the occupants of the boarding houses at European or Anglo-Indian schools but only to destitute orphans who have to obtain a certificate of destitution from the magistrate of the district in the mufassal and from the Chief Presidency Magistrate in the case of the City of Madras. It is a rule that no boy over 16 and no girl over the age of 18 shall be eligible; and no scholar reading beyond Standard VII can receive any grant, unless in very exceptional cases sanctioned by the department.'

"Last year what we were debating was the question whether the old rates of Rs. 10 in Madras and Rs. 8 in the mufassal should not be enhanced and we came to the conclusion that these rates, which were fixed many years before, ought, in consideration of the increased cost of living, to be increased by at least 50 per cent. It is that increase which is the ultimate cause of the provision we are now discussing. I pointed out that several deserving orphanages would have to be closed if the additional sum was not placed at their disposal. I deprecated then, and I am glad to say that the majority of the House agreed with me in deprecating, any conclusion which was likely to result in throwing numbers of destitute orphans, indiscriminately on to the streets. If the same conditions apply in regard to Indian orphanages, I for one am fully prepared to support the application of similar provisions to such cases. But, as I observed last year, 'boarding institutions for Indians are comparatively rare', and to what extent Indian orphanages stand in need of the same help as European or Indian orphanages, I do not know. That is a matter which the Director of Public Instruction and his staff are engaged in investigating. I also pointed out last year that Government were doing something in the way of meeting boarding charges of Indian orphans in the case of the industrial settlements. The provision we are discussing does not relate to the question of grants to hostels. That is quite a distinct issue, a question of building grants. These boarding grants come under a different category. The real answer is an answer which in this system of diarchy it does not fall to me to give. For it is the transferred part of the Government which should provide similar grants for Indian orphanages where the circumstances justify it."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I do not think any one will ask for a reduction of the boarding grants already provided for in the case of European and Anglo-Indian schools. But the point which has really given rise for anxiety and some sort of dissatisfaction in the minds of several of us is that, notwithstanding the fact that one year has elapsed since our last discussion on the subject, nothing has yet been done to help Indian orphanages during the course of the year. The question is a very simple one on the face of it. We were told that the Government and the Director of Public Instruction had information about the existence of Indian orphanages deserving such help; and if that information was available, why it was not possible for them to come to a decision on this simple question even after such

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [22nd March 1922]

a long time, passes my comprehension. I find no justification for this. Since this matter has now been brought to their notice, let it be hoped that no time will be lost and that steps will be taken to rectify this omission even before the close of the current year. I do not think we can go to the public with any sense of gratification that, while we have been voting for grants for these Anglo-Indian institutions, nothing has been done in the case of the Indian institutions. While I do not think it is necessary to press this motion for reduction at this stage, still I think this discussion would have served a very useful purpose, if only the Director of Public Instruction would make his recommendation soon and see that the omission is made good in the case of Indian orphanages, even before the close of this year."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—" May I correct one misapprehension, Sir? It is the statement that nothing has been done till now in the case of Indian orphanages. As a matter of fact, my inspectors—Government inspectors—have collected information; they have made inquiries; they have submitted reports to me; I have already, some time ago, submitted my recommendations to the Government and I have advised Government—I am not at liberty to state what my advice to the Government is—but I have advised Government and I am at the present moment awaiting Government orders. I just wish to state that it is a misapprehension to state that nothing has been done, when the position is that this department is doing its level best to hurry on things and to make recommendations in accordance with what is known as the general policy both of the Government and of this Legislative Council. If Members would only come and ask about the state of these various things either by form of questions or by demi-official letters to me, I shall be able to give them the fullest information and they will know what the exact position is and this would save a great deal of discussion in this Council."

Rev. W. MESTON :—" Sir, I simply beg to confirm what the Director of Public Instruction has said. During the past year some of us have had occasion to approach him in connexion with boarding grants and have met with the most sympathetic treatment. We understand that certain schemes regarding boarding grants are under consideration and we await the result of these with interest."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" Sir, the course of discussion has brought out very many things which require to be looked into first by the Government and then, if necessary, by the Council. Applications from Indian orphanages, it is said, have been received but not disposed of. We find no provision made this year in the budget for Indian orphanages. That shows, Sir, that nothing has yet been settled with regard to these Indian orphanages and it is not known whether they would get any help at all in the near future. Then, Sir, it was stated that these boarding grants are given as stipends in European schools and they are in a different position from the hostels which are managed in connexion with other schools. I believe last year when the question was raised, a number of hon. Members referred to the question of hostels and they said that these hostels ought to be helped by the Government. I was one of those who supported the Government at the time and I did so on the understanding that the Government were going to help these hostels and they were going to be liberal towards meeting the expenses of these hostels. Now we find that no provision has been made for these hostels. It is said that the hostel grants mentioned are

22nd March 1922] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiya]

only for building grants and not for the upkeep of the hostels. That is a question which requires the consideration of the Minister. He will have to frame a bold policy with regard to it. Otherwise, the Council will have to take up this question also.

"So far as the grants now debated on are concerned, as the hon. the Home Member has said, it was not my intention that any portion of the community should suffer because the Government have committed a mistake. The hon. the Home Member has been referring more than once to diarchy. Well, we see the result of the diarchy. Under the diarchy the reserved portion is able to act in any way they like and allot as much money as possible for the departments under their control, whereas the transferred departments are not able to make themselves felt."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" May I draw attention to the fact, Sir, that these allotments are made after the sanction of the Legislative Council? "

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" I am only referring to what the hon. the Home Member said. I say that the provisions made in the budget for the transferred and reserved halves show the weakness of the system. Well, we see that the result of the diarchy is not in favour of the transferred departments at all. I do hope that the transferred departments will get better treatment in future and that institutions under the transferred departments will get better consideration at least hereafter. So, Sir, as I said already, it is not my intention that the Anglo-Indian community should suffer for the mistakes made by the Government and I have not changed my opinion from that I held last year, viz., that the poor boys though they belong to the Anglo-Indian community and come under the reserved department should not be made to suffer. Therefore, I do not want to press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 517.

The following motion was not made :—

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—

517. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 26,900 for European schools.*

Motion 518.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

518. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,21,600 for European education by Rs. 100.*

"I would invite the attention of the House to the figures published at page 149 of the budget, where we find the sums provided for inspection of schools under different agencies. It appears to me that the agency is far too much for the actual needs of the case. The number of schools appears to be 92. Of these, more than one school are located in the same place. So far as the public instruction in the Presidency is concerned, the proportion which the expenditure under inspection bears to the total expenditure under public instruction is 3.63 per cent. But I fear that compared with the total cost on education under this head, the expenditure on inspection would be found to be very heavy indeed. I do not see the need for so much inspecting agency. There was an assistant inspector last year and I think the

4 p.m.

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [22nd March 1922]

same assistant inspector with a woman assistant inspectress provided in the budget would both be able to do the necessary inspection satisfactorily. Further, I notice a proposal was made in 1912, which has not been given any attention to by the department. The Conference on the education of the domiciled community in India held at Simla in July 1912 resolved that concentration of schools was desirable wherever possible. So far, no steps have been taken in Madras to give effect to this resolution. This is from the report of public instruction in the Madras Presidency for the year 1920. In this connexion I would like to suggest that the number of pupils who receive boarding grants should be mentioned in the report for the information of all concerned. So, for the reasons that economy is possible, that the inspecting staff is far in excess of the needs of the case and that the proposals already made for reduction have not been given effect to, and in order further to mark our sense of dis-satisfaction with the non-provision of any amount for Indian boarding institutions, I beg to move that this grant be reduced by a sum of Rs. 100."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, I wish the hon. Member had had the courtesy to give me previous intimation of the point he was going to raise, for then I should have been much more fully prepared to deal with it. As a matter of fact, I have before me a lengthy exposition of the case for inspecting staff."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I should like to correct the hon. the Home Member and say that it was not due to any intentional discourtesy that I did not intimate to him the points I was going to raise."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I do not suggest for one moment that the hon. Member was intentionally discourteous. I know him far too well to suppose that he would be guilty of deliberate discourtesy to anybody. But there are discourtesies due to want of thought. The House must recognize that the Member in charge of a portfolio is at a distinct disadvantage if topics of which he has no information are raised. I am not prepared to say off-hand what steps have been taken in pursuance of resolution passed in the Simla Conference with regard to the amalgamation of institutions. It is quite likely that the Director of Public Instruction will be able to say something about that and I have no doubt that he will be able to deal more fully with the question of inspection and inspecting staff than I propose to do. All that I propose to say on the subject is that we are satisfied that as things stand at present a special inspecting staff for these European schools is necessary. They differ very much from the ordinary Indian schools, differ in respect of curricula, differ in respect of the type of pupils, differ in respect of the type of examinations: in fact the differences are so many that I cannot enumerate them fully. But the general conclusion is that special qualifications are required of the inspector and his staff. As a rule we desire, and very naturally, to allot a European member of the Indian Educational Service for the inspection of these schools. This is not always possible, but that is our idea. As to the quantity of work which is in issue it is quite a mistake to suppose that judged statistically it is any less than that devolving upon the average inspector of Indian schools. The figures put before me suggest that the reverse is the case and that the average volume of work that falls on the shoulders of the inspector of European schools is larger."

22nd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

"I think the third and the last point which the hon. Member took was that we have failed to supply him and the House with statistics as to the number of persons in receipt of boarding grants. I will present him with a simple arithmetical problem, and if he will devote a minute or two to it, he will arrive at maximum and minimum figures within which the figure he desires will be found. I think I mentioned that the old rates were Rs. 10 and Rs. 8. The new rates are Rs. 15 and Rs. 12 according as the pupils are in Madras city or in the mufassal. The revised estimate figure is Rs. 1,75,000. If this be divided by 12 and by 15, the results will show how many pupils are furnished with boarding grants at Rs. 12 per head and how many at Rs. 15 per head. The figure which the hon. Member wishes to arrive at will be somewhere between those two figures."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I do not say that the total number of inspectors should be reduced. There may be two people as at present. All that I want is that instead of an inspector on Rs. 1,000 a month, there may be an assistant inspector on a salary of Rs. 300 a month."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—"The pay of inspector is nonvotable."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"All that I wish to say is this: when you want an inspecting agency, is it not possible to utilize the services of a cheaper agency when available? I do not say that the pay of inspectors should be cut down. I wish to point out that it is unnecessary to spend so much on mere inspection. I therefore press my motion."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—"Sir, the hon. Member desires information with regard to the steps that have been taken in the amalgamation of institutions. I might give him the information that it was only within the last fortnight that I had a conference in my office of the representatives of managers of three schools in Madras and we discussed together the possibilities of amalgamation. It was put forward at that conference that instead of having an amalgamation, it might be more desirable to throw open European schools to larger numbers of Indians who desire to come in and that, Sir, is another problem which is receiving my attention. That is a problem which is also being discussed by the Government of India and its advisory board. I may say that I have at the present moment a large file in that connexion and I should have been able to advise the Government on the matter a week ago had it not been for the present meeting of the Legislative Council. I hope in the course of the next fortnight to be able to submit definite recommendations to the Government with regard to the position of European schools with reference to Indian schools. I should just mention this fact that if the hon. Member had only taken the trouble to let me know in advance the point on which he desired information, he could have easily obtained additional information."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, as the hon. Member wishes to press the resolution and as he has done so on a fresh point namely that it might be possible to replace the inspector by an assistant inspector, it becomes incumbent upon me to give a little more information on that aspect of the case. In the first instance I would say that as the officer ultimately responsible for the general control of European schools I should certainly wish that the officer who is charged with the inspection of the class of institutions that come within my sphere should be of high status. I certainly could not

[Sir Lionel Davidson] [22nd March 1922]

accept as authoritative the views of an officer of the grade of assistant inspector of schools in the case of a large institution like the Lawrence Memorial school which has just come under our control. There are, I believe, 500 boys in that school, to say nothing of girls, and the standard of education is high. That is not a class of institution which can properly be inspected only by an assistant inspector. I do not think that if the hon. Mover ponders over this, he will seriously urge his proposal. Then I must draw his attention to the comparative figures. I do not wish to rely on the technical question whether the post of an inspector is votable or non-votable; I rest my case on the fact that an officer of the rank of an inspector is clearly required to discharge the duties without which the Government cannot properly exercise supervision over European institutions in this presidency. If the hon. Member refers to the details given at page 149 under Detailed Account 31-E of the Civil Budget Estimate, he will see that whereas last year we had both an inspector and an assistant inspector of schools we have dispensed with the assistant inspector this year, not because an assistant inspector is not necessary, but because we have decided in lieu to employ a woman assistant inspector on a temporary basis in order to deal specially with girl pupils. There are a very large number of boys and girls receiving education in European schools and the absolute minimum of the inspecting staff for that purpose is one man and one woman. I have already given reasons why the man must be an officer of high status. I venture again to appeal to the hon. Mover of this nominal reduction to withdraw his motion if it is merely based on the question of the inspecting staff."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Before I withdraw I should like to say one or two words. I was aware of the fact mentioned by the hon. the Home Member that there were last year two inspectors and that there was no woman inspector. The hon. the Home Member stated that there was only one school and I do not see any reason why there should be two inspectors, one man and one woman. I wish to know whether both of them are required to supervise a single school."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Pardon me, Sir, there are many European institutions which require to be supervised."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"The hon. the Home Member mentioned only one, the Lawrence Memorial school."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I mentioned only the most important of them all."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, I think my purpose has been served in drawing the attention of the hon. the Home Member to the matter of the inspecting staff. I therefore withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 9.65 lakhs under Demand XV—European Education was put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XVI—EDUCATION (NON-EUROPEAN).

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, I beg to move that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 143.10 lakhs for Demand XVI—Education (Non-European)."

22nd March 1922]

Motion 519.

4-15 p.m. Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

519. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 85,500 for grants to the University by Rs. 12,000.

"Sir, I beg to apologize to my hon. Friend on the left the Member for the University and I wish to state the circumstances under which I am justified in bringing forward this motion. The defects and irregularities about which I complain are not due to any fault of the hon. Member but rather that he suffered from some of them himself. The particular circumstances which prompted me to table this resolution are to be found in the proceedings of this Council for the 21st January 1922. My hon. Friend Mr. P. O. Etirajulu Nayudu asked the hon. the Minister for Education what the duties are of Professor Rao Sahib S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar, University lecturer; who scrutinizes his work and for what period his appointment was sanctioned; whether he had written any books and whether they had been published either by the Government or by the University; and whether he was given special permission to publish books and appropriate their sale-proceeds. A harmless question from a representative of the tax-payer who is called upon to pay from the revenues of the State to the tune of Rs. 85,000 to the University. The answer to the first part of the question :

"What the duties are of Professor Rao Sahib S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar, University lecturer' is: 'the duties of the professor are to deliver lectures of a specialised character in Indian History and Archaeology with a view to supplement the ordinary instruction in the affiliated colleges and to make researches.'

"To the second part 'who scrutinizes his work and for what period his appointment is sanctioned' is: 'the Government have no information in regard to the first part of the question. The professor's appointment has been sanctioned for a period of ten years in all which will terminate with 31st October 1924.'

"To the third part 'whether he has written any books and whether they have been published either by the University or by the Government': 'the answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. The books have not been published by the Government and the Government have no definite information as to whether they have been published by the University.'

"The answer to the last part 'whether he is given special permission to publish books and appropriate their sale-proceeds' is: 'the Government have no information' It is a very unenviable position for the Government to say that they have no information. I then asked 'whether the information which is said to be not available will be obtained and placed before the Council.' The hon. the Minister was good enough to tell me: 'Information will be obtained from the University to whom reference has been made.' I will be obtained from the University to whom reference has been made.' I then said in words which now turn out to be prophetic 'if the Government could not get the information private members cannot have facilities to obtain it'.

"In pursuance of the promise then made, the hon. the Minister has apparently addressed the University and in answer thereto he has received a reply of which owing to the courtesy of the Minister I have been furnished with a copy. This is the letter received from the University.

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiayar] [22nd March 1922]

‘With reference to Government Memorandum No. 184-B-1, dated the 20th January last, requesting the Syndicate to furnish the Government with an account of the work of Dr. S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar, University Professor of Indian History and Archaeology, since his appointment, I have the honour, by direction, to furnish Government with copies of the reports of the Syndicate to the Senate during the period of tenure of office of the Professor.’

‘With reference to Government Memorandum No. 134-B-1, dated the 30th January last,

apparently things are not promptly attended to and a reminder had to be sent

I am directed to invite your attention to the fact that the answers to the question referred to therein involve reference to matters solely within the competence and jurisdiction of the Syndicate and the Senate and to the internal affairs and concerns of the University, of and over which

here the language smacks of the lawyer

the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor and Fellows for the time being have the entire management and superintendence.’

“Sir, after reading this, I am reminded of the solemn vows which the Chancellor takes from the candidates appearing before him for taking the degrees. They are asked to promise amongst other things whether they will comfort themselves with humility and candour. The answer that has been vouchsafed by the University to the hon. the Minister is, I am sorry to say, wanting in those virtues which the candidates for degrees are asked to practise. Sir, if the people who provide the University with funds to pay this Professor are to be told that it is not competent for the tax-payer to enquire and if even the Minister representing the Government is to be told that it is not competent for him to put any question, then to say the least, such a conduct is highly undignified—I won’t use a stronger term. (Hear, hear.) Sir, those who pay have a right to ask for an account of the stewardship rendered, whether it be by the University or by any other body and it is the height of impropriety to have vouchsafed such an answer. We asked for bread in the shape of information and they have given us a stone in the shape of reports of the Syndicate to the Senate. It now transpires that even the Government have not been able to extort information from this superior body, viz., the University. To such an institution are we to pay Rs. 85,000 of the tax-payer’s money without having a right to exercise any control—not so much to exercise control as even to get information as to what is being done with the money?

“Sir, there are other things about which we have much to say regarding the University. I have referred to the fact that my hon. Friend to my left suffered by it. I am sorry to be personal in my observations. When he was Inspector-General of Education of Mysore he stood in competition with another gentleman unconnected with Education except probably by publishing books adjusted to the University curriculum. The University is so constituted that Mr. Reddi had no chance; but that some body else not very much connected with the University had the better chance. That shows that the foundation and the superstructure are not all that is desirable. It looks as if the whole thing should be demolished and a new structure built on the ruins of the old. The expenditure we are incurring on the various works of architecture may be utilized in the reconstruction of the University. It is with that object that I move the reduction of the allotment of Rs. 85,500 for grants to University by Rs. 12,000 which represents

22nd March 1922] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiayar]

the contribution to the University Professor for Indian History which is being paid no doubt by monthly instalments of Rs. 1,000 to the Professor whose work is kept hidden under a bushel.”

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—“I am in a peculiar position. I have to oppose the motion for reduction of allotment Rs. 85,500 for grants to the University by Rs. 12,000 moved by my hon. Friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiayar. I do so on this consideration. I do admit that the University requires reorganization and I think the hon. the Minister for Education has it in his own power to do so by bringing in a Bill in this Council for the reorganization of the University. But I do not for a moment concede the position taken up by the hon. Member Mr. Tanikachala Chettiayar. The University is, in my opinion, an autonomous body, and I think it should be once for all settled on the floor of the House that the University, even though it receives a grant from the Government, is not responsible to the Government. That position is well understood in western countries. We are borrowing from the west in the organization of democratic institutions, and I hope that we will bear in mind the fact that only under such a policy that the Universities thrive and that the members belonging to the University should be free to carry on research without being hindered by even the Legislative Council. The second point is that the hon. Member made a remark about the Professor of History. I am personally acquainted with the Professor of History.”

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—“May I clear a point, Sir? I have not raised the point as to the Professor of History or his work. I am concerned with the answer given by the University to the Government. That is a question of the account of the work of those who are conducting the affairs of the University.”

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—“I think it is very wrong of the Government to have asked for an explanation regarding the work of the University Professor. I am acquainted with his work. Though his work in the opinion of some may not be of a very high order (prolonged laughter), I think that during the period of eight years when he has held this post he has done far better work in research than has been done in the past. The University can certainly take credit to itself for the fact that at last it has given a chance to one of its sons for doing research work to show to the world that there is such a thing as South Indian History. The University has done well in giving him an opportunity of doing this work. I hope the House will bear in mind the principle I put forward, that it is very wrong to think that the Government can control the University, because it gives a certain amount of money. As I have said before, Sir, the University ought to be an autonomous body conducting its affairs without interference from outside.” (Hear, hear.)

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU:—“Sir, I have myself tabled a similar motion. I have nothing more to add to what Mr. Tanikachala Chettiayar said. Though my hon. Friend Dr. P. Subbarayan says it is wrong to interfere with the affairs of the University, I believe that so long as we pay money we have a right to interfere.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—“Mr. President, before proceeding to deal with the more serious points raised by the hon. Mover, Mr. Tanikachala Chettiayar, I should like to say a word in regard to the personal matters that he mentioned. He suggested that I suffered under the system. I was

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

[22nd March 1922]

wondering what my suffering consisted in. If in a certain election I was defeated by a certain candidate who in the opinion of my hon. Friend was not better than I, I candidly regard it as no personal suffering. In the second place, the system has nothing to do with the matter. The other candidate's qualifications were more responsible for my defeat. There are two or three points of very serious portend indeed that my hon. Friend raised on this occasion. The first one is that the University had sheltered itself under its rights and rules and refused to supply certain information asked for by the Government at the instance of this House. I do not wish to go into the merits of the question. It is after all a small matter but there is a question of principle involved, namely, whether we could find fault with anybody created by ourselves, and vested with definite powers under the statute, so long as that body is acting within such powers. It is no use creating a body with statutory powers and then expecting such an autonomous body to act under our orders. It has been suggested that there might have been greater courtesy shown. Well, courtesy is a reciprocal duty. There is no need to fret over it. If the language employed leads to misunderstandings, the proper remedy is not to attack the University in this House but settle it by mutual adjustments. My hon. Friend Mr. Etirajulu Nayudu tabled certain questions. In my opinion, they really raised a very fundamental issue. One of the questions asked is, who scrutinizes the work of the Professor of History. In a University the Professors are supposed to be, whether they are or are not is quite a different matter, they are supposed to be authorities in their own subjects. Who then is to scrutinize the work of the Professor? I simply do not know. If the Legislative Council wishes to undertake that task, I wish them joy. Personally I will have nothing to do with such an inquisition. It was also asked what books he published and whether owing to any special permission he appropriated the profits. Is the University to pry into the private affairs of its professors? I do think that the question was not happily put. If there have been misunderstandings between Government and University, I hope my hon. Friend the Education Minister will proceed with caution and display the same qualities which he expects the University to display. The University is an autonomous body as stated by Dr. Subbarayan. I am sorry I have not got the quotation here, but I distinctly remember Lord Bryce saying that Government should not interfere with the internal working of the University even if it receives a grant. Even when grants are given for some specific purposes, as far as possible they should be of the nature of grants to be expended by the University at its own discretion. The reason for it seems to be simple as well

4-30 p.m. as convincing. After all, the University, whether it is so or not in fact—I am not saying anything more—is the most intellectual body. It is composed of intellectuals, and the professors there are authorities on the subjects concerned, and by giving lump grants and leaving it to them to spend at their discretion, it would secure better results than by directing the expenditure itself by detailed rules and regulations. That is one side of the question which ought not to be lost sight of. And lastly, on this point of autonomy, when you once invest a body with statutory powers you must have confidence in that body—a good deal depends on confidence—so long as it keeps within its powers. If it goes beyond, you are bound to interfere with it. If it keeps within its powers, anything in the nature of an authoritative interference should be most carefully avoided. My hon. Friend referred to matters which are relatively of far more importance than these

22nd March 1922]

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

things, namely, the reconstruction of the University. The University is at one with the Government in thinking that its constitution should be renovated. Resolutions were passed by the Senate over a year ago on the subject. It now rests with the Government to take steps to reconstitute the University on a more modern and democratic basis. No one connected with the University will say that the present constitution is the best possible. We do want it to be renovated. The University, the Senate and the Syndicate have not stood in the way of the Government in this matter. The sooner the Government moves in the matter the better will it be, and nobody will be more pleased than the University itself."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—" I want to emphasize one or two points that have arisen in connexion with this debate. The constitutional aspect of the matter has been placed before this Council by the Member for the University, and I would like to invite the attention of this Council to the fact that some years ago the Government of India gave a recurring grant of Rs. 65,000 which was handed over to the University for very definite and specific purposes. And one of these purposes was the creation of a University professorship in Indian History and Archaeology on a salary of Rs. 500—50—1,000 per month. That, Sir, is the outstanding fact that I would like to place before the Council before it proceeds to vote upon this question. Before the Reforms scheme came into force this grant was not made by the Local Government; it was a grant made by the Government of India. The Local Government was merely the channel through which that grant passed. And the specific object that has aroused a certain amount of discussion in this Council is one which is included in the specific allotment of Rs. 65,000. I now ask this Council to accept the moral responsibility that is laid upon it by the Reforms scheme. That moral responsibility comes in wherever the Government of India formerly paid a grant for a specific purpose to a definitely constituted body—in this particular case it is a statutory body—whether it be a local body or whether it be a University; I ask this Council to assume the responsibility that rightly devolves upon it under the Reforms scheme and accept the moral obligation under which it has to continue the payment of Rs. 65,000, which includes the pay of the professor of Archaeology. That, Sir, is the financial aspect of the question.

" I should like the Council further to bear in mind, before it comes to a decision upon this matter, that as the Member for the University has told us, the reconstruction of the University is on the anvil, and I trust that before the next budget is taken up a definite decision will have been arrived at in the proposal to put the University on a different footing from what it is at present. The Government has a very large control over the University, almost complete control, but, as already pointed out, that control should be exercised in general and not in minute details upon which it is very doubtful whether this Council is a sufficiently experienced body to exercise that control."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" Before the hon. the Minister rises, may I ask one question, namely, whether the view given expression to as to moral responsibility without being entitled to ask how the money is being applied is a position which the Minister accepts the responsibility of?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PAIRO :—" It is true that the grant was first given by the Government of India. But since April 1921 it is a provincial grant and is charged on the provincial funds. Therefore this Government

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[22nd March 1922]

makes direct grants now to the University of the amounts specified in the resolution. The original object, when the Government grant of Rs. 65,000 was given by the Government of India, was this. But it is now allocated by the University changing altogether the specific objects and aims with which the Government of India gave this grant of Rs. 65,000. Therefore the responsibility of examining the present allocation falls upon this Government. This Government and this House which has voted this allotment have a right to question how the allotment has been expended and whether the instructions of the Government when making the grant have been carried out. (Hear, hear.) The original allocation was Rs. 6,000 for a librarian, additional libraries and staff, and cost of publication; Rs. 4,500 for special lectures; Rs. 12,000 for a professor of Indian History and Archæology; Rs. 6,000 for the development of the study of South Indian languages and other contingencies. Now it is modified and re-allotted like this: Librarian: as against Rs. 6,000, it is Rs. 1,765; additional library and cost of publication: as against Rs. 4,500, it is Rs. 3,500. The original sum of Rs. 12,000 which was intended for special lectures for the benefit of the post-graduate students of the University has been reduced to Rs. 3,788; professor of Indian History: from Rs. 6,000, it has been altered to Rs. 14,000; development and study of South Indian languages and other contingencies: from Rs. 6,500, it has now been altered to Rs. 7,848; professor of Economics: Rs. 30,000; and Tamil lexicon: Rs. 25,000. Thus the House will see that the whole allotment has been changed by the University as it pleased. Just as in the case of any other local body or corporation, constituted by the Legislature, it has a right to ask how the grants that have been given have been expended. It is true, as my hon. Friend Mr. Reddi said, it is an autonomous body. The word 'autonomous' has been defined subsequently. If the House will read the Saddler Commission's report it will see how far the Government is entitled to control the allocation of funds granted by it."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Does the hon. the Minister mean that the Government can sit in judgment over the University which is a corporate body?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"The Government, when it contributes funds, has the right to call for an explanation as to how those funds are utilised. I do not want to enter into the academical discussion of the question whether the University is an autonomous body and how far the Government has got control over it. My position is this: So far as the budget allotment is concerned, that allotment has been made by the Government with specific instructions. Government has got a right to ask whether the specific instructions have been carried out or not. We are not discussing an ideal state of things. We are discussing their practical aspect. The point is that we have to apply the rules and procedure as they exist, not as they ought to be."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Does the hon. the Minister mean in these specific instances that this Legislature can sit in judgment over the work of the professor of Indian History?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"I have said already the Government made the grant; the Government has got the right to call for information; and this Legislature which votes the money has also the right to call for explanation. Therefore speaking on the budget, I will only say that

22nd March 1922]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

the amount having been granted by the Government, and that amount having been modified, changed and altered afterwards by the University, the Government has a right to call for information. I do not say anything definitely as to what are the different powers of the University, and how it should be constituted. All this I am sure will come up when I prepare the University Bill for which I am gathering materials, and, as observed by the Director, we are at work collecting information from all sides. It will be discussed in this House when the Bill is ready. But we are concerned with the practical side of the question, and we are constrained as a business body, as a legislative body, as a responsible Government, to demand whether, if we make a grant of a certain amount to a body constituted by the Legislature, we have got the power to question how it is spent. There is no academical discussion of the powers of the University under the Act. Here are the rules, here are the specific purposes for which this money is to be devoted. The whole question is whether the objects have been carried out or not. If the purposes have not been defined, no doubt it is entirely within the discretion of the University to dispose of the grant as it likes.

"Now, as for the reduction, I am not at all in favour of the motion. I oppose the motion, and I hope that my hon. Friend will not press the motion further."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"I have listened to the speeches of the hon. the Minister and the Member for the University, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, who is driven to such straits that he has to pluck up courage and plead that he is inferior to the other candidate. This, however, is a small matter. In regard to the main question of the propriety of the answer which has been vouchsafed by the University, I join issue with him. He is unfortunately in the position of a lawyer, which is not his usual profession, of defending the University against the attacks made on it in virtue of his position as its representative here. No doubt it is an autonomous institution, and according to the rules of the West, whatever it does there should be no interference with it. But to ask for information as to what is being done with the money that has been received by the gentleman who received it, is certainly not interfering with it."

"If, for instance, the Minister or this House, or any other person sent a requisition to that gentleman asking him to deliver lectures on 'Kangaroos' in the 'Island of New Zealand' instead of lecturing on anything to be found in the Madras Presidency or in India, he would not be justified in doing so. But to ask what he has been doing for the last eight years, and to let us have some information is not interfering with the internal administration of the University. I am very glad that the hon. the Minister has not chosen to express his approval of the dictum which the hon. Mr. Littlehales has laid down, i.e., regarding the moral responsibility which lay upon this House or the successor of the former administration for continuing this grant which was instituted by the Government of India in the pre-Reform days. I suppose what he meant was that we are but the trustees for the application of this money, that the Government of India is the donor, and that the University is the beneficiary. I suppose he knows also that the trustee has a duty to find out whether the money entrusted to him for a particular purpose is being properly applied, and if not, whether he is not guilty of breach of trust, and therefore—"

[22nd March 1922]

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"But surely the reports of the Syndicate contain information on the work of the particular professor."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"May I point out, Sir, that to collect this information from these books is like tracing a needle in a haystack. This is not the kind of information that we want. The University is giving this information in the form of a report of its working year after year to its *alumni*. To come to my point, we would certainly be guilty of breach of trust if we did not inquire how this money has been applied, whether it has been properly applied, whether the person who is receiving this money is efficiently carrying on his work of investigation and original research year after year. Under these circumstances, I submit we are perfectly entitled to call for any information, and to withhold the grant allotted to the University, if it does not render a proper account of the money which it has received. It is only a question of giving information and of accounting for money received, whether the money has been properly applied, and if we ask for such information it is not interfering with the internal administration of the University or with any University regulation such as that every lecturer shall deliver so many lectures during the year, and so on. However, having regard to the assurance given by the hon. the Minister that he has before him the question of the reconstruction of the University, and as I hope that a more reasonable spirit will prevail in the University after this discussion, I beg, Sir, with your permission, to withdraw this motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 520 to 523.

The following motions were not made:—

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU:—

520. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 85,500 for grants to University by Rs. 12,000.

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—

521. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 85,500 for grants to University by Rs. 100.

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR:—

522. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 85,500 for grants to University by Rs. 12,000.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

523. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,98,876 for Government Arts Colleges by Rs. 1,000.

Motion 524.

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

524. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,46,800 by Rs. 20,000.

"My object in moving this motion is to enforce this principle, i.e., that Government professional institutions should be as much as possible run on economic lines and not prove a great burden on the Indian tax-payer. Now this grant refers to the College of Engineering, and I find, Sir, that this

[22nd March 1922] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

institution costs the Indian tax-payer something like Rs. 1,71,250. I had occasion to remark that the state of things revealed by the report was, to say the least, nothing short of a scandal. Now this institution has been run with nearly 2/3rds, nay 3/4ths, as the report itself admits, of the senior staff absent. That is what we read on page 11. There were three professors who were not working the whole year, i.e., the Principal, Mr. Barker, who resigned, the professor of Civil Engineering, the professor of Mechanical Engineering, and the post of professor of Technical Chemistry remained vacant, and the Director of Public Instruction in his remarks at the end of the report says that 'the results of the several examinations held during the year were very fair.' The Director notes with pleasure that 'the college has maintained a state of general efficiency during the year.'

"Sir, my contention is that if it was possible for the institution to maintain its efficiency even while 3/4ths of the senior staff were absent on leave, it should be possible, I think, to run that institution more cheaply, and to lighten the burden which falls on the Indian tax-payer. I think the House will do well to enforce this maxim, i.e., that at least 50 per cent of the charges should be met either from fees or from other sources of income; otherwise institutions of this nature would certainly be a burden on the tax-payer who does not derive any immediate benefit from them."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"These are professional colleges and special qualifications are necessary for a professor to be able to lecture to his pupils. As regards mechanical engineering and technical chemistry, for the last six months we have been asking for a suitable candidate. With regard to mechanical engineering there are certain names before us, and we are considering whether the qualifications of the two candidates that are now before us are sufficient for lecturing on mechanical engineering. The whole system, as I said at the beginning of my general remarks, must be altered before this House can charge the Member or the Minister. When we want a certain professor with a specific qualification, we intimate our requirements to the Secretary of State. The High Commissioner advertises for this purpose and from the list prepared in the office of the Secretary of State he sends down a candidate to Madras. The candidate he thus sends down to us we are obliged to take. We have complained with reference to the way in which the Secretary of State deals with us. It is the system that is responsible for this. So this system has to be altered before this House asks us to say why these places have been kept vacant. I do not specifically refer to the recent instances in the Engineering College or the Presidency College where we wanted a certain candidate with special qualifications, and when the candidate came down, instead of being specially fit for the required subject he was found fit for another subject. Even under such circumstances we find it very difficult not to take him at the time when he actually arrives and especially when an engagement has been entered into with him. Therefore it is not this Government that is to blame, but it is the system under which this Government is working. It is for this House to alter that system, and when that is done the result which the hon. Mover has in view can very easily be achieved."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR:—"I hope the hon. the Minister will do his very best to change the system, and if the system is changed certainly our objects can be achieved. I beg therefore to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

[22nd March 1922]

Motion 525.

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

525. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,47,238 by Rs. 3,000.*

"My object in making this motion is to have one piece of information either from the hon. the Minister for Education or from the Director of Public Instruction. Is it not possible to run the Teachers' College more economically by showing greater saving if some system could be devised for increasing the fees to be paid by students attending the practical section? For, I find that this institution costs nearly Rs. 59,148, and the charge under provincial revenue is Rs. 57,937. If the hon. the Minister or the Director of Public Instruction will give me an assurance that by raising the fees or by reducing the staff, if necessary, some saving will be made I shall be satisfied. I only raise this point on a question of principle. It is possible to raise the fees by about 40 or 50 per cent."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"As regards the increase of the fees of candidates, hon. Members already know that the candidates find it very difficult to pay even the fees now current. If you increase the fees they will ask for increased stipends, with the result that we shall have to pay more than what we are now paying. So that I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that if we reduce the grant in one way they will increase the charges in another way.

"As regards the reduction of the staff, recently Government received proposals from the head of the department for the appointment of one or two additional lecturers owing to the increasing strength of the institution. Therefore it is not possible at present to reduce the staff, nor, as I showed, is it possible to reduce the expenditure by raising the fees. However, as this question has been raised, I am sure to look into the matter in detail."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—"May I ask whether the fees of the students attending the practical section of the Teachers' College cannot be raised?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"If the fees are raised there will be, I fear, a fall in the strength of the college, because the students may go to other institutions where the fees are lower. However, I shall see if it is possible to raise the fees in areas where there are no similar institutions for the candidates to go to."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—"I beg to withdraw my motion, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 526.

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—"Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

526. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 14,400 for L.T. section for women.*

"Sir, I find that this is the first time the Government have come to us for a grant for this purpose. I have only one or two words to mention in this connexion. There is already a college existing where training is given for women

22nd March 1922] [Mr. P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu]

graduates. I find from the budget estimate that this amount of Rs. 14,400 is required for two lecturers costing Rs. 4,800 plus Rs. 1,200 as teaching allowance; stipends to the extent of Rs. 3,200; and the rest for contingencies, establishment, etc. Why so much as Rs. 4,000 is required for contingencies when the teaching staff alone is provided Rs. 4,800, I should like to know. Besides, in every mufassal station in every district there are schools for training teachers, and there are no separate schools for women. That being the case, what is the extra necessity for opening a training section for women in the Presidency town? I can only say that so far as I know there are very few students who will be found to join, when the department is opened. I do not mean to say that a teaching department is not necessary, but all that I say is that it is not necessary just at present when there are very few students who will make use of the opportunity. As far as I know there are only a few students from Travancore and Cochin. How far it will be useful to this Presidency if these pupils are trained, I leave it to the House to judge.

"There is another point. Our province is very backward so far as university education among women is concerned. That shows that there will not be many students willing to undergo the training. I therefore suggest that this may be deferred for some time to come and it would be better to persuade the existing training colleges to train these women for the present. With these few words, I move my motion."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, I am really sorry that this motion has been tabled. That Mr. Etirajulu Nayudu of all persons, who is very keen on the expansion of female education and who has been in his own district trying his best in the matter, should try to curtail the expenditure on female education seems to be a matter for surprise. Considering the difficulties that now exist in Madras for the training of women, a new section is intended to be attached to the Queen Mary's College temporarily. When the matter was inquired into by the Director, all the difficulties were set forth, and the Government sanctioned a temporary scheme. In order to expand female education we must have teachers trained for the purpose. The hon. Mover referred to the fact that the need in the mufassal is greater than the need here in Madras City, as there is a training college here to which girls can go, and as girls have already been going to that college. It is true that there is a training college here to which the girls can go, but they are only going there with great inconvenience. There are no lady lecturers there nor are there boarding facilities in the Saidapet College. Therefore if there is a residential college like the Queen Mary's College and a training section is opened in that college, it will be more useful and more conducive to the progress of female education. We want teachers and without them we cannot get on, and this House should also examine the question raised by the hon. Mover, that is, while concentrating our attention on the City of Madras, we must not neglect the question of the organization of education in the mufassal. My own impression, after visiting several places, has been that the training schools in the mufassal are not up to the mark and therefore it is desirable that we should place a well-trained superintendent to go round and give them new life and vigour. Without therefore necessarily saying that we would deprive the city of the benefits of a special training institution, I may assure my hon. Friend that we shall also pay attention to the mufassal and hope therefore that he will not press his motion."

[22nd March 1922]

The Rev. W. Meston :—"Sir, I trust that this motion will not be pressed. One of my reasons for this hope may seem to be an indirect one. It is because I have been for the past two years pressing on missionary bodies the advisability of starting a college for the higher training of women teachers, a step which there is good reason to believe will soon be taken. My reason for urging the establishment of such a college is identical with that which leads me to support the maintenance of the grant on behalf of the L.T. class connected with Queen Mary's College, namely, the great need which exists in this Presidency for the provision of adequate facilities for the training of women graduates as teachers. My other reason is that the present method is a very satisfactory means of meeting that need. Having been appointed under the Universities Act to conduct the local inquiry required for the affiliation by the University of L.T. class in Queen Mary's College, I was able to see the conditions under which the training is carried on, and the benefits which the students derive from their teaching and life in that college.

"Further it is to be noted that it is not only the city which benefits by this class. Though it exists in Madras the women who are trained in it will go out to various parts of the Presidency, so that the mufassal no less than the town will share in the educational advantages which this class will afford. And no one will deny that a large number of highly-trained women teachers is very much required. Indeed the need is so great that there is room for at least two such institutions. Ten years ago who would have thought that there would by this time be two degree colleges for women in Madras, each of them with over a hundred students? Let the facilities be given, and there is no doubt as to their being fully used.

"I may also draw the attention of the House to the fact that the University of Madras, among its resolutions based on a consideration of the Calcutta University Commission report, recommended that the facilities for the training of women teachers should be increased, and the same position has been reached by a committee more recently appointed as a result of one of the resolutions before this Council. Besides, Sir, this class in Queen Mary's College is one which deals with the training of graduates, with those who are receiving instruction for the highest form of teaching; other classes and schools attend to those whose training is of the primary or secondary grade. By means of this class the whole of women's education is benefited down to its most elementary forms, as indeed has always proved the case when the highest forms of education have been properly dealt with. It is for reasons such as those which I have stated that I sincerely trust that this motion will be withdrawn."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, Mr. President, I hope the hon. Minister will not accuse me of want of sympathy towards female education. But I might point out that, as he himself said, education must begin from the base and not from the top and that charity ought to begin at home. For, after all, we know in spite of there not being a special college for girls to train them for the L.T. degree they have been passing examinations all the time, which shows that they have had some facilities. But I think more facilities can be given by the Government in the way of scholarships and giving better encouragement to them than what they are now getting when they pass the examinations and apply for various situations in Government service. Sir, I may also say that when I spoke of

22nd March 1922] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

charity beginning at home so far as the need for the L.T. section is concerned, I was thinking of the fact that the section in the Queen Mary's College is providing vainly for our sisters in Malabar and Cochin. And I do not believe that there are any appreciable number of students coming from the Madras Presidency proper, which is under the administration of the British Government. So much so, that I put a question and I await information. Is it proposed to appoint as principal or professor a person who has had experience of this country and conditions of life here and who has had previous training, or is it only intended to fill it up by one of those persons of the Indian Educational Service system who have got out after recruitment made by the Secretary of State? The persons selected by the Secretary of State may be without any previous training, without any previous knowledge of the conditions of the country, and without any previous knowledge of the languages of the country and the various circumstances which go to make a good professor or principal. It is a consideration of all these things which would enable the House to say how they make up their minds in regard to this motion. I know, as I pointed out recently, several young women who have passed examinations but who have not unfortunately received that encouragement which we expect they should receive at the hands of the Government and their educational officers. For there is this distinction made between woman and woman, as there is a distinction made between one class of men and another class. Already there is a lot of discontent among men in this country as to the way in which they are treated. If to this you are going to add discontent, amongst educated girls, you will be adding to the miseries of the country. Therefore it is that while we allot money for education, we should so allot it and administer it that it may be a source of benefit and strength to the Government and not a source of dissatisfaction and discontent in the country."

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—"Sir, I was really very sorry that I was misunderstood by the hon. the Minister. I have every sympathy with the education of girls. I do not say that it is not at all necessary for all time to come to establish a training college and staff. But just now at the present moment when our funds are poor I have suggested that we should manage with the existing institutions. I may also say that this amount of Rs. 14,000 and odd may very usefully be spent in granting stipends and scholarships to students in Madras as well as mufassal. Anyhow, since I have heard the hon. the Minister say that he would look into this question carefully and scrutinize, I have no mind to press this motion further."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 527 and 528.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

527. To omit the allotment of Rs. 14,400 for L.T. section for women.

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

528. To omit the allotment of Rs. 14,400 for L.T. section for women.

[22nd March 1922]

Motion 529.

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

529. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 10,89,067 for Madras University by Rs. 100.*

“ Sir, my object in tabling this motion is to elicit information from the hon. the Minister for Education on a few points. One is whether the provision of about Rs. 16,000 includes the Government of India scholarships to students proceeding to England, I mean the one given by the University of Madras, and whether this item of money given hitherto by the Government of India has now been provincialized and is going to be paid by this Government. I hope, Sir, if such provision has not been made, that the hon. the Minister would see his way to make it by reappropriation or by some other means. I think it is very necessary that the Government should select capable young men who can be sent to Oxford or Cambridge or some other University where they can carry on research work for three or four years and can come back here to conduct research especially in the realm of science.

“ Secondly, I should like to know from the hon. the Minister for Education whether the Government would provide for a science block in the Queen Mary's College. These girls are now going for scientific instruction to the Presidency College. I know, Sir, that the Professor at the Presidency College has got a large number of men pupils to teach and so the girl pupils are given turns, especially as in science you have got experiments and demonstrations. And these lecturers have got to work overtime on Saturday also. There are two special assistants in the Presidency College in order to give these girls instruction in science. I think it would be better if the instruction is imparted at the Queen Mary's College itself. I understand that no provision for science block is made in the Queen Mary's College as there are no funds available. I hope, Sir, that the Council will be able to make the hon. the Minister see his way to provide a building for a science block in the Queen Mary's College.

“ Thirdly, I would like to touch one further point. Replying to the criticisms offered on education during the general budget discussion, the hon. the Minister said that his policy was national efficiency, and he quoted as an example of national efficiency the fact that once upon a time out of 42 appointments in the Indian Educational Service, 31 were held by Europeans and only 11 by Indians, and now there are 22 Indians and about 19 Europeans. He then turned round and asked the question whether this does not conduce to national efficiency. I for one answer, Sir, that it does not. I certainly think that Indianisation of the services is a very good thing and it is not because it will make for national efficiency but because we get men born in this country for a less sum than what we have to pay to the European. But as long as the European remains to serve in this country, I think it is the duty of the man who is in charge of the department to appreciate the work that the European members of the service are doing in this country (hear, hear). I for one admit, Sir, that the Europeans have done very well by this country. Of course, we are moving in different times and different times need different men, and it is because of that I want Indians in service. But that does not mean that the Indians in services make for national efficiency. It is merely because that we want our own

22nd March 1922]

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

country men, and merely because that we will be helping the sons of the country to pursue the profession of education that we think Indians should replace Europeans.

“ But it must be granted that as long as Europeans remain in service in this country, they ought to be made contented with their lot. The working of these reforms depends largely upon how we treat the services. I cannot concede, Sir, that replacement of Europeans by Indians is the setting up of a new system and the beginning of a new policy. What we want to work for, Sir, is to gradually organize education in such a manner that we shall have at least one primary school in each village and a secondary school at each taluk headquarters.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ I can only sympathize with the lack of information on the part of the hon. Member in not knowing how we have been able to found schools year after year in the villages. If he had taken the trouble to read the administration report of last year or the previous year, he would have found how rapidly elementary education has been progressing in this Presidency. And as to treatment of Europeans I yield to none in that respect and I fail to see any new theory in what my friend has enunciated in this House. No Indian politician or patriot will minimise the importance of the services that the Europeans have rendered to this country and I yield to none in my admiration and appreciation of those services. We want their sincere co-operation with us in carrying out the reforms successfully. I am sorry that Dr. Subbarayan, who has known me all these months, has not been able to appreciate this position; and I do not know whether I should put it to his discredit in not appreciating me or to my misfortune that he has not understood me. It is however unfortunate that he has raised this issue in the present case. I do not see any purpose, any principle, any object which is served in raising the question now.

“ As regards the founding of a science school in the Queen Mary's College, I shall be very glad if the Finance Member or the Finance Secretary is able to find funds for me not only for this but for many other objects which I proposed. I had to struggle hard to get money for the chemistry expansion in the Presidency College and there are various other proposals; but as a matter of understanding with the Government no funds should be asked for this year owing to financial stringency for new works. That Dr. Subbarayan, though he was part of the Government at the time, at any rate in his capacity as a Council Secretary, and though he was aware of the conditions, should have made this statement passes my comprehension.

“ Then, Sir, as regards scholarships for going to England, that also is a matter of finance. The Indian Government felt that it was quite convenient to put it on the Madras Government and the Madras Government is not better off than the Indian Government. If therefore there are funds we shall be able to attend to this also.

“ Many useful and many desirable schemes and better schemes than any that have been raised in this debate have had to be laid aside for want of funds. If Dr. Subbarayan or his friends are able to find me funds I shall be very glad to utilise them for the purpose. It is very unfortunate that Dr. Subbarayan has raised this racial question at present in this debate, knowing as he does the financial position and I see no justification for it unless there be some motive.”

3356

DEMAND XVI—EDUCATION (NON-EUROPEAN)

[22nd March 1922

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Sir, I did not raise any racial question. I merely said that it is not national efficiency to replace Europeans by Indians. I do not press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The Council adjourned at 5-25 p.m. to meet at 11 a.m. on Thursday the 23rd March 1922.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

3357

The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George at 11 a.m. on Thursday the 23rd March 1922, the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR Avargal, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

I

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

[Order made by the President of the Madras Legislative Council under Standing Order No. 15—

(1) Printed copies of the questions and answers to be put and given at a meeting of the Council shall be placed on the Council table an hour before the President takes his seat.

(2) The questions shall be put and answered in the following manner:—

The Secretary shall call the name of each interpellator in alphabetical order, specify the serial numbers of his questions, and make a sufficient pause to allow him or any other member a reasonable opportunity of rising in his place if he is desirous of asking a supplementary question. Supplementary questions must be put immediately after the principal questions to which they relate.]

Enhancement of certain fees.

1385 Q.—Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the opinion of the Judges of the High Court has been obtained by the Government with regard to the enhancement in the fees for entry as Advocate, Vakil or Attorney, as proposed in article 25 of Schedule I-A to the Bill to amend the Indian Stamp Act; and

(b) if so, what opinion the Judges of the High Court have expressed with regard to this matter?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The Government are not prepared to publish the opinion of the Judges of the High Court in the matter as they were consulted unofficially.

Stocking of tin plate.

1386 Q.—Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO: With reference to the statement in the last Administration Report of the Fisheries Department, that a large quantity of tin plate costing about Rs. 15,000 had been purchased owing to depletion of stock and that the quality and the packing condition of this tin plate were thoroughly unsatisfactory, will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(1) why, if the stock was depleted and the price was heavy, a smaller quantity was not obtained;

(2) whether it is a fact that the purchase of this consignment was arranged by Mr. Hornell when he was in England;

(3) if so, how he accounts for the inferior quality;

(4) whether he compared the prices charged by other manufacturers and obtained sanction of the Government before the purchase was made;

(5) in how many years this large consignment of tin plate will be used up by the cannery, taking the average consumption of the last five years;

(6) what was the largest quantity of tin plate purchased in a single consignment by Sir Frederick Nicholson when the cannery was under his control;

[23rd March 1922]

(7) whether it is a fact that he purchased only smaller quantities as it took only two or three months to get fresh consignments from Europe, and also because tin sheets became rusty in the moist climate of Malabar, and hence large stocks were difficult to keep; and

(8) whether the present Director and the Manager were ignorant of these facts?

A.—(1) The depletion of stock was not with the manufacturers as the hon. Member's question seems to imply but at the cannery. The quantities purchased during previous years varied between 95 and 175 boxes, but in the year 1920, 206 boxes, a somewhat larger quantity than usual, were purchased as—

(a) provision had to be made for a longer time ahead than usual owing to the uncertainties of delivery and shipment that prevailed at the time and

(b) a greatly increased output was hoped for in the ensuing season.

(2) No.

(3) & (4) These questions do not arise.

(5) The stock now on hand is 90 cases. It will last only about three months, fish being available.

(6) 175 cases.

(7) & (8) The hon. Member is referred to clause (1) above. Sir Frederick Nicholson was accustomed to purchase stock estimated to last for not more than one season and the same consideration guided the computation of the quantity indented for in 1920. Tin sheets do not become rusty in Malabar when stored with ordinary precautions.

II

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

DEMAND XVI—EDUCATION (NON-EUROPEAN)—cont.

The Council then resumed consideration of the budget for 1922-23.

Motion 530.

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

530. To omit the allotment of Rs. 25,000 for the employment of medical inspectors.

“ Sir, the introduction of medical inspection of our young people who attend schools is a step in the right direction, and, I am sure if the parents of these students only co-operate with the schools a great deal can be done to save the life of many a promising youth. The medical inspection of schools is as follows. The department has arranged that each student should have a sheet on which are printed different columns denoting different ailments. There is also a column for the previous history of the student. The student is examined, if I am not mistaken, three times during his school course, once when he enters the school, then when he enters into the fourth form, and lastly when he leaves the school, and if it is necessary he is examined oftener. When he is to leave one school and go to another he carries this chart along with him.

23rd March 1922]

[Mr. A. T. Palmer]

“ As regards the person who medically inspects the student—I am speaking of private schools—every management can choose its own medical officer who is approved by the department, and the charges due to this medical inspection are included under contingencies and the Government pays a grant on it. That is the method of procedure in vogue at present in regard to medical inspection of students. I have absolutely nothing to say against that method. I do not want it to be misunderstood that I am against medical inspection. But I am against this item that is placed here, which is, as I learn, intended for employing three medical men to inspect the Government schools, and it seems for that purpose they are going to divide the Presidency into three circles and the functions of these men are to medically inspect the Government institutions, also to collect statistics, and thirdly, if there is time, to medically inspect the other schools also. That is what I learnt yesterday from the Director of Public Instruction.”

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—“ I should like, Sir, that he gave my own version of the matter.”

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—“ Sir, I say that the employment of these medical inspectors is not necessary. For in every place where there is a Government institution, I am sure there is some medical officer or other, and it he is paid an extra allowance for inspecting the school in that place it would be much cheaper and then it would save travelling allowance which is, as I see, not included here, but which I am sure will be budgeted for in the near future.

“ Secondly, Sir, as regards the collecting of statistics, an extra clerk may be employed in the Director's office who can easily do the work.

“ As for the third function of inspecting medically schools that are already being inspected by other medical men, I think it is unnecessary, and therefore, Sir, I strongly object to this item of employing medical inspectors entirely on the basis of retrenchment.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Sir, there is no question as to the need for medical inspection of schools. The hon. Mover has stated how the medical inspection of aided schools is now conducted and what it is to be with reference to the Government schools. This provision was made last year under the grant of Rs. 75,000. Last year we tried to secure qualified persons who would undertake this responsibility. We have the whole Presidency divided into sections and have to place qualified people in charge of those sections, but the salary that was offered to them was not adequate and no medical officer was coming forward to undertake this work. The arrangement could not be carried out. It has now been proposed by the Surgeon-General that a salary of Rs. 300 may be given and a medically qualified person may be selected so that he may be in a position not only to undertake the medical inspection of Government schools, but also to assist the work of the aided institutions. The aided institutions were given liberty to employ their own medical inspectors and the Government gives a grant towards the expenditure incurred by those institutions. In order to supplement their work the medical inspectors appointed by the Government are also required to see how far the work is conducted in those schools. The threefold duties referred to by the hon. Mover would involve the employment of a full-timed man, a man who is little above the grade of an Assistant Surgeon. We know the present pay of the Assistant Surgeon and when they did their work in their own

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[23rd March 1922]

limited areas they did not want to go about the whole Presidency, or at least a third portion of the Presidency. To ask proper persons to do this work, this salary is now proposed by the Surgeon-General, and at a meeting where consultation was held among the Surgeon-General, the head of the Education Department and the Minister, it was considered necessary to give a proper salary to qualified persons in order that this work may be carried on both in Government institutions and also to supplement the work that is going on in aided institutions.

"The hon. the Mover has suggested that in order to carry on this work it is better to give some additional remuneration to the local medical officer and to have the work done. Hon. Members are aware that it is not in every place where there is a Government school there is a qualified medical officer. There are sub-assistant surgeons in charge of hospitals and dispensaries and the assistant surgeons are at the headquarters hospitals attached thereto. In such cases, it is not possible for them, in addition to their professional duties attached to the hospital or dispensary, to be able to spare time to go about in the rural parts. The schools are not concentrated at one place. If you take one district, you will see that the schools are spread over a large area and in some districts it may not be possible to ask the local medical officer to undertake this responsibility. There is that difficulty. In some other places, as the hon. Mover suggested, it may be possible perhaps at the headquarters that this work can be done. The difficulty the Surgeon-General points out is that these people do not have the special training nor will they have the time to devote for this special work of examining individual students in each class, marking their condition in the chart and then making their report as to whether there is any improvement in the physical health of the students.

"These are the difficulties that were laid before us by the Surgeon-General and we thought that we should give a trial to this experiment and see how that would work. That is why provision has been made for the next year. We believe it would not be possible to have the local medical officer to attend to this work as it would occupy most of their time. The remuneration that we ought to give them must also be sufficiently attractive to induce the people to undertake this responsibility. It is on these grounds that the allotment has been made."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"Mr. President, I rise to oppose the motion made by my hon. Friend, Mr. Palmer. It is absolutely necessary that we must have some sort of supervision over the medical inspection of schools. As the hon. Minister said, it is not possible to get always men who are qualified to undertake this work of medical examination of schools. I know, Sir, as a matter of fact, big institutions, wherein we have more than a thousand students, are entrusted to the care of one medical man who is not a full-timed man and who is allowed private practice also and who can therefore devote but an hour or two in a day and who can at this rate examine no more than six or seven students if he is to examine according to the rules laid down in the forms supplied to him. Sir, every health officer is a medical man, but every medical man cannot be a qualified health officer. Even so, every medical inspector is a medical man, but every medical man cannot be a medical inspector because medical inspection work requires a special training. I was about to suggest to the hon. Minister that these inspectors must undergo a special training because medical inspection is a branch which is not very well understood in this country. An ordinary medical man, even a medical

23rd March 1922]

[Mr. U. Rama Rao]

graduate, has to know himself, learn all about medical inspection before he undertakes the work. Medical inspection does not merely consist in an examination of the pupils' health but also of the surroundings of the school, its ventilation, water-supply, drainage and questions like that. Sir, I myself have tabled a motion here to reduce the provision for medical inspection by one rupee. It is just to get some information as to the number of schools under medical inspection and the qualifications of medical inspectors. And as to the way of supervision over these medical inspectors, unless we call for returns once in three months there is no use in entrusting the work to the medical inspectors. To my own knowledge, there are institutions in the City of Madras which ought not to exist because they have no proper means of ventilation, no proper amount of light, no good surroundings and because they are in a very insanitary locality. Some years ago, Lieut.-Col. Pope is reported to have said to a young man who went to him for a remedy for short-sight thus—

"My dear young man, what is the use of your passing the B.A. when your eyes become b-a-d due to reading in bad and ill-lighted schools and what is the use of your passing M.A. when you may become m-a-d due to want of proper care of health."

"This is perfectly true of our young men who are reading in some of the Madras institutions which are very ill-fitted to use as schools and colleges. Some of the big institutions in this city have no proper means of light and ventilation. Boys suffer from varieties of contagious diseases which could be prevented by proper medical examination of schools. For instance, diseases like short-sight, adenoids and a number of others can be checked if there is a medical inspector who goes and points out the disease to the parents of the pupil, to the headmaster or the guardian. In many cases the medical inspectors themselves are ignorant of the necessity for good ventilation and other things, and unless and until there is good supervision over the inspectors, it is of no use. I see in the budget about Rs. 2,200 is provided for boys and Rs. 2,000 for girls and again a provision of Rs. 20,000 for secondary schools under local bodies and lastly a lump provision of Rs. 25,000, thus a total amount of Rs. 50,000 nearly has been provided. I do not know whether it is proper for the department to spend all this amount towards the employment of medical inspectors. I do not know whether it is intended for the pay of the medical examiners or the supervisors. If it is intended for the supervisors, I have no grievance, but if it is for medical inspectors I do not see any reason why we cannot compel the private institutions to pay towards the charge of medical inspectors. If the provision is intended to cover the cost of medical supervisors, the sum would not be enough because the Presidency, as the hon. Minister has said, will have to be divided into three divisions and a pay of Rs. 300 provided will be hardly sufficient to attract a man who is an authority on the subject and with these few words I strongly oppose the motion."

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, Mr. President, when I saw this motion tabled, it passed my comprehension how an educationist and a medical man thought fit to give notice of it. For, they ought to have known the advantages of medical inspection better than others. I am quite satisfied now that they realize the necessity for medical inspection. They only object to the mode of working. My hon. Friend, Dr. U. Rama Rao, mentioned

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar] [23rd March 1922]

that medical men are not well equipped and that they ought to undergo a training. I do not know what kind of training the sub-assistant surgeons have, but we, Sir, graduates of the Medical College are thoroughly equipped to do this work. We do not want any extra training. Sir, the advantages of medical inspection both to the public and to the pupils that resort to the various schools are manifold and various. The schools are one of the sources of disseminating communicable diseases such as itch, ophthalmia, pharyngitis, enteric fevers not to speak of tuberculosis and various other diseases. A boy goes to the school with itch and communicates it to other children who in their turn carry it to the various localities. The medical inspector is able to ask the authorities of the school to keep the boy away from others and if the infection is severe ask them to keep away the child from attending the school. Similarly granular eyelids and ophthalmia are spread and they can be prevented by the medical inspector. Some children happen to suffer from eruptive diseases and before the period of communicability expires, they go to school, infect other children and thus spread the diseases. The medical inspector prevents such children from going to school. In some cases children having suffered from typhoid fever go to school while they are still typhoid carriers and carry infection which the medical inspector on the spot is able to prevent. These are some of the many ways in which the medical inspector prevents spread of diseases. Coming to the children themselves, mostly in lower classes, children are affected with throat diseases, granular eyelids, pharyngitis and adenoids. Every medical man knows what the effect of adenoids is both on the various organs of the body and on the general growth of the child. The medical inspector will be able to restore the child to its health. As to granular eyelids, the tendency among our children is to allow it to develop till the child becomes purblind. The medical inspector here again nips the disease in the bud and saves the future misery of the child. Again, Sir, pupils of the higher classes, the fourth or fifth and sixth forms, are subject to other diseases. When they grow from boyhood to manhood, the organs of the body are not able to supply the demands made upon them by the changed functions of the body and they suffer from various diseases. Let us take the organ, the heart, for instance. When the boy grows into manhood, the heart begins to work itself up to supply the increased surface of the body and it will exhaust itself in trying to cope with the situation."

Mr. O. W. E. COTTON :—"Is the hon. Member in order, Sir, in giving us all these details on a consideration of the motion before the House?"

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU (*from the chair*) :—"I was just about to say that. It is not open to the hon. Member to go too much into the details on the motion under discussion."

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"I only dwelt upon the necessity for medical inspection, for a medical inspector specially appointed will be able to do this. I therefore support the grant asked for medical inspection for Government colleges and schools. He need not supervise the various private institutions. I oppose the motion for reduction."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—"Sir, I do not wish to detain the Council at any length, but I have been asked by the hon. Member from this city for certain information. I refer him to the last Public Instruction report, for 1920-21, page 16 where under the heading 'Medical Inspection', the first

23rd March 1922]

[Mr. R. Littlehailes]

sentence runs thus: 'As a result of the introduction of medical inspection in schools, 143 schools appointed medical inspectors during the year and 11,986 pupils were examined.' With regard to the medical examination of these pupils, I might inform the Council that I have at the present moment in my office an enormous bundle of reports of medical inspection of schools. I discussed these reports in the most general manner possible with the Surgeon-General and gave him three typical reports for investigation and perusal. He went into these very carefully and he entirely agreed as to the absolute necessity of having some correlating officer. As a matter of fact, our original intention was to have three correlating officers, but the funds at our disposal were insufficient and in this matter we must accept the advice of the Surgeon-General. It is a technical matter relating to education and he maintains that a specialistic training is required with special emphasis laid upon those particular ailments to which children are most subject, like throat diseases, diseases of the eye and of the nose. As a result of the conference which the hon. the Minister referred to, at which two Ministers were present besides the Surgeon-General and myself, it was decided that we should have one medical officer appointed immediately to get the work correlated, and to enable us to bring out—I hope very very shortly—a report which I previously promised to the Council on the medical inspection of schools in this Presidency. I have in my hand the annual report of the Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education in England for 1920. That, Sir, is a volume of over 200 pages; it contains an immense amount of information, and most useful information, for educational and medical officers not only in Great Britain but also in this country. The work that this medical officer whom we propose to appoint has to do is, as was stated, to correlate the results which we already have, to bring out a volume of this kind which will be laid before this Council, to circulate information to the various institutions and to help them in knowing what the medical state of the children in their own district is. In addition, he will have to inspect the Government schools in his area and he may be called upon by the managers of aided schools to supplement the work which is generally done in aided schools.

"The second point that was asked related to the qualifications of the inspectors. I may state that whenever an appointment is proposed to be made, I ask the advice of the Surgeon-General as to whether that appointment is satisfactory. On his advice the appointment is made. It is a technical matter and the department of Public Instruction acts upon the technical advice of the Surgeon-General. With regard to the supervision to be exercised over the inspectors, I am in entire agreement with the remarks of the hon. Member for Madras (Mr. U. Rama Rao)."

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI :—"Sir, I have heard both the hon. the Mover and the Director of Public Instruction at some length. I have absolutely no difference of opinion with regard to the necessity and importance of a system of medical inspection in schools. But, so far as what I have gathered from the remarks of the Director of Public Instruction, I fear we may want many times this Rs. 25,000 in case we want to carry on the system of medical inspection to its logical consequences. The hon. the Minister for Education has enlightened us that the institutions that are to be subjected to this medical inspection are Government schools which are strewn over the whole country, here, there and everywhere and which are ever increasing all over the land.

[Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai]

[23rd March 1922]

So far as the secondary schools are concerned, I may state perhaps without any fear of contradiction that in every place where there is a secondary school, there is a local board dispensary or a Government or municipal hospital. Now, what I fear is that we may not be able to have a separate agency to do any appreciable work with this small allotment of Rs. 25,000 considering the magnitude of the work and that is why I would say that we could as well omit this provision this year, especially with such a huge deficit staring us in our face. Meanwhile, there are some means by which we can carry on this kind of inspection work. Now, once more I may say that even in a dispensary there is a qualified man attached to it and he can be asked to go about the schools in the area once in two or three months, make an inspection—a cursory inspection of course—and he may report the results of such inspection to the local authority or to the manager of that particular school. He can even inspect the local board institutions also and when there are one or two exceptional cases which are very complicated and which require deeper investigation, it is perfectly open to that sub-assistant surgeon to report the matter to the manager of the school or to the Government so that that particular child may be sent to the district headquarter where there is a medical man of superior qualifications to examine the case, diagnose and do the needful. There is another thing also. We may not be able to do all that is required to be done with regard to the health of the children by mere medical inspection. Even after the medical inspection there are so many other things to be done. My friend, Mr. Rama Rao, was telling us that there was also the question of sanitation, ventilation and all these things. What is this medical inspection going to do in the way of meeting all these requirements? Supposing there is a medical inspector who goes to a school and finds that that school is ill-ventilated and is in an insanitary condition. Who is to improve all that? Where is the money to come from to set right all these defects? How are we to find funds for building really sanitary schools? All these things do arise. When we have absolutely no means of meeting or attending to the advice of medical inspectors, what is the good of this provision of Rs. 25,000 which is no small slice of the money that we have at our disposal. Assuming that a system of medical inspection is absolutely necessary in order to bring our educational institutions into line with those existing in other civilized countries, my only fear is that this Rs. 25,000 will certainly not be sufficient. I quite agree with the hon. the Mover, Mr. Palmer, that it is absolutely necessary, but nothing is going to be achieved by this Rs. 25,000. That is the reason why I support the mover."

Mr. A. T. PALMER:—"I withdraw my motion, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 531.

The following motion was not made:—

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO:—

531. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 25,000 for the employment of medical inspectors by Rs. 1.

23rd March 1922]

Motion 532.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion:—

532. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 73,88,136 for primary education by Rs. 100.

"Sir, in this connexion I want to draw the attention of the House to grants to local bodies and to educational councils. As regards the grants to local bodies, the Government have promised to give them Rs. 2 per teacher provided the local boards find a similar sum from their resources. There is a further limitation on this, viz., that it should be from their general resources. That is how I understand the position to be. Now it is a well-known fact that local bodies have hardly the wherewithal to meet their normal expenditure and to expect them to find any amount out of their general resources to give as additional pay to teachers is, I think, asking them to do an impossible task. This reminds me of certain philanthropic gentlemen in big places who subscribe perhaps Rs. 10,000 on paper and say that that amount will be given to them if they can find another hundred people who will pay a similar sum. They are pretty certain that that sum will not be forthcoming and that the promised amount is quite safe in their own keeping. I do not say that the Government are actuated by similar motives, but the net result of their condition is more or less the same in this particular instance. I think it is not fair that these local bodies should be asked to find the money out of their general resources. Strictly speaking I think Government should make this grant unconditionally.

"The next point to which I wish to invite the attention of the hon. the Minister is as regards the district educational councils. I fear these educational councils have not been doing all that they were expected to do when they were first sanctioned. Really it is time for us to consider whether the district boards may not be asked to take over this work. Now, the majority of the members in these councils consist of district board and taluk board members. There are a few members elected by the municipalities and there are also one or two educational officers on it. Surely it should be possible for us to devise a system by which such representatives from the municipalities or from educational agencies may find a place on the district board, and I think a body consisting of all these may well be entrusted with the work of looking after the education of its particular district. As it is, we are spending a lot of money in the form of establishment, at the rate of two clerks and two peons for each council, rent for the building, and travelling allowance of members of the council, and after all most of the work done by the councils is simply to record the Government orders received, or file certain copies of proceedings they may get. Surely I think for work of that sort, a sum of a lakh of rupees, or it may be even more at the end of the year, seems to be unnecessary."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, hon. Members will remember that the teaching grant is given not as an absolute grant, but because it was found that the local bodies were not able to pay adequately to their teachers. When the finances of the Government of Madras were in a flourishing condition, a grant of Rs. 4 was given purely as a matter of famine condition for one year and one year only. During that period the local boards have had funds contributed from provincial revenues to pay their teachers at the rate

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[23rd March 1922]

of Rs. 4 each. If the local boards desired to continue that payment, they would have to find money from out of their own resources to supplement the salaries of the teachers. However that may be, representations were received from the Elementary Teachers' Association all over the country that this grant should be repeated and that their conditions were such that unless increased salary was given, they would not be able to continue as such. In view of the demand from several sources, Government thought that out of the Rs. 4 grant, it would be reasonable that half of it should be borne from provincial funds. Hon. Members will remember that this grant of Rs. 2 is a recurring grant and therefore every year, as far as funds would permit, Government are prepared to pay the Rs. 2 grant to the local bodies, the other Rs. 2 being met by themselves."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" I would like to be informed, Sir, whether the Rs. 2 grant is an annual recurring grant, or whether it is bound down by restrictions and limitations."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" It is, as I said, an annual recurring grant subject to the vote of the Legislative Council. Every year the grant will come up before the Legislative Council and the Legislative Council has to sanction it. Otherwise it is a recurring grant given to the local bodies. The other Rs. 2 has to be found from the resources of the local bodies. The local bodies have to levy an education cess for the purpose of the expansion of elementary education and for the introduction of compulsion also. Some local bodies may after levying this education cess satisfy themselves that they have done all that they could for the teachers and may not provide anything in addition to the cess for this education grant. There are various sources now open to the local bodies for increasing their resources. They can increase the local rates. The new Municipalities Act and the Local Boards Act give ample powers to local bodies so that they may tap all their resources and increase the rates as much as possible. Now, consider the position of the provincial finance. If you want that the Rs. 4 grant or the Rs. 2 grant should be absolutely given, then it might be that the local bodies would not exploit all their resources, nor would they economise in the way that they ought to in order to find the Rs. 2 for their teachers. It was with a view to encourage economy in the administration of local boards and with a view to make them self-reliant as far as possible by increasing their own rates without having to depend entirely on provincial revenues that the Government decided to give the Rs. 2 grant to those local bodies who were able to allot an equal amount from their own resources, whereas to make them entirely dependent on provincial revenues seems to me to be crippling the independence of the local bodies. The Rs. 2 grant was given with a view to give them more liberty and freedom in their own local administration and in order to help them to rely on their own resources, I know that representations have been received recently that certain local bodies are not able to find this Rs. 2 from any of their resources. But that is a matter entirely for my hon. Colleague the Finance Member to see whether he will be able to release those local bodies from such a condition or not. If such representations, as I said, come in, it will be a matter for consideration, after examining the financial condition of that particular local body, whether that particular local body has managed its affairs prudently and economically and whether it requires any special aid or not. But as far as the general proposition is concerned, it seems to me to

23rd March 1922]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

be a very sound one that the Rs. 2 grant should be given from provincial revenues when the local bodies are able to raise the other Rs. 2 themselves in order to give the teachers an increment on their salaries.

"The second point raised by my hon. Friend, Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, is that these district educational councils are not doing any work at present. I am sure that those who have been managing the district educational councils do not agree with him at all in the matter. The presidents of the Nellore district board and the Cuddapah district board do not agree at all with the hon. Member Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. I am sure that those who have been really taking interest as Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju who has helped us in the matter of framing rules really believe that there is very much work for the district educational councils to do. Specially looking at the powers given to these councils in the matter of preparing their own curriculum of studies in consultation with the local inspecting officer, and considering the liberty that is given to them in the matter of school buildings—for either they can have pakka buildings or have places where there is the necessary air and ventilation—and seeing also that in the matter of the selection of text-books great freedom is given to these councils you can understand the nature of the work these councils will have to do. Gradually you will find that there are a large number of representatives from the local boards and the municipalities in these educational councils who will be assisted by the local educational officer whose help will be useful in the matter of organization, expansion of elementary education, selection of text-books and arranging curricula that will suit local conditions. Therefore, we find that there is plenty of work to be done by these district educational councils. It is only recently, as you know, that these rules have come into force and some councils may find it difficult because we have only recently published the rules. From the rules now published it will be seen that there is very large scope for useful and active work for the district educational councils in the matter of the expansion of elementary education, especially when the new schools have to be founded by them and when the responsibility is cast on them they will find that greater work has to be done by them. When we are withdrawing the supervisors from elementary education and placing sub-inspectors to be assisting these district educational councils you find that the responsibility falls upon the members of the district educational councils to find new schools and also recognize schools wherever there is a demand from private agencies. This is not an easy task and this is a very responsible task. Therefore if this item of expansion of work is to be carried on by the district educational council I will consider that it is doing a very great service to the country and it will be a service that will be considered as one of the items of national service to be rendered by the district educational council."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" Sir, the hon. the Minister for Education has given us some idea of the working of the district educational councils. Many of the members, I am sure, will not agree with him and those that have got some experience of them know how paltry is the return that we get for the money that we are spending. Having tasted something of the diarchy in the Provincial Government, I am sorry that the Minister for Education should have chosen to introduce this precious experiment in all

[Mr. Biswanath Das]

[23rd March 1922]

directions of our activities. For instance the local boards are left to manage some of the board schools and then the district educational council is there to look after some other schools."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES:—"May I just correct a misapprehension and state that the district educational councils manage no schools?"

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"I know that the district educational council does not manage any school; but it has a very important function to perform in connexion with the distribution of grants. I am sure that if either of these activities were handed over to the local bodies or the management of all the schools is transferred from the local bodies to a sort of educational board as in England it will be an excellent thing. I am sure that this double control will, after a very short time, bring us a crop of trouble and differences and end in a tug of war between the local bodies and the district educational councils. After all the work turned out by these district educational councils is nothing. The most important work that they have to do is the distribution of grants which I am sure was very well done by the inspecting officers. Had the inspecting officers sought the help of some of the members of the local boards or had called the local bodies to elect some representatives to help in their work I am sure the Government would have done far better work with little expenditure than what has been done now. Secondly as for the collection of statistics, that is one of the works of the district educational councils. I am sure the inspectorate would have done it better and I know—as I had some correspondence with the district educational council, Ganjam—and I can assure the Director of Public Instruction and the hon. the Minister for Education that even in these returns of statistics they will find great difficulty and utmost delay. These returns will thus be much more delayed than before. As for the curriculum I think they could have done well if they had sought the opinion of some of the educationists of this country or co-operation of some of the educationists in each district with the co-operation of the local bodies. So from these it is clear that the formation of another body like the district educational council is not very useful. As for the two rupees grant referred to by the hon. the Minister for Education I wish to say that these local bodies have started schools on the perfect understanding that the Government will give them subsidies from time to time. These schools when they were first started had teachers who were paid Rs. 8. Subsequently the pay was enhanced to Rs. 12. Government paid the increase in order to have the teachers brought to this standard. I believe when the present Education Member spoke on a similar resolution before the House he presented a grave situation that might arise unless these teachers were paid Rs. 4. Having thus realized the difficulty and danger I am sure he ought to have chosen a better course and should have at least given freely to the local bodies the grant of two rupees without restrictions. Then the hon. the Minister spoke of the increased resources of these local bodies. I think he has not realized the difficulties of these local bodies who were kept half-starved and who were left to drag on a miserable existence. If in this plight he would call upon them to contribute two rupees quota out of their funds, I am sure they will have to close some of their activities to meet the Education Member half way. Sir, he has spoken of and laid much stress on the increased resources. I am sure the increased resources he refers to is the three pies cess which the new Local

23rd March 1922]

[Mr. Biswanath Das]

Boards Act authorized them and also the education cess. I may at the outset inform him that the people have to pay so many cesses. All these cesses now come to one anna nine pies in the rupee. There has therefore been a tendency among the members of the local boards to oppose these cesses and they cannot therefore expect very great income from this source. Then the second source that we have is the company tax and the profession tax. The profession tax and the company tax are not expected to be very good sources of income in view of the undeveloped state of our country. The increased salary of the sub-assistant surgeons, the sanitary officers, schoolmasters, the vaccination officers and the various other expenses they have to meet are nothing in comparison with the new sources of income that the Government were pleased to show them. Under these circumstances it is very unfair for the Government to ask the local bodies to pay out of their resources two rupees to have the benefit of the two rupees grant. So, I believe the hon. the Minister for Education will remove all the restrictions and distribute the grant with a free hand without any restrictions."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Sir, my friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar who moved this resolution stated that this promise of two rupees by the Government to the local bodies was analogous to the promise of a person who makes a promise of contributing 10,000 rupees for a charitable purpose on condition that the persons concerned will also contribute an equal amount, knowing very well that the persons concerned cannot and will not contribute a like amount. I may be permitted to tell my friend that it was not in this spirit that the Government have promised this two rupees contribution. This question was carefully considered by the Finance Committee and at first it was difficult to provide for this two rupees contribution. But the Finance Member and the Finance Committee found that the local boards were also in difficulties. A great deal has been said to-day about the financial difficulties of the local boards, and it was with a knowledge of these difficulties that the Finance Committee and the Finance Member at length consented to give this two rupees contribution on the distinct understanding that the local bodies concerned must also contribute a like amount. Sir, it is not possible to make any larger contribution and it was not for want of sympathy with the local bodies that this amount was not raised to a higher figure."

The Rev. W. MESTON:—"I should like to express my satisfaction with the attitude taken by the hon. the Minister in regard to the questions that have been raised by the mover of this motion.

12 noon.

As regards the matter of grants to local bodies, I venture to say that in going through the various discussions in this Council and in other places I find there is sometimes a tendency to confusion between education which is managed by local bodies and education which is managed by private agencies. In other words, I feel that there is a desire on the part of some that local bodies should have not only the benefit of the powers conferred upon them under statute in regard to education but should also have the benefit of the grant-in-aid system. The hon. the Minister has made it perfectly clear that these two things do not mix. They must be kept perfectly separate. The local bodies have their own means of raising funds for education; in their desire to advance it in their own areas they tax themselves, and in proportion as they sacrifice their own resources they receive the subsidy of Government. Private agencies have no powers to raise money by taxation,

3370

DEMAND XVI—EDUCATION (NON-EUROPEAN)

[Mr. W. Meston]

[23rd March 1922]

they give out of their own resources, and in proportion as they give they receive the aid of Government. I trust that this distinction will be kept perfectly clear by members of this Council.

"Secondly as regards district educational councils, we have seen them working for less than twelve months. But my membership of one of them has made me feel that these councils confer real benefit on education generally. And consultation with others some of whom are chairmen of these councils and who are also members of this House has confirmed me in that position. Thus by means of a council where all interests are represented and where nothing but education is considered, the advantages to education are great and I trust that they will be found to be so great that as time goes on further responsibilities will be bestowed upon these bodies, and then we shall see how they will become most important factors in the development of national education."

MR. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI:—"Sir, I am quite in agreement with the view that the aid which the Government has given towards the emoluments of teachers is not enough. At the same time I must take this opportunity of thanking the Minister for Education and the Director of Public Instruction for the earnestness which all the year round they have been evincing in the cause of elementary school teachers and elementary education in general. I must also thank the Finance Member for the sympathy with which he seems to have met the demands of the Education Minister and the Director of Public Instruction. No doubt, there are many local bodies who have decided to levy the education tax. Government, no doubt, is doing its best in giving its aid towards elementary education. Now we have not only the promised contribution of money which is equivalent to the tax that we raise over and above the usual contribution that we used to receive towards the net cost of maintaining these elementary schools but in addition to that we have these Rs. 2 out of Rs. 4, for which I do feel thankful to the Government as one connected with the spread of education in rural parts. I have one request in this connexion. Now I put this question before the Government as also the Education Minister for consideration. We of the Penukonda Taluk Board were giving till August of last year in spite of Government Orders to the contrary at the rate of Rs. 4 to all our elementary school teachers and my district board president said that since the Government withheld this grant he ought not to risk and that he should see that he kept himself within the financial limit. That is, till the end of August last year, the taluk board has been paying all these teachers in spite of Government Orders at the rate of Rs. 4 each and when it was stopped the cry grew more intense among the local board teachers for increase of their pay and we were considering how to meet this very reasonable demand. Recently in consultation with the educational officers of my district, we had to revise the pay of these teachers. In doing so, we dropped the allowance system and gave a substantial increase to their pay. We raised the minimum pay of untrained teachers from Rs. 10 to Rs. 12 in place of Rs. 10 + 4 allowance. The trained teacher who used to get the minimum of Rs. 12 + 4 is now paid Rs. 15 as pay without allowance, the increase extending to those receiving higher scales also. What I would ask the Education Minister and the Director of Public Instruction is that we may not be denied the benefit of the moiety allowance on the technical ground that we have ceased to pay allowance as such. The local boards also may be relieved from the condition that they ought to meet the expenditure

23rd March 1922]

[Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai]

under allowance from general revenues without encroaching on the power of education tax.

"With regard to the usefulness of the educational council, I am sorry I have to differ from my friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar."

RAO BAHADUR A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, two questions have been raised in the discussion of this motion; one relating to the grant of allowance of Rs. 2 by the Government and the other, to the utility of district educational councils. So far as the first question is concerned, if the Finance Member and the Minister for Education had said that on account of the present financial stringency it was not possible to grant an allowance of more than Rs. 2 for a teacher and sanctioned the grant without any further conditions, there would have been no such room for dissatisfaction, because everybody appreciates the real difficulty of the position in which the Government is placed. The boards would have then tried to the best of their ability either to supplement these grants or to satisfy the teachers with the grants given by the Government. But the imposition of these conditions has placed some of the boards in a very difficult position. Some had to close with hopeless minus balances. They had to choose between denying the benefit of this provision to these elementary school teachers altogether and cutting down urgent requirements of theirs, even then budgeting for a large minus balance. I think it would have been more satisfactory if the grant was sanctioned without these conditions and the local boards were given a free hand in the matter. I was somewhat taken aback when my friend the hon. the Minister for Education stated that the case of such local boards which were placed in this unhappy predicament would be separately considered and referred us to the hon. the Finance Member. I think, Sir, that so far as the question of giving this allowance to these teachers was concerned, the hon. the Minister for Education should have taken the responsibility himself without placing them again at the mercy of the hon. the Finance Member and given them the additional allowance without any such conditions. He not only required these local bodies to satisfy the department of education but he also wanted them to satisfy the requirements of the Finance Member.

"Now coming to the question of district educational councils, I believe there has been some misapprehension as to the scope of the work of these councils if we are to understand correctly the spirit of the remarks made by Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. There is not the slightest doubt that they have a very useful field of work if they are to discharge their functions properly. There is not the slightest doubt that we cannot ask for all the powers now vested in the district educational councils to be vested in the local boards themselves. However much we may be wedded to our faith in these local boards, we have a number of schools—about two-thirds of the total number are aided schools—and unless managers of aided schools have confidence in the local boards themselves, we must have bodies like the district educational councils in which all interests are represented to deal with this question of grants. The distribution of grants is more difficult in the case of aided schools than in the case of other schools and the district educational council has very important duties to discharge. It was stated that they have only to record reports and so forth. It is not so. My hon. Friend may rest assured that the question of distribution of grants is a very difficult question indeed. Before grants are distributed,

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [23rd March 1922]

various reports are sent regarding these schools from the sub-assistant inspectors to assistant inspectors of schools and again from the assistant inspectors to the inspectors of schools and from them again to the presidents of the district educational councils. They have to be scrutinized carefully before they are disposed of and grants are distributed. I may also state that so far as my experience goes in connexion with the district educational council with which I am concerned, in a number of cases we had to differ from the recommendations made by the inspecting officers and in consultation with them we modified the grants recommended by them. It requires, no doubt, an amount of time and an amount of trouble in dealing with these questions. Again, Sir, it must be stated that the Director of Public Instruction has inaugurated the policy of asking the councils to distribute arrear grants. This means additional responsibility. He was perfectly right in doing so because he wanted to wash off his responsibility in the matter of distribution. I wish to impress on the hon. the Minister for Education and the Director of Public Instruction that if they really want that these district educational councils should do their work satisfactorily, the amount placed at their disposal is quite inadequate. I may give some practical instances. Thousands of reports had to be considered by us and we had some special sittings for the consideration of these reports. There are again members from the rural parts who are prepared to interest themselves in the matter. When we were getting several reports from schools in which adequate grants were not recommended, the members of the council naturally asked me why they should not be given facilities to inspect schools in their own particular ranges and then to report about their actual condition in the light of the recommendations of the inspecting officers. I had to tell them that if they did so they had to take the responsibility themselves and do it at their cost. However much they desired to do the work and make reports, proper funds were not forthcoming. If only the work is to be done satisfactorily, Government must place them in possession of funds to a larger extent."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" Mr. President, I only want to refer to the recent order of the Government regarding the allowance passed about the beginning of this month. By that time the taluk boards have finished the preparation of their revised budget and they have also finished the preparation of budget for the next year. The allotment is at Rs. 2 for each teacher. At this rate a sum of Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000 will be required; when the number of schools is nearly 150 or so, I do not think that it is possible for any taluk board to readjust its budget in order to obtain the grant which the Government promises. It is more inconvenient for the taluk boards in the current year. When the Government issued the order in the month of March, I wonder how the taluk boards can readjust their revised budgets in order to pay their teachers the increment of Rs. 4. In that aspect of the question I believe my friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar is perfectly right in his remarks regarding the current year. I am glad that the hon. the Minister has promised to consider separately the case of those boards which are not able to avail themselves of this grant."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" Sir, I have got to say only a few words on this motion as the hon. the Minister has referred to me in the course of his speech. Firstly as regards the question raised by my hon. Friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar about the

23rd March 1922]

[Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu]

grants, I can say that it would be extremely good if we are given the full loaf. But instead of having none, we will be thankful to the Government to have at least half a loaf and the Government also promised that these grants will be recurring grants. No doubt there is this difficulty that the local bodies have to find funds equal to that amount. But in a laudable question like this, I do not think it will be difficult for the local bodies to find funds. They may starve other activities to some extent, but they should be able to find funds for this very necessary purpose of assisting primary education. That is my view of the matter. I, however, realize the difficulties of the local bodies, but I think all of them can be overcome. That is about the first question.

"As regards the second question, I cannot agree with my hon. Friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar that the educational council is not necessary, in the sense that the local bodies can themselves manage elementary education or rather deal with elementary education in the district. My hon. Friend forgets that the local bodies do not have all the elementary schools in the district. There are some schools managed and maintained by them and there are other schools managed and maintained by other persons or bodies. It is with the object of bringing all these primary schools to co-ordinate with one another on important questions and to lay down a uniform policy with regard to elementary education in a particular district that these educational councils were established. I myself am a member of one of the district educational councils and I know we have got very hard work to do in the councils. The establishment of the district educational councils has brought to prominent notice the vagaries that have been going on for several years undetected in these primary schools. There were several bogus schools and in them there were several bogus pupils; the educational authorities, namely, the sub-assistant, the assistant inspectors of schools and even the inspector of schools were unable to detect these things. But now, as there are members in the educational council from the various parts of the district, every member knows the vagaries connected with the portion of the district from which he comes and he would bring them to the notice of the council at its general meeting. In that way we would be able to detect several vagaries. I think that is really a very great advantage and we now see that money is very usefully spent. We are now in the beginning of it and even in the very beginning we find the advantages of the district educational council. As time goes on and as we gather more experience, I think these district educational councils will confer very great benefit on primary education.

"Lastly, I submit that these local bodies have got a good deal of functions to perform. They are not merely engaged in education but they have got several other functions to do. Education is only one of their functions and it would be impossible to devote much time to it. As education is one of the best needs of the country especially primary education, it is better that it is brought under the sole management of a council whose sole duty is to deal with primary education. I therefore cannot at all agree with my hon. Friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, we had a debate on this question at considerable length and I propose to withdraw my motion. But before doing so, I wish to make a few observations. The hon. the Minister for Education has conceded that there are a number of local bodies which are perfectly unable to meet this demand of finding this Rs. 2 to pay all their teachers. As regards such boards at least, he must make up his mind to give

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [23rd March 1922]

this grant unconditionally. Needless to say that these districts are the districts in the famine zone including the district of Ganjam. As regards the district educational councils, I do not think I have heard anything to change my mind. I never stated that district boards as they stand at present should discharge the functions of district educational councils. I did suggest that some modifications are necessary in the constitution of the district boards before they can be expected to discharge the functions of the district educational councils. For example, the managers of aided elementary schools may be constituted into an electorate to elect a member to the council. The municipalities may be asked to elect one member to represent them on the board and the Government may be asked to nominate certain educational officers to serve on the board. I think a district board so constituted will be sufficiently representative and the lack of machinery complained of by my hon. Friend Mr. Krishna Rao would be met by such an arrangement. With these remarks, I beg to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 533 and 534.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN:—

533. *To omit the grant of three lakhs provided for opening new elementary schools.*

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—

534. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for personal assistant, Madras Educational Service.*

Motion 535.

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

535. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for personal assistant.*

"In making this motion it is my intention to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister for Education to the fact that this department is too top-heavy. In 1920-21 and in 1919-20, there was no additional deputy director or deputy directress. It is only since last year that these two additions have been made and the machinery has been made too top-heavy. I would appeal to the hon. the Minister for Education to see that these two posts are abolished. I would also submit that in no other province of India is there a deputy directress and I do not see why there should be one in this Presidency alone to supervise female education. It is not the case in Bombay or Burma and we find there that the Director of Public Instruction is managing the whole affair."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I beg to rise to a point of order, Sir. I should like to know whether the hon. Member is speaking on personal assistant or on deputy director."

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI:—"With regard to the point of order raised by my hon. Friend I must say that the four items being non-votable, we cannot make any reduction in them. We can only take a subject which is votable and that is the personal assistant. That gives me an opportunity to express my views on the too top-heavy machinery. There is no necessity for these two additional appointments. They never existed

23rd March 1922]

[Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai]

before the reforms. Before the reforms, the machinery was rather simple; then there was only the Director of Public Instruction who was assisted by a deputy director. I therefore appeal to the hon. the Minister for Education to reconsider the whole matter and see whether he can avoid this imposition of a heavy burden on the tax-payer."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, no one will be more pleased than myself or the Director of Public Instruction if it were possible to cut down what my hon. Friend calls the top-heavy system. But the work in the Director's office is such—my hon. Friend Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar had an occasion to go round the office and inspect the work done and was satisfied that the work was heavy—that it is absolutely necessary that there should be an assistant for the Director. If we want the Director to do his work properly and efficiently, then we should have to give him proper assistance not only in the matter of conducting routine work but in the discharge of the various problems that come up in the matter of secondary and collegiate education. The two deputy directors that are now in his office are fully occupied with the work that comes in connexion with elementary, secondary and collegiate education. Not only the distribution of the grants, but also the various problems and schemes that come from the districts have to be closely scrutinized and examined and the Government have to be advised by the Director on the suggestions made by these responsible persons. It is not possible for us to have a less responsible officer as assistant to the director in the matter because he will have to deal with educational problems that come from the districts, they have to be completely thrashed out and recommendations made to the Director. Similarly with reference to the women's branch of education, hon. Members of the House will agree that in order to develop female education, it is necessary that there should be a special officer who would be interested in the development of women's education. Whatever may be the difficulties of the present incumbent, whatever may be the irregularities pointed out and whatever may be the disadvantages we cannot but come to the conclusion that in spite of the defects, in spite of the irregularities and in spite of the disadvantages, we want a special officer who would be the watch-dog for the purpose of expansion of female education in this Presidency. If you do not have a special officer who would devote her or his time for the purpose of ascertaining or inquiring into the condition both in the districts and in the City, then you will not have proper education. The Director would be fully occupied as I told you with reference to education of boys and education in colleges. Therefore in addition to these three officers the personal assistant would be a very useful office assistant to the Director. You have got a whole establishment wherein a number of clerks and managers are working; in order to see that these clerks work properly, that their work is properly systematized and carried out that there is no waste of time or energy, it is necessary that the Director should have a personal assistant. If you look into the condition of work that these people have got to do, then I am sure the council will agree with me that the Director requires a personal assistant. Unless we reduce the work of the Director, I do not see how we can reduce the top-heavy system. Therefore you have to devise means to reduce the work of the Director and it is for the council to suggest in what way it can be done. We are really considering the whole matter with regard to the reorganization of the educational system in the province, how far we can relieve the congestion of work of the Director and how far we can relieve him

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[23rd March 1922]

from doing ordinary work which his subordinates can do. If the district inspectorate reorganization is completed, then it will be time enough for this council to consider whether the top-heavy system as it is called can be reduced or not. But, under the present existing conditions, it seems to me that none of these officers can be dispensed with. As I told you yesterday, I may repeat that, unless the system is changed and unless the department is reorganized, it will not be possible to do away with any of the officers. Until then it is absolutely necessary to have the whole of this staff to aid the Director of Public Instruction."

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—" We see there are certain irregularities in the department. I may give an instance. A letter was addressed to the Director of Public Instruction by a teacher, Venkatachalam Chetti by name. I approached the Director of Public Instruction on behalf of the petitioner. He was good enough to call for the papers but the papers could not be traced. This was due to the fact that there were too many officers as the deputy director, additional deputy director, deputy directress and the personal assistant. No doubt the Director was good enough to ask the petitioner to re-submit the petition. On the assurance given by the hon. the Minister that he would re-consider his scheme, I withdraw the motion. He wanted us to give him suggestions. We are prepared to do so."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 536.

The following motion was not made:—

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—

536. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 49,084 provided for establishment by Rs. 12,271.

Motion 537.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" In moving

537. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,41,000 for general direction by Rs. 100

" I wish to invite the attention of the House to the women's education in this Presidency. I think, Sir, dealing as we are with Indian girls, I should think that the inspection agency should consist of Indian women. (Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao—" Hear, hear.") On the other hand, I find a number of costly appointments in the cadre of Indian Educational Service. In it Indians are not practically represented. Taking the civil list, I find among the Inspectresses Miss R. McLeod, Miss Alice Sergeant, Mrs. M. A. Srinivasa, Miss A. DeRozario and Miss M. C. E. Karney. Now, Sir, I think it is wholly objectionable that we should have a foreign agency to look after the education of Indian women. I think it is a national question in which all of us are concerned very much. I ask the hon. Minister if he cannot see his way to appoint Indian women for these posts. If he could not find people, with the necessary qualifications, I think these appointments should be kept vacant until we are able to fill them with Indian women. Coming to the question of the deputy directress, I think the appointment is entirely superfluous."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Order order. Is not the post of the deputy directress one of the italicised appointments?"

23rd March 1922]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I beg to invite your attention to the fact that we are entitled to refer to it, in discussing such a motion of reduction of allotment as this."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Is it contended that this post should go?"

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I suggest that it should be done away with. In this connexion I should like to read what took place last year when I raised a similar question—

" The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I must again raise the same point of order. The particular proposition now urged relates to the abolition of Inspectors. I say that the provision for such officers is a non-votable item. I seek your ruling that he cannot attack the item of Inspectors."

" Then you observed, Sir,—

" I have no hesitation in giving an answer to that point. A specific motion asked for in a non-votable grant will be out of order. But in a general motion where opportunity is taken to review the whole matter, it is perfectly open to the hon. Member to condemn or find fault with the administration even of a non-votable item, because he is putting forward suggestions for the consideration of the Government. What the House is asked to decide is to make a total reduction under the head " Education." Otherwise, it is difficult for the administration of any department to be criticized. I would rather allow it."

" That is my recollection. It is for the President to decide."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Yes. The hon. Member will go on."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I say this appointment is superfluous. The hon. the Minister is referring to old conditions to justify the present position. When we have our own Minister, an elected representative of the people at the head of the educational administration of the Presidency he can well look after boys' education as well as girls' education. It is for him to lay down a policy, and it is for his subordinates to carry out his policy. I do not think that the deputy directress of instruction is necessary with such a high pay."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" It is very inconvenient for me to answer the question raised by the hon. Mover of this resolution. If a resolution on the same subject is tabled by him or by anybody else, then it will give me an ample opportunity to go into the pros and cons of the question. But in a debate on the budget it will not be possible to answer the very important question which the hon. Member has raised. I have already said what I had to say on the subject in my remarks on another motion."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" The hon. the Minister for Education has informed the House, that he is contemplating some reorganization of the department. I was wondering whether it could not be convenient to the House if the hon. the Minister will see his way to take us into his confidence and indicate the general lines which he is considering. I have no right to ask him. I hope he would do so without inconvenience to himself, and give an opportunity for discussion in this Council."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" In connexion with the question of recruitment to the inspectorate, I wish to inquire if the hon. Minister has had any application from qualified Indian lady graduates for appointment to this branch of the service and whether these appointments are filled up in England purely on the initiative of the Secretary of State or at the request of the Local Government. I do not wish to raise any racial question at all. At the same time, I am anxious to know whether applications have been received from Indian lady graduates for appointments and if so whether they have received any consideration from the department."

[23rd March 1922]

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"In regard to the policy of reorganization, it is quite premature for me to say anything. I have received the report from the Director of Public Instruction, and I have myself a scheme worked out. We have to collaborate before we can announce to the Council or to the public what the definite lines of reorganization are."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I do not want to carry on this discussion at a disadvantage to the hon. the Minister. I withdraw the motion so that the question may be given proper attention."

Motion 538.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

538. To omit the provision for 8 out of the 13 assistant inspectors of schools and the provision for 60 out of 217 supervisors of elementary schools.

"In the budget for the year 1922-23, there are 13 assistant inspectors provided for. I want to omit the provision for 8 out of these 13 assistant inspectors. Then again, there is provision for 217 supervisors. Out of these, I wish to delete the provision for sixty supervisors."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Before he proceeds further I would point out to the hon. Member that he has not told us what amount he desires to omit."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I found a difficulty in giving the amount. You will be pleased to note that with reference to the assistant inspectors the total amount provided is Rs. 29,700. They are on a time-scale of pay 250-25-50-50-800. Similarly the supervisors also are on a time-scale of pay. So, I found it difficult to make a calculation; so I did not give it."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I cannot admit a budget motion which does not say what the amount is that is proposed to be omitted. I really cannot allow it. What hon. Members should do in such cases is to give an amount roughly and leave it to the Government to correct the amount if it is wrong."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"It is too late now."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"He can do it now."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Thanks, Sir. With your permission, Sir, I would like to reduce the allotment for assistant inspectors by Rs. 10,000 and that for supervisors by Rs. 10,000. In moving this motion, I am not making any suggestion which is not made by the department itself. As a matter of fact, the department itself wanted to delete the provision for these 8 assistant inspectors and 60 supervisors. I find in the memorandum of the Finance Secretary that the proposal from the department was received too late by the Finance Department. By the time the proposals reached the Finance Department, the budget had already been prepared. So it was not possible to cut out this. Mr. Moir says—

'Proposals have been received for holding in abeyance eight posts of assistant inspectors and sixty posts of supervisors, but the corrections have not been carried out in the estimates as they were received too late.'

"The old difference between the proposals of the department and mine is, that the department wants to keep these appointments in abeyance while

23rd March 1922]

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

I want them to be deleted. That is the only difference. Apparently, they do not want to fill in these appointments during 1922-23. I do not want that these should stand, seeing that there is no need at all."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, from the footnote at the bottom of page 151, it will be seen that the figure given in the budget excludes the pay of six posts kept in abeyance under G.Os. No. 1165, Home (Education), dated 24th September 1919, and No. 1426, Home (Education), dated 4th December 1920. So it will be seen that the figure 13 in the budget is an actual provision for only seven. The remaining posts have been absorbed owing to the creation of seven inspectors in the Indian Educational Service. Of these seven, one is deputed to Coorg. The real provision for the Madras Educational Service is in respect of only six assistant inspectors. Then it may also be mentioned that eight posts of assistant inspectors though in the Madras Educational Service are really in the subordinate educational service. The posts are kept in abeyance instead of completely eliminating them pending the reorganization of the department which is under contemplation, when most of the people from the Madras Educational Service would be placed in charge of districts. Therefore it is premature for the department to make up its mind now to delete the provision in view of the reorganization. After the reorganization question is settled, we can take up the question of eliminating these posts. Until that is done, I would request the House to sanction the allotment as it is now."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Having regard to the statement made by my hon. friend that he would keep in abeyance the question of eliminating these offices pending the reorganization of the department, I do not like to press the motion. If the House will permit me to withdraw the motion, I shall do so with pleasure."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 539.

12-45 p.m. The following motion was not made.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

539. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,42,830 for supervisors of elementary schools by Rs. 5,000.

Motion 540.

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

540. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 67,700 provided for inspectors' and inspectresses' establishments by Rs. 5,000.

"Those of us who are interested in educational matters know we have got at present too many inspectors of schools. There was a time when there were only four or five circles for inspector of schools for the whole Presidency. We have now one inspector practically for each district. The salary of the inspectors is a non-votable item and my aim in bringing forward a resolution of this kind is to reduce their number. I will even go to the extent of saying that the cadre of inspectors of schools may be abolished altogether.

"Sir, I knew as a student what sort of inspection these people were conducting. As the manager of high school, I happen to know what precious little work they are doing at the time of the annual inspection. And

[Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan] [23rd March 1922]

then, Sir, I have a couple of friends among the inspectors and I know what an easy time of it they are having. One thing they did was to check the accounts of the schools. Now that the department requires a qualified auditor's certificate to be submitted along with the financial statement of each year, they might be relieved of this work. The inspection of the registers does not take much time and can very well be done by a less costly agency, if required. One other work, the most important, though, I am afraid, they are the least qualified for it, is the general supervision including the teaching of special subjects. These officers are graduates specialized in one subject only and naturally cannot be expected to have even an elementary knowledge of other subjects. A History graduate can have no notion of how mathematics must be taught; nor can a Chemistry graduate handle History or Botany unless he undergoes a special training in those subjects. Unfortunately specialization is begun from the lowest classes of these schools and it passes my comprehension how our inspectors can give a leading to the teachers. According to my opinion the best agency for this work is a non-official body consisting of three or four headmasters of schools who may be deputed to inspect all schools in a particular circle once in two or three years. They will be able to do more useful work than the present staff of inspectors. I believe it is time to dispense with this costly agency. With these words, I commend this motion for the consideration of the House."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"It will be very unfortunate that in a department where inspection is necessary in order to see that the schools are maintained up to the standard and the educational rules are properly enforced, that the travelling allowance should be reduced. When we give grants to those institutions, they are given under certain conditions and it is necessary to see that those conditions have been fulfilled. The hon. Member Mr. Tampan is suggesting that the inspecting officers do not go into the matter of real inspection, namely, whether the standard of education is kept up properly, whether a particular subject is taught on modern methods or whether they are not at all attended to but that, on the other hand, they are going into the accounts of the schools to judge whether the schools are properly maintained or not. Of course, there have been complaints. The departmental heads will be glad to inquire into the specific instances that are brought to the notice of Government, and I am aware of the defects that Mr. Prabhakaran Tampan pointed out. They will be rectified immediately, and I hope such are very few, namely, the inspecting officers instead of attending to the real efficiency of the schools merely satisfy themselves with examining the accounts. But the House will agree with me that they may do that work in exceptional cases. Generally, the inspectors are doing very useful work, and it is necessary that they should be touring constantly from firka to firka, from taluk to taluk, that cannot be done by sitting at the headquarters, and it is absolutely impossible for them to write up reports sitting in one place. Therefore they have to visit these places frequently and see that the standard is maintained and for this purpose the travelling allowance is absolutely necessary to the educational department. These inspectors have to travel a certain number of days and maintain certain standard of inspection. Therefore, hon. Members would see that this grant is necessary."

The Rev. W. MESTON :—"Sir, this is a proposition with which I have no sympathy. I have always felt that the University and State funds spent on

23rd March 1922]

[Mr. W. Meston]

the inspecting staff was one of the best investments that could be made for the advancement of education, because the whole of the present improved condition depends on that. We have all experienced what the hon. the Mover has referred to, namely, the strain which the school management is put to at the visit of each Inspector. It takes perhaps a month for the school to recover after each Inspection. But that goes back to many years ago. Conditions have changed tremendously within the last 20 years. I can attest to this from my personal knowledge. The number of Inspectors has been so greatly increased that the schools are now really benefited by the way in which this whole educational policy is carried on. As at present the investment of State funds in this direction should be continued."

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—"Neither the arguments of the hon. the Minister nor those of other members have been able to convince me that the expenditure is necessary. I, however, withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 541.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

541. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,06,335 for general inspection by Rs. 50,000.

"Sir, with the increase in the number of schools it is absolutely essential that there should be an effective system of inspection. It is not on the ground that there should not be the necessary inspection, that I raise this question. But I feel, Sir, that we must have a less costly machinery of inspection. It is that aspect of the question that I wish to place on this occasion before this House and before the hon. the Minister for Education. There have been various changes made from time to time regarding the inspecting machinery. And there has been under consideration a scheme to appoint one inspector of schools for every district, to dispense with the assistant inspectors of schools, to appoint deputy inspectors and do away with the sub-assistant inspectors and supervisors of schools. Before the hon. the Minister for Education gives his approval to such a scheme, it is absolutely essential for him to consider whether in the present circumstances of the country we can afford to have such a costly machinery for inspection and whether it is necessary to have such a machinery. Most of the work in the districts regarding education relates to primary education. The district educational councils have come into existence, which are expected to do all the work in that direction. I put it to the Council whether such a costly machinery is necessary for the purpose of organizing education in the districts. No doubt special arrangements are necessary for special high schools and colleges; but ordinarily it is enough to have one of the grade of assistant inspector to be in charge of that work."

"Secondly, Sir, with regard to the elementary schools, I think it necessary to consider that there are now proposals for altering the curriculum so as to satisfy the local needs and requirements, so as to satisfy the opinions of persons for whose benefit it is intended. Men of the qualification of supervisors of schools, provided they are given some more incentive to work and provided some better men are recruited for the post will be enough, in the place of the highly-paid deputy inspectors of schools. It is because such proposals have been under consideration and the hon.

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [23rd March 1922]

Member Mr. Krishnan Nayar has just moved and withdrawn a motion for cutting eight assistant inspectors of schools and 60 supervisors of elementary schools, I think it is necessary that this question is carefully examined before it is accepted.

"You will find from the Financial Statement presented to us that 'the provision made in the current year's budget for additional inspectors and sub-assistant inspectors and for the transfer of certain posts from the Subordinate to the Madras Educational Service has not been utilized. Proposals have been received for holding in abeyance eight posts of assistant inspectors and sixty posts of supervisors, but the corrections have not been carried out in the estimates as they were received too late.' And again it is said, 'the following schemes which form part of progressive schemes of advance have been cut out:—(1) Appointment of additional inspectors and sub-assistant inspectors and inspectresses.'

"Sir, if we could have large additional income to the credit of our provincial finance, we could have very costly inspectors for each district and also highly-paid deputy inspectors and do away with the assistant and sub-assistant inspectors and supervisors. But if we are alive to the fact that we are short of funds for carrying on various useful objects and that we can have effective inspection by means of supervisors and sub-assistant and assistant inspectors, I request that the proposals which have been hitherto under contemplation should not be hastily given effect to. Feeling that the financial condition needs more close scrutiny, my own impression is that we have now arrived at a stage in our finance when we must think of trying an experiment on much cheaper and more economic lines than hitherto. When we realize our condition to be most critical, is this not the time to think of reducing the expenditure on this costly establishment?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"The hon. the Mover has pointed out that the question is one whether there should be a reduction in the number of supervisors or whether there should be a better staff of sub-assistant inspectors. There are two schools of thought in this matter holding opposite views. At one sitting of the advisory committee we had a discussion of the subject, and the two views were presented to the Government on this matter. The opinion was divided. We want to see how far it is possible to reconcile the two opinions, or to carry out one or the other, that which seems to be more efficient."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I do not wish to press it further."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 542.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

542. To omit the allotment of Rs. 8,500 for Sanskrit education.

"Mr. President, this motion has been tabled for the sake of eliciting information. I should like to know what the total number of schools in the department is and how many of these are in receipt of grants from Government and are subject to the supervision of the State. The amount provided is now Rs. 8,500. I am given to understand, though I cannot vouchsafe for the accuracy of the figures, that the total number of Sanskrit schools is

23rd March 1922]

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

well over 700, and of this number those that are within the control of the department are only about 75 or 80, and it is for these 75 or 80 schools that the sum of Rs. 8,500 is to be provided. The vast majority of these schools may have their own reasons for refusing to come under the department and are doing their work absolutely independent of the departmental regulations. I have nothing to do with them at present. But with regard to the schools which are aided, one or two questions of interest arise and I want to have light from the Minister thereon. One is whether they are institutions of what I may call a sectarian character where the study is pursued on dogmatic lines. The second is whether admissions are restricted to particular castes. I am all in favour of encouraging Sanskrit education for the sake of its cultural value and the light it throws on our ancient civilization. I very much doubt if dogmatic or quasi-religious instruction in classics is one of the things for which State funds could be appropriated. If we are to do that in the case of the Hindus I am sure our Muhammadan friends would not like it and it is sure to create some heart-burning. It is therefore for the sake of knowing the views of my hon. Friend that this motion has been tabled. In the reorganization that he is contemplating I trust he will try to bring in Sanskrit schools within the department, so that our Sanskrit studies may not follow the old dogmatic and sectarian lines."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"The number of aided Sanskrit colleges is twelve and aided schools twenty-one. The total number of schools including the unaided was 269 in 1920—

1 p.m. 21. The system obtaining in these schools and colleges is non-sectarian. One college is specializing in grammar, another in Vedanta and a third in another school of philosophy and in that way the colleges are maintained. The schools also include a general culture of studies and are not run on sectarian lines."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—"Sir, I want to oppose the motion and say a few words if you will allow me to do so. In the course of discussion on the demands, I have noticed Mr. Ramalinga Reddiyar and others advocating reductions under various headings by lakhs. But I was rather surprised that this trifling amount of Rs. 8,500 should have attracted their attention and that they should have wanted this amount to be cut down."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"On a point of personal explanation, Sir, I have already disclaimed any intention to have the allotment deleted. As I said already, I moved the motion only for the sake of securing a certain information."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—"I thought their object in moving this reduction must be due to one of three causes, first apathy for the spread of Sanskrit education, or second that Sanskrit education is purely beneficial only to a certain sect of the community or third that the supervising staff is entirely Brahman so that if the sum is not granted, the Brahman may be shut out. As regards the first point Mr. Ramalinga Reddiyar said that it has his full sympathy. As regards the second that a certain section alone is being benefited by Sanskrit education I must say that it is not so, because members of the depressed classes Thiyyas and others also are coming to these Sanskrit schools to study. In this connexion I would say that it is only a decade or two ago that a revival of Sanskrit study commenced, the impetus to it being given by Mr. Krishnamachariyar, M.A., the veteran Sanskrit scholar.

[Mr. T. Namberumal Chetti] [23rd March 1922]

All honor to him. Through his influence more than 60 or 70 Sanskrit schools and colleges were started in various centres all more or less under private management a few being under district boards. Several of my own community who till recently set apart funds for feasts and festivals, and, for providing for gold and silver *vahanams* in temples, are now diverting portions of such funds for Sanskrit education. The Yeteendra Pravara Chetti charities maintain a Sanskrit College at Sriperumbudur. Kakiman Adikesavulu Chetti Charities maintain a school in the city. Yet another in Triplicane is maintained by Kalavala Kannan Chetti's Charities, at the opening ceremony of which our worthy President took a leading part. Above all, the Venkataramana Sanskrit College in Mylapore which is doing splendid work and turning out Siromani pandits year after year is lending lustre to the spread of Sanskrit education. I hear also there are several schools in Malabar started by Jenmies in which Muhammadan boys and boys of the backward classes are receiving Sanskrit education. It is therefore clear that these are not sectarian institutions. Now I come to the third cause. Sir, it is to supervise these various institutions that receive Government grants that this small sum of Rs. 8,500 is provided in the budget. An attempt to cut this down will surely check the spread of education already started and check also the bringing into life of new institutions. If in the mind of the mover the party spirit is obtaining away, viz., that the supervision is being done by Brahmans and therefore it should be discouraged, I consider, Sir, that until such time as there are Sanskrit pandits amongst non-Brahmans such a spirit may be allowed to rest. Year after year it is open to the House to vote for this expenditure and when time is ripe for non-Brahmans to take up the supervision, communal interests may then be brought up for recognition. With these few words I oppose the motion."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" My hon. Friend having prepared a speech I did not think it right to interrupt him by any disclaimer or personal explanation, which might have produced a serious effect upon his speech. If the effect of Sanskrit culture is to attribute motives of that kind to those with whom they might differ, I for one would be sorry to see Sanskrit education spreading. However, I may say that my hon. Friend has been misled, and I do not think there is any need for me to repudiate the kind of communal or sectarian motives that he has attributed to me or to the colleagues that joined me in tabling this motion. I was indeed very glad to hear that in all these colleges admission is open to all communities."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I thought he was rising to a point of personal explanation."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" I was going to say that admission is open to all classes of students and as for the supervisors being all Brahmans, I can assure my hon. Friend that I did not know that that was so. I thank him for having told me that; and as for the motive attributed to me, i.e., that I was trying to subvert the inspecting staff by cutting down the provision spreading of Sanskrit education, but I am opposed to too many dogmatic institutions for reasons which I have never made a secret. I do not subscribe to the doctrine that you should have more Sanskrit colleges and schools for spreading Sanskrit education; for Sanskrit education is liberally patronised by the Madras University, and it has a very honoured and important place in the course of college studies. The University have

23rd March 1922] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

devised Siromani and other grades. I am entirely in sympathy with the encouragement of Sanskrit education, but not the kind of education that would bring about a false spirit in the minds of the peoples. If such an education should be provided for and if the charges were to be borne by the community to which my hon. Friend belongs, it is entirely their look out and I have no objection, but what I do object to is that State funds should be spent on such institutions. Anyway, since I know that this is not the case at all, I have no desire to press this motion to a division, and I request the leave of the House to withdraw it."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I perfectly agree with what my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi said, i.e., that when Government give grants they should not give grants to institutions which work on sectarian lines. I do not think that the grant made to Sanskrit colleges is really very much considering the provision for the European schools for which we voted the other day. I think therefore that the same principle should be applied to all Sanskrit schools and colleges including the National Premier College in Madras."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 543 to 551.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

543. To omit the allotment of Rs. 8,500 for Sanskrit education.

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

544. To omit the allotment of Rs. 8,500 for Sanskrit education.

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

545. To omit the allotment of Rs. 8,500 for Sanskrit education.

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

546. To omit the allotment of Rs. 8,500 for Sanskrit education.

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—

547. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 13,09,400 by Rs. 24,000.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

548. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 13,09,400 for inspection by Rs. 100.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

549. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 1,40,01,188 for education by Rs. 100.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

550. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,01,188 for education by Rs. 5,000.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

551. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,01,188 for education by Rs. 100.

Motion 552.

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARAMNAM NAYUDU :—" Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

552. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 1,40,01,188 for education by Rs. 100.

[Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu] [23rd March 1922]

"I should at the outset acknowledge that the suggestion for a resolution of this type I owe to an observation that you, Sir, were pleased to make during last year's debate on the budget. Therefore, I believe it is altogether superfluous for me expressly to disown any intention either to show up an old and at his expense. I should, in fact, if I might, state, in a word of acknowledgment, that so far as I am able to understand he has been endeavouring, alike in the matter of improving the organization and in the direction of amplifying the finances, to pursue a policy of progress with a zeal and a steadfastness which, when the results come to be known, will entitle him to the thanks of all friends of education. (Applause.)

1-15 p.m. "At the same time, Sir, while appreciating the work of those that are engaged in the field, it may be open, I believe, to a humble member of this House, to indicate certain drawbacks and shortcomings the removal of which is desirable in the best interests of the educational advancement of the country. To a few of these drawbacks, adversely bearing upon the educational system, I shall invite the attention of this honourable House. I believe that they deserve close and prompt attention, if the system is not to get out of date.

"Sir, the first question I should like to raise is whether our programme of administration provides for adequate time, thought and energy being given to this work, in a measure commensurate with its paramount importance. About 75 years ago, the Governor-General of the day, the first Lord Hardinge, observed that for all the ills that India 'is heir to', the first remedy is education, the second remedy is education, and the third remedy which India has through generations suffered from, then I submit that no amount of time devoted to this work and no measure of attention bestowed upon it will ever be considered too much for the purpose. When, however, we remember that under the existing scheme of administration this all-important department is, to use a homely expression, bundled up with three other big departments and their united burden is cast upon the back of a single Minister, one may well ask whether the department merits no better treatment. On the other hand, there is the strange fact that somehow, perhaps more out of considerations of administrative convenience than from any intrinsic fitness, the field of work is broken up into four or five sections, and these several sections are given in charge of four, if not five, members of the Government. That, I submit, is a method not very conducive to an intelligent treatment of the department as an organic whole, as an articulated system in which the various parts fit into one another in effective co-ordination. Taking these two points together, would it not be a more eligible arrangement if as many as possible of these different sections, now distributed over a number of departments, were put together and placed in the charge of one Minister who might, as a set-off, be relieved of one or more of those departments which are now entrusted to him?

"Next comes the consideration that education is now a transferred subject. To say that education is a transferred subject may sound like a trite observation. All the same, it may not be superfluous or amiss to ask ourselves what we understand by a subject being transferred. To me, Sir, it denotes that the subject has been transferred from the category of an administrative department to the category of a national problem. Therefore, it seems to

23rd March 1922] [Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu]

me that a transferred subject ought to devolve upon every Member of this representative House special responsibility as regards its effective administration. It will be a great mistake to fancy that the head of the department alone is responsible, and we may be content to be his critics. We are bound to contribute our share to the reconstruction of the system, each after his own lights. In this connection, Sir, I shall, if I may without causing offence, refer to one grave anomaly. In my judgment it is a paradox, if not an irony, that in a so-called transferred department there should be a large set of non-transferred items, items which we cannot vote upon, items which are proof to our 'voice'. With the partiality of a school-master for an illustration, I shall say it looks as though a certain plane has been declared the village common to which all the recognized inhabitants have the right of access; but as one enters one finds a plot here and a plot there fenced round by barbed iron-wire with the warning notice, 'Trespassers will be prosecuted.' That, I think, is a serious defect which calls for speedy readjustment, if—digressing for just half a minute, I might say—diarchy is not to be pronounced a failure. Sir, I am not so much concerned with the pay or the personnel; what I do note to be a grave anomaly is that those who are thus individually insulated become prime movers in the administration. In actual result I believe, if I may once again draw upon an illustration, it creates situations not much unlike one of those conventional cosmopolitan dinners, with high caste caterers, to which one at times invited. One goes in great expectations of social amenities, but one returns with a painful consciousness of patronizing condescension; while during the function there is a repeated manifestation, in the relations between the caterer and the catered, of a large measure of passive resistance (Laughter). Sir, for this reason, in the best interests of the department, this maladjustment should be speedily set right.

"But a far more vital question is the one that, when a department has been declared 'transferred,' it is thereby placed wholly under what I call 'indigenous initiative.' As the Braidwood Lecturer last year said, in the ship of State 'the motive power in the engine-room should hereafter be Indian.' (Hear, hear.) It is this initiative that is sadly wanting. If again I may take an illustration, with the partiality of the son of a military officer, from the Army, I shall recall that little incident which was reported some time back as having occurred in Mesopotamia: the enemy had turned their guns upon our men, the latter desired to reply; hence some of the sepoy went up to the subadar and said, 'Kevun, Subadar Sahib, goli chalayn?'—'Well, Subadar Sahib, shall we open fire?', and the answer was 'Zara sabar karo, lieutenant se puchleyn,' 'Wait a minute, let us ask the lieutenant.' This subadar, who had perhaps put in more years of service in the army than the lieutenant had seen years of existence, had to take his instructions from the youthful lieutenant before he could do the elementary duty of responding to the enemy's fire (Hear, hear). It is this utter lack of a chance for initiative work that has stunted the growth of indigenous talent. Therefore, I urge, Sir, Indian intellect ought to count; Indian experience ought to receive credit; the engine should move with Indian power, though the watch and the outlook be the joint duty of the Indian and the European. That is the last point, Sir, on which, if I have any time left, I should like to lay special stress. As the hon. Sir Ashutosh Mukherjee, the Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University, perhaps the most illustrious exponent living of the Indian university system of education, observed only the other day, the

[Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu] [23rd March 1922]

Indian universities have not been able to take root in the life of the nation because they have remained exotics. Perhaps my hon. friend, the Member for the University, will remark that this direful consequence is due to the fact that the University has not been allowed to exercise its autonomous powers. But I venture to think, Sir, that autonomy is a mere relative term. Autonomy is good or bad according to the conditions under which it works. Unless it is environed by democratic circumstances and influenced by a democratic spirit, autonomy may stand divided by a very thin partition from autocracy. It is this autocratic exercise of autonomy that has put the Indian universities out of joint with the life of the nation (Hear, hear). It is, therefore, high time that not merely the Indian universities but the whole system of education was put in vital touch with the living, throbbing work-a-day existence of the Indian nation. (Applause.) Here thorough, radical reform is imperative. If undue attention has hitherto been given to only one type of education, if, as is hinted in the report of the Calcutta University Commission, high schools have been mere nurseries for the University, need we wonder that the whole system has virtually remained outside the current of national life? High schools ought to be treated as a self-contained whole; the education imparted in them ought to be ample enough in range and varied enough in quality to befit a person to enter life at its close. There is a host of other points which arise as we face this issue of a system of education under Indian initiative. But time forbids my setting them out. With the permission of the House, I shall just refer to two of these points. Firstly, the available resources and the method of apportionment should be so regulated as to serve the needs of all sections of the people inhabiting this presidency. Hitherto unfortunately it has gone mostly in favour of one or two particular communities, while others have been left out in the dark; I do not say from any deliberate malicious motive, but mainly because those that had the ordering of things in their hands knew no better. But that practice must end; not only equal but proportionate attention should be accorded, not only equal but commensurate facilities should be afforded, to all communities (Hear, hear); to every community according to its own aims and needs. Just as the doctor bestows the closest care upon a case which is the most serious, even so the educator shall give the largest and most sympathetic attention, as due of right, to those communities which are very backward in education. (Hear, hear.) Thus it is, to come to a specific instance, that I hold that we shall be repaying a long standing debt of obligation to the depressed classes, if we make the most liberal provision for their education in the budgets of this Presidency. (Applause.)

“Then, Sir, the second point is that even as in legal definitions ‘he’ is said to include ‘she’, we seem to fancy that a system of education that works well for boys ought to fit in quite as well for girls. That notion ought to change. Not only as the Calcutta University Commission’s report has told us, but also as the Government of India have stated in one of their Resolutions, I believe in the year 1919, there ought to be formulated a differentiated system for our girls and women, a system that is more in accord with their tastes and aptitudes, with their outlook on life, with their station and duties in after years. That is another object on which we shall do well to concentrate our attention for a while. Here, again, I shall plead that the available resources, time, money and energy be equally distributed among girls and women of all communities. It is sad to recall

23rd March 1922] [Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu]

that not long ago, perhaps only a couple of years back, an official document owned, as regards a certain home or hostel for girls, that out of 87 inmates so many as 75 were receiving free not only education but also boarding, lodging, books and all the other necessities, notwithstanding the fact, as that document itself admitted, that several of them belonged to families that could afford to pay but declined to do so. Such misdirected liberality should cease in the true interests of the favoured community itself; and the available facilities should be open in a free and well-graduated manner to all sections of the Indian community.

“The last subject to which, with your permission, Sir, I shall draw the very special attention of this House, is the plight of us poor schoolmasters. Let not this House be deceived by the glamour of the ‘fat salaries’ that are drawn at the top of the system by some of the Government servants. As to that, I hold that he who needs a ‘fat salary’ in this department is an interloper. In consonance with the traditional beliefs and the age-long sentiments of this land, we have always associated a teacher with plain living and simple surroundings. But it is one thing to practice plain living; it is quite another to be put on short commons. And whatever might be the good fortune of the few celestials, it must be confessed of the whole host of subordinate teachers that from year’s end to year’s end they are put on short commons. Is that fair or humane; or shall we not realize that money spent on education is undoubtedly money wisely employed? Notwithstanding the remark made yesterday by the hon. the Finance Member that this was a much-favoured department, I beg leave to submit with the utmost humility that this department is not receiving even a moiety of what is really its due. I may for a moment borrow the language of the fable to which the hon. the Home Member alluded the other day, the fable of Menenius Agrippa in *Coriolanus* and declare that we teachers may, without immodesty, claim that it is we that supply the general food which all do live upon, we are the store-house and the shop of the whole body. Will this hon. House, in recognition of our humble services, say, ‘you grind for all, you furnish the flour for all, and you be content with the bran’? Shall I not pray that ours may be valued, as it ought to be voted, really the most productive of all departments? May it be realized, in the language of the Bible, that whatever is spent on this department is like bread cast upon the waters which in due course will yield a return ten-fold and even hundred-fold in value.” (Applause.)

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“Sir, after the most instructive, eloquent and illuminating address from the hon. Member, it is not for me to reply to all that has been said; and I whole-heartedly agree with him in all that he said. But I take exception to one, namely, where he referred to me personally. I do not wish to appropriate for myself all the credit that he has conferred on me. I have in this matter the energetic co-operation and advice of the head of the department. I have in the Education Adviser one who is always in sympathy for the progress of education movement in this country. I have pressed with him very difficult matters, which is no doubt against some of his views; but he loyally carried out the policy and worked out the policy as directed by the Government. I am sure that with the co-operation of the Council in the schemes that we have begun, God-willing, we may be able to show a better record at the next budget meeting. We are perhaps in the beginning of the question and we are paying our close and honest attention to the educational improvement and advancement of the province

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[23rd March 1922]

But, as I said, with your co-operation, Sirs, in voting sufficient money we may be able to advance all the proposals which are most required for the educational advancement of our province. Sir, I agree specially in the matter of the standard of education for boys and girls. It is only the day before yesterday I read the Government of India order and the literature connected with the subject. I am sure that, as I collect and gather information more and more, I will be able to evolve a system which would be different from the present system of education between boys and girls. But, as you know, these matters take time and it cannot be done in one month or two. We have to gather the materials and place them before experts for discussion and, after receiving advice and guidance in the matter, we must make up our minds as to what the particular system might be that would be suitable and how far finances would support the scheme, and then launch it for practical work. All these things would take time; but I may assure you that I will leave no stone unturned in order to see to the system which has been most useful and instructive and which will tend to the progress of the country is carefully examined and brought to successful working."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 553.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

553. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,15,500 for examinations by Rs. 100.

"Sir, I wanted to refer to the question of the Special Test examinations in connexion with this motion. It is well known that the University for some time past have been having the examinations in regard to several of their courses twice a year. The Law College examination, the Intermediate examination and the B.A. examinations are held twice a year. I think the same principle should be extended to the case of the Special Test examinations as well. As at present, candidates can appear only once a year and that means considerable hardship in the case of the subordinates for whom a success in this examination is necessary for promotion. If, unfortunately, they fail in one year, they have to wait for another year to appear and pass this examination for their promotions. In the meanwhile, there may be vacancies and they may be barred from getting any of them. The Government will not at all be losing anything by introducing the change suggested by me. I find, as a matter of fact, that, in all these examinations the Government has been gaining money rather than losing. So that even from a financial point of view it would be a paying concern and the relief it affords to the poor subordinates would be very great indeed."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"That is a matter which is already engaging the attention of the Government and I think the matter is before the Finance Department. Orders will soon issue favourably."

The motion was then by leave withdrawn.

Motion 554.

The following motion was not made:—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—

554. To reduce the allotment of 143.10 lakhs by Rs. 10,000.

23rd March 1922]

Motion 555.

The following motion standing in the name of Dr. P. Subbarayan was with the permission of the House moved by Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI:—

555. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 143.10 lakhs by Rs. 10,000.

In doing so, he said:—"Sir, I wish to draw attention of the members of this House to the inadequate provision made for the maintenance of the Oriental Library of Manuscripts. In an obscure corner and under a still more obscure heading 'miscellaneous' some Rs. 10,000 is provided for the next year. The revised estimate for 1921-22 was reduced to Rs. 23,000 from Rs. 27,000 budgeted. For 1922-23 it is further reduced to Rs. 10,000. The establishment alone must be Rs. 12,000 per annum. Some details regarding the working of the department will be of interest. This consists of three sections: (1) Permanent, (2) Peripatetic and (3) Publication. The first section denotes its time to the acquisition and preservation of oriental manuscripts and books in various languages. The second denotes its time in visiting various districts and collecting manuscripts, and the third the Publication section does the printing and publishing of unpublished manuscripts under the name of 'The Madras Government Oriental Series.' It may be interesting to learn that the first section, the Publication section, has published so far 24 volumes of descriptive catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts and 5 volumes of other languages. Printing and publishing them lie before them, a huge task.

"The Peripatetic section secured 500 manuscripts during the year. It is reported that several books were lost in the recent Malabar disturbances.

1.45 p.m.

"The third or Publication section have ready for publication two rare manuscripts and there are also 200 more available, some of which are—

Commentary on Arthashastra.

Commentary on Natya Sastra.

Brihaspathi Suthra.

"There are also others of rare value. If the Publication section started so recently as in 1920 is to be abolished as it is likely to be, I am afraid the world will be deprived of seeing rare books gathered under one roof at considerable expense and trouble. If the Mysore Government did not publish this Arthashastra, a rare work of which there had been only one manuscript available, our Finance Member would not have been able to quote texts.

"The Madras Oriental Library is, I understand, the best and biggest in India. The other Government institutions are—

Bombay Government Sanskrit Series.

Mysore Government Sanskrit Series.

Travancore Government Sanskrit Series.

Gaikwar Oriental Series.

Srinagar Sanskrit Series.

Benares Sanskrit Series.

"There are also three private institutions—

Pandit Series.

Kavya Mala Series.

Anandarama Series.

[Mr. T. Namburumal Chetti]

[23rd March 1922]

"All these bear no comparison to the Madras Oriental Library. This institution has been preparing manuscripts and sending them to Indian and foreign scholars. Distinguished scholars like Dr. Thomas, the Librarian to the India Office, have made a very good mention of the institution. At the Oriental Conference held in Poona in 1919, two hundred of these rare manuscripts were exhibited. Perhaps time has come for the extinction of these activities of this library. If so, we shall be responsible to the future generations for the neglect of our sacred duty to ancient Sanskrit literature."

The Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"I quite agree with my hon. Friend in his desire to have the collection of manuscripts done by the Oriental Library and we have provided Rs. 10,000 for the purpose of purchase and collection of oriental manuscripts and for the maintenance of the staff of the library. At present, we are unable to make any more provision in the budget. If we have a prosperous year, we will be able to provide for more. But the hon. Mover simply requests the Government to do something more in the matter of the collection of manuscripts for oriental studies."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 143.10 lakhs under Demand XVI—Education (Non-European) was put and carried.

The grant was made.

The Council rose for lunch at 1.50 p.m. and re-assembled at 2.40 p.m.

DEMAND XVII—MEDICAL.

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR:—"Sir, I move Demand XVII that the Government be granted Rs. 48.47 lakhs for Medical."

Motion 556.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I beg to make the following motion:—

556. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,70,380 for district and medical officers (12 I.M.S. and 11 Civil) by Rs. 1,000.*

"I need hardly say, Sir, that this is one of those motions for reduction under which we want explanation and information. We have heard so much of diarchy and one of our revered leaders referred to the evil of having a number of heads for practically the same department. This Medical department has got a similar peculiarity. Though the whole department is under one Minister, some of the officers in that department are not subject to his control. But so far as the Indian Medical Service officers are concerned, we have heard in various parts as to the various attempts that are being made as to their recruitment in India as in England and also as to the way in which the officers in India and those from England should be controlled by the Minister in charge. We all know that the Medical department is one of the departments where there should be no curtailment under any circumstances whatever, but the grant should be increased year after year. So far as this particular service is concerned, the last year's budget shows that there were 24 officers whereas there are only 23 this year.

23rd March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

"One other circumstance that requires explanation is this: whereas there were only ten Indian Medical Service officers last year, the number has been increased to twelve this year. It is therefore necessary exactly to know under what circumstances the recruitment has taken place during the current year and the circumstances under which the recruitment is to take place next year. This is certainly one of those departments where indianization can be easily made and where it is absolutely necessary. We have heard of funny stories where people who were not acquainted with the language of the patients had to make signs to understand the grievances of the patients and sometimes such a treatment by signs have led to serious calamities. Therefore, Sir, if there is any department where the officers should be Indian, I think this should be one of them. I do not at all mean to say anything against some of the higher officers who are experts. But our experience also goes to show that so far as operations are concerned many Indian assistant surgeons some of whom have risen as civil surgeons are in no way inferior to the Indian Medical Service Officers in every department of work. Anyhow, we need hardly say that it is not at all our intention to send away men who are already there bag and baggage. But when you fill up the places that are likely to become vacant, this question must be considered.

"I may also refer to the point that the salaries of Indian Medical Service officers are also non-votable; for instance, there are the officers who are full-time professors in the Medical College. I have given notice of another motion on that point but I do not think it is worth while to spend the time of the Council by making both the motions as they are allied to each other. I hope the hon. the Minister will be pleased to give us also information as to whether it is found necessary to have full-timed Indian Medical Service professors in the Medical College for which very fat salaries are given, and whether these places cannot be given to people who are already having private practice and who are probably Indians. These are the few points on which I will be glad to have explanation and information, and I am sure the hon. the Minister will be kind enough to furnish it."

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR:—"Mr. President, when I had notice of the resolution, I was indeed at a loss to know what the underlying idea of the resolution was. But from the speech of the hon. Mover I gather that the resolution is intended to elicit a declaration of the policy of the Government regarding the nationalization of the Medical Service.

"Sir, Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar has dwelt at length on the question of indianizing the medical service. Indianization of the medical service may mean either the exclusion of Englishmen (Indian Medical Service officers) from that service or the gradual and increasing association of Indians (provincial medical officers) with the higher posts in the Medical department. If the former idea is suggested, I have no hesitation to reject the suggestion at once."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I clearly stated that it was only the latter that I meant."

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR:—"My reason for the summary rejection of the idea of excluding the Indian Medical Service officers is that most of the well-known medical institutions in the Presidency are staffed by Indian Medical Service officers. They are doing exceedingly

[Mr. P. Ramarayaningar] [23rd March 1922]

well and can compare with the best of the medical institutions elsewhere not only in India but also in other civilized countries. I need hardly say that we owe a deep debt of gratitude to the Indian Medical Service for introducing into the country a highly-developed system of medical relief. Sir, it will be a disaster to exclude Indian Medical Service officers from our medical service. I am glad to hear from my friend that he did not suggest that the Indian Medical Service officers should be excluded.

"Sir, so far as the indianization in the limited sense is concerned, there can be no objection to it. I have every sympathy for the suggestion to promote as many deserving provincial officers as possible to the higher posts in the medical department. This Government for the last six months have been in correspondence with the Secretary of State and the Government of India to have as many as sixteen higher posts hitherto reserved for Indian Medical Service officers thrown open to provincial men. If the Secretary of State approves of this Government's proposal, a large number of higher appointments in the medical service will be available to the deserving provincial men.

"Sir, the hon. Mover has in this connexion referred to the appointment of the Professors of the Madras Medical College from the provincial medical service. The recommendation which this Government made to the Government of India includes proposals for the appointment of some professors from among the provincial medical officers. If, as I said, the Secretary of State's sanction is accorded to the recommendation of this Government, some of the professors of the Medical College can be recruited from the provincial medical service.

"Another observation made by my hon. Friend is that the medical service is not under the Minister's entire control. I could not exactly understand the force of the observation."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I said clearly that the whole department was under one Minister but that all the officers were not subject to his control."

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"The fact that some officers are subject to dual control is due to the military exigencies and the constitutional position of the Provincial Government. If a change in the present arrangement is to be effected it can only be effected by higher authorities. Sir, I have no objection to submit the proceedings relating to the debate on this resolution to the Government of India and the Secretary of State for India."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, the issue under discussion is a very important one and inasmuch as the hon. the Minister has been pleased to say that he will place the proceedings of this House on this matter both before the Government of India and before the Secretary of State, I think it is but right that this question should be debated upon a little longer. As was rightly remarked, we do not object to the officers as such but we do take strong exception to the system. Whether the officers of the Indian Medical Service happen for the time being to be Europeans or Indians is a matter of no concern at all. Both would be equally costly so far as our province is concerned and the necessity for it is not at all clear. It was remarked by the Minister in Bihar, Sir, that while he had no objection to the retention of these officers, he had considerable objection to their being officers of the Indian Medical Service subject to the liability of constantly being taken away from India on military

23rd March 1922] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

duty. Now, I do not know why we should subject ourselves to such disadvantages. During the war, these officers were away from our province for a long time, and so far as I can see the medical administration in the Presidency was none the worse for it and we saved a huge sum of money. I think also that if the system is changed the effect of it will be, I am bound to say, an introduction of a larger number of Indians in the administration and it will lead also to economy.

"Turning for a moment to the three hospitals in the Presidency town itself we notice that the cost incurred in the different institutions shows extraordinary variations and perhaps I am right in saying that to some extent, these fluctuations may be traced to the fact that there is more of Indian control in one institution than in another; I am not quite positive, but it is just possible that the comparatively less expenditure in some of the institutions is due to the simple fact that one who knows the habits and tendencies of the people here is likely to understand better the needs of the people and provide for them at a minimum cost. Taking, Sir, one item, cost under diet, I find Rs. 1,45,790 was spent at the Government General Hospital, Rs. 56,960 at the Rayapuram Hospital and Rs. 17,363 at the Royapetta Hospital. Of course we have to take into consideration also the number of in-patients treated in these different hospitals, so that we may arrive at the relative cost per head. In the General Hospital the number of in-patients was 8,610, in the Rayapuram Hospital, 5,250 and in the Royapetta hospital, 2,717. The average, if it is worked out, will be found to be about Rs. 16 per head in the General Hospital, Rs. 10 in the Rayapuram Hospital and Rs. 3 in the Royapetta Hospital. Now, you see, Sir, the difference is very striking. But it may be urged that in the Government General Hospital there are a number of European in-patients treated. Even then, I fail to see the reason for the high dietary charges there and, so far as the difference between the Rayapuram and Royapetta hospitals is concerned, any such explanation is altogether out of question. There is again another item which would illustrate my point. As regards the medicines in the General Hospital Rs. 60,000 was spent, in Rayapuram hospital Rs. 46,000 and in the Royapetta hospital Rs. 8,996. I wanted to see, Sir, whether the number of patients treated in these different hospitals varied in the same proportion but there is nothing of that sort, so far as the Rayapuram and Royapetta hospitals are concerned."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Order, order. Before the hon. Member proceeds further, I would like to point out to him that the present motion is on the establishment of medical officers and that hospitals and dispensaries come a little later on. I fear what the hon. Member is dealing with will be wholly outside this particular vote."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"My point was only this: that the change advocated by the hon. Mover and supported by me would really lead to economy also in different departments. That was how I had to bring this in. I do not want to go further into the matter. The reason for the low cost in the Royapetta hospital appears to be due to the use of bazaar medicines to a larger extent than in the other hospitals. If it was found advantageous to do so in the Royapetta hospital, I do not know why the same should not be done in other hospitals. Thereby we could save much money for other institutions or other objects. By reason of the inherent

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

[23rd March 1922]

defects of the system itself and by considerations of economy and many other things, which one has now no time to dwell upon, I think the system deserves to be changed altogether."

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Mr. President, it is a matter of great satisfaction to hear from the hon. the Minister the various steps that have been taken during the last year to indianise the medical services. He has pointed out to us how a number of men in the provincial service were put in places which were hitherto occupied by Indian Medical Service officers and how such a provision is to be made for more. All these things go to show that the hon. the Minister has been taking steps in the right direction, steps in accordance with the popular opinion of the Legislative Council. So I do not understand why there should be any complaint at all. I cannot help expressing our admiration in the highest degree of the work done by our first Minister the hon. Mr. Ramarayaningar in conducting the affairs of the Local Self-Government department in a very able, efficient and conscientious manner giving perfect satisfaction to all parties concerned, be they Indians or Europeans."

Mr. F. J. RICHARDS:—"I wish to mention just one point, Sir. The hon. Mover asked why the number of District Medical and Sanitary officers has gone down from 24 to 23. That is because the one officer for the Agency division has been excluded from the item."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I am very thankful, Sir, for the information given by Mr. Richards. I was looking into the financial statement, but I could not find it there. That was however a small matter. I heard, Sir, some rumours that good work has been done by way of Indianization in this department. While other Ministers had an opportunity of showing as to what they had done, I am very glad that the hon. the Minister in charge of this department has now taken advantage of this opportunity and publicly announced as to what he has done. In the words of Mr. Usman Sahib, we all feel very thankful to him for what he has done. On the last point also, instead of simply communicating the proceedings of this Council, I request him to press his own opinion on the Cabinet and to address the Viceroy and the Secretary of State with the resolution of the Cabinet also on that point. We know the well-known proverb that young lawyers and old doctors should be preferred and in the Indian Medical Service also, with due deference to the many doctors here it is said that men become great doctors after murdering many people—after getting more experience in medical work they are able to become first-class experts in the Medical department. The difference between the Indians and the Europeans in the higher appointments is only this, that after retirement the Europeans will go away and we will not have the benefit of their experience while in the case of Indians that will not be the case. I once more thank the hon. Minister and the Secretary in charge of the department for their past work and we hope that all that we expect from them will be fully realized before the next budget is presented. With these words, I beg leave to withdraw."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

23rd March 1922]

Motions 557 and 558.

The following motions were not made:—

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—

557. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,37,855 for establishment by Rs. 157

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—

558. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,54,985 for establishment by Rs. 100

Motion 559.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO:—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

559. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,05,630 for matrons and nurses by Re. 1.

"My intention is not to reduce the amount to show any saving but simply to draw the attention of the House and of the Minister to the amount of money that we are spending for nurses. Sir, in the year 1919 about Rs. 2,83,000 were spent for nurses whereas this year the amount shown in the budget is Rs. 1,05,630. I do not in the least grudge that we should spend more for the purpose of nurses. Nor do I complain that the nurses do not deserve this amount. With the exception of a few, three or four or half a dozen of them at the top, the rest do deserve the amount of money that they get. In fact, they ought to be better paid at any rate. At this rate we are not in a position to make any advance any further in nursing services. The nurses available for the different hospitals both in the city and the mufassal are very few, and we want to increase that number by at least double. To increase the number we must have money, and unless and until we try some other means to get some cheaper agency to manage the hospitals we would not be able to progress any further. So, instead of having these costly nurses, I propose to entertain Indian nurses at a cheaper rate. The nurses at present are paid from Rs. 400, 300, 200, 145, the lowest pay being Rs. 50, and the Indian nurses are paid Rs. 40 and Rs. 30. Certainly they are much cheaper. Sir, it is argued that Indian nurses are not so efficient as the English nurses. I do not believe in that statement. Again it is stated that Indian women do not come in large numbers to be trained as nurses. They do not come in large numbers because they are treated in a different way altogether. They are not given the same pay, for instance, as the English nurses. Indianizing the nursing service is the only possible way of improving the service. It is with this intention that I move this motion."

Mr. F. J. RICHARDS:—"Mr. President, I entirely agree with the sentiment expressed by the hon. Mover, a sentiment which I believe is shared by many hon. Members of this House, that nurses are of supreme importance in connexion with medical relief. Members of the profession are the first to admit that however skilful a physician may be, however skilful a surgeon may be, bad nursing will let him down.

"My hon. Friend the mover of this motion has really confined himself to one point, viz., the recruitment of Indian nurses. That again is one, I think, I may say, in which the head of the department as well as the House are in entire sympathy. But there is a very real and substantial difficulty in inducing Indian ladies to come forward and take up this honourable profession.

[Mr. F. J. Richards]

[23rd March 1922]

"There are two schemes at present for the training of Indian nurses.—

"A One of them is the Government scheme at the General Hospital for which there are ten sanctioned appointments, and quarters for ten nurses have actually been built. Five women are entertained at present, and no more can be obtained. In 1920 there were 25 applications, but 14 of the applicants did not return their application forms, three were found to be unsuitable and only five could be entertained. In 1921 there were 22 applicants of whom 14 did not return their application forms; five were entertained, and three were found to be unsuitable. In 1922 so far only one application has been received. There are at present at the General Hospital five Indian nurses only, and it is doubtful how many of them will complete the course.

"The main difficulty in the way of training Indian nurses at the General Hospital is that they are unwilling to work in the men's wards. Now, all-round nursing is absolutely necessary in any hospital, and I think that the members of this House, being of the male sex, would rather resent the suggestion that nursing should be confined to female patients.

"B The second experiment is that started on the initiative of Sir Sivaswami Ayyar and another gentleman resident in Calcutta, Mr. N. R. Ayyar. The idea was to train Brahman or high caste Indian women as nurses at the Victoria Caste and Gosha Hospital. The Superintendent reports that out of seven nurses with which the scheme started, four remain and one has been dismissed, and the Superintendent is very doubtful as to the possibility of training the remaining three.

"I may perhaps at this point summarise the distribution of the Indian nurses in Madras. There are two Indian Christians (who are pupils) at the General Hospital; six Brahmans (who are also pupils) at the Caste and Gosha Hospital; of non-Brahmans there are three pupils at the General Hospital and one at the Caste and Gosha Hospital; and at Royapetta there are ten Indian nurses of whom eight are not fully qualified.

"Regarding the treatment of these nurses as compared with that of the Anglo-Indian nurses, I am informed there is no practical distinction except in the case of diet charges, and even there I think it is a generally understood principle that Indians require a little less than Anglo-Indians.

"One other point I wish to bring to the notice of this House. In the General Hospital last year out of nine sanctioned appointments of nursing sisters, no less than five were vacant; this year, the number vacant is six. Of staff nurses last year, out of 33 sanctioned appointments no less than 20 were vacant. In the current year, of 35 sanctioned appointments, no less than 20 are vacant. In other words, the sisters are two-thirds under strength, and the staff nurses three-fourths under strength. There are several reasons which I need not dilate upon for this reluctance of nurses to remain in service, one of the most serious being matrimony. An important factor is the question of emoluments. The attractions of private practice and the terms offered by the Queen Alexandra Nursing Service are so much more favourable than those which the Government, even after the reorganization can offer that the nurses trained in Government Hospitals tend to drift away to other spheres of work. As regards the importation of nurses from Great Britain, orders have not yet been passed guaranteeing them their passages outward and homeward, and no girl who has to subsist on the low pay that is given to

23rd March 1922]

[Mr. F. J. Richards]

nurses can be expected to come to this country without some guarantee that she would be given passage home again if she is invalided or has to quit service for some other sufficient reason."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Sir, I wish to put in an earnest plea both to the hon. Minister and the Surgeon-General to make serious attempts—I do not mean to say that they are not doing it now—to get the services of Roman Catholic nursing sisters. They are nuns and come generally from very good families in Great Britain, Switzerland, Belgium and other European countries. I have had occasion to see the work that is done by these nursing sisters elsewhere, and I can say that no body of nurses will render such faithful, effective and efficient service as these Roman Catholic nuns. From the point of view of expenditure, their services are not at all costly. They have to be provided of course with free quarters and the necessary clothing, and they have also to be provided with quarters for worship, and besides they will have to be paid a very small amount of money which will just suffice for keeping their body and soul together. The service that they render in the hospitals is not out of desire for money but out of their religious vow. And if we elicit the sympathy of the religious heads of the Roman Catholic religion, I feel confident that the services of at least some of these nursing sisters can be obtained. I put in therefore my earnest plea to the head of the department and to the hon. Minister in charge to enlist the sympathy of these religious heads so as to get the services of the nursing sisters."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"As most of the patients are Indians, and Indians would prefer only Indian nurses, I moved this motion, and now with the assurance of sympathy given by the Secretary I beg leave to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 560 to 570.

3-15 p.m. The following motions were not made :—

Mr. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU :—

560. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,05,630 for *stretches and nurses* by Rs. 52,815.

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO :—

561. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,56,000 for *cost of medicines, etc.*, by Rs. 1 lakh.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

562. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 9,36,914 for *hospitals and dispensaries* by Rs. 100.

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—

563. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,00,000 for *contribution to local bodies* by Rs. 2-50 lakhs.

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO :—

564. To omit the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for *investigation of hookworm disease*.

[23rd March 1922]

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

565. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,47,908 for salaries—Medical College—by Rs. 1,000.

Mr. R. T. KESAVULU PILLAI :—

566. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 90,000 for stipends and books of civil pupils by Rs. 100.

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO :—

567. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 90,000 for stipends and books of civil pupils by Rs. 20,000.

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—

568. To omit the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for women's medical school, Madras.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

569. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,37,700 for medical college and schools by Rs. 100.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

570. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 47,75,347 for Medical Department by Rs. 5,000.

Motion 571.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“ Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

571. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 47,75,347 for Medical Department by Re. 1.

“ My object in moving this resolution, Sir, is just to place before the House and also before the Minister some of the irregularities in the Medical Department.

“ In the first place, Sir, last year when I urged the Minister to indianize the Medical Service, he said—and to-day also he said the same thing—that it was entirely left to the Government of India and the Secretary of State to deal with the Indian Medical Service. I know, Sir, that in this Presidency there are about 56 or 57 appointments over which the Minister has no control whatever. But when he had an opportunity of appointing Indians in places which were created of late, he could have insisted on those places being filled in by Indians. To give an example of such an appointment, I would mention the appointment of the X-ray Specialist in the General Hospital. He is not a doctor, he is not a medical man; he is only an electrician. He was brought to Madras on two years' agreement with the distinct understanding of training assistant surgeons and sub-assistant surgeons. At the end of the two years, Sir, I want to know how many men he has trained, and if he has not trained any, why he has not done so. Now I understand there is a proposal to make him permanent in that appointment. That appointment could very well have been held by an Indian. I know for the matter of that, that the son of a Civil Surgeon who was undergoing training in England was asked to undergo special training in X-rays, but when he came back with the X-rays qualification, the appointment was not given to him. I repeat that that appointment could have been very well given to an Indian. In that way the hon. the Minister has failed to indianize the Medical Service. Then again,

23rd March 1922]

[Mr. U. Rama Rao]

Sir, another place fell vacant in the King's Institute, Guindy, i.e., the place of the Assistant Director of the King's Institute. That place ought to have come to an Indian. It does not come within any of those listed appointments. The Minister was not able to get that place for an Indian, and a member of the Indian Medical Service was called for, and that place was filled by him.

“ Then, Sir, owing to financial stringency lots of temporary Assistant Surgeons' and Sub-Assistant Surgeons' places have been abolished. I welcome that. But when those places were abolished, the Government ought to have taken into consideration the case of those assistant surgeons and sub-assistant surgeons on whom they had not spent any money. They have given notice to those assistant surgeons who have undergone post-cultural training, to men who have undergone health officer's training, and to men who have undergone dental training. All that means cost to the State. Instead, they should have sent away only such of those on whom Government had not spent any money. Without taking this into consideration by sending such men away, the Government have lost the services of very valuable men. When these men go out of the Government service, they set up private practice, and when once they start practice, it is very difficult for Government to get their services back. And after all, they are men who have undergone various training, as I have already said, at the cost of thousands of rupees to the State.

“ Then again, Sir, there is a peculiar thing in the Medical department. These assistant surgeons and sub-assistant surgeons are compelled to pass two septennial examinations before they are promoted to higher posts. Such analogy does not exist anywhere in any other service. Even the I.M.S. officers had once before to pass such examinations, but now they are granted study leave instead. These men who have put in 20, or 15 or 10 years' service are asked to undergo the examination. No doubt the Public Service Commission recommended that these men must not be asked to undergo an examination, but that they must undergo the post-cultural training. But now even when they undergo the post-cultural training, they are made to undergo this examination also. It is very humiliating for a man who has put in some 20 or 23 years of service to be asked to undergo this examination. Though it may not be a written examination, yet the candidate is examined and his efficiency noted, and he is not promoted to the higher grade unless and until the examining officer is satisfied. All these things are unheard of in any other department. By giving the post-graduate training to such men, we spend every year not less than Rs. 25,000 which money could very well be utilised elsewhere, in the shape of travelling allowance, or for purchasing medicine for poorer patients.

“ Then again, with regard to compounders, they are very important persons. The lives of the patients entirely depend on them. They are not trained properly. They are not given any organised training, and they have no schools to undergo the training. They are simply asked to compound in the compounding rooms and they are examined by somebody and given a diploma. So much so, when they come out, they are absolutely useless. They do not know the dose of each drug, and do not know how to compound.

“ Then again, Sir, when I gave notice of a resolution that the Personal Assistant to the Surgeon-General must not be a man of very high grade,

[Mr. U. Rama Rao]

[23rd March 1922]

that resolution was ruled out of order. Anyhow, Sir, there are some appointments for which private practice is not allowed. For instance, the Surgeon-General, the Sanitary Commissioner, the Chemical Examiner, and the Personal Assistant to the Surgeon-General are not allowed to have any private practice. But the present Personal Assistant to the Surgeon-General is allowed to have private practice. These men ought not to be allowed to have any private practice, because they will be influenced from outside. I have nothing to say against the present Personal Assistant to the Surgeon-General, and he is a personal friend of mine, but my complaint is only against the system. That system is bad. It is said that a full-time man is not engaged for that work, he is only paid Rs. 200 extra for the work he does, but if you do not want a full-time man, why do you appoint him at all. The work could as well be done by the Surgeon-General and his Manager, and that money could thus be saved. And if you want the present man to continue, he must not be permitted to have private practice.

"Then as regards the hookworm disease on which we are spending money year after year, that is a very good thing and ought to continue, but I would like to know how much money was spent so far, in what stage the experiments are, and how far it has improved the condition of the people.

"Sir, my object in bringing all these things to the notice of the Council is not with the object of reducing anything at all, but if all these things which I have mentioned will be favourably considered, or if any promise is held out that they will be favourably considered, I am prepared to withdraw my motion."

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, Mr. President, so much has been spoken about the indianisation of the Medical Service. Taking the profession of nurses into consideration, it is not want of any sufficient attraction that is the cause of the dearth of nurses. West has taken to nursing as a profession of honour and as a means of serving humanity, while the East has not come up to that level. That is how, Sir, we are having literate members of very respectable families and even Royal families taking to nursing in the West. So when we say that there are not Indian nurses, it is not because the Government are not willing to encourage them, but because our people are not willing to enter as nursing sisters.

"Again, coming to other services, so much is spoken of about indianisation. Sir, in this connexion let it be remembered that indianisation does not mean 'Brahminisation'—excuse me, Sir, for saying so—for, in the pre-Reform days Indian meant 'Hindu' and 'Hindu' meant a member of a particular community. That is why in the pre-Reform days, we preferred a European oligarchy to any other oligarchy in this land. Now, our Minister has already promised to give effect to this indianisation of the Service. I have got my highest respect for the Indian Medical Service, but if you want to replace it by Indians, I request the Minister to see that communal representation is observed in its minutest details." (Laughter.)

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"Sir, I have got only a few words to say, not in disparagement of the provision made already, but to bring to the notice of the hon. the Minister only a few facts concerning local bodies.

"In the first place, so far as the medical institutions in the mufassal are concerned, those medical institutions which have been in existence prior to 1915 were given and are continued to be given annually a small percentage.

23rd March 1922]

[Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu]

That is, in the case of the sub-assistant surgeons, the municipalities are given 5 per cent and the local boards are given 10 per cent. In the case of civil assistant surgeons, it is I believe $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and $22\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Sir, considering the increased cost and the increased pay of these establishments and the low finance of the local bodies, I would only request the hon. the Minister, if possible and if circumstances should be better during the course of the year, not to forget to make some adequate provision to meet the extra cost of the local bodies.

"Secondly, Sir, for those medical institutions which were started since 1915, no doubt half the cost is given, but the salary of the sub-assistant surgeons and the civil assistant surgeons has been increased without the consent of the local bodies. I object to it on principle. And if the Government wish to increase the salary in order to secure efficient service, they must take our consent beforehand. If they do not care for our consent, they must be prepared to meet the entire extra cost.

3-30 p.m. "Therefore to say that we will do as we please and pay half of the original promised amount only, I say, Sir, is not conducive to the dignity or welfare of the local bodies. Again, Sir, no doubt it is very good of the hon. the Minister to make a provision of 5 lakhs. It is admitted that even this 5 lakhs will not go even to meet half the cost. That is expressly admitted in the note prepared by Government themselves. I hope the Government will be pleased in the course of the year to make an additional provision if that can possibly be done.

"Thirdly, Sir, there is another grievance of the local bodies. That is with reference to the transfer of the medical subordinates. These medical subordinates are transferred by the Surgeon-General from one end of the Presidency to the other end, and the local bodies are made to pay the travelling allowance incurred thereby. I fail to see on what reason the local bodies are made to pay for these travelling allowances. Government retain the control, and I submit it is their duty to provide for the cost involved by the transfer. If it is only a transfer within the district, and if the district board president does it, then of course the local bodies must be called upon to pay for it. But why should the local bodies be called upon to pay for power and control which is entirely in the hands of the Surgeon-General and in the exercise of which even the local presidents are not consulted. Sometime ago it was said or it was so understood that in the matter of transfers local board presidents will be consulted. I have not yet been consulted so far as I am personally aware of on any such transfers. In fact transfers come all on a sudden and transfers come very frequently too and we are told we have no control over this matter. We are powerless. As long as you control, it is but fair that you should bear the cost of the transfer yourself. That is a thing, Sir, which I wish to bring to the notice of the hon. the Minister and request that a speedy redress of that grievance may be granted.

"Lastly as regards the provision for medical buildings I wish to say that either more buildings are necessary here or they require some extension there."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Do medical buildings come within this vote?"

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"They all come under this. A very small amount, Sir, in fact a few thousands are provided this year and

[Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu] [23rd March 1922]

I submit that it is absolutely insufficient to meet the demand. One more thing and I am done. We are not yet in a fair prospect of introducing the system of Unani and Ayurvedic medicines, in the mufassal or in the metropolis. If such a system is evolved, and if that is to be brought into force in the mufassal, it will not only be appreciated by the people who are accustomed to it but it will also cheapen the existing system, that is the western system of medicine. So I submit the sooner the system of Ayurvedic and Unani systems of medicines are introduced the better will it be for all concerned. It is said that the report of the committee will not be out before the end of 1922-23. I submit it is not a very encouraging outlook to wait till the end of the next year. And then, when will it be considered by the Government, when will a system be evolved out of it and when will the institutions be started in the mufassal? I think it will take many years. That is not a very pleasing prospect."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya:—"Sir, I am very highly thankful to the hon. Member for Madras, I mean Dr. U. Rama Rao, for giving us an opportunity to discuss the medical policy of the Government. I am sure he never means to pass a vote of censure on the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government. But certainly, Sir, we have a right to discuss and put forward our proposals or observations on the medical administration of the Presidency. Dr. U. Rama Rao has very rightly called the attention of the hon. the Minister regarding the indianization of services. I think the declaration regarding the increased associations of Indians will have no meaning if we do not from this stage start on a progressive policy of indianizing the services. If such a policy is not pursued, I do not know how the required percentage of 48 per cent will come within ten years. This being a question affecting the whole population, and this Council being mostly of the representatives of the people of this Presidency, and the Ministers being the leaders of the successful party, I think we have a right to question them why such a policy was not followed. For the point raised by Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar I shall not be sorry (I should be very glad) if all the offices are filled by non-Brahmans. What I want is Indianization and not Brahmanization. Let the service be indianized, being filled either by the Brahmans or non-Brahmans. For myself, I shall be very happy and very glad if our non-Brahman friends will take up to responsible posts. Coming to medical aid, I am sorry, Sir, that adequate provision is not made for extended medical relief in this Presidency though too many Government Orders are issued from time to time. I had sad experiences of this when cholera broke out in the district of Ganjam. The sanitary inspectors and the cholera party's doctors that were sent to the districts were utterly useless and leaving the people helpless. In the first place they did not know the nature, customs and the language of the people. So we had to provide them each with servants who could also be interpreters. The pity is that the patients were all Oriyas, and the doctors were all Tamilians. The so-called cholera treatment was therefore utterly useless."

Mr. S. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI:—"Generally speaking, the Medical department is the most important one. Among the Indians when a gentleman meets another gentleman one blesses the other with health, long life and prosperity. The first item that comes is health. So it is the bounden duty of the Government to look after the health of the people. If there is any failure in that department, who is to be blamed? Certainly it is not the Government.

[23rd March 1922] [Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai]

It is the people who ought to be blamed more for that. Generally speaking, our people do not appreciate English treatment. They believe that it costs more. Some of them believe the disease is due to some evil spirit and not due to any disorder in the body. Such being the case, how can they expect any success in the medical department? They generally call the medicine given in the hospital as 'hospital water,' for aqua forms greater part of it. So, after going two or three days to the hospital, they stop away. This is reported as a case cured. In one sense it is true. What else can they do? Whenever a person dies in the hospital they report the case as 'died.' The sense of sanitation and cleanliness of our people is very curious. Our people think it is most holy and clean if they purify their houses with cow-dung. But they think it is most impure if pure water is given by another man in the hospital to be taken in. They think that any kind of dirty water is clean and holy. This thing should vanish before you appreciate the treatment in the English hospitals. Any amount of money spent on this department is well spent, for it is for the purpose of the welfare of the people. Surely the people prefer Indian treatment to the English treatment. I mean the Unani and the Ayurvedic Siddha Vaithya treatment. We must also try to establish it on a scientific basis. There are any amount of vaidyans in India. Their medicine will never cure but in most cases kill people. We must try to do away with such people and establish the system on a scientific basis. You should infuse greater faith in the people by giving them better opportunity to appreciate the treatment. If this thing is introduced by the Government, I think the Government will be doing the greatest good to the people. You should indianize the service, but in doing this you should see to select one who is clever and honest. If you appoint one who will say that the operation was successful but the patient died under chloroform, we do not want such sort of report, and we do not want such a sort of man. There must be clever men and honest men who will do their duty conscientiously not caring for their selfish interest. Most of these surgeons are allowed to have their own private practice. In the villages there is no chemist's shop; every hospital is turned into a chemist's shop. They bring the medicine to their homes for their private practice and they give water as medicine to the poor in the hospital. That practice should be put a stop to. I once more beg that our Medical department should be reorganized and more money should be spent."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I want to have some information from the hon. the Minister. There is one item called 'Contributions to local bodies.' I should like to know whether Government have accepted the recommendation of the Finance Committee and if so whether this five lakhs represents the half-share of the maintenance of the hospitals of local bodies. I believe the hon. the Minister is perfectly aware that the cost of maintaining these institutions has gone up very much. Medicines are certainly much more costly than before. And as has been pointed out by my friend Mr. Narasimhacharlu, the further charges by increase of pay to assistant surgeons and sub-assistant surgeons have been thrown upon these local bodies. The Government have done so even without consulting them. I should like to know from the Minister whether the Government have accepted the recommendation and if so whether this five lakhs represents the half-share."

[23rd March 1922]

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"Sir, the question raised by my friend Mr. Ramachandra Rao is in regard to the recommendation of the Financial Relations Committee. The Government have accepted the principles underlying the recommendations of the Financial Relations Committee, but they have not as yet come to a decision regarding the proportion of the grants to be paid to the medical institutions under local bodies. The amount of five lakhs is not calculated at 50 per cent rate. If 50 per cent grant is to be given to all the institutions, the amount required will be a great deal more. But for the present the idea is that some relief should be given to the local bodies though not at the rate of 50 per cent.

"Now coming to the criticisms of Mr. U. Rama Rao, to begin with I have only to tell him that I have been doing my best to secure as many appointments for Indians as I can. Recruitment to the Indian Medical Service is made by the Secretary of State.

"Sir, the hon. Member has referred to the appointment of assistant director in the King Institute. So far as that appointment is concerned, it is entirely not in my hands, it is in the hands of the Government of India. He has also taken me to task for having appointed Captain Barnard as Radiologist. The captain has a European reputation as a radiologist and his war work is spoken of in very high terms by the highest authorities. We could not have appointed a better man."

Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo :—"May I know, Sir, where his work has been reviewed, in India or in England?"

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"In England and on the Continent. He has completely justified the high expectations and I have no doubt that those of the hon. Members who have visited the institution are sure to appreciate his services.

"Mr. Rama Rao's next criticism is in regard to the post-graduate course to the assistant and sub-assistant surgeons. Better authorities than Mr. Rama Rao consider that such a course is necessary in the interests of the service. He has also complained that the Government have not appointed the son of an assistant surgeon as a radiologist. It is true one Mr. Graham applied for the post but he was not found fit for the place."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"It is not Mr. Graham that I referred to."

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"I do not know whom he means. I should like to know the particular person he is referring to."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"If the hon. Minister wants the name now, I have no objection to give it. It is the son of Doctor Verghese. He has got a letter written by the authorities here."

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"In any case, we have secured the services of the best man available."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"Is he a medical man, Sir?"

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"He is a Radiologist. He may not be an M.B. & B.S. or L.M. & S. of the Madras Medical College or an L.M.P. of the Rayapuram Medical School."

23rd March 1922]

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"But the man I refer to is an M.B. & B.S. of the Edinburgh University. He is not an M.B. & B.S. of the Madras Medical College or an L.M.P. of the Rayapuram Medical School."

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"That may be, but we want a Radiologist and not an M.B. & B.S. of this University or that University. We want an expert in radiology."

"Sir, another criticism which he has levelled against the Government is that compounders should not be given any training. I was rather surprised to hear that from the hon. Member. Medical men seem to think that it is necessary that the compounders should have some sort of training."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"My complaint is that compounders are not given proper training."

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"But the head of the department thinks otherwise. He considers that the training that is given to the compounders is quite good."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"Otherwise, he would have given a better training." (Laughter.)

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"One more complaint of Mr. Rama Rao is regarding the appointment of personal assistant to the Surgeon-General and his having been allowed to have private practice. Perhaps Mr. Rama Rao thinks that it is not desirable to entrust the powers of appointment to a medical officer with private practice. The personal assistant having nothing to do with the appointments, I do not understand why Mr. Rama Rao should take objection to the personal assistant being allowed to have private practice. If we insist on having a full-timed officer as personal assistant to the Surgeon-General and insist on his not having private practice, we have to pay him considerably more, and this the Government are not in a position to do at all events at present. Besides, as matters stand now, that appointment is a listed appointment. No assistant or civil surgeon can be appointed until the Secretary of State accepts the recommendation which, as I stated, this Government had already made."

Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo :—"Has this Government made any recommendation with regard to that?"

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"Yes, Sir; the appointment of personal assistant to the Surgeon-General is one of those appointments which this Government recommended to the Secretary of State to be thrown open to the provincial medical men."

"Sir, as regards hookworm disease, the Local Self-Government Secretary will reply:

"My hon. Friend Mr. Narasimhacharlu has complained, and I must say rightly too, of the hardships which frequent transfers bring on to the local bodies. The Government are alive to these hardships. The Surgeon-General is just now engaged in formulating a scheme which, if adopted, will greatly minimize the hardships. Mr. Narasimhacharlu has also referred to the inadequacy of the provision for medical buildings. I fully sympathize with him and assure him that, if more funds are available, the Government will be glad to make a more generous provision for the medical buildings."

"As regards the points which Mr. Das has raised, they cover the same ground as those of Mr. Rama Rao and so I have nothing more to say than what I have already said."

[23rd March 1922]

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" Regarding cholera parties, Sir ? "

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" Yes, Mr. Das has also referred to the unfitness of the cholera party that was sent to the Ganjam district. My only reply is that I cannot accept the oral statement of Mr. Das. But at the same time I assure him that, if any complaint comes through the proper channel, i.e., either through the district board president or the district medical and sanitary officer, the Government will certainly inquire into the matter and see if there was really anything wrong."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" May I say for the information of the House that the district board had a special committee regarding this and has made certain specific recommendations to the Government ? "

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" The committee has to forward their recommendations to the Government through the district board president."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" I want to know, Sir, from the Minister for Local Self-Government whether in other parts of the world an X-ray man is a medical man or not."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The Minister has already replied."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" But I want to know, Sir, whether in other parts of the world the X-ray man is a layman."

" Another point which has not been answered is whether the X-ray specialist who was specially sent for to train the sub-assistant surgeons, and assistant surgeons has trained them. If not, why has he not trained them ? "

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—" I move that the question be now put."

The motion that the question be put was put and carried.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" I want to withdraw my motion."

The hon. the President said that he was unable to allow the Member to withdraw the motion at that stage as the closure had been moved and carried.

The main motion (of Mr. Rama Rao) was then put and was unanimously negatived.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" I demand a poll, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The motion has been unanimously negatived."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" I said 'aye'."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I did not hear it."

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 48.57 lakhs under Demand XVII—Medical was put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XVIII—PUBLIC HEALTH AND VITAL STATISTICS.

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" I move, Sir, for a grant not exceeding 27.20 lakhs of rupees for the Department of Public Health and Vital Statistics."

[23rd March 1922]

Motion 572.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

572. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 80,100 for general branch by Rs. 15,000.

" This item for which I am making this motion is to be found at page 168 of the budget estimate under the heading 'General branch.' This item, as the House will be able to see, has shown a tendency to go up year by year. In 1920-21 there is a provision for Rs. 44,961, in 1921-22 the budget estimate gives us Rs. 57,600 as compared with the revised estimate of Rs. 60,200. Coming to the budget estimate under discussion we find provision being made for Rs. 80,100. On going through the details, I am led to think that this increase is due partly to the revision of salaries of the assistant directors of public health and partly to the strength of the assistant directors having been raised from three to five. The House will also be pleased to note that each assistant director is started on a salary of Rs. 500 on the incremental scale going up to Rs. 1,000 and in addition thereto he is also permitted to draw a local allowance starting on Rs. 200 and going up to Rs. 350. In the year previous, i.e., 1921-22, we had only three assistant directors of public health, whereas in the lean year in which we are being threatened with a financial crash and when the financial condition may be said to be in a state of despair, provision has been made to increase the cadre by two. It also inevitably carries with it the local allowance of these two officers. I should like to know what necessity has been felt for raising the strength of the assistant directors from three to five. Whatever necessity there might have been, I venture to submit with confidence, having regard to the financial stringency, whether it is not proper to allow it to stand over until matters improve. We cannot think of increasing the staff and increasing the establishment and thereby increasing the burden upon the people, especially when during these five days we have been fighting very hard, if I may say so, and we have been engaged in the task of scraping to the very bone. I am not impressed with the necessity of increasing the strength of the assistant directors from three to five."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" Sir, I strongly oppose this motion on the ground that it is not possible for one assistant director to tour all over the Presidency. If any amount of money is spent upon public health, so much amount will be a saving in the Department of Medicine. Prevention is better than cure and in a matter like public health we are not spending as much as we ought to spend for preventing illness. So, I strongly object to this motion."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—" Sir, having tabled a similar motion, I beg to support this motion. There is an increase of one assistant director of public health made this year. Three has been increased to five and one assistant director omitted; which makes an increase of one. The amount spent on the establishment and on the officers is Rs. 64,394, whereas the amount allowed for public health purposes for the whole Presidency is Rs. 82,677, which will give an average of about Rs. 3,400 for each district. As we all know, the work done by these officers is simply to supervise the vaccination work and to look after the fairs and festivals. To look after the vaccination work there are inspectors who are

[Mr. T. Balaji Rao Nayudu] [23rd March 1922]

paid from provincial funds. There are also the district medical and sanitary officers to look after this work and also the sanitary conditions. These deputy directors or assistant directors are not in any way superior to the district medical and sanitary officers. I do not see any utility in having these officers for only looking after the vaccination and for supervising the arrangements at festivals. That being so, I am in favour of abolishing this establishment, or if that establishment is considered necessary, the Sanitary Commissioner may be done away with and two assistants may be kept on to supervise the work of the local boards, etc. I am not quite in favour of taking away this amount from the budget, but I want it to be used as an addition to the grant already made or for other purposes relating to sanitation and public health. Recently the Government seem to have started a scheme of appointing a few sanitary officers for some districts as a tentative measure. If funds permit, I think other districts may be allowed to have a sanitary officer, each paid from provincial funds. If that scheme is going to be extended, I think more districts may be provided with health officers. With these remarks, I support the motion of my hon. Friend Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" May I ask the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government to give the names of the two gentlemen who have been appointed ? "

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" They are Captain Subrahmanyam and Mr. Adiseshayya.

" Sir, objection has been taken to the appointment of assistant directors of sanitation on the ground that they have not been doing good work hitherto. It is true that hitherto they have been attending to the supervision of vaccination and other unimportant matters; but now the whole scheme has been revised, and according to the present scheme, they have to attend to important matters. Five districts are required to have health committees with qualified staff to attend to sanitary arrangements. In other districts where no such committees are formed, the sanitary work has to be done under the supervision of the assistant directors of sanitation. My hon. Friend Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu suggested that the services of the assistant directors might be utilized in connexion with the formation of health committees in districts other than the five districts. The Government are trying the scheme as an experiment in the five districts. If the experiment proves successful, committees with qualified staffs will be formed in other districts. So far as the present assistant directors are concerned, they are already appointed. I believe my hon. Friend Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar is under the impression that the appointments are to be made in the next year. If so, he is labouring under a mistake. The appointments have already been made. As I have stated, the suggestion of Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu is engaging the attention of the Government. They propose to extend the system of appointing district health committees to other districts. As soon as these committees are formed, and the district health staffs organized, the abolition of appointment of range assistant directors may be considered."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" I understood the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government to state that these two appointments had been made. Turning to page 57 of the Financial Statement, we find that out of the two

[23rd March 1922] [Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

officers, one assistant director was appointed late in the year. There is absolutely no indication in the passage that follows that the other gentleman too has been appointed. These are the words used in the Financial Statement—

'The saving in the revised estimate for 1921-22 as compared with the budget occurs in the lump provision for two additional assistant directors as only one was appointed late in the year.'

'The increase in the budget estimate for 1922-23 as compared with the revised is mainly due to the revision of the pay of assistant directors, to a full year's provision being made for the fifth assistant director.'

" Therefore, I beg to submit that both those posts were not filled when the provision was made in the budget. Anyhow, in view of the statement of the hon. the Minister, that the scheme is under revision, that experiments of having committees in some districts is about to materialise, I do not want to weaken the hands of Government by pressing this motion to a division. In view of the sympathetic statement made by the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government, I beg leave to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 573 to 577.

The following motions were not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—

573. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,49,400 for public health by Rs. 64,394.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

574. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,45,576 for public health establishment by Rs. 20,000.

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—

575. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 40,000 for grants on account of municipal health officers by Rs. 20,000.

Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO :—

576. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,320, the cost of eight cholera duty assistant surgeons, by the cost of four.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

577. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 26,63,676 for public health by Rs. 100.

Motion 578.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I beg to make the following motion :—

578. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 27,07,676 for public health by Rs. 100.

" Sir, my object in tabling this motion is to raise the question of the general policy which underlies the administration of this department. I am afraid that in this department we have far too many high officers without ever having the means by which we can carry out the several plans they would naturally put forward as a result of their investigations. That, I think, is a mistaken policy to be adopted anywhere. I think none of us should go in for advice if we are not prepared to act on that advice or if we have not the necessary means to carry out that advice into practice. We have a sanitary commissioner and five assistant directors and a huge establishment. I should like to know what it is that we can do to profit by the several wise counsels which I have no doubt they are giving us from time to time.

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [23rd March 1922]

I may tell the hon. the Minister that, even if a humble individual like myself is deputed to go about the country and suggest means for improving sanitation, etc., he will find that he will have more suggestions than he can possibly attend to. I shall go from village to village and suggest to the Minister that manure pits should be removed to outside the village limits, stagnant pools should be covered, that prickly-pear should be cut and burnt, and so on. Why, I can multiply my suggestions. But what is it that the Minister can do? He has no money with him to carry out any of my suggestions. If these modest proposals I have enunciated have failed for want of funds, what should I say of the unduly costly schemes which these highly paid officials would find it necessary to put forward to justify their appointments? I think the whole system requires a thorough overhauling. Take for example the question of Director of Town-planning. They appointed Mr. Molony for a year."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Does town-planning come within this vote?"

MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Yes, Sir, it is included in this vote. I myself was astonished to see town-planning included under this head. Now, Sir, Mr. Molony was working for a year. I know him very well and he is likely to have given the Government new schemes. He should have flooded the hon. the Minister with new proposals. I find that a successor has been appointed and it will be the same story with him also. I do not think any useful purpose will be served by continuing these high officers without carrying out the plans they suggest and would appeal to the hon. the Minister to take that aspect of the matter into consideration. I am sure the hon. the Minister has his sympathies with me though his official reply may belie what he has in his heart."

MR. F. J. RICHARDS:—"My hon. Friend, the mover of this motion, 4-15 p.m. suggests that ordinarily one does not seek advice unless one sees one's way to carrying it out. This reminds me, if I may dilate for a moment, of a man who went to consult a specialist about his health. He was a Scotchman. The specialist asked him to abstain from all his favourite weaknesses, to give up his tobacco, his whisky and soda, his coffee, tea and cocoa and in fact everything he liked. As the man took up his hat to leave, the specialist asked 'What about my 3 guineas?' 'What for,' asked the patient. 'Three guineas for my advice' was the reply. The patient retorted 'But I am not taking your advice.'

"I am afraid, Sir, a little too much of that spirit prevails among local bodies and in this House with regard to the Director of Public Health and his assistants. Complaint has been made—and that, I think, is almost the only point that I have to answer—that too many 'high officers' are appointed, and that they can do nothing if they have not got the staff or the money to carry out their views. That exactly is the position. As was already explained in the debate on the resolution previous to this, I am sorry to have to retrace the ground that has been traversed—at the present moment we are at the parting of ways; an entirely new policy is under contemplation. District health staffs and district health boards are to be tried in five selected districts. Three cholera parties have already been disbanded and divided up among those districts. A number of health officers

23rd March 1922] [Mr. F. J. Richards]

have been trained. If the scheme after a year or so of trial proves successful, if ways and means can be found to expand it, and if other district boards are prepared to adopt the experiment, it may be possible to do away with a number of these 'high officers'. But it would be madness at the present moment, when preventive measures are so extraordinarily backward in this Presidency, to get rid of these officers before the new scheme is assured of success and before all districts are equipped with preventive officers and staff.

"It is necessary, even if these assistant directors were abolished, that there should be a few expert officers at headquarters to co-ordinate the knowledge gained in special branches of preventive medicine. I am informed that there are no less than nine such officers in the Bengal Presidency; none of them are 'range' officers like our present Assistant Directors. They are all engaged at headquarters in collating and putting into form, both practical and useful, the information derived from the districts. I hope the House will bear with me for a moment if I give a concrete instance. Under present arrangements, if there is an outbreak of cholera in a district the cholera party is wired for. The medical officer and his sanitary inspectors (and possibly also a deputy sanitary commissioner) proceed to the spot. It takes time for them to get there, four or five days, possibly a week or more. An epidemic of cholera reaches its maximum intensity in a very short time—it may be within 24 hours. It may have begun to die out before the cholera party arrives. That is not *prevention*. Now in most districts of this Presidency cholera breaks out at definite seasons and travels from village to village along a definite route. It is a matter for local investigation to ascertain the dates on which outbreaks may be expected and the routes they will probably follow in each area in the district and by skilled investigation it should be possible to determine within a margin of error of a week or so either way when an outbreak is likely to occur and to take steps to prevent it. It will be a real economy both in labour and in human life, if preventive measures can be made really preventive and if the local preventive staff can anticipate the period of outbreak.

"Money has been referred to by some hon. Members as the chief necessity. But I am inclined to think that the greatest necessity at the present moment is not so much money as work and hard thinking. I may cite as an example the campaign against hookworm, which has not yet been discussed. Objection has been taken that we know all about hookworm and its cure. Now we know that about 98 per cent of the population of this Presidency is infected with hookworm and it has been pointed out that if all local agencies would set themselves to establish units of their own, with very little expense hookworm might be stamped out. The hookworm problem is now a matter of campaigning. It has passed the investigation stage. Two things are necessary—(1) treatment and (2) propaganda against ignorance. Now, if arrangements could be made to treat every patient in every hospital and dispensary, every convict in every jail, if every mission or social service association takes up the campaign, if treatment could be accorded in every industrial school, orphanage and asylum, if every landlord on behalf of his tenants, and every local board, municipality or criminal settlement would establish units of their own, this scourge, which so seriously impairs the man-power of this country, would be eradicated. Action on these lines would not be expensive. But the public conscience is not sufficiently

[Mr. F. J. Richards]

[23rd March 1922]

aroused, and the public are not sufficiently informed of the dangers of this disease to set local agencies going. But until these local agencies take up the work, it would be a gross dereliction of duty for the Government to relax their efforts to stimulate preventive activities.

"One more word, Sir, and that is as regards the appointment of the Town-planning Officer. The appointment of Mr. Dann was decided on before the discussion on the budget last year, and before the appointment of Mr. Molony. It would, I think, be out of order to discuss at a budget meeting the work done by Mr. Molony. Mr. Dann is now endeavouring to tackle the housing problem. I am perfectly sure that there is no member of this House who is not deeply interested in the improvement of housing. A superficial acquaintance with this subject will convince any one that a solution of the problem is utterly impossible if the cost is to be met solely from taxation either by the Provincial Government or by local bodies. On the other hand, such experience as we have had shows that improvements in housing can be effected on a self-supporting basis in some cases, on a basis which is very nearly self-sufficing in others, and in other cases again, on a basis which is actually remunerative. It is for every local body—and I think every member of this House also—to consider whether it is not possible to improve the conditions under which people live not only in Madras City, but also in the mufassal on rational business lines, so that the increase in land values accruing from the improvements effected may be secured for the benefit of the tax-payer instead of inflating the profits of private speculators. It is hoped that on these lines Mr. Dann will be able to justify his appointment."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I agree with the hon. Member who has just now spoken that it is desirable to make all efforts for the improvement of public health and to form district units for the purpose of organizing a regular system for carrying out that object. At the same time, I find it impossible to subscribe to the proposition that what is important is not so much funds as hard thinking. It is there that I entirely disagree with him. It is my duty to place before the Council certain facts to show that the local bodies are not in a position to carry out all the objects they have in view as the hon. the Government Member desires. It is said that instructions of the sanitary officers have to be carried out. It is also pointed out that they must consider means by which the masses are to be regularly instructed by health propaganda. I may assure him that we have been paying consideration to this aspect as much as possible. We have also organized in some places Public Health Committees. But though we have organized public health committees we have not been able to achieve anything useful; we have not the means to vote for funds for carrying out these works. In most of the rural parts what is needed is good drinking water. Time was when the Government gave liberal grants for that purpose as minor sanitary grants. These grants have now been stopped. No doubt if application is made for some specific purpose, grants for relief are given; but there is no regular system as in former years for improving the water-supply in these rural areas. So long as the question is not looked at from that standard, it is not possible to effect any improvement in that direction. We were again told that the recommendations of the sanitary officers ought to have been attended to by the local bodies. It is true. But if the recommendations involved items of expenditure which they cannot meet, what are they to do? Nobody knows more than the Secretary for

23rd March 1922] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

Local Self-Government Department the fact that several of the local bodies have sent up proposals to close hospitals and dispensaries for want of funds. That is the state in which they are at the present moment. Does he expect that they will, without substantial financial assistance from the Government, be able to carry out any useful work for the improvement of the public health of the districts? Apart from the principles and theories put forward, if the Government really wish that the public health in the Presidency ought to be improved, it must be in the direction of carrying out such measures in district centres. Is it supposed that five or six officers who make periodical visits now and then to the various districts will be able to do useful work considering the area of the Presidency and considering the magnitude of the various districts? It is impossible to believe that under these circumstances they will be able to do their work satisfactorily. We must therefore devise a measure by which each district will be a unit by itself, a self-contained unit and will be able to carry out all measures concerning public health. If this financial question is not settled, there is no use asking local boards to work out some theoretical policy unless after examining carefully the resources of every local board he is able to lay his finger on a particular item of revenue available for the purpose. If it is not possible to point out any income at their disposal available for this purpose, it is necessary for the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government to place the whole case before the combined Government and see that adequate grants are given. If no such efforts are made, I may assure this House that the appointment of five or six officers or even more without proper allotment of funds will not serve any useful purpose, however long we may discuss this aspect of the question."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, the whole question of public health is beset with many difficulties, and the main difficulty is one of finance. I know that the five gentlemen are very admirable men in themselves, and I am certain they will write very admirable reports, which will be printed and reviewed and then sent to the local bodies for explanation and the explanation will come that there is no money to be spent on public health."

Mr. F. J. RICHARDS :—"I thought it was made clear in the debate on the previous resolution that it is not proposed to increase the number of 'range' assistant directors and that, of the five men, three are on a temporary footing and only two are permanent and that it is not proposed in the immediate future to place any more on a permanent footing. We are at present in a transitional period; the three existing ranges must be retained till district health staffs are sufficiently organized to replace them and meanwhile two or three assistant directors will be put in specialist's work at headquarters on the lines that have already been explained."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, the hon. Member's explanation has not improved my position. My contention is this; that whatever my hon. Friend may do, whatever the new public health board may say, whatever the district public health board or committee which has to be formed is likely to do, all their suggestions will ultimately result in financial proposals. I do not suppose my hon. Friend will deny that proposition. Unless therefore the question is tackled on financial considerations, nothing definite will be achieved. I may give an illustration. In one of our northern

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [23rd March 1922]

districts, at one time, the district officer and the assistant health officer went round the whole village and drew up about two hundred to three hundred reports of inspection. The proposals contained in those reports, if carried out, would have meant several crores of rupees. Therefore the whole question, if the hon. the Minister is anxious to improve the position, is to seriously consider where the money is to come from.

"Suggestions have been made, and one of them was that it is contemplated to acquire lands in the neighbourhood of towns. My hon. Friend Mr. Richards said that either the Government or the local bodies will immediately acquire land for the purpose of development in the neighbouring parts of the town. That is diverting into the pockets of the tax-payers or local bodies all the profits of speculators. But has anything been done in that direction?"

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"I assure my friend, Sir, that in many cases sites have been acquired and large tracts of land have been acquired by the Government."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I am delighted to know that; I am still more delighted that the hon. the Minister has risen to tell us that. Is it in the neighbourhood of the Government House. (The hon. the Minister : 'No'.) Is it in the neighbourhood of Madras? (The hon. the Minister : 'Yes'.) Very well; so all our improvements centre round the City of Madras."

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"Even in the mufassal. Some of the municipalities have been asked to acquire lands."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I claim acquaintance with the municipal administration. Schemes have been put forward time after time and they have all been turned down. I do not blame the present Minister, but we have no system of finance and the whole trouble arises from our not looking squarely in the face of this important question as to how we are to finance our town-planning schemes. Unless the hon. the Minister is in a position to announce a policy of financing these large town-planning schemes which have been pending for a long time, I do not think there is any likelihood of any improvement in our position."

"Another question of great importance which has a bearing on public health is that many of these drainage and water-supply schemes have been pending for years without any financial prospect. I know the whole question was reviewed five years ago and schemes involving three to four hundred lakhs for water-supply and drainage have been pending for want of funds. Nothing has been done, and in the present budget, an inadequate sum of five lakhs has been provided for that. My hon. Friend may say that the present financial position does not allow more. But this must come from loan funds. If my hon. Friend wishes to do any good in the way of improving public health he must largely centre his activities on loan transactions. I am certain it has nothing to do with the current revenues of the province at all. Again, the whole question is ultimately a question of finance. And if the hon. the Finance Member and my hon. Friend the Minister will put their heads together and put forward a definite and comprehensive scheme of improvement, it is only then that these three officers who have been newly appointed will be useful."

23rd March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

"Only one other matter, Sir, and that is, some reference has been made to the Town Planning officer. Sir, we are told that he was appointed before Mr. Molony's appointment was made and he has come here, and I think he has come for a definite term of years. I think he will draw very admirable plans again. We have Mr. Lanchester's plans for the improvement of Madras; we had Mr. Geddes's and we shall have more. Of course they will all be admired and finally pigeon-holed. And when this Town-planning Officer departs from here, I do not think any more improvements will have been effected than what have been there already. That again is a question of finance. He will draw up schemes and submit them to the Government and my friend the Surgeon-General will admire them and forward them to the Minister and the Minister will forward them to the municipalities, and the municipalities will say they have no money, and then the whole matter will come to an end. Therefore I think the whole question of public health ultimately resolves itself into a question of finance. If there is one policy which the Minister may evolve, for the improvement of sanitation, for the improvement of towns and cities and for any improvement in our rural life, it depends on this question of finance; so every problem is beset with difficulty and ultimately it resolves itself into a question of finance. I do not object to these five appointments; I wish success to the experiment, but I fear that it will end in nothing as many other experiments have done."

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI :—"Especially because I am a representative of the rural areas I wish to say a few words. The condition of public health, sanitation and water-supply in rural areas is simply wretched. I cannot say that the amount which is now allotted for the purpose, namely, 27 lakhs, is a bit in excess. I think more may be given if it can be properly spent and in the right direction. I do not want to discuss the question as to the necessity or otherwise of the appointment of the additional deputy directors or assistant deputy directors. It is for the Government to see whether such an appointment is necessary. They are the controlling authority. No doubt in many cases it is left to the local bodies. In communication with them they may decide the question. Anything that could be saved may well be spent on the improvement of sanitation and water-supply. People suffer very much—I may say they are almost grovelling in filth and dirt in the rural areas. No money is properly spent in that direction. I see from the budget all that is provided for on account of water-supply, etc., is Rs. 8,00,000 which is inadequate. Even the amount that was sanctioned has not been utilized in the rural areas. I would ask the hon. the Minister to see to this point and issue distinct instructions to the local bodies to attend to the matter of improvements of sanitation, to the public health and water-supply in rural areas."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"Mr. President, Sir, no other question is better connected with the well-being of the rural population than public health. On this matter the Local Government was pleased to accept the recommendations of the Financial Relations Committee regarding the minor sanitary grants. Hitherto, the minor sanitary grants to local bodies were on an average coming to 12 lakhs. If you take the grants that were made hitherto, for the last 10 or 12 years, it comes to twelve and odd lakhs a year. This amount was given up because the Financial Relations Committee has recommended it. If the Government had accepted other recommendations of the Financial Relations Committee in other directions in

[Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju] [23rd March 1922]

which the aid is to be given to the local bodies and then accepted this recommendation it would have been quite different. On the other hand, without accepting any other recommendation, such as contribution for secondary education, aid for medical relief and various other objects, they simply accepted the recommendation of the Financial Relations Committee that they should not give any grant in this particular direction. That is a very unsatisfactory policy. The masses in the rural areas cannot be satisfied by any other measure which the Government may adopt in the matter of public health. The first thing which the rural population is mainly concerned with is drinking water-supply. What does it matter to the masses so long as they do not get their drinking water-supply? There are various villages where drinking water cannot be obtained and the villagers have to go a long distance to get water; sometimes they have to go miles even to get their fresh water-supply. The only answer I expect of the Government is that they have given new powers to the local bodies to augment their resources and to say that it is their duty to make arrangements for water-supply. I may mention here, Sir, that it is all illusory to say that the resources of the local bodies could be augmented. I may mention, Sir, that though the new Act was in force for a very short time, the local bodies have almost taxed to the full extent and they find their resources are not enough even to meet the ordinary demands, because the cost of maintaining the services they are maintaining has gone up and so it gives no satisfaction at all to say: 'We have augmented your resources, you had better tax yourself and get your water-supply.' That is a very unsatisfactory state of things. I hope the Government will re-examine the whole question and do something for the masses in this direction.

"In this connexion I wish to point out that the resources of the Local Government were augmented during the course of these two years by the new settlement of provincial and imperial revenue to the extent of nearly two and a half crores, but all that went towards the augmentation of the pay of the public services and not a single pie went for the improvement and well-being of people in the rural areas."

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"Sir, I have nothing more to say except to add a word or two in reply my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramachandra Rao's remarks. He said that everything depended upon the financial position. I do not deny this, but we cannot postpone the execution of certain schemes until we get money. It may be that we are faced this year with a deficit budget, but this state of things may not continue for ever. We must be prepared with schemes even if we have no funds for their execution. Moreover there are schemes which may not require large investments and yet the execution of which may require skilled supervisor. For instance, dealing with hookworm disease requires more propaganda and preventive measures, which may not cost large outlay. The assistant sanitary directors are expected to arrange for propaganda as well as actual preventive work. In these circumstances, I do not think it would be advisable to do away with these officers. I quite sympathise with those of my hon. Friends who deplored the fact that we have not been able to budget for costly schemes, but I need hardly say that is due to the fact that our revenues for the year have considerably fallen."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—"Might I ask for some information, Sir? The hon. Member Mr. Richards, in the course of his remarks, referred

23rd March 1922] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

to the hookworm disease and I find the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government has also spoken of this disease. I think the hon. Member Mr. Richards said that 98 per cent of the people of this province are infected with this hookworm. This is an alarming statement. (Laughter.) He went further on to say that the result of the infection, if unchecked, would be the destruction of the man-power of India. Sir, if 98 per cent of the people of this province are infected by this disease, I think it might very well be that 50 per cent of the hon. Members of this House are also infected (laughter). Therefore, Sir, I should like to have some information on that point, on what authority Mr. Richards has made that statement. If his statement is well supported by evidence, I should like to know what steps the Sanitary Department have taken or are intending to take in order to eradicate this pest."

Mr. F. J. RICHARDS :—"I had hoped to be able to place on the table of this House two pamphlets which would answer fully the questions asked by my hon. Friend. The pamphlets are in the press, but unfortunately I could not get them in time. I think probably to-morrow I can place the pamphlets in his hands and the hands of other members of the House. I do not wish to take up the time of the House in answering in detail his question at the present moment. It is rather a long story."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I wish only to make a few observations before I withdraw this motion. The hon. Mr. Richards as well as the Minister for Local Self-Government referred to the hookworm disease. I think the question of hookworm disease is an imperial matter, and if so, the Central Institute at the headquarters should, strictly speaking, look to this matter and further, from what has been said it appears that there is nothing more to be done in the matter. All that can be known is known and what remains to be done is only to popularise the information that we have already got, and for that I do not think why we should have a provision of Rs. 15,000 under that item. It is not a small sum at all and I would only refer to the hon. the Revenue Member who considered that even Rs. 25 was a very big sum for him and ask whether Rs. 15,000 which is many times over Rs. 25 is not a big sum. If it can be saved, it has to be saved. As regards the other points, I do not think it has been seriously disputed that while we are not able to spend much money upon schemes, we are spending on establishment more than what is necessary. However, I withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 27.20 lakhs under Demand XVIII—Public Health and Vital Statistics was put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XIX—AGRICULTURE.

The hon. Bai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"I beg to move for a grant not exceeding a sum of Rs. 14.82 lakhs under Demand XIX—Agriculture."

[23rd March 1922]

Motions 579 to 581.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—

579. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,600 for Personal Assistant to the Director of Agriculture.*

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI :—

580. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,600 for Personal Assistant to the Director.*

Mr. O. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

581. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,600 for additional assistant to the Director.*

Motion 582.

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—“ I beg to make the following motion :—

582. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,600 for additional assistant to the Director.*

“ I move, Sir, this motion only to elicit information as to what are the qualifications and duties of the additional assistant to the Director.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“ Sir, the additional assistant's place is perhaps better described as a statistical assistant's place. The question was raised last year, Sir, and this House was pleased to sanction the appointment. On that occasion, I brought to the notice of the House that the information prepared by this officer was demanded by the Cotton Committee and the Board of Agriculture, and I also pointed out the various advantages accruing to the Government and to the country from the preparation of these statistics. In addition to these bodies, the Cotton Committee and the Board of Agriculture, two other bodies of a responsible kind, have also recommended the preparation of these statistics, after the above debate took place in this House. The Sugar Committee and the Industrial Committee have also recommended an intensified preparation of statistical information. Sir, the duty of examining statistics by tahsildars hitherto undertaken by the Board of Revenue is now transferred to the Agricultural department. Orders are in the course of being issued in this matter. This was originally agreed upon in G.O. No. 2290, dated 13th October 1919, but it was held in abeyance with a view to consider the question of the simplification of the karnam's accounts. Such simplification is found impossible and all the work of statistics done by the Board of Revenue will have to be hereafter undertaken by the Board of Agriculture, that is, by the special officer. The preparation of the weekly season report should also be undertaken by the Director of Agriculture, as also the return of retail prices. At present 6 crops are being forecasted; in all 18 periodical forecasts relating to paddy and industrial crops are submitted by the karnams, revenue inspectors and tahsildars. There is also a demand for statistics of the main food crops, such as ragi, cholam, cumbu, varagu, Italian millet and samai. There is also a difficult problem of the estimates of outturn of mixed crops.

“ The advantages of these crop forecasts and statistics can never be over-estimated. They give us an idea of our food supplies and will enable us to prepare ourselves against famine or scarcity conditions. They also assist the producer and the trader in this country in fixing prices especially

[23rd March 1922] [Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu]

in the case of forward contracts. To be forewarned is always to be forearmed and the statistics are useful as indicating to the ryot, to the merchant and even to the foreign trader and manufacturer, to Government and public men, the barometer of production which so largely guides the barometer of prices. These statistics are thus useful to the country as well as to the Government.

“ The question is also, to some extent, of international importance. The international character of the trade in sugar and cotton is well known. India can no longer remain in isolation. The trade in and the prices of her industrial crops are determined by the world markets and accurate statistics are all the more necessary to steady her markets. Information as to the total quantity and value of agricultural produce and the average annual income of the agricultural classes from year to year is useful as showing where we stand and what the essentials are for the country's further progress. It is to statistics that we must turn in order to obtain answers to several questions which are of vital importance to the country. The following are some such questions :—

(1) The pressure of population on the soil and the question of an approaching insufficiency of food supply, a problem which very often threatens our country, as already mentioned.

(2) The replacement of extensive by intensive cultivation.

(3) Changes in the economics of agriculture and changes in agricultural conditions due to changes in prices and wages of labour and other causes.

(4) Variations in livestock and their sufficiency or otherwise.

(5) The proportion of breeding to young stock and how this is affected by the spread of cultivation as giving an index to our supply of milk, wool, skin, meat, etc.

“ The factors of statistical importance are (1) production, (2) consumption, (3) amount in stock and (4) prices. Their future inter-relation at any moment has to be judged from their inter-relation in the past. Another use of price statistics is to show the changes in the purchasing power of money and this is essential if the economic phenomena of different countries or at different periods are to be compared. This is done by the use of index numbers. Again, the comparison of wages and prices shows the improvement in the economic condition of the people which is the vital concern of every civilized Government.

“ Sir, all this work is being attended to by this one officer who is assisted by a very small staff. Last year I brought to the notice of the House what agencies America employs in preparing this statistical information. There is considerable demand for our forecasts even as they are. The Tuticorin Cotton Merchants' Association and several cotton traders in Bombay are constantly asking for our reports and the last mentioned are urging for more frequent reports on cotton. The Agricultural Department is also publishing returns every week of the cotton received at mills and pressed and the returns are sent to 104 companies or individuals interested in cotton. The value of these statistics has been repeatedly acknowledged by the trade. All this work has to be done by the Statistical Assistant.

“ I have to say only one word more, Sir. In a letter, dated 2nd March 1922, the Secretary to the Indian Central Cotton Committee has observed as

[Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu] [23rd March 1922]

follows about the Madras forecast: 'I believe Madras is considerably ahead of several other provinces in the accuracy of the figures.'

"I have submitted how these figures are necessary and it is impossible that these figures could be prepared except with the help of a specialist. I may also bring to the notice of this House, Sir, that this specialist Mr. Viswanatha Rao has been asked for by the Government of India for their statistical work and the Director of Agriculture found it impossible to spare his services and in order not to stand in his way was prepared to recommend him for a higher salary. We have got a very able officer and the figures furnished by him are more accurate than those in any other province and I think it will be a great disservice to the country if this appointment is taken away."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I should like to have one small information. I think the hon. the Minister said that this was a portion of the work hitherto done by the Board of Revenue. So, is this a new appointment?"

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"It is not a new appointment."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"May I know whether, in consequence of the reduction of the work of the Board of Revenue, there has been any reduction in the establishment of the Board? This is a very relevant inquiry. I do not wish to discuss the international importance of these statistics."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"Whether my hon. Friend wishes to discuss the international importance of these statistics or not, no Government can claim to be civilized if it does not prepare statistics. As for the question with which my hon. Friend is more interested, viz., whether there was any reduction in the establishment of the Board of Revenue, I may tell him that the establishments hitherto doing this work will be transferred to this work under the additional assistant."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 583.

5 p.m. The following motion was not made:—

Mr. B. MWUNISAMI NAYUDU:—

583. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 9,000 for additional assistant to the Director.

Motion 584.

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

584. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for duty allowance to personal assistant.

"Sir, it does not need many words to commend this motion to the House. We are bound to support the wishes of this House, that as far as possible all the duty allowances which are now being given should be abolished. With these few words, I move this proposition."

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI:—"Sir, I have given notice of a similar motion. I think that the duty allowances given to the various officers

23rd March 1922] [Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi]

should be abolished. The Members of the House have expressed themselves in no uncertain terms regarding the omission of these duty allowances. We find that duty allowance is provided for the personal assistant to the Director of Agriculture at the rate of Rs. 100 a month. We, at first, understood that the Government intended these duty allowances only as a temporary measure intended to remedy some adverse circumstances which are of a temporary character. But they are continuing these duty allowances always. It seems to me that no good case has been made out to allow these duty allowances. The Government must go into the whole question, as recommended by the Salaries Committee and see whether these allowances can be merged in salaries or dispensed with. I therefore press for deletion."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"Sir, so far as these duty allowances are concerned, it seems to me that the House is more or less determined to take them away. In fact, in one or two previous cases they have been done away with already. Whether the cause is the same as mentioned by my hon. Friend, I may say that I do not wish to go against the wishes of the House. There is only one matter which I must, however, bring to the notice of the House, namely, that while they accepted to omit, or rather have taken away the duty allowances of some officers in the city of Madras, they have not taken away similar allowances in the case of others. Of course, if it were left to me, I should have said that in the city of Madras where these officers live, the cost of living is higher than in the mufassal, and the house-rent alone covers a large portion of the allowance that we are giving. Anyhow as the House is of opinion, and as it appears to me the whole House is anxious, that these allowances should be taken away, I do not wish to oppose this motion. But, Sir, if finally it turns out that some officers in the city of Madras are allowed and others are not allowed this duty allowance, we may have to come before the House with an additional application or a supplementary demand for grant, so that there may be some consistency of procedure in this matter. For the present, I am prepared to accept the motion of my hon. Friend Mr. Tangavelu Pillai."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—"Sir, in supporting this motion, I beg to state for the information of the House that we, the members of this House made a serious mistake. There were some motions for the omission of duty allowances, and some were voted against, under the head 'Land Revenue.' Then we thought that the matter ended in a compromise by the hon. the Revenue Member consenting to deduct Rs. 5,00,000 from the total grant under that head, and that all the items of duty allowances allowed to the deputy collectors lent to the various departments would go under that head. So when we discussed other items in the budget, there was no opposition about these duty allowances, or anybody getting them. But later on, it is stated that all the deputy collectors who were lent to other departments like General Administration, etc., were not affected. If that is so, the personal assistant to the Chief Conservator of Forests and the personal assistant to the Inspector-General of Registration are the only unfortunate men who are to suffer by the resolution carried by the House. If the general opinion expressed in this House of omitting all duty allowances is not to be given effect to by the Government, but only the particular duty allowances voted against will be cut out, I think we will either have to cut out all the duty allowances or give back the duty allowances specifically voted

[Mr. T. Balaji Rao Nayudu] [23rd March 1922]

against. In fact, there is no reason why a number of officers in the Presidency town, for instance the Assistant Secretary of the Finance Department, temporary Additional Secretary, Revenue Under Secretary, Development Under Secretary, Under Secretary of the Law Department and Assistant Secretary to the Board of Revenue, should get the duty allowances; and only the personal assistant to the Chief Conservator of Forests and the personal assistant to the Inspector-General of Registration should lose their duty allowances? If that is so, we shall have to deduct all the duty allowances, or allow the hon. the Home Member to bring in a supplementary demand for grant in the case of these two officers of the Presidency town. In regard to the officers of the mufassal, my opinion, as also the sense of the House, is, that the duty allowances should be disallowed for all officers of all classes."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I also gave notice of a similar motion. I thought, Sir, that after the hon. the Minister has agreed to take away this duty allowance, the motion might be withdrawn so that it might be utilised by the department in other ways. Whatever that may be, a grave position has been raised, namely, that because an understanding was practically come to that all duty allowances should go away, we thought we need not press the motions for omissions of duty allowances in some departments. The only difference we thought was that in non-votable items which affect civilian officers they might not be bound by the decisions of this Council, and the two civilian officers that spoke on that subject would not take the responsibility of cutting short the duty allowances which are non-votable. So far as the votable items of duty allowances were concerned, I think a few motions were pressed and voted upon in some cases, and in the cases they were carried by a large majority. Therefore, in any case, a kind of understanding was come to, and some cases of duty allowances were not taken up, as it was thought that it was left to the Executive officers of the departments to similarly cut them off. Our opinion was not that any one or two of these duty allowances should go so far as votable officers are concerned. I am sure that some of us would bring a resolution so that it would also be possible to cut down the duty allowances in non-votable cases also, as we believe that it would be considered invidious that some officers should draw duty allowances while others do not, that highly paid officers should receive the allowance while officers on lower pay are not allowed to draw it. I think that all officers who are now receiving duty allowances should continue to do so, unless we are able to decide that no one should receive it at all. So I would request the House to consider the position before disposing of this motion."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir, as I was specifically referred to by my hon. Friend Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu, I think I ought to make my position somewhat clear in regard to these duty allowances. It was urged by him, if I understood him aright, that because I agreed to a lump deduction of Rs. 5 lakhs from the total grant which I had asked on behalf of my department, and as the Council had already voted against the duty allowance in respect of one particular set of unfortunate officers, therefore there was a sort of understanding in his own mind that I was going to effect a similar stoppage of duty allowances in the case of other officers about whom motions had been tabled but either were not discussed, or if discussed were not pressed. May I remind the hon. Member that the reduction of Rs. 5 lakhs which was of course discussed and

23rd March 1922] [Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

voted upon by this House was the last item in the agenda of that day. All the motions which related to the elimination of duty allowances in regard to a variety of heads which were embraced in my grant had been previously before the House; some of them, as I said, were not pressed, and some of them discussed and withdrawn. It was only in regard to the Indian settlement officers and the assistant settlement officers that I complained that the Council had shown their wrath in the extreme. I tried to save them from that wrath but I found myself helpless. I was able to understand the attitude of the House by reason of the fact that Settlement officers and Survey officers have unfortunately been criticised rather adversely in this House more often than once. There was, I submit, no sort of undertaking between myself and the House as regards the duty allowances which were neither discussed nor pressed. The only duty allowance which was discussed and carried by the House was the duty allowance relating to the Settlement Department. To that extent, I confess I will take the sense of the House into consideration. But that I should extend the same action in regard to departments where duty allowances have not been withdrawn by the vote of the House, I do not think, Sir, would be in any way a correct position to adopt. Nor is it indeed correct to infer that I agreed definitely, when the final vote for the reduction of Rs. 5 lakhs was passed, to extend a similar process of elimination of duty allowances wherever the words 'duty allowance' occurred in the whole budget grant relating to the department. I just wish to clear that misapprehension."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"As I also have been referred to, I think, Sir, it is incumbent on me to say a few words in order to bring out clearly, as I understand it, the position which has now arisen. Hon. Members or some of them have realized the fact that the effect of their resolutions will be to penalise one individual or two individuals out of many who are practically in an identical position. I refer to those officers who are on the cadre of the Deputy Collectors and hold selective appointments in the city of Madras. I will not take it any further—to any wider area—as I understand that is the point taken. It had special relation to an officer in whom I have particular interest, the personal assistant to the Chief Conservator of Forests. I did my utmost to prevent the Council from carrying a motion depriving that deserving officer of a duty allowance, but I was unsuccessful. I had to send word to him that I much regretted the decision of the Council which I thought involved an injustice to him, but that as the resolution had been carried, I saw no means of evading the force of it and must therefore give him the alternative of resigning his present appointment and going back to the regular line or continuing to serve in Madras without the allowance on the assurance of which he originally accepted the appointment. The Chief Conservator and I shall be very sorry indeed if as a consequence of the resolution of this House and the pressure of his domestic circumstances, he replies 'I cannot afford to serve any longer in the appointment I now hold, and must ask to be relieved of it and posted to some other appointment in the regular line'. I told him that if he elected the latter alternative, I would do my utmost to see that he was not deprived of any portion of his duty allowance until he had been actually relieved by the Revenue Department, which I would request to make immediate arrangements for the purpose. That, Sir, is the position which has arisen. Some of the hon. Members of this House have been struck by the anomalies which arise out

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[23rd March 1922]

of their action in reducing duty allowances in some cases and not pressing or withdrawing motions for the reduction of duty allowances in other cases. My hon. Colleague Mr. Habib-ul-lah has pointed out that there was no understanding that he should make similar reductions in all cases. His repudiation of that suggestion is quite in consonance with my recollection of what took place.

“Personally I should be very glad indeed if some decision could be arrived at which would have the effect of remedying what I personally regard as an injustice to the personal assistant to the Chief Conservator of Forests. I say nothing about other officers such as the personal assistant in the Registration Department. Now it is one thing to say that what is considered to be an injustice should be remedied, and it is quite another thing to say exactly how that result can be achieved. But if there really is a general feeling that it is desirable to remedy what I look upon as an injustice and what hon. Members may regard as something less serious but still worthy of being remedied, I would suggest that perhaps the best method of bringing out the sense of the House in the matter is by forcing a division on this motion, it being understood that a substantial majority in favour of the retention of the duty allowance in this case is at least some indication of the sense of the House that something should be done to remedy the action previously taken. I merely suggest this course. I have actually received a personal representation signed by, I think, 12 members of this House who voted in favour of striking off the duty allowance of the personal assistant of the Chief Conservator. The purport of it is that they would be glad to have the matter settled otherwise if the effect of that note is to create an anomaly directly prejudicing one officer out of several. The Government cannot act on any representation received from 10 or 11 members of the House. But if the House should signify in any way by a substantial majority that it sympathises with the view taken by these 10 or 11 members, the Government would be ready to consider whether there are any means of giving effect to that desire.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“Sir, the statement of the hon. the Home Member has come upon me as a surprise, especially that portion of it that he received a representation from 12 members of this House for a reconsideration of the votes which have already been given. So far as I am concerned, I will say this: this question of duty allowance was under discussion last year and also this year. It was discussed in connexion with the first of these demands, Land Revenue. It was again discussed in connexion with civil justice for district and sessions judges, I do not say that there was any distinct understanding between the Revenue Member and the House; but I did understand that the House has, in these two or three motions, given sufficient indication of their desire in regard to cutting down the duty allowances of the officers in the provincial service. I did not understand the House in any other manner except this. If now the Home Member says that there is no understanding, that the Government will not take it as indicating the wishes of the House—”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“May I rise to say that I never suggested or intended to suggest anything of the sort. The position is that whereas the sense of the House as originally indicated was in favour of cutting down duty allowances and whereas now a section of the House is

23rd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

desirous of making a modification in particular cases, what I wish to ascertain is whether that section is an important section covering a majority of the House or not.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I very much fear that the House has been for the last 15 minutes engaged in a discussion somewhat irrelevant and opposed to the standing orders. When Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu said that there was some misapprehension, I thought I might as well allow that to be cleared up. But the thing has turned out to be something more than a mere misapprehension. What evidently some hon. Members are troubled about is that in some cases the House has voted omission of the duty allowance, and in other cases it has not. They now come forward and say that the action of the House has produced an anomaly. But how that general question of anomaly is relevant to this motion whether the duty allowance to the personal assistant to the Director of Agriculture should or should not be omitted, I confess I do not see. In view of the statement that the Home Member has made that by some process of voting upon this particular motion we could take the sense of the House with regard to the general question of duty allowances, I feel bound at once to warn hon. Members that that cannot be done. Whatever some hon. Members may or may not have in their minds, what they will now vote upon is the question of the duty allowance, proposed to be omitted, in the case of the personal assistant to the Director of Agriculture.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“There is no question of voting necessary, as I am prepared to accept the motion, Sir.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The voting is nevertheless necessary.”

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—“I may be permitted to withdraw it, Sir” (Cries of ‘No, no.’)

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“Let me finish. That is the situation as I have explained. My impression is this. The House was of opinion in some cases that the duty allowance should go, and in other cases that it should not go. When the question of misapprehension was first raised, I hardly thought that it would take this turn. Votes are taken on definite principles. Every motion is read out, is discussed, and is finally voted upon unless withdrawn. And if after all the trouble that I have been taking to make things as clear as I can, if hon. Members at the end of a few days rise up and say that they have been under a misapprehension, either I must be wanting in clearness or the hon. Members must be wanting in an adequate understanding of things. That is what it comes to. So far as I am concerned, let hon. Members clearly understand that the votes already taken cannot be gone back upon. In regard to subsequent motions, hon. Members may vote as they please. But a vote upon one motion cannot in any case be taken to be equivalent to a vote upon any other motion, or all motions put together, much less could it be taken to mean a reversal of a vote or votes already taken. The position is very clear, and I would beg hon. Members to understand the issues clearly and avoid further misapprehension in regard to them. I may also add that if hon. Members on the non-official benches feel that certain duty allowances had been passed by a misapprehension it is open to them to bring up a consideration of those allowances by way of resolution.

[The President]

[23rd March 1922]

If the Government feel that a perfectly clear vote of the House must be reversed, it is properly open to them to bring forward a supplementary demand at a later stage."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I wish to be quite clear, Sir. I am doubtful if it is open to the Government to bring forward any such supplementary grant. If I do not mistake the rules, there are great difficulties in the way."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I do not say I have examined the rules. I only mention it in passing. Were not certain travelling allowances cut down, and did not the hon. the Home Member reserve to himself the right to bring forward a demand for a supplementary grant at a later stage with regard to those allowances ? "

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" May I venture to say, Sir, that I spoke of allotments for travelling allowances which stand altogether on a different footing ? A duty allowance when cut out goes for good. But when a portion of an allotment for travelling allowance is cut out, the balance remains and can be utilized for perhaps two-thirds of the year."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" There is probably nothing sacrosanct about these things. A duty allowance goes when it is omitted; and if it is put back, it comes. But I cannot permit a vote upon the motion now before the House to be taken to indicate the wish of the House in regard to any general question. Also I feel that I must refer to the incident which the hon. the Home Member has mentioned. Certain hon. Members have evidently written to him privately stating that they had been under a misapprehension in regard to certain votes taken in the House in which they had participated. While of course it is perfectly open to any hon. Member to write to the Government, explaining his position in any case, I must point out that the proceedings of this House are public; the share which hon. Members take in them is also public. I do not think the House could now cognize any statement like that made behind its back. I do not presume to blame any hon. Member for having written what he has. But so far as the House is concerned, I feel bound to rule that the House is not called upon to take note of such a thing."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Sir, by way of personal explanation, I should like to say that the representation which I referred to was presented to me this afternoon at 3 o'clock, and that I had had no previous intimation or anything of that sort. And so far as I am personally concerned, I am quite prepared to place it in your hands at once. I was consulted on the question whether I could suggest any means of enabling the signatories to give effect to a change which they personally desired. My answer was that it was essential to ascertain whether the change that they desired was desired by the House as a whole; and if that could be ascertained by any means then it might be possible for Government to meet their wishes. I do not wish for one moment to take advantage of this motion as a means of going back upon any previous decision of this House. But I am responsible for suggesting one method of elucidating what as a fact are the wishes of this House. You, Sir, have just ruled any such procedure to be out of order. But I must emphasize that my only object was to ascertain the wishes of the House in the matter."

[23rd March 1922]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" With reference to what the hon. Member has said, I would say that I have not questioned the hon. Home Member's intentions."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I looked on it as an inference not from what you said, Sir, but from what has been said by certain hon. Members in the course of the discussion. I should like to take this opportunity to explain that it was my intention to prevent any inference being drawn that Government are seeking to force the House to a reconsideration."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" As for the paper that is proposed to be placed in my hands, all I would say is that I take no interest in it. I will leave it where it is."

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—" I press the motion, Sir."

The motion was put and declared carried.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU demanded a poll, but again just before the commencement of the poll, said that he did not want it, on which the hon. the President observed: " An application for poll once made cannot ordinarily be withdrawn."

A poll was then taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 27. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti |
| 2. Rao Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi | Nayudu. |
| 3. Nayudu. | 28. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 4. The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 29. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam |
| 5. Mr. E. Periyasayagam. | Nayudu. |
| 6. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. | 30. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao |
| 7. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. | Pantulu. |
| 8. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 31. M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 9. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankineedu Prasad Bahadur. | 32. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 10. Mr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu. | 33. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimha Chari. |
| 11. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 34. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 12. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 35. Mr. K. V. Ramachari. |
| 13. Mr. B. P. Devarajulu Nayudu. | 36. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 14. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirejulu Nayudu. | 37. Mr. M. B. Seturatnam Ayyar. |
| 15. Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar. | 38. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 16. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 39. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 17. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 40. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |
| 18. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 41. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 19. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 42. Rao Sahib E. C. M. Masoarenhas. |
| 20. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 43. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 21. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 44. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 22. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 45. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahim |
| 23. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 24. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 46. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib |
| 25. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. | Bahadur. |
| 26. Mr. A. Subbarayan. | 47. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya. |

Noes.

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| 1. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar. | 2. Rao Bahadur T. Nanberumal Chettiyar. |
|--------------------------------|---|

[23rd March 1922]

Neutral.

The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson.	7. Mr. R. Littlehales.
" Sir Charles Todhunter.	8. Mr. P. T. Rajan
" Khan Bahadur Muhammad	9. Mr. F. J. Richards.
" Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur.	10. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai.
4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar.	11. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar.
5. Mr. T. E. Moir.	12. Mr. S. Muttumanicka Achari.
6. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton.	

The motion was carried, 47 voting for, 2 against and 12 remaining neutral.

Motion 585.

The following motion was not then made :—

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI :—

585. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for duty allowance to personal assistant.

The Council then adjourned at 5-35 p.m. to meet at 11 a.m. on Friday the 24th day of March 1922.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Friday the 24th March 1922, the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR Avargal, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

I

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

DEMAND XIX—AGRICULTURE—*cont.*

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The Council will resume discussion of Demand XIX—Agriculture.”

Motion 586.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

586. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for duty allowance to additional assistant to the Director.

“I do not think I need say much on this point. The hon. the Home Member challenged the House to decide on the motion before it yesterday regarding the duty allowance to the personal assistant to the Director and as a result of the decision already arrived at, both the House and the Government are morally responsible to accept this motion. I request the House to pass this motion.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“I do not think there was any question of challenge by my hon. Colleague, but he was only speaking of a paper which reached his hands; otherwise the discussion would not have taken place. So far as the resolution now before the House is concerned, it is more or less the same as was discussed yesterday, and since the House decided for the omission yesterday, I do not propose to object to the motion now.”

The motion was put and carried.

Motions 587 and 588.

The following motion standing in the name of Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai being identical fell through in consequence :—

587. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for duty allowance to additional assistant.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

588. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 400.

Motion 589.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

589. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 73,887 for Agricultural College by Rs. 18,000.

“My object in moving this resolution is to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister for Development to what I consider to be a superfluous establishment for the Agricultural College. In 1919-20 we had one Principal and Superintendent on Rs. 500—50—1,000, one Assistant Principal

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [24th March 1922]

on Rs. 500 and one lecturer in engineering on Rs. 400. In 1920-21 instead of one assistant principal, we have two men on Rs. 500 and Rs. 400, respectively, the others remaining as usual. In 1921-22 there appears to have been some rearrangement of work. The Principal who was till then called Superintendent also, appears at least in the budget merely as Principal on Rs. 1,500 per month. I do not know if the omission of the word 'Superintendent' means that his work was reduced in any appreciable way. He was assisted by a Vice-Principal and an Assistant Principal. In the budget for 1922-23 there is no addition to the Principal, Vice-Principal, and Assistant Principal. The appointment of a lecturer in agricultural engineering still continues though the pay is shown in another page. I think, Sir, that either the appointment of the Principal or that of the Vice-Principal may be done away with. I do not know what amount of teaching work the Principal and the Vice-Principal respectively have. I am of opinion that, in addition to the few hours of teaching work they may have in the college, they may well attend to research work also. So if there is any chance of a vacancy occurring either in the place of the Principal or that of the Vice-Principal, I think it need not be filled up and the work may be redistributed so that an additional appointment may be unnecessary."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"So far as these additional appointments are concerned, they are really no additional appointments at all. The Principal and the Vice-Principal were already there. It so happened that the Principal went on leave and so there was some saving under that head. As regards the Assistant Principal, I may bring to the notice of the hon. Member that he should have been strictly called an assistant professor and not assistant principal. As regards agricultural engineering, agricultural teaching must necessarily include some teaching in agricultural engineering because the students should have to know the various implements essential for cultivation and unless the students are taught something of agricultural engineering they will be under practical difficulties. I may bring to my hon. Friend's notice that formerly there were three classes, whereas now we have five. The two new classes have reference to the new course that has been introduced. The college will be affiliated to the University of Madras very soon. Several hon. Members of the House have pressed upon me the need for such affiliation. That is going to happen very soon and the matter is with the University and I understand orders will be passed shortly. New classes have been opened and that accounts for a little more expenditure. As a matter of fact, my hon. Friend may also see that whereas the expenditure under the votable list was Rs. 81,000 previously, this year it is only Rs. 73,000. I may also bring to the notice of my hon. Friend that the Poona College, which I suppose does not compare so favourably with ours—I do not refer to the Pusa College—costs Rs. 1,39,000 whereas our college cost us only one lakh and fifteen thousands. I therefore think that my hon. Friend will be satisfied with the information."

Mr V. C. VELLINGIRI GOUNDAR:—"Sir, I have to say a few words on the general administration of the department."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"Probably, Sir, the proper place for my hon. Friend to make his remarks on the general administration of the whole department will be at the end when motions for reduction of the total grant are taken up. I only suggest this to him."

24th March 1922]

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think the hon. Member can speak about the Agricultural College now and reserve his remarks about the general administration till the motions for reduction of the total grant are taken up."

Mr. V. C. VELLINGIRI GOUNDAR:—"I will then reserve my remarks to the end, Sir."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, I should like to make a few observations on this question of the Agricultural College. Reference has been made by the hon. the Minister to a proposal to affiliate this college to the University. Perhaps hon. Members are aware that the proposal has already been approved by the Senate and I do not know whether the decision of the Senate has reached the Government. My point however, Sir, is this. The Royal Commission on the Public Services has recommended that agricultural education should be so improved and so expanded and brought up to the highest standard of European or American efficiency as to permit the recruitment of agricultural officers entirely from this country. And this was more than ten or twelve years ago when the report was under consideration. I submit, Sir, that neither the Secretary of State nor the Government of India have taken any steps in this direction up to the present day. Now that subject is a transferred subject and is entirely under the control of this Council, and I sincerely trust that there will be no more delay in making agricultural education efficient so as to furnish other than merely agricultural officers receiving agricultural training. The aim and object of the Agricultural Department as hitherto managed by Government has been merely to manufacture officials and to give agricultural education only to such number of persons as is necessary to maintain the department. That ideal ought to be given up entirely and it should be the aim and policy of the Ministry of Agriculture to provide the necessary facilities for the highest form of agricultural training in this country not only of the collegiate type but also of the lower type of agricultural education. I have had the opportunity recently of looking into the question somewhat more fully than I had previously done and I am more than ever convinced that the first necessity of the situation in this country is to expand agricultural education to the highest standard prevailing in western countries more especially in view of this ultimate idea of recruiting agricultural officers entirely here. There is no question of principle involved. There is absolutely no justification for any recruitment outside this country in this matter. This matter has already been fully considered by the Royal Commission on Public Services and they have once for all laid down that the recruitment of agricultural officers should be done in this country and that a beginning should be made by expanding these colleges. Sir, as to how it can be done, as to whether there should be an agricultural college of the highest standard of efficiency in each province or whether there should be a central institution financed by more than one Provincial Government or whether it should be done by expanding the central institutions at Pusa is a matter for the Provincial Government and the Government of India. I do not propose to deal with that aspect of the matter. It is a costly business, no doubt, to bring the agricultural colleges to the highest standard of efficiency prevailing elsewhere. That is a matter to be negotiated between the several Provincial Governments. Therefore, Sir, while not objecting to this grant, it seems to me, Sir, that we have to go still further and much further than has hitherto been done in the matter of agricultural education."

[24th March 1922]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ Sir, the hon. the Minister has told us that the college is, so to speak, being reorganized, and I do not know if in connexion with that rearrangement of work the present staff will be necessary. I wanted to know whether there was enough work for them at present, what they are teaching and all that; but anyhow, in view of the fact that the college is going to be placed on a different basis, I do not press this motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 590.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

590. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,31,040 for salaries for research institute by Rs. 1,000.*

“ Before proceeding further, let me once for all say, Sir, that it is not my intention either in making this speech, or in any other speech which I have made, so far as the agricultural college and the department of agriculture is concerned, to say anything against them or against the amount of money that is spent on them. But many of us are certainly against whatever may be found to be a waste in this or in any other allied department. If I now say a few words, Sir, it is only just to place the matter before the hon. the Minister so that he may take any further action which may be necessary in regard to it. So far as this branch of the department is concerned, we need hardly say that the whole country is interested, as the hon. Member Mr. Ramachandra Rao said, in the development of agriculture in all its various forms. In one of the anniversary meetings of the college, we had to express our regret that in these budget discussions we could not at all move for any increase, and we were then advised that it might be done by way of a resolution. But we did not want to move any resolution for increasing the expenditure, because there is the hon. the Minister in charge of this department who takes a good deal of interest in its development and there is also the Director who has got experience in this matter, and if they move for any additional grants, the House will be most willing to sanction the required grants.

“ As regards the work done in the research institute, the hon. the Minister gave us on a previous occasion a list of the work done by some of these special experts. I do not charge him with anything, but I may add that, just as a dramatist throws down the curtain when the play has just come to an end and he has nothing more to show, the hon. the Minister threw down his paper. So far as the mycologist is concerned, the hon. Member gave a number of instances where he has done very good work. I admit all that. It may be, Sir, that he is an Indian, or it may be that it is a special department in which he has got much scope to do work, but there is no doubt that the mycologist has done excellent work. I had opportunities of examining his laboratory and some other works he has done and I must say that he has so far done very good work.

“ So far as the entomologist is concerned, I have got, Sir, some complaints. I have mentioned them both before this House and in the agricultural college itself. The entomologist is a European and an English-trained specialist. He has got two gazetted assistants and two non-gazetted assistants. But, so far as his work is concerned, I hope the hon. the Minister

[24th March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

will be able to-day to give us the results that have been so far achieved by his department. I know the hon. Member will be able to say that he has examined so many cotton worms, that he has examined so many other worms connected with other diseases, but what I want to know is, and I will be very glad if some such information is forthcoming that as regards any worm which he has so far examined, any specific remedy has been found out to prevent any particular disease, something other than the usual remedy of saying, ‘take away all the plants and there will be an end of the disease.’ So far as this department is concerned, we blame it for not becoming more popular and for not doing sufficient work to make the people go to it. But so far as we here are concerned, we can only request the hon. the Minister to remember the proverb that ‘if the mountain will not go to the Prophet, the Prophet must go to the mountain’. The people are not in a mood to go to the Agricultural College; we must make the college go to the people. As I have said, the best way to do this will be to have something like itinerary farms by which these people may go to a village, stop there for about 15 days, then move on to another village and then revisit them after six months or so. So far as this particular Entomological department is concerned, the two diseases that are particularly noticeable in the Coimbatore district are, one as regards cotton and the other as regards betel vine. So far as the betel vine is concerned, there is one important thing which goes to make this department most unpopular. There are two branches of this department, the Entomological or the Research department and the general department. I brought this disease as regards the betel vines to the notice of the Entomologist through the Director of Agriculture. After a few days of investigation, there came a memorandum from the Director of Agriculture saying that the worm had nothing to do with that disease and that the whole trouble was due to some defects in cultivation. Thereafter he asked the Assistant Director of Industries to investigate into this matter. The Assistant Director of Industries then told me that it had absolutely nothing to do with any defect in cultivation and that the disease was due to the worms and that therefore if anything had to be done, it could not be done by the general department but only by the Entomological department. Thus, so far as the public are concerned, it does not really matter for them whether the Entomologist finds out the remedy or the general department. I know personally from various experiments made that whereas in places where these worms existed the sugarcane cultivation was very bad, the cultivation was certainly better in the adjacent fields where they did not exist. So, that is a sure proof that the disease is brought about by the presence of these worms only. Hence I believe the hon. the Minister will be conferring a great boon on the public if he were to direct the Entomologist to enter into this matter very carefully, and to devote some particular time with a view to destroy these worms and not to say simply after one or two years that they spent a lot of time and money over it, but that the worm did not yield to them and therefore that it had nothing to do with the disease. In Coimbatore this betel vine cultivation and the sugarcane cultivation was going on in very many places, but the cultivation has now considerably fallen owing to this disease and the rents of landlords also were falling. Mr. Macmichael once said while presiding over a meeting in that college that the department had nothing to do with the increase of rents, but I don’t think he was correct for the yields will have to be increased if there is to be an increase in the rates. The fact is, Sir, that the betel vine disease is a dangerous one so far

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [24th March 1922]

as the Coimbatore district is concerned. The disease is affecting that particular crop as well as the sugarcane cultivation very seriously, and both of these are very valuable crops in the Coimbatore district. Therefore if proper attention is directed towards this, the department will be doing excellent work.

"Only one other thing I have to say with regard to sugarcane. I do not know why the sugarcane expert has been taken away from the Provincial Government. We had one sugarcane expert and an assistant sugarcane expert before under this Government. Now it has become an Imperial matter. No doubt the Imperial experts will be devoting some attention so far as this Presidency also is concerned, but what I want the hon. the Minister to see is whether it would not be more desirable to have at least an assistant sugarcane expert here who will be able to devote his time fully so far as this Presidency is concerned. Sugarcane is a very valuable crop here. The Imperial duty on sugarcane is likely to be increased, or it has been increased already by this time. There will be a great demand for the swadesi manufacture. In addition to the question of jaggery, which I hope in due time the hon. the Minister for Excise will deal with, sugarcane is another important source of sugar and any attempt made to improve the sugarcane cultivation and any amount of money spent on it will, I am sure be amply justified. Therefore we want a sugarcane expert also, an assistant or somebody else, who would be able to devote his full time towards this. The hon. the Minister may say that the present Imperial sugarcane experts also are devoting a lot of their time towards this Presidency, but we want a man who could devote his time fully towards this Presidency, and I hope the hon. the Minister will see to that, if possible.

"As I have already said, it is not at all our intention to curtail any of the work or expenditure in this direction, but what I want to say is this: This Agricultural College and the Research Institute are situated in the same building, or at least in adjacent buildings and as such, much can be done to utilize the time of the experts also more in connexion with the teaching in the college. That will also show us some means of retrenchment without in any way impairing efficiency. Therefore, if there is any vacancy either in the college or in the institute, the hon. the Minister will consider the desirability of putting the same person on to the college as well, as it is being done in some cases.

"With these few observations, I might make a personal request to the hon. the Minister just to do what he could in these directions to help both the landlord and the tenant without in any way throwing the interest of either to the winds. I have got full confidence in him and I request him to devote a little more attention to these matters in which case I am sure he will be able to do real good to the public."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"Sir, my first duty is to thank my friends Mr. Ramachandra Rao and Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar for their reasonable attitude, and the only attitude that can possibly be taken in a matter like this, that we must expand agricultural education and research work, and that, if possible, more money should be put into them. As regards their criticisms, Sir, I am indebted to them and if my interference in any way can lead to greater production either in the work of these experts or in that of the college staff, certainly I may assure my friends I shall not be wanting.

[24th March 1922] [Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu]

"Well, Sir, we are told that I stopped speaking about the Entomologist on the last occasion when I spoke so much about the Mycologist. It was not because, Sir, I had not a good account to give of this expert officer, but because you put limitations on our time and in fact we had only one half day for the seven Members of Government and I had to adjust myself to that time. As it was, if I am not mistaken, I had to speak for more than an hour on that occasion, and to take more time would have been most unreasonable and perhaps would have been an annoyance to the Members of Government, not to speak of the inconvenience I would have been causing to my hon. Colleagues. I can only say this at this stage that I have got with me—not here, but in my house—a report of the Entomologist showing all the work he has done during the period he has been there. I shall be very happy to place it in the hands of my hon. Friend and he will see from it that really good work is being done. It may be, Sir, that much attention has not been devoted to betel leaf, but the reason, I believe, is this.

"Experts in the beginning at least look to the more important crops such as paddy and cotton. My hon. Friend himself has referred to the research work, the study of bacilli, their life history, their course of development and so forth that severally form the work of our Entomologist and the pamphlet that I was speaking of will give my friend an idea as to what has been done in that direction. My hon. friend also wanted, Sir, that I should give another instance of the line in which the Entomologist has been working. I may mention the paddy crop. There is in the Kistna district a station in which the worms that dangerously affect the paddy crop were being examined and I may inform my hon. Friend that certain good results have been obtained. As regards doing work more than talking, I am afraid the experts don't talk much. They sit in their rooms, Sir, poring over and through that long tube which they call a microscope, they try to make little things look big, things which do not appear to the common eye. Such people do very little talking. I can very well understand that immediate results of a far reaching kind cannot be expected in so short a time. I have often submitted to the House that the success of a scientist has to be built upon a series of failures. Let us not grudge a few failures in the case of these scientists. Quite recently I received a book which I have not brought with me now. It dealt with the chemical industries of Germany. There is one sentence in that book the gist of which is this: for every 100 scientists that were employed on research work 99 were failures and one a success. But if it was possible to estimate in money the value of the work turned out by this one chemist it was more than that of all the other 99 put together. One such single research in the case of paddy will be enough for us. I am not referring to the single seed planting or seed rate. But by cross-breeding they have been able to evolve a strain which has produced 16 per cent more than what is ordinarily got from the ordinary strains. The father seed when planted in the best soil and under the best circumstances was able to produce, let us say, hundred measures. Then this new seed from that seed prepared anew by cross-breeding produced 16 per cent more or 116 measures. I suppose it is called Coimbatore No. 24 and there is a persistent demand for it. So far as the sugarcane expert is concerned he is taken over by the Government of India because the Government of India have been paying the whole cost. He has not been taken away from our control and the

[Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu] [24th March 1922]

Director of Agriculture has full control over him and he works under this Government. I may also bring to the notice of this House that sugarcane is not so widely planted in this province as it is in Northern India and that is the reason why he had to be taken away from us. In fact, the Government of India have been paying for him from the beginning. It is but right that for account purposes the cost of his department should be put under the Government of India. I have very little more to say except that I shall be very glad certainly to avail myself of any advice from my hon. Friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar and if there is anything that I can do, it only requires a word from the hon. Member. I am going to Coimbatore, the place where he lives, and both of us can visit the college and see for ourselves if anything further than what is being done can be done."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I should like to make one or two remarks in connexion with this Research Institute. One point which was very much discussed was whether agricultural research should be kept separate from agricultural education. I trust that the time will come when this idea that agricultural research should be divorced from agricultural education will be given up. It had been pointed out to us by more than one student in the United Kingdom that opportunities for agricultural research in this country are not made available to them, that experts for research work are entirely recruited from the United Kingdom with the result that those who wish to pursue agricultural research have to go abroad. It is for these reasons that many of our students, attracted by the opportunities of getting into the Imperial Agricultural Service, are now in the British Universities in large numbers. I met them almost in every University and the universal complaint was this: that agricultural education in this country has suffered considerably by keeping the research portion of it entirely closed to agricultural students. The idea of the Royal Commission on the Public Services was that the Agricultural Research Institute at Pusa should be expanded and combined with the Agricultural Colleges and that the whole basis of agricultural education should be expanded and amplified in such a way as to combine research with instruction. This essential idea has been kept in abeyance all these years and I trust, Sir, that the hon. the Minister would tackle this problem immediately and see what can be done to remedy this obvious defect in our present system. Of course I do not wish to refer to a statement made that the conditions of agricultural instruction in the United Kingdom are not at all suited to this country. It is a much wider question than can be discussed under this motion. But if agricultural research is to make any advance in this country I have no doubt whatever in my mind that it should be so extended and combined that the majority of students pursuing agricultural instruction should have opportunities of developing as experts in all the various branches of agricultural knowledge. That I submit is the chief point for consideration. With reference to the budget that has been already discussed I trust that before this item comes up next year this question will have received attention."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I want to say a few words. I need hardly express my thanks to the hon. the Minister. But I wish to say one thing. He need not wait till he goes to Coimbatore and takes me to the college."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" We will both see in April next."

24th March 1922]

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" What I say is this. There is in the office of the Director of Agriculture the whole correspondence dealing with the question I have referred to. One particular agency says that it falls under the range of the other agency and the other agency says that it is the duty of the first agency. In the meantime the worms go on increasing as they always do. This is prevalent both in the case of the sugarcane and the betel vine. I request him not to spend even one more day but at once to issue orders to the Director of Agriculture, whose subordinates are fighting among themselves as to which man should do a particular work, to see that the disease is at least reduced. I know about the statistics that will be furnished by the Entomologist about the whole number of worms analysed, the number of worms dissected and all this and all that. All that I say is that so far as the treatment of the disease is concerned, nothing practical has been done. Instructions should be issued not to find out the life history of the worms but to find out the life history of the disease, the means to eradicate it or at least to reduce the effects of the disease. These are the points so far as the betel vines are concerned. There is already considerable correspondence about it and I request the hon. the Minister to issue instructions to the Director to see that something is done. As for the sugar expert I know he is being paid by the Imperial Government. My fear is that he may be suddenly transferred to Pusa. We must have some one under the control and under the pay of this Government so that his attention and his responsibility may be confined to this Presidency. These are the points which the hon. the Minister may take into consideration and I think I am obliged to him for the kind way in which he has taken my suggestions. I will not call them advice. It only remains for him to put them into action."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 591.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

591. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 32,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 3,200.

Motion 592.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I beg to make the following motion :—

592. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,23,333 for research institute by Rs. 20,000.

" Sir, in making this motion for reduction I have to make one or two observations. Last year one of the hon. Members of this House in winding up his remarks on the Agricultural department spoke as follows; ' I am not at all satisfied with the Agricultural department which has not been able to do any good to the ryot population either in the way of improving manure or raising new crops or in the matter of economic growth of crops which are absolutely necessary in the interests of the cultivator.' Needless to say, Sir, these remarks have peculiar significance when it is remembered that they were made by no less a member than the present colleague of the hon. the Minister for Development. I refer to the hon. Mr. Patro. I am quite prepared to agree that for really good work we may need people of a higher calibre than those who are now employed in the work and that such people

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [24th March 1922]

need larger pay than what each of them is receiving now. Even if it is so I would rather wish that we pay far more and get a little good than employ any number of officers on really high pay though not so high as the first-class man may demand and yet derive no benefit worth mentioning. Turning to the staff I find that there is a tendency to hastily conclude that good work is done simply because the pay of particular people has been increased. That cannot be so. For example in the research institute department we had formerly one agricultural chemist and one assistant agricultural chemist. Now the budget provides for three assistant agriculturists. Further all these are gazetted officers. I think really for the sort of work that is done by these people we may have only one gazetted assistant and not three as provided for in the budget. The work of analysis now has become a kind of routine work. It is but reasonable therefore to expect that this work can be carried on by subordinate officers under the supervision of the expert, viz., the agricultural chemist and his gazetted assistant. Take again the case of the agricultural botanist. So far, all his attention seems to have been confined to the southern districts of the Presidency. The area under paddy cultivation is no doubt large there. But in the northern districts, Kistna, Godavari and Ganjam also, there is a good deal of land under paddy cultivation. Is it not time that the expert who has been so long remaining in the south should turn his attention to the northern districts and see what he can do there?

11-46 a.m. "The third appointment, I wish to refer to is that of the bacteriologist, who at present is Mr. Norris."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"Mrs. Norris."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Her husband also is a bacteriologist."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"He is not now in our province."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Has that appointment been abolished then? From the civil list I find that both the names of these people are borne on the list. I thought the whole thing appeared to be rather anomalous. The place of a married woman is, I think, more in her house than in her husband's office. Are they to work in the same place and go on leave simultaneously? There are so many questions connected with this which I thought I would raise here and get an answer from the hon. the Minister."

"As regards the Entomologist, I have also some complaint to make. My districts also are periodically affected by these pests. Recently we had a pest called 'Aggipurugu'. I believe the Collector brought it to the notice of the authorities and so far, I think, nothing has been done to investigate and find out how this pest can be rooted out."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"Sir, so far as the increase in the staff is concerned, it necessarily follows because more experts are being appointed. My hon. Friend next referred to the question of sending this paddy expert from the south to the north. In the south it will be remembered that only some experiments on rotation and manures were carried on. Yet the question of strain still remains and that will be attended to in the new farm that will be started. At the same time I may bring to the notice of my hon. Friend that the question of sending him and getting more work of this kind done in the Northern Circars is just now engaging the

24th March 1922] [Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu.]

attention of the Government and I hope I shall be able to satisfy my hon. Friend soon."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya:—"May I know, Sir, where the hon. the Minister is going to have an agricultural school or farm?"

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"The agricultural school will be in Anakapalle or Samalkot so far as the Northern Circars are concerned."

"As regards the appointment of Mr. Norris and Mrs. Norris, my hon. Friend made some observations which I don't think I can leave unchallenged. We were told that the place of a wife is in the house and not in the office or in the laboratory. That is no doubt our conception in this country; but in civilized countries, if a lady thinks that she can serve humanity and the world much better in the laboratory than in the home, she is generally allowed to carry out her wish. As regards the inconvenience to the department when they go on leave, I may tell my hon. Friend that before her appointment, we made it a condition precedent that the leave or transfer of one should not in any way interfere with the presence of the other at his or her post. As for separation it is their concern and not ours and they have agreed to remain separate when one goes on leave or is transferred. I may tell the House, however, that both Mr. Norris and Mrs. Norris have been found to be devoted to their work and have been doing excellent work and Government have absolutely no reason to complain of their being together in the same place."

"The last point raised by my friend was about the 'Aggipurugu'. Government have received no information about this matter and probably if my friend had only written to me, I would have been able to do something. But I have just received a note saying that Mr. Sampson, the Director of Agriculture, who had information of this has promised to depute an officer to investigate it. I shall look into it and if an officer has not already been sent, I will see that one is sent immediately."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I think the disease has now disappeared. I do not know what the officer to be deputed now is going to do hereafter. I am sure the Collector of the district made a report on this question and I do not know what arrangements exist in the department for such information to reach the hon. the Minister in time. Another question which has not been answered is that in the place of so many gazetted officers, some non-gazetted officers may be appointed. For example, I referred to the appointment of the Entomologist. I am sure that till recently there was only one gazetted officer; but now I think there are two of them. This makes a great difference. The non-gazetted officers will be paid far less than the gazetted officers, i.e., Rs. 250—750 a month. Similarly in the case of assistant directors, I suggested, that there might be one gazetted officer to hold that office and that the others need not be gazetted officers. I say that without reducing the number it is possible to save money. May I request the hon. the Minister for Development to give his consideration to this aspect of the matter also?"

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"All that I can say is that these assistants are persons who will be in direct and close touch with the senior officers and in these days when we are fighting for the appointment of more Indian officers in the Indian Agricultural service,

[Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu] [24th March 1922]

unless these assistants are prepared for places in the Indian Agricultural service, unless they are directly trained and unless they are men of a certain calibre and receive that kind of training which is essential for their being appointed to that service, we shall be losing the opportunity of training them properly. Subject to this, I shall be glad to consider the question raised by my hon. Friend."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 593.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. R. T. KESAVALU PILLAI :—

593. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,26,333 for research institute by Rs. 1,00,000.

Motion 594.

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

594. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 33,141 for assistant directors of agriculture by Rs. 16,576.

" Sir, in making this motion, it is my intention to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister that for the better working of this department, it is much better that they enter into the confidence of the people and for this it is necessary that there should be an advisory board in each centre and the directors are asked to take their advice. This country being an agricultural country, it is necessary that the advice of these people who are trained in agriculture is taken. They will give better advice and with their co-operation this department can work much better. I may also bring this fact to the notice of the hon. the Minister, that the United Provinces Government have recently come out very boldly with a policy to reorganize the agricultural department."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" Sir, so far as the assistant directors are concerned, they work in co-operation with the deputy directors. It has been my impression, Sir, that these officers are in close touch with the agriculturists of the country. In fact, their work consists in that. My friend says that the question of agricultural boards may be considered. As it is, we have got an agricultural standing committee advising me. But since it seems to be the desire of my hon. Friend that there should be some sort of organization in the districts, I shall be glad to consider any suggestions that may be made in that direction and if my hon. Friend will be good enough to give me an idea of what sort of boards he wants, I will certainly consider the point."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 595 to 600.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

595. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 7,500.

24th March 1922]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

596. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,42,300 for deputy and assistant directors of agriculture by Rs. 100.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

597. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,67,000 for improvement of cotton cultivation by Rs. 17,000.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

598. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 62,200 for Agricultural engineering by Rs. 3,000.

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—

599. To omit allotment of Rs. 30,500 for eradication of the palmyra disease.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

600. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 14,28,421 for agriculture by Rs. 25,000.

Motion 601.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I move :—

601. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 14,28,421 for agriculture by Rs. 25,000.

" I wish to bring to the notice of the hon. the Minister, in moving this motion, one or two facts connected with the agricultural well-being of the ryots. The first relates to chemical manures. The hon. the Minister is aware that there has been considerable trouble in the deltaic districts in regard to what is known as 'patimannu.' I think it is not necessary to dilate at length on this matter. Hon. Members coming from the Kistna and the neighbouring districts are aware that the village site has been dug up and pits are made to be filled up by the department of Public Health. These pits have been dug up for taking away what is known as 'patimannu' containing some phosphates for manuring fields. This source of supply has been exhausted and the department some years ago made experiments and they closed their experiments on the ground that their chemical manures could be replaced by something which could be obtained from Messrs. Parry & Co. I do not know if it is a wise policy. It means this : that persons have to go all the way to Ranipet to get this stuff from Messrs. Parry & Co. It has been pointed out in more than one agricultural conference during the last 6 or 7 years that the railway freight rates on agricultural manures should be reduced and that was the opinion of very responsible agricultural officers and notwithstanding many representations on this subject, I am very sorry that nothing has yet been done in this direction of cheapening agricultural manures for the agriculturists.

" Now the only proper thing to be done is to undertake the manufacture of manure somewhere in one of the districts on the east coast and to establish another factory somewhere in the southern districts with the necessary apparatus for the manufacture of chemical manures on a large scale. I think this is the only solution of the problem.

12 noon.

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [24th March 1922]

"Such a problem has not yet been tackled. I suggest that no time should be lost by the Government in establishing a factory for the manufacture of chemical manure on the east coast on a scale which will pay the agriculturists to take it and to apply it to their lands. We should do something more than refer these people to Messrs. Parry & Co.

"Another question in connexion with manures is that of fish-guano which was in use until quite recently, but for some unaccountable reason the supply has not been equal to the demand. I also learnt recently that the manufacture of manure out of fish-guano has been completely stopped. I do not wish to make any definite assertion as to this fact. But whatever it is, if it has to come to the east coast, it has to be brought all the way from Calicut and the trainage may cost more than the value of the manure itself. Therefore this question of manufacture of chemical manure to take the place of 'patimannu' which is supposed to contain 'phosphorus' and which is now exhausted is one of supreme importance. So far as I know, nothing satisfactory has been attempted. I know some experiments were made in 'patimannu' some years ago and they were quickly abandoned without any satisfactory results. That is the first question I should like to place for the consideration of the hon. the Minister for Development.

"The second question relates to the question of demonstration. In his opening remarks on the budget the hon. the Minister for Development stated that scientific experiments will be made in agriculture by the Government. He also stated that a horse can be taken to a pond but it cannot be made to drink water. I am afraid that is not the correct attitude to take in the matter."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"It was not the attitude of the Government. I only stated it in reply to an interruption by some hon. Member."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I have a distinct recollection of three things, that a horse was referred to, and also a pond and the horse being taken to water. It may be that I am wrong in my inferences. But these three observations are quite clear in my mind and they came from the hon. the Minister and not from anybody else. But however I do not wish to pursue the matter any further. We know our agricultural population is very ignorant and the only thing that appeals to them is ocular demonstration. A large sum of money is being spent in other countries in this direction. Whatever may be the state of education in those countries, the person who corresponds to the ryot here is as conservative towards the results of scientific agriculture as he is here and all those prejudices are broken down only by ocular demonstration, by lectures and so on. That is of the utmost importance for the promotion of the knowledge which many of our scientists in agriculture are now making available to the ryot. Therefore I suggest that there should be expansion of the activities of the Agricultural department in the matter of demonstration. All that I know is that there are at present a small number of agricultural inspectors who tour round the districts. They are not enough and I am not sure that they are doing useful work in this direction. What is necessary is that consistently with our present finance, the whole thing should be carried out in a manner in which the ryot can digest easily. It is true that leaflets are printed, but I do not know how many are read by the ryot. It is

24th March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

entirely a question of demonstration. My hon. Friend wishes us to understand that the ryots are really benefited by the various experiments which are being conducted by our agricultural experts. I believe they do not follow the real method of making them agreeable to the ryot and I trust that something will be done to make these experiments also advantageous to the people. Of course it is true that deputy directors go about in the districts but I do not know whether they are perfectly in touch with the agricultural population. No doubt they are required under the rules to be in camp for a certain number of days in every month.

"Therefore I want that these two questions of supreme importance to the ryots, should be tackled properly, one relating to the question of agricultural manures, and the other relating to the consumption of the knowledge made available by these experts and unless proper steps are taken in these two directions, I am afraid the general impression in the country namely that the Agricultural department is of no good to the people will gain ground."

Mr. A. T. MUTTUKUMARASWAMI CHETTIYAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, agriculture is the chief occupation of the bulk of the people in this presidency. We endeavour much to see that the lands yield greater produce. Any attempt proposed to be made by the Government for improvement in the method of cultivation, dissemination of the knowledge of the use of better implements, the storage of manure, the use of leaf manure, the extensive use of single seed planting, which was estimated to effect a saving of nearly a crore of rupees to the ryots in this presidency in the purchase of seed grains—all such attempts made by the Government should be supported by the Council. We are the ryots ourselves and we are the elected representatives of the ryots who form the bulk of the electorate. There is no use attempting to reduce the grant required by the Government under the head 'Agriculture.' If there is any misapplication of the grant, certainly any hon. Member of the Council has his own remedy against any such extravagant or useless expenditure incurred against the policy enunciated by the Council and the Government. With these few remarks, I strongly oppose the motion."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"Sir, no other subject is better connected with the well-being of the rural population than agriculture and any amount of money which this Government proposes to spend on agriculture will be quite welcome to the members of this Council. But we shall have to see what the arrangements are that the Government have made for the dissemination of the knowledge among the rural population. As far as we can judge from the budget, my impression is that no forward step is taken in the matter of propaganda work. Most of the propaganda work is expected to be carried on by the lower subordinates and the figure of lower subordinates employed stands the same as last year. Of course there is some variation in the number of upper subordinates employed. Last year it was 67 and this year it is 87. I believe that upper subordinates are not intended for propaganda work. Most of the work is being done by the lower subordinates and their number is very small. Very soon the Government must evolve a system whereby all the recent achievements of the department could be brought to the notice of the rural population. We have got agricultural farms with some staff at the rate of one for each district or one for two districts. In the past much has

[Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju] [24th March 1922]

been done in the matter of expanding the number of agricultural farms, but whenever we visit a farm or have a conversation with the deputy director of agriculture, the general complaint is that he has not got sufficient number of hands to send round to the villages for propaganda work. All the money that is now spent and all the results now produced by the department must be carried out fully for the improvement of the knowledge of the ryot. We cannot afford to wait any longer, for every day we lose is a great loss to the country. I hope the hon. the Minister will see his way to increase the number of propagandists. I know this question is intimately connected with the question of the number of hands available and also with the question of recruitment to the agricultural college. The number of lower subordinates manufactured year after year is very limited: it ranges from 20 to 40. That is a very small number taking into consideration the vast area we have to deal with. This I believe necessitates the establishment of another agricultural school to prepare lower subordinates to undertake propaganda work."

MR. V. C. VELLINGIRI GOUNDAR :—"Sir, no department of Government requires greater retrenchment or is more capable of admitting greater retrenchment than the department of Agriculture and I believe there is no department which has got such *immense potentialities* for the good of the country and the ryot, but I confidently assert that no department is so singularly barren of useful results to the tax-payer and the ryot as this. No department spends so much extravagance and waste as the department of Agriculture. I will take the Agricultural College first. The College of Agriculture has cost the Government, heaven knows how many lakhs, ever since it was determined to establish it at Coimbatore with the magnificent structures and quarters for officers and staff. Still in the year 1921 after so much expenditure and with the institution so fully manned with experts, we have the melancholy fact, that for the certificate course, 39 were offered admission but only 26 joined and it is admitted that the course has lost much of its popularity. For the diploma course 28 were offered and 18 actually joined and it was found necessary to grant stipends to all students and even then it is found difficult to induce students from the educated classes to take to an agricultural course. The original object of the college, namely to induce the sons of the ryot to have practical lessons in agriculture have failed in spite of the lapse of years. The whole scheme of the Agricultural College appears to be really in the nature of an experiment still.

"The Saidapet farm and the college were abandoned though after expenditure of vast sums of money and the location at Coimbatore was decided upon and huge sums have been spent and the college side of the institute is confessed to be still not a success. The mere fact that lakhs and lakhs have been spent and are being spent does not go to show that we have emerged beyond the stage of experiment. It is so judging from this fact, that an agricultural school was opened at Anakapalle and after three years of personal attention on the part of the deputy director, the school was closed and not serving any useful purpose and the same fate may overtake the college at Coimbatore. The gradual and growing unpopularity of the courses may lead to the closing of the college or removal elsewhere as was done from Saidapet to Coimbatore. Why so many lakhs should have been spent in grand architectural buildings and residential quarters in such a state of affairs and to serve what purpose it is impossible to divine.

24th March 1922] [Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar]

"The very magnificence of the buildings, the well-laid out plots, the grand residences and the army of servants and peons serve to over-awe the ryot and bewilder his wits. So that the class of people for whose benefit such institutions should exist derive not the least benefit. With all this what do you think the department has done last year. Plans and estimates for buildings on a vast scale have been prepared for opening a new school at Taliparamba. Furthermore ten new appointments in the Indian Agricultural service, chemists, economic botanists, agrostologists, bacteriologists and what not, were sanctioned and most of the places filled up and six gazetted assistants to the 'ologists' above mentioned were created and the post of an assistant director was created to assist the over-worked professor of agriculture who had to teach a smaller number of students. A more heartless and sinful waste of money, it is impossible to imagine and this is the first fruit of the new transferred subject of Development.

"What have the experts newly created done or have been doing?

"*Chemistry*.—It appears that owing to lack of gas, not much work could be done; but certain soils were analyzed and some report is being written by the acting chemist.

"The Economist Botanist for cotton came, and after some time, his official designation was decided to be 'cotton specialist.' Of 12-15 p.m. course there was no special work waiting for the expert, and so stationed at Coimbatore with inadequate temporary laboratory accommodation, he took charge of the Anamalai-Cambodia station. He is busy improving Cambodia cotton and a lengthy paragraph in the report of the Director of Agriculture is devoted to showing what the expert is discovering with regard to Cambodia cotton. There is one very useful fact he has discovered, namely, the single plant selections of cotton which had been produced during the last two years under the superintendence of Mr. H. C. Sampson were not single selections, but mixtures of the produce of two or more plants. Not only has this been discovered, but this mistake has been traced to the carelessness of the assistant farm-manager. We do not know what other work will be found for the cotton specialist. Apparently at present the circumstances are not favourable to his work and the expert is waiting for work to be given to him. The other experts and the gazetted assistants are examining strains of paddy, grass and pests. Some research work seems to have been done for the benefit of certain planters.

"Some more experts who are to be recruited from England are expected to arrive as soon as buildings and quarters at a cost of 5 lakhs are completed. It does not appear that any urgent work is waiting for them. The foundations of the buildings have been finished, but I pray that either the building work may be stopped or, if that is impossible, that simpler and cheaper designs may be adopted. It is heart-rending to contemplate that while colleges in medicine, engineering, forest and even in arts have been supplying men who are doctors, engineers and those otherwise useful to the State or employees in public and private services, not one man that has come out of the Agricultural College has been found or heard to be useful for the advancement of agriculture.

"There was also, during the year, a reorganization of the agricultural engineering section and it seems that the Agricultural Engineer could not do much work owing to want of an office and workshop, and for the latter,

[Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar] [24th March 1922]

plans are in preparation. A better illustration of the policy of drift of the Government, firstly to create a highly-paid officer and then to find work for him, it is difficult to find. The Agricultural Engineering Department, if properly equipped and managed with a workshop with all modern appliances, will be of some use to the ryots, but all the money goes to pay the experts and gazetted officers, and no money is left for equipping a workshop, although the improvement of this section was said to be necessary in several reports of past years.

"The old ruinous policy must be scrapped and there must be a change of heart and change of policy in this all-important Department of Agriculture. Money can well be spent to the lasting benefit of the ryot and tax-payer, the backbone of our agricultural country, if the right methods are adopted and the department is more manned than at present by persons who know agricultural conditions peculiar to this land and have intimate knowledge of the difficulties of the ryot.

"It is not my object to deprecate the value of scientific research and discovery or speak disparagingly of the work—the important work of specialists and experts. Scientific work and discovery may bring lasting boons. But my point is that it is possible to waste money on expert knowledge or research work more lavishly than absolutely necessary and all that money can be spent in solid, constructive and instructive work which will reach the ryot immediately."

(Here the bell was sounded and the speaker resumed his seat.)

Mr. V. P. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—"Sir, eighty-five per cent of the population of the country is said to be agriculturists. Many of my hon. Friends here complained that too much money has been spent in this department. The work done by this department is of immense benefit to the agriculturists. No other department has such immense potentialities for doing good to the country as this department. So instead of asking the money to be cut down, we must be prepared to vote more than what we are giving now.

"Of course, at the commencement it may be costly, but in the long run, we shall reap the benefits. We have not given them sufficient time to develop their projects. Besides, the experts we are getting from foreign countries have got to learn the climate of our country, the nature of the soil and other cognate things, and to find out in what way all these pests could be removed. All these things must necessarily take time. So, instead of asking the money to be cut down I do think that we must give more money. Whatever is done now is not properly developed so that people may be benefited by it. The number of inspectors must be increased enormously, and demonstration work must be carried on on a larger scale. These experts may then be able to succeed in their experiments and justify their appointment to the Government. But it is the people that ought to be convinced of it, so that for this purpose in every taluk at least, a demonstration farm should be opened. Otherwise the work of these experts will be thrown away. With these observations, I beg to oppose the reduction."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—"Sir, the hon. the Mover emphasized the importance of chemical manuring. I think that before we introduce the chemical manuring, we must have a knowledge of the bio-chemistry of the

[24th March 1922] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

soil, what chemical manures should be made use of, in what proportion these manures should be employed. All these questions presuppose a fair knowledge of the soil in the different parts of the province, a comprehensive scheme of soil-analysis, both mechanical and scientific, of the quantity of potash or other minerals and the nature and quantity of organisms present in the soil. In respect of popularising these manures I think it would be more advantageous to the agriculturist to be told how he may derive very great benefit from the proper use of the farm yard manure and also how it will do him immense good to raise a crop of leguminous plants. For agricultural experts themselves are doubtful of the results obtained by an indiscriminate use of costly fertilizers or chemical manures. There are many agricultural operations which are mechanically gone through by the agriculturist. He has perhaps an empirical knowledge of all these things; and the researches made by specialists have proved that all these empirical methods are certainly very good and very useful. (Hear, hear.) A rational application of these methods with such improvements as admit of being introduced at very little cost will be productive of greater good than the extensive use of costly fertilizers.

"Secondly, some remarks have been made with regard to the work of the specialists. I think, Sir, I am in duty bound to bear testimony to the very good work done by the specialists, especially in the Tinnevely district. I speak of the Tinnevely district because my experience does not extend to other districts. My hon. Friend Mr. Somasundaram Pillai is not here. The other hon. Friend Mr. Shanmukham Pillai will surely bear me out when I say that the cotton crop in the Tinnevely district has been free from certain pests which had been attacking the crop in the past and making the cotton grown there very inferior in quality. Owing to the work of these specialists, we find a better cotton crop, and this crop contributes very much to the prosperity of the people of the Tinnevely district.

"The third point, Sir, is that a great deal more has to be done by these specialists. There is therefore no lack of work for them. We do not know for certain what are the precise functions of the different organisms on the soil which are responsible for liberating ammonia and certain acids. What those organisms are and what are their respective functions, how they can be brought in to the soil in such numbers as are necessary for conferring fertility on the soil, all these are questions that must be studied scientifically before they could become matter for demonstration. As regards the last point, that is, demonstration work, I feel that it is not necessary for a special staff of officers to be appointed for this purpose. The present staff can cope with this work. There are, besides, a number of pamphlets issued by the Publicity Bureau and the Agricultural Department, and many more such pamphlets might be issued. And popularising these pamphlets, having by turns a great exhibition in the different districts, which will attract all ryots, especially the wealthy landlords, would go a great way towards educating the people in all those very indispensable and necessary things, which ought to be known to every ryot and a knowledge of which, I believe, will surely contribute to the agricultural prosperity of this province. Therefore, very far from thinking that the Agricultural Department, as it is now run, is a burden on the tax-payer, I think that the benefits which the department has already conferred upon the ryots of certain districts will be extended, day by day, enriching this province. Considering the other and more important

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

[24th March 1922]

branch of the work of the department, the many agricultural pests that have been successfully eradicated and will continue to be eradicated if specialists like Mr. Barber and others go on with their researches and the experiments to have a better crop of sugarcane and to find certain remedies for certain insects that affect not only sugarcane but other crops as well, considering all this, I believe it is possible for us to say confidently that this department is doing good work."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"I have listened to the speeches of the hon. the Mover and Mr. Vellingiri Goundar. Whatever excuse there may be on the part of the mover for not quite appreciating the work that has been done in Coimbatore, I find there is none for my friend Mr. Vellingiri Goundar. Probably he is illustrating the truth contained in that well-known statement 'nearer the Church farther away from God'. For he happens to be at Coimbatore, and day in and day out he probably sees the palatial building of the Agricultural College and therefore he seems to think that it is not doing good work. Sir, I have a different tale to tell about it. I happened to go there only about six weeks ago on a professional business and took advantage of that occasion of going around the whole College through the courtesy of various professors there, European and Indian. There I saw what was being done, and I was particularly struck by the series of experiments which have been carried on and which have resulted in successfully spraying sulphate of copper by mechanical appliances. All kinds of useful researches are made there. Thus, they were able to put a stop to the pests that attack sugarcane, cotton and maize crops and grapes. That discovery is the result of a long series of experiments, and therefore you cannot judge of the work done by the department only by the number of men turned out, but it must be judged by the quantity of useful work done there."

Mr. V. C. VELLINGIRI GOUNDAR:—"I am not much concerned with the work of the department. I have only given the general policy. I did not touch upon the work of the department which my hon. Friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyyar is referring to."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"If I have any complaints against the Minister it is rather that he has not fought sufficiently with the hon. the Finance Member for giving him the proper amount of funds. I find in the budget estimate of 1921-22 the total including votable and non-votable items to be 18½ lakhs of rupees. This time it is only 16½ lakhs. I suppose it is to be accounted for by the fact that owing to the financial stringency, the pruning knife that has been applied all round has also been applied to the Agricultural Department with the result that the provision under this head has been reduced, and instead of deprecating the fact that money is being spent, we are to fight for more money being placed at the disposal of the Minister, so that he may be enabled to carry on the useful work which is being done by this department on a larger scale."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I have tabled the next motion but I would prefer to speak on this motion as I do not intend to embarrass the hon. the Minister in his attempt to develop the agricultural progress of this country. It is not my object to say that the amount spent is not properly spent. That is not my point. We do require experts and we do

24th March 1922]

[Mr. T. M. Narasimhaacharlu]

require researches which are of immense use to the rural population. It is well known that the masses consist mostly of agriculturists. It is also equally well known that their methods of agriculture are almost primitive. Consequently there is a necessity for engaging experts and more experts too, if possible, for finding the means to improve the agriculture of the country. My complaint is that the masses have not yet been benefited by the researches that have been made by these experts. They are very simple people; they are ignorant people; and they cannot be expected to understand the technicalities of these things. What I would urge is that these things should be made so simple and so easy, both by ordinary, simple language and by demonstrations in every district and in every taluk, so that the people may have the fullest benefit of the researches that have been made by the Department of Agriculture. It is no use to discover improved methods and to lock them up in one's heart or in one's bureau. The great use consists in disseminating that knowledge so that it may reach the masses and they may appreciate and follow it up in their methods of agriculture. That is the thing that is essential, and my complaint is that you can rather forego some of the extravagant expenditure that has been allotted in the way of contingencies and other things and utilize that amount for the propagation of the benefits that have been discovered by these experts to the advantage of the masses. That is my point. Therefore, Sir, I submit that that is the point which the hon. the Minister will be pleased to bear in mind. In fact, in my district, people know very little of what is being done in the Agricultural College of Coimbatore or elsewhere. They are in the very same state as they were 25 years ago, and will the hon. the Minister be pleased to send some experts there to propagate their knowledge among the people of my district so that they may also be benefited by such knowledge? Can he not start a farm there under the guidance of one or two experts and demonstrate according to the nature of the soil and the nature of the manure available there? Can he not demonstrate the benefits that have been discovered by these experts? At present, sufficient provision has not been made for achieving such purposes. That is my point. Therefore, I say, both in the matter of seeds, and in the matter of the proper kinds of manure that should be applied to the soil, the method of ploughing the soil and cultivating it at proper seasons—all these things, I think, an expert will be able to do by demonstration in the locality.

"I say, Sir, that the masses are not so stupid as not to understand the benefits if they are demonstrated to them. If the masses do not understand them, it is because they do not know or because what is being done does not really benefit them. Therefore, I submit, the whole attention of the department must be directed to the propagation of the knowledge to the masses. That is why I have tabled another motion, but I prefer to speak on the general motion because the real complaint is that sufficient attention is not being given to the propagation of this knowledge to the masses."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I had no intention of saying anything on this motion but I am afraid that after hearing the speech of my friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyyar—I find myself compelled to make some remarks—I cannot but compare him to one of those holiday tourists who come and stay either in Government House or some hotel and go away after a few days and say that they have knowledge of everything in India,

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [24th March 1922]

and that nobody except themselves, whether Indian or European, knows so much as themselves. I was surprised to hear from him that he had a full knowledge of everything that is going on in this Agricultural College after a few hours' visit to that college which he was able to spare during his short trip to Coimbatore on professional engagement. He went on to criticise and misinterpret the words of my hon. friend, Mr. Vellingiri Goundar, who only said that a good deal of money that is spent was being wasted.

"No one in this House or anywhere else says anything about the large sums of money that are reasonably spent by this department. We, on the other hand, are for spending more money in this department reasonably, but we emphatically say that some money is also wasted now. So that, the hon. the Minister will do well to see that money is not wasted, and that the allotments made are spent for useful purposes. Mr. Vellingiri Goundar never said that there is absolutely no use of this college. His point, and my point also, was that the ryot population does not get any benefit that may be compatible with the large sums of money that are spent upon this department. He said that the college was primarily intended for the sons of the soil and for the actually tilling ryots. But now if at all it benefits anybody it benefits only the non-cultivating ryot. The actually tilling ryot does not find this college of any use to him. Unless a man is prepared to take up Government education imparted in this college is found to be practically of no use to him as an actual tiller. By this I do not mean to say that education in this college is of no use at all.

"Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar was correct in speaking highly about the spraying machine. I have found this machine to be useful, and I have got one myself. I am making use of this in my compound where there are a lot of flower plants, fruit trees, grape vines, etc. Therefore when I was saying something about the wasting of money by this department I do admit also that the department has done some good. The Mycologist has been doing very good work. It has considerably benefited fruit trees, flower plants, etc., and the grapes which are grown in several districts, but which are not to be found much in Coimbatore. With all this we do think that much more good can be done if only this money is better utilized. Mr. Vellingiri Goundar is one of the richest ryots who actually cultivate the land, and what is more, I believe, he is also one of the non-official visitors to this Agricultural College, and, if anybody's opinion is weighty at all in this matter, it is his. Mr. Vellingiri Goundar has visited the college several times, and he and myself had occasion to go to the college together once, and I can say that it is not want of appreciation as the last speaker was induced to remark but it is a desire to see something more useful done by this college that Mr. Vellingiri Goundar was speaking on this motion, and were it not for the fact that his time was up he would have proved it. Our object was not to curtail the allotment. We want more money to be allotted, but we still maintain that much money is wasted by this department, which can be utilized in better ways such as giving to the actual farmer information about scientific researches, etc. In this way we think something more useful could be done not necessarily useful to us educated people alone, but to the tillers of the soil also.

24th March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

"In this connexion I may say that I have purchased a monsoon plough and given it to the tenant. This plough remains as new now as it was at the time I purchased it. It is not capable of being pulled by ordinary bulls. So, what I say is, much of the improvements effected by the department is not capable of being used by the ordinary tiller. Lastly, I think that the Agricultural College will justify the money spent upon it only if it is able to give to the tiller its experience and knowledge whereby he may work with a little less expense and with a little less difficulty."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"Mr. President, my first duty is to thank my friend Mr. Narasimhachari for the attitude he has taken in this matter. While he criticised the work of the experts he very generously stated that we require more research officers and more experts if possible. He more than once kindly acknowledged the services rendered by the department and by the experts. It is perhaps not surprising that my friend on the opposition bench, Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, should go to the defence of Mr. Vellingiri Goundar seeing that both of them represent the same constituency. There is nothing in what my friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar had said which could be taken exception to. My friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, in defending Mr. Vellingiri Goundar, said that the ryots were not benefited, and that the sons of the soil were not educated in the school so that they might go back to their fields and utilize their agricultural knowledge on their own farms.

"Well, Sir, on the question of the benefits, I have already submitted to 12-45 p.m. this House that judging only from the seed rate more than a crore of rupees has been saved, and that the various diseases that were prevented or cured in the case of the extensive vine yards in the Madura district showed what profits were derived owing to the work of these Agricultural officers. Sir, I shall mention only one other instance, because there is no use repeating those to which reference had already been made by me if hon. Members like my friend Mr. Vellingiri Goundar are not prepared to accept our statements. Reference has been made to the work of the Agricultural Department and of the experts in dealing with the cotton diseases of the Coimbatore district, and the new strains that were introduced there, and also to the development of cotton cultivation in the districts on that side. Quite recently the department has prepared an estimate of the work done there, and the benefit that has accrued to the people thereby. From the year 1908 to the year 1918, we calculated the benefits that were derived by the people on account of the Agricultural Department and by their advice on the one single item of the strains that were employed eliminating all factors like the average rise of prices due to world causes. It has been found that the money value of the increased output—not due to other causes but that due to our own exertions—came to Rs. 50,00,000 and that in one year alone. The value of the produce of the year 1918 alone was increased by Rs. 50,00,000, and this covered, I was about to say, the whole expenditure of the Agricultural Department, from the year 1908 to 1918. Let me emphasise this, Sir, with your kind permission. From the year 1908 to the year 1918, for a period of ten years, the cost of the Agricultural Department was not more than Rs. 40,00,000, and the increased profits made by the cotton producers in those districts, profits which could be attributed only to the work of the Agricultural Department and the research work of the experts in one single

[Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu] [24th March 1922]

year, viz., 1918, alone, came to Rs. 50 lakhs. In calculating that, they have eliminated the increase in prices due to world causes and the various expenses that must have necessarily been incurred in producing cotton. Eliminating all these causes, and taking into account only this single cause of the work done by the department of Agriculture, it has been discovered that an extra profit of something like Rs. 50 lakhs has been made by the ryots in a single year. Now, I leave it to the House to judge whether in the face of these circumstances it is justifiable to say that the ryots have not been benefited by the Agricultural Department or by the work of the Agricultural experts."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"What I said was that the benefit to the ryots was not as much as may be commensurate with the amount spent."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"I am giving an estimate of the amounts spent. From the year 1908 to the year 1918, the whole cost of the Agricultural Department was only Rs. 40 lakhs, and in the year 1918 alone, the increased profits due to the direct result of our work was Rs. 50 lakhs."

Sriman SASTI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo:—"May I know, Sir, what is the basis of these statistics?"

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"I have no objection to place the details of these calculations before my hon. Friend and he is at liberty to criticise them."

"Well, Sir, as regards the question of the sons of the soil, my friends are carrying coals to Newcastle when they suggest it to me. My friend from the Kistna district knows that I belong to an agricultural family, and if any one can claim to be interested in the agriculturists of this country, I can lay as much claim to it as anybody else. Well, on this question of the sons of agriculturists being trained in agriculture, you, Sir, Mr. President and your Secretary are well aware that attempts in that direction were made, and in fact I have got in my office a number of reports from our worthy Secretary when he was Director of Agriculture wherein he complained of this very thing and wanted to induce agriculturists to send their sons for agricultural training. We recognize that the elementary duty of this department and the object of this agricultural college is to see that the sons of the soil, sons of agriculturists are trained, so that they may go to their fields and utilize that knowledge on their own farms. But unfortunately in this country, our people are so educated that their studies are only pursued for gaining wages or salaries. For years our own university education has been like that. What can we do? Fifty years of university education have not produced a single inventor in this country. And why? Because we have been trained to be officers or clerks or something of that kind. Education for itself, for its own sake, has not been attempted in this land, and it is a curse of the country itself and not a fault of the Department of Agriculture or of the authorities of the Agricultural College. Why lay it at the door of the Agricultural College then? By all means let them (the sons of agriculturists) come, we welcome them and we are prepared to give them scholarships. Nothing would please the Agricultural Department and myself or the Government more than to admit them to the agricultural classes, and to see that they are trained, because we know that those who serve the Government in

24th March 1922] [Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu]

these departments after all, however good the work they have done, do it for the sake of their own appointments, whereas if the sons of the soil are trained we recognize that they get the training for the country's and for their benefit and for their advancement, and when the production is increased, naturally the national wealth will be increased and it will be of great benefit to the country at large. To charge us therefore that the sons of the soil have not got the benefit, to charge the Agricultural department or the authorities of the College of Agriculture is, I think Sir, not fair.

"Now I shall turn to the more reasonable criticisms, if I may say so, of my Friend Mr. Ramachandra Rao and others. Mr. Ramachandra Rao, Sir, was referring to chemical manures. I am aware, just as he is—we belong to the same place and the same district—that almost all the earth known as 'pati' earth is being dug out and if we go to the agricultural villages of those parts, we shall find nothing but big pits going to 20 feet below the surface of the earth. The attention of the Government was drawn long ago to the existence of these pits, and various attempts have been made to replace this 'pati' earth by chemical manures. Reference has been made to the fact that it was advised that these manures should be obtained from Messrs. Parry & Co. Well, Sir, I do not know what harm there is in so doing when there is only one firm which is able to supply these manures. Why should we not recommend the people to go to that company? Those of our friends who have seen the Ranipet works are in a position to know what attempts they are making to produce these manures. It may be in the first place in their own interest and to get profits, but at the same time it is a work which is not done by others, and certainly the people of this country ought to be thankful to Messrs. Parry & Co. for their exertions in trying to produce these manures. It has been said, Sir, that the railway fares are in the way. That is quite true, and I may tell my hon. Friend for his information that this Government have been trying their best to induce the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Company and the South Indian Railway Company to charge lower fares for the freight of the manures from one part of the Presidency to another. Unfortunately, we have not yet been able to make them consent. They put one or two conditions, namely, that a certain number of tons should be carried every year because it may not be possible for them to carry small lots as they cannot make arrangements for it. There was also another difficulty as regards carriages, because they wanted to carry it in open trucks, and we could not consent to it, because owing to exposure in the air and moisture the manures would be spoiled if so carried. But still the question has not been given up, and it is now under correspondence between this Government and the Government of India. No pains will be spared and every possible attempt will be made to see that some concession is obtained from these authorities. I am afraid we cannot compel them, but we must only appeal to their good sense and better patriotism, and I expect, Sir, whoever may be the authorities, they will be patriotic enough so long as they are in this country."

"Well, Sir, my friend has referred to fish guano, fish manures and other forms of manure and wanted that the Government should undertake the preparation of these manures. Let me at once inform my hon. Friend that Agricultural officers have been collecting and mixing up new forms of manure and selling them in the Tanjore district. If we go further than that, it would at once make the Government a trading firm, which it is not the

[Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu] [24th March 1922]

intention of Government to become, nor will it be the idea of any one here to drive Government to that length. It is not right that Government should compete with private enterprise when there is a firm forthcoming willing and ready to prepare these manures and sell them. Certainly all that the Government could do is to negotiate with them for better terms, but certainly not to compete with them on a commercial basis and any arrangement that we might make in the preparation of these manures or selling them will at once be challenged by merchants who would say that Government have no business to come into the trade. All the same, Sir, we have been doing some pioneering work and to that extent we are in conflict with traders. Hon. Members are perhaps aware that in the Trichinopoly district there are what are known as phosphatic nodules. Phosphorus is to be found in the stones all over the district, almost on the surface and more often buried in the earth. And the Director of Industries is just now engaged in carrying on experiments in that direction. If we succeed, I put it cautiously, Sir, if we succeed, because it is after all an experiment and all experiments are beset with the possibilities of failure, certainly we may be in a position to place at the disposal of the country large quantities of phosphatic manures. The 'pati' earth in the Godavari and Kistna districts is really the old earth of deserted villages, the nitrates and the salts used by the people going to the bottom of the earth or at least underneath the surface of the earth and getting mixed up with the earth; that earth is used in these districts. The fact is that there is more phosphorus in it, and if this phosphatic nodules problem should become a success, it can certainly replace that 'pati' earth successfully. Then, Sir, there is the question of fish manure and fish guano, to which reference has been made by Mr. Ramachandra Rao, and there is the farm manure and the cattle manure, and then there is the green manure. In the Godavari and Kistna districts, as my hon. Friend is aware, apart from the green leaves of the forest known in the Guntur district, they raise certain crops, sunhemp for instance, allow it to grow until it flowers, then cut it and till the land with it, with the result that a manure is obtained. All these things have been engaging the attention of the Government of Madras and the department of Industries and the department of Agriculture. I do not think, Sir, that it will be fair to us to say that this question of manures has not been attended to, or that sufficient attention has not been paid to it."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I do not wish to take up the time of the House in replying to what my hon. Friend said, for he made several observations, and I have no time to cover the whole ground. Nevertheless, I hope he will profit by the criticisms that have been offered in this House. I should think, Sir, that the hon. the Minister has made a too zealous and too one-sided defence of the departments under his control. It is only natural and I do not wish to dilate very much on the points he has made. But I think he must recognize that the whole result of agricultural education at any rate so far as it has been given hitherto has been to supply the department with officers.

" I am perfectly certain that nobody who knows the history of our agricultural organization in this Presidency will deny the fact that the object of the Agricultural department in this Presidency has been merely to satisfy departmental needs and not necessarily to place at the disposal of the people a system of general agricultural education. As it is my hon.

1 p.m.

24th March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

Friend will concede that, notwithstanding the very many pious resolutions that have been passed at agricultural conferences, the whole system of agricultural education has not been perfected with a view to place it at the disposal of the people. I maintain, whatever may be said to the contrary, that that criticism is just and that every hon. Member who criticized the system in that way is just."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" I concede that myself, Sir."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Of that I am glad. Therefore, I think, Sir, that this criticism by Mr. Vellingiri Goundar and Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar is made with a view to emphasise the point that the system of education should be so changed as to adapt it to the agriculturists' needs. I do not wish to go into the various matters referred to by my hon. Friends. Even Mr. Tanukachala Chettiyar seems to have a complaint against the Minister—"

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" His complaint was that I did not demand more funds."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" There ought to be an agricultural organization in this country perfect in all respects. The hon. the Minister in charge referred to the fact that Messrs. Parry & Co. are already dealing in manures and said he should not come into collision with private enterprise. I trust the Minister will see the limitation of that doctrine. That doctrine was accepted for years and I believe it has been dethroned by the Industrial Commission and in a matter such as this where tremendous quantities of bones are exported from the east coast which could be made available at a nominal cost, if a little trouble was taken by the department of Agriculture, I submit, Sir, that to stand by this doctrine of colliding with trade interests cannot be accepted at any rate by me. I think Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar also referred to this matter. I am perfectly aware of the methods of improving the soil. Agriculturists say that this is not enough now and that artificial manures have come into use. It is right policy to use them wherever they can be applied with advantage. There is one other matter which I would like to refer to. My hon. Friend Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar was rather inclined to support the Publicity Bureau as against demonstration. I think, Sir, there is no use publishing a number of leaflets. I am myself a member of the Publicity Bureau and I know something of that body and its limitations. What is wanted for the ryot is ocular demonstration which cannot be made by the Publicity Bureau."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—" I also spoke of exhibitions being held in districts."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I do not answer my Friend. If we have an enormous finance at our disposal, we may get exhibitions in this matter too. In fact exhibitions are not quite favoured just at present. I think the object of this motion has been stated; and I trust in the matter of demonstration my hon. Friend said that he is negotiating with the Government of India and he must in the matter of freight entirely depend upon the good sense of the railway company. I believe the question of rates are entirely with the Government of India. And even as regards the railway companies, their rates are always subject to the sanction of the Railway Board and I believe that a committee is about to be

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [24th March 1922]
constituted in consequence of the Railway Commission's report. I withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 602 to 604.

The following motions were not made:—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—

602. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 14,28,421 for Agriculture by Rs. 1,00,000.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—

603. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 14,28,421 for Agriculture by Rs. 5,000.

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—

604. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 14,28,421 for Agriculture by Rs. 3,80,100.

Motion 605.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

605. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 14.82 lakhs for Agriculture by Rs. 100.

"In view of the fact that the question has been discussed from various standpoints on the motion of Mr. Ramachandra Rao, I have very little to add. And if I now say anything I would lay special emphasis upon two aspects and leave it to the department to pay sufficient attention to those matters. I may premise by saying that the hon. the Minister need not enter into any special defence when such criticisms are offered and need not be under the impression that any such criticism is merely intended to expose the faults of the department. On the other hand, this is just the time and place for any useful suggestions to be made regarding the work of the department and we hope that these suggestions, in the fulness of time, be given careful consideration. I do not subscribe to the view that the Agricultural department is not in any way useful or that it is not doing useful work. And there is no one here who will advocate that appropriate funds ought not to be voted for the maintenance of the institutions. If still members find it necessary to draw attention to certain defects, it is because they feel that, notwithstanding the work hitherto done in the past, the work actually turned out is not satisfactory and really useful to the masses. The only point that I wish the hon. the Minister to consider is that while forgetting his calculations of the 50 lakhs that have been spent on the department and the 50 lakhs that have been saved in cotton in one year, he will consider whether the benefits that can be expected have been afforded to the peoples concerned and if not, what are the causes which have led to such a state of things. There is no use of justifying the institutions or the experts or the experiments so far as it is not possible for him to satisfy the public at large who are really the people for whom these schemes are meant to be beneficial. Within the limited time at my disposal, I cannot expand the subject. But judged by the results of the operations, it will be seen that the people have not really been benefited by it.

24th March 1922] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

"No doubt the problem for consideration is whether a bureau of information in central places would be useful. The hon. Member Mr. Tangavelu Pillai drew attention to it and the hon. the Minister promised to make inquiries. I only wish to ask whether the officers touring in the districts did specially take advantage of their presence and hold conferences with agriculturists and elicit information from them. Reports of touring might have been sent up and those reports might have been considered by the superior officers. What I really think it necessary is whether in each and every one of their tours they made it a point to have a conference with the leading agriculturists of the locality and discuss with them the problems affecting agricultural improvements.

"In addition to it the formation of boards in each district or at least in important centres will serve a useful purpose. My hon. Friend referred to the Central Advisory Board. But that will not serve much useful purpose. The conditions in each district are different and the Central Advisory Board can perhaps discuss general questions of policy for the whole of the Presidency. But so far as particular districts are concerned, there must be similar boards constituted in each centre on a satisfactory basis.

"The second point is that sufficient attention has not been given to the question of agricultural education in the lower stages. It will be remembered that from 1913 and 1914 onwards, various resolutions were moved in this Council for the establishment of agricultural schools in several districts. This was considered very desirable even in the various conferences held for the purpose, and recommendations also were made for the establishment of agricultural schools. I may particularly refer to the conference at Simla on the 18th and 19th June 1917. There it was specifically stated notwithstanding the discordant note by Mr. Wood—

'The conference are of opinion that it should be laid down as a goal that every rural district should have one or more agricultural middle schools usually situated near to demonstration or experimental farms.'

"Mr. Wood wishes to qualify acceptance so far as regards Madras by expressing his view that for that province concentration on demonstration is more desirable than the establishment of schools. These resolutions were passed in the year 1917; but the hon. the Minister will be satisfied that very little has been done to give effect to the recommendations of the conference.

"Again, Sir, coming to the question of primary education, it will be found that definite suggestions were made at the conference as to the extent to which primary education should be made useful to the masses.

'The conference also strongly insist on the desirability of adapting primary education in rural areas more closely to rural needs. Whilst agreeing that no attempt should be made in primary schools to teach agriculture or horticulture as such, the following suggestions are made towards the solution of this problem. Nature study should be made a necessary part of the curriculum in rural schools.'

"And then they say that 'special attention should be paid to the training of rural teachers, preferably in a separate training school' and that 'the Agricultural department should, when opportunity offers, co-operate by vacation courses for such teachers.'

"In spite of these two important things, I wish to know if anything has been done in the way of training teachers in the matter of agriculture so as to enable them to get the advantage of the training and to give proper

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [24th March 1922]

instruction to their pupils on the subject. I believe, Sir, that whatever might be the result of the instruction given in the Agricultural College, whatever might be the final result of the experiments carried on, it may be taken for granted that if the mass of the people of the country ought to be benefited, it must be through these new types of schools brought into existence in large numbers. And unless definite steps are taken in the direction, I do not think any benefit would come out of the operations of this department."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"My hon. Friend started by saying that we should not object to criticisms for it was not at all the object of this House to minimise the usefulness of the Agricultural College or the expert staff, but that useful suggestions were made in this House for the benefit of the department and the Minister in charge. That spirit, Sir, I fully appreciate, if I may so put it, and no one will be more glad than I to receive any such criticism. My learned Friend has said that there is no use in merely justifying the experts or the college. He was perfectly justified in saying that from his own point of view. I thank him for it. But there are others. Sir, who stated that the department was 'barren of all results' and had 'not emerged from the stage of experiments,' and so on and so forth. I am glad, Sir, at the turn the debate has taken to-day. From an attack against the college and the experts, it is now suggested that we are all right, that our experts are pretty good people, that the college has now done some little good work, but that we must see that the knowledge of such good work is brought to the country and that the agriculturist is benefited by it. I welcome that criticism, but let me tell them that even in that direction we have not been idle. We have got a regular staff of demonstrators, upper subordinates and lower subordinates. About 125 of them are going about the districts and are spreading the knowledge and the results not merely of the experiments in the Research Institute, but of the experiments on the Government farms, and these results are carried even to the fields of the agriculturists. Let me explain further. The first stage for the expert is to find out something, whether it be the cause of a disease, the life-history and the cure of those mischievous little things, the bacilli or the microbes or whatever they may be called, or it may be to produce a new strain by the combination of different plants from the flowers of two different plants. That is one thing which I hope many of my hon. Friends—I know some of them have seen—will go and have a look at in this Institute, how from the male flower of one plant and from the female flower of another plant, eliminating the female of the first one and the male of the other, a combination is made and a new strain is produced. When this is done, Sir, it is experimented on the farm at Coimbatore. When that succeeds and a new strain has been obtained, it is transplanted in the farm and a small tract of land is cultivated with the new strain. That does not suffice, because what grows in Coimbatore may not grow elsewhere. Then it is taken to the farm at Samalkota if it is the Northern Circle, or to Manganallur if it is the Southern Circle, or to Taliparamba if it is the West Coast and experiment is made there. A certain plot of land in this new locality is cultivated with that new strain and the result is found out. When this is done, the demonstrators come into operation; they take the seed to the ryots, ask them to try this new strain on their own fields under the supervision of the demonstrator

[24th March 1922] [Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu]

or under higher officers. They supply the new seed, tell them what manure to use, at what time to sow, and supervise the cultivation of the crop. All that is demonstration and propaganda work. I take it.

"Then, Sir, there is the Publicity Bureau which sends out considerable literature on these subjects every year. Apart from the Publicity Bureau the Agricultural department itself publishes numerous pamphlets by the thousand and by the lakh and distributes them freely. The 125 demonstrators and other officers are mainly intended for the single purpose of carrying this knowledge to the agriculturist and they are, I contend, doing their work quite satisfactorily. Of course, I appreciate my hon. Friend's criticism that more ought to be done. Certainly I shall be glad to get more done. But the trouble again is the Finance department. We have to cut our coat according to the cloth that is supplied. But I have no reason to complain that a large cut has been made in my department either by the Finance department or by this House. Still we do want more money and then only greater developments will be possible.

"There is one other point which was referred to. The hon. Member Mr. Krishna Rao asked what has been done with regard to the proceedings of the Board of Agriculture and two questions were raised, namely, elementary education and middle schools. As to middle schools a committee was appointed by the Madras Government some three or four years ago on which there were three members of the Educational department and three members of the Agricultural department. They came to the conclusion that one school should be tried in each centre; one in the Telugu country somewhere near Anakapalle, another in the south in the Tamil country and a third on the West Coast. In the West Coast, the Taliparamba school should have been started this year. But unfortunately the buildings were delayed. But I may tell the House that the buildings are nearing completion and we expect to start the school in a very few months. Orders have also been issued for the school at Anakapalle. Unfortunately again, the question of finance came in our way. I may also bring to the notice of the House that we wanted to have the school building and the quarters for the staff and teachers at Taliparamba to come into existence long ago. But it was discovered that the Public Works department estimated these at Rs. 85,000. Well, I said that it was impossible. I may say that it was the late Mr. Stuart who sat with me for three hours on one occasion to discuss this one question and took away the papers saying, 'I do not want to send it to the Public Works department, but I will do it myself.' We have got now an estimate for something like Rs. 25,000 or for nearly one-fourth of the original cost. This was approved and the buildings are nearing completion. But even Rs. 25,000 in a year like this would not be a possibility for a secondary school, for added to the further expenditure on the staff and on the students—because some scholarships will have to be given to students to attract them—it will come to a large amount. If money is forthcoming to-morrow I shall be able to open a school at Anakapalle and one in Palur in the south or in some other places. But funds are wanting and schools could not be opened. It is not because the Government are wanting in sympathy for this education. It is not because we have not made attempts to start the schools. In fact, we have appointed committees, we have the reports, we have got the schemes ready, the only thing wanting is that blessed thing which is wanting in the budgets of all countries just now—money.

[Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu] [24th March 1922]

"As regards elementary education, similar attempts have been made at Anakapalle and Samalkota, where we have elementary schools and where farmers' sons are given the elements of education in agriculture and in Palur also there is a school. We recognize that it is not enough. It was stated a little while ago that 80 per cent of the population of this country consists of agriculturists, and it is only right that agricultural education should be brought home to these villagers. It is a great problem, Sir, and one in which the co-operation of the Education department is absolutely necessary. But I may tell again, Sir, for the information of this House, that my hon. Colleague the Minister for Education has been trying to introduce agricultural classes in the elementary schools and with my consent and with my co-operation he has been able to appoint an ordinary teacher, an L.T., to sit together with an officer of the Agricultural department and prepare text-books for these elementary schools in agriculture in the vernaculars. These two officers are just now working at it. As soon as the text-books are ready, I expect my hon. Friend Mr. Patro to introduce these text-books into the curriculum of the elementary schools; for each class certain hours in their education are to be devoted to agricultural studies. Hon. Members are probably aware that already there is what is known as gardening, however insignificant it may be at present. It has already been introduced in the elementary schools. With the help of these agricultural classes and with the help of the little gardens that they have got in the schools some little education in agriculture it is possible to give. But that does not in the least take away my responsibility or the responsibility of my department for the spread of agricultural education. But I may say again that it is not because we have not made any attempts to do it but because we have no funds that we have not been able to do more."

Mr. V. C. VELLINGIRI GOUNDAR :—"Sir, I have no time to speak on the farms, but now let me say a word about the farms started under the auspices of this department."

"The central farm at Coimbatore can be worked on really economical and profitable lines, if there is not such a costly staff of supervision, and there can be established a really good breeding farm with adequate provision for grazing grounds, thus saving unnecessary purchase of cattle, bulls and also fodder."

"The farm at Chintaladevi appears to me to be an excellent idea. But what has been hitherto done and proposed to be done makes me pessimistic as to its future not only from the point of view of utility, but also from the point of view of economy. This scheme was taken on hand in 1918, and before the farm was started, Government got the live-stock export, and after the lapse of so many years, the roads are being laid out. The place is thirty-six miles from the nearest railway station and a wind-screen of trees is being formed and the belt of trees to form as a wind-break has just begun to grow, but apparently rainfall is not quite so favourable. Of course the Public Works department has started work on its usual scale—the work of putting up buildings and quarters. After all, this is to be an experimental farm and perhaps by the time the grand buildings and quarters are completed, the experiments may have to be given up."

"The same is my complaint with regard to the other farms, like the Pollachi cotton farm, where buildings and roads are just complete. The

[24th March 1922] [Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar]

Koalpatti, the Samalkota and Bantanahel farms are other instances. Now, is it the right thing to proceed in this manner with regard to experiments? To have costly experts who can never get into touch with the ryots and who have to learn after coming here Indian conditions, Indian climate and Indian ryots and who have to undergo training to start with, to have costly buildings and quarters, and then to write learned treatises on technical and scientific matters which are unintelligible to the ryots. What I would suggest is, that Government should give up the policy with regard to experimental farms and instead start on small scales demonstration farms and have a staff who can understand the language of the country and know the local conditions and who can get the ryots to co-operate with them. I would even welcome the opening in every taluk centre such demonstration farms with the help of students passed out of the college, where ryots themselves can be induced to cultivate on certain agreeable terms. To go even further, inducement in the shape of rewards, prizes or compensation can be offered to the ryots to induce them to take to methods of cultivation which the department thinks are of use to them. It is in this way by direct touch with the ryot that agriculture can be improved by departmental action and not by the expert working at the microscope and writing learned theses. The ryots in Coimbatore and in the delta tracts particularly are intelligent folk and are most hard-working and if they have not derived any substantial benefit from the department, there can be no greater condemnation. The only real and practical things which the department has done for the ryot are the improvement of cotton cultivation, spreading single seed planting of paddy, some improvements in sugar-cane selection, pumping installations, treating palm diseases, green manure seeds, etc. But all this is out of all proportion to the colossal amounts consumed by the department and its officers and experts."

"The department is fond of dreaming in crores of money being saved to the ryot if the single seed planting and other improvements are adopted universally. This estimate in my humble opinion, exists only in imagination and can never be realized in practice."

"Another point of mine with regard to experimental farms on a large scale is this. After the experiment is demonstrated to be a success, the necessity for its being continued ceases to exist, and the farm should be discontinued and further fields of work and development of other branches in the order of importance to the ryot must be taken up and new experiments tried. If this is conceded, where is the necessity for costly structures and residential quarters on these farms? If these farms are intended to be demonstration farms to the ordinary ryot and labourer for whose benefit the department should carry on its activities, what is the meaning in having grand structures and well laid out quarters? In my opinion, they are so much money thrown away besides their scaring away the ryot, as I said, by their very grandeur. The buildings on these farms, or of any schools, or institute in agriculture should be on the simplest and cheapest scale designed for temporary purposes and most particularly on the demonstration and experimental farms. Ambitious schemes with regard to buildings, etc., should at once be given up and opening of new farms and schools should only be undertaken after conference with the local ryots and not on mere resolutions of this Council or on one-sided expert opinion."

[24th March 1922]

[The hon. Member was obliged to resume his seat as his time-limit was over.]

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The time allotted for the discussion of Demand XIX—Agriculture having expired, the hon. the President put the question that the Government be given 14.82 lakhs of rupees *minus* Rs. 2,400 for the Agriculture department and it was carried.

The grant was made.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Before the House adjourns for lunch, I would mention that it would probably be convenient if we take up immediately after lunch items of business II, III, IV and V on the agenda paper. The first is a piece of legislation which has to be got through and passed before the 1st April. The second is an amendment to the Standing Orders. And the other two relate to elections to committees. So, if hon. Members have no objection, I shall take up items II, III, IV and V immediately after lunch. (The hon. Members signified their assent.) That being settled, the House will now adjourn for lunch and meet again at 2-30 p.m."

The House then adjourned for lunch at 1-34 p.m. and re-assembled at 2-35 p.m.

II

A BILL TO AMEND THE COURT FEES ACT, 1870.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The following communication has been received from His Excellency the Governor in respect of the Bill to amend the Court-Fees Act, 1870, which was passed at the meeting of the Council held on the 15th March last and was subsequently presented to His Excellency the Governor for his assent:—

Message from His Excellency the Governor.

The proviso which has been added by clause 6 of the Madras Court-Fees (Amendment) Bill to paragraph (iv) of section 7 of the principal Act provides for the calculation of the value of immovable property 'in the manner provided for by the next succeeding paragraph'. The next succeeding paragraph here referred to is obviously paragraph (v) of section 7 of the principal Act. But clause 7 of the Bill has introduced another paragraph—paragraph (iv) (a)—between paragraphs (iv) and (v) of section 7 of the principal Act. The paragraph next succeeding paragraph (iv) of section 7 of the principal Act would thus be paragraph (iv) (a) and not paragraph (v). His Excellency the Governor thinks that in clause 6 of the Bill the words 'the next succeeding paragraph' should be omitted and the words 'paragraph (v) of this section' substituted in their stead.

2. In clause 9 of the Bill the substitution of the word 'instituted' for the penultimate word 'filed' would, His Excellency the Governor considers, be a verbal improvement in the Bill.

3. To avoid possible doubts as to the true scope and interpretation of article 11 of Schedule II it seems desirable to omit the words 'and not otherwise provided for in this Act'.

24th March 1922]

[The President]

4. His Excellency the Governor therefore returns the Bill to the Council for the consideration of the following amendments:—

Clause 6.—At the end, omit the words 'the next succeeding paragraph' and substitute in their stead the words 'paragraph (v) of this section'.

Clause 9.—For the penultimate word 'filed' substitute the word 'instituted'.

Schedule II, article 11.—In column 1, omit the words 'and not otherwise provided for in this Act'.

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, I want to explain to the House the necessity for these amendments. The House will remember that there was an amendment proposed by Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar in which the words 'as the next succeeding paragraph' occurred. If there had been no further amendment, there would have been no trouble. But subsequently Mr. N. A. V. Somasundaram Pillai put forward another amendment to insert a new clause—clause 4 (a)—between clauses 4 and 5. That amendment was carried, and now the next succeeding paragraph would be, if the present wording is retained, clause 4 (a) and not clause 5 as was the intention of the House. That is the first amendment. The next amendment has to be introduced owing to a clerical error. The word 'instituted' is to be substituted for the word 'filed' to bring the language in conformity with the technical expression. In Schedule II, article 11, column 1, the words 'not otherwise provided for in this Act' finds a place owing to the mistake of the copyist. If you read article 1 of Schedule I you will find '... or memorandum of appeal (not otherwise provided for in this Act)'. It is in order to avoid that, that this amendment is proposed. All the amendments are only verbal amendments."

The hon. the President then put the following amendments to the House and they were carried:—

Clause 6.—At the end, omit the words 'the next succeeding paragraph' and substitute in their stead the words 'paragraph (v) of this section'.

Clause 9.—For the penultimate word 'filed' substitute the word 'instituted'.

Schedule II, article 11.—In column 1, omit the words 'and not otherwise provided for in this Act'.

III

AMENDMENTS TO THE STANDING ORDERS.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar wants leave to amend Standing Order 40 as follows:—

(1) At the commencement of paragraph (1) of Standing Order 40 insert the words 'The Member of the Government in charge of the Law Department shall ex officio be the Chairman of every Select Committee'; and

(2) In paragraph 3 of the same Standing Order, omit the first sentence."

"Does any hon. Member object to it?"

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I object, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Hon. Members who are for the introduction of these amendments to the Standing Orders will please rise in their places."

Six hon. Members stood up.

[24th March 1922]

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"A point of order, Sir. The Council Secretary rises not from his seat but from the seat of another Member. Is he in order?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The rule that Members should rise from their seats is only for the poll. Only six hon. Members are for the introduction of the amendments to the Standing Orders. Therefore the hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar has not the leave of the House."

IV

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, I beg to make the motion standing against my name:—"

That with a view to the constitution, in pursuance of rule 33 of the Madras Legislative Council Rules, of a committee on Public Accounts for the year 1922-23, this Council do proceed on a date to be fixed by the hon. the President to elect seven members to be members of the said committee.

"In moving this proposition I should like to express my regret that it has been possible to make very little use of this committee of all the talents for the reason that the function of the committee is to examine the expenditure of the funds voted by the Council and that the accounts dealing with the first budget voted by the Council will not be ready till next September. We have done what preliminary work we could this year and there will be plenty of work from September onwards for the new committee."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I fix 6 p.m. to-day as the latest hour for nomination of candidates for election. If the nominations are sent to the Secretary, the time for the election, if necessary, will be fixed later on."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I should like to know if any nomination forms are to be filled up?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"You have only to write in a piece of paper: 'I propose the following members as members of the Public Accounts Committee' and then fill in the names. The consent of the nominated member should be obtained before nominating him. I fix 6 p.m. to-day as the latest hour for the nomination papers to reach the Secretary so that hon. Members may have time for consultation. If the number of names proposed is equal to the number of seats, then there will be no election."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Would it be possible to give a little more time so that consent may be taken from Members who are not present to-day?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The Member nominating can in most cases anticipate the wishes of the Member whose name he proposes; he would ordinarily know whether his nominee would be willing or not. He can act upon that knowledge."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I only made the suggestion, Sir, because I feel responsible in a measure for springing this motion on the Council. There is no great hurry about the election of the committee. It will begin its operations only after April."

[24th March 1922]

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"In view of the fact that we have to finish the agenda if possible before the prorogation of the session by His Excellency, I do not propose to postpone the date."

V

FINANCE COMMITTEE FOR THE YEAR 1922-23.

2-45 p.m. The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I beg to make the following motion:—"

That in accordance with resolution No. 17, passed at the meeting of the Council on 1st April 1921, regarding the constitution of a Finance Committee, this Council do proceed, on a date to be fixed by the hon. the President, to elect six persons to be members of the committee for the year 1922-23.

"In so doing, I should like to say how much the Government appreciate the sacrifice of time and talents that has been made by the members of the existing Finance Committee, upon whom there has been imposed a very heavy burden of work since their appointment. They have held no less than 22 meetings, and I hope they will hold two more before the end of the year. They have digested a great mass of figures and have advised in great detail upon the budget as well as upon a large number of other matters perhaps most important of which was the question of the revision of the pay of the Madras city constabulary. I need hardly add that they have treated the Finance Department and the Finance Member with the greatest kindness and consideration, and they have our most grateful thanks for all the help that they have given us in our work. Their successors will, I am afraid, have an equally hard task, if not a harder one. But, as in the case of the Public Accounts Committee, they will not be asked to take it up until after the 1st April. As I have just said, I hope to secure the co-operation of the members of the existing committee for two more meetings, one for certain urgent grants which must be put forward before we finish our discussions, the other to examine the question of any changes that are needed in the budget procedure in the light of what has been said in the Council during the present debates."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I second it."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"In supporting this motion may I be permitted to say that we, the members of the Finance Committee, have received always from the hands of the hon. the Finance Member, Sir Charles Todhunter, uniform courtesy and kindness. We troubled him very often with requests for information, and whenever the request was made he was always cheerfully complying with it. He placed the whole staff of his at our disposal, and he was always kind and ready to supply us with any information and to oblige us in every way. We take this opportunity of tendering our best thanks to the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter for all the kindness that we received at his hands during the last year."

The motion was put and carried.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Here again, I have to announce the time within which nominations have to be sent in to the Secretary. I fix 6 p.m. to-morrow as the latest hour for these nominations."

[24 th March 1922]

I—cont.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—cont.

DEMAND XX—CIVIL VETERINARY SERVICES.

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" Mr. President, I beg leave to move that this House be pleased to grant a sum of 5.96 lakhs under Demand XX—Civil Veterinary Services."

Motion 606.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

606. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 16,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 1,600.

Motion 607.

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—" Mr. President, Sir, I make the following motion :—

607. To omit the allotment of Rs. 2,000 for veterinary hospitals to be opened during the year.

"I do this, Sir, with some fear and trembling. (Laughter.) I fear because the Veterinary department being a necessary adjunct of all civilized governments, I will be labelled as an uncivilized being for making a motion of this kind. I tremble because I may be treated to a lecture on rinderpest and cattle diseases in general. But I may assure this House that I have no special aversion for this Veterinary Department. I only wanted to place before this House a suspicion that I have—a suspicion mostly based on personal observation—that some of the veterinary hospitals, at any rate, are lying idle. If you go to any prominent place, Sir, these veterinary hospitals are sure to attract your attention with their big signboards, fine compound walls and very nicely white-washed buildings and enormous sheds that could accommodate even elephants. But I am hardly aware of any patients, equine, canine, bovine and ovine, coming to them. And you can see the veterinary doctor with his assinine (laughter) patience whiling away his time because he has no other work to do. I believe, Sir, that these veterinary hospitals are placed in wrong places. I think they ought to be more rural than urban. In these days of motor-cars I do not think veterinary hospitals situated in towns have much work. On the other hand, if they are placed in country places very near villages, I think they will be of greater use. If the hon. Minister for Development looks into the case and closes down those hospitals that are lying idle and opens up hospitals in places where they are really needed, I shall be very thankful to him. The second thing I wish to draw his attention to is the personnel of the Veterinary Department. I have come across men who are afraid to go near even dogs that are dying, who cannot approach a bull or a cow without a long stick in their hands. I have come across men who are afraid of a buffalo, and they leave all the work to the hospital servants and they do little work. I hope the hon. Minister will do something for improving the veterinary hospitals."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" I am extremely sorry, Sir, that the experience of my hon. friend with the Veterinary Department has been so unfortunate. I do not think, Sir, the suggestion for the

24th March 1922] [Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu]

closing down of hospitals can be seriously considered by this House. It is well known, and it needs no repetition from me, that ours is an agricultural province and cattle are the first consideration of a ryot. These hospitals are intended for the benefit of the cattle. The suggestion that we ought to locate the hospitals, as far as possible in country places, in rural areas, certainly deserves consideration, and I am perfectly willing to see what can be done in that direction. There are also sheds at these hospitals which have accommodation for a considerable number of horses and cattle. My hon. Friend said that some of them were places big enough for elephants. That is true in places where elephants have to be treated, in places like Rajahmundry, Polavaram or Cocanada, in the Godavari district to which my hon. Friend belongs and where I know there are a number of elephants to be treated. When we consider that the value of these elephants may range from one thousand rupees to twenty thousands, I do not think it can seriously be contended that they should be closed down because they have got room enough for big elephants. Mr. Muniswami Nayudu—I do not find the hon. Member here—had been dinning into my ears that I should provide a hospital at Chittoor. I may submit also that there are other requests, for instance, from the Raja of Ramnad who I am sorry is not able to be present owing to a domestic bereavement. He was pressing upon me the need for more of these hospitals. As a matter of fact, I asked for six hospitals and since the Finance Department could not find funds, I reduced the number to three and still further, for the same reason, reduced it to one. The provision of Rs. 2,000 is meant for a single hospital and I am very sorry that we are not able to get more money and that all my attempts to secure more have failed. In these circumstances, I hope my hon. Friend will not press his motion for the reduction of the provision for a single hospital."

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—" Sir, the hon. the Minister for Development might call for statistics in support of the statement that the cases of these hospitals having patients are few and far between. In those cases, I think the hon. Minister can close the hospitals without any fear. I wish that the Ministers that we have appointed from this House show more personality and display strength and do something good for the country. I do not want them to go into the old ruts but I wish them to chalk out new paths of procedure. I might also say, Sir, that these veterinary men may be asked to carry on experiments on breeding of animals and so on which are entrusted to a separate department. I have no desire to press this motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Demand XX was then put and granted *nem. con.*

DEMAND XXI—CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES.

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" I beg leave to move, Sir, for a grant of 6.81 lakhs under Demand XXI—Co-operative Societies."

Motion 608.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

608. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,29,000 for 23 assistant registrars by Rs. 10,000.

[24th March 1922]

Motion 609.

3 p.m. Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

609. To reduce eight assistant registrars of co-operative societies out of 17 on Rs. 300—850."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member must say by what amount he wants to reduce the grant."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" I want to reduce the provision of Rs. 1,29,000 by Rs. 50,000, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Then hon. Member had better specifically move it in that form."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" Yes, Sir. I propose to reduce the sum of Rs. 1,29,000 in detailed account No. 34-C. Agriculture—Co-operative societies, provision for assistant registrars, by Rs. 50,000. The reason why I wish to reduce this number is this. Their chief work consists in the supervision of the work done by the Inspectors of Co-operative Societies. So far as my experience goes, the assistant registrar for the district of Chittoor and Cuddapah is not touring largely over the rural areas. So far as I was able to see, he issues instructions to the inspectors and the inspectors supervise the work of the existing societies and also they devote a portion of their time to organize new societies. The assistant registrar no doubt passes big proceedings criticising the work of the inspectors. But the real work that has to be done is to see not only whether the inspectors are doing their work properly, but also to see whether the societies do their work properly. I think, Sir, that so far as the latter portion of the work is concerned, the assistant registrars do very little. If that is not their legitimate function, as I take it to be from what I see actually from their working, I fail to see why there should be so many as 17 assistant registrars and why that number should not be reduced by eight. Now, most of these societies are credit societies and each society contains a certain number of members. Their liabilities are unlimited. The president and the secretary of a rural society sometimes happen to be influential but needy members. It came to my notice, Sir, directly that an amount was borrowed in the names of some of the members, but it was appropriated by the president or the secretary or some other influential member in the names of the other members, and that too sometimes without their knowledge. Very many are forged. These things have come to my notice and they have also been brought to the notice of the local authority. In the course of my touring in the villages, the same complaints have been made to me by several individual members : ' Sir, in my name money is taken. We are said to be the debtors, Sir. We have not taken a single pie out of it ' and so on. Now, what is the object of creating co-operative credit societies? It is to help the poor people. It is not to help the influential. In that way, Sir, the poor are not benefited, while the societies themselves are brought into discredit and I am quite sure if such a state of things is allowed to continue for some time more, there will be no progress in co-operation at all in rural areas. I came to know that statements were recorded by inspectors in the Cuddapah town itself to the effect that no money was disbursed to them; and that afterwards seeing their inconvenient position, the president and the secretary

24th March 1922]

[Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu]

borrowed money elsewhere, paid up the amount and hushed up the matter. This incident, Sir, took place in a suburb of the Cuddapah town itself. It was brought to the notice of the Assistant Registrar, but I do not know what he has done about it. This is what takes place in my district and I do not know what is taking place in other districts. But I think human nature is the same in this respect in other districts as well. Therefore, if the duty of the Assistant Registrars does not consist in seeing actually that the amount is disbursed to the persons that are in need of the money, and to persons in whose name the money is taken out from the district central bank, I fail to see, Sir, why there should be so many as 17 Assistant Registrars for the purpose of merely supervising the work of the Inspectors. That is my chief point, Sir, and I submit that if the Assistant Registrars' duty does not consist in this respect also to the extent of finding out and seeing that the people are actually benefited by it, I think, Sir, there is absolutely no need for so many as 17. I may suggest also that whenever a society borrows money from the district central bank, the Assistant Registrar must be himself present and see that the money is actually distributed in his very presence to the members in whose names and for whose benefit it is borrowed. I think, Sir, that unless this is done, there will be no proper working at all, and I am quite sure that the societies themselves will be brought into disrepute and very shortly the whole fabric will tumble down. That, I submit, Sir, is the reason why I wish to reduce the allotment by Rs. 50,000."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—" Sir, though my experience of the Assistant Registrars is different from what my friend has just now stated, yet I do not see the necessity for maintaining as many as 17 officers on very high salaries. There are 23 officers costing over Rs. 60,000 on Rs. 300 to Rs. 850 and only six are on Rs. 250. The men on Rs. 250 I am sure must have been doing as good work as the other officers drawing Rs. 300 to Rs. 850. So there is every reason to reduce the number. Besides, honorary men are being appointed to these places and they are doing the work exceedingly well. That being so, I do not see any necessity for keeping any men on higher salaries and spending a lot of money over them. I would, therefore, support this reduction and would request the Minister to remove them and replace them by new officers on Rs. 250.

" With these remarks I support the motion."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" Sir, so far as the policy that is now enunciated by my friend Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu is concerned, I have been following it. Six officers were newly appointed on Rs. 250 each. As regards the others, certainly as opportunity occurs, we shall replace these Deputy Collector Assistant Registrars in accordance with the observations made in this House by hon. Members. I have said this on more than one occasion and that policy will continue. But it will be remembered, Sir, that the Revenue Department has obtained an increase in their cadre to the extent of ten members in the Deputy Collector's service in order to be lent to this department, and until that order is changed, we must abide by the orders of the Secretary of State. But of course there will still remain seven places and I may assure the House that at the first opportunity, as soon as one man goes out or resigns or wants to go back to the revenue line, or takes leave, I shall replace him by the less costly recruit. But as regards the change in the principle itself, Sir, I must sound a note of warning. It will be remembered, Sir, that this scheme is a new scheme and was started

[Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu] [24th March 1922]

only two years ago and intended to be reconsidered after five years. It is a temporary scheme and last year I explained to the House the necessity for these paid officers, that the work of organization and propaganda work in the earlier stages must be left in the hands of paid officers who alone could devote the time and energy necessary for these things. As a matter of fact, I may bring to the notice of the House that before the scheme was introduced, we had only 3,676 societies. In the first year that number was increased by 1,351, making up a total of 5,027 societies and by June 1921 another 1,261 societies were added, so that by the end of June 1921 we had 6,288 societies. That will work out, Sir, to a proportion of 58 per cent increase in the number of societies. In other words, where there were 100 societies, the department was able to increase their number to 158, and during the last six or seven months the number of societies must have gone up to at least 8,000. Now when all these societies are formed and are put on a stable basis, certainly the question will arise as regards the reorganization of the whole thing. As I have already submitted, these appointments are only temporary. No permanent appointment has been made. And, while we are still in the process of steps, I submit that it will defeat the very purpose with which we started. It is not intended that these officers should all be permanent. The question of removing or continuing or reducing their number will arise within three years more, and if we by that time have gained sufficient experience and if by that time a sufficient number of societies has been started and placed on a sound basis, certainly then the honorary agencies may be able to continue the work. As a matter of fact, we have at present 65 honorary assistant registrars. Some of them do excellent work and I am thankful to them for the work they have been doing and the time they devoted to that work. But, Sir, in the nature of things, a non-official gentleman, an honorary assistant registrar, can devote only his spare moments and leisure hours to work of this kind. So, in the beginning while the organization is going on and when societies are being formed and being placed on a proper footing, it is not possible, Sir, to expect this honorary agency to do all that is necessary in a matter like this. That, I think, Sir, should satisfy my friend so far as the number is concerned.

"My hon. Friend was referring to certain irregularities, or even crimes, I should call them, which seemed to have taken place in his district. Certainly, Sir, to forge another man's name and to draw money in the name of another is a crime for which I think sufficient punishment is provided in the Indian Penal Code. Certainly it is open to any one, not merely to the person affected, but to any one—if my knowledge of the Criminal Procedure Code is correct—to be a complainant in such a case. It should have been at once brought to the notice of the police and certainly I am going to inquire into it if my hon. Friend will give me the names of the persons and see that such action is taken as may be found to be necessary. But one thing, Sir, please judge of the work of these societies, or of that of Inspectors and Assistant Registrars by instances such as these.

"Human nature being what it is, crimes will be committed. But let that not deter us from doing our duty. In instance we have got the freedom of the press. In spite of the fact that there may be one newspaper here and one newspaper there which has no other work but that of vilifying a certain class of people, is that a reason why the

3-15 p.m.

[24th March 1922] [Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu]

freedom of the press should be curtailed? I can quote many other instances. That seems to be a very exceptional and an unfortunate case. I say I shall be very glad to investigate the case and do the needful."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"I am very glad, Sir, that these older gentlemen who are not only old in age but also old in the service drawing fat pay should be replaced by younger gentlemen. That has been given effect to by the hon. the Minister by providing for six younger men from the deputy collector's cadre. So far good. Still he could have made further attempts to reduce the number from 17. He says that he is going to do that still further. For that certainly we shall be very glad. Then so far as the question of honorary assistant registrars are concerned he says that there is a large number now and it is a matter for consideration whether that number may not be increased and whether they could not be asked also to organise and supervise the societies near about. After all the hon. the Minister says that the present scheme is only a temporary makeshift and that the matter is being experimented upon. He says that out of this, Government are going to evolve a new scheme. I welcome the suggestion and I hope that during such reorganization he will take note of all the defects pointed out above and try to remedy them. For these reasons, Sir, I beg leave to withdraw this motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 610.

The following motion was not made :—

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—

610. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,53,600 for salaries for co-operative credit by Rs. 50,000.

Motion 611.

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

611. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,73,000 for travelling, house-rent and other allowances by Rs. 1,00,000.

"In making this motion I wish to bring to the notice of the House that this department which is meant entirely for the benefit of the ryots has failed to achieve the end for which it was established in 1905. For the last two years honorary assistant registrars have been appointed. Even then any one reading the administration report of the co-operative department for last year will see that even according to their own admission—

"It is impossible for the ryot to enjoy the advantage of loans at low interest and also the system of 'condoned unpunctuality' in repayment and easy renewal of the bond which are the main attractions offered by the local money-lender. The co-operative movement in fact cannot be thoroughly healthy unless its members become more businesslike than at present. The real remedy must lie in less laxity on the part of the central banks and primary societies, but it is clear to the Government that the influence of assistant registrars and their subordinates can also be made effective in this direction."

"It is clear that things have not progressed to such an extent as was expected of the department. The number of these assistant registrars should have been increased and more assistant registrars should have been appointed with a permanent allowance or honorarium of Rs. 50 per mensem. They can easily do the work and make the people understand the value of the co-operative movement. I think that it would be far better if Government

[Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai] [24th March 1922]

made up their mind to amalgamate this department with the registration department. One may say that the registration department has been doing a lot of useful work. They are now working the Indian Companies Act. The Act works on the same lines as the co-operative department. When the registration department can manage the Companies Act successfully it can also very easily work the co-operative department. You also see, Sir, that the salary of the assistant registrar is far more than any other official like the tahsildar and the sub-magistrate. The influence of the sub-registrar is so great that he could, in addition to other duties, take up the co-operative work and increase the number of co-operative societies and banks. With these words I submit this motion for the acceptance of the House."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"Sir, I have already submitted that the department has just been started and is in the process of organization. The organization is not complete and it is, for the present, only intended for five years of which two years have already expired. I think my hon. Friend will certainly see the necessity of waiting for three years more and seeing what lesson it teaches us. I have already pointed out that we have 65 honorary assistant registrars. Under his scheme of sub-registrars to do the work, each of them would have to attend to 30 to 40 distant societies and I do not think it is possible for the registration department to manage as many societies as that. They have got their own work to attend to and this addition will mean an increase in the number of sub-registrars, and so on and so forth. So, Sir, my hon. Friend here will see that this is a matter in which the interests of the ryot are involved. My friend is aware of the great difficulties which the ryots have in securing loans cheap. As a friend of the ryot, and I know he is a friend of the ryot, he will see to their necessity and see that this work is carried on and the results awaited. Any criticism from friends will always be welcome and I should certainly urge upon him to watch the present work for three more years."

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—"I think from the hon. the Minister's statement that we have got to wait for another three years because the scheme has been just launched. I see that the United Provinces Government has been much bolder in revising its policy. I do not see why the Madras Government should not embark upon the same policy and see that the department is placed on a sound footing to do good to the people."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 612.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

612. *To omit the allowance of Rs. 23,952 provided for allowances.*

"I think it is not necessary for us to go at length into this question. The details are here. This sum of 23,952 is made up of: duty allowance 17 (100), local allowance 2 (25), 1 (20), 1 (10), 1 (6), duty allowance 16 (10), conveyance allowance 1 (5), 1 (10) and duty allowance (10) to typist, shorthand allowance (25) to a clerk in the Registrar's office. These are the allowances, Sir, that are provided for. With regard to these allowances, the House has already taken a definite attitude. I would invite the attention of the House to the decisions with respect to other departments. I might say

[24th March 1922] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

that there is no more onerous duty attached to these offices than to those the duty allowance to which were disallowed by the House and so there is no necessity for these allowances. So, I make this motion."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"Sir, I know the House has accepted the principle of this motion, so far as other departments are concerned. So far as this motion is concerned I am sure I shall be able to induce the hon. Mover to withdraw the motion for the following reasons. As my hon. Friend himself has pointed out it involves other allowances such as Wynaad and other local allowances. Secondly there is this trouble. We have entertained in the services, deputy collectors who were lent by the Revenue department. I admit that there is reason to urge that there is no necessity to pay them this allowance. But so far as the new incumbents are concerned we have not been paying them any allowance. If my hon. Friend will leave the matter to me I will see how best we can manage this affair. I hope my friend will see the practical difficulty and withdraw the resolution."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"In view of the assurance given by the hon. the Minister that he will deal with these people in the same way as the other officers whose duty allowance has been disallowed by the House I have no objection to withdraw my motion."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"I will see what I can do. If the Government is doing away with the duty allowance in the case of the other officers I will also do the same in the case of these assistant registrars."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 613 and 614.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

613. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 23,952 for allowances by Rs. 20,400.*

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

614. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,94,459 for co-operative credit by Rs. 70,000.*

Motion 615.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I beg to make the following motion :—

615. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6.81 lakhs for co-operative societies by Rs. 50,000.*

"I wish to impress upon the attention of this House that we have been embarking upon an increase in the expenditure year after year even above the original intention when this department was brought into existence. When the committee on co-operation in India inquired into the whole matter it was contemplated that after so many years of working the management of the various societies must be left to the hands of the various non-official agencies and Government should withdraw their control from the societies. These societies came into existence more than fifteen years ago and we have been feeling the useful work done by these societies. As has been pointed

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [24th March 1922]

out by my hon. Friend Mr. Narasimbachari there have been cases of abuses of powers which have been coming to notice now and then. But we cannot condemn the system on account of some instances of such abuses of powers.

“But I would ask whether it is necessary to increase expenditure under this head in a way in which we have been doing in the face of the accepted policy that as early as possible Government control should be withdrawn from the management of the societies and they must be managed by non-official agency. My hon. Friend, the Minister for Development, has told us that the new scheme has come into operation very recently, that it has been in existence for two years, and that we must try its working for another three years. I should have been glad if he had been in a position to make some more positive statements as to what is going to happen at the end of three years and if it had at least been definitely settled that, after the period of three years is over, the original policy of placing these bodies in non-official hands will be re-embarked upon and that the expenditure we are now called upon to incur is a temporary one and for a definite period of three years. If some such assurance can be given, we will be in a much better position to appreciate the reasonableness of the demand made. My fear is that when once we start upon any scheme though we say it is temporary, it is very difficult to go back and to reduce the expenditure. It is that fear in my mind that has prompted me to place this motion before the House. If, on the other hand, we are definitely assured that it will be in existence for three years and three years alone and it is an accepted policy to withdraw Government control after a certain period, we will be in a position to vote for the grant. If my hon. Friend cannot give us a satisfactory reply, then I think it will be necessary to press this motion to a division. Fifty thousand rupees out of 6.81 lakhs of rupees is not much. Even if we do this in a business proposition, it is quite possible and practicable to reduce it to that extent. Let us remember that this Rs. 50,000 is the amount provided in excess of the amount noted in the revised estimate, and even if we deduct this Rs. 50,000, we will be sanctioning the same amount as we provided for the current year.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—“Sir, I am asked to state definitely what will happen at the end of three years. Let me say, Sir, that I do not pretend to prophesy what is going to happen three years hence. In the first place, it is not right that I should in any way tie down my successor. If I am guaranteed in this place for three years more—I do not know whether he will venture to guarantee that—I submit that it may be possible for me to say something definite. But I think there are some indications, Sir, such indications as can be given by a Government, so far as the conduct of the future Governments is concerned. In G.O. No. 135, dated 20th June 1920, when this reorganization scheme was sanctioned, the Government said that ‘they trust that before the expiry of five years for which period the present additions to staff are temporarily sanctioned, co-operators will have devised means whereby the Government will be relieved of the cost of audit either in whole or at any rate as to a substantial part thereof.’

“There is a sufficient indication in the Government Order, Sir, that after five years they would try their best to see to it that a reduction in this expenditure is made. I would submit one thing: in a matter like this anything like a definite assurance is impossible. But so far as it is possible and reasonable for the Government to give an assurance, I assure my hon. Friend of this,

[24th March 1922] [Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu]

namely, that if I should happen to be in power or in this House, I will certainly raise my voice to see, after the societies have gone ahead and have been sufficiently placed on a stable basis, that the time has come when a reduction ought to be seriously considered—if not the whole reduction at once, at least a reduction in particular areas—and I will see that a beginning is made that the work is carried on partly by non-official agency. Of course we are accustomed, at any rate the reform scheme has accustomed us, to try these things stage by stage. I should think, Sir, that if things go on as well as they are going on at present, he who is in charge of this office will certainly be well advised to try to commence a reduction in the official control over these societies. In civilized countries co-operative societies, at least in the developed state, are left to private agency. All that I can submit is that it is the policy of the Government also that they should be left to private agency in the fullness of time. It is not desired that any Government money should be spent for all time to come. It is intended to start societies, to place them on a stable basis and then leave them to the control of the private agency.

“My hon. Friend says that so far as the number of societies is concerned, it is in no way proportionate to the number of people or the agricultural indebtedness of the people in this land. As a student of politics and statistics, Mr. Krishna Rao knows the enormity of the indebtedness of the ryot. In order, therefore, that facilities may be afforded to the debtors in the country and seeing that something more remains to be done, I think the present agency must continue for these three years at least. If after three years’ good work is done in this direction, nothing will please me more than to see that they are handed over, as far as possible, to private agency, stage by stage.”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—“I cannot expect my hon. Friend to give a more positive assurance than that he has given in the circumstances in which he is placed. But may I point out even before I make up my mind to withdraw the motion that he may very well consider to withdraw the official agency if within these three years in the particular circumstances of any particular area, he is satisfied that he can appoint an honorary assistant registrar in that area? I think he can try the experiment before the expiry of the three years and start the non-official agencies gradually. I cannot expect this change to be done all at once. I do not expect that simply because three years expire on the 31st March of a year, the official agency will at once be withdrawn on the 1st of April of that year. If the policy is accepted, we need not confine ourselves to the statement of the Government Order and if, within the course of the next year, he is satisfied that in any particular area he can withdraw the official agency he can do so and appoint an honorary assistant registrar to take up the work. It will be well to make a beginning even before the expiry of the three years. To that extent the hon. the Minister can give an assurance. If he is prepared to give us that assurance, I have no objection to withdraw the motion.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—“I shall certainly consider that.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

[24th March 1922]

DEMAND XXII—CINCHONA.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I beg to move, Sir, for a grant not exceeding 4.29 lakhs under Demand XXII—Cinchona."

Motion 616.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

616. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,29,030 for cinchona plantations by Rs. 100.

" I just want to say a few words on this motion. I must first of all say that I have to tender my thanks both to the Secretary and to the Under Secretary of the Development Department. They gave me very useful information in this connexion both orally and in writing. If at all I move this motion it is only to say a few words on the working of the whole department. The hon. the Home Member said the other day in dealing with this work that he was personally sorry that the Imperial Government did not take up this department. All I can say is that, so far as the planters are concerned, they are not at all sorry that this has not gone up to the Government of India. They will be glad that it is under this Government and that the hon. the Home Member will be in charge of this. One thing that I want to know is as to why this department should not be handed over to the Agricultural department; because after all, the officer in charge of this department is a deputy director of agriculture. He practically belongs to the Agricultural department. I think in the general statement also dealing with agriculture, it is stated 'a scheme for the development of the planting industries involving the establishment of four—to be raised ultimately to six—experimental stations, the appointment of a mycologist and the continued employment of the deputy director, planting districts, has been sanctioned for five years from 1st April 1919.' For the purpose of better carrying out the whole work, I think it will be better that the whole thing is under the Agricultural department, so that the whole development of the planting districts may come together.

" So far as the question of cinchona is concerned, it has become a swadeshi enterprise so far as the Southern India is concerned. In the Coimbatore and the Nilgiri districts, there are a number of planters who are doing this work. Unfortunately, now it so happens that a large quantity of bark is obtained from Java. I know that a reply will be given so far as the planters are concerned, namely 'they do not give the proper quality of cinchona; there is not the sufficient quantity of quinine; therefore we have necessarily to go out for this purpose.' What I would submit to the hon. the Home Member and to the department is whether they cannot take up the work of making this matter better known to the planters. There is a wrong impression in the minds of some of these planters that purposely Java bark is purchased, because the Government of India or their officers want to help Java planters and do not take cinchona bark from Southern India planters. It should be very well advertised as to what quantity of the bark can be purchased from them and of which quality and all that. It is only then that the planters will be able to grow the necessary trees. Now that rubber is suffering from an economic point of view and even tea and coffee are not yielding as much as before, the planters of Southern India and in and near Coimbatore district

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

especially will be very glad to have an opportunity of knowing exactly if they can grow the proper tree, what the quality that is required is and all such information. So I request the hon. the Home Member to take some steps by which the people may exactly know as to what and how they should grow. I know the growing cannot be done in a year. It will take a lot of time; but still they want an opportunity. A chance may be given to them."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Sir, the hon. Mover has asked me, in the first instance, why the Cinchona Department should not be handed over to the Agricultural Department on the ground that it forms an integral part of that department. There is a very simple answer. Under statutory rules cinchona is a reserved subject and therefore it cannot be controlled by the head of the Agricultural Department or the Minister for Development. I might also add that it is rather a special topic, and one of the reasons which led to its not being classified under the general head 'Agricultural' is perhaps that until quite recently it seemed highly probable that all the cinchona factories and plantations in the Indian Empire would be placed under the administration of one officer. That was the provisional intention in 1918 and 1919. But two or three months ago, the Government of India came to the conclusion that it was much better to leave the development of cinchona in the hands of the Provincial Governments. There are, I think, only three Provincial Governments concerned—Bengal, Madras and Burma. That, however, is a matter of general policy which cannot be properly discussed here, and I do not propose to pursue the topic.

" My hon. Friend's next point is that cinchona planting is a 'great budding industry,' and that there are a number of planters, downcast by the depression of tea and rubber, who would be only too thankful to embark upon the profitable business of growing cinchona, if their ignorance were enlightened. I venture to think, Sir, that the hon. Mover has only recently come into contact with the question of cinchona plantation. It came to my notice more than 30 years ago, and even then the industry was in a decadent condition. I do not believe that it is at all necessary to enlighten the average planter in Southern India on the subject. The truth is that a great deal of money was spent on cinchona plantations many years ago. The vicissitudes of prices taught planters by experience that it was not as a rule a profitable venture, and they steadily came to the conclusion that it was best to cut their losses and get out. In fact most of the bark which has been supplied to our Cinchona Department by private enterprise of late years has come from the harvesting of trees which are cut down while a cinchona estate is being deliberately wiped out. The planters came to the conclusion that it was no use of pursuing that form of cultivation. If any particular firm or planter wants any information, I think they or he can always rely on getting it from Mr. Wilson, the Deputy Director of Cinchona. In a letter which he wrote in consequence of enquiries made by the hon. Mover, he mentioned specifically that he was in very close touch with nearly all the large growers of cinchona in Southern India, and in consequence had intimate knowledge, and added that he had actually had to relinquish a large portion of his allotment for the purchase of bark simply because private growers could not continue to supply it. The Cinchona Department would be only too glad to get larger supplies from private plantations, if they were forthcoming. Our great difficulty in the future is the prospect that because private enterprise will not do anything in this direction, we shall probably have to

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[24th March 1922]

face the very difficult problem of taking up fresh land and starting new cinchona plantations at the cost of Government."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I am very thankful to the hon. the Home Member for the information furnished by him. I know that under the statutory rules, the Cinchona Department is a reserved one; but these rules can be changed. If this Government should recommend to the Government of India and the Secretary of State, I am sure the rules can be changed. I know certain firms dealing in cinchona do not at all know the real state of affairs in regard to this industry. I know correspondence has been going among some respectable firms in regard to this matter. Because the planters have realized that certain industries like rubber are not yielding good profits, they are willing to take to this cinchona industry. It is not that there is no cinchona bark, but the fact is that unfortunately the Government did not require them. However, as the hon. the Home Member has already given me an assurance, and the department is helping in all possible directions, I do not press this motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 4.29 lakhs under Demand XXII—Cinchona was put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XXIII—INDUSTRIES (including Fisheries and Weights and Measures).

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" Sir, I beg to move that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 16.50 lakhs under Demand XXIII—Industries (including Fisheries and Weights and measures)."

Motion 617.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—

617. To omit the allotment of Rs. 24,386 for 'Other schemes.'

Motion 618.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

618. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,22,991 under Contingencies by Rs. 1.

" Sir, in page 187 of the budget a number of items have been provided. Lump sum for West Coast station and Cannery including Fishery education—Rs. 67,800; other schemes—Rs. 24,386; other contingencies—Rs. 5,000; provision (half grant) for construction of a school and temperance hall for Mogear fishermen of Udipi taluk—Rs. 3,693. These are some of the items, but no details are given. Further, I wish to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister that in South Kanara district there is not a sufficient number of fish-curing yards. Some taluks in South Kanara contain only one or two fish-curing yards situated at long distances, which give no facility to the fishermen living in the intervening villages to cure their fish in those yards. I wish more fish-curing yards be opened."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" Sir, the details required by my hon. Friend Mr. Rama Rao are too many, but I shall be very glad to give them to my hon. Friend privately."

24th March 1922]

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" I only want an assurance that these sums are required for purely educational purposes."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" Sir, it is my desire to increase the number of fish-curing yards. My hon. Friend will please remember that there is another factor to be reckoned and that is the Salt Department which represents the Government of India. Certain salt concessions were given to these fish-curers and unless we obtain sanction from the Salt Department, it is not possible to open any new works. Anyway I shall try my best to induce them to open as many fish-curing yards as possible. In fact, a scheme is now before us for the construction of fish-curing yards and in that connexion we can also raise the question of increasing the number."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 619.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

619. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,54,000 for fishery bureau by Rs. 1,000.

Motion 620.

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

620. To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,250 for one Deputy Director.

" In making this motion it is my intention to point out to the House that this department should be manned by persons who are experienced industrialists. This department itself was started by Sir Alfred Chatterton and now we have a great administrative officer in the person of my hon. Friend Mr. Cotton as the Director of Industries. I want to know that when the Deputy Director goes on 8 months' leave whether his place will be filled up by a man in the same cadre or whether it is intended to bring an experienced industrialist for that place."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" Sir, that question has not yet been decided, but if my hon. Friend wants that an Indian should be appointed, then certainly the qualifications of those who are available will be considered in filling up the vacancy."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 621 to 630.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

621. To omit the allotment of Rs. 7,200 for officer on special duty.

622. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,08,250 for Director of Industries by Rs. 1000.

623. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 15,400 for salaries of Madura Technical Institute by Rs. 100.

624. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,55,700 for the Madras Technical Institute by Rs. 100.

[24th March 1922]

Mr. R. T. KESAVULU PILLAI :—

625. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,15,700 for the Madras Technical Institute.

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—

626. To omit the allotment of Rs. 50,000 for 'other miscellaneous experiments.'

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

627. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 14,18,321 for industries by Rs. 100.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

628. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 14,18,321 for industries by Rs. 5 lakhs.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

629. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,02,000 for expenditure in England by Rs. 100.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

630. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 16.50 lakhs for industries by Rs. 100.

Motion 631.

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

631. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 16.50 lakhs for industries by Rs. 100.

"Sir, I make this motion for the purpose of drawing the pointed attention of the hon. the Minister for Development to the fact that in the Madras Exhibition of Indian Arts and Industries, the Department of Agriculture had put in certain exhibits in which it has been scientifically proved that 'cholam' can replace 'barley' in the preparation of malted foods. Subsequent to that period the Agricultural Department seems to have issued some bulletins.

"I find that it has been scientifically proved that cholam can replace barley not only in the preparation of what we call 'Horlick's malted milk' or 'Kepler's malted extract' but also in regard to other matters, such as 'Mellin's food' and so forth. We find that all these products are being imported from England or America in very large quantities. But it is certainly wrong that we should allow this manufacture not to be proved commercially profitable in India. With this object I ask the Director of Industries for information as to what has been done since the publication of these agricultural bulletins to prove that 'cholam' can be used on a commercially profitable basis. All that I heard from the Director of Industries was a reference to the publication of the Agricultural Department of the Government of India in which it is stated that scientifically it is possible to replace barley by cholam. Nothing else has been done. I submit that we

24th March 1922] [Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu]

are spending as much as 16 lakhs over the industrial department and the question as to whether this product, namely, 'cholam' can be made commercially successful ought to be taken up by this department and preference should be given to this subject. When I see that nothing has been done for over six years, I suspect that it may probably be due to some caveat or some objection raised by some British manufacturer or foreign manufacturer that it interferes seriously with their manufacture.

"And my doubt has been confirmed when I find in the
4 p.m. 'Further Selection of Papers relating to Forest Exploitation' on page 8, the following :—

'Our activities in this undertaking have aroused the interest of the British bobbin-makers. Protests have been made to the Secretary of State for India against them but naturally the British trade cannot in this matter be permitted to impose their will on India.'

"I think it very probable that there was some protest made by the British manufacturers to the Secretary of State for India, and that is the reason why this matter has not been taken up by the department. I hope and trust that no such objection has been made by the Secretary of State. Even if such is the case, I hope the Department of Industries will do its best to show that it is possible to prepare malted food on a commercial scale from cholam. It is to draw the attention of the department that I have tabled this motion."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"I do not want to trouble this House with quotations from the literature on the subject. There is a small booklet on the exhibits of food and industrial products shown at the Madras Industrial Exhibition, 1917, prepared by Mr. Ramaswami Sivan, then Assistant Agricultural Chemist, now in the Indian Agricultural Service. The Chemist has no doubt analysed the articles and has found out that it is possible to make malt here. I have made enquiries since the notice of this motion was given and the following summary of the results obtained has been furnished to me :—'Cholam is better suited for malting purposes than the other common South Indian cereals experimented with; cholam malt extract hydrolyses soluble starch at a greater rate than barley malt extract; in the case of hydrolysis of starch by cholam starch the proportion of dextrine to sugar produced is greater than in the case of barley malt compared under identical conditions; the products of starch hydrolysis by cholam malt consist, as with barley malt, largely of maltose and dextrine.' The above summary shows the exceedingly technical nature of the work. So far as the Chemist is concerned he has done his work. The question has passed from the stage of laboratory experimenting. Now it must be worked on a commercial basis. I shall be glad to consider the question of starting a pioneer factory which is uppermost in the mind of my hon. Friend. If this is to be done I shall have to come to this House for a supplementary grant. On the other hand if it is his intention that this department should assist any private individual or a private agency which is prepared to take up this industry, I can certainly give him the assurance that the services of the department will be at the disposal of the gentleman or company prepared to undertake such an enterprise. If it is asked whether it would be profitable to manufacture it and place it in the market so that those who intend taking up the enterprise may benefit, I shall certainly be pleased to make further enquiries and investigations."

[24th March 1922]

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—" All that I wanted is that it should be demonstrated by the Industrial Department as to whether it can be made a commercial success, by starting a factory something like the Chrome Leather Factory, the Aluminium Factory and so forth. It should be made plain that it can be made a commercial success. If that is done I shall be satisfied. On the assurance of the hon. the Minister for Development I withdraw the motion."

Mr. C. W. E. COTTON :—" I hope I may be permitted to reply to a statement of Mr. Tangavelu Pillai. He seems to be under the impression that the present Deputy Director of Industries is not an industrialist. Before he came to the Department of Industries he was in a firm in Bombay. I wish to remove the impression created by the remarks of Mr. Tangavelu Pillai."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The allotment of Rs. 16.50 lakhs under Demand XXIII—Industries was then put to the House and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXIV—LABOUR AND ALLIED DEPARTMENTS.

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Mr. President, I move for a grant not exceeding 7.87 lakhs for Labour and allied departments. The departments concerned are: Inspector of Factories, Steam-boiler Inspector Establishment, Registration of Traffic, Commissioner for Labour and Industrial Settlements."

Motions 632 and 633.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

632. To omit the allotment of Rs. 9,480 for Chief Inspector of Factories.

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—

633. To omit the allotment of Rs. 9,480 for Chief Inspector of Factories.

Motion 634.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

634. To omit the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for staff of inspector of factories.

" It is only in this Presidency that the inspector of factories is different from the inspector of steam boilers. In Bombay, Central Provinces, United Provinces and Burma both the offices are combined and are held by one officer. Here we have two different officers for doing the same work. The work of the inspector of factories is to find out whether the sanitary arrangements and the health of the operatives are alright, whereas the steam boiler inspector's business is to find out whether the machinery is in working order. So by amalgamating these two offices we can have a saving of Rs. 50,000. There is no reason why we must have two sets of officers when practically the same qualifications are fixed by the Industrial Commission, and when the business of both is to examine the same localities and to discharge similar functions. The only thing that can be said in favour of the present system is that one set of officers have to examine the machinery and to see whether

[24th March 1922]

[Mr. U. Rama Rao]

the machines are in working order, that is, to examine them when the machinery is still and not working, and the other set of officers have to go when the machines are working and see whether the conditions of labour are good. But the same officer can examine on a week day whether those conditions are good and on a holiday whether the machine is in working order. Under these circumstances I do not see any reason why there should be two sets of officers for the same purpose. Moreover both the officers have to travel from one end of the Presidency to the other and visit the same places. This involves a large amount of money in the shape of travelling allowances, and this can be saved if the same officer is asked to look after both the duties. Therefore I beg to make the motion for reduction."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Mr. President, there has been a good deal of misconception in the speech of my hon. Friend as to the duties of the inspector of factories and the steam-boiler inspector. There is a fundamental mistake made by the hon. Member when he imagined that if there is an amalgamation of the inspecting staff in these cases there will be a saving in the number of officers who are employed. There won't be any saving. There may be a saving with regard to the chief inspector of factories. What the hon. Member forgets is in this province the chief inspector of factories is in direct charge of one of the circles like any other inspector. This question of amalgamation was very carefully considered in 1919 and the Government then came to the conclusion that amalgamation was not desirable after a very anxious enquiry. They came to this conclusion because the qualification required for the factory inspector is different from that of the steam-boiler inspector. In the case of the steam-boiler inspector he has to conduct his inspection when the machinery is not working; in the case of the factory inspector he will have to inspect when the machinery is moving. I shall read the conclusion to which the Government came—G.O. No. 471, Home (Judicial), dated 27th February 1919 :—

" The Government have given their consideration to the proposals . . . for the reorganization and strengthening of the factory inspection staff in this Presidency and they have arrived at the following conclusions: (i) that the Public Works Department cannot be indented on for the supply of Factory Inspectors; (ii) that the amalgamation of the factory and the boiler inspection staffs would be radically unsound, because of the difference in the qualifications required and the impracticability of combining the duties . . . "

" The question was again recently considered and we had to come to the same conclusions. All that I need now say is that the kind of qualifications required for the inspector of factories and the steam-boiler inspector are different. As regards the qualification of the factory inspectors, a liberal education is required first; more especially after the Union Acts are passed the factory inspectors would have a great deal of work to do in connexion with the investigation of causes of disputes in the workshop between the management and the employees, I at least expect it. They should have also a theoretical training in engineering and a thorough practical training in mechanical engineering. They should also possess a general knowledge of the principles of sanitation. They must have also some practical experience of factory work either in India or Europe. They must have also ability to converse with the factory operatives, in their own language. As regards the qualification of the boiler inspector he must have a first class Board of Trade certificate; he must be able to know all about the mechanism of the steam-boiler with an experience of land as well as marine boilers. Then so far as the duties are concerned the duties of the inspector of factories are laid down

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

[24th March 1922]

by statute. In the case of factories working all through the year he must visit each factory at least once a year, and in the case of seasonal factories at least once in the season. He will have to see whether the health of the operatives is cared for and the conditions of the Act under which women and children could be engaged in those factories are fulfilled. So far as the boiler inspector is concerned all that he has to do is to examine whether there is the licence for the boilers, whether the boilers are in good condition, and if the conditions of licence are not satisfied he can cancel the licence. As regards the amalgamation of the two staffs the experiment was made in Bombay in 1920. This is the result of that experiment.

4.15 p.m. "I am reading an extract from a letter from the Collector of Bombay as regards the result of this amalgamation—

'The feature of the year (1920) was the amalgamation of the Factory Department with the departments of Boiler and Smoke Nuisances. This came into active operation in the latter part of the year. It has not evinced any prospects of success. The joint staff entrusted with triple duties is not sufficient for paying surprise visits to every factory while under working conditions, particularly in the mufassal. In practice, in Bombay and Ahmedabad, boiler and factory duties have respectively to be allotted to different inspectors as before. The supervision of boiler inspection needs the sole attention of one chief inspector and the same is the case with factory inspection. Factory matters are becoming of much greater importance owing to the development of industry and the legislation and the administrative changes consequent on the Washington Conference. The present difficulties will be much enhanced when the present Act is intended to include a larger number of factories.'

"The new Act will come into operation in July 1922. It must be remembered that under the new Act you may require inspection even with regard to establishments which employ more than ten persons though there is no mechanical power. Boiler inspection and factory inspection require, in my opinion, different types of inspector, and each must be a specialist.

"I therefore submit to the House that there is not likely to be any material advantage in the shape of less expenditure by amalgamating the two departments, and you certainly are not going to make any profit out of that. The 15,000 rupees is intended for additional inspectors whom you are bound to appoint after the Factory Act comes into force and because by reason of the new Act a much larger number of factories will have to be inspected. That is the reason for putting this 15,000 rupees, which is not for the present ordinary establishment. If you reduce the 15,000 you cannot have the additional inspection which you are bound to make under the Statute."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"I do not press it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 635.

MR. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

635. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 61,850 for inspector of factories by Rs. 40,000.

"Sir, I have had the advantage of listening to the hon. Member for Law and Labour in support of the present system. Sir, I have thought that the argument for the separation of the two sets of work, namely, inspection of factories and inspection of steam boilers is that it has to be done at different times, because for one the engine must be cool and for the other the engine must be hot. I find that as the reason given by the hon. the Finance

24th March 1922] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

Member in his Financial Statement, considering the strong feeling entertained by the several members when this subject was discussed at one of the Finance Committee meetings. That has been the reason for the duplication of the machinery and adding to the cost of the tax-payer. Though I have listened carefully to the reasoning of the Madras Government through the hon. the Law Member, I have not yet heard from him anything why the recommendation of such an influential, important and costly commission as the Indian Industrial Commission should have been brushed aside and the opinion of the Local Government alone be taken. Sir, I have before me the recommendation of the Indian Industrial Commission in which they say in paragraph 358.

'We have also proposed that the staff employed for the administration of the Electricity, Factories and Boilers' Acts should be transferred to the Departments of Industries, and only in the case of the Electrical Inspectors, for reasons given in Chapter XV, do we propose any additional expenditure.'

"This was the opinion of an influential committee, a committee which knew what it was about, and made the recommendation that the two departments should be transferred to and be under one department, namely, the Department of Industries. No doubt, as against this, apparently, in view of the dissatisfaction expressed from time to time, a reference appears to have been made to the Collector of Bombay. The opinion of the Collector of Bombay is sought to be placed against this recommendation. If it was the considered opinion of the Government of Bombay which probably have reversed what they have done previously, it should be entitled to consideration. It might be that the Collector of Bombay like various officials in this presidency was very anxious that there should be as many appointments as possible. That is no reason why, when we are complaining that our financial burdens are heavy, we should not effect economy wherever possible.

"Sir, it was said that this qualification of people who inspect the factories when the boiler is hot is something of a liberal education and those who inspect when the boiler is cool should have a licence from the Board of Trade. In the answer given to an interpellation by Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar in the beginning of this week as to the qualifications of the various inspectors employed both in the boiler inspection and the Factories departments I fail to see any one who possesses the requisite qualification which has been claimed for them. But so far as I can see, they are all Matriculates with very little of technical qualification, such a high qualification as the Industrial Commission recommended. For instance, at page 193, they say—

'The industrial engineers who would be required in the provincial departments would be concerned mostly in the erection of small power plants and in advising on the erection of machinery in factories; specialist knowledge, where needed, would be provided, as a rule by seconding special men from the cadre of the Industrial service or by temporary appointments. They must be good all-round men with a wide range of practical experience. Men of the class required should be recruited in the first instance as explained by us in the next chapter, but they will need training and practical experience before they are fit to be placed on responsible work. As we pointed out there, the engineer staff should form the basis from which our proposed Industrial service will be built up, and for exceptionally qualified men there would be prospects of rising to administrative rank.'

"So, I pointed out that engineering knowledge should be possessed as the basic qualification for Inspectors, whether they inspect the boilers or whether they inspect the factories. In fact, what do they do? One attends to see if the machine and parts are all right; that is the boiler inspector. The other inspector comes and sees whether the men employed there are getting proper comforts and their requirements are being attended to. I was somewhat surprised at the statement from the hon. the Member for Government

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar] [24th March 1922]

that they are also making inquiries as to disputes, if any, between the employers and the employed. I thought it was in the special province of the Commissioner of Labour, but has this power been delegated to the Inspector of Factories? I was not aware of that. If we have done this amalgamation which has been recommended by so high an authority as the Industrial Commission, we shall be able to save a lot of travelling allowances, which will be incurred by two sets of officers going about on inspection in different capacities.

"In the Inspector of Factories department, where the salaries of the Chief Inspector and the two inspectors amount to Rs. 20,520, the travelling allowance is Rs. 13,000. Again, in the Steam Boiler inspection establishment where the Chief Inspector and the three inspectors altogether draw Rs. 33,000 their travelling allowance is another Rs. 20,600, so that one great achievement we shall make by amalgamating the two would be that we shall save the travelling expenses of two sets of officers going about from time to time. Apart from that, as has been pointed out by the Industrial Commission, there are great advantages in one set of officers being employed on the same duty, for there will be absence of conflict in the instructions which will be given to the proprietors of factories, one set of instructions being given by the Factory Inspector and another set by the Steam-Boiler Inspector. After all, they have to do with the same persons. It may be each one has to look at things from his own point of view and between the two there may be conflict.

"Sir, I find, also, in the Steam-Boiler Inspection establishment there were only five superior officers last year, the chief inspector, the second inspector and third inspectors. It is proposed to add to that number by one more, and while that staff is strengthened by additional one this inspector of factories staff is also said to be strengthened at an additional cost of Rs. 15,000, where already the inspectors, with their 20,000 and 13,000 rupees draw in all 33,000. Sir, it may be as pointed out by the Collector of Bombay, which however has not been approved by the Government of Bombay, in a place like Bombay which is such a large industrial presidency, where there are ever so many mills and factories, compared with Madras, there is sufficient work to justify one set of officers with one kind of work and another set of officers with another kind of work. But in a small place, from the industrial point of view, like the Madras Presidency, it is altogether objectionable and not admissible. Moreover, very large sums are spent in travelling because the Madras Presidency is such a wide area, whereas the Bombay Presidency is a very much more compact area, and therefore the amount of travelling allowance will be very high. So, under these circumstances, I appeal to the House to support the motion for reduction by Rs. 40,000, so that the two offices may be combined and a lot of travelling allowances which could be saved might be saved, and also the duplication of the staff, not merely of the Chief Inspector of Factories and the Chief Inspector of Steam Boilers, but that the clerical establishments also might be reduced. With this view I commend this proposition to the acceptance of the House."

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"I support the motion, and I endorse all the statements made by my friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar. I think, Sir, in running these two establishments, there is overlapping of duties. In Bombay and other parts there is only one establishment, and I learn also that there is a scheme submitted by one of the officers that these two departments should be amalgamated, and by such amalgamation we would save over Rs. 40,000."

[24th March 1922]

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"I do not know who the last speaker referred to is. He talked about a scheme submitted by one of the officers for amalgamation. I may say that I did my best to carry out that amalgamation in 1915. I pressed this in view of the economy with all the power at my command, but I was quite satisfied that it was a business proposition in which we should have nothing to do. Now Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar has referred to the report of the Royal Commission, and he was inclined to say that such reports are *sacro sanct*."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"I may claim very great credit for the gentlemen who made the investigation and upon whom some lakhs of Indian money have been spent."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"I hope he will allow equal credit to the report of the Public Service Commission which came to the conclusion that no advantage could be derived from this amalgamation. So, for his commission on the one side I have another commission on the other."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"May I point out that the Industrial Commission's report was made in the year 1918 whereas the Public Service Commission's report is a much earlier document and moreover the Industrial Commission sat much longer."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Again, Sir, I am not quite sure that the Industrial Commission did propose to make one class of men do both classes of work. What they proposed was to put the two sets of inspectors into one service. I also proposed some years ago to put them into one service and I was satisfied after full enquiry that there is nothing to be gained from a business point of view by such an amalgamation. The fact is that the duties of the two sets of officers are quite different. One set have to inspect when the engines are stripped and they are men in whom a good knowledge of engineering is required. I put it to hon. Gentlemen in this House that when business people bring out new types, say, of multiple tube boilers, it is desirable that they should have some expert who can help them, if necessary, to set them up. The boiler inspector, is a man who is required to know all about the boilers in the factory. The factory inspector is required to be sympathetic in looking after the welfare of the children and so forth. This officer has got to go to the factory when it is actually working to see whether there are proper precautions taken for protection and for sanitation. It must be clear that both these duties cannot be done at one and the same visit, and consequently there is no gain in amalgamating the two services.

"Then it is said that amalgamation would result in a great saving under travelling allowance. I do not see how this is possible because the two inspections cannot be carried out on the same day. If the two inspections have to be carried out on different days, how should we be any better off by sending officer A twice than by sending officer A the first time and officer B the second? Supposing you have a factory at a very distant place like Kulasekharapatnam, you have to send your boiler inspector down there to look after the boiler, possibly to give some instructions for alterations to be made in relation to it. He goes when the boiler is not working, possibly in the off season. Is he to wait there until such time as the factory commences to work again in order to inspect the arrangements made for the welfare of the children? Otherwise, where is the advantage unless he can do the two inspections simultaneously? Is the amalgamation a business proposition? That is really the only question. I quite realize that it looks as if there was

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[24th March 1922]

some saving in it. At one time I thought there was a saving in it myself. I did my best to get that saving. I have satisfied myself that there was no means of effecting a saving unless we restrict our inspections which, under the law, we cannot do."

Mr. A. M. MacDOUGALL :—"Mr. President, I did not intend to take part in this discussion, but as there seems to be great misconception in the House as to the duties of boiler and factory inspectors, and as I have had some experience, I would like to give the House the benefit of that experience.

"The boiler inspection takes place at the most convenient time for the factory, frequently on a holiday. When the inspector calls, the boiler is cold and ready for him. He strips, gets into a boiler suit, and enters the boiler in order to test the plates, tubes, etc. The boiler is then tested under pressure and the inspector certifies the pressure the boiler can be worked to with safety.

"Under the Act, a steam boiler, no matter how small, must be inspected once a year and a certificate granted. If the owner of a steam motor car lived in the remotest part of the Presidency, it would be necessary for the inspector to go there and inspect the boiler of the car and license it even if there was no factory in the district. Otherwise the owner would not be allowed to use his car. This may seem ridiculous, but, it is a fact. The Madras Corporation own a steam lorry and it is necessary for them to have the boiler inspected every year. I myself have a very small boiler to run a vulcanising plant. It is so small as to be almost insignificant, yet it is necessary to inspect it once a year.

"Some years ago His Excellency the late Lord Minto visited a Native State in the Punjab, and in the course of the visit inspected the stud farm. He congratulated the superintendent on the well kept appearance of the stables, etc., as well as the condition and quality of the horses. The superintendent (who was a Scotchman) thanked His Excellency and expressed the hope that he would not be long before he paid another visit to the State. This was said in such a way as to cause His Excellency to inquire why he (the Superintendent) wanted him back again. 'Well' he said, as soon as the authorities knew Your Excellency was coming they bought all the whitewash in the Punjab and put it on the walls. There will be no more money spent till you come again and that is why I want you back.

"The application of that story to factory inspectors suggests that the essence of factory inspection is surprise visits. If the inspector advised the factory owner of his intended visit, the owner would see that the walls of his factory were whitewashed, the latrine flushed out, the moving belts guarded and children who should not be there sent away. It is often said and I believe with some truth that as the inspector comes in at the front door the children under age are sent out at the back door. The factory inspector to carry out his duties properly must see factories working under normal conditions in order to ascertain whether the conditions of the Act are being carried out properly. This cannot be done by one man combining the two duties as the essence of surprise would be eliminated by the boiler inspector's notice of inspection.

"It is possible to amalgamate the two departments under one Director as the qualifications for both are somewhat the same and one man could act in both capacities, but the duties ought to be separate and distinct in that the Boiler Inspector should not act in that capacity at the time he was doing

[24th March 1922]

[Mr. A. M. MacDougall]

Factory Inspector's work. It would perhaps be better to place both departments under the Director of Industries instead of as at present under the Law Department, the former being more in touch with the special work. I therefore beg to oppose the motion before the House."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—"Sir, one looks after the health of the animate and the other looks after the health of the inanimate object. The two offices cannot be combined in one."

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—"Sir, in supporting this motion I beg to say that what is at present going on is that the boiler inspector always sees that his inspection is at one end of the Madras Presidency on one day and the next day at the other end, so that he may get travelling allowance and also account for his time. There are possibilities of both kinds of work being done by the same person. If the boiler inspector or the factory inspector wants to have the work finished at one and the same time he could arrange the work in such a way that all the factories from Madras to Villupuram are inspected on days allotted to each factory. Starting from Madras on his way to Villupuram he can examine the factories and on his return he can examine the boilers. In this way he can arrange to distribute his inspection between his inward and outward journeys. What do we see now from the boiler inspector's report? He is always going on tours more for travelling allowance rather than for the actual work. So this arrangement of examining the factories on his inward journey and the boilers on his outward journey, I think would be enough. With these few words I support the resolution."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"Mr. President, it has been said that factory inspectors are intended to look after the health of the children and the boiler inspector after the health of the machinery. I have to question whether in view of the statement given by Government in answer to the question of Mr. Natesa Mudaliyar in which I find that of the three people employed as factory inspectors only one person possesses qualification as a sanitary inspector, and the other two are pure mechanics, the latter are qualified to look after the welfare of the children. I do not see how the qualifications of the factory inspector differ very materially from those of the boiler inspector. If it is a fact that you want a different type of man for the factory inspector's post, then you want him either to be a man possessing the qualifications of a sanitary inspector or one who combines in himself both the qualifications of sanitary and a boiler inspector. What I find from the statement is that the two people who possess qualification in mechanical engineering are not sanitary inspectors and the one man possesses a certificate of sanitary inspector, but has no qualifications in mechanical engineering. That I think is the hard fact that ought to influence our decision.

"Then, I see a difference is made between visits and inspections. Further down at page 7 of the statement it has been said that the figures given there represent the number of visits made in each district and not the number of inspections carried out. I am not a technical man like my hon. Friend Mr. McDougall, but I take it that inspection means a detailed examination of the machinery and the boiler, and visits may probably mean casual visits. Now if two out of the three factory inspectors do not possess sanitary inspector's certificates and are merely mechanics and if you also make this distinction between visits and inspections I wonder why all these factory inspection posts could not be taken up by those men with mechanical qualifications during their visits to the factories. I think the kind of sanitary

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi] [24th March 1922]

qualifications that a factory inspector should possess need not be of a very high order. Even educational inspectors are supposed to look into the sanitary conditions of the school and to see that sufficient air and light is provided there, and whether there are other conveniences. Under those circumstances we would be requiring one set of inspectors to look after the public health and the other for inspecting the efficiency of the school.

4-45 p.m. "However, on the facts as presented in this document, I do not see that we are pursuing a policy of differentiation, so far as the qualifications are concerned; between the two sets of officers and if there is no such differentiation, I do not see why they should not be amalgamated and why this factory inspection should not be done, if not on the same day on which the boiler inspection is made, on the previous or following day. It has been said that the factory inspector's visits are surprise visits, but I am afraid we have found it to be otherwise."

Mr. A. M. MacDOUGALL:—"The factory inspector I have in my mind always paid surprise visits."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"In Madras perhaps he may be able to pay surprise visits, but his mufassal visits do not seem to be surprise visits."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"May I say that surprise visits are a regular feature of the work of the factory inspector, even surprise visits at night."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I say, Sir, that in the Bellary district, I found the gentlemen concerned waiting with a carriage for the boiler inspector to go to the place of inspection?" (Laughter.)

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I have nothing more to say, Sir, except that under our present financial condition, it would not be a wise measure to have two separate officers. With these few words, I support the motion."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I should also like to say a few words in support of this motion. I have given notice of a motion to abolish the post of the Chief Inspector of Factories, but some doubt was raised as to whether the Chief Factory Inspector could be abolished or the boiler inspector. So, I thought that the best thing would be not to move my motion but wait for the other general motion being brought forward. It has been said that there are two inspectors, the factory inspector and the boiler inspector, and their qualifications have been very well defined by the hon. the Finance Member. The factory inspector has to possess sympathy and the boiler inspector must have knowledge of boiler, mechanism, etc. I do not know if there is anything to prohibit the boiler inspector who may get a licence of knowledge of boilers, from having sympathy, and if he is precluded by his licence from having sympathy.

"And then, the second thing I was noticing was that there appeared to be an impression in the minds of some hon. Members that a cool boiler and a hot boiler were as different from each other as a living man and a dead man. In most factories, there are two boilers—one cool and one hot—and under the Factory Act there is a rule that there must be one holiday every week for every factory. Therefore if the same officer has both functions combined in him, he can come on a Monday if it is a very big factory, whether with previous notice or without notice, it does not matter. If a man can go without notice for the factory inspection, he may as well go for the boiler inspection without notice, and there is no reason why he should give notice in the case of either inspection. As a rule there is a holiday for each

24th March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

factory. Supposing a man goes there and sits for three, four, five or six days, or as many days as may be necessary for factory inspection before a holiday comes when he may inspect the boiler which gets cooled after a few hours of non-working, and then he may again if necessary inspect the factory. The only qualification is that he must have sympathy, and his licence would not prohibit his exercising sympathy. So, if he has the licence and also the necessary sympathy, he may examine the factory and then on a holiday either in the middle or at the end of his factory inspection he may examine the boiler also. After all, I do not think the boiler inspection would take very long. He can get into the boiler and he will certainly come out after his inspection. Therefore so far as the combined inspection is concerned, I do not think there will be any difficulty.

"There is also another fact to be noticed, and it is that these factory inspectors and boiler inspectors are not single persons. I do not say that they are necessarily married, but they always have a number of subordinate inspectors. The rule is that they send some of their subordinates beforehand to see that everything is ready; and then they themselves come, examine, and sign the certificate. Probably the certificate is also prepared by the subordinates and he signs it. If there is one officer for both departments, he may as well send one subordinate for the boiler inspection and another for the factory inspection, and then have the certificates ready to be signed. Another fact has been forgotten, namely, it may be that in a place like Kulasekharapatnam, there is only one factory. But in many places there are a number of factories; one factory may be working and another may not be working. The inspector may go and examine the factories that are not working and immediately after that is done, he may go and inspect the other factory where work is going on. When the two branches of the departments are to be worked together, it may be that the number of subordinates may be same, but so far as the people on the top are concerned, there is absolutely no necessity for any duplication in supervision or duplication in travelling allowances, etc. I may also say that all factories have no boilers and these are much more in number than those that have got boilers, because there are a number of factories run by oil engines and a number of others (whose number is daily increasing) whose motive power is electricity. All these come under the Factories Act, but many of them will not come under the Boiler Act. If a person who has knowledge as well as sympathy is appointed as inspector of boilers and factories, then there may be no difficulty in his examining both factories and boilers and a good deal of money will be saved. It is in that view that I say that the money spent on one of these posts may very well be saved. I think we have too much of straw and it is better that we cut down some straw so that the bricks may be substantial. So, I strongly support the motion before the House."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Mr. President, I have not been able to find any statement or any recommendation made by the Industrial Commission to the effect that there should be an amalgamation or that the same set of officers should do the work. All that I find is a recommendation that they must be placed under the Industries Department and they must do the work under the Director of Industries. There is nothing said in the report so far as I can see as regards amalgamation. I asked my hon. Friend for a reference and he gave reference only to a passage at page 215 which does not deal with any amalgamation at all, but only deals with the person in whom control should be vested."

[24th March 1922]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" May I know the number of the paragraph, Sir ? "

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" It is paragraph 358 at page 215. If there is any other paragraph, I shall be very much obliged to the hon. Member if he would refer me to it. All that we can do is to transfer the administration of the Electricity, Factories and Boilers Acts to the Department of Industries ; whether the Local Government have the power I have not examined ; the Director is in the transferred department. On the other hand, the Public Services Commission who very carefully considered the amalgamation of these services in order that there might be a larger cadre to select from, came to the deliberate conclusion that that could not be done. The report says—

' As now arranged, each province or group of provinces ordinarily has its own staff for boiler inspection. Only in the Central Provinces and Berar this factory and boiler inspection work is done by the same officer, but in the United Provinces and the Punjab the inspectors are under the general supervision of the factories inspectors of those areas.'

" That is important in view of the reduction now proposed, namely, Rs. 40,000. It is not a question of reducing the supervising staff or the amalgamation of the chief inspector of factories and the chief boiler inspector. But it is a question of reducing by Rs. 40,000 the amount which is budgeted for the inspector of factories ; with this knowledge, namely, that as soon as the new Factories Act comes into force, the number of factories which will have to be inspected will be nearly double than what we have now. I repeat again so that the House may be in a position to appreciate the motion now before the House, that the motion is to reduce the total grant for inspection of factories by Rs. 40,000, so that what is left is less than Rs. 20,000 which is the provision for extra inspection. Now, Sir, let me proceed with the quotation from the Public Services Commission's report—

' As in the case of the factory inspection departments, we have considered proposals for an all-India organization as well as suggestions for amalgamating everywhere the factory and the boiler staffs.'

" That is for the purpose of having a larger cadre so that there may be an improvement in the position of the services—

' But we are of opinion that the existing arrangement is the right one and that the difficulties now being experienced will pass away as the cadres grow in size and importance. We are also satisfied that the present overlapping in the United Provinces, the Punjab and the Central Provinces and Berar is for the time being unavoidable. But as those provinces develop industrially the organization prevailing in the other provinces should be adopted.'

" That is the recommendation. It was pointed out by Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, I think, that Madras province is a province where you have got to travel very long distances. That would be a reason why we must have more inspecting staff. As a matter of fact, I find from the statistics that our inspectors do more inspection work than those either in Bombay or in Bengal. It is on that ground that the Chief Inspector of Factories wanted to have his pay raised to the pay which is given in Bengal and Bombay, which we have not given him yet owing to our financial position. Therefore the fact that the House desires to amalgamate the factories inspection with boiler inspection could not reduce the number of officers necessary for the purpose of making these inspections. If at all it is possible to reduce the expenditure, we can only reduce it by amalgamating both these under the same supervising head, that is instead of two chief inspectors, we may have one chief inspector. That question was very carefully considered both in 1919 and also later on in the beginning of this year and the Government have found that if they

[24th March 1922] [Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

wanted the Factories Act or the Boilers Act to work properly, they must have the necessary number of inspecting staff. We are not able to reduce either in the one or in the other. We want to increase the number of inspecting staff under the new Factories Act of 1922."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" Sir, as the staff dealing with the inspection of steam-boilers has also come in for discussion and as I am responsible for that staff, I think I should join in this debate and explain to the House the responsibility which these officials have, the quantity of work that they have got to turn out and how, as it is, they may be regarded as absolutely under-staffed. The House is fully aware, I assume, that the work of inspectors of whom I am speaking is conducted under the Steam-boilers and Prime-movers Act. The duty of inspecting boilers and prime-movers is cast upon the Government by legislation, and the Government cannot get rid of that obligation inasmuch as it is a statutory duty. This statute lays down that a party is entitled to claim inspection of his boiler within a specified period from the date of his application for a licence in respect of such boiler.

" And if the Government on whom is cast this statutory responsibility of having to inspect the boilers before the grant of a licence neglect to depute officers for the said inspection within a period, the owner of the boiler is at liberty to proceed regardless of the fact whether he possesses a licence or not. The various sections of this Act to which I would like to invite the attention of the House are particularly sections 5, 7, 10 and 13. These sections relate to boilers which are now in operation but in respect of which licence can be granted only for one year and which, under law, shall be renewed by the inspector of boilers only after inspection. Then there is a second class of boilers which are proposed to be installed for the first time and which cannot be installed in the absence of a licence from the inspector. In addition thereto, these inspectors are bound to respond to numerous calls from boiler-owners if their machinery has gone out of order. Fourthly, and perhaps the most important duty is that they are bound to pay surprise visits to these boilers to see whether all is well and the conditions of the licence are adhered to. These I would briefly submit are the principal duties cast by law on the boiler inspectors and which the Government cannot get away from.

" Now, is it imagined that all this work is done wholly out of the money collected from the tax-payer ? That probably is a consideration which must have weighed considerably in the minds of hon. Members of this House in coming to the conclusion that as far as possible they should save money by retrenchment. With regard to that, I would at once say that we possess authority under the Act to collect a fee from individuals whose boilers we inspect. In fact we recover nearly a moiety of the cost by means of inspection fees. If the duties of these officers are amalgamated, the inevitable result would be lesser inspections, and consequent dereliction of duty cast on the shoulders of the Government under the statute and probably also the running of all boilers in a condition which should be deprecated as absolutely dangerous to human life—a duty again which Government cannot absolve themselves from. These in brief are the duties and responsibilities of the staff.

" Let me place before you a few statistics and ask whether this separate establishment of boiler inspectors has justified itself. I will merely place

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [24th March 1922]

before you a brief analysis of the number of inspections that have been conducted by these officers which in the last year amounted to no less than 2,182. These 2,182 inspections are merely in respect of boilers owned by private individuals. But the officers of this department have also yet another responsibility: that responsibility being on behalf of the local bodies. They have to inspect boilers under the control of local bodies in respect of water-works or drainage schemes or a sewage farm and the like. To the long list of 2,182 inspections which have been conducted by these inspectors as mentioned already, you will permit me to add those of other descriptions which by themselves would demonstrate that the present number is absolutely insufficient. There were 84 thorough inspections of mufassal water-works and filters at Guindy, 66 visits to the several workshops in Madras in connexion with the repairs of the water-works plant, 7 boilers inspected in Bangalore, Kolar Goldfields, one at the Saw Mills, Trichur, and one at the Singarani collieries. These boilers were located outside the jurisdiction of the Act and yet inspections were made after sanction was obtained from the authorities concerned. Four boilers were examined in Coorg under the orders of the Government. The House may probably remember that a part of the administration of Coorg is conducted by the loan of officers from Madras. Furthermore 19 boilers were examined in vessels in inland water-ways under the orders of the Government.

"Now, I ask whether this bulk of work done in one year could be regarded as so insignificant as not to justify the existence of a separate inspectorate for doing that work and whether it can be urged that if the duties of factory inspectors are amalgamated it will still be possible for the existing number of officers to carry them on satisfactorily? Is it therefore asking too much of the House to concede that the number will certainly have to undergo increase as things stand at present?

"Now, something was said about Bombay; it was urged that the province of Bombay is the richest in India with an industrial development even unimaginable and that therefore we should not indulge in comparisons with that province. However I wish to say one word, i.e., the number of boilers inspected in Bombay by any single inspector in a year is 288 as against 500 inspected by a single inspector in the Madras Presidency.

"Then again, Sir, in the next year's budget we have taken credit for a sum of Rs. 48,500 on account of probable receipts which are expected by the inspection of boilers by our staff. If you are going to suggest the amalgamation of the two, it would necessarily result in work not being done so thoroughly and so efficiently as to lead to a large number of boilers being uninspected and the rate of progress so far achieved being considerably hampered for want of close and vigilant supervision over the boilers. It would also mean that the duty imposed upon Government will be considerably neglected, the plant and machinery employed in our factories will be allowed to run its own way leading to risks and catastrophes which again might result in danger to life and property. This certainly will not redound to the credit of any responsible Government. I may add that if you find a larger number of inspectors in the budget for the next year, it was not merely that we wanted to increase them without any justifiable cause. I wish to assure the House at once that from statistics we found that the number of works inspected from year's end to year's end has gone on increasing to such an extent as to render the addition of establishment to cope with that work

24th March 1922] [Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

absolutely imperative. We began only with 139 boilers in this Presidency in 1897-98 and this rose up to 1,300 in 1916-17. We expect the number to be nearly 2,000 in the year of grace 1922-23. When therefore there is a progressive increase in numbers and when therefore the bulk of work goes on increasing in proportion, a similar increase in the staff should also be inevitable. Let us remember that the more the number, the larger the number of inspections and the greater the receipts realized from that source. I do not wish to add much more on this subject except to answer one or two points mentioned by a member from the bench beyond.

"It was suggested that the inspectors conducted their inspections on one day in one corner and on another day in an altogether different corner of the Presidency, thereby insinuating that these inspections are conducted more or less to qualify themselves for something like a substantial travelling allowance. I may at once affirm that these inspections could not be conducted according to anything like a previously prepared programme. For the inspector has no knowledge as to where his services would be requisitioned to-morrow. He may suddenly receive a telegram for inspection of a new boiler in one corner, or for the inspection of a boiler which has gone out of order in another corner, or an anonymous complaint that a particular boiler is running contrary to the condition of the licence. He must at once bundle up his luggage and start, it may be to Ganjam to-day and to Tinnevely the day after as his duties may demand."

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—"May I know if there are many such calls for urgent inspections?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Numerous, I would underline the word."

"Finally, Sir, I should certainly not have spoken at such length in connexion with this motion except for the fact that my department was referred to in the course of the debate."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"My friend Mr. Natesa Mudaliyar referred to the fact that one or the other of the officers had recently sent up a report for the amalgamation of the two systems. It is either the Chief Inspector of Steam-boilers or the Chief Inspector of Factories. I dare say that proposal is before the Government and perhaps it is having their attention. Then, I think, the question may be examined in the light of that report and whatever conclusion we may then come to may be acted upon. I would rather suggest that the whole question may be looked into by the Finance Committee and the matter then decided finally. That is the only suggestion I would make."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, this question of the amalgamation of these two departments is one of importance purely from the point of view of economy. I am certain that every hon. Member of this House is aware of the extremely unwise step of getting rid of the inspection of steam-boilers by the inspectors, and I am also certain that it is absolutely unnecessary to convince us—as the hon. the Revenue Member referred to the numerous inspections—that this step is intended for public safety, and it is not one which this Council would like to take away. But, Sir, the whole question is one of organization of services. Some difference has been made by the Royal Commission on Public Services in their report between these two departments, but they took care to point out

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [24th March 1922]

that each province can develop these two departments as it liked. In fact they say in page 122 on the Factory and Boiler Inspection departments as follows:—

'The functions of the factory and boiler inspectors are not necessarily interchangeable. In fact in most of the provinces the two sets of officers have no connexion with each other, and are recruited separately for separate duties and on separate terms. We have decided, therefore, to deal with their cases separately, but in one annexure, as in certain of the less industrially developed provinces the staffs have not yet been differentiated.'

"Then they indicate that in certain provinces these two departments consist of a combined service for discharging these two functions but which are discharged by two separate sets of hands. At the same time, the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter himself told us that in 1919 the question of the amalgamation of these two departments was taken up and considered, and therefore if any hon. Member has put forward a proposal for the very same amalgamation which the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter had to consider, I think it is not surprising and it is certainly not an unreasonable proposition. At the same time, I feel, I think other hon. members also feel, that by cutting down this allotment by Rs. 40,000 we may be exposing the public to a certain amount of danger. As a matter of fact, this question was considered in 1919 and the amalgamation was again suggested by some other officer to whom reference has been made by Mr. Natesa Mudaliyar. I think the whole question has to be examined by some committee which in the present case should be the Finance Committee of this Council. I therefore suggest that this question may be set at rest just at present at this stage and the question of the amalgamation of these departments may be considered in the light of the report of 1919 and in the light of any subsequent report that might have reached Government. I trust that the strenuous way in which this question has been advocated here is sufficient indication that every hon. Member of this House desires the amalgamation, and it is somewhat queer that there should be one officer for the inspection of boilers in the factories and another officer for the inspection of the factories themselves. It means a duplication of the staff, and, so far as I am able to see from the qualifications laid down in the Royal Commission's report, there seems to be not much difference between them. I do not think that the Government is objecting to an amalgamation but the whole trouble seems to be the question of the services, the difficulty of recruitment, the place of recruitment, the conditions of service and all the questions with which we have been made so familiar during the last four or five days, but these ought not to be a ground for putting off amalgamation. I trust therefore that all the papers in connexion with this question will be placed before the Finance Committee and a considered decision come to on this question."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Having listened carefully to the debate on this important question and having regard to the difficulty that I feel in giving my vote one way or the other, I have resolved, with the permission of the Council, to make two appeals: one is to the Government, and particularly to my friend the hon. the Finance Member, and the other to my friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyyar, the mover of this resolution. As I said, Sir, I find there are valid arguments on both sides of the question and I feel considerable difficulty in voting for this proposition one way or the other. The appeal that I have to make to the Government Members, and particularly to the hon. the Finance Member, is to have this question examined once again. I say once again, because this question was once examined in the Finance Committee; but after that examination some light has been thrown

24th March 1922]

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

on this question by the debate in this Council, so that my appeal to the hon. the Finance Member is this, to have this question more carefully examined in the Finance Committee in the light of all the information that has now been elicited and in the light of the documents that have been referred to in this debate. If the Government and the hon. the Finance Member will give that undertaking—and I am sure they can have no reasonable objection to give it—to have that question examined further, I should make an earnest appeal to my friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyyar to withdraw this resolution. As the hon. Sir Lionel Davidson said two or three days ago—I do not approve of the word he used—a 'catchvote' or whatever it is—I believe, Sir, this important question should not be settled by discussion on a motion for reduction of a portion of a grant, but it requires more elaborate examination. The question is particularly important and it becomes more important especially after the Factories Act comes into operation in July; so that I request my hon. Friend to give that undertaking, namely, to have this question examined more completely in the Finance Committee, and if my hon. Friend on behalf of the Government gives that undertaking, I would request my friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyyar to withdraw his motion."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I was not here during the earlier stages of this debate; otherwise I should have taken the first opportunity to say that this very question of the amalgamation of the two staffs arose directly out of those passages in the report of the Royal Commission on Public Services from which Mr. Ramachandra Rao was reading just now. It was one of the most troublesome questions that I had to deal with when I first became an Executive Councillor. It caused me a very great deal of trouble, and I took particular pains to examine the issue and personally question those in a position to give valuable information on the subject. That was a little over three years ago. The conclusion at which I then arrived—a conclusion accepted by the Government—was that the amalgamation of the factory and boiler inspection staffs would be radically unsound, because of the difference in the qualifications required and the impracticability of combining the two classes of work. At that time I was perhaps in a better position impartially to deal with the question than my hon. colleagues, Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar and Mr. Habib-ul-lah Sahib, because the steam-boiler and the factory staffs were both under my control and I had to balance one department against the other. Not very long after the question of the recruitment of officers for both staffs came under my attention and necessitated orders on several occasions. We had to advertise for suitable persons, and the qualifications requisite and the qualifications said to be possessed by the various applicants in their applications, which were received by the score, were absolutely different for the two sets of appointments. I went laboriously through long lists of individual applications for the two different sets of appointments and I can assure the House that there are radical differences between the qualifications requisite. Nothing would be more rash than hastily to assume that it is possible to combine the duties of a boiler inspector with the duties of a factory inspector. I am quite satisfied that a detailed examination of that issue, if it is accompanied by actual visits to factories and by actual presence during boiler inspections, will convince any unprejudiced person that the two sets of officers are and must be kept separate and that it would be a retrograde step to let Madras revert to the backward condition denounced in the Public Service Commission report with regard to some of the provinces

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[24th March 1922]

of India where the conditions are so undeveloped that the two staffs are still united. I imagine, Sir, that the appeal which has been made for a postponement of any hasty decision on this very important issue will be responded to by those concerned and that we shall not be asked to carry by division a vote the consequences of which might be very disastrous."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" May I say, Sir, so far as I am concerned, I shall only be very glad to place this matter before the Finance Committee for a thorough re-examination. We are shortly to have a new Finance Committee, and I feel sure that they would bring an open mind to the examination of this question as I shall endeavour to do myself."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" In view of the appeal made by my hon. friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar and the very generous undertaking given by the hon. the Finance Member, I do not press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 636 to 644.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

636. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 61,850 for inspector of factories by Rs. 100.

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

637. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 61,850 for inspector of factories by Rs. 40,000.

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

638. To omit the allotment of Rs. 61,850 for inspector of factories.

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

639. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 61,850 for inspector of factories by Rs. 40,000.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

640. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 61,850 for inspector of factories by Rs. 40,000.

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

641. To omit the allotment of Rs. 61,850 for inspector of factories.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—

642. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 31,920 cost of 5 inspectors by cost of 2.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

643. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 78,100 for establishment by Rs. 10,000.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

644. To omit the allotment of Rs. 78,100 for establishment.

The Council then adjourned at 5-30 p.m. to meet again at 11 a.m. on Saturday the 25th March 1922.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

The Council met at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Saturday the 25th of March 1922, the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR Avargal, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

I

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

[Order made by the President of the Madras Legislative Council under Standing Order No. 15—

(1) Printed copies of the questions and answers to be put and given at a meeting of the Council shall be placed on the Council table an hour before the President takes his seat.

(2) The questions shall be put and answered in the following manner :—
The Secretary shall call the name of each interpellator in alphabetical order, specify the serial numbers of his questions, and make a sufficient pause to allow him or any other member a reasonable opportunity of rising in his place if he is desirous of asking a supplementary question. Supplementary questions must be put immediately after the principal questions to which they relate.]

Irregular procedure of the Acting Principal, Government College, Mangalore.

1387 Q.—Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS : Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state—

(1) whether the present acting Principal of the Government College, Mangalore, compelled every student of the second year University class to pay a subscription of Re. 1 each for an 'At Home' held by the Principal and the staff to meet Mrs. Sarojini Nayudu on the occasion of her visit to Mangalore to preside over the Karnataka Provincial Congress Conference ;

(2) whether the Principal fined Re. 1 extra such students as did not promptly pay up the subscription, either because of their inability or because they did not participate in the 'At Home' ;

(3) whether the fines thus levied have been credited to the Government account ;

(4) whether the Government have taken or propose to take any action in this matter ;

(5) how many hours of actual class work the present acting Principal of the Government College does ; and

(6) how many hours of class work his predecessors, Messrs. Malim and Krishnamma, used to take up when they were in charge of the college ?

A.—Government are enquiring into the allegations contained in this interpellation.

Supply of salt to prisoners.

1388 Q.—Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasaya : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the quantity of salt allowed to each prisoner in the district jails is considered sufficient ;

(b) whether any complaints have been received regarding insufficiency of salt in the rations given to prisoners ;

(c) whether the prisoners who have been now undergoing terms of imprisonment for picketing at abkari sales and for similar offences in the Berhampur district jail have suffered in health owing to insufficient supply of salt ; and

(d) when and by whom the quantity of salt to be rationed out to each prisoner was fixed ?

[25th March 1922]

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) & (c) A letter signed by the hon. Member and another Member of Council containing statements among other things as to the insufficiency of salt and as to the health of some of the prisoners has been received and Government have called for a report.

(d) The attention of the hon. Member is drawn to G.O. No. 714, Judicial, dated 17th April 1913, which has been placed on the Editors' Table.

Punitive police in certain villages of the Anantapur district.

1389 Q.—Mr. P. SIVA RAO: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government have placed punitive police over the villages of Kodavandlapalli, Marthad and Doragal villages and their hamlets in the Kadiri taluk in the Anantapur district;

(b) if so, for what period; what the strength is of the police and the additional expenditure involved;

(c) what the reasons were for taking such a step; whether the Government will be pleased to place on the table the Gazette notification ordering the same and all connected papers;

(d) how many villages are comprised within the area and what their total population is;

(e) whether the Government propose to construct a permanent additional police station with lines for the use of the punitive police; if so, what the total estimated cost of the buildings is and how much of it is proposed to be recovered from the inhabitants of the locality; and whether construction has commenced;

(f) whether it has been decided in what proportions and by which persons the additional cost should be borne; if so, whether the Government will be pleased to place the order relating to the same, with the reports on which it is based and all other connected papers, on the table; and

(g) how many crimes have been reported from the police station of Kodavandlapalli in the Kadiri taluk since the imposition of the punitive police?

A.—(a) The answer is in the affirmative.

(b) For three years from 15th July 1921. The strength of the force is 1 head constable and 20 constables and the total cost is about Rs. 5,472 per annum.

(c) The reason for imposing the force was the great increase of crime in the area concerned due to protracted party feuds and factions between the influential Reddis of the locality. The notification was published at page 665 of Part I of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 5th July 1921.

(d) Three villages with a total population of 2,513.

(e) Certain semi-permanent buildings are necessary for the additional police at Kodavandlapalli. The cost of these, estimated at Rs. 9,168, will be recovered from the inhabitants of the three villages referred to in clause (a), and work on them has already commenced.

25th March 1922]

(f) Under section 15 (4) of the Police Act, 1861, this is a matter which is left to the discretion of the District Magistrate and no specific proposals have been received from him.

(g) The Government have no information.

II

COMMUNICATION TO THE COUNCIL.

With reference to the answers to question No. 1213 asked by Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu and the supplementary question put by M. R. Ry. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 21st January 1922, the Secretary laid on the table G.O. No. 329, dated 16th March 1922.

III

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

DEMAND XXIV—LABOUR AND ALLIED DEPARTMENTS—cont.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The Council will now resume discussion of the budget for 1922-23—Demand XXIV—Labour and allied departments."

Motion 645.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

645. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,240 for Personal Assistant to the Commissioner of Labour.*

"Sir, I have first to assure this House, and especially my friends opposite (*referring to the representatives of the depressed classes*), that it is not my intention in giving notice of this motion that by this means there should be any stoppage in the progress that has been made in the amelioration of the depressed classes, or that the progress for this year or the next and the years after should in any way be arrested. I am aware, Sir, that for a long time we have been negligent in our duty towards the communities which have come to be called the Panchamas and the depressed classes. The very name is a slur on us not on them I should think. It only shows that we have not paid them the attention that they are entitled to receive at our hands. The arrangements made by the Government for uplifting the depressed classes have aroused strong feeling in this city on both sides. The Government at first appointed a Commissioner to look after the interests of the depressed classes. Unfortunately they added later on to him the duty of looking after labour and labour problems. By that means and by the unfortunate occurrences which took place last year a considerable amount of bad blood has been roused and I fear anybody who brings a motion like this is likely to be looked upon by one side or the other with those feelings in mind. So far as I am concerned, Sir, I may assure the House that those occurrences which took place last year and the feelings that the very same occurrences have roused have nothing to do with me, and if I have brought this motion, it is not because of any of those occurrences or of any of those feelings, but because in the interests of the depressed classes and in the interests of their advancement I consider that it is necessary that we should reduce the cost of the establishment that is provided for their benefit. Sir, it is unfortunate that we are not in affluent circumstances and we cannot afford to allot for the amelioration of these classes all that will be necessary. Our finances are very

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [25th March 1922]

much depleted and what we can allot for the improvement of the depressed classes is very little indeed. If out of that little we are to provide a large slice for maintaining an establishment, I beg to submit it is a short-sighted policy and we will not at all be doing them all that, as I said, they are entitled to. The whole provision that has been made for the amelioration of the depressed classes is 5 lakhs, out of which a lakh and seventy-five thousands is allotted for establishment. Then there is the other question whether this establishment, even if we agree that it should be provided, would in any way be sufficient to carry on the work; if not, whether it is not necessary that we should devise some other policy than what is involved in these establishments. The establishment that is provided is a separate establishment to look after the interests of the depressed classes and for carrying out whatever is proposed to be done for them. I may at once say, I do agree that it is absolutely necessary that there should be some officer working directly under the Executive Councillor in charge of this particular matter, to co-ordinate the work in the districts, to make a sort of programme of improvement for these depressed classes and also to see that progress is made from time to time. To that extent, Sir, I feel it is necessary to have some officer. Having said that, Sir, I do believe that it will be absolutely impossible to place the whole work under this officer for the reason, viz., that, if we do that we will have to create a large establishment in each district separately, probably one officer of the grade of a deputy collector with a large number of subordinates under him. I do not think it will be possible in the present financial condition to provide this very large establishment. I think, Sir, that when we are able to allot several lakhs for each district, then probably we can have a costly establishment for carrying out all this work in each district. But now when we have only five lakhs for the whole Presidency, to take away Rs. 1,75,000 for the costly establishment is, I think, a short-sighted policy indeed. The question may be asked what we are going to do for the amelioration of these classes of people, how we are going to have the work carried out. The works that have to be carried out in regard to these classes, Sir, come under three main heads. First, this is much more important than we are likely on a superficial view of things to take it to be the provision of wells for the water-supply of these classes.

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—“Sir, I rise to a point of order. The motion is to omit the allotment of Rs. 4,240 for the personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour and I wish to know whether it is in order to speak about the special agency and so on.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“My reason for dealing with this question is this, Sir. Whether we should have a personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour will depend upon the policy we are going to adopt on this motion. If we are going to have the present proposals, I do not know how many more officers will be necessary on the whole. On the other hand, if the policy I would like to suggest is accepted, there will be absolutely no justification whatever for a personal assistant. So far as these wells are concerned, if only a particular amount of money is given to each local board earmarked for this particular purpose very much greater work can be done than otherwise. From the nature of things, these wells should be dispersed over the whole district and it will not be possible for any single officer or even for two or three officers to look after all these wells in a particular district. So we ought to have a costly establishment in

25th March 1922] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

each district to look after these wells if we want a separate establishment to look after them. I do not think it will be practical politics to think that these wells could be attended to by a special agency.

“The second question is about education. There again, Sir, if an amount is given for that purpose and if it is earmarked for extension of education among the depressed classes and if it is handed over to the local boards or to the educational department, I think the work can be done satisfactorily and there will be no necessity for a special establishment.

“The third and probably the contentious portion of the work which is proposed to be done for these people is the question of house-sites. There, also, where the extent of land to be acquired is small and the provision that is made is restricted to a few people, the better course, in my opinion, will be to leave the work to the general revenue agency. I do not think a small work like that will require a special agency. It will be too costly. Where however there are big schemes to be carried out as in the districts of Tanjore or Chingleput, probably a special officer for a few months can be employed for carrying out these works as is done in other cases. For instance, whenever large acquisitions are to be made for a railway construction a special officer is appointed. Here also where necessary a separate establishment like an assistant commissioner with a staff may be appointed for the time that may be necessary to complete the scheme of acquisition. That can be easily done and that is the only case where intensive work is proposed to be done. If that scheme is accepted, I beg to submit that there will be no necessity for all the establishment provided, viz., a personal assistant, several assistant commissioners and probably also a large number of tahsildars. It will then be enough that a few tahsildars and a few revenue inspectors are left to carry on this work. As I said, a Commissioner of Labour attached to and working under the Member in charge of the department here in the headquarters will do all that is necessary for the purpose, co-ordinate the work, make a programme of the works that have to be done and see whether they are carried out from time to time. We would also gain largely in prestige and in getting things through successfully if a scheme like this is adopted because the Member in charge will be the person directly responsible and directly interested in the work and it will not be the Commissioner of Labour. A Commissioner of Labour of such high status as a man on a pay of Rs. 2,750 will not be necessary. An officer on Rs. 1,000 working as I said under the Executive Councillor in charge of the department will for this purpose be quite adequate. Even if it is considered that there is more work, to make programmes and things like that probably two assistants, one for the north and another for the south, will be quite adequate. The works can be carried out by the district agency and there will be no necessity for a large establishment. It is in that view that I bring forward this proposal.”

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—“Mr. President, I have also given notice of a similar motion and I may say that while giving 11-15 a.m. notice of that, it was not at all my intention that the work in connexion with the depressed classes should in any way be interfered with. The amount of work so far done and the attention that has been paid to the depressed classes are not worth notice and the department that is costing so much has not done all that it could. In tabling this motion, it was my intention that this post of the personal assistant should be abolished

[Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai] [25th March 1922]

and a man from the depressed classes should be appointed under the Commissioner of Labour so that the grievances these people are suffering from and the nature of the work that has to be done may easily be brought to the notice of the Labour Commissioner. It is these people alone who know where the shoe pinches and not the others. But, if you put a man from any other community in charge of the depressed classes, he will not have the same sympathy with them as a man of their own community will have. It is far better that in connexion with this work an honorary man, or an assistant on a smaller pay from the same community should be appointed."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I also rise, Sir, to support this motion. It is unnecessary for me to emphasize what has been said both by the mover of the motion and by my friend Mr. Tangavelu Pillai who stated that there was no intention whatever in moving this motion to deprive the depressed classes of the benefits they are reaping from this commission. It is certainly desirable to advance their interests as much as possible and the most important work that is done on their behalf in this department is the acquisition of sites for their dwellings. No doubt other kinds of work also are being attended to in this department; for instance, the reclamation of Kallars, the education of the depressed classes and so on. But probably, as I stated, the most important work is the acquisition of house-sites for these classes. My friend the hon. the Law Member who is in charge of this department will correct me if I am wrong when I say that the districts where this kind of work are specifically being carried on, that is the acquisition of house-sites."—"

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"May I ask a question, Sir? The motion now is to take away the personal assistant to the Labour Commissioner. It is not proposed to abolish the Labour Commissioner and he is expected to do the duties which are now devolving on him and as such there is no good in our discussing whether we should have a special agency or an ordinary agency or any other thing in the district. The question solely for the consideration of the House is whether the Labour Commissioner should have a personal assistant or not for discharging his duties as a Commissioner."

The CHAIRMAN (Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu):—"It appears to me that this question which is now being discussed as to the range and amount of work has a bearing upon this point, viz., what the volume of work involved is and whether that work requires the appointment of a personal assistant under the head of the department."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Quite so; thank you, Sir. In fact, if you had not given a ruling at once, Sir, that was exactly what I was going to submit as my important reason for entering into these questions. Thank you again, Sir, for the ruling that you have given. I was going to observe, Sir, that the special districts where this kind of work has been going on were Chingleput, Tanjore and Godavari. I believe the activities of this kind of work in the Chingleput district have ceased, if not completely, at least to some extent. But this kind of work, I believe, is going on even now in the Tanjore district and in the Godavari district. The other day, Sir, a petition was presented to the President of this House formally by one of its members who represent the Tanjore district, Mr. Somasundara Mudaliyar.

25th March 1922] [Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

Copies of that petition were distributed among the members of this House and I read it. I do not want to go into the various allegations made therein. Some of them may be exaggerated and some of them may be true or false. In any case, I may submit this, Sir, at this stage that very serious allegations are made regarding the conduct of some officials who are working in this department, and if even a tithe of those allegations be true, this department instead of doing good which it was intended to do, is, I am afraid, doing considerable harm. Of course it is for the Government —."

The CHAIRMAN (Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu):—"What is the bearing of that upon this question?"

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"This way, Sir. The person against whom these allegations are made is one of the assistant commissioners of labour."

The CHAIRMAN (Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu):—"That has not yet arisen. We are dealing with the personal assistant to the Labour Commissioner."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"You were just pleased to rule, Sir, that the policy of this department has been under discussion."

The CHAIRMAN (Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu):—"If you wish to state that it is these allegations and things of that kind that have amplified the work of the department, and if on that account you want to suggest that the work could be reduced by the adoption of any other alternative policy, that would be all right."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"In fact, I was going on to that, Sir. The point which I was going to emphasise was this. This kind of work, viz., the acquisition of house-sites for members of the depressed classes, can best be done and done more effectively too by the ordinary revenue authorities of the district, the Collector and his staff. That was my point, Sir. (At this stage Mr. T. E. Moir wanted to say something and got up.) Well, Sir, I may say that if I am constantly interrupted by members like this, I shall be obliged to claim your indulgence for an extension of the time limit fixed for our speeches."

Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"I beg to rise to a point of order, Sir. The question is whether the discussion of a different policy in connexion with the whole Labour department is relevant to a motion for the abolition of the personal assistant to the labour commissioner. It may be relevant to a motion where the whole policy is sought to be changed. But I may say, Sir, that it would be rather a difficult question if on a side issue as to whether a particular post can be abolished or not, the whole question of the policy and the future development of the Labour department were to be taken into consideration."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Sir, with reference to what my friend Mr. Moir was saying, in the first place, I submit, Sir, you have to give a ruling on this question, and secondly, no doubt the immediate question with which we are now concerned is the desirability or otherwise of abolishing the personal assistant's post. But, if it is not necessary to have a special department or to have a special commissioner for doing this kind of

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

[25th March 1922]

work and if this kind of work can very well be done through the ordinary revenue agency—the Collector and his subordinates—naturally I beg to submit these things become relevant.”

“What I was going to submit, Sir, was this. The kind of work which is done and which is intended to be done can better be done by the Collector and the ordinary revenue establishment working under him. As a matter of fact, now, there is the Labour department with a Commissioner at its head and a number of revenue inspectors and tahsildars working under him. Instead of the work being facilitated, I have been told the natural result is friction between this particular department and the ordinary Revenue department. This friction will certainly disappear and be eliminated if this work is entrusted to the ordinary Revenue department. After all, Sir, it is the ordinary Revenue department which has the best opportunities of attending to this work. The Collector and his assistants, the divisional assistants, the tahsildars and others that work under him know the conditions of the district better than the special officers who to-day may be working in this district and to-morrow may be transferred to another district. With reference to this point one other thing strikes me. The head of the department has two functions, namely, as protector of the depressed classes and also as protector of labour. I submit it is highly incongruous that these two functions should be combined in the same individual. With reference to what unfortunately took place in the city of Madras last year,—I refer to the Puliyantope disturbances—though we members from the mufassal have no special interest in what takes place in Madras—we are under the impression after a perusal of what took place that the Commissioner of Labour found himself in a very embarrassing and difficult position because he had two different kinds of duties which were conflicting with one another. For as a protector of labour he had certainly to look to all classes of labour, whether they were members of the Adi-Dravida community, or of the Muhammadan community or were caste men. But as the director of the depressed classes he had to attend particularly to the interests of the depressed classes. As was notorious, the members of the depressed classes came in collision with the labourers belonging to other communities, so that it is unfair, I submit, Sir, to the Labour Commissioner to be in charge of these two kinds of duties which sometimes cannot be reconciled one with the other. For these reasons, Sir, I support the resolution.”

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—“In speaking on this motion I wish to steer clear of all controversial topics. I do not for a moment consider about the policy or the justification for the existence of this department at all. It does not directly arise out of this particular issue. Nor is it necessary for me to consider whether it is desirable to tack on the Labour department with any other department. It is not my purpose to discuss whether a special department is necessary at all or whether it is not better to leave the matter to the ordinary revenue authorities. Confining myself to the particular question whether a personal assistant is necessary at all, I wish to show that his salary is about Rs. 4,240 per annum, his duty allowance Rs. 1,200 and his conveyance allowance is Rs. 1,200 per annum. In all he costs about Rs. 6,600 per annum. Now where is the justification for this personal assistant? In this connexion we have to consider the volume of work turned out by the Labour Commissioner and whether he would really require the assistance of a personal

25th March 1922]

[Mr. P. Siva Rao]

assistant. The first duty that is assigned to this Labour Commissioner is the amelioration of the condition of the depressed classes. When I support this motion I should not be misunderstood as saying that the depressed classes do not require our utmost care and attention. On the other hand, I am one of those who believe that the regeneration of our country depends mostly upon the amelioration of the present condition of the depressed classes. I am not suggesting that these depressed classes do not require any special or preferential treatment at the hands of the Government.

“Coming to the duties of the Labour Commissioner, I find that the amelioration of the depressed classes seems to be the foremost. Besides this, he is entrusted with the control of the agricultural and industrial settlement work, acquisition of house-sites for the depressed classes which I understand is taking place in three districts of the presidency, amelioration of the condition of the backward tribes such as the Chenchus of Nallamalai and the Kallars of Malabar, and supervision of factories and labour. Considering all these duties, considering also the number of schools which the Labour Commissioner has to supervise—I think the number is 470—considering also the criminal settlement work over which he has got the final control—I think they are 12 in number—the question seriously arises whether we would do well to spend Rs. 6,000 and odd for this costly machinery of a personal assistant. I must unhesitatingly say, Sir, that there is no necessity for a personal assistant. We should also remember that the Labour Commissioner has three assistant labour commissioners under him. There is the Revenue department and the district executive force waiting to co-operate with him. The question is whether an assistant in the shape of a manager on a salary of Rs. 100 or Rs. 150 will not do. To me a personal assistant costing 6,000 and odd seems to be a luxury. There is no sufficient duty for him.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“Mr. President, within the five minutes at my disposal I do not propose to travel into the policy of having a Labour department to do special work on behalf of the Panchamas. I must say this at once, viz., that after an experience of 30 years and after investigation by special officers ranging over five years we came to the deliberate conclusion that this work on behalf of the depressed classes could not possibly be done and it was not done by the ordinary revenue divisional staff. If you are going to do this work you must have a special staff and a special establishment for the purpose of doing this work. I will read only one passage from a letter which we sent to the Government of India asking for this special department. It was, as I said, as a result of 30 years' experience and five years' detailed enquiry that we asked for it.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“Is the document that he is reading from placed on the table?”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“I will place every paper here on the table.”

The CHAIRMAN (Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu) :—“I believe after all he has not read from it as yet.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“The question is whether this work should go on or should not go on. We shall have to do this work by a special establishment. Experience has shown that the Revenue department cannot possibly attend to this work. We gave the depressed classes facilities for acquiring land for cultivation; we afforded them facilities

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar] [25th March 1922]

work and if this kind of work can very well be done through the ordinary revenue agency—the Collector and his subordinates—naturally I beg to submit these things become relevant.”

“What I was going to submit, Sir, was this. The kind of work which is done and which is intended to be done can better be done by the Collector and the ordinary revenue establishment working under him. As a matter of fact, now, there is the Labour department with a Commissioner at its head and a number of revenue inspectors and tahsildars working under him. Instead of the work being facilitated, I have been told the natural result is friction between this particular department and the ordinary Revenue department. This friction will certainly disappear and be eliminated if this work is entrusted to the ordinary Revenue department. After all, Sir, it is the ordinary Revenue department which has the best opportunities of attending to this work. The Collector and his assistants, the divisional assistants, the tahsildars and others that work under him know the conditions of the district better than the special officers who to-day may be working in this district and to-morrow may be transferred to another district. With reference to this point one other thing strikes me. The head of the department has two functions, namely, as protector of the depressed classes and also as protector of labour. I submit it is highly incongruous that these two functions should be combined in the same individual. With reference to what unfortunately took place in the city of Madras last year,—I refer to the Puliyantope disturbances—though we members from the mufassal have no special interest in what takes place in Madras—we are under the impression after a perusal of what took place that the Commissioner of Labour found himself in a very embarrassing and difficult position because he had two different kinds of duties which were conflicting with one another. For as a protector of labour he had certainly to look to all classes of labour, whether they were members of the Adi-Dravida community, or of the Muhammadan community or were caste men. But as the director of the depressed classes he had to attend particularly to the interests of the depressed classes. As was notorious, the members of the depressed classes came in collision with the labourers belonging to other communities, so that it is unfair, I submit, Sir, to the Labour Commissioner to be in charge of these two kinds of duties which sometimes cannot be reconciled one with the other. For these reasons, Sir, I support the resolution.”

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—“In speaking on this motion I wish to steer clear of all controversial topics. I do not for a moment consider about the policy or the justification for the existence of this department at all. It does not directly arise out of this particular issue. Nor is it necessary for me to consider whether it is desirable to tack on the Labour department with any other department. It is not my purpose to discuss whether a special department is necessary at all or whether it is not better to leave the matter to the ordinary revenue authorities. Confining myself to the particular question whether a personal assistant is necessary at all, I wish to show that his salary is about Rs. 4,240 per annum, his duty allowance Rs. 1,200 and his conveyance allowance is Rs. 1,200 per annum. In all he costs about Rs. 6,600 per annum. Now where is the justification for this personal assistant? In this connexion we have to consider the volume of work turned out by the Labour Commissioner and whether he would really require the assistance of a personal

25th March 1922]

[Mr. P. Siva Rao]

assistant. The first duty that is assigned to this Labour Commissioner is the amelioration of the condition of the depressed classes. When I support this motion I should not be misunderstood as saying that the depressed classes do not require our utmost care and attention. On the other hand, I am one of those who believe that the regeneration of our country depends mostly upon the amelioration of the present condition of the depressed classes. I am not suggesting that these depressed classes do not require any special or preferential treatment at the hands of the Government.

“Coming to the duties of the Labour Commissioner, I find that the amelioration of the depressed classes seems to be the foremost. Besides this, he is entrusted with the control of the agricultural and industrial settlement work, acquisition of house-sites for the depressed classes which I understand is taking place in three districts of the presidency, amelioration of the condition of the backward tribes such as the Chenchus of Nallamalai and the Kallars of Malabar, and supervision of factories and labour. Considering all these duties, considering also the number of schools which the Labour Commissioner has to supervise—I think the number is 470—considering also the criminal settlement work over which he has got the final control—I think they are 12 in number—the question seriously arises whether we would do well to spend Rs. 6,000 and odd for this costly machinery of a personal assistant. I must unhesitatingly say, Sir, that there is no necessity for a personal assistant. We should also remember that the Labour Commissioner has three assistant labour commissioners under him. There is the Revenue department and the district executive force waiting to co-operate with him. The question is whether an assistant in the shape of a manager on a salary of Rs. 100 or Rs. 150 will not do. To me a personal assistant costing 6,000 and odd seems to be a luxury. There is no sufficient duty for him.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“Mr. President, within the five minutes at my disposal I do not propose to travel into the policy of having a Labour department to do special work on behalf of the Panchamas. I must say this at once, viz., that after an experience of 30 years and after investigation by special officers ranging over five years we came to the deliberate conclusion that this work on behalf of the depressed classes could not possibly be done and it was not done by the ordinary revenue divisional staff. If you are going to do this work you must have a special staff and a special establishment for the purpose of doing this work. I will read only one passage from a letter which we sent to the Government of India asking for this special department. It was, as I said, as a result of 30 years' experience and five years' detailed enquiry that we asked for it.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“Is the document that he is reading from placed on the table?”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“I will place every paper here on the table.”

The CHAIRMAN (Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu) :—“I believe after all he has not read from it as yet.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“The question is whether this work should go on or should not go on. We shall have to do this work by a special establishment. Experience has shown that the Revenue department cannot possibly attend to this work. We gave the depressed classes facilities for acquiring land for cultivation; we afforded them facilities

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar] [25th March 1922]

for getting poramboke lands for house-sites and in many other matters we afforded them various kinds of facilities; but the progress was nearly none. 'This fact is due largely to the ignorance of these classes and partly, perhaps, to the lack of sympathy displayed by subordinate officials; and even where the Government officers have the requisite sympathy, they have not the time to undertake the large volume of propaganda work involved in the initiation of measures on a large scale and in carrying them out in detail.' There is one fact in this connexion to which I wish to draw prominent attention. The special department has undertaken the work in two or three districts as was pointed out. The special department has not got sufficient funds to undertake work in the neighbouring taluks. Instructions are given that the Assistant Labour Commissioner should finish one taluk and then go to another; and if any applications are received from the neighbouring taluk they must be transferred to the ordinary revenue officials for disposal. This rule has been in existence from 1920; none of that work has been done by the ordinary revenue officials. Now I shall confine myself to the personal assistant. You will find, Sir, that the personal assistant is of the grade of a deputy collector who gets a salary ranging from Rs. 300 to Rs. 850 according to his grade. This personal assistant is in the headquarters assisting the Labour Commissioner in the various duties he has to discharge. The Labour department, at the head of which is the Labour Commissioner, deals with the following: administration of the Factories Act, working of the Planters' Labour Act, working of the Workmen's Breach of Contract Act, emigration of labour, labour bureau and employment bureau, wages census, industrial disputes—this on the side of industrial labour—management and control of settlements under the Criminal Tribes Act and investigations into the conditions of the depressed classes and also hill tribes outside the Agency tracts and measures for their advancement. These are the various kinds of work that he has to do. I shall just tell you what is being done merely for the collection of labour statistics elsewhere. For the purpose of merely collecting labour statistics, they have a labour office in Bombay costing Rs. 70,000. There is a Statistics Commissioner at the head of the department who is drawing, I believe, exactly the same salary as the Labour Commissioner here. There is a separate officer for the purpose of supervising criminal settlements. That officer and his establishment in Bombay cost Rs. 54,035, so that between these officers for labour statistics and criminal settlement alone it costs about a lakh and twenty-five thousand rupees. Our Labour Commissioner has to do both these, and also depressed classes work which is even more important than the other two in this province. He is the protector of depressed classes and the motion is to cut out the personal assistant given him. I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that if you take away the personal assistant there is nobody in the headquarters except a clerk or two. There is no manager or any other person who will be responsible even for the routine business.

11-45 a.m. "Now, Sir, I had a note from the Labour Commissioner to enable us to address the Government of India and if the House wants I will read extracts from it. He says: 'To enable the Labour Commissioner to discharge more effectively the duties of his combined charge, he ought to have under him a Secretary to deal with all questions relating to industrial disputes, labour statistics, all questions affecting the Madras City and such other confidential inquiries as these matters necessitate. There must

25th March 1922] [Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

be a separate statistical manager who will be in charge of the labour statistics, wages, housing problems and all other problems involving economic inquiries or statistical information.' Many of the matters with which the Commissioner of Labour deals are matters regarding the depressed classes and require his personal inspection and supervision. I forgot to mention that he has got to go on tour for the purpose of seeing whether the industrial settlements are being properly worked. When the Commissioner thus goes on tour, there should be some officer at the headquarters to deal with all general questions and for this purpose there should be a personal assistant of the grade of a deputy collector in separate charge of the depressed classes, criminal settlements, emigration, factories, etc. Now, Sir, we were of opinion that there should really be two separate departments, one dealing with the industrial labour and the other dealing with the depressed classes. If the House is prepared to sanction funds to have these two departments under separate heads I shall be extremely pleased. But in our present financial state we cannot afford it and we are getting on with one single Labour Commissioner to do both these functions. The House will remember that for the purpose of making some inquiry into the statistics, we had a deputy commissioner for some time last year. We have not got him now. If then we take away even the personal assistant, it means that the Labour Commissioner cannot possibly go on tour. That means he cannot effectively discharge his duties of supervision over the depressed classes work. That is the position which the House will be reducing itself to. But if it is desirous of abolishing the whole department, then let them say so. Don't say that you want a Labour Commissioner but would not give him a sufficient establishment. Every head of a department has got a personal assistant of the grade of a deputy collector and some departments have got more than one personal assistant, and they have all been accepted by this House. Why should not this particular head of the department have a personal assistant? If we expect him to do the duties which are imposed upon him he must have one."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"At first I did not want to intervene in the debate on this question. But the hon. the Law Member has gone into the programme of work that is being done by these officers. I think it is necessary to say something in connexion with this question of abolishing the personal assistant. It is said that it is absolutely necessary for the purpose of carrying on the work in the city, at any rate, that there should be a personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour. If he is to be confined only to the office, as personal assistants to the Collectors are, I for one should have had no objection to that. But to do the duties of the Commissioner of Labour during his absence and that for the City of Madras, though for the mufassal other people might do the work, it is said that such a personal assistant is necessary. Now, we have to put against the Government of India's orders speaking as to the absence of any substantial work for the past 30 years, the experience gained during the period during which this establishment has been at work, i.e., for a few months or few years in Madras. Sir, last year in the budget debate, I had to remark with reference to the Labour Department that the impression was gaining ground, whether by accident or otherwise, that the longer the Labour Commissioner's Department was in existence, the longer had been the period of strikes. At that time I was only thinking of the long strike in October, November, December and January of 1919 and 1920. Subsequently, after that remark was made, we have had

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar] [25th March 1922]

that long strike which has involved Madras in those dark things about which I need not speak at present. No doubt, as personal assistant, the personal assistant has been going about. We know how things have been going on during that period. Of course, I do not wish to revive the memories of Puliantope. We had to complain how every time there was disorder there was the Commissioner of Labour along with the police. But as to how that administration went on, we may refer to the report made by Sir William Ayling's Committee and how far the work of the personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour or of the Labour Commissioner himself has been of benefit to the labourers or the depressed classes can also be seen from that. I refer to a note made by our esteemed friend Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu. He concluded his report by saying: 'I will close this note with a remark or two on the subject relating to the condition of these pitiable men who had to get on without shelter, and for a time even without food.' According to the statistics furnished to the committee, 418 huts were destroyed by the several fires; of these, 269 belonged to Adi-Dravidas and 149 to others. Sixty-seven of the latter belong to chucklers (a community which my hon. Friend Mr. Guruswami has the honour to represent in this Council). Living under similar conditions and undoubtedly in similar circumstances in life, how glaringly unequal was the relief afforded to these sufferers? Over and above the contributions made by philanthropic gentlemen, a sum of Rs. 20,000 of Government money was spent on feeding and sheltering the Adi-Dravida occupants of the 269 huts, whereas the occupants of the other 149 huts received contribution to the extent of Rs. 100. How will this inequality be interpreted, Sir? To the average mind in what light will it present the authorities to the public view? What mutual feelings are likely to be fostered between these communities who are neighbours? Sir, one other thing that I wish to draw attention of the House to is to be found in the administration report issued by this department. I have said that while public money was placed at the disposal of this department for the relief of sufferers, how amongst the depressed classes themselves this money was unequally distributed, one class being completely neglected, namely the chucklers. In the administration report it is stated that the following special grants were made during the year. For the Adi-Dravida hostel in Madras a sum of Rs. 1,000 was placed at the disposal of Mr. M. C. Raja for expenditure in connexion with that hostel."

Mr. L. C. GURUSWAMI:—"In this connexion I wish to say that Rs. 504 was given to me."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"When? Before or after the report?"

Mr. L. C. GURUSWAMI:—"After the report."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"This report comprised the administration for the year 1920-21 and the report was issued apparently on the 7th November 1921. A sum of Rs. 1,000 is placed at the disposal of Mr. Raja in connexion with the Adi-Dravida hostel to be opened in Madras. I asked Mr. Somasundaram Pillai as to where this hostel was and to give me some other information relating to it; but he could not give me any information. I asked my friend Mr. Guruswami and he said that he knew nothing."

Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"Does the hon. Member mean to suggest that we placed Rs. 1,000 at the disposal of Mr. Raja for a hostel which did not exist?"

25th March 1922]

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"All that I say is I asked Mr. Somasundaram Pillai for information and he says that he does not know anything about it. I ask whether this amount was made available equally to all sections of the depressed classes. While it is said that efforts are being made to alleviate the distress among these communities, are the contributions which are placed at the disposal of this department equally distributed? I do not propose to speak at great length as to the necessity of having a personal assistant."

"Dealing with the class of work which has to be done, we were told about the criminal settlements. Sir, no doubt, it all sounds very big to speak of supervision over criminal settlements. I would refer the House to page 11 of the administration report of the Labour department. In respect of almost every one of the criminal settlements the money provision that has been allotted has been handed over to respectable agencies such as the Salvation Army, American Mission, Messrs. Parry & Co. at Kulasekarapatnam and to other agencies. In fact the policy relating to the handing over of money intended for these settlements to these agencies was questioned in this House."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"May I ask whether all this is relevant to the question whether the head of the department requires a personal assistant? It seems to me to be entirely irrelevant."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"It is perfectly relevant having regard to the speech made by the hon. the Law Member in which he said that these are the various duties which the Labour Commissioner has to discharge and for which he requires the assistance of a personal assistant."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"May I mention, Sir, that I raised a point of order on this question that all this is not relevant but I believe the Chairman over-ruled me?"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"May I submit, Sir, that the question in issue is whether there is work for the personal assistant or not; and whether it has been well or ill done is not relevant?"

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"The hon. the Law Member referred amongst other things to the various duties to be done by the Labour Commissioner and said that therefore he required the assistance of a personal assistant. Therefore, I am also entitled to say that it is a duty which does not involve much work because as I see, out of Rs. 1,60,000 allotted for criminal settlements, a sum of about Rs. 1,40,000 has been handed over to these respectable bodies, the Salvation Army, the Missionaries, Parry & Co., etc. I think that when last year it was asked whether it was right to entrust monies for the uplift of these communities to those bodies who might have an inclination to convert them and so on, the House by a majority approved the principle of entrusting the money to them; because it was said that they did the work as a matter of love and the money that was paid to them could not cover the ordinary managing expenses by an independent agency. Under these circumstances, having approved the principle of entrusting the management of these communities to the respectable bodies, to say that the Commissioner of Labour has to do much supervision work is not correct."

"As regards the labour bureau, employment bureau, wages census, we know what kind of census is being taken. After the trouble in Puliantope was over, I put the question what the number of Adi-Dravidas working

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar] [25th March 1922]

in the mills was and what the number of caste people. When they are posing that they are doing a lot of census work, they were not able to give me this information. I have a candid confession from the Government that the Government are unable to give me information. That is the kind of census work that is being done.

"As for the working of the Planters Act, steps are being already taken to repeal that Act. That is the information I gathered. As regards Workmen's Breach of Contract Act, absolutely nothing seems to have been done.

"As for emigration of labour, we know formerly the Collector of Madras was doing this work. Towards the amelioration of depressed classes, this report says that out of Rs. 2 lakhs allotted for that purpose, 1½ lakhs was taken for establishment and the remaining 50 thousand was set apart for miscellaneous work, such as sinking of wells, acquisition of sites for foot-paths, etc. So in the name of the depressed classes for whom two lakhs of rupees have been set apart, 1½ lakhs went for establishment and half a lakh only actually went for their benefit. Under these circumstances, Sir, and when various suggestions are made for working this department on a reorganized basis giving these people the benefit of the protector of depressed classes, without any intermediate officers who rather hinder the work than advance it, I ask that this motion may be supported and passed by this House."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"The only point which the hon. the Law Member urged against this motion being accepted was that experience of the past 30 years showed that ordinary district agencies could not be expected to do the necessary work and to devote the required attention to the depressed classes. Well, Sir, the proposal that I make is that a protector of depressed classes should work directly under the Law Member himself, and that he should co-ordinate the work and should also see whether the proposals made by him are carried out. I am sure if effect is given to my proposals, the failure in the past can be remedied. Then the hon. the Law Member stated that there are in Bombay a Labour Commissioner and also a Superintendent of Criminal Settlements. Well, Sir, he stopped with Bombay and did not go to the other presidencies for the simple reason that there are no such officers in those places."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"There are superintendents of criminal settlements in other provinces and the statistical work is also being done in other provinces."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"I believe, Sir, that from what I read from the proceedings of the conference of the Directors of Industries for last year, it was only in Bombay they had a Labour department. In Calcutta they appear to have a bureau of labour, and in no other presidency there is such a department like this. I know that the conference paid special attention to what was done in Madras, and I believe the conclusion they came to was that the department of labour ought to be placed under the Director of Industries and should not be under the Commissioner of Labour. For the labour work to be done under the Director of Industries, there ought to be a personal assistant in charge of these labour statistics just as we have a personal assistant under the Director of Agriculture to prepare agricultural statistics. That is the way in which things ought to be done

5th March 1922] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

and it is not right to have this Labour Department tacked to the protector of the depressed classes. It was then stated that there was no manager in the office and so a personal assistant was necessary."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"What I stated was that there was none to look after the work in the office if the personal assistant was taken away, not that the manager in an office can do the work of a personal assistant."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"If the work entrusted to the protector of the depressed classes is to be as I propose, then there will be no necessity for a personal assistant, and a manager in the office will be quite ample. So, Sir, the reply given by the hon. the Law Member does not go to demolish my arguments. I am not at all concerned with the past history of the particular persons employed in the Labour Department or whether the work was done well or ill by those who were in charge. I only raise a general question. I have clearly stated what I have to say, and I do not think I have heard anything from the hon. the Law Member to change my opinion. Under these circumstances, I press my motion for the acceptance of the House."

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR:—"What is the time allotted for the discussion of this demand?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think it is half a day."

Mr. M. C. RAJA:—"Sir, the motion on the agenda is to omit the allotment of Rs. 4,240 for Personal Assistant to the Commissioner of Labour. Sir, being myself a member of the depressed classes, I have closely come in contact with the work of the Personal Assistant to the Commissioner of Labour referred to in this motion, and I know somewhat the work which he is carrying on in the office. I do not think any other hon. Member in this Council except my hon. Friend Mr. Guruswami knows the volume of work that is done by the personal assistant here in Madras. The personal assistant in Madras is not a personal assistant such as you see in other offices. Here the personal assistant is also doing some executive work. The protector of the depressed classes being a touring officer throughout the whole Presidency he is absent sometimes nearly for the whole month, and therefore during his absence it is essential that there should be a responsible officer in the office to carry on the work, of course, on the lines laid down by the Labour Commissioner. If you do away with this personal assistant, it would be simply to cripple the work of the Labour Commissioner, and we would consider that as aiming at the interests of our community. My hon. Friend Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar when he opened the debate said that he was not for stopping or arresting the progress of the work that was being done. But I ask, if you do not have efficient men, how can you carry on the work? Some of the hon. Members tell me: 'We are giving you 5, 10 and 15 lakhs of rupees; why do you want officers?' I answer them: 'You are giving us money to construct houses and at the same time you are asking us not to employ efficient men to do the work; you would not allow us to employ good maistris or good engineers and you also ask us not to use good bricklayers.' It is something like that when you do not want this personal assistant and yet you say: 'We are not against the progress of the depressed classes.' My hon. Friend Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar also said that the great non-Brahman Hindu community did not pay sufficient attention to these classes. That is

[Mr. M. C. Raja]

[25th March 1922]

the very fact, Sir, why you should pay particular attention now to these classes; that is the very reason why you should employ efficient men, and that is the very reason why you should spend more money on this special kind of work which requires a great deal of energy and enthusiasm. If you are not going to employ efficient men to do this work, you may as well abolish the Labour Department and leave things as they are. We consider this motion as an attempt to do away with the useful work done for the depressed classes. I am not speaking on my own behalf, the individual 'Raja'. I am ventilating here what my community has said in a conference last week. I am not going to swallow the pills that you are giving me, however sugar-coated they may be. I am responsible to my community, and I am simply voicing in this Council the instructions they gave me.

"My hon. Friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, the loud-mouthed champion of the non-Brahmans, comes out and says that a *thousand* rupees was given to the Adi-Dravida Students' Hostel. I wish to know what his intention is. He says at one time: 'Do not spend money over officers who protect the depressed classes'; at another time he says 'I do not give money for starting a students' hostel'. Is this the sympathy that he evinces towards the depressed classes?"

MR. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"My point was that the money did not go to the whole of the depressed classes."

MR. M. C. RAJA:—"I will ask my hon. Friend whether he is holding any brief for any section of the depressed classes and whether he had applied for any help on behalf of a section of my men to the protector of the depressed classes, and whether he was refused help by him. I am constrained to say, Sir, that I thought I was living in the year 1922: but now I see I am made to live in 1822. I am sorry I have to speak like this. I do not mean anything personally to my hon. friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar. I am only giving out the feelings of my community."

MR. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI:—"Sir, I presided over a conference of the depressed classes, and I know their grievance is that a man of their own community should be appointed as personal assistant. They think that, if one of their own men was employed, their interests will be better served."

MR. M. C. RAJA:—"I do not say that I do not want a man from my own community to be appointed as personal assistant."

"Then, you want cheap machinery to conduct the work of my people, and you want a very efficient and highly paid machinery for conducting the work of your own people. You do not go in for people with minimum qualification to attend to your work. You want efficient men, men with great intellect for your work. For Panchama work, you say: 'there is no necessity for a deputy collector, an ordinary man will do.' You know as a matter of fact, there are certain deputy collectors who are called 'Panchama deputy collectors' because they do work for the depressed classes."

"I know my hon. Friend from Trichinopoly. He is a great friend of the depressed classes and he has been taking a good deal of interest on their behalf. I do not know these things personally; but that is what I hear from my community in Trichinopoly. I think my hon. Friend wants that honorary men should be appointed to look after the interests of the depressed classes just as there are honorary co-operative assistant registrars. I wish to tell him that this work is one which requires constant attention of the worker

[25th March 1922]

[Mr. M. C. Raja]

from hour to hour and day to day. He will have to devote his whole time to look after the interests of the depressed classes. Spasmodic work and work done in spare hours as is done by the honorary assistant registrars will not do. I am myself an honorary registrar and I can devote only a few hours to that work."

MR. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI:—"I do not say that honorary men should be appointed. I say men belonging to the community of the depressed classes should be appointed."

MR. M. C. RAJA:—"This is a special kind of work which requires the constant attention of good men, men specially endowed with ability as you see in public services. Unless you have able men, it is not possible to do this work satisfactorily. Therefore, I think a personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour is quite essential."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"All I wish to do is to try and bring this debate back to the issue which really ought to be discussed on the motion before the House. It is for the omission of an allotment of Rs. 4,240 for the personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour. The only issue which properly ought to be discussed and which is directly relevant to that motion is the question whether or not the Commissioner of Labour requires the assistance of a personal assistant for the proper discharge of his duties. If it is desired to question the general policy of the Labour Department, the discussion on that point ought to be initiated on subsequent motions. There are plenty of suitable motions from No. 676 onwards. I have not the slightest doubt that the hon. the Law Member and others directly concerned with the department would welcome a discussion on the issue of general policy when we reach those motions. But I submit that it places those who have to answer this motion in a very difficult position, if the debate is allowed to turn on general policy."

"It is not relevant, I urge, now to rake up the questions how business has been transacted in the past, what the policy should be in the future, and whether one type of work or another should be included within the scope of the Commissioner of Labour. The only issue is whether he requires a personal assistant. If I had had any idea that the range of discussion was going to include so large a field, I would have asked you, Sir, to consider whether it would not be possible to adjourn this item under Standing Order 34 until after the discussion of motions on the broader issue of general policy. But if it is too late to suggest that course, I would still urge the House to come down from the higher atmosphere of policy to the ground level of the specific question whether a personal assistant is required or not. I happen to know something personally about the Commissioner of Labour's work in the past and what he has to do in the present. It is no use discussing details now, but I can confidently assert without any qualification that there is ample work for a personal assistant, that, if the Commissioner of Labour had no such assistant, the utility of his appointment would be very seriously reduced. One word of personal explanation before I resume my seat. One speaker has referred to the fact that the Commissioner of Labour, Mr. Moir, had happened to be present on every occasion when recourse was had to shooting during the disturbances in the mill area. I think that statement was made once before and I then replied that the reason was that Mr. Moir was exactly

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[25th March 1922]

where he ought to have been. He was doing his best to prevent the necessity for shooting. He was doing his duty under very difficult conditions, thrusting himself into the forefront of the trouble with the single idea of preventing trouble, of preventing any necessity for shooting."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU:—"I move that the question be put."

The motion for the closure was put and carried.

The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson demanded a poll. The House then divided on the closure motion as follows:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankinesu Prasad Bahadur. | 25. Diwan Bahadur M. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. |
| 2. Dr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu. | 26. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 3. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 27. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. |
| 4. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 28. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. |
| 5. Mr. B. P. Devarajulu Nayudu. | 29. M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 30. Mr. P. Siva Rao. |
| 7. Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar. | 31. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 8. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 32. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 33. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 10. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 34. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib. |
| 11. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 35. Mr. A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar. |
| 12. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 36. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 13. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 37. Munshi Muhammad Abdur-Rahman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 14. Mr. K. A. Kandaswami Kandar. | 38. Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razzaq Sahib Bahadur. |
| 15. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 39. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla Padsha Sahib Bahadur. |
| 16. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 40. Diwan Bahadur Govindoss Chathurbhujadoss. |
| 17. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 41. Sir M. C. T. Muttayya Chettiyar. |
| 18. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | |
| 19. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | |
| 20. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | |
| 21. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | |
| 22. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddi. | |
| 23. Mr. T. Somasundaram Pillai. | |
| 24. Mr. P. Subbarayan. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 12. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo. |
| 2. " Sir Charles Todhunter. | 13. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 14. Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 15. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 5. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 16. Rai Sahib E. C. M. Mascarenhas. |
| 6. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 17. Rev. W. Meston. |
| 7. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. | 18. Mr. M. C. Raja. |
| 8. Mr. R. Littlehailes. | 19. Mr. L. C. Guruswami. |
| 9. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 20. Mr. R. T. Kesavulu. |
| 10. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai. | 21. Mr. G. Vandannam. |
| 11. Diwan Bahadur T. Desika Achariyar. | 22. Sir James Simpson. |

Forty-one voted for and 22 against the motions.

Then the main motion for the omission of the allotment for the Personal Assistant to the Commissioner of Labour was put and carried.

The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson again demanded a poll.

[25th March 1922]

The House then divided as follows:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 27. Diwan Bahadur M. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. |
| 2. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankinesu Prasad Bahadur. | 28. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 3. Dr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu. | 29. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. |
| 4. Mr. B. Appaswami Nayudu. | 30. Rao Bahadur C. Venkata Ranga Reddi. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 31. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 6. Mr. B. P. Devarajulu Nayudu. | 32. Mr. P. Siva Rao. |
| 7. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 33. Mr. S. Muttumanicka Achari. |
| 8. Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar. | 34. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 9. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 35. Mr. A. Rangnatha Mudaliyar. |
| 10. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 36. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 11. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 37. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 12. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 38. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib. |
| 13. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 39. Mr. A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar. |
| 14. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 40. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 15. Mr. K. A. Kandaswami Kandar. | 41. Munshi Muhammad Abdur-Rahman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 16. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 42. Saiyid Diwan Abdur-Razzaq Sahib Bahadur. |
| 17. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 43. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 18. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 44. Diwan Bahadur Govindoss Chathurbhujadoss. |
| 19. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 45. Sir M. C. T. Muttayya Chettiyar. |
| 20. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | |
| 21. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | |
| 22. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | |
| 23. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | |
| 24. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddi. | |
| 25. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. | |
| 26. Mr. P. Subbarayan. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 11. Mr. R. Littlehailes. |
| 2. " Sir Charles Todhunter. | 12. Mr. E. Periyannayagam. |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Mohammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 13. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. |
| 4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 14. Diwan Bahadur T. Desika Achariyar. |
| 5. " Mr. P. Ramaswamyangar. | 15. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 6. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 16. Rev. W. Meston. |
| 7. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 17. Mr. M. C. Raja. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 18. Mr. L. C. Guruswami. |
| 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 19. Mr. R. T. Kesavulu Pillai. |
| 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. | 20. Mr. G. Vanlanam. |
| | 21. Sir James Simpson. |

The motion was carried, 45 having voted for and 21 against.

Motion 646.

The following motion was not moved as it referred to a "matter substantially the same as that of the previous motion:—

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI:—

646. To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,240 for personal assistant. }

Motion 647.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The following motion of Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu is out of order as the House has already decided to omit the allotment of the personal assistant whose duty allowance is referred to in this motion:—

647. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for duty allowance of the personal assistant."

Mr. O. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Sir, if for any reason the item is restored by His Excellency the Governor, we should like the duty allowance to go. This is a reserved department."

[25th March 1922]

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I am bound to deal with points of order as they arise. I am bound to rule out the motion as out of order. In regard to the contingency raised by the hon. Member, Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi, I really cannot take up that in regulating my decision on a point of order."

Motions 648 to 652.

For the same reason the following motions were ruled out of order:—

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR:—

648. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for duty allowance of the personal assistant.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—

649. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for duty allowance for the personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour.

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—

650. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for the personal assistant.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—

651. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for duty allowance of the personal assistant.

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA-PILLAI:—

652. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for duty allowance of the personal assistant.

Motion 653.

The following motion was not made:—

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI:—

653. To omit the allotment of Rs. 17,140 for three assistant commissioners.

Motion 654.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

654. To omit the allotment of Rs. 17,140 for three assistant commissioners.

"I have set at length my view on the subject when I spoke on the motion regarding the Personal Assistant to the Labour Commissioner. I said that there ought to be a protector of the depressed classes under the Member of the Government in charge of the portfolio. But we have no necessity for these three assistant commissioners to work in the districts. Therefore I move for the omission of the allotment."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Now I propose to deal with the question of district staff. Before I do so I want to make a statement as regards the allegations made in the petition which was presented to the House and to which a reference was made by Mr. Krishnan Nayar. There were two petitions. When the first petition was presented to me I had enquiries made with regard to those allegations by the Labour Commissioner

[25th March 1922] [Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

On his enquiry it was found that the allegations made therein were not correct, and in one instance it was demonstrably false. One of the allegations was that the acquisition has been made in a village for non-Panchamas, as a default on the part of the Labour Department. It was found on inquiry that there were no acquisition proceedings at all in that village. Then, Sir, I asked the Labour Commissioner to meet Mr. Somasundaram Mudaliyar, Mr. Vandayar and other leading mirasidars and have a discussion with them in the presence of the Collector.

He found, when he went there to discuss this question that Mr. Somasundaram Mudaliyar had no personal knowledge as to any of the allegations made in the petition presented by him (Mr. Somasundaram Mudaliyar) to me. That is what he says (I believe I have shown this report to Mr. Somasundaram Mudaliyar): 'On my arrival at Tanjore I discussed the matter with the Collector and Mr. Somasundaram Mudaliyar—'

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARAM MUDALIYAR:—"May I request the hon. Member to let me know whether I have stated anything in my letter in reference to that affair?"

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"His petition is before the Council and they can judge. All that I have to do is to inquire into those allegations. This is what the Labour Commissioner says: 'On my arrival at Tanjore, I discussed the matter with the Collector, Mr. Somasundaram Mudaliyar, Rao Bahadur Appaswami Vandayar and another mirasidar. I had hoped to get special information from this discussion which would help me in defining my inquiry which could not extend to every case mentioned. But I found Mr. Somasundaram Mudaliyar had no personal knowledge of any of these things. The chief point made was that the acquisition work which was intended only for the Panchamas was now being extended to other castes.' With regard to that, questions have been put in the House and I have answered them. From that the House will see that only a very small proportion of the acquisition has been made for the caste Hindus; they are economically in as bad a position as the depressed classes. I may also say that the Government Order appointing the special establishment for depressed classes expressly referred to other labourers in addition to Panchamas. He continues: 'the more definite point was that raised by Mr. Vandayar to the effect that persons of other classes for whom lands have been now acquired are not genuinely in want. On that he has personally made several inquiries in several villages.' I can give you the whole of this report, whosoever wants it. The result of those inquiries was that, as far as I could see, acquisitions had been made with great attention to the rules, the one doubtful point being the one already referred to, namely, whether the acquisition should be undertaken for small farmers. He went into this question fully and he found, fortunately for him from the books which were produced by the mirasidars themselves, that the so-called varamdar was in a worse position economically than the ordinary coolie. I had another petition presented to me. I sent it to the Labour Commissioner for inquiry. The inquiry is not complete. The investigations refer to individual cases. So far as the inquiry has gone, it has left a general impression on my mind that there is no basis for most of the allegations."

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARAM MUDALIYAR:—"I want to ask whether notice has been given to the persons who have given affidavits that a regular inquiry would take place. No such notice has been given to me."

[25th March 1922]

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“I do not wish to make it an absolutely judicial inquiry ranging for years, with vakils appearing for parties with examinations and cross-examinations. We are bound to have the assistant commissioner's explanation, and that I have. The Commissioner of Labour, if it is necessary to inquire into these cases, will give due notice to Mr. Somasundara Mudaliyar.”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“I rise to a point of order. The question is whether it is necessary to have three assistant commissioners. We are now going into the details of some petitions presented and the results of the inquiry. From the way in which this discussion is drifting, I hardly think that it is relevant to the point at issue.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I think it is relevant. Of course the question is whether there is need for three assistant commissioners of labour. The hon. the Law Member's point is that there is a lot of work to be done, and he goes on to enumerate some of the items.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“Not only that. A challenge was made that not merely the Labour Commissioner's assistants were useless for the purpose of doing that work, but it is said they were retarding the work of the amelioration of the depressed classes by coming into conflict with other officers by setting up a class conflict. The challenge was made by Mr. Krishnan Nayar. I was talking about the petitions presented here only with a view to take away any prejudice that might be entertained by any members of this House by reason of those allegations. Do not imagine that those allegations have been proved. I ask you to suspend your judgment on that.”

“Now, I am not going to take up very much more time of the House. In this connexion I might draw attention to a passage which I read on the last budget debate and which I shall read again. It bears repetition. This is the deliberate opinion of the Board of Revenue as to the possibility of the ordinary revenue divisional staff undertaking this work and carrying it out successfully. ‘After a careful consideration of the problem of the depressed classes, the Board has come to the conclusion that however liberal and generous the attitude of the Government towards the depressed classes may be and whatsoever may be the facilities accorded for the improvement of the condition of the community, the effect desired is not likely to be produced so long as there is no separate agency to carry out the policy of the Government in this respect. Supposing the improvement of the condition of these classes has in the past received the approval of the Government, owing to the lack of special organization they have failed in their object. There is a general indifference and even hostility to measures calculated to improve the depressed classes and the Collector has not the force or the will to carry out such measures; so they will become inoperative owing to the passive obstruction or indifference of the subordinates. It is therefore essential that a special staff of officers should be appointed as protector of depressed classes.’ In any event, we want to have a person to co-ordinate the work. You may say there is the co-operative department for the purpose of doing co-operative work and the revenue divisional staff for acquisition of house-sites and that local boards will bestow their blessings on these persons if we give them enough money, or the department of education is anxious to provide education. Assuming they are to co-ordinate their activities, what

25th March 1922] [Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

happens now is this. The special assistant commissioner goes to a particular village, makes inquiries there as regards the Panchamas. He is told that they must have house-sites, they want water-supply, the mirasidars object to their going in certain streets; he is told they have no educational facilities and their community cannot get access to the ordinary schools. Then he sets about doing or getting these things for them, addressing the proper department, if necessary. Therefore, what is required is a co-ordinating agency for the purpose of doing the whole of this work for these persons. It may be that this special agency may not be necessary years hence; but so long as they are not in a position to fight for their rights, whatever rules you may make, however much sympathy the Government or the officers concerned may have, this work cannot really be done except by a special agency appointed for this special purpose. If this work should be done, and if the House thinks that this work ought to be done, then there is no other alternative except having these officers. Let us not cloud the issue. Our 30 years' experience has shown that this work could not be done without a special agency. That is my experience and that is the experience of officers who know more about the subject than I. As I said, Sir, it is one of the rules that if the assistant commissioners of labour get any applications from a neighbouring taluk in which the special agency is not working they should send over these applications to the ordinary revenue divisional staff for them to do the work, and we know, they have not done it.”

Mr. R. T. KESAVULU PILLAI :—“Mr. President, Sir, with reference to the motion set forth by some of the hon. Members of the House to retrench the Labour Department, I beg leave with all deference to put in my strongest opposition on the following grounds.

“The Labour Commissioner's department, I must point out, was a thoughtfully organized one, which was considered absolutely necessary for the amelioration of the depressed classes, and it was established before the Reform scheme came into force.

“I was under the impression that one of the greatest reforms that would emanate from the present popular Government will be the better advancement of this department both financially and effectively to reduce the many drawbacks and the tyranny that the poor depressed classes were subjected to by the over-scrupulous high-caste Hindus and the greedy zamindars. To my surprise now I find that the hon. Members who have now come forward to lay the shears to this most important and useful department take no consideration whatever for the reason of its existence and the good work it has done now under the staff. At present, we see only some three districts in the presidency reaping the benefit of this department and we also find that the three assistant commissioners have in their hands full work and in fact require more assistance. To set forth a motion to abolish these appointments in my opinion is to reduce the department to its minimum usefulness. Deputy tahsildars and revenue inspectors, I must say, are men of not very high standing in the eyes of rich zamindars and landholders, and I fear the prestige and the importance they carry in their respective villages and zamins will cast a mighty influence over these subordinates and make them humble servants of these village dignitaries rather than the faithful servants of Government to work for the amelioration of the depressed classes. We have found that formerly the welfare of the depressed classes were delegated

[Mr. R. T. Kesavulu Pillai] [25th March 1922]

to the Collectors of the district and their subordinate officers, but the multifarious duties these officers had to attend to, gave them very little opportunities to devote their attention to the special work of rescuing the poor depressed classes from the enormity and tyranny of their employers and the caste prejudice which made them to be treated more as beasts than human beings.

"I dare say that all the members are aware that the leading people of the depressed classes are holding conferences and meetings in several parts of the Presidency passing resolutions for the consideration of the Government and the members of this House against the abolition of the Labour Commissioner's Department or any reduction in its establishment and staff, and I would respectfully submit that the hon. Members in putting forth motions will give due consideration and weight to this resolution. Lastly, Sir, if the House were to go on cutting down the allotments like this, I may be pardoned for saying that this House will be only overdoing its functions."

Rao Bahadur V. APPASWAMI VANDAYAR:—"Mr. President, somehow my name came before this House and therefore I have to say a few words on this motion. I was asked by Mr. Mudaliyar to go to the Collector's bungalow to meet Mr. Paddison, Commissioner of Labour. Accordingly I went there and met Mr. Paddison. After several questions being put to and answered by Mr. Mudaliyar, finally Mr. Paddison asked me whether I knew anything about the matters contained in the petition. I said I only knew one thing and that was that out of the grant made for purchase of lands for the depressed classes to Ukkadai Rao Bahadur Annaswami Thevar, lands were purchased for some of the Christian people who had money to fall back upon. I asked Mr. Thevar to represent these facts to the Collector. I do not know his decision. Mr. Bhavanandam Pillai himself admitted that 22 persons had been proved that they were not fit for this grant and that already 15 persons had been withdrawn from this. This substantiates what I said before."

"With regard to Mr. Mudaliyar's affidavit I should say that I have come into contact with persons who are prepared to put in affidavits to prove that their statements are true. The hon. Member Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar has brought in a motion on this subject and I have also tabled a similar motion for the same purpose. Somehow or other those motions have not come up. Now my humble impression is that this work can be done without any prejudice to the depressed classes by the Collectors or by some other agency. These commissioners are superfluous men and their work can be done by other officers who have time to bestow their attention on these people."

Mr. G. VANDANAM:—"Sir, coming as I do from a Telugu district, I have different views on the Labour Department from those expressed by hon. Members who have spoken before me. The hon. the Law Member made us understand that after 30 years of patient experimental work they have come to the conclusion that Panchamas have need of a separate protector to develop their interests. I am very thankful to the hon. the Law Member and to the Government for giving us a protector. But they are vitiating his work by heaping upon the Labour Commissioner a variety of duties which are of no advantage to the depressed classes. If the intention of the Government is to do good to the depressed classes, the Labour Commissioner ought to have different duties from what he has been doing. The hon. the Law

25th March 1922] [Mr. G. Vandanam]

Member has given us a catalogue of duties which did not at all affect the interests of the depressed classes. Therefore, if the Government have any idea of doing good to the depressed classes, the first thing they have to do is to relieve the Labour Commissioner of duties other than those of protector of the depressed classes. If I had my own way, I would like to suggest to the Government that instead of having a very costly machinery and excluding the Telugu country from the benefit of the protector of depressed classes, what they should do is to have a number of well-paid agencies to do the work in all districts of the Presidency at the same time so that all the members of the depressed classes may reap the advantages. So far as the present protector of depressed classes is concerned, he is very well known in the Tamil country and in Madras. In the Gōdāvari district even his name is hardly known. If the protector of depressed classes is to confer any benefit upon the people it would be this. It is a pity that there is no standing committee of the House to advise the Labour Commissioner about the interests of the depressed classes. We have a number of committees to advise on this and on that. But on such an important question as the protection of the depressed classes there is no committee at all and there is no one to advise the Labour Commissioner as to the work he has been doing. The impression left in the minds of people of my parts is that he is in Madras solely working for the Tamil country. Therefore, if the Labour department is to justify its existence it must do some work for the Telugu country also. Much money is being spent at present in the name of the amelioration of the depressed classes. The Labour Commissioner has to answer so many international labour problems. It is true that he has to settle labour disputes in Madras and other places and it is true that he has to look after the factories and other things. But should he not look after the welfare of the Panchamas in the Telugu country? He has not been doing this. So, my point is that instead of having such a costly machinery and instead of spending so much money on the establishment, upon the assistants and upon this person and that person, it is better to have an honorary agency to go and examine into the condition of the depressed classes, to suggest methods for their improvement and bring them before the Government for solution. If this is not done, I am afraid the condition of the depressed classes can in no way be ameliorated."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"Mr. President, the speech of the last speaker has only added more force to what I said. I said that if the present policy is to be continued we ought to have at least one officer for each district and a number of assistants under him if his work is to be satisfactory. That was the reason why I opposed the present policy. I also said that we have not got funds enough to make provision for anything like an establishment to carry out that policy for the improvement of the depressed classes. I said that no large part of the 5 or 6 lakhs now provided should be spent on establishments and that we should try to get the work done by other agencies. There should be a staff provided in the headquarters for co-ordinating the work to be done for these depressed classes and for making a settled programme of work for these people and also for watching if that programme is carried out. That was what I proposed and it was in view of that policy that I moved for this omission. The last speaker has only confirmed me in my view. I now respectfully ask the Council to take this view and accept the motion."

[Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar] [25th March 1922]

"As regards what was said by the hon. the Law Member and others about the work of the men at present employed in the department I have absolutely nothing to say. My proposal has nothing to do with the present men or the work they are doing. It is based on a question of policy and with that view alone I press this motion."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Mr. President, it looks as if one district is jealous of another. The intention of the Government was to undertake the special work in at least eight districts where the depressed classes population was the largest. We started work in three districts. We wanted to have special agencies at Guntur, Kistna and another district."

Mr. G. VANDANAM :—"Of the eight districts, in how many taluks are there agencies for the protection of the depressed classes?"

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I cannot make any distinction between Tamil, Telugu, or any other country. All that we can do and are anxious to do is to help as large a number of depressed classes as we can reach, to whatever district they may belong, whether Tamil, Telugu, or Kanarese. I believe there are some in Malabar, some in South Kanara, some in Telugu, and some in Tamil districts. That is not the point. However, I am making this offer to the House; it has been found, or rather that is the opinion of experienced officers, that this work cannot be done by the ordinary Revenue Divisional staff, because we are not in a position to give a special agency in every district. One hon. Member proposes to abolish all the agencies in all districts. That is a very curious position."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"It is not my proposal to abolish all agencies in all districts. I said in my speech that we should have some agencies for the operation of the programme and then wherever there is work specially to be done we will have to create agencies for three months or six months. That is what I proposed."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I believe all sorts of methods have been tried, but to no purpose. I am willing that this work should be undertaken, for instance in the Guntur district by the Collector and revenue divisional officers. I am also willing to try the experiment in Chingleput, the work being done by the same agency in one taluk of the Chingleput district, along with special agencies in other taluks. In South Kanara, where there is a well organized mission society let the ordinary staff undertake this work. If necessary, I shall provide funds for them to do the work. We shall see whether that work has succeeded and benefited the depressed classes to any extent. If at the end of the year you find that the ordinary revenue staff is able to do that work without the aid of a special agency, or is able to do that work as well as the special agency work, by all means let us abolish the special agency. Let us not prejudge by *a priori* reasoning, but let us have some practical experience. I have only one thing to say and that is with regard to the particular village mentioned by Mr. Vandayar in his speech. I understand from the Labour Commissioner that the case is still being inquired into."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I should like to make a few observations more or less in support of what my friend Mr. Vandanam said in connexion with the organization of the department. I do not wish to go into the complaints brought by him to the notice of this Council or to go into the report of the Labour Commissioner. However, the

[25th March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

papers have not been placed at the disposal of the House. If the hon. the Law Member wishes to refer to any allegations made in those papers, he should have placed them on the table of this House."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"They are not complete. As soon as they are complete I shall place them on the table of this House."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"My hon. Friend has no right to refer to anything which is not complete."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I am entitled to refer to them. With regard to the first petition, we had completed the inquiry. As regards the second which merely contains certain allegations, this is being inquired into."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I must repeat the view which I have expressed more than once."

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—"May I ask, Sir, why Mr. Paddison has given me no notice and whether he has personally examined all the persons mentioned in my petition? All my petitions are not mere paper. They are all supported by affidavits. May I know whether a regular inquiry has been made? What I find is that his inspection lasted only for two hours in a village, and if this is so, I challenge the hon. the Law Member to make a regular inquiry and ascertain whether the facts and statements contained in my letter are true or not."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"There were two petitions presented to this House on the same day, one was presented to me earlier. With regard to the first petition, I found, after making inquiries, that the allegations made in it were inaccurate. With regard to the second petition, I found that it contained personal allegations against a particular officer working in a district, which do not really matter so far as the policy of the Government as regards this department is concerned. As to the second petition, I have got an answer from the officer who was attacked and on that reply inquiry will be made by the Labour Commissioner and due notice will be given to the interested parties. I really wonder how it has anything to do with the policy of the Government."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I wish merely to make a suggestion in regard to some of the statements made by way of reply by the hon. the Law Member. If he wants to refer to any portion of the report, the regular procedure to be adopted by him would be to print that portion and place copies of that statement on the table of the House, so that we may be in a position to see what that report is and what those allegations are. Instead of doing that, my hon. Friend wishes merely to make an offer by saying 'I am quite willing to place this report at the disposal of any hon. Member that may want it'."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"If I refer to any portion of any report, I must be prepared to lay it on the table of the House. That is the rule, and I say I am prepared to lay it on the table. It does not mean that I should distribute copies to all hon. Members whether they want to see it or not."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I shall argue this matter by means of a regular resolution at a later stage. That is all I can now say and I do not want to waste the time of the House."

[25th March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Will the hon. Member be entitled to argue a point of order by a resolution, Sir ? "

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" If he brings forward a resolution on the subject, then that will be decided. "

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" I was acting in accordance with the ruling of the President. If I made a mistake, I entirely apologise to you, Sir. "

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I shall now go into the merits of this question for a few minutes with your permission. The whole point raised is, what should be the organization of this department. Three assistant labour commissioners have been appointed in this new department, and the whole question is whether this reorganization is the best in the interests of the depressed classes and for the settlement of labour questions. My friend Mr. Vandanam has already said that in the interests of the depressed classes it would be better to separate that portion of the work relating to their amelioration from that relating to the settlement of labour questions. Hon. Members are aware that there are always conflicting interests, of wage earners as against capitalists, and if anybody who is interested in the welfare of the depressed classes wishes to have the sympathy of all classes it is not by mixing up questions of labour, questions of wages, and the various questions in which capitalists come into conflict with agriculturists. Therefore the proposition that these things should be kept separate is a perfectly sound one. The reason why such an organization fails in the districts is the mixing up of these two classes of work, and if the same individual does both the classes of work, it may probably be to the detriment of the depressed classes themselves who are proposed to be benefited by these operations. Therefore, it seems to me, Sir, that the best way, so far as I can see—and I venture to put forward this suggestion for the consideration of hon. Members, the hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar and the Labour Commissioner—is to see whether they could take advantage of the existing staff in the districts, the existing depressed classes societies which exist in many places, and whether the Government should depute some officer in the district itself—it may be a deputy tahsildar or some other officer of that grade—to continue to bring to the front various questions relating to the amelioration of these depressed classes, the question relating to the acquisition of house-sites, the question of the disposal of lands. Then I ask my hon. Friend why the Revenue Department refuses to do this work on behalf of the depressed classes? My hon. Friend was eloquent in their praise, and whenever a single statement is made against any officer, almost all of my hon. Friends opposite get up and stand up for every one of them. Now, I ask him why they do not see that their own officials do their work sufficiently well? Here is the Commissioner of Labour who goes to all the districts and tells them, ' Look here, these lands have to be acquired. . . . ' "

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" I would at once beg permission, Sir, to correct a word. It is not a question of refusal, but it is a question of ability to do work over and above their ordinary heavy duties. "

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I call it passive resistance and nothing but passive resistance. I myself know of a great many complaints with reference to land acquisition. The things are done in

25th March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

such a leisurely fashion, and I think I must charge my hon. Friend who is in charge of this department that if he wishes to put a little more life and a little more zest into the Revenue Department he ought to see that he receives a periodical return of the land acquisition cases which have been delayed for more than three months. "

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Such returns do exist in every district which is properly administered and regularly scrutinized. I think the return is a half-yearly one. "

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" If, notwithstanding all these returns, these difficulties are not rectified, I think something is seriously wrong somewhere. I think it is time enough that my hon. Friend should see that these officials do their work with reference to land acquisition more promptly and efficiently. "

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Sir, may I take up that challenge as regards the ability, or, as my hon. Colleague has put it, the possibility, of this work being done by revenue officers with reference to my own personal experience in the district of Chingleput? The question of the amelioration of the condition of the backward classes was taken up in that district many years ago by a missionary whose name we have all learned to revere, the Rev. Mr. Andrew, and he spent a great deal of time and trouble upon the matter, one of the results of which is the settlement at Melrosapuram. Meanwhile certain revenue officers had also taken it up, including Mr. Mullaly and Mr. Tromenheere, who wrote a great report on the system of practical slavery existing in that district. The matter went up to the Board of Revenue and Government, and when their orders were issued, Sir James Thomson, who at that time (1894) was Collector of the district, issued instructions with a view to seeing that they were given effect to, especially in the matter of the provision of land for the lower castes. When I went to that district in 1912, I made inquiries for these orders and found some difficulty even in discovering them. When I did so, I found that the whole scheme had been allowed to fall into abeyance, because the revenue officials had not — " "

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" May I ask the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter whether he pursued his inquiries further and found out who was responsible for all these things done by Mr. Trevelyan and other gentlemen mentioned not being carried out? Is it the Government or the Board of Revenue or is it the district officer? "

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" If the hon. Member had let me finish what I was saying I would have told him just what had happened. I pursued these orders, which I revived, and I set to work to discover how much land had been assigned to the lower castes. I will give one instance of the results. In that case, a piece of land had been assigned to a low caste man; but the village officer—whom certain members of the Council are fond of representing as the one essential official, the person upon whom the whole structure of Government rests—this officer had made out a joint patta for the land belonging to the Adi-Dravida and for some adjacent land belonging to a caste man. The caste man had failed to pay his share of the kist. The whole of the joint patta holding was brought to sale for arrears and the Adi-Dravida, who knew nothing whatever about his neighbour's land, was

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[25th March 1922]

ejected from his piece of land for his neighbour's default. I offer this to the Council as a sample of the results that occur when we leave matters entirely to revenue officials over whom there are not sufficient superior officers to exercise the exact and efficient supervision which is required. I am therefore entirely in agreement with Mr. Vandanam's suggestion that the two sets of officers should be kept separate. The duties of specialist officers such as these have been defined elsewhere, namely, to induce Collectors to distribute their neglect; that is to say, the revenue officers have so many duties imposed upon them that they must neglect some and the function of each specialist officer is to see that whatever else they have to neglect, his department is attended to."

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR:—"I thought the Collector has been relieved of the income-tax work and some other branch of work, and is also likely to be relieved of the treasury work. I think the Collector can very well undertake to do this work, and if the Collectors are not properly doing it, the Government can insist on their doing it."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"The Collector has not yet been relieved of work in connexion with income-tax and he never did hold charge of the treasury. The only thing that he has been relieved of is the local fund work. In place of that he is having new duties imposed upon him every day. I think it is quite out of the question that he should take on those of the specialist department."

"At the same time, may I say that personally (I am not speaking for the Government) I am and have always been entirely in agreement with the hon. Member Mr. Ramachandra Rao when he says that the function of the amelioration of the depressed classes and those in connexion with labour disputes should be separated. The only difficulty about separating them in the case of the Labour Commissioner is that we cannot afford two officers. This objection, however, does not apply to the case of the officers in the districts. For, so far as I am aware, none of these officers have yet been required to intervene in industrial disputes. In other words, their duties have been confined to work for the amelioration of the backward classes."

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, the Puliantope affair and other occurrences referred to were very unfortunate incidents in the history of the department of Labour Commissioner. But, Sir, a high compliment ought to be paid to Mr. Moir, the Labour Commissioner for the untiring devotion with which he worked in connexion with the amelioration of the depressed classes. I had the fortune to go about with him and I really admire his zeal. If the Council feels that the three assistant labour commissioners should go, I request the Government to have honorary assistant labour commissioners appointed as far as possible from the depressed classes themselves. Sir, in support of my friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar I request the Labour Commissioner to seek the grievances of the depressed classes, and not to wait till petitions are received from them. If they can take care of themselves, why should there be any protection at all for them?"

Mr. A. T. PALMER:—"Sir, if I rise now, it is more to pour oil on troubled waters (laughter) than anything else. There is an impression, Sir, that the party in power is against the depressed classes, but I should like to correct that idea and say that the party in power is not against the depressed

25th March 1922]

[Mr. A. T. Palmer]

classes (hear, hear). Their idea is only to effect retrenchment. They think that more money is spent on the establishment than on the amelioration of the depressed classes. Mr. Vandanam has said that if honorary workers are appointed, the work would be done better and cheaper, but I am afraid Mr. Vandanam has not understood human nature well. The work amongst the depressed classes is one that demands much patience and tact and I am sure no honorary man would undertake to do that work. Besides, this is a work that must carry along with it some authority and power. I am sure if honorary men are appointed, they would be quite useless in this matter of uplifting the depressed classes."

Mr. G. VANDANAM:—"I said that, in the absence of paid men, honorary workers may be appointed. You cannot have paid men until honorary workers do some work."

Mr. A. T. PALMER:—"Sir, I would therefore appeal to my friends here not to be so very stringent on the money that is spent on the depressed classes at the present juncture. We are only starting the work, and the work is in the initial stages and there are many districts where this work must be carried on and many districts are awaiting the advent of these officers who would uplift and help the depressed classes. I would appeal to the hon. Mover not to press this motion, but allow that the money allotted for this department for this year is passed. There was the question, Sir, of the separation of the Labour Department from its other branch of work. This is a very knotty problem, but from the common-sense point of view as labour is recruited mostly from the depressed classes, I do not see why there should be a separation of these two branches at the present time."

Mr. L. C. GURUSWAMI:—"Sir, I rise to oppose the motion before the House. The net result of accepting it will be to paralyze the work of the speedy uplift of the depressed classes in the Presidency. In this connexion, Sir, I beg your permission to read out a resolution with reference to the Labour Department that was passed at the second conference of the Arundhatias whom I have the honour to represent in this Council, on the 19th instant, under the presidency of the Raja Sahib of Pithapuram. The resolution runs as follows:—

1-15 p.m. '3. (a) This conference fully appreciates the programme laid out by the Labour Department of the Government of Madras for the uplift of the depressed classes.

(b) It is emphatically of opinion that a special agency is absolutely necessary to give speedy effect to the programme.

(c) This conference further strongly urges that not only should the department be continued but should also be strengthened so as to extend its operations to all the districts of the Presidency.

(d) If for any reason the department cannot be strengthened by means of paid officials this conference prays that honorary officers may be drafted in on the lines of honorary assistant registrars of the co-operative societies."

"From this it will be seen, Sir, that in the opinion of my community a special department is absolutely necessary for giving speedy effect to the programme of the Labour Department with reference to the depressed classes.

"This motion is supported among others on grounds of economy. Every possible reduction has now got to be made on account of the very unsatisfactory state of our finances. I have no objection to any prevention of waste

[Mr. L. C. Guruswami]

[25th March 1922]

and to the substitution of a cheaper agency for a costly one. I fully realize that in these days of financial stringency the existence of this office is a burden on the tax-payer. But at the same time it should be remembered that the office itself is a necessary burden. Ever since the establishment of this office the depressed classes have been cared for by the Labour Commissioner in a manner that has given satisfaction to them. And they are much better off and more contented than they were before the institution of this office. So let us not practise false economy, let us not refuse funds for essential and useful services which raise the moral and material condition of the masses of whom the depressed classes form a large part occupying a position which is disgraceful to humanity. It has been suggested that a separate department is unnecessary for looking after the depressed classes and that the Revenue Department could well do it. Sir, I beg to differ emphatically from this view. Before the institution of this office some such thing was no doubt in existence. But such an arrangement was not satisfactory and nothing practical was achieved for the following reasons: The Revenue Department have multifarious duties to attend to and as such they have very little time to look after the needs of the depressed classes. Secondly, some of the officers themselves in the department may not be in full sympathy with this question and in that case the depressed classes will be completely neglected. Thirdly, even if the officers have sympathy and good will towards them they are practically unable to do much for them owing to the influential and formidable opposition of the landlords and ryots. Lastly, the revenue officers generally deal with all these matters through their subordinates who will surely face all the difficulties I have just now mentioned. From this it is clear that the old system of leaving the matter in the hands of the Revenue Department was a failure and consequently the Government established this office in 1919. If you like you are quite welcome to reform or reorganize the Labour Department or change its name or personnel. But a special agency there must exist for carrying out the programme that has already been chalked out for the uplift of the depressed classes.

"Indeed, Sir, not only do I want the present special agency to be retained in tact, but that it should be considerably strengthened so as to extend its operations to all the districts of the Presidency. It was the present financial stringency that prevented me to press for the enlargement of the special department. Under these circumstances the abolition of even these three assistant commissioners would be extremely undesirable. I therefore oppose the motion."

MR. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, my friend Mr. Palmer very rightly referred to the fact that we have been contributing in a larger measure for the depressed classes from year to year. I have figures taken from the budget book which show that in the year 1920-21 loans were made to co-operative societies in connexion with the acquisition of house-sites for the Panchamas to the extent of Rs. 1,04,500. Recoveries were made to the extent of Rs. 73,000 and that left a balance of Rs. 30,000. Last year there was an allotment of Rs. 3,00,000 which when added to the previous year's balance comes to Rs. 3,30,000. There was again a recovery of Rs. 15,000 only. And even in this year of financial stringency there is an allotment of Rs. 3,15,000. This leaves a total unrecovered amount of Rs. 3,40,000. This is so far as co-operative societies for the purpose of

25th March 1922]

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyyar]

acquiring sites are concerned. For the year 1920-21 the budget allotment for the general purposes of Labour Department was Rs. 2.84 lakhs and in the year 1921-22 the budget estimate was Rs. 4.74 lakhs and the revised estimate was Rs. 5.71 lakhs and this year we have budgeted for Rs. 6.62 lakhs. Sir, these figures disprove any allegations that it is intended to reduce the allotments for the depressed classes or that they are not being treated properly or sympathetically.

"The hon. the Finance Member has referred to very many respected names in ancient times who were unsuccessful in Chingleput in their efforts to obtain land for Panchamas. May I point out that they had not the benefit of a Labour Department, money allotments, establishment, etc., which are available at the present day? May I remind him of the existence in the present day of another very distinguished officer in that district, an officer who has been specially selected for his tact and ability to deal with a difficult situation in another quarter of this Presidency? Is it not a fact that Mr. Vernon has made a very different report on the work of the Labour Department as it is at present constituted with regard to all its activities whether for good or for evil? Contemporaneously with the disturbances which were going on in the mill area here, in certain villages in the Chingleput district under the directions of the assistant commissioner of labour sites were selected for acquisition contrary to the District Collector's recommendations and which tended to create danger to the peace and tranquility of the district and Mr. Vernon had to place special police to guard the area. Particularly in a place called Mangadu, 170 flimsy huts were put up by the Adi-Dravidas who had come from various neighbouring villages on the village grazing ground. The several huts grew up like the prophet's gourd in one night and with the greatest difficulty the District Collector was able to keep the peace of the district and he had also to address the Government on the subject. My friend Mr. Somasundara Mudaliyar was twitted by the hon. the Law Member with presenting in the petition he submitted allegations which had not been proved. That is with reference to Tanjore. I am not concerned with that. But so far as the Chingleput district is concerned there have been various irregularities if not under the very auspices at least under the encouragement of the Assistant Commissioner of Labour, and this formed the subject matter of correspondence between the Collector and the Labour department if not with the Government direct. Then it was that Mr. Vernon also wrote to Mr. M. C. Raja inquiring if the Adi-Dravidas in acting as they did in Chingleput district were being advised by him. Then Mr. Vernon pointed out the danger of officers dealing directly in the name of the Labour Commissioner and acting independently of the officers like the District Collector or the Divisional Officer, and without consulting them as to whether proposals for acquisition or grant of site would cause any breach of the peace or inconvenience to the other people. I believe —"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TUDHUNTER:—"May I say that I mentioned that the Collector and his officers have no time to attend to this work? I really do not see what they have to do with the present thing."

MR. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"Here is an organization, here is a protector of the depressed classes and more than that a Government Member and all of them have —"

[25th March 1922]

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"Is the hon. Member proposing to destroy the organization?"

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"I do say that it shall not be destroyed, but that it shall be re-organized with a view to economy, efficiency and expediency. We shall not grudge to allow even 10 lakhs for their benefit, but we shall still economise as much as possible the expenditure on the establishment and do what is conducive to the best interests of the country. Sir, there are already disintegrating influences at work in all mufassal stations. There is the work of the non-co-operator. Add to this the work of the Assistant Commissioner of Labour who, in the name of the Commissioner, comes into the district and makes use of his powers independently of the District Collector and others who are responsible for the peace of the locality without trying to find out whether his proposals could be carried out without inconvenience to the rest of the citizens, without caring to ascertain whether his schemes could be carried out in a manner calculated to give little irritation to the rest of the people. An officer working independently of the Collector or the Divisional officer gives the impression to the depressed classes that their protector lives outside the district and that they need not care for their caste neighbours or the district officers. Would this not lead to ill-feeling and is that conducive to the good administration of the country? I do not seek to destroy the fabric, Sir, I only wish to destroy that which makes for mischief."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"May I say just one word, Sir? I am not going into the merits of the controversy between them. The instructions from the Labour Commissioner were that they should take every opportunity to seek their (Collectors') assistance and advice and keep the Collectors thoroughly informed of the progress of work and of the questions and problems that arise from time to time."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"I am only concerned with what is actually being done and not with the instructions that are given. More often the instructions are altogether different from what actually takes place. On these grounds I support the motion. There may be another organization making use of the district agency and of the special tahsildar and the Revenue department who are still retained and against whom there is no proposal for cutting down. Mr. Vernon has expressed it emphatically that they can do this work with necessary instructions as to policy from the protector of the depressed classes but working under his orders."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"Mr. President, I have been very much at a disadvantage during this discussion: because, on the first motion which was merely a motion that a particular post should be abolished, various questions of organization and policy and past events with which I myself was incidentally connected and took some share were discussed. I was then prevented by a motion for closure from speaking on that motion and been raised. We now have another motion ostensibly on a particular part of the organization of the Labour Department but on which general questions have been raised; and apparently it is the only opportunity when I am likely to have to say anything on the general question. If I am permitted to do so I must be thankful to you, Sir, for any latitude that you may give me, such as has been given to other members of the House."

25th March 1922]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

"I will, however, try as far as I can to confine myself to this question of Assistant Commissioners. I may say that their abolition is by no means such a trivial matter as Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar has attempted to maintain. Regarding the whole of this question and the work which is being done for the depressed classes, the House has already been told for how long a time measures for the benefit of the depressed classes had been cogitated by Members of the Government and by other officers who have been responsible for dealing with this question. The measures regarding district organization which after much thought and consideration were put forward were given effect to as the deliberate decision of the Government in order to redeem long due pledges to the depressed classes. It was in fulfilment of these pledges these district organizations were entrusted with the duty of looking after their interests. It was further not intended when this organization was started that the Assistant Commissioner should be confined to three districts only. Two years ago, a proposal was put forward for expanding that system to eight districts, and it was hoped that eventually there would be a similar organization in every district in the Presidency in charge of the duty of spending the funds which this Council provides for the betterment of the depressed classes, for expanding their education and for meeting their other wants. If it had not been for the financial situation, to the necessities of which the Labour Department as other departments has had to bow, the proposals for district staffs in connexion with this object, before this Council would have been very much greater than they are. It is now, however, proposed, while maintaining the allotment under loans or under special grants for the depressed classes, to wipe out by a stroke of the pen the whole organization on which the spending of those sums depends. Now, what has been offered to the depressed classes in the place of this organization? Another enquiry. The matter has been under enquiry for thirty years one way or the other, and a definite and particular enquiry, as the hon. the Finance Member told the House, was made five years ago, and the whole of this is now sought to be thrown into the melting pot. Are the depressed classes to wait for another five years, for another enquiry and for another report? Some hon. Members have previously—"

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"There is no proposal for the appointment of any committee of enquiry. The only proposal was that the Commissioner here should make some proposals, the working out of those proposals being left to the district officers. There are no proposals for appointing a committee or making an enquiry."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"I certainly distinctly remember one hon. Member—I cannot remember who it was—saying that this matter should be enquired into again and a fresh policy devised for carrying out our purpose. That is what is proposed to be offered to the depressed classes in place of the organization which we entrusted with the work of the expansion of the depressed classes."

"Mr. Ramachandra Rao offered them a return of the lands which have not been assigned to them. Let me answer by saying, 'Is this what the House proposes to give to those waiting millions—for they are literally millions—who have been waiting and waiting for months to know what the decision of this House is going to be with reference to their future?'"

[25th March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" May I ask the hon. Member as to what is exactly the statement that he refers to as having been made by me?"

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—" A return was offered to them with reference to grants available for assignation."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I did not offer that return to the depressed classes but to the hon. Members opposite. I have never intended to say that the depressed classes should suffer anything in any slightest degree; but, on the other hand, all the land that is available should be given to them, and every effort should be made to ameliorate their position. I referred to the return simply for the purpose of showing the want of diligence on the part of Government officers in working the acquisition. If necessary, the return may be presented to the hon. Member Mr. Moir or to the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter, and not to the depressed classes."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—" I am quite unmoved by that explanation for there is little comfort for the depressed classes in the hon. Member's further statement."

" Now two things have been urged with reference to these special establishments: one is that they do no work, the other that they have done too much. If they have done nothing, what is the meaning of this petition submitted to the House protesting saying that they have done too much. Their fault is not that they have done too little, but that they have done too much. It is the sincerity and the success of their efforts to promote the interest of the depressed classes that has roused against them the manifold forces of reaction and obscurantism. It is also said, 'Why not abolish the staff and tell the Collectors that in future they are to do this work?' I think it has been sufficiently explained to the Council that there are reasons owing to which Collectors have failed to secure such progress as could be desired."

" I was astonished to hear one hon. Member apparently refer to the Chingleput district as an example of what might be done under this proposed system. I may admit that in the Chingleput district even with a special staff at command and an Assistant Commissioner, the Labour Department's success has fallen far short of its efforts. But if the Chingleput district is an example of what can be done by the ordinary revenue staff, why is it that much has not been done? Of course, I do not blame any one for it, for one knows how true it is that the ordinary revenue establishment cannot also attend to these special duties. During the last twelve months, although 18,000 acres of land have been reserved for the depressed classes, why is it that the revenue staff was not able to assign an acre of land to a single man?"

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" May I ask Mr. Moir to suggest the answer to that question himself?"

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—" By all means, if the House thinks that the measures taken on behalf of the depressed classes could be improved, let fresh measures be suggested. We have now at the head of the Labour department one of the most experienced and open-minded officers in the service. If suggestions can be made to improve things, I feel sure that they will receive his most anxious consideration. But surely it is unfair to him to

[25th March 1922]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

make mere casual suggestions, to say that possibly new methods could be tried, and without consideration of the problems and of the manifold issues which they involve, while vaguely suggesting that new measures could be taken, by your votes to make it impossible for him to carry on the existing system until a new one has been devised."

" I may say one word more. Is it not advisable for this House in this discussion to bear in mind the necessities and demands of the depressed classes themselves? They want no further investigation of their needs and no new systems. They merely ask that they should be improved. During the whole time I was Commissioner of Labour I was flooded with incessant appeals from the depressed classes of every district that this organization which they saw was doing such good work in districts like Godavari and Tanjore should be extended to the districts in which they were themselves living. May I further say—"

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" I may just ask whether special assistance may not be given to the Collector solely for this kind of work and if the district work of the depressed classes could not be thus better done and all these troubles avoided."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—" As an administrative measure, I do not see where economy will come in and am not prepared to say whether it will work better. It is one of those administrative questions which no one would be prepared to answer at a moment's notice. But surely it is an evidence of the premature discussion of such questions, and it is unfair that random suggestions should be put forward in connexion with such a very important matter as the welfare of the depressed classes, and the Government urged to try them. May I add, further, that it is those Collectors who are most anxious to do something for the benefit of the depressed classes in their districts who have specially asked whether it would not be possible to extend this organisation into the districts over which they preside? I do hope that this House will realise that this motion goes far beyond the mere question of saving something like Rs. 17,000 out of the sum which has been provided for the establishment. As I have said, there are millions waiting outside this House, waiting to know what the decision of this House will be and wishing to know finally whether, when a few years ago these reforms were under discussion, they were justified or not in anticipating their results with the greatest misgivings."

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—" Sir, I thank my friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar for bringing once more my name into the discussion. He very kindly referred to my name and said that Mr. Vernon had written to me a letter. Sir, I did not have any close conference with Mr. Vernon. All that I knew was that Mr. Vernon wrote me a letter and I answered him. But my friend Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar seems to know more of Mr. Vernon, his willingness to take up this work, and so on. I do not know all that. We are for a special agency for carrying on this work. My friend Mr. Vandanam said that no ameliorative work was being carried on in most of the Telugu districts. It is because a Council like this has not given sufficient funds to carry on work in all the districts. If in a democratic Council like this—"

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" I think a Council like this cannot increase any allotment of its own accord and proposals for

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [25th March 1922]

increase will have to come from the Government in the first instance. It is unfortunate therefore that we cannot propose any increase in the allotment."

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—"I think the members of the Finance Committee represent us and also represent the views of the Finance Committee. What I was given to understand was that the Labour Department sent in proposals for the extension of the work. The hon. the Finance Member also has said in the memorandum which he read the other day that he cried halt to a certain extension of work in regard to the depressed classes. So I say, Sir, that the Council did not vote for more money to carry on work in other districts."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"May I point out that even with all the retrenchment in the air a sum of Rs. 1.60 lakhs has been set apart for the reclamation of the condition of the Kallars, whereas it formed a part of the general allotment of Rs. 2 lakhs for all the criminal tribes previously?"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I point out with reference to that that the rest of that general allotment is gone?"

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—"I was not holding any conference with the Labour Commissioner to know all those details. What I know, I say. I know he has sent up proposals for additional districts and the money was not granted."

"Sir, some of the hon. Members were of opinion that this work could be left to the revenue officers in the districts. I should like to call attention to the extract which the hon. the Law Member read from that Government Order published by the Board of Revenue some years back. This experiment was tried for over three or four decades and was found to be unsuccessful. My community has been agitating for a special agency. As my hon. Friend Mr. Vandanam has said, by means of resolutions passed at various conferences the Telugu districts have asked for a special agency. And in one of the conferences, in that held at Amalapuram, one of my hon. Friends Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu has presided and, I believe, a Minister was also present. All that I would like to say, Sir, is that this work is of a special kind and requires a special training. Moreover, Sir, one reason why Mr. Arulanandam got a bad name in Tanjore was, if I understand it correctly, that he was trying to pull down the slavery of my community. Slavery is existing, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I do not want to interrupt the debate which is going on with a considerable amount of latitude; but if we are going to deal with slavery in Tanjore just now, I fear this debate will be greatly protracted."

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—"All that I want to drive at is that a man of sufficiently high status is required to do this work. You know, Sir, in the mufassal parts the influence of the local magnates overrides the influence of the petty officials and therefore if the officials appointed to do this work there are of sufficiently high standing, say of the grade of a deputy collector, or a gazetted officer, such people alone can acquire land according to the Land Acquisition Act, and I think, Sir, the work will be carried on successfully. On the other hand, if the work is to be left in the hands of the deputy tahsildar or the revenue inspector who is only a reporting officer, he will have no power at all for acquiring sites. All that he will do is he will go to

25th March 1922] [Mr. M. C. Raja]

the spot and write a report and send it to the office. The deputy tahsildar cannot send a communication direct to the Collector. He must send it to the office. The sarishtadar is in the office and he puts a note and sends it to the Collector. He may say the deputy tahsildar reports so and so. We cannot accept this. The paper should be sent to the revenue district officers for further investigation. You know, Sir, what that means. In this connexion I should like to point out certain incidents that took place in the South Arcot district during the time of Mr. Guppy. I have got the proceedings here, Sir. Swami Sahajananda applied for the acquisition of some lands in South Arcot. Of course, the Revenue Department put in a number of obstacles in the way of the acquisition. But the Swami persisted in it and the sympathetic Collector went and inspected the spot, and here is his statement. He says: 'I therefore resolved to inspect the land and did so. All reports in the file are misleading. More correct reports are found in another file not shown to me before inspection. The northern portion is the highest and is no use for storing water. The middle portion is low and is required for draining off surplus water of Kunnamangalam tank. South of this is the bund on which there is an Ayyanar temple. South of the bund is a swamp along the western margin of which runs an irrigation channel to take Kunnamangalam tank to wet fields.' The notes later on read: 'The Mirasdar, Mr. V. Velayudam Pillai, is the chief opponent of the alienation. Knowing that I inspected the land, he gave up the contention that the northern portion is required for water spread and says that it is required for village site. The contentions of persons who offer contradictory arguments of this kind are not worth anything.' So, Sir, you will find what sort of support the report of the deputy tahsildar is likely to give to my people and what support they are likely to get from the Revenue department. And further, Sir, as regards the Chingleput district, you remember that in the budget speech, I spoke something about Mr. Vernon. At a conference in Chingleput district my people have passed a resolution in which they say—

'That this Conference resolves that in the interests of the community it is desirable and necessary that Mr. A. Doraiswami Mudaliyar, Deputy Collector and Personal Assistant to the Collector of Chingleput, should be immediately transferred from the district, since there is reason to fear that he exerts his influence against the progress and prosperity of the depressed classes in that district.'

"My people in that district come and say that because there is Mr. Doraiswami Mudaliyar as personal assistant they are not able to get anything from the Collector. I am placing all these facts to show how people throw obstacles in the way of the progress of my community. Unless we have a special agency set apart there is no salvation for us; and to relegate us to the tender mercies of the revenue inspectors or the deputy tahsildars is the same as bringing on our destruction. Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar said something about Mangadu. I should like to ask my hon. Friend who said that these people went there and put up huts in one night, whether he has seen my people also there and asked them what the matter was. If he had seen Adi-Dravidas and the mirasidars on opposite sides, then I would agree to whatever he says."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"That is the work of the district authority. I am only referring to the correspondence."

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—"I therefore say, Sir, that the hon. Member is saying all these things under instructions given to him by one side and that he has not seen these things. I have come here to represent a big community

[Mr. M. C. Raja]

[25th March 1922]

and if we want to do efficient work in this Council, it is our duty that we should consider the interests of all the parties concerned and come to a conclusion instead of taking sides with one or the other."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the House long at this stage of the discussion. I only want to assure my Adi-Dravida friends that we are heart and soul with their cause."

Mr. M. C. RAJA:—"It is not the mere assurance that we want but actual work to be done."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Sir, I refuse to believe that a gentleman merely because he belongs to that community should be made the dictator as to what should be done by the Legislative Council. Our sympathies are entirely with the progress of these classes and in this matter I am perfectly certain that where we differ is in regard to the machinery to be established for achieving the progress of these people. I suggested when the hon. Member, Mr. Moir, was speaking, whether a district agency at the head of which there will be an officer of the rank of a deputy tahsildar or a tahsildar acting as the personal assistant to the Collector would not meet the ends in view and also avoid friction. Sir, friction necessarily arises because we have two agencies without any connexion whatsoever with each other to deal with land acquisition. That seems to me to be the source of the trouble."

Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"May I say, Sir, that during the time I was the Commissioner of Labour, I had relations with the Collectors and in the case of the Collectors of all districts in the Presidency excepting one district which I need not specify, there was no tendency towards friction at all."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"When I talked of friction I was not thinking of friction between the officials but I was thinking of the kind of friction between the tahsildars and the people on the one side and the Adi-Dravida brethren on the other. I think an agency of this kind would probably work better. The matter requires investigation. It was said in previous years that the revenue department was not able to achieve much. The proposal now made differs from the previous practice in three very important respects. Firstly, there would be the protector of the depressed classes at Madras to co-ordinate the work of the districts, and reports would have to be sent to him as to what has been done on the orders that he had issued. Secondly, there would be a special staff—special not independent, the orders of the Collector which would be in charge of this work and under this department. Thirdly, there would also be definite appropriations earmarked for this purpose at the disposal of the Collector. So with these three functions of the Labour Commissioner and that of the protector of the depressed classes should be separated as they may sometimes be contradictory re-organization is effected we would be doing our best both by the Adi-Dravida and the general interest of the country at large."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"With reference to the speech of my hon. Friend, Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi, I shall examine the question of co-ordination of the special staff with the Collector. If I remember right even now, the proposals for acquisition of house-sites come

[25th March 1922]

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

through the Collector and this is true at least so far as the Chingleput district is concerned. I am not quite sure with regard to other districts but I remember to have seen papers connected with acquisition coming through the Collector. I am quite ready to examine the question and that is all that I can say. It is not a question of economy. I am quite willing to see whether you can reorganize the district establishment so as to be more in touch with the Collectors with regard to this work. It was in this connexion that I was referring to the instructions given to the Assistant Labour Commissioners asking them to be in touch always with the Collectors before they make acquisitions and to take their advice and to report to them fully and not to do anything without consulting them. We have issued these instructions. 'If in particular instances it has not been followed there is the Labour Commissioner who would carefully go into every one of these matters.'

"I may say, Sir, with regard to the separation of the departments concerned, it was my desire as well as the desire of the Labour Commissioner that these should be separated. This year we are not able to work it out because there is no money for the purpose of separation."

The motion was then put to the House and a poll was taken with the following result:—

2 p.m.

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 26. Mr. P. Subbarayan. |
| 2. Dr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu. | 27. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar. |
| 3. Mr. B. Appaswami Nayudu. | 28. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. |
| 4. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 29. Mr. C. Venkata Ranga Reddi. |
| 5. Mr. B. P. Devarajulu Nayudu. | 30. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 31. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 7. Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar. | 32. Diwan Bahadur T. Desika Achariyar. |
| 8. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 33. Mr. S. Muttumanicka Achari. |
| 9. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 34. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 10. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 35. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 11. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 36. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 12. Mr. O. Tanikaobala Chettiyar. | 37. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 13. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 38. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampam. |
| 14. Mr. K. A. Kandaswami Kandar. | 39. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib Bahadur. |
| 15. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 40. Mr. A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar. |
| 16. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 41. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib Bahadur. |
| 17. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 42. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur-Rahman |
| 18. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 19. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 43. Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman |
| 20. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | Sahib Bahadur. |
| 21. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | 44. Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razzaq Sahib |
| 22. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. | Bahadur. |
| 23. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 45. Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 24. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddiyar. | 46. Sir M. C. T. Muttayya Chettiyar. |
| 25. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 12. Mr. E. Periyannayagam. |
| 2. " Sir Charles Todhunter. | 13. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam |
| 3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad | Nayudu. |
| Habib-ul-Jah Sahib Bahadur. | 14. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. |
| 4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 15. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 5. " Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 16. Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 6. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi | 17. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| Nayudu. | 18. Rev. W. Meston. |
| 7. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 19. Mr. M. C. Raja. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 20. Mr. L. C. Guruswami. |
| 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 21. M. R. T. Kesavulu Pillai. |
| 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. | 22. Mr. G. Vandanam. |
| 11. Mr. R. Littlehales. | 23. Rao Bahadur T. Numberumal Chetti. |

[25th March 1922]

Neutral.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankinodu Prasad Bahadur. | 5. Rao Bahadur A. H. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |
| 2. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryasayanamurti Nayudu. | 6. Mr. P. Siva Rao. |
| 3. " M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. | 7. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhaচারু. |
| 4. " L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar | 8. Sriman Naji Bhushana Kath Mahasay. |
| | 9. Rai Sahib E. M. C. Masoarenhua. |

The motion was carried, 46 members voting for, 23 against and 9 remaining neutral.

Motions 655 to 658

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The time of half a day allowed by His Excellency the Governor for the discussion on this grant having expired, the following motions 655 to 658 have now lapsed":—

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—

655. To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for duty allowance to three assistant commissioners.

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU:—

656. To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for the duty allowance to three assistant commissioners.

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR:—

657. To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for duty allowance to three assistant commissioners.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—

658. To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for duty allowance to three assistant commissioners.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—

659. To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for duty allowance to three assistant commissioners.

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—

660. To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for duty allowance to three assistant commissioners.

Mr. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU:—

661. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 62,180 for salaries by Rs. 50,000.

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI:—

662. To omit the allotment of Rs. 2,000 for lump provision for temporary additional establishment.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—

663. To omit the allotment of Rs. 67,490 for establishment.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—

664. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 25,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 20,000.

[25th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—

665. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for conveyance allowance to the personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—

666. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for conveyance allowance to the personal assistant to the Commissioner of Labour.

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR:—

667. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,25,000, the lump provision for free grants for the settlement of the depressed classes.

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—

668. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,000 for reclamation of kallars by Rs. 100.

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU:—

669. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,000 for reclamation of kallars by Rs. 100.

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—

670. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,000 for reclamation of kallars by Rs. 50,000.

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR:—

671. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,06,000 for reclamation of kallars.

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR:—

672. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,000 for reclamation of kallars by Rs. 100.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO:—

673. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,000 for reclamation of kallars by Rs. 1.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—

674. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,06,000 for reclamation of kallars by Rs. 100.

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR:—

675. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,00,000, provision for education charges of depressed classes.

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—

676. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 25,000.

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA:—

677. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 1,50,000.

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR:—

678. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 1,10,000.

[25th March 1922]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

679. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 33,000.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

680. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 25,000.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

681. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 25,000.*

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

682. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,65,650 for Labour Commissioner by Rs. 25,000.*

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—

683. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 17,164 for the officer and establishment for the Chentsus on the Nallamalais by Rs. 100.*

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—

684. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,326 for the settlement at Siddapuram, Kurnool, by Rs. 100.*

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—

685. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,24,880 for Commissioner of Labour and Industrial Settlement by Rs. 90,500.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

686. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,24,880 for Labour Commissioner by 1 lakh.*

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

687. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7.87 lakhs under Demand XXIV by Rs. 3,00,000.*

Mr. V. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—

688. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7.87 lakhs under Demand XXIV by 2 lakhs.*

The demand for 7.87 lakhs under Labour and allied departments, minus Rs. 21,380, being the deductions made by the House, was then put and carried and the grant was made.

IV

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Before the House rises for lunch, I have to mention that the number of candidates nominated for election to the Public Accounts Committee is 13, while the number of seats to be filled up is 7. An election of 7 candidates, out of the 13, by means of the single transferable vote, will be held in the Council Chamber at 5-40 p.m. to-day.”

The House then adjourned for lunch at 2-5 p.m. and re-assembled at 3 p.m.

25th March 1922]

III—cont.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—cont.

DEMAND XXV—EXCHANGE.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding 16.52 lakhs under Demand XXV—Exchange.”

Motion 689.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

689. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 16,52,000 for Exchange by Rs. 100.*

“ My object in moving this is merely to know why we in this presidency, who are not responsible for the exchange policy resulting in this loss, should bear this loss. From the statement made by the hon. the Finance Member when presenting the budget, I see we paid nothing last year and that there were some orders from the Government of India fixing some rate and saying that we in this presidency should pay according to that rate and that the loss should be borne from the coming year. I suppose it is not a votable or a non-votable item and I do not know what it is. I do not say anything at all one way or the other. I do not want to embarrass my hon. Friend, but I want him on behalf of this presidency to represent to the Government of India and the Secretary of State that we are not responsible for this loss and that we should not be debited with any of this. I would like to know what my hon. Friend himself thinks about the matter, but I do think, Sir, that it is one of those old maxims that those who have no control should not be asked to pay. In this particular instance we have no control whatever over the financial policy which has resulted, or which is likely to result in this loss. I would therefore make this motion.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Sir, I am not quite sure if I have clearly understood my hon. Friend's motion, but as far as I can make out, it amounts to this, that because the Government of India have not been very successful in their currency policy so far as it relates to the matter of exchange, we are to demand of them that they shall arrange for us to transact business always on the basis of a 2s. rupee. If the hon. Member will give me any plausible arguments with which I can enforce that request when I go to Simla to discuss the question of the contribution, I shall be glad to consider them. But I am afraid at present I should be laughed out of court before I had stated his proposition.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Sir, so far as I can recollect, I do not think that we have had this loss debited against us in any of the previous years. If that is a fact, it is a sufficient argument why we should not be burdened with this this time.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ If I may invite my friend's attention to paragraphs 166, 167 and 168 of the memorandum, he will find an explanation of the reason why this was not debited in the previous year. It amounts simply to this, that the Government of India had not fixed the rate. We are therefore bringing forward a supplementary estimate now that

[Sir Charles Todhunter] [25th March 1922]

they have fixed it. As regards the coming year, they have fixed the rate and that has enabled us to put it in the budget and not to ask for a supplementary grant at the end of the year."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Before I withdraw my motion, I would only say one word and that is that perhaps the Government of India were convinced before that they were responsible for the financial muddle which has resulted in this great loss and that that was the reason why they did not fix the rate hitherto and did not call upon Local Governments to make a contribution on the result of their transactions. But now they are clearly making an attempt to raise a debit against these provinces and I trust the hon. the Finance Member when he goes to Simla will make the best of the situation and try to get it withdrawn as early as possible."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" I need hardly say, Sir, that if I could get 16½ lakhs conscience money out of the Government of India, I should be very glad to take it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Demand XXV—Exchange—16.52 lakhs was then put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXVI—CIVIL WORKS—IN CHARGE OF CIVIL OFFICERS.

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" Sir, I beg leave to move for a grant not exceeding 37.53 lakhs for Civil Works in charge of civil officers."

Motion 690.

The following motion was not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

690. To omit the allotment of Rs. 34,260 for the Trichinopoly district board for special repairs to trunk roads caused by flood damages.

Motions 691 to 695.

Mr. F. J. RICHARDS :—" May I rise to a point of order, Sir? Motions 691, 692 and 693 have no relation whatever to the demands which have been moved. Is it in order, Sir, to move them?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" If the hon. Member Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar had been here, and if he had moved these, Mr. Richards should have raised the point of order. But in the circumstances I really don't see why I should express an opinion on motions which have not been made."

The following motions were not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—

691. To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,000 for constructing a new fly-proof kitchen in the Central Jail, Rajahmundry.

25th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—

692. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 11,280 for constructing 15 cells for juveniles in the Central Jail, Cannanore, by Rs. 9,680.

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—

693. To omit the allotment of Rs. 16,000 for constructing 32 cells in the close prison, Central Jail, Trichinopoly.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

694. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 35,18,000 for original works by Rs. 100.

Mr. N. A. V. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI :—

695. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 37.53 lakhs for Demand under Civil Works—In charge of Civil Officers by Rs. 5 lakhs.

Demand XXVI—Civil Works—In charge of Civil officers—37.53 lakhs was then put to the House and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXVII—CIVIL WORKS—PUBLIC WORKS OFFICERS
(RESERVED PORTIONS).

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I move, Sir, for a grant not exceeding 2.14 lakhs under Demand XXVII—Civil Works (Reserved portions)."

Motion 696.

3-15 p.m. Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" I beg to make the following motion :—

696. To omit the allotment of Rs. 11,000 for constructing a left wing in front of the Military Secretary's room in the building at Government House, Ootacamund.

" In making this motion I should like to have, Sir, some information as regards the arrangements that are made in Ootacamund for the Government House. For the last two or three years there have been provided several extensions both by building new buildings and by taking over other buildings occupied by other people. In the last year provision was made for the construction of two or three buildings and also for the construction of two gates. Such of us as had been to Ootacamund last year found that some of the buildings that were occupied hitherto by the clerks were occupied by the bodyguards of His Excellency the Governor. I do not know, Sir, whether it is the intention of Government that those buildings ought to be taken over for the Government House and that they should also form part of the Government House hereafter. They are in a very good locality and they could be utilized as residences of Under Secretaries and others. If they are not wanted they can be sold. If they are sold they will fetch very good prices indeed. So, Sir, it is with the intention of asking what are the new buildings that are to be put up in the current year and what is proposed to be done next year and whether it is the intention of the Government to take over these buildings which were occupied by the clerks permanently for the Government House that I brought this motion. One object which induced me to do this is this. These buildings are not provided for in the current

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [25th March 1922]

year's budget while the estimate has been sanctioned in February and work has already been started."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I am afraid I cannot regard these enquiries as relevant to a motion to omit a specific allotment for Rs. 11,000. I am quite prepared to justify that allotment. As a matter of fact it is the remainder of a very much larger sum for a work which is in progress and which is practically finished. I cannot carry in my head all the items of work for the next year. This particular item was, I understand, sanctioned by the Government of India and provision was made from the current year out of the lump allotment passed by this House. The Chief Engineer tells me that the work is practically done."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"It would have been better if some information were given. I see the difficulty of the hon. the Home Member."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"If the hon. Member had given me notice, I would have come prepared."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"As I said it is not my particular intention to object to this particular grant. So I don't press it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Demand XXVII.—Civil Works—Public Works officers for 2.14 lakhs was then put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXVIII—CIVIL WORKS—PUBLIC WORKS OFFICERS
(TRANSFERRED PORTIONS).

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"I beg to move Demand XXVIII—Civil Works for a provision of 7.11 lakhs."

Motion 697.

The following motion was not made:—

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERMAL CHETTI:—

697. To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for constructing a residence for the Collector, Coimbatore.

Motion 698.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

698. To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for new Collector's office, Vellore.

"At page 8, item No. 10, it will be seen that the estimate is said to cost Rs. 2,12,400. The outlay was Rs. 2,929 for land acquisition and the probable amount of expenditure for the current year is estimated to be only Rs. 1,000. For 1921-22 the amount put down there is only Rs. 1,000 and the amount proposed to be spent for the next year is Rs. 30,000. As only the land seems to have been acquired and as only very little amount out of the total estimate is expected to be spent during the year, I think, Sir, we may as well postpone the commencement of the execution of this work till we

[Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu] [25th March 1922]

arrive at more fortunate times. That is my idea. I do not mean to say that this should be abandoned. In fact, Sir, North Arcot is my own district. I should be the last man to cut away any item of expenditure there. All I can say is whether this cannot be postponed."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I am glad, Sir, that the proposer of this motion is a native of North Arcot district. I feel certain that any appeal I may make to him on behalf of North Arcot will not fall on deaf ears. This new district was constituted in 1911 and ever since that time repeated attempts have been made for the purpose of securing a habitation for its principal office in the district. The necessary land and building called 'Mayne's bungalow' were acquired nearly seven years ago. Plans and estimates were prepared on several occasions since but they had to be turned down on each occasion on the score of improvements which were suggested from time to time thereto. Last year we had final plans and estimates but according to the arrangement which was then suggested that new works should not be included in the budget, this estimate should not have been included in the last year's estimate. Nevertheless it was so included and was allowed to get through. Probably the House knew full well that inasmuch as I had deliberately included it I would justify the allotment entered in the budget. The gentleman who had tabled the motion last year to eliminate that sum did not move that motion feeling, as I said, that I would justify the position. From 1918 onwards officer after officer who visited North Arcot has noted that the Collector's office was housed in a most incommodious, inconvenient and dingy little building which was originally intended to be occupied by the gosha ladies of some of the State prisoners who were removed to the Vellore fort. The records are not merely kept in different parts of these offices but they are also kept in the building called the Mayne's bungalow which, as already stated, was acquired seven years ago and which has not yet been reconstructed. A portion of the records, I am told, still remains in Chittoor as there is no room for them in Vellore. Under these circumstances I ask whether efficient administration is possible at all. In November last I went to Vellore and had the estimate considerably curtailed because I knew the financial stringency. If the building is not now sanctioned the consequence will be that nearly 50 to 60 thousand rupees which was spent seven years ago for the acquisition of the site and building thereon called Mayne's bungalow which is now tumbling down and the money spent in 1920-21 as well as that spent in the current year will all be waste. I, therefore, ask the House, and particularly the mover of the motion who happens to be a native of the North Arcot district, whether he would allow the administration of his own district to be conducted in such distressing conditions. I can assure the House that the work is really being done under most distressing conditions. The consequence of dropping the proposal will be that all the parties and their pleaders and other gentlemen who wish to see the Collector will have to go to his residence. They have all to go to his residence because there is no place in the office to receive them. For this reason we have also installed telephonic communication between his office and residence."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I do not press it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

[25th March 1922]

Motion 699.

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—" I beg to make the following motion :—

699. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for quarters for the District Forest Officer, Cuddapah.*

"I wish to know if any rent is collected on such buildings, or are they built merely to accommodate the officers free."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Ordinary rent will be charged. The item is an item passed by the Council after a good deal of debate."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—" If it is to be rented, then I wish to make a few remarks. An investment of Rs. 30,000 at 7 per cent on capital and 3 per cent on maintenance should bring a return of Rs. 250 per month. Is the District Forest Officer who is to occupy the House likely to pay Rs. 250 per mensem? I do not think so. This investment will therefore not pay."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" During the course of the debate on budget grants last year, the hon. the Finance Member was pleased to state that the question of levying higher rates of rents was under correspondence with the Secretary of State and I do not know what the result of that is. If the old system is to continue, I am sure the tax-payer will be a great loser. According to the existing rates, if I remember right, the officer has to pay 10 per cent of his salary or 5 per cent of the invested amount whichever be less. Now, the Government is borrowing at the rate of 6 per cent and the cost of maintaining these buildings is generally calculated to be 2 per cent of the cost of construction. That means that unless we levy 8 or 9 per cent of the invested amount as annual rent on public buildings, the interest on the amount invested on these buildings will not be paid and the tax-payer will have to pay it. In this connexion I wish to know the reason why all these buildings that are built for public officers are built from the ordinary revenues of the State. They are works of permanent utility. They are expected to pay some return and why should not the Government have a scheme for this and utilize the borrowed capital for the construction of these buildings? Why should they go on in the old method of meeting the expenditure from the ordinary revenues and make it a burden on the present generation when they are works of a permanent nature."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" On the last point I would only say this : that we are going to meet out of the advance not only this but a good deal of our current expenditure in the current year. As regards the matter of calculation of rates of rent, that is a matter arising in the transferred Department of Public Works."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I am glad, Sir, that the question has been raised, because it gives me an opportunity of emphasising a matter which is of a very great importance to the Forest Department, namely, the provision of decent housing for our officers. Year after year we have been obliged to put out essential proposals for the housing of the District Forest Officers. This year I think something like seven or eight items have gone out. It is a very serious question what we are to do with new recruits when

25th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

they come out. They have to be posted somewhere; we do not know to what districts to post them, because not a house of a suitable description can be found in many districts. I could give many instances in point. Some were mentioned last year. I should be very thankful if the discussion of this particular motion led to a thorough investigation of the steps which are necessary to remedy a state of affairs which can only be described as extremely unsatisfactory. The practical financial difficulty lies in the fact that you cannot expect officers to pay rents which will give an adequate return on the present rates at which buildings are constructed by the Public Works Department. It is quite certain that 10 per cent of the salaries of the occupiers in the case of forest officers will not ordinarily give an adequate return on the cost of buildings of this sort. It seems to me that there are two alternatives. One is to recognize frankly that the additional cost must be met by the State and the other is to drop the method of employing the Public Works Department to build substantial structures and to ask our officers to accept houses of brick and mud with thatched roofs such as those often constructed for railway engineers when railway works are in progress. They are fairly cool, and comfortable; and they would be better than nothing. As things are now, rented bungalows are not procurable. And there are cases of men living miles away from their headquarters because they are not able to get proper accommodation. It is a very serious question; and the seriousness is going to be aggravated now that the Council, as I am glad to note, has committed itself to a policy of development, because that will mean more forest officers as our development schemes go forward expanding, as I hope, rapidly. We shall have to provide some form of housing for our officers, for one cannot expect men to go and work in places where there are no houses, no roofs over their heads. I have again to say that I am very glad that the matter has been brought forward."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 700.

The following motion was not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—

700. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for quarters for the Conservator, Salem.*

Motion 701.

Rao Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

701. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 29,000 for constructing district registrar's office.*

"This is item 13 at page 8 of the Public Works budget. The amount of the estimate is Rs. 39,000. Nothing was spent in 1920-21 and in 1921-22 also nothing seems to have been spent. But in 1922-23 Rs. 29,000 is proposed to be spent. It appears to me that it is altogether a new work. Consequently, I wish to know whether this cannot be postponed, if it cannot be abandoned."

[25th March 1922]

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, this is an incomplete work for which already Rs. 3,000 have been spent. By mistake it is not so stated in the budget estimate."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 702.

The following motion was not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—

"702. To omit the allotment of Rs. 7,800 for iron record-racks for the District Court, Trichinopoly."

Motion 703.

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—" I beg to make the following motion :—

703. To omit the allotment of Rs. 7,500 for constructing a fly-proof kitchen in the new Central Jail, Vellore.

" My reason for making the motion is this: Rs. 29,000 for a kitchen appears to be very high. It is impossible to make a kitchen absolutely fly-proof. Flies will get in somehow. Even persons with cleanly habits and clean dress have flies over them, and even under a punka flies are seen sitting on the food on the dining table. Much more so, in the case of cooks and maties who are unclean and dirty. Flies naturally sit on them, and thus they are carried into the kitchen. Any provision for fly-proof shutters to a kitchen is a waste and may be avoided."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Mr. President, on expert examination and on expert counsel ranging, I believe, for about three years, the system of having fly-proof kitchens in the Central Jails has been adopted. With all respect to the hon. Mover I cannot accept his ideas as to what is necessary for sanitary purposes in the jails. Anyhow we have already spent Rs. 14,000 last year. I do not know whether the hon. Member proposes that further work should now be stopped and the money already spent should be wasted. I may mention this for the information of the hon. Member: that most of the coolie labour in the construction of this fly-proof kitchen is convict labour which we are using for the purpose. If he thinks that we are spending more, there again, Sir, I am under the control of the Public Works Department, which scrutinizes every single rupee which is spent. I am unable to see how I can stop the work now."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—" I do not propose that the work should be stopped. I simply say that the fly-proof shutters which is an item of expenditure may be abandoned and other items such as flooring, roofing, etc., may be proceeded with. In this way savings may be effected."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Probably my experience may be of some use to the Council and my friend Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar. In the Trivandrum Central Jail large numbers of persons were suffering from dysentery and in spite of best treatment of the medical officer in charge of the prisons, this disease persisted in continuing. At length a suggestion was made that, if a fly-proof kitchen was provided for the room in which food was cooked for the prisoners, the disease would disappear. The suggestion was adopted and there was an immediate and perceptible improvement in

25th March 1922] [Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

the health of the prisoners. So, I believe, there is really benefit in the construction of this fly-proof kitchen in the jails where large numbers of persons are confined. Probably, in the light of this information, my friend will not press his resolution."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" I think, if the hon. Mover would visit the fly-proof kitchen in the Penitentiary, he will see that it is possible to keep flies out."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 704.

3-45 p.m. Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

704. To omit the allotment of Rs. 14,000 for constructing quarters for inspector, etc.

" Sir, the total cost of the estimate as entered in page 10 of the Civil Works budget is Rs. 63,300. According to the book on type-designs and their cost published by the Public Works Department, I find an inspector's quarters should cost Rs. 2,510. A head constable's quarters should cost Rs. 273 and a constable's hut should cost Rs. 174. Applying these rates the total cost of building one inspector's quarters and huts for 7 head constables and 80 constables must be Rs. 18,341. I find 75 per cent should be added to it to arrive at the current schedule of rates."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" May I ask the hon. Member what is the date of the scale from which he is quoting as the standard rate."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—" This work was published in 1907 or 1908. I am adding 75 per cent to the cost to bring up the total to the present schedule rates. Applying the rates as appearing in the book referred to above and adding 75 per cent the total of this work ought to be Rs. 32,000 and not more. Still a sum of Rs. 63,000 is provided for. I wish to know why there is so much difference in the sanctioned amount."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I am afraid I am not in a position to enter into the details of the estimate for these buildings; but I observe that they are to be constructed in a place called Russellkonda, which is rather remote from civilization or at least from those aspects of civilization which include ample provision of labour and building materials. It is just possible that that is the reason why this estimate seems high. But it would be really a much more practical proposition, though in this case it is rather late in the day if my hon. Friend Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar—I know he is a great contractor—would come forward with tenders at rates substantially below those adopted by the Public Works Department. If he is prepared to do that, I have not the slightest doubt that something in the nature of a deal would be quite welcome."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—" Last year the hon. the Home Member offered a similar contract to me. What I wish to say is that even if we add 75 per cent, the total estimate comes only to Rs. 32,000. Taking into consideration the distance from the railway centre, there must be some reason for the cost being double. As the hon. the Home Member promised to go into the matter, I do not press the motion."

[25th March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" May I first of all say, Sir, that this is not a matter which I, as Home Member, can go into? The matter is in the hands of the hon. the Minister."

Sriman Sasi BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—" Sir, there is no special need for increasing the estimate at Russellkonda. Russellkonda is a place which abounds in building materials. There is also a saw-mill located there. That means there is a timber depot at Russellkonda. Bricks and all building materials are also available at very cheap rates at Russellkonda. I come from that place and I claim that it is not far from civilization. It is my firm conviction that building materials are much cheaper in Russellkonda than at any other place in the Ganjam district. Therefore, I do not see why this estimate should have been increased to such a large amount as Rs. 63,300."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" From what the hon. the Home Member has stated, it is really a matter for consideration for the hon. the Minister in charge of the Public Works Department whether he cannot reconsider the estimates prepared. Here is a statement made by a distinguished gentleman of the experience of Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar. He is not speaking without facts and figures. He has considerable experience in contract work. He knows exactly how things are working in different places. I think, the Council should benefit by the observations made by him from his great experience. I would therefore appeal to the hon. the Minister to go into the matter fully and see if any reduction is possible. This much I do say that it is not always safe to adhere to rates mentioned by the Public Works Department, as something sacred and immutable. We have known time and on that a work for which an estimate had been prepared by the Public Works Department for a high figure could be done for a much lower sum."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" There are schedule rates for each part of districts. The Assistant Engineer there in charge of the Russellkonda division is a very experienced officer who has constructed seven buildings recently in that locality. I am sure he must have taken the standard rates of the Public Works Department into consideration. But, if really there is anything which is very much in the estimate, I will draw his attention to the remarks made by hon. Members in this House that the estimate deserves reconsideration in the light of what has been stated here."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—" I wish to point out that there is another work on this list and applying this principle of adding 75 per cent to the rates quoted from this book the estimate amount sanctioned is approximately correct. That item is 52. XXX and 41. Provincial Civil Works. It is only in the case of item 28 there is an enormous increase and I therefore wish to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister to that fact."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Before the House gives permission to the hon. Member to withdraw his motion, may I say, Sir, that this very item finds place in last year's budget? The figure entered there as the total of the estimate is Rs. 52,300 and the authority sanctioning it is given as a Government Order, dated 24th April 1917. Since April 1917, there have been increases in the cost of labour and building materials. That, I presume, accounts for the fact that the estimate is now entered as Rs. 63,300. But in the absence of the estimate, I am entirely unable to say whether it follows

25th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

the particular type-design referred to by my hon. Friend Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar. I do not think we can profitably discuss the details of the case. We must leave that issue to the Minister to settle with the Chief Engineer afterwards if need be."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 705.

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

705. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 20,000 for residence to the Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Western range.*

" Sir, I think a sum of Rs. 56,900 spent on this building should fetch Rs. 5,700 per annum (providing 7 or 7½ per cent for the capital cost and 2½ per cent for maintenance and repair) or Rs. 500 per mensem approximately. The utmost that we can realize from the occupant is Rs. 200 per mensem and the net monthly loss for the Government is Rs. 300. I wish to know whether a less pretentious building could not be provided and the loss averted."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Sir, the position is just the same as that which I explained with regard to the earlier resolution. This particular item was entered in last year's budget and was passed by the Council last year. There is now an increase in the total amount owing, I presume, to the increased cost of labour and building materials in the interval. We want a house for the Deputy Inspector-General of Police at Coimbatore. He is at present allowed to live either in Ootacamund or Coonoor, because he cannot find any accommodation whatsoever at Coimbatore. Whether there is a profit or loss to Government, it is certainly incumbent upon Government to house this police officer in Coimbatore. The questions of the cost of building and the amount of rent that we derive from it are matters for my hon. colleague Mr. Patro."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" The hon. the Home Member observed that, because we sanctioned this amount last year, there does not appear to be any reason for changing our view now."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" May I say at once that something like Rs. 20,000 is expected to be spent on this building before the end of this year, if I do not misapprehend the entry made at page 11 of the Public Works Budget estimate. That is the reason why we must go on with the work."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" If we have already wasted some money paying higher rates than were necessary according to the observation made by my hon. Friend Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar, I do not see why we should not go into the matter now if the rates already fixed require revision. Even if we had spent a part of the money, much more remains to be spent. I hope the hon. Minister will kindly re-examine the question of reduction."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I understand that contracts have already been given."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

[25th March 1922]

Motion 706.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—

706. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1.5 lakhs for constructing temporary buildings for the special police force in Malabar by Rs. 1,00,000.

Motion 707.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :

707. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,50,000 for constructing police lines for special police, Malabar.

“ Sir, in page 10 of the Public Works Budget Estimate against item No. 42, in the column ‘references and remarks’, nothing is quoted. It appears to me that this probable outlay of Rs. 50,000 is undoubtedly being spent in the course of the year to meet an emergent occasion, that is to locate certain temporary police officers. It appears to me that there is absolutely no reason why for temporary police permanent buildings should be constructed there. It cannot be the object of the Government that special police should be permanently stationed in Malabar for all time to come. It should only be to meet an emergency and if the country settles down to peace and order, I fail to see in the first place why there is any necessity for constructing police lines at a cost of Rs. 2 lakhs. In the second place, the estimate is stated to be Rs. 2 lakhs. It is within square brackets. It means that the estimate is not finally arrived at. It is only an experiment and a surmise and not a definite amount arrived at by careful calculation and scrutiny. It is also stated that Rs. 50,000 will be spent or has been spent already or is being spent. I think, Sir, that seeing that the trouble has already subsided, the sum of Rs. 50,000 already spent will meet the emergency and no further amount need be spent for this purpose. Moreover I think that if we erect large buildings and place the police there, they will always try to justify their existence there by raking up some trouble here or there and they will try to remain there for ever. It is necessary that no room should be given for such temptation at all. If we give them small quarters and try to get them out of Malabar as early as possible then it will lead to the peaceful and harmonious living of the people as before. I therefore submit that this sum of Rs. 1,50,000 can very well be omitted from this year’s budget.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ The line of criticism which the hon. Member pursued leaves me aghast. It is our desire to maintain the peace of Malabar by the location of a special force, over 600 in number, specially armed and specially equipped and they will, I fear, have to be retained in the district not for one year but for many years to come. I cannot imagine that the inhabitants of Malabar would welcome the immediate withdrawal of this force. If they are to continue there for some years, obviously you must provide them with buildings of a semi-permanent nature for their accommodation. It is only buildings of a semi-permanent nature that are contemplated, and they must be put up before the monsoon. That is the reason why detailed estimates were not in existence at the time when the budget was prepared.

25th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

This matter was engaging the very serious attention of the local officers in Malabar and of the Government in the month of February. 4 p.m. It was abundantly apparent that we must get a real move on with the construction of these buildings. The question of cost per square foot was carefully examined. I believe I am right in saying that the class of buildings contemplated is of a semi-permanent nature—iron roofing and mud floors with walls and ceilings of wood. I am sorry I cannot give any more details: but this I may say that the scheme of construction makes it probable that if these buildings should ultimately not be required—though I do not myself think that that contingency is likely to arise for many years, a considerable proportion of the materials can be sold. I do not think that the House will require any further justification from me of the necessity of the provision of accommodation for the special police who have to be maintained for the public peace in Malabar.”

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—“ Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to say in what places it is proposed to construct the buildings ?”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I understand the scheme contemplated is six armed camps in different places. I cannot trust my memory to say in exactly what places the buildings are to be constructed. Perintal-manna is one. I will give the hon. Member a list afterwards. The places were very carefully selected in consultation with Mr. Knapp, Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. Ellis and Mr. Evans. I compared the sites proposed with the maps of Ernad and Walluvanad, and satisfied myself that they are suitable places.”

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—“ Sir, the feeling in the district is that these armed camps should continue for a long time to come. The time is not yet in sight when we can with any sense of public safety abolish the special police force. Therefore I shall appeal to the hon. Mover to withdraw the resolution.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ I do not want to press the motion, Sir.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 708 and 709.

The following motions were not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

708. To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for constructing quarters for armed reserve town police.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

709. To omit the allotment of Rs. 20,000 to extend the office buildings of the Criminal Investigation Department.

Motion 710.

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHEITI :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

710. To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for constructing quarters for the armed reserve.

[Mr. T. Namberumal Chetti] [25th March 1922]

"The sanctioned estimate is Rs. 1,67,000. But no particulars are given as to the number of huts to be built, the number of quarters for sub-inspectors and for inspectors, etc. Such details would help members to ascertain whether the sanctioned amount is or is not according to cost detailed in the book on type designs."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I cannot say off-hand. I imagine that this item is identical with item 139 in last year's budget estimate where the details given are one sub-inspector, three sergeants, fourteen head constables and one hundred and forty-three constables. But it is just possible that since then there have been some changes in the strength of the reserve and consequently some expansion of accommodation."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—"I withdraw the motion, Sir."
The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 711

The following motion was not made:—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

711. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for constructing quarters for the armed reserve.*

Motion 712.

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

712. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for the construction of the engineering school buildings at Vizagapatam.*

"My idea in making this motion is to draw attention to the fact that a certain proportion of the students trained in the school will be of no use in the future. I have got sympathy for my own part of the country and for the construction of engineering school buildings for Vizagapatam. But now, on account of the reduction in the temporary engineering establishment a number of temporary subordinates are without work. Besides this we have a number of passed candidates seeking employment without being able to get any. These engineering students cannot get employment anywhere else except in the Government service or in the local fund department. There are now nearly 150 students trained every year in the college at Guindy and in the school at Vizagapatam. For each student an expenditure of Rs. 2,500 is incurred in addition to his own private expenditure. If students are admitted year after year like this, I am sure that the number of students who succeed from the school and college will be far in excess of the demand either by the Government or by the local bodies. The students who pass from these institutions will be of no use for they cannot like medical students set up private practice. These engineering students have no go other than entry into the Government or quasi-Government service. No doubt in Europe there is scope for private enterprise for engineering students, but in India there is no scope for them as the people cannot afford to pay much for the engineer for their buildings. My principal idea in moving this is that I have been repeatedly

25th March 1922] [Mr. A. Subbarayudu]

telling the Government that irrigation works are being neglected, and that more money should be devoted to improve them. Irrigation works not only remunerate the Government but profit the people also.

"My another point is I have no objection to school buildings being constructed at Vizagapatam provided you stop similar classes in the Madras College of Engineering. There is no use spending money without any hope of getting an employment for the students, who spend everything they have to find at the end of their course that they have nothing to fall back upon."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Repeated representations were made to the Government that the Engineering College was not able to afford room for all the applicants. Year after year a large number of applicants were to be refused admission. In fact the number of admissions was only a very small percentage of the applicants admitted. Resolutions were moved urging on the Government the necessity of starting an engineering institution in the north and in the south to afford facilities for all who sought admission. Now my hon. Friend says that because a policy of retrenchment is being pursued in the Public Works Department there is a certain amount of grumbling among those who have been dispensed with. He asks where are we going to find employment for them? I will ask him what are we going to do with the people who are turned out of the arts colleges, medical colleges year after year? It is not merely for the purpose of entering Government service that people must seek admission in these colleges. There are various avenues for them. They can take contracts under the Public Works Department and the Local Boards. The old idea that we are only to look up to the Government service after passing out of the colleges must be given up now. We are changing our policy and principle. In the revised

4.15 p.m. Engineering College calendar we have introduced a clause that there should be no guarantee for students passing out of the college. Originally, in order to draw people into the Engineering College, there was a clause that a certain number would be given appointments. We afterwards found that such a large number were seeking admission that it was necessary to restrict the number, and the guaranteed appointments are also to be taken away. Only yesterday I received a letter from one of my friends from Vizianagaram asking that I should afford facilities for him to get admission to his son in the Vizagapatam Engineering College.

"Again, now, in view of the Telugu University, there will be several colleges started in the area. We must concentrate our energy in a particular place and we must multiply institutions there in order to achieve the Andhra University. Therefore I am sorry this narrow view of the question with regard to the Engineering College will not be the proper thing. I think the hon. Member will view the whole question in the light I have presented and withdraw his motion."

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—"The hon. the Minister was pleased to say that these passed candidates might take up work under Government on contract. I am sorry to say that such contractors who have taken work are few and miserable. Generally, the executive officers do not like passed engineers to work under them, because they might find out their mistakes and expose them. People in the Andhra country have said for a long time that they should

[Mr. A. Subbarayudu] [25th March 1922]

have an Engineering College at Vizagapatam. It was a fact that there was a demand from a number of Arts students. Then there was some hesitation as to whether a college should be opened at Vizagapatam. Subsequently the Government adopted the policy of admitting graduate students from the several districts and from different communities. That time is now gone. The hon. Minister said that he had several letters from his friends asking for facilities for the admission of their sons into the Engineering College. But even now, people ignorant of the present conditions and the difficulty of getting jobs think that every one of them that pass out of the Engineering College could get the job either of a sub-overseer, or a canal supervisor, which is a very remunerative job. We cannot allow them to think that there is still a genuine demand for these people. We know how many overseers and supervisors are hanging on this Secretariat. What is the fate of these people?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Does the hon. Member want his motion to be voted upon?"

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU:—"I do not want to press the motion if the hon. the Minister assures me that he will give my appeal a favourable consideration."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"If he wants all these people to be employed under Government I will have to ask my hon. Friend to find sources for employing these people. Already my hon. Friends have strongly advocated retrenchment, and we have retrenched 6 lakhs. If he wants that all the passed people should be employed, he will have to provide the necessary funds for the purpose."

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU:—"I withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 713 and 714.

The following motions were not made:—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—

713. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for the new Engineering school buildings, Vizagapatam.*

Mr. A. T. PALMER:—

714. *To omit the allotment of 0.1 lakh for the construction of a combined girls' school and training school for mistresses at Mangalore.*

Motion 715.

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

715. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for construction of a combined girls' school and training school for mistresses at Mangalore.*

"Mr. President, the percentage of scholars to the total population in this Presidency is 4.4. The total number of boys and girls that ought to be in schools is 15 per cent of the total population. In the year, 1920-21, the net expenditure on education was 144 lakhs. When all the boys and girls in the

25th March 1922] [Mr. E. C. M. Mascarenhas]

country go to school, the expenditure will be not less than 500 lakhs. It is evident that this large amount of money cannot be obtained without further taxation.

"Sir, if education is to be extended and at the same time expenditure kept down as low as possible, Government schools should not be unnecessarily increased, but aided schools encouraged.

"The average annual cost of educating each pupil in Government institutions comes to Rs. 54-9-9, whereas the cost to the Government of such a pupil in an aided institute is Rs. 3-15-2 only, or in other words, it is one-fourteenth of the expenditure in the Government institute.

"Sir, now I will speak on the state of affairs in Mangalore. An aided training school for mistresses was started there in 1890 or 32 years ago. It has trained and is training teachers of all communities. Up till now it has admitted 625 girls and turned out 227 secondary mistresses and 316 elementary mistresses or a total of 543 mistresses and these are employed not only in various parts of this Presidency but also in other Presidencies.

"Instead of allowing this aided institute to develop, Government stepped in, in 1912 and opened a training school for mistresses in a rented building, and now it has made a provision of Rs. 10,000 for a combined training school for mistresses and girls' school. The estimate does not seem to have been prepared as the amount is left blank in the budget estimate. If this Government school is for training elementary mistresses in Kanarese only, then there is no objection; but, if on the other hand, it is the intention of the Educational authorities to develop it into a secondary grade English training school, then I am afraid the existing aided school, which is run cheaply, will have to be closed for want of pupils. I therefore request the hon. the Minister for Education to let this House know—

(a) what the combined girls' school and training school for mistresses will cost for the buildings;

(b) whether the accommodation is for an elementary girls' school and training school for elementary mistresses only; and

(c) whether it is the intention of the Educational authorities to develop it into a secondary grade training school for mistresses.

"Sir, I am asking for this information, so that we may sanction only what expenditure is absolutely necessary for a combined elementary Kanarese training school for the needs of the South Kanara district and nothing more, and also to help in keeping down expenditure on the score of economy, as low as possible."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, as to the necessity for a training school, there is no question, because the girls' school was there for a very long time and it has been very popular. And attached to the girls' school we have had also a training school at which it is intended not only to train elementary grade but also secondary grade teachers in that part of the West Coast. There are also other private schools which have got such a training section attached to them. In that district there are three girls' schools, but this is a very flourishing girls' school where we have got 400 pupils and most of the pupils are Indian Christians. There are a few Hindus and few European girls also. In order to improve the school a training section was attached, and it is located in a rented building. So, in 1920, the

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[25th March 1922]

Government sanctioned a new site for the school. Already, Rs. 15,645 was spent for the acquisition of the land, and it will all go to waste if we give it up now. The building is an urgent necessity. The school authorities are pressing on the inspectors and the inspectors have reported to Government that accommodation for locating the training institution is urgently necessary and that it would meet a large demand not only in Mangalore but in the neighbouring taluks also. It will spread over the whole district and the whole district will have a training institution in Mangalore."

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—" I think the opening of this Government school was a mistake. It was not established long ago, but in 1912. I have some figures. From the year 1915-16 to 1919-20, a total of 221 pupils have been trained in it out of which 4 are Anglo-Indians, 190 Indian Christians, 14 Brahmans and 13 non-Brahmans. In the aided schools, 261 have been trained in the same period, of which 135 are Anglo-Indians, 120 Indian Christians and 6 non-Brahmans, whereas in the other Government institute we had 190 Indian Christians. Government have established the institute practically for training Indian Christians. Pupils of the other communities are very few. In Malabar also, there are training institutes. I think one is known as the Moyan training institute, and at Calicut also there is a training institute. The opening of a school at Mangalore was unnecessary, and I think the Government will do well to limit it to an elementary training school in Kanarese only."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Does the hon. Member wish to press his motion to a division ?"

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—" I do not wish to press it to a division, if the hon. the Minister for Education gives me an assurance that he will not develop that institution. I believe this provision of Rs. 10,000 is the thin end of the wedge."

Rao Bahadur A. RAMAYYA PUNJA :—" I rise to oppose this motion. 4-30 p.m. There is a strong necessity felt for a Government girls' school in Mangalore. The Hindu inhabitants of this town urged upon the Government some years ago the necessity for the establishment of a girls' school there, because for want of a school like this, they had to send their girls to Christian institutions. It was on that consideration that this institution was opened by the Government and provided courses therein for training mistresses also. All are agreed at least that female education ought to be promoted, and that can only be done by a number of mistresses trained in Government training schools. Sanction was accorded for the establishment of such a school, and a piece of land was also acquired for this purpose in September 1920 at a cost of Rs. 15,645. The school was located for the time being in a rented building. Now it is found necessary that the Government should have a building of their own. I think it is with that object a sum of Rs. 10,000 is asked for. I do not see what reasonable objection could be made for building the school on the land that has already been acquired at a cost of Rs. 15,000 and odd. The objection now raised that there are already girls' schools conducted by Christian agencies is no reason why Government should not continue their existing school. The effect of withholding this amount would be to shut up the institution. I therefore strongly object to this motion."

[25th March 1922]

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—" The hon. Mover has based his arguments mainly upon the discussion of the relative merits or advantages of aided institutions *versus* Government institutions. I think it is well for the Council to note that so far as possible the Educational Department and the Minister have been advocating a policy of encouraging the establishment of aided institutions. They do not advocate the maintenance of Government educational institutions except as a very last resort. There are many members present in this chamber who have had to press their claims very vehemently and very ardently upon the Government, asking them to assume control over aided institutions. What I have just stated is, however, the general policy of the Government. I should like further to state that about ten years ago, at a conference of Inspectresses, it was decided that training schools for women teachers in several places were necessary, and so far as the West Coast was concerned, Mangalore headed the list. It might be asked why Mangalore headed the list when, as has been pointed out, there is already one training school in existence there. Formerly, there were two training schools there. One has gone. The position is that at the Mission training school English is the main subject and there are not full facilities for instruction in Kanarese. As it is desirable, if we wish to pay due attention to the encouragement of the vernacular languages—"

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—" Aided schools also teach Kanarese."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—" English was the main language of instruction, and Kanarese was subsidiary. At that time numerous applications were received from those in the Training School for exemption from the use of the vernacular language in the examination."

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—" Applications for exemptions were apparently received from the Anglo-Indians and not from the other sections of people."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Before we proceed further, I wish to point out that we cannot deal with the whole question of Government schools *versus* aided schools on a motion like this. I would appeal to hon. Members that such a large issue could not be profitably discussed on a small motion like this."

Mr. R. LITTLEHAILES :—" We shall have numerous exemptions to be granted if we desire to emphasise that instruction should be in vernacular, and we have received several applications for exemption last year. I might now refer to the report of the Director of Public Instruction for last year—I merely refer to the actual number that has been read by the hon. Mover—wherein you find that in aided schools out of the total number of girls undergoing instruction there are more in number of Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Indian Christian girls than there are in Government schools. If you go into the figures with regard to the Government school in Mangalore, there is only a single Anglo-Indian. There is a large number of Indian Christians, but there are also Indians, i.e., Brahmans and non-Brahmans, while in the aided school there is not a single Brahman or non-Brahman. These, Sir, are the facts. When we set up this Government institution it was for the definite and specific purpose of training teachers in Kanarese as their main language, thus paying attention to the vernacular, and now, when

[Mr. R. Littlehailes]

[25th March 1922]

we find it necessary also for giving more facilities for all classes of people to receive the necessary instruction which they do much more readily in a Government institution than in aided institutions we have to provide such a school. I do not labour further the point, but so far as the point whether such an institution is necessary, I may say, as I have already pointed out, there were previously two schools. One was under the old Basel Mission, but that school was closed. Government stepped in and they maintain their own training school. That might be cited as an argument to show that the Government do not want to start an institution as a rival to an existing one, but only to replace the institution which fell out owing to the war and other causes. I want to impress upon the Members of this Council that we have already acquired the land, we have already got some drawings and plans for the building, and under these conditions the building ought to go on."

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—" We have not been told what is going to be the cost of the building."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Will the hon. Member withdraw the motion?"

Rai Sahib E. C. M. MASCARENHAS :—" If the hon. the Minister will assure me that it will be an elementary training school."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" There can be no conditional withdrawal."

The motion was put to the vote and lost.

Motions 716 to 718.

The following motions were not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

716. To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for construction of a combined girls' school and training school for mistresses.

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

717. To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

718. To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.

Motion 719.

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

719. To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.

"I find at page 10 of the Public Works Budget estimate for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club amounting to Rs. 1,63,800. The probable outlay during 1921-22 is shown as Rs. 11,000 and under 'grant for 1922-23 for works in progress' there is a sum of Rs. 75,000 provided. Sir, this work formed the subject of discussion last year, and in the column of amount of estimate there was absolutely nothing given. No estimate had been prepared and no information was given to the House, but a sum of

25th March 1922] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

Rs. 32,000 was asked for, and I remember a number of hon. Members including myself had tabled resolutions for the omission thereof. But owing to the fact that there was no time to discuss this matter, there being other more important items, it was not discussed with the result that it was deemed to have been admitted. Now it appears that Rs. 11,000 has been spent in the year, and our sanction is now asked for an estimate of Rs. 1,63,800 whereof Rs. 75,000 can be utilized this year. I object to the grant as a whole, on the ground that in this year of financial stringency such a large sum of money on an item like this should not be spent. There are also more important grounds on which I object to this. The place has got a very bad reputation. It is that it has been the location of a venereal diseases hospital and the biggest drain in Madras runs alongside of it. This is the property which now belongs to Government and which they now want to improve by spending on it the sum of Rs. 1,63,800. This thing came up for discussion in the Finance Committee and more than one member including Sir James Simpson disapproved of spending any money on this property. That is the opinion of the Finance Committee. Moreover, I heard the same objection raised in this Council also: that money to the extent of Rs. 1,63,800 ought not to be spent on this property.

"There is another reason for my objection. This property is not quite close to any of the colleges. No doubt the Christian College is about two furlongs from this as also the Law College. All the students who are not already located in hostels are living in close proximity to their colleges. This is not useful for anything except as a place for going to in the evening. It is not used by the students of colleges situated at a distance, and it is not a proper centre for them to justify the expenditure of a sum of Rs. 1,63,800 of which Rs. 75,000 is allotted for this year. On these grounds I oppose the grant."

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB :—" Mr. President, I rise to support the motion. When I came before this Council for a Muhammadan high school in Georgetown and a college in Umdah Bagh for Muhammadans the Government opposed it and said that there were no funds. I sympathised with the Government. But the action of the Government in this case shows that they have got plenty of money or they are acting light-heartedly. They had provided funds for certain improvements to the club. Last year it was said if we do not cut down the funds under this head, the Government might come to us next year with a provision for Rs. 1½ lakhs. Year after year they are going on increasing this allotment.

"This place was formerly used not as a lunatic hospital, but one for the treatment of venereal diseases. With these few words, I support the motion."

Mr. O. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" Mr. President, if at all I rise to speak on this motion, it is not merely because I am the member for the University of Madras, but because all educationists believe in the necessity of a students' club. We hear a great deal said about the need for the development of the character of the students and for seeing that they do not come under undesirable influences. One of the best ways of maintaining their character and of associating them with desirable men and influences is to provide for them a really good centre where the students can foregather. Those who have been educated in the west will bear testimony to the extreme value from the point of view of character of the famous

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

[25th March 1922]

students' societies called University Unions. This property was taken up and the students' club was started in Madras, if I remember aright, in order to counteract some of the undesirable influences which were working on the students of Madras, and I am told that it is doing very good work. I do not consider the students' club to be anything unnecessary or of the nature of a luxury, but I regard it as an integral part of the University organization. If I remember rightly with regard to all the newer universities that have been started or that are now proposed to be started, provision has been made for a students' club for the under-graduates. I am now only pleading for the principle of having a University students' club. I think it would be a very bad thing indeed if that idea was given up. But after I have listened to my hon. Friend Mr. Tanikachala Chetti'yar, I am rather doubtful whether the present site is the best possible one. But, however, that is a matter for the people here, the authorities of the University and the officers of the Education Department to consider and decide upon. I should be very sorry if this House should vote this item out on the ground that the University club is a superfluity. Further, I find that already about Rs. 11,000 have been spent, and if we do not go on with the work and complete it, that money would be a waste. So long as the House does not vote it out on the ground that the University students' club is a luxury, I have nothing to say. Only let not an existing club be destroyed till another and a better one has been put up. But I do hope that the students of Madras, thousands of whom do not know how to spend their evenings between 5 and 7, will be provided with a splendid club in which all can foregather, and spend their time in a manner that will be conducive to their moral character."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, I do not think there would be any question about the need for a University Students' Club in the City of Madras. This was started three years back with the view of bringing together college students living in Georgetown and of providing for them some common ground where they could meet and spend their evenings satisfactorily. In Georgetown, where a large number of college students live, there are a number of eating houses and hotels where students do not get their meals properly and the hotels are run in a very bad style. Therefore, in order to provide facilities for good food and for good social life this club was started. Another reason why this club was started was that the students of the colleges, for instance, the Christian College and the Pachaiyappa's College have got their hostels, but the Law College and the Medical College have no hostels. Therefore that a large number of students from these colleges, the Law College and the Medical College, may have quarters for themselves. Government have provided its own building. The building belongs to the Government and the Government spent Rs. 11,000 in repairing it. The building is in need of a lot of repair urgently, and in order to make it a residential place for students to live in it as a hostel, a gymnasium is attached to it with the requisite apparatus so that the students may go there morning and evening and take part in gymnasium exercise. This is the object of the students' club, and in order to give facilities for a large number of students who cannot get food in eating houses, meals are provided for them and they are charged for it. As I said, in order that it may be a useful social centre, a gymnasium is provided. In this way a large number of students receive relief from this place and it will be a pity if we should have to cut down anything of the grant. There is also a small reading room attached to it,

25th March 1922]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

and in course of time it may develop into a regular club. In order that the students of the Madras City and of the colleges in its neighbourhood may very well learn the habits of social life and club life from the beginning and to distract them from the various undesirable influences and directions, they are brought together here so that they may meet each other in the mornings and evenings and thus necessarily have a sort of club life and social life gradually. Friendships and unions are formed and the whole atmosphere will be quite wholesome. Though it is a fact that the present locality is not a very healthy one, that it is in Popham's Broadway and that it was originally used for a hospital and that the building requires urgent repair, the principle of having a university club must be granted by every one. Therefore if this building is considered to be not suitable at all and if we can provide funds, we can find another place, and until then we may use this for the university club. If we are able to get two or three lakhs more we can put up another building, but we want this amount budgeted for, in order to carry on the necessary repairs and make necessary adjustments in the present building so that it may be used as a residential club. A building like that for the purpose of a club is absolutely necessary in these days. As I told you, undesirable influences are working in the minds of the students and we must provide a place where people could visit them from time to time and have social intercourse with them, have social parties so as to have a chastening influence on the members of the club. On the whole, I think it is a very desirable thing. Some time back some of us were invited to go to the place and see how it was working. At present it may not be all that is desirable, but in course of time it is capable of improvement. Therefore, I may say that this motion for a wholesale reduction of the grant is not at all desirable at present."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—"Sir, I desire to support the motion for the omission of this grant. Mr. Tanikachala Chetti'yar in his opening remarks said that the first reason for urging this omission was financial stringency. It also struck me, Sir, as essential that in this year of financial stringency no amount should be spent on a luxury so to speak. But the hon. Member Mr. Ramalinga Reddi said that it should not be considered a luxury and that the Rs. 11,000 already spent on it would be a waste. I do not think so. Buildings in Popham's Broadway are fetching nearly five or six times their value about ten or twenty years ago. For instance, I may mention one building lately occupied by Messrs. Fox & Co. The owners were not able to realize more than Rs. 25,000 thirty years ago, but to-day, even if we offer Rs. 2,50,000 the owner would not sell the property. Even if the Government sell their building now, they would get five or six times its original cost, and the Rs. 11,000 spent on it already would not be a waste. As the surroundings are ill suited to the club, it is well the building is sold now, and a new building provided on the Marina."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTI'YAR :—"Sir, after listening to my friend Mr. Ramalinga Reddi and the hon. the Minister I find that Mr. Ramalinga Reddi supported it only as a club for the evening, whereas the idea of the Minister is to convert it into a hostel which was not what Mr. Ramalinga Reddi wanted. As my friend Mr. Namberumal Chetti'yar pointed out, the building has a value as house property in Popham's Broadway and the value can be realized by sale and the amount of Rs. 11,000 spent on it would not be a waste, and a suitable building can be obtained in any other locality.

[Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar] [25th March 1922]

My friend spoke of foregathering of students. It can be done in the foreshore of Madras. That can very well be done in other parts in Madras where there are more beautiful structures and more desirable surroundings where young men can find amusement. I do not think that the surroundings of the present buildings are conducive to health and there is no scope for recreation. On all these grounds, I press this motion to a division."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I believe no objection was raised even by the mover of the motion to the establishment or the advantages of a University students' club. His main objection, so far as I have been able to follow him, was that the building was in an inconvenient locality and that the club was not doing very useful work. If that is the ground of objection, I believe the only way in which we ought to proceed is to allot more funds and have a better building in a more suitable locality. That is the direction in which I would request him to consider the desirability of improving the University students' club rather than by cutting down the provision of Rs. 75,000 made in the next year's budget. I also wish to remind this House that we have all along, in dealing with these buildings, shown consideration to works in progress. This question about the students' club came up last year and the provision was allowed to remain. If it was thought that the building was in an objectionable locality and that different steps should be taken, the better course would have been for a specific motion of the description to be brought forward for the consideration of the Government and the necessary alteration would have been made. Having allowed that provision, I would request the mover himself to consider whether it is desirable to vote down the provision without pointing out at the same time a different building which would be useful for the purpose. So long as it is admitted that these buildings have been in existence and have been used for this purpose during the last three years, so long as it is clear to the members of this Council that the students have been using those buildings with profit and with advantage and so long as it is clear to us that we did allow this provision to remain in the budget of last year, I would request the House not to embark on a policy of undoing the work which has been done in the last two years without having a proper substitute for it. I think also that it would be setting up a bad precedent. But when the Government are in a position to allot larger funds for this purpose, and when we can think of changing the building and having another university students' club, then it would be time enough to consider the suggestion of the hon. Mover as to what to do with the property and whether it would fetch good value or not. But till that time arrives and till the Government or the Minister assures us that he is prepared to find funds on a larger scale and provide a new students' club, I would entreat every one in the House not to take away the institution in existence before taking up another building useful for the purpose. For these reasons, I oppose this motion."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"Mr. President, I rise to support the motion of 5 p.m. Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar. As pointed out by Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar, I do not see why such a large sum as Rs. 75,000 should be spent upon it if the place is going to be sold. If the Council thinks that this is a place not suitable and wishes to have a central place in a better locality, I do not see any use for the Government spending such a large sum. I agree with my friend Mr. Ramalinga Reddi that a

25th March 1922]

[Mr. P. Subbarayan]

university club is a necessity, but what I say is that such a club should be in a suitable locality and not in the place where it is now. So I support the motion to omit the sum altogether."

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—"Sir, I oppose this motion. My friend Mr. Subbarayan says that the surroundings are bad enough for students to live in. Students live in narrow streets and unhealthy lanes and under worse conditions. This club that was established in Georgetown is by far better than many of the hostels in Madras. Instead of accommodating themselves in filthy hotels this is surely a much better arrangement for the students and therefore I oppose this motion."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—"Sir, it is very unfortunate that the hon. Member has chosen to press this motion. I expected, Sir, that after what fell from Mr. Ramalinga Reddi and after the lucid statement of the Minister for Education the hon. Mover would withdraw this motion. He has not done so. And I must say, Sir, that this University Students' Club is a splendid institution which is doing wonderfully good work. First of all I may say, it serves the purpose of a hostel for the Medical and Law students as also for the other students in Madras. There is only one other hostel, the Victoria Hostel, and this University Club is supposed to supplement the little relief that the Victoria Hostel is giving to the numerous students. Secondly, it serves the purpose of a club where the students are weaned away from undesirable influences and have the advantages of some recreations. Now, Sir, the only objection that is raised against the club is, as stated by Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar, that the club is a luxury. All seem to concede the principle of a club. But that it is not a luxury has been very well explained by Mr. Ramalinga Reddi. It is by itself an integral part of any University system. Another objection is that it is in a bad locality. There was a Lock hospital there originally. But it can be made quite suitable for students and its unhealthiness also could be set right. The club has gone on for nearly three years and there have been no complaints of its insanitary nature and we have nothing to conclude that this is in an unhealthy quarter. However, that question might still be considered by the Minister for Education before he embarks on further expenditure. And then if he thinks that it is not quite suitable he may make up his mind to select another place. Sir, a sum of Rs. 11,000 has already been spent upon it and the building has been voted upon in the last year's budget and it went unchallenged. For all these reasons, I appeal to the hon. the Mover not to press the motion, especially when he concedes the principle of founding a club like this."

The motion was then put to the House and lost.

Motions 720 to 742.

The following motions were not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI :—
720. To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—
721. To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.

[25th March 1922]

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

722. To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—

723. To omit the allotment of Rs. 75,000 for improvements to the Madras University Students' Club.

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—

724. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,00,000 for constructing a new chemistry block for the Presidency College.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

725. To omit the allotment of Rs. 15,000 for the New General Hospital, Cocanada.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

726. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,00,000 for additions to the Agricultural College and Research Institute.

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—

727. To omit the allotment of Rs. 70,000 for constructing buildings for the cattle farm at Ohintaladevi.

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—

728. To omit the allotment of Rs. 50,000 for the construction of buildings for the Madras Trades School.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

729. To omit the allotment of Rs. 50,000 for construction of buildings for the Madras Trades School.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—

730. To omit the allotment of Rs. 22,000, for wages of coolies.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

731. To omit the allotment of Rs. 22,000 for wages of coolies.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

732. To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,000 for charges for carting articles.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—

733. To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,000 for charges for carting articles.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

734. To omit the allotment of Rs. 25,000 for improvements to roads at the main gate of the Government House.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

735. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,14,500 for repairs to Civil Works—Civil buildings for west coast by Rs. 100.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

736. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,24,000 for repairs to Civil Works in the Nilgiris by Rs. 100.

25th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

737. To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for one assistant to the consulting architect.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

738. To omit the allotment of Rs. 7,322 for one deputy sanitary engineer.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—

739. To omit the allotment of Rs. 7,322 for one deputy sanitary engineer.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

740. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 14,950 for two assistant sanitary engineers on the specialist scale by Rs. 7,475.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

741. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 14,950 for two assistant sanitary engineers by Rs. 7,475.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—

742. To reduce the allotment for 4 assistant sanitary engineers by the cost of 3.

Motion 743.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

743. To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,846 for one temporary assistant sanitary engineer.

"Sir, I must say that the present establishment of the Sanitary Engineering department consists of one sanitary engineer, two deputy sanitary engineers and four assistant engineers. This question of the establishment necessary for the sanitary engineering department was considered at length by the Finance Committee in consultation with the Chief Engineer and the decision of the Finance Committee was there should be one sanitary engineer, one deputy sanitary engineer and one assistant engineer. It was represented to me afterwards that it was necessary to have one deputy sanitary engineer more to provide one for the North and one for the South. In accepting that arrangement we thought we could allow two deputy sanitary engineers and two assistant sanitary engineers and the rest who are temporary could go. This was what we thought and we have also expressed that. One deputy sanitary engineer and one assistant sanitary engineer are already permanent and the others have been temporarily drafted from the Public Works Department and so there will be no difficulty in asking those not wanted to revert to their permanent places."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, there is a good deal of justification in asking the temporary men to revert to their former places. I shall be prepared to consider it."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, as the hon. the Minister has not said that he accepts it, I press the motion."

The motion was put to the House and carried.

[25th March 1922]

Motion 744.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

744. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for assistant sanitary engineer*

" Sir, this is the second of the appointments mentioned by me in the previous motion and it can go. The other appointment has already been voted against."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I agree."

The motion was put and carried.

Motion 745.

5-15 p.m. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

745. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,350 for the personal assistant to the sanitary engineer.*

" In fact, as has been already pointed out, there are one chief sanitary engineer, two deputy sanitary engineers and even after the omission of two assistant sanitary engineers, there are still left two assistant sanitary engineers. Their work is very little and I do not think there is need for a personal assistant to the sanitary engineer. In fact the whole allotment for works is only about Rs. 8 lakhs and there is not a pretty large number of works, and at this rate it will take six years more for finishing the works that are already in progress. There are other works that are sanctioned but waiting to be executed, works waiting to be sanctioned and works waiting for the preparation of plans and so on. Practically there is no work for the personal assistant to the sanitary engineer."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" The specialist cadre consists of one sanitary engineer, two deputy sanitary engineers and two assistant sanitary engineers. Now, the sanitary engineer requires a personal assistant, because he has to do a lot of routine work and he has also to attend to the drawings. It may be we have not got much work to do at present, but there are large number of schemes for which plans and estimates have been prepared last year and which have been scrutinized by the chief engineer, and there are also other schemes for which plans and estimates are under preparation. When the sanitary engineer goes on tour, it is necessary that there should be a responsible officer at the headquarters to look after the office. Therefore, as in the case of every other chief officer, the sanitary engineer requires a personal assistant to look after the office work during his absence on tour. Though it may seem that he has no work now, under ordinary circumstances it will be found necessary to have a personal assistant. The personal assistant is not borne on the cadre of specialists. So it is very necessary to retain the personal assistant to the sanitary engineer."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" I am at a loss to understand the arguments of the hon. the Minister. There are four officers in this office besides the sanitary engineer, namely, two deputy sanitary engineers and two assistant sanitary engineers and they are all in one and the same place. At least one of them can be expected to be at the headquarters while the others are away on tour. In fact, I do not see, Sir, any

25th March 1922] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

necessity for a personal assistant in an office like this. If the officers are posted in different places, then I can understand the necessity for this post. In the case of the other chief officers, there may be necessity for a personal assistant because there is no other officer capable of doing the work in the absence of the chief officer. But in this particular case, Sir, all these five officers are in the same place and I do not see there is any necessity for a personal assistant at all. The argument of the hon. the Minister does not at all take account of the officers besides the Sanitary Engineer. Now, I am sure, he will find his way to accept the resolution that has been moved."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" I only wish to emphasise the point that we cannot subscribe to the suggestion of the hon. the Minister for Public Works that every officer should have a personal assistant. I do not think that it is the standpoint from which we must look at this question. We must consider each case on its merits. In this particular case if the sanitary engineer has got sufficient work to require a personal assistant, then it is our duty to sanction it. If, on the other hand, there is not sufficient work, there is no necessity for sanctioning this post. The statement made by the hon. the Minister that this year he has not got sufficient work is itself sufficient to justify the deletion of the appointment. So far as the increase of work in future years is concerned, I think we can deal with such cases as they arise. I think it is our duty now not to vote for this personal assistant. If the work accumulates and if it is found necessary to have this officer, it will be time enough for the hon. the Minister to bring in a motion for renewing the appointment. There is no necessity for continuing the post."

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—" I only want to ask for information. I find from the list of officers a large number of Assistant Sanitary Engineers and also an office manager. I want to know whether this personal assistant is a technically qualified officer like the sanitary engineer himself, so that he can render technical aid to the sanitary engineer and look after the technical section of the work also during his absence, or whether he has simply to run the office and get the routine work done, in which case there is the office manager to do such things. I should like to have this information."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" The personal assistant is a technical man and he has been in service for thirty years."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Let us see what the work of this whole of the Sanitary Engineer's Department is. They are not an executive staff. Their work consists mainly in drawing up plans and estimates for water-works and drainage schemes, and giving advice to the Government and to the officers of the ordinary Public Works Department."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I propose to give them also execution work in the case of the schemes prepared by them, and a specialist cadre has been formed to carry on this work."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I was speaking of the work that they now do and not of what is proposed to be given to them hereafter. When that measure is adopted the Government can come forward and ask for more establishment. As it is, their work consists in designing certain schemes and in giving advice with reference to water-works and drainage

[Mr M. Krishnan Nayar] [25th March 1922]

schemes. When once these schemes are completed, the actual execution of the work is entrusted to the ordinary officers of the Public Works Department and, as I submitted, there are now one chief sanitary engineer, two deputy sanitary engineers and, even after the omission of two assistant sanitary engineers, two more assistant sanitary engineers, so that there are five officers, and if my information is correct, all these officers are located in the same building and the only other work that they have is to inspect and examine the drainage works and water-works that have already been completed. With reference to this inspection of water-works which are 29 in number, the personal assistant has nothing to do, because he has only got office management. Even if somebody is necessary to look after the work in the office during the absence of the sanitary engineer, there are the other officers like the deputy sanitary engineers and the assistant sanitary engineers, and it is absolutely unnecessary to have the personal assistant also. This resolution is not intended to send away the present personal assistant. When he retires the vacancy need not be filled up. When that contingency arises, there is no need to have this post."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"If this resolution is passed, it will be necessary to pass an order to send him away and he will lose his pay for the month of March."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I do not care for the consequences. I believe, as my hon. Friend has told us that he has already put in thirty years' service, he can very well be sent away."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—"I have given notice of a motion to do away with the whole establishment and I wish to take this opportunity of expressing my views on that matter."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. I daresay the hon. Member realizes that the present motion is with reference to the appointment of the personal assistant to the sanitary engineer, whether it is necessary to retain the provision for his post or not. We are not at present concerned with the question of the whole establishment."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—"I suppose the qualifications of these officers in the sanitary establishment are the same as those of Public Works department officers and I know that several ordinary Public Works department officers do sanitary work also. I do not see any difference between the qualifications of one set of officers and those of the other set, and therefore there is no necessity at all for an establishment costing Rs. 1.61 lakhs annually, and as we are agreed already that a major portion of this item should be cut down, I think the personal assistant also may be done away with."

"There is one more point. The sanitary engineer also may not be necessary, and his place may very well be taken by one of the deputy sanitary engineers, and if the arrangement for doing away with the sanitary engineer is agreed to, the whole department can be run by the two deputy sanitary engineers and two assistant sanitary engineers, and I hope the hon. the Minister will think of giving effect to this suggestion."

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI:—"No case of necessity is made out for a personal assistant in the present case. I take this opportunity of

25th March 1922] [Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai]

saying that as a rule the practice of giving a personal assistant to the head of an office or department must be discouraged as much as possible, unless the Government is prepared to make the head of the office idle or to keep on an incompetent man."

A poll was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 25. Mr. P. Siva Rao. |
| 2. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankineedu Prasad Bahadur. | 26. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhaacharlu. |
| 3. Dr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu. | 27. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 4. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 28. Mr. K. V. Ramachari. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 29. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 6. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 30. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Kath Mahasayo. |
| 7. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 31. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. |
| 8. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 32. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 9. Mr. O. Janikachala Chettiyar. | 33. Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 10. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. | 34. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 11. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 35. Mr. S. Arpudawami Udaiyar. |
| 12. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 36. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 13. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 37. Rai Sahib E. C. M. Mascarenhas. |
| 14. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | 38. The Zamindar of Mandasa. |
| 15. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 39. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampar. |
| 16. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. | 40. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib. |
| 17. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai. | 41. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib Bahadur. |
| 18. Mr. A. Subbarayudu. | 42. Mr. Saiyid Muhammad Padsha Sahib Bahadur. |
| 19. Mr. P. Subbarayan. | 43. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. | 44. Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib. |
| 21. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | 45. Mr. Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razzaq Sahib. |
| 22. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. | 46. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 23. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | |
| 24. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 9. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. |
| 2. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 10. Mr. R. Littlehales. |
| 3. The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ullah Sahib Bahadur. | 11. Mr. E. Periyannayagam. |
| 4. The hon. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 12. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. |
| 5. The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 13. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 6. The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 14. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. |
| 7. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 15. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. |
| 8. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 16. Mr. S. Muttumanikka Achari. |
| | 17. Mr. A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar. |

The motion was carried, 46 voting for and 17 against it.

Motion 746.

The following motion therefore fell through:—

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—

746. To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,350 for the personal assistant to the sanitary engineer.

Motion 747.

The following motion was not made:—

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—

747. To omit the allotment of Rs 1,61,575 for sanitary engineering department.

[25th March 1922]

Motion 748.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

748. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 19,88,613 for establishment by Rs. 2,00,000.*

" I want to raise a question which I have raised more than once in the Finance Committee that one way in which the extraordinary cost of the establishment could be reduced is by taking away all the intermediate officers between the district officers and those at the headquarters. It was thought so far as the Public Works department was concerned that the question of the abolition of the superintending engineers was a matter which required the scrutiny of the Government. It was said, Sir, that the superintending engineers had a lot of work to do besides ordinary supervision and it was said that in regard to estimates, they had the power of sanction beyond a certain limit and that the work could not be left either to the executive engineer or to the Chief Engineer. Sir, in regard to this matter, by the kindness of the Chief Engineer I was able to get some insight into the working of the office and I found, Sir, that in this department as in others there was much room for decentralization. It was said that a deputy secretary was necessary at the headquarters because the superintending engineers were not scrutinizing some of the estimates sent to the Chief Engineer. It was said that the estimates were sent directly to the headquarters and that they were not scrutinized by the superintending engineer. It was said, Sir, that these estimates were scrutinized by the Chief Engineer's office. In regard to a large number of works the Superintending Engineer gives his sanction at the present moment and unless his work is decentralized in order to give a little more power to the executive engineers, it may not be possible to reduce the number of superintending engineers. It was also said that these superintending engineers were also inspectors of local board works and as such they could not be removed. It seems to me, Sir, if only the principle of decentralization is given effect to and more powers are given to the executive engineers and if the estimates that pass from the superintending engineers are scrutinized by them and not merely sent in a post office like fashion, I think there will be room for taking away the deputy secretary in the office and though it will not be possible to take away all the superintending engineers it seems to me there is room for reducing the number by one or two. These are matters which I should like that the hon. the Minister and the Chief Engineer would consider deeply and if they only accept the principle of decentralization and try to carry it out we can make large savings. It is with the intention of drawing the attention of the hon. the Minister and the Chief Engineer to this aspect of the matter that I make this motion."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, I may say that the Public Works department has done its best in going into the matter of the whole establishment and cutting it down as far as possible. For some time to come this department will have to work under considerable difficulty and disadvantage. A large number of officers having been dispensed with, we have to reorganize the department, redistribute the work, and re-adjust the jurisdiction. My hon. Friend Mr. A. Subbarayudu has referred to the large number of

25th March 1922]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

officers that were dispensed with; nevertheless redistribution of the work is a great problem for us. While we have done so much in the office recently, it is rather too much for my friend to press the matter again. In course of time I hope to be able to examine with the assistance of the Chief Engineer how far decentralization could be given effect to and the work could be reduced. Unless the work is reduced at the Chief Engineer's office, it is not possible to dispense with any of the officers now in existence. I have already told the House in my general remarks about the necessity and desirability of retaining the superintending engineers. They fill a place that is absolutely necessary in the scheme of the work of the Public Works department. It is impossible that they could be eliminated in carrying out the works. There are large responsibilities vested in the superintending engineer. While the executive engineers are entirely entrusted with carrying out the execution of works according to plans and estimates, the superintending engineers have to supervise their work and they have got also some original powers. It is not possible for me to assure my friend, but I am quite willing to consider all that he has said and see whether we can work on with the limited establishment we have now."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" As I said, Sir, my intention in bringing this motion was to bring to the notice of the hon. the Minister for his consideration and examination, the question of further retrenchment in the establishment of this department and in view of the remarks of the hon. the Minister, I do not press my motion and beg leave to withdraw it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 749.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

749. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 58,86,692 for Civil Works by 5,00,000.*

" Sir, in moving for the reduction, I do not wish to take the House through the various allotments made in the public Works estimates, but I wish the House to consider whether it is not possible for us to put off out of the provision made for the next year a portion of the total allotment made. " I do not wish to suggest that we should put off works in progress and that we should give up schemes already sanctioned or already in operation. But if we realize that we are required now to vote for large sums of money for civil works, however valuable and necessary the works may be, that we will be called upon to vote large sums of money as per supplemental motions of which notice has been given it will be apparent that a fresh reconsideration of the allotment made is necessary with the object of effecting retrenchment. If I put it at a sum of five lakhs, it is because I felt that if we confine our attention to urgent works and if we put off the completion of works in progress for another year, it will be possible for us to effect a saving in the provision to that extent. No doubt, while we were dealing with various specific motions, objections were raised as to the necessity for particular works. It was pointed out that we must provide for the residence of officers and for new Collector's office at Vellore regarding the policy of which no objection was taken. But in a year when we are required to strain every nerve to

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [25th March 1922]

find additional funds by additional taxation and by other means it must be our duty to effect as much saving as we can. It is a small portion of the amount entered in the budget estimate that I wish to omit. I think the House may adopt the principle which it enunciated in dealing with some of the motions, not all, of making a reduction from the total grant."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"I must say with due deference to my hon. Friend that it is most unfair that such a motion should be tabled in connexion with the Public Works Department. Having reduced six lakhs of rupees, having cut down 18 per cent of the establishment as it was originally proposed, the unfortunate rule that the House applied to the case of reduction of 1½ or 2 per cent should be applied to this case also seems to me doing great injustice to the department which has conscientiously and dutifully carried out the instructions of this House and of His Excellency. I am surprised that my hon. Friend should have pressed this motion at all and made a speech on it. If he had not known the fact that the only department that has done its best and loyally carried out the wishes of this House and of His Excellency, he would not press the motion. But having known that, that he should propose this motion seems to me unfair and ungenerous. Moreover, the allotment consists of voted and non-voted items and motions have been tabled asking for curtailment in various directions. Hon. Members have, either out of consideration for the subject, or for the reason that they were not able to support the motions, withdrawn them or abandoned them. In spite of it, that my hon. friend from Nellore should have tabled a motion for a reduction of five lakhs of rupees in a department which has already retrenched six lakhs of rupees seems to be doing the greatest injustice to the department and I am sure the House will not agree with him."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, my hon. Friend opposite has made an appeal to this House not to accept this motion on the ground that the department has already effected retrenchment in various directions and that we should not go further. I wish to draw a distinction between retrenchment effected in the case of reduction of establishments and that effected in the case of the allotment under works. I have not in my opening remarks made any reference to the reduction under establishment."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"My hon. Friend has not tabled any motion with reference to any particular work to be carried out to be eliminated."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I think my hon. Friend should have been patient to have understood my main point. As I stated in the beginning, I think that in matters of this description where one department or another has tried to include in the budget various works, if the House considers that it is necessary to effect a retrenchment under this head, I thought, Sir, and I even now think that it is more desirable to effect a reduction in the general allotment leaving the various departmental officers to put their heads together and see what works are urgent and what not. In that manner retrenchment can be effected; and it is for that reason and it is after due consideration that I proposed not to affect this particular item or that regarding which the head of departments had placed a provision in the budget, but to put it before the House whether, taking a proper view of the situation, we cannot reduce the total allotment by a specific sum. I believe

25th March 1922] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

in the correctness of the course pursued by me. Now, Sir, regarding the suggestion made that in the case of a department that has already applied the pruning knife to a considerable extent we should be fair in pressing further, I quite accept the position that there has been substantial retrenchment effected in the department. I quite realize in the case of the establishment there has been a reduction to an extent to which I myself was not prepared to go. I am of opinion that with the limited establishment it may not be possible to spend this year any large amount. What I want to maintain and the House to consider is this: whether the House is entitled to vote for such a large sum and whether we cannot go further and reduce the allotment. I cannot at all understand the surprise of my hon. Friend regarding the position taken up by me when the allotment proposed to be affected is that on works. And then, my hon. Friend said that no specific item was mentioned. It was so because I wanted to give a wide latitude, an absolute discretion in the matter of selecting works to the officers concerned."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"The list of works rests with the departments concerned and the Public Works department are merely agencies for carrying out the works demanded by the other departments of Government."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"That is the very reason why I stated already that the departmental officers ought to put their heads together and see what buildings can be put off. If I now referred to my hon. Friend opposite, it is not because I ignored that fact but because I wanted my hon. Friend who has no doubt been very earnest in retrenching to see whether some more money cannot be saved in this particular direction. I do not want to tie his hands or fetter his discretion or embarrass his position, but I only appeal to him to sit down quietly after this session has passed and to see whether some of the works proposed could not be put off for some time to come and whether expenditure on some buildings cannot be cut off so that we may save some more money in the year to come. I do not want to embarrass the position of my hon. Friend by pressing the motion to a division. With these remarks, I beg leave to withdraw it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 750 and 751.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

750. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 58,36,692 for civil works by 100.

Mr. N. A. V. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI :—

751. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 78.11 lakhs for Demand under Civil Works—Public Works officers by 10 lakhs."

Demand XXVIII—Civil Works for a grant of 78.11 lakhs minus Rs. 12,796 was then put and granted *nem. con.*

The House then adjourned at 5-45 p.m. to meet at 11 a.m. on Monday the 27th March 1922.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Monday the 27th day of March 1922, the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR Avargal, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

I

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

[Order made by the President of the Madras Legislative Council under Standing Order No. 15—

(1) Printed copies of the questions and answers to be put and given at a meeting of the Council shall be placed on the Council table an hour before the President takes his seat.

(2) The questions shall be put and answered in the following manner :—

The Secretary shall call the name of each interpellator in alphabetical order, specify the serial numbers of his questions, and make a sufficient pause to allow him or any other member a reasonable opportunity of rising in his place if he is desirous of asking a supplementary question. Supplementary questions must be put immediately after the principal questions to which they relate.]

Sub-overseers in the Public Works Department.

1390 Q.—Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Public Works be pleased to state—

(1) how many sub-overseers are going to have their services dispensed with in the Public Works Department and how many were given notice in the Second Circle;

(2) whether the reduction is intended for effecting retrenchment or to serve any other purpose;

(3) in either case what is the necessity for appointing additional overseers to fill their places, seeing that the replacement of two sub-overseers by one overseer results in an extra expenditure of $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent;

(4) what is the increase of establishment sanctioned to the Public Works Department during the past five years in numbers and extra cost incurred;

(5) what is the total amount of expenditure incurred by raising the salaries of provincial gazetted and subordinate officers of the Public Works Department; and

(6) what is the amount given to them in lump sums by giving retrospective effect to the revision of salaries?

A.—(1) The services of 51 sub-overseers are proposed to be dispensed with in the Public Works Department.

In the Second Circle, the Superintending Engineer has served notices of discharge on 58 permanent sub-overseers. Only about 21 permanent posts are to be abolished and the matter is under separate inquiry.

(2) & (3) The reduction is intended only for effecting retrenchment of expenditure. Two of the sections in the Kistna Eastern division now held by sub-overseers are to be placed in charge of upper subordinates from 1st April 1922 as their jurisdictions are to be enlarged by reducing the total number of sections.

[27th March 1922]

(4)

Engineer Establishment.

Year.	Increase in number.	Extra cost.
1916-17	Nil. 18 (from 165 to 183)	Nil. The increase is the result of the introduction of the new Madras
1917-18		
1918-19		
1919-20		
1920-21		

Engineering Service (in place of the Sub-Engineer establishment) to provide for the bulk of the permanent subdivisional officers. The extra cost on account of the increased number of appointments and on account of the introduction of the new service is given in the answer to (5) below.

Specialist Establishment (Architects and Electrical Engineers).

Year.	Increase in number.	Extra cost per annum.
1916-17	Nil.	Rs.
1917-18	Nil.	Nil.
1918-19	1 (Architect) from 2 to 3	Nil. 4,800
1919-20	Nil.	Nil.
1920-21	1 (Architect) from 3 to 4 1 (Electrical Engineer) from 2 to 3	Nil. 17,400

NOTE.—The number of Architects has since been reduced by 1, i.e., from 4 to 3.

Permanent Upper Subordinate Establishment.

No increase in the past five years. On the other hand there has been a decrease in number consequent on the formation of the new Madras Engineering Service.

Temporary Upper Subordinate Establishment.

Year.	Increase in number.	Extra cost per annum.
1916-17	No increase but decrease by 41 (from 173 to 132).	Rs. Nil.
1917-18	21 (from 132 to 153) ..	15,120
1918-19	1 (from 153 to 154) ..	720
1919-20	46 (from 154 to 200) ..	33,120
1920-21	12 (from 200 to 212) ..	8,640

NOTE.—The number for 1922-23 is to be reduced to 167.

27th March 1922]

Lower Subordinate, Clerical and Menial Establishments.

The information is not readily available.

- (5) The extra expenditure per annum on account of the promotion of sub-engineers and supervisors to the new Madras Engineering Service is about Rs. 3,05,000. But the *ultimate extra cost* on account of the introduction of the Madras Engineering Service will be reduced to about Rs. 1 lakh per annum by a reduction of numbers in the Indian Service of Engineers. Information in regard to the clerical and menial establishments is not readily available. The revision of pay of lower subordinates has not yet been given effect to.
- (6) The amount given in lump sums to the men appointed to the Madras Engineering Service by giving retrospective effect to their promotions is about Rs. 4,40,000. Retrospective effect was not given to the revision of the scales of pay of clerical and menial establishments.

Village service establishment.

1391 Q.—Rao Sahib S. ELLAPPA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

- (a) what is the income from the enfranchisement of village service inams in the proprietary estates of the Presidency; and
- (b) how much do the Government contribute as their share towards the pay of the village service establishments of the proprietary estates?

A.—The Member is referred to the Civil Budget Estimate for 1922-23 which contains the information.

Travelling allowance of vaccinators.

1392 Q.—MR. A. P. I. SAIYID IBRAHIM RAVUTTAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the Government have increased the travelling allowance of the vaccinators?

A.—The answer is in the negative.

G.O. No. 1630, P.H., dated 2nd December 1921, containing the most recent orders on the subject of the travelling allowance of vaccinators under local boards is laid on the table.*

No travelling allowance is ordinarily payable to municipal vaccinators.

Record-of-rights and settlement of rent in Kallikota and Atagada estates.

1393 Q.—SRIMAN SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

- (a) whether the Kallikota-Atagada estates in the Ganjam district were surveyed in 1912 with the promise that the record-of-rights and settlement of rents would be effected on the conclusion of the survey;

* Vide Appendix on page 3584 infra.

[27th March 1922]

(b) whether on the conclusion of the said survey the ryots of these two estates were asked to deposit money for the said record-of-rights and settlement of rents;

(c) whether it is a fact that most of the villages in these two estates have deposited the necessary money;

(d) if so, what is the delay in effecting the necessary record-of-rights and the settlement of rents due to; and

(e) with reference to the recent representation of the ryots' association of these estates to the Commissioner of Land Revenue, what steps have been taken to expedite settlement operations and when the said operations are likely to commence?

A.—(a) A survey of the Kallikota-Atagada estates was ordered in 1912. The Government did not give any promise that a record-of-rights and settlement of rents would be effected on the conclusion of the survey.

(b), (c), (d) & (e) The Government have no information, but will call for a report.

APPENDIX.

[Vide answer to question No. 1392 asked by Mr. A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 27th March 1922, page 3583 supra.]

G.O. No. 1630, P.H., dated 2nd December 1921.

Read—the following papers:—

Memorandum No. 2223-1, Medical, dated 12th July 1920.

File of replies to Memorandum No. 2223-1, Medical, dated 12th July 1920.

Order—No. 1630, P.H., dated 2nd December 1921.

The Government approve the action of the Madura District Board in having raised the fixed travelling allowance of vaccinators employed under local boards from Rs. 10 to Rs. 15 a month and recommend the higher rate to other local boards for adoption. The Government would also advise all local boards to consider whether it would not be desirable in the interests of efficiency to pay them according to the rates given in the Civil Service Regulations.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Local Self-Government)

B. RAMA RAO,
Under Secretary to Government in charge.

To Presidents of all District Boards, except Malabar.
„ Presidents of all Taluk Boards (through Presidents of District Boards).
„ the Surgeon-General.
„ the Sanitary Commissioner.
„ the Accountant-General.
„ the Examiner of Local Fund Accounts.
Copy to the President of the Malabar District Board.

27th March 1922]

II

ACT ASSENTED TO BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“I have to inform the House that the Bill to amend the Madras City Municipal Act, 1919, which was passed at the meeting held on the 14th March 1922, received the assent of His Excellency the Governor on the 24th March 1922.”

III

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“I have to inform the House that as a result of the ballot held on Saturday, the 25th March 1922, for the election of seven members of the Public Accounts Committee, the following members have been duly elected:—

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.
Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu.
Mr. P. T. Rajan.
Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu.

Mr. Saiyid Muhammad Padsha Sahib.
Mr. S. Arpudawami Udaiyar.
Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.”

IV

FINANCE COMMITTEE.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“With reference to the Finance Committee, the nominations to which were received on Saturday, I have to inform the House that up to 6 p.m. on that day 19 hon. Members had been duly nominated. The election of six members out of these 19 to serve on the Finance Committee for next year will be held at 1-30 p.m. to-day in the Council Chamber, the Secretary being the returning officer as usual.”

V

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

DEMAND XXIX.—PENSIONS.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding 42.93 lakhs under Demand XXIX—Pensions. This is a demand, Sir, with respect to which no amendments have been received, and I think you, Sir, like the presiding Judge at a Sessions when there are no criminals, are entitled to the presentation of a pair of white gloves.”

The demand was put to the House and carried, and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXX—STATIONERY AND PRINTING (RESERVED).

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding 26.12 lakhs for Stationery (for reserved departments) and Printing.”

Motion 752.

The following motion was not made:—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—

752. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 8,60,000, for expenditure in England, by Rs. 100.

Motion 753.

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU:—“Sir, I beg to move—

753. To omit the allotment of Rs. 8,60,000 for expenditure in England.

[Mr. A. Subbarayudu]

[27th March 1922]

"This amount is shown in the budget for purchase of stationery and also for replacing the stores in the press. The revised estimate for 1921-22 was 23 lakhs and odd, while in the present budget a provision of 28 lakhs and odd is made. That shows an additional amount of five lakhs of rupees. Now, Sir, the price of paper at present is 50 per cent less than what it was in the past, and as such it is difficult to understand how the additional sum of five lakhs of rupees is going to be spent. The present market price of paper is £20 to £40 according to varieties, while the price last year was £100 to £150 per ton. From the report of the hon. the Finance Member, I see that economy is being effected in all directions, and also a special director of office systems has been appointed for finding out economies. In these circumstances also, the provision ought to have been much less. I understand that recently a committee has been appointed for finding out the stationery expenditure, and I also learn that forms are abundantly printed which will be available for another ten years. As such, there must naturally be some reduction for the coming year. Besides, hon. Members are aware that the Imperial budget for the year 1921-22 amounted to 98 lakhs of rupees, while they have this year reduced it to 67 lakhs. That shows a 30 per cent reduction, while our expenditure is 22½ per cent more. This amount of eight lakhs is provided for the purchase of stationery in England; and I

do not see necessity of purchasing stationery in England while you have provided in the budget Rs. 11,50,000 for the purchase of stationery from the central stores. The purchase made during the current year from the central stores is Rs. 14,73,000 whereas your estimate for this year is Rs. 11,50,000. A reduction of Rs. 3,20,000 is naturally due to the reduction in the price of paper and not in the quantity. So, where is the necessity for you to estimate another eight lakhs of rupees for purchase in England. If you want to purchase for eight lakhs from England then, naturally, you must deduct that amount from the purchase in the central stores. You have not done so. While the expenditure for the last two years was ranging to 23 lakhs, this year you are charging 23 lakhs. Naturally the prices are cheaper now. More economy is being observed. But if the amount goes higher than the previous year it is inexplicable, unless it be that you are going to make some purchases for the coming years also. I also see that you are spending Rs. 50,000 as a separate item from the ordinary head of contingencies, viz., Rs. 8,000 for charcoal, Rs. 4,000 for miscellaneous and Rs. 30,000 for contingencies, and indents for stores Rs. 15,776. You have already budgeted for these items, and where is the necessity for another allotment of Rs. 57,000 for the purchase of press materials. It is very regrettable that whereas a number of paper mills here are supplying to the merchants in India, the Government of India is not able to make the purchases from the paper mills in India. I am doubtful whether the paper got from England is cheaper than the paper of the Indian mills. No doubt the Indian paper mills are able to supply only a cheaper variety. But those varieties will certainly beat down the imported goods in the matter of cost. I therefore see that is no there necessity for your extra expenditure of Rs. 8,60,000 from the central stores. I, therefore, make this motion."

Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"The hon. Member who made this motion has requested an explanation of the apparent large increase in the proposed expenditure on stationery in the coming year. I have attempted to explain the situation in the budget memorandum. I admit that the figures are not

[27th March 1922]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

in themselves very clear or explicit, but I followed the old custom under which this expenditure is exhibited. But I hope that from next year we shall be able to effect some improvements in the manner in which these statements are presented by making a clean separation between 'stationery' and 'printing' which, I think, will help to make matters clearer to the members of the Council.

"The real explanation of this apparent increase is that it is due to a new arrangement in connexion with the stationery stores in Madras. As has been explained in the memorandum, hitherto these stores known as the 'central stores' were financed entirely by the Government of India and our position was this: that all articles indented for on behalf of the stores were paid for in the first instance by the Government of India and we merely paid them for what we actually consumed by an annual adjustment. Then the question of future arrangements arose in connexion with the reforms and after considerable correspondence on the subject the Government of India in October last informed us that they had decided to abolish the present central stores and that we must in future finance our own stationery. They did not, of course, propose to remove their property from the stores to Madras as that would have been an absurd and wasteful arrangement. But they said 'you shall take over the contents of the existing stores at the close of the year 1921-22 and shall repay us for the value of the stores on hand at that date by annual instalments of five lakhs.' They also requested us to agree in future to supply certain imperial officers whom it would be difficult for them to supply from Calcutta and to agree that they should be allowed to continue to draw from the stores which will now be our stores on payment of the cost of articles drawn therefrom plus a certain charge for our services in running the stores. Thus what we have now to do is not only to pay for all future purchases of stores but also to repay the Government of India for the balance of stores in stock. In fact our position is like that of a merchant who has been carrying on a business on a standing overdraft with his bankers who is suddenly told that he will no longer be allowed an overdraft and that he will have to repay his overdraft in annual instalments. We are in exactly the same position. The apparent excess of 4.84 lakhs over the expenditure of 1921-22 is accounted for by the fact that we are now not only making our annual purchases but that until we have paid the Government of India for the stocks in store we shall have an increased expenditure on that count until we have wholly repaid it. Under the agreement that extra payment amounts in the coming year to 5 lakhs. Now, as regards our reserve stock which was maintained by the Government of India, we have hitherto had no anxiety. We paid in cash for what we bought and reasonable requests for additional stocks were met without any question. The rule regarding the reserve was that in respect of articles procured from Europe we should have a year's stock in reserve and in the case of country articles that we should maintain a six months' stock in reserve. A reserve of that kind is obviously very essential when you are dealing with stores to the value of 20 or more lakhs because unless you have a sufficient reserve, especially at the present time, you are going to be entirely at the mercy of the market, and as a matter of fact during the last two or three years we have several times been caught at a disadvantage owing to our having to purchase our supplies in a hurry and thereby being at the mercy of those from whom we purchased them. It may be useful to the Council if I state the position with regard to our stores. The figures given on page 71 of the memorandum

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

[27th March 1922]

will show you that in 1920-21 our actual expenditure on stationery amounted to 15.72 lakhs. That of course was considerably in excess of what we had hitherto been accustomed to. The House is aware that there was a very large expenditure in connexion with the introduction of the reforms and with the elections which were necessary to set them going. For 1921-22 in spite of the warning of the previous year we reduced our budget estimate to 10.26 lakhs, but this optimistic anticipation has been entirely falsified. You will see from the same memorandum that the revised estimate for the current year at a time when the budget was prepared several months ago was 14.73 lakhs. We have received later information since then and the estimated expenditure during the current year is 16.19 lakhs or an increase of about Rs. 40,000 over the actual expenditure for the previous year.

11-30 a.m. "This excess expenditure means of course a further reduction in the balance of stock in hand. The actual estimate of consumption of the Stationery Department for 1922-23 when the original budget was put in was 14½ lakhs; but in its enthusiasm for economy the Finance Department cut it down to the figure which the hon. Member has referred to, viz., 11½ lakhs. If we can get down to that extent the Finance Department will be extremely pleased. But I am afraid we shall go far beyond that amount next year. The most we can possibly hope for is to reduce the expenditure to 15 lakhs. Now you see from the figures that the provision we have made for expenditure in the coming year is 16 lakhs, including 8 lakhs in India and 8 lakhs in England. With a balance of 7 lakhs you will have a total supply of 23 lakhs worth of paper and stationery. Now if we were to maintain the old rule—the salutary rule—laid down by the Government of India that, to avoid placing ourselves at the mercy of the market, we should have a reserve stock of one year's supply of articles procured from England and a six months' reserve of articles supplied here, we ought to have a reserve of 11 lakhs; whereas our actual figure will only give us a reserve of 8 lakhs, that is to say, 3 lakhs less than the figure which the Government of India insists upon as a measure. I think it would be inadvisable to run any risk especially in the present fluctuating condition of the paper market by placing ourselves to a larger extent at the mercy of the producers. We have not thought it possible therefore to reduce the reserve which we ought to have to a greater extent than 3 lakhs.

"As regards expenditure in England, I may say that it is at present merely a nominal figure. We have not yet committed ourselves to the actual expenditure in England except for certain articles which are immediately required and which we knew were either obtainable only in England or under existing circumstances could be supplied thence at a lower price. At present we have not committed ourselves in view of the existing circumstances to actual purchase either in India or in England and although the entry of 8 lakhs was based on our information that certain articles and increased production than they could be supplied from the mills here, we have not committed ourselves to that course. What we propose to do is to instruct the Superintendent of Stationery to watch the market carefully, so that he may gain the advantage of any change in prices either in India or in England. I trust, therefore, that with this assurance the House will accept the estimate. I hope I have explained to the hon. Member the increase of 5 lakhs to which he referred.

[27th March 1922]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

"I propose now while dealing with the general question of stationery expenditure, to explain why the estimate covers two demands, one demand which will be moved under the reserved head and the other which will be moved under the transferred head. That is simply an attempt to show against the reserved and transferred subjects their proportionate share of expenditure. Naturally the expenditure is much larger at present under the reserved departments; because they include more stationery consuming departments such as the 'land revenue' and 'administration of justice.' But in case of any misapprehension I may state that that apportioning of expenditure between the reserved and transferred departments is purely formal. I will ask the House not to suppose that the expenditure which is required on transferred subjects will be refused. The hon. Member himself has explained that it is really a joint-stock and each department has its actual requirements to meet as they arise.

"As regards future expenditure, it is very difficult to hold out any hope that it will be possible to reduce it. We do hope to be able to check the increase in expenditure. But we have to meet so many new demands on our stationery. Take for example a department which was referred to the other day, the Department of Agriculture. There was a demand from several parts of the House that the Agricultural Department should do much more to disseminate knowledge among the people. The only way in which we can do this is by the circulation of pamphlets and notes on a large scale; and I am sure the House would greatly regret if any reduction of expenditure under this head and a consequent reduction in the dissemination of knowledge of that kind were made. I may say that no object can be gained by under-estimating our possible expenditure under stationery. If we do under-estimate it and have to go to the House for supplementary grants, it merely means, as I have already pointed out, that we shall have to go to the Government of India and we may have great difficulty in getting the Government of India to meet our needs full. On consideration of the whole subject, the Finance Department and the Government have come to the conclusion that this is an essential demand and I hope that the House will accept it."

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU:—"I am not at all convinced by the arguments of the Finance Secretary. It will be a simple rule of three for the hon. Members to find out the solution. The consumption is less; the prices are less; but the expenditure is more. I understand that the hon. the Finance Secretary tells us that he is purchasing this 8 lakhs worth of paper from the central reserve. I want to know in simple words how he explains the extra quantity or the extra amount."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"May I reply, Sir? I shall be very glad to give the hon. Member the explanation in a few simple sentences. I fully recognize that the account is extremely difficult to understand for reasons which Mr. Moir has explained. He has explained the figures in detail. Now let me try to explain the entries, as the hon. Member says, in a few words—in simple sentences.

"In the first place we have got to maintain a reserve of stationery. We never had a reserve before. We have now got to pay for a reserve. That is new expenditure for this year and expenditure resulting from the reforms.

"In the second place, when we issue stationery from the store we show a debit in the accounts of the amount that was paid for it when we purchased

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[27th March 1922]

it. If we issue stationery to-day, we do not pay the price of to-day, but we pay the price which existed, say, four years ago, when paper was very dear. These are the two main items which account for the increase.

"There remains the question that we do not buy in India. The answer to that is that at the time when we wanted to purchase, the prices in India were much higher than the prices in England.

"Lastly, as regards the quantity, we have made many economies, but we have to set against them items in connexion with which there has been an increase in the expenditure, for instance, expenditure for purposes of this Council. But again the increase shown in the books is not really an increase in the quantity but an increase in prices. The price of paper has increased enormously and for the same sum of money we get much less paper than we did in the days before the war.

"This is then the explanation in a few words: institution of a reserve; increase in prices; and the fact that we show our expenditure for the year at the price at which the paper was bought."

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—"Now I find that the Government is purchasing the stores of the Central Government at a higher rate. What is the necessity for the Madras Government to purchase the stores of the Central Government purchased long ago at higher prices?"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"The Madras Government is subordinate to the Government of India and the Government of India have issued instructions to us to pay and we have to obey."

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—"Why should not other Provincial Governments do so?"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"The arrangement is not one peculiar to the Madras Government but is one that extends to all Governments that have stationery stores."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 754.

11-45 a.m. Mr. A. T. PALMER :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

754. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 26.12 lakhs for stationery by 5 lakhs.*

"Sir, I have tabled this motion with two objects in view. One of them is to reduce the expenditure on stationery. The Government have been trying its level best, as it says, to reduce the cost of stationery. It has been using the same envelopes over and over again in despatching letters and it is trying to effect retrenchment in stationery and in other ways. But it seems to me there is still much waste of stationery in the Government departments. There is unnecessary record of statistics that swell its reports. I am specially referring to the hydro-electric survey reports for example. It is a very beautifully bound book with a beautiful map of India and with so many plates, but the work done is incommensurate with the report circulated."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, the report of the hydro-electric surveys is a Government of India publication and the cost of printing it is borne by the Government of India. We have nothing to do with it."

[27th March 1922]

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—"I said that as one of the samples of reports. I think it can very well be reduced in size and statistics. I also find our very Legislative Council not to be setting a very good example in the matter of stationery. We sometimes receive the same thing over and over again, first typed and then printed and so on. I think we can keep in mind the Scottish proverb: 'many a mickle makes a muckle' in the matter of stationery. We are tempted to waste stationery as if they are worth nothing. Their accumulated cost seems to be very heavy.

"My other idea in tabling this resolution is a little carefulness in stationery will result in less red tape. As one of the hon. Members remarked, if this Government ever sinks at all, it will be sinking in its load of papers and records and stationery and red tapism. As I said before, for quick despatch of work there must be less of stationery. I have often seen clerks sitting in the same room, if they want to consult one another, they pass paper from one to the other and then accumulate the file. What can be easily done by verbal exchange of thought is done on paper with the result that paper is much wasted and also much time is wasted."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"Mr. President, it has been rather difficult to hear the hon. Member from this side of the House, but I think the main gist of his statement is there are still items in which considerable economies can be effected in the use of stationery. Now I have no doubt that there are still such items and we have not yet got to the end of our search for economies. May I assure the hon. Member that, during the past year, there has been discussion on these matters again and again. If he wishes I could give him, though not now, a complete statement of all the ways, large and small, in which we have attempted to enforce economy. I can assure the hon. Member that investigations and further measures of economy will be continued during the coming year. But after all there is a limit to which you can effect economies in such ways and I do not anticipate that we should be able to effect such further economies by such measures as would in any way justify our consenting to a reduction in the present estimate. I may say that the expenditure on stationery in this Presidency, if you consider that it covers the administration of a population well over 40 millions, would not to a western eye seem a very heavy item. As an instance of our economical ways I might possibly cite the papers which are put before this very Council. No one can say that it is an expensive paper. There are probably few legislative councils in the world in which their proceedings and the matter placed before them are put up in such cheap form. If we went in for still cheaper paper we should soon arrive at a paper on which you could not write or print on more than one side. I can assure the hon. Member that the question of further economies has not been lost sight of and we shall attempt to effect further savings by every possible means."

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—"We should effect economy not only in the matter of quality but also in the matter of quantity. I have no idea of pressing this resolution. If the Government is a little more careful, they can effect greater economies."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Before the resolution is withdrawn, I should like with your permission, Sir, to indicate one direction in which economy is possible. It is a direction which concerns this Council. I have been at pains to total up the questions and resolutions since the reformed

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[27th March 1922]

Council came into being in January last year. I find that the questions answered during that period number 1,949, that there were 421 resolutions on matters of general public interest and that budget motions to the number of 1,474 have been tabled. Further the proceedings of the Council, which are put in our hands in those admirable booklets by the Secretary aggregate to 4,164 pages up to the 4th March 1922. I have no doubt that a total of 5,000 pages will be easily exceeded before the proceedings of the last three weeks have been put in print. I mention these figures because hon. Members do not quite realize what a terrible volume of work the reformed Council has brought about. Every one of these pages, it would probably be no exaggeration to say, means many other pages in the lower stages of the official hierarchy. The preparation of answers to these questions and also to the questions which are sent in but do not reach the stage of being answered, the preparation of replies to resolutions, whether they are moved or not moved, has cast a very heavy burden on the administrative machinery. During the past three weeks it has been a matter of extreme physical and mental strain to keep anything like pace with the current duties."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 755 to 757.

The following motions were not made :—

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

755. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 26.12 lakhs by Rs. 100.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

756. *To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 26.12 lakhs by Rs. 100.*

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—

757. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 26.12 lakhs for stationery by Rs. 5 lakhs.*

Demand XXX—Stationery (for reserved departments) and Printing for Rs. 26.12 lakhs was put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XXXI—STATIONERY AND PRINTING (TRANSFERRED).

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, I beg to move that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 2.07 lakhs under Demand XXXI—Stationery (for transferred departments)."

Motions 758 to 760.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

758. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2.07 lakhs for stationery and printing by Rs. 100.*

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

759. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2.07 lakhs for stationery and printing by Rs. 100.*

27th March 1922]

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

760. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2.07 lakhs for stationery and printing by Rs. 100.*

Demand XXXI—Stationery (for reserved departments) for Rs. 2.07 lakhs was put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XXXII—RESERVE WITH THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I beg to move that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 6.00 lakhs under Demand XXXII—Reserve with the Finance Department."

Motions 761 to 765.

The following motions were not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

761. *To reduce the allotment of 6 lakhs for the reserve provision at the disposal of the Government by 5 lakhs.*

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

762. *To reduce the allotment of 6 lakhs for the reserve provision at the disposal of the Government by 5 lakhs.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

763. *To reduce the allotment of 6 lakhs for the reserve provision at the disposal of the Government by 5 lakhs.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

764. *To reduce the allotment of 6 lakhs for the reserve provision at the disposal of the Government by 5 lakhs.*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

765. *To reduce the allotment of 6 lakhs for the reserve provision at the disposal of the Government by 5 lakhs.*

Motion 766.

Mr. O. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

766. *To reduce the allotment of 6 lakhs for the reserve provision at the disposal of the Government by 5 lakhs.*

"Sir, I want to know whether it is necessary to have such a large reserve in the financial budget itself. We have been told that this amount is kept for emergency purposes. However, such a large reserve seems to be open to objection. The House would see that whenever the Government want to spend more money they come to us for the necessary sanction. Whereas if they have such a large reserve, they would be spending it to the last pie and come to us only after the whole amount is spent. In any case I want to have some more light thrown upon the matter by the hon. the Finance Member."

[27th March 1922]

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Sir, while I quite agree that this demand for a grant requires some explanation, I think I shall be able to satisfy the hon. Member that under the peculiar circumstances of the present year it is a necessary demand. The circumstances of the country this year are altogether peculiar. The Council have made large reductions in the budget amounting to something like eleven lakhs up to date, and in several instances, after attempting in vain to make specific reductions, they have made drastic cuts out of total allotments. Hon. Members in preparing these cuts have stated that, if the Government find any difficulty in the course of the year, they can apply to the House for supplementary grants, and the House will help them out of their difficulties. I would deprecate such a method of finance in any year, but in the present year would point out that it would be a practically impossible arrangement. In an ordinary year we should have balances to draw upon and normal revenues exceeding our expenditure, and if anything unforeseen happened we should be able to meet it out of our own funds subject to the Council voting the money. In the current year our revenue is not equal to our expenditure, and we have to borrow. In these circumstances it is extremely doubtful whether, even if the Government of India gives permission for an overdraft, we shall be in a position to meet any unexpected situation. The Council has asked us to put up a further demand of 22 lakhs for village officers, which will make up our deficit to 50 lakhs. What their action on the budget involves is this. If we find ourselves in difficulties owing to the drastic cuts, we shall have to come forward from time to time throughout the year with continuous requests for supplementary grants. If we have nothing in the budget to meet the supplementary grants we shall have to go to the Government of India to give us small additional loans. Now I venture to think that that would place us and the Government of India in a position of very great embarrassment. If the Council made these cuts with the prospect of our having to ask for supplementary grants, then it should make some provision out of which these supplementary grants could be given. If this position is granted, the question arises when the provision so made is to find place in the budget. We cannot draw the money in advance and call it balance, and the only other head it is possible to put it under is reserve.

“ My hon. Friend seems to be under the impression that this reserve of six lakhs is so much pocket money which the Finance Department can use as it likes. I hope that he will disabuse his mind of that idea. The Finance Department has no such power. It can only transfer funds within a grant and he will see that there are no other items in this grant to which this money could be transferred. We hope to secure from the Government of India permission to draw up to six lakhs if urgent necessities make it imperative to move for supplementary grants in the course of the year. But we shall certainly not think of doing so without the sanction of the Council when that is required before we incur expenditure on any item. As to the question whether we are likely to have to come to the Council for supplementary grants, I would ask the Council to look into the list of supplementary grants asked for for 1921-22. I would ask them to consider how it would have been impossible to anticipate in this year such things as the rebellion in Malabar or the troubles in Guntur. I hope we shall not have to meet any such thing this year; but we must anticipate some possibilities. If I may mention one or two, there is the danger of an epidemic in any of our over-crowded jails, which would involve expenditure

27th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

in moving a large number of prisoners, the possibility of shortage of grains in the devastated areas in Malabar which we may have to meet at least by purchase and resale. There are other measures which we may have to take for the relief of sufferers in the rebellion or for the control of persons that have taken part in it. I think these circumstances will be enough to satisfy the Council of the necessity to make such a provision which could be drawn upon in the absence of a favourable balance. My real fear is that the provision for a reserve in the current budget is far too small to meet the demands that are certain to raise. Even if the Council passes this six lakhs we are likely to have to come to them for a further amount.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ I do not know whether to accept the explanation as satisfactory or not. The hon. the Finance Member has told us that this provision has been made in view of the special circumstances of the year. One of the special circumstances seems to have been his prophetic vision of the cuts that this Council would make in the grants asked for. It makes me wonder whether the possibility of these reductions was taken into consideration when these figures —.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ May I say that when I spoke on the special circumstances of the year, what I had in mind was the absence of any balances from which we could draw.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ I quite accept the assurance. I am also convinced of the special circumstances that he drew our attention to. I only hope, as he mentioned the cuts made by this House, that that idea will not be allowed to influence the budgets of the future. I agree that in the absence of a favourable balance we should have some reserve with the Finance Department. My only fear was that the reserve would be something like a pocket money to the Government. As the hon. the Finance Member has given us the assurance that before incurring additional expenditure he will come to this House for sanction, I beg leave to withdraw my motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 767 to 769.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

767. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,00,000 for reserve provision at the disposal of the Government by Rs. 5,00,000.

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—

768. To omit the allotment of 6 lakhs for reserve provision at the disposal of the Government.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

769. To reduce the allotment of Re. 6,04,000 for miscellaneous and unforeseen charges by Rs. 5,04,000.

Demand XXXII for 6 lakhs for Reserve with the Finance Department was then put to the vote and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXXIII—AGENCY.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ Sir, in rising to move the demand of 29.37 lakhs for Agency, I wish merely to say that the provision made this year is, so to speak, starvation provision.”

[27th March 1922]

Motions 770 to 772.

The following motions were not made :—

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasaya :—

770. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,415 for salaries by Rs. 100.

Dr. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU :—

771. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,415 for salaries by Rupees 50,000.

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—

772. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,42,071 for General Administration (Agency) by Rs. 100.

Motion 773.

Dr. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU :—“I beg to make the following motion :—

773. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,42,071 for General Administration (Agency) by Rs. 100.

“Sir, having had experience of Agency life and service, I can lay claim to speak a few words on the formation of the new Agency district. The budget provision under this head for 1922-23 is 29.37 lakhs, while it was only 5 and odd lakhs last year. The Agency tracts of the three districts of Ganjam, Vizagapatam and Godavari cover an area of 20,000 miles of which nearly two-thirds belong to the Raja of Jeypore and other zamindars; the rest belongs to the Government. Now the Government propose to open up these 20,000 square miles which will profit largely the Jeypore estate whose income after this exploitation, will increase by leaps and bounds. He pays only a few thousand rupees as *peshkash* for this extensive piece of land. The Government says: ‘it might reasonably be expected that the Raja of Jeypore and other owners of the zamindari properties would agree to give their fair share of burden as they would get a large share of the benefit.’ When the Government intends spending 2.50 crores in five years on this exploitation, I am sure the House wishes to know how much these Rajas will pay either annually or in lump sum, or whether any arrangements to that effect have been arrived at. Before the Government settle this part of the business, I am not for spending such large sums in these private and zamindari lands except as far as they may be necessary for political reasons. As for spending any reasonable amounts in the Government Agency they may do so.

“The expenditure on the Agency establishment has increased with no appreciable advantage to the public. Formerly the Agency tracts in each of the districts of Ganjam, Vizagapatam and Godavari were under the Collectors’ charge, with a handful of officials and there was nothing found defective in the system of administration. The population consists mostly of primitive people, and do not require elaborate machinery of judicial and police establishment. Those tracts were hitherto handled by three divisional officers, and a handful of sub-magistrates and police force. Now the establishment has increased considerably. For instance, there are 1 commissioner, 6 assistant and deputy commissioners, 1 deputy collector, 1 district and sessions judge, 22 tahsildars, deputy tahsildars, 1 district superintendent of police, 3 assistant superintendents, 4 deputy superintendents and 23 inspectors with the necessary increased ministerial establishment, involving a heavy expenditure.

[27th March 1922] [Mr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu]

I wish to say that, as the people are primitive, no intricate legal question will arise, nor will there be among them any serious crimes. There will be reason when the country is well opened and the people get civilized to have the above establishment. The expenditure on these establishments may be well utilized on communications, etc.

“My next suggestion is that the posts of assistant and deputy commissioner may be reduced to 3, and that they may all be provincial service officers. The jurisdiction may be retained, and a selection may be made from the senior grade of the district munsifs or the junior grade of sub-judges with sessions powers. It is said that an officer who will go to the villages of hill tribes is necessary. Even in such a case, an experienced Indian will serve the need. A two thousand rupees officer is not the only person who can dispense justice to the hill tribes, the population being 12 to 15 a square mile. When there are serious cases to be tried, there is no reason why a senior grade civilian assistant commissioner should not be able, to cope with the sessions work, and why a portion of these sessions cases from a stated area should not be given to the commissioner, if a sub-judge cannot be given these powers. The Agency division is still young and there is no reason why the commissioner should not be able to spare some time for the purpose.

“One thing more, Sir. The sanction of the Secretary of State for India for the constitution of the separate Agency division must have been got at least in October 1920. All the Agency was under the management of the Collectors of the three districts. The Agency portion of the three districts is as large as, if not more than, the plain portions of these districts. We have 5 civilian officers and 2 provincial officers in the cadre, when the same work was done by the 3 Collectors or a few sub-collectors. Does it not stand to reason, that the three district charges, should be readjusted and the number of Collectors reduced? Why was no anxiety shown to effect this retrenchment, while so much haste was exhibited in adding to the cadre? I submit, Sir, that the whole scheme requires looking into. If this is done, I have no doubt that the saving proposed can be effected.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“I cannot say that the hon. Member has indicated any real possibility of saving. He did not give me any notice of the lines on which he was going to traverse the Agency administration and, it is rather difficult to make a note of a succession of individual criticisms, not one of which is new, and to answer them in detail in the time allotted. I must therefore take only one or two points. In the first place, the hon. Member has contrasted the total allotment of 29.37 lakhs with the figure of five and odd lakhs of last year. He is evidently under the impression, and desires the Council to share that impression, that the expenditure on the Agency has been multiplied something like six-fold in the past year. I can assure him that there has been nothing of the sort. The trouble lies in the fact that the arrangement of the budget heads this year of entering together, for the convenience of this House, all the items relating to Agency is radically different from the arrangement of last year. When the case of the Agency expenditure was put before the Cabinet by the Finance Secretary, that provision for establishment was brought prominently forward and he furnished us then with a statement of additional items of staff. As to the need for the staff which administers the Agency, a variety of information, at one time or another, has

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[27th March 1922]

been supplied to the House in printed papers and, I am afraid, I cannot, in the time at my disposal, traverse that issue again in detail. I notice with great regret that the mover went out of his way to attack the Raja of Jeypore and zamindars generally in the Agency tracts, as if all those exploitations, or developments as I would prefer to say, which, we contemplate, are mainly in the interests of the large zamindars. I must repudiate that point of view altogether. The Government of the province is not concerned with the personal interests of individual zamindars, but it has very much at heart the well-being of the ryots who live in zamindari areas, and it is the ryots who live in those areas who will be more benefited in the long run than the zamindars themselves. That is the main answer to criticisms of the zamindars in general. I regret that our colleague, the Raja of Jeypore, is not here to-day, for I have no doubt he would have answered the criticism directed against him personally.

"There has been a further criticism regarding the employment of a district and sessions judge. With that I will not deal, Sir, not merely because it is non-votable but also because I dealt with it in the general discussion of the budget and pointed out then how the employment of such an officer was in the interests of what Mr. Palmer called the 'naked and poor Koyas'.

"Before I sit down, I will merely add that the budget was carefully discussed with the Agency Advisory Committee and I can confidently say that except in regard to the item of the district and sessions judge, I carried them entirely with me. If I was able to satisfy the Advisory Committee in regard to points of detail, I think the House may take it that the budget generally is fair and not extravagant."

Dr. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU :—"I beg to withdraw the motion."
The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 774 to 777.

The following motions were not made :—

Sriman SASI BRUSHANA RATH Mahasaya :—

774. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 13,000 for law officers by Rupees 8,000.

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

775. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 29.37 lakhs by Rs. 100.

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

776. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 29.37 lakhs by Rs. 100.

Mr. N. A. V. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI :—

777. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 29.37 lakhs by 1 lakh.

The demand for Rs. 29.37 lakhs—Agency was then put to the House and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXXIV—REPAYMENT OF LOAN TO CENTRAL GOVERNMENT.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 16.28 lakhs for repayment of loan to Central Government."
The motion was carried and the grant was made.

[27th March 1922]

DEMAND XXXV—LOANS AND ADVANCES BY THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 97.83 lakhs for Loans and Advances by the Provincial Government."

Motion 778.

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—

778. To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,00,000 for Rameswaram canal scheme.

"Sir, before I make this motion, I should like the Government to give us an opportunity of discussing the scheme as to its suitability or otherwise at the present juncture. Now, we are glad that we are not under a moral obligation to vote this grant. I do not see the advisability of embarking on such a scheme during a year of financial stringency. To a certain question put by Mr. Ramachandra Rao, the Government was pleased to reply that this item was intended for the purpose of employing the Mappilla prisoners who are now in jail. I would submit that it is not proper that these persons should be lodged in jails at Rameswaram, which is considered to be a sacred place by the Hindus. Just as Mecca is to Muhammadans so Rameswaram is to the Hindus. Rameswaram is a place to which millions of Hindu pilgrims resort every year, and if these Mappilla prisoners are taken there, there might be great trouble. As regards the scheme itself, I wish to point out that it would serve no useful purpose for steamers going through to Rangoon and Calcutta. This canal will not be useful unless there is a harbour. The Tuticorin harbour is far away, and a separate harbour at Rameswaram would cost about two crores of rupees. I ask whether we are in a position to pay that huge sum. Consequently, if there is any strategic value in the opening of this canal, I think it is the bounden duty of the Government of India to embark on such a scheme. With these words I make my motion."

Mr. R. APPASWAMI NAYUDU :—"Sir, I rise to support the motion. The Rameswaram canal scheme which has been put forward at this time is, in my opinion, not a sound one. No doubt the hon. the Finance Member had told us the other day that the canal scheme was an old one as old as the scheme for the Dhanushkodi crossing to Ceylon. But, Sir, that scheme has been dead and buried these so many years, and why it was resurrected only some months back in connexion with Tuticorin harbour scheme and why this scheme should be made an integral part of the harbour scheme is really inexplicable. Sir, for the past decade or so, the Tuticorin public have been agitating to have a deep water basin in their harbour so as to make the ocean-going vessels touch their port and to load and unload their cargo direct on land. In this scheme the engineering features were complete and it was ready cut and dry. At this stage, Sir, only some months ago, a committee with official preponderance was appointed by the Government to investigate the Tuticorin harbour development scheme. The committee dragged on its sittings to a considerable length of time and arrived at a definite conclusion by a majority of 10 to 5 that the Tuticorin harbour development scheme should be pushed through and the Rameswaram canal scheme should be abandoned. Though this committee has sent in its report long before, why

[Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu]

[27th March 1922]

this was not made public along with the Government orders thereon and why should there be so much of secrecy hanging over it really passes my comprehension. At any rate, Sir, the committee which has sat over it has given its verdict against it, the general public never wanted it, the trading companies at Tuticorin are dead against this proposal, and we the representatives of rate-payers in this Council are most unwilling to sanction a large sum to a scheme of doubtful utility, especially at this time of financial stringency. Has the Government ever consulted the steam navigation companies as to whether they would use this canal for purposes of navigation as well as trade? Sir, I doubt very much that these companies would ever use this canal to more than a moderate extent with so many risks to navigation attending it.

"Sir, this scheme was not yet fully investigated, the engineering features of which were not yet complete, and it is not yet known whether it will be a paying concern or a losing one; and to ask, Sir, at such a juncture, to contribute to such a scheme of a doubtful nature a large sum of the people's money to an extent of 12 lakhs, especially at a time when we are face to face with grave deficits and when our people are suffering from hunger and famine and while this sum of 12 lakhs can safely and profitably be utilized for our own irrigation purposes so as to be a source of immense benefit to our hunger-stricken population, is what I would call a most unsound statesmanship. Sir, if on the other hand, the Government propose to spend this sum on the Tuticorin harbour scheme which has been designed, examined and appreciated by the more competent men, then there would be at least some justification; for, I am sure, it would prove not only a remunerative business, but also the trade and commerce of that port would be placed in a state of high efficiency.

"Then again, Sir, a plea was put forward so as to appeal to the good nature of the general public by the hon. the Finance Member, to find suitable work for the thousands of Mappilla prisoners in a place where they could be adequately guarded. If Rameswaram could be found to be a suitable place for these Mappilla prisoners, I am certain that Tuticorin offers still more facilities for guarding the prisoners there. Then again, another plea was raised by the hon. the Finance Member that the scheme was an old one and it was not pushed through then owing to the objection raised by the Admiralty; but that it has since withdrawn its objection, the work may be pushed through. Well, Sir, I should like to know if ever the Admiralty wanted this to use as a naval basis or as a coastal defence. It never suggested itself to it, especially at a time when the International Conference demands for disarmament. Sir, these are all the reasons that strongly appeal to us to reject this grant of 12 lakhs."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Mr. President, I hope I may 12-30 p.m. crave your indulgence it, in order to make this matter as clear as I can in the briefest possible time, I read out a note which I prepared for a meeting of members a few days ago. But, I beg leave, before I begin to do so, to clear away any misapprehension that we are proposing to take 12 lakhs of the taxpayers' money and to make a final expenditure of that on this work which, as has been said, is mainly for the benefit of through traffic steamers. The proposition before the Government is this: a private

27th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

company is about to be formed to dig this canal and meanwhile we have sought everywhere for possibilities of employing the unskilled labour of thousands of Mappilla prisoners who otherwise would be a cause of enormous expenditure to the country. After examining irrigation schemes and every other scheme we can possibly think of, the best plan we were able to discover was to set them to work on this canal. That is the sole reason why this provision has been put into the budget in rather a hurry. The proposition is that, assuming that a company will be hereafter formed, we shall make over to them the work done and recover from them whatever we have spent on getting it done by employing the Mappilla prisoners on it.

"At the same time I should like to clear away a misapprehension that there has been some secrecy in this matter. We have been blamed for the delay in dealing with the Tuticorin Committee's report. The Tuticorin Committee's report is dated 24th January 1922 and I ask the Council to say whether the Government have had time since then to digest a report of this kind. We have been almost continuously busy on the budget since the end of January 1922. That is the sole reason and there is no secrecy about it. I venture to think that the Council have no reason to complain of delay in the matter when they consider the number of hours that we have spent in this House.

"The following, Sir, is the note which I asked your permission to read.

"I am glad to have the opportunity which this and connected resolutions give me of supplementing the brief statement which I was enabled to make the other day to this Council regarding the Rameswaram canal. As some members of the House are possibly aware, this is a very old project and although it cannot claim to rank in importance with such schemes as the Panama and Suez canals, its object is the same—to shorten the length of one of the world's main trade routes and to effect economies in time and consumption of fuel and thereby reduce transport charges. There is at present a narrow channel known as the Pamban pass which enables small coasting steamers and sailing vessels to pass from one sea to the other. This channel is however quite unsuited for conversion into a large ship canal. Earlier proposals led to a Parliamentary Committee being appointed in 1862 to report on a suitable site for a canal across the island of Rameswaram and the site which they selected and their proposals with others which followed them were under consideration from time to time up to 1884 when a company was actually formed for the construction of a canal but, owing to financial difficulties, no progress was made. In connexion with the proposed Dhanushkodi line the South Indian Railway Company carried out a survey in order to decide the final alignment for the canal and prepared an estimate amounting to Rs. 46 lakhs for the construction of the canal, the necessary swing bridge over it and the lighting and buoying of the approaches. The extension of the South Indian Railway which was part of that scheme has been carried out, but the canal project was not proceeded with owing to objections which were raised by the Admiralty. These objections have now been withdrawn and we understand that the Admiralty would now welcome its construction. The Madras Government have therefore had the question re-examined by the Harbour Engineer whose reports confirmed the view held by a series of experts who had examined the scheme in earlier years that the construction of such a canal is perfectly feasible. His provisional estimate is for a total expenditure of 60 lakhs to provide a canal to a depth of 30 feet and a bottom

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[27th March 1922]

width of 120 feet. The financial aspect of the scheme has also been examined by an *ad hoc* committee at Tuticorin and that committee estimates that there would be a gross revenue of say 7.59 lakhs which would provide for maintenance and establishment charges at 37 per cent and for a sinking fund and interest at 8 per cent on an expenditure of 60 lakhs. This estimate is probably a conservative one. The actual saving on the voyage from Cape Comorin to Calcutta would be 240 miles and to Rangoon 109 miles, to which must be added the great advantage of avoiding a stormy passage round the island of Ceylon during the monsoon season. The canal would also be of strategic value in times of war, and if it has been in existence it is possible that the career of the *Emden* would have been shorter and less successful. It is, however, with the commercial aspect of the case that we are at present concerned, and as the scale of dues on which the estimate of revenue is based would enable shipping making for Calcutta or Rangoon or returning therefrom to effect considerable economies both in time and running expenses, there is no reason to doubt that on such terms the canal would be generally used. If we accept the conclusion that the scheme is practicable and likely to be financially successful, the next question that arises is by what agency the canal should be constructed. An examination of this question showed that there were three possible alternatives :

Firstly, that the expenditure should be met entirely by the Government, that is to say, either by the Government of India or the Madras Government from loans raised for the purpose ;

secondly, that it should be constructed entirely by a company formed for the purpose ; and

thirdly, that it should be constructed by a company in which the Government should take shares.

" While the subject was under consideration we were approached by Admiral Sir Edmond Slade with the proposal that the canal should be constructed by a company which he was prepared to form, of which half the capital should be found by public subscription.

" As a result of personal discussions with Admiral Slade, the views of the Madras Government were communicated to the Government of India and I now wish to inform the Council as to the conditions on which the Madras Government would be prepared to assent to a company being formed for the purpose. They are that the proposed company should be domiciled and registered in India with a rupee capital and that its operations should, if necessary, be confined to the construction of a waterway, the question of the possible development of a harbour being determined by the actual course of events. The Government would have full control over the rates of canal dues to be levied, although it is obvious that these rates must necessarily be limited to an amount which would afford sufficient inducement to shipping to make use of the canal. The Government would have the option of purchasing the undertaking after a term of say 50 years, and also that of taking up to 51 per cent of the shares of the company. The land which was acquired by the South Indian Railway Company for the purpose would be made over to the company, its market value being credited to Government in the shape of shares in the company. The Government of India are themselves, owing to financial stringency, unable to take up shares ; but they have no objection to the Government of Madras doing so. It will be also open

27th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

to the Madras Government to reserve their option to take up a certain percentage of the capital for a period of years. There is thus every prospect that this scheme, for the resuscitation of which we are largely indebted to the initiative and interest of His Excellency the Governor will, ere long, become an accomplished fact to the lasting benefit of the commerce not only of the Madras Presidency but of the other provinces on the littoral of the Bay of Bengal.

" As I have already explained, the matter which lends immediate importance to the construction of this canal and which is responsible for this entry in the budget is this. As the House are aware, the large increase of our jail population owing to the Malabar disturbances is imposing a very heavy burden on the finances of the Presidency, and this is enhanced by the fact that it is very difficult to improvise in temporary jails means of employment for a very large body of prisoners. In this connexion, the Rameswaram canal suggests itself as the most promising scheme for getting over this serious difficulty and the Harbour Engineer and the sanitary authorities are at present busy working out plans for their employment on the excavation of the canal. We have ascertained that this scheme will be equally possible whether the canal is constructed by the agency of a company or directly by Government.

" I now turn to another issue which the construction of this canal will raise—an issue, I admit, of the very greatest importance. Parallel with the consideration of this scheme the Government have had under their consideration proposals for the improvement of the port of Tuticorin and it is obvious that the construction of a canal may considerably affect the future of that port. Opinions as to what this effect will be naturally vary considerably. It is clear that, with the construction of the canal, even if it is used primarily merely as a thoroughfare for ships on long distance voyages, there will be a tendency for a demand for certain facilities to grow up, these facilities being in the first place for such essentials as coal and potable water. It is also possible that, if Rameswaram proves a suitable spot for the landing and shipping of certain kinds of cargo, a demand for certain facilities for that purpose will also gradually arise. In the opinion of some, this must inevitably lead to the extinction of Tuticorin as an important port and they would even go so far as to demand that, on this ground, the construction of the canal should be prohibited and that attention should be devoted entirely to the construction of an up-to-date and fully equipped harbour at Tuticorin. Others, again, are of opinion that in any case the canal would be a necessary adjunct to Tuticorin in order to attract the volume of trade which alone could justify the large proposed scheme in connexion with it which has been under examination. In the opinion of the Madras Government it is impossible to say what the effect of the construction of the canal would be, but they have certainly no intention of attempting to force events or to control the future developments of trade by forming plans for the construction of a large port at Rameswaram. At the same time, they hold that it would be a narrow-minded and reactionary policy to obstruct the canal scheme simply because it may lead to developments which would be unfavourable to a particular port, or deliberately to sacrifice wider interests to purely local considerations. They are not unmindful of the fact that much capital has been sunk in the existing port of Tuticorin, but they cannot ignore the

[Sir Charles Todhunter] [27th March 1922]

equally important fact that, if the plans for the development of a modern harbour at Tuticorin were carried out, the greater part of this capital expenditure would necessarily be of little value. The present town and business quarter of Tuticorin lie at a distance of three or four miles from the only possible site for the new port. Even if it were possible for the Madras Government to raise the necessary capital for that scheme, they would not, as at present advised, feel justified in doing so merely to perpetuate, though with a shorter lead, the present primitive methods by which the cargo is shipped from or discharged into lighters; and an essential part of any such scheme would be the construction not merely of a harbour but of a new port and business quarter contiguous to it; and, so far as business interests are concerned, it would, in the long run, so far as Government can see, make little difference to them whether this new capital expenditure was laid out in the neighbourhood of the new Tuticorin harbour. That is, however, taking long views and it may be that these prognostications will prove false, and it is for this reason that the Government of Madras propose to concern themselves at present solely with the question of the canal. It may be that Tuticorin will retain its existing trade; it may be that its position on the canal route will enable it to extend its trade; it may be that circumstances may prove too powerful and that the existence of the canal will result in the development of a port also in its immediate neighbourhood. As it is, the Government of Madras propose to abstain from any attempt to coerce trade in the interest of any particular theory or locality. They intend to give it free play and let it discover its own requirements and, if possible, to provide for those requirements where and as they discover themselves.

"We are of opinion that the system of preferences is out of date, and, as I have stated, that large and beneficial enterprises should not be thwarted merely because they may run counter to minor interests. These are merely our tentative views. Much has to be done before any final agreement is arrived at. Neither the investigations nor the estimates are yet complete and what has led to the provision in the budget is first the fact that if the money is not provided for now it is likely that we shall have to wait another year to secure it, and secondly, the fact that after an examination of all possible projects for the employment of Mappilla prisoners, this is practically the only one which appears to the Government to combine the essentials of unskilled labour for a very large number of men which will ultimately be remunerative, necessary sanitary conditions and comparatively easy conditions for guarding. The actual sum provided for is the sum which has been set down by the Harbour Engineer to be spent in the course of the year 1922-23 and it will be seen that if the scheme for the entrusting of the canal to a company eventuates, it would not represent a final payment, but it would be recovered in cash or in shares from the company. At the same time, the Government do not propose to embark on any part of the expenditure until they have satisfied themselves as to the soundness of the scheme by every test they can apply, and if the Council would like to associate certain of the representatives of business interests thereon with the Government for the purpose of testing the scheme, the Government would welcome their advice. When I refer to the representatives of business interests on the Council, I have in mind the members for commerce and industry, namely, Sir James Simpson, Diwan Bahadur Govindoss Chaturbhujadoss, Mr. Alexander, Sir Muttayya Chetti and Mr. MacDougall, with whom we might perhaps

27th March 1922] [Sir Charles Todhunter]

associate, Diwan Bahadur Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu and Rao Bahadur Namberumal Chetti. We are quite prepared, if the Council so desires, to place all these papers before a committee of these gentlemen before proceeding to incur any expenditure on the scheme.

"I would only like to add one word with regard to the entirely new objection that has been raised, that is, that of interfering with the holy island of Rameswaram. I have said that the existing Pamhan pass is an artificial structure, and I am not aware of any objection having been raised to that cut being made. Nor do I understand that any such objection has been raised during the half century that this matter has been under consideration. The land has actually been acquired and the inhabitants of this island did not object on the ground that the land was sacred at any stage of the acquisition proceedings. Lastly, as regards the danger of the Mappillas interfering with the inhabitants of the island, of course it is a part of the scheme to fence them off in a separate place, and the advantage afforded by the fact that Rameswaram is an island and that it is possible to use the sea on one side to prevent them from escaping."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"Mr. President, I carefully heard the written eloquence of the hon. the Finance Member. I may first mention to him that I am not one of those gentlemen that were invited to hear the views of the Government on this matter, and I do not know the reason why such invitation was not extended to me."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"May, I say, Sir, that the sole reason was that I did not expect a gentleman from the north of the Presidency, to take an interest in this matter. The invitation was sent to the members who had given notice of motions and to others who come from places near Rameswaram."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"I only want to make a request to him, whenever he entertains members for private conversations, he may extend the invitation to other members also."

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI:—"May I say, Sir, that those who gave notices of motions on this question were asked to meet the hon. the Finance Member, so that we might understand the matter and decide whether to press the motions or not?"

Rao Bahadur V. APPASWAMI VANDAYAR:—"Not only that, Mr. President, but the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter was kind enough to extend the invitation not only to the members who had given notices of motions, but also to others. I have not given notice of any motion, but I went there."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"All right, Sir; I do not think there is any great importance in it. On the merits, I am not convinced of the necessity of now voting for this amount. From the Finance Member's own speech it is clear that it is not a well-matured scheme and that there are many points that have yet to be settled. I am afraid that the Government have not a clear mind of their own on the whole scheme. They have not stated whether they would hand it over to a company or whether they would take shares in it. In this connexion, I want to bring to the notice of this House the treatment that was accorded by the Finance Department to the industrial concerns of the Presidency. The other day, the hon. the Minister for Development said that he was not able to finance or take any shares in the

[Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju] [27th March 1922]

paper mills concern at Rajahmundry, because the law does not allow him to do it and he wanted to amend the law. I think that where the Government have got a will they have got a way of devising some method. The present scheme under discussion is a method which the Finance Member devised and he may have suggested the same to the Minister for Development and it would have pleased this House very much. In the same budget, if one sort of treatment is to be accorded to one branch—

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"May I say, Sir, that the present proposal is to do some work in anticipation of the formation of a company but it is not at present a question of taking shares in a company. I dare say legislation would be required in both cases."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"I respectfully say that the same kind of device was available to help the paper concern."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"May I ask, Sir, whether these paper mills or cotton mills will provide labour, unskilled labour for Mappillas? That is the reason why we are proceeding in advance."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"When I am speaking on this particular aspect of the question, I completely divest myself of the question of employing the Mappillas. But if work must be found for them, I believe that the Government have got a good many well-matured schemes, sanctioned schemes either of irrigation or of drainage. These are the schemes that more directly concern the people and great attention ought to have been paid in that direction."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I wish to say, Sir, that these were the schemes to which attention was first paid, as I have already said, but we could not find a suitable scheme."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"I have already mentioned, Sir, that where there is a will there is a way. My only complaint is that the Government did not make its will effective towards helping irrigation and drainage projects. That is all my criticism regarding the matter."

"Sir, in this connexion, when the company itself is not formed, when the plans of the whole scheme and the details have to be worked out and are not known, when the exact cost of the scheme is not known, I think the Government is not justified in coming forward for a vote of this House for this large sum. We do not know what our future commitments will be and whether they may end in gain or loss. When the work is half proceeded with, it may be said that more is required. Is it going to be a burden on the taxpayer for ever? Under these circumstances, I strongly object to the provision in the budget, and I support the motion for omission of this amount."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Mr. President, I may first of all thank the hon. the Finance Member for his courtesy in asking some of us to meet him and discuss this question with him. After giving the matter my most careful consideration, I must say that I have come to the conclusion that no case has been made out for us to invest this money on this scheme, especially when we do not know the full cost it may involve. I am not much perturbed about the Mappilla prisoners being employed in the neighbourhood of Rameswaram. I doubt very much if there are many people who would object to the scheme on religious grounds, and I do not think that in these days such a sentiment should be seriously taken into account."

27th March 1922] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

"But even as a business proposition, I do not think that we are in a position to say that it can be or will be a success. In the first place, there is the question of competition with Tuticorin. That, again, is a matter on which I do not like to say much because, if the Rameswaram canal scheme is going to be such a clear and certain success, then in the interests of the country it does not matter if Tuticorin is obliged to take an inferior place. One hon. Member raised the question as to whether the estimated expenditure would be sufficient. The estimated expenditure is Rs. 60 lakhs, and reference has been made to the other ocean-connecting canals, like the Suez canal and the Panama canal. In the case of the Suez canal the voyage saved has to be measured literally by thousands of miles, and in the case of Panama too there is the same advantage as it saves a voyage all round South America. But here in the present case the economy effected in the distance is only about 240 miles in one direction and about 100 and odd miles in another. We do not know a single oceanic adventure of this kind that did not cost at least four or five times, the original estimate of expenditure. The Panama canal cost a very great deal more than what it had originally been bargained for and so did the Suez canal, and I am not at all sure that this Rs. 60 lakhs will not be the beginning of a scheme which may involve us in several times the estimated expenditure. After the scheme is completed, this project by itself might not be found sufficient, but a harbour and other things may have to be added later on, though, of course, the hon. the Finance Member guarded himself by saying that one could not foresee the future and the necessary developments that may be required in the future. But I am certain that this amount of Rs. 60 lakhs is an under-estimate. Whether it is an under-estimate or not, we do not know what the details of this estimate are, and we do not also know what factors have been taken into account in launching on this scheme. It is just like asking us to jump before we have had a chance of looking. Supposing that we vote this amount now, more money may be necessary afterwards. Once we vote for it, we would have to go on voting for more money. It has been said that the Council should look at this matter as an investment, and that a company would be formed. In the first place, we do not know what that company is, in what stage it is now, when it would be formed, and so on. It may be formed only when there are fair indications of success, and supposing the indications are otherwise, or that the scheme is going to cost us far more than the present estimate, we are not at all sure whether the company is going to be formed, and if so, under what terms. These things are all in embryo as it were. And then, what is the estimated profit? On the present estimate of the cost, I am told that Government expect to get—I may be corrected if I am wrong—8 per cent. If that is what they expect to get, I am perfectly sure that they can consider themselves most fortunate if ultimately they can get even 2 per cent. For these reasons, I am opposed to the scheme. We could afford to embark on such schemes provided we have surplus money. But this is a year of a deficit budget and a year in which we, as the hon. the Finance Member of the Government of India said, have not turned the corner of our difficulties. This is not a year in which we can embark on a scheme of this kind which would commit us to an indefinite expenditure with very little prospect of success. Again, if the company is formed, the terms read out by the hon. the Finance Member do not in the least satisfy us. There is no provision made in it, there does not seem to be

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

[27th March 1922]

even the idea of making a provision, for a number of higher offices therein being reserved for Indians. It is an important scheme, and it would be necessary to employ a host of engineers and others. We do not know the number that may be employed, and how many of them are going to be Indians; and how many of such appointments will be reserved for Indians. I would therefore ask my friends not to vote for this scheme. The scheme which has been kept pending since 1862 can very well remain as it is for a few more years, and nothing will be lost.

"As regards finding employment for Mappilla prisoners, it seems to me that the whole of this scheme, instead of being started as a business proposition and then worked up down to labour supply, has been worked up the other way, that is, from a labour proposition to a business proposition, which is the reverse of what it should be. This reminds me of an old story of a *rishi* whose *kaupinam* was being eaten away by rats. He procured a cat to get out of the trouble, and he wanted milk to preserve the cat, for which purpose he had to go in for a cow, and he invested money in the purchase of a cow, and so on. Whatever else we do we shall not imitate that innocent *rishi*."

MR. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—"Sir, I have also given notice of a motion on the subject, and I rise to support the motion now before the House. The hon. the Finance Member was good enough to refer to the Tuticorin Harbour Committee, and also proposed that he would lay that report on the table. I submit, Sir, that so far as that Committee's Report is concerned, what I hear is that they recommended that this Rameswaram canal by itself would be financially unsound, unless it was supplemented by a harbour and a port. Unless this is done—I may be right or wrong, and I would ask the hon. the Finance Member to correct me—the scheme may not be a success."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"May I give the hon. Member the exact wording? The majority of the Committee were not prepared on the material before them to find that the canal would be commercially profitable."

MR. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—"May I request the hon. the Finance Member to hand me over a copy of the report, so that I may see whether I am correct in my statement or not? Now coming to the statement that Rs. 60 lakhs are required for the canal—I believe I am right in saying that he said that Rs. 60 lakhs would be just necessary for digging the ditch alone, and then for putting the canal in proper working order—neither the Committee nor the hon. the Finance Member have been able to give us any definite figures as to what that cost would be. I submit therefore that in order to

1 p.m. have a canal alone in perfect working order we would at least have to spend another 60 or 70 lakhs of rupees so that the total would come to about 130 lakhs of rupees. Then it is said that the advantages are that ocean ships passing round Ceylon to Calcutta could pass through this canal and save the voyage of a day and a quarter or 240 miles, and that we could place a toll upon their tonnage. In order to do this I believe we have got to take into consideration the annual cost of maintaining this canal. What would be the annual cost? No one who knows about Rameswaram can be perfectly sure whether this canal would not be filled up in a very short time, and in order to keep the canal in a working condition we may have to spend a larger amount. The hon. the Finance

27th March 1922]

[Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai]

Member is not prepared to tell us what the cost of the annual repairs would be, and what the cost of the establishment. Add to all these things the expenditure and the capital outlay. And then we have also to consider whether the ships would consider it profitable to pass through this canal just to save a 240-mile voyage if, as I believe, Sir, a toll would have to be raised and raised so much that the ships would not prefer to take this course and would rather find it advantageous to go round Colombo and spend a day and a quarter more. Therefore, I submit, that the advantages that have been so much spoken of and so eloquently described by the hon. the Finance Member are merely in the air. And I do not know whether they would materialize. On the other hand, I am afraid I would have to assure hon. Members of this House that this canal would be rather a big burden upon us. As my hon. Friend Mr. C. R. Reddi said, once we start upon this scheme, God only knows how far we may have to go. We must invest some more money in course of time. Instead of the $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent which the hon. the Finance Member has promised, I do not know whether Mr. C. R. Reddi was not more correct when he said that we should not be able to get even two per cent. The hon. the Finance Member said something about the company that would take up the work of the canal, with or without the aid of the Mappilla prisoners. If I remember right, what he said was that he would work it with the aid of the Mappilla prisoners and hand over the work to the company, ourselves taking a share in the company for the amount that is invested. As the hon. Member said, no expert has been able to assure us that this scheme would be a success. If it is a success, well and good. If not, is the company prepared to undertake it? Is the hon. the Finance Member prepared on behalf of the company to give us that assurance? Even if he is prepared, I can only tell the House that a company which is willing to take up a financially unsound concern is not a company which can be entrusted with this business. And then, so far as the Mappilla prisoners are concerned, the hon. the Finance Member said that one reason why this scheme has been provided for in this budget, is that we have got an enormous number of Mappilla prisoners for whom we must find work. But is that a reason why we should be committed to an initial expenditure of 12 lakhs? It has been stated in the report just now read by the Finance Member that the total scheme would cost 60 lakhs of rupees, and we are asked to commit ourselves to 12 lakhs this year for the simple reason that the Mappilla prisoners should be provided with work. Is that a reason, Sir, I would ask for voting for this allotment?"

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI:—"I rise to say a few words in opposing the motion before the House. Mr. Ramalinga Reddi mentions the Suez and Panama canals. In these cases the ships have to get round Africa in the one case, and South America in the other case. Rameswaram canal is a canal of four miles, and it does not bear any comparison with the cost of those two canals. If we are so careful and calculating even when we are to spend a small sum, such schemes cannot be pushed forward. There must be some venture, and without venture there is no success. At an informal meeting the other day the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter asked the members present to interpellate. Every one of the members present spoke of his individual scheme. The member from Tanjore advocated taking up irrigation work in his district and suggested utilizing the services of one or two

[Mr. T. Namberumal Chetti] [27th March 1922]

thousand Mappilla prisoners in that area. Another member from Tinnevely observed that the harbour at Tuticorin should receive first attention. Personally I would gladly have this sum of 12 lakhs spent on building houses for the poor in Madras. I only mention these facts that small schemes should be subordinated when schemes involving world-wide interests are under consideration. Parochial schemes should give way to Imperial schemes. This canal has been under consideration for the last half a century, and the present is the proper moment to push it through for the following reasons: (1) The Admiralty which was withholding sanction till now has now withdrawn the objection and is no more standing in the way. (2) A company is willing to work the concern, and private capital should be encouraged to flow when Indian capital, owing to poverty and want of enterprise in the country, is not forthcoming. The most important factor, viz., the ways and means of finding employment for the Mappilla prisoners, which is engaging the serious attention of the Government, is afforded by the scheme.

"As regards the statement that the Mappilla prisoners should not go there, I may state that till now there was no such objection of Mappillas remaining in the island of Rameswaram. I would therefore ask the House to consider not the parochial but those Imperial and broad-based interests which would benefit the world's trade and safeguard the country. For, this canal scheme is advocated by the Government for strategic reasons. We are the ambassadors of the people, and we should guard their interests and should support the well-considered conclusions arrived at by the Government. Far from being pedantic I would here quote a sloka from the great Valmiki:—

अर्थानर्थान्तरे बुद्धिः निश्चितापि नशोभते ।

वातयन्ति हि कार्याणि दूताः पण्डितमानिनः ॥

"We, the ambassadors, should not thwart the mature conclusions arrived at after studying the *pros* and *cons*, and we should not consider ourselves clever and prevent the large and broad schemes being given effect to.

"One other point I wish to bring to notice is as to how our reticence has brought on us this aftermath of the world war. The *Madras Mail* during the war period published two or three articles on "Arthasastra" showing that the Germans followed the system of warfare chalked out in Kautilya's "Arthasastra." The Germans have translated this work and adopted those modes of warfare. Very likely the Germans have gathered also poisonous-gas fighting. Had we not been reticent we should have been the first to adopt gas-poisoning and end the warfare in a much shorter time and avoided the aftermath of this world war which brought on trade depression, rise in prices, and lock-outs, etc."

Diwan Bahadur T. DESIKA ACHARIYAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, I must support the motion to omit the allotment of 12 lakhs in a year of this kind. I am not at all inclined to be an ambassador who does not consider the *pros* and *cons*. But I think the House has absolutely no information with reference to this scheme which appears to be a wild speculation. There are many complicated issues which arise for decision and with these complicated matters which still await decision whether the Government could embark on capital expenditure amounting to 12 lakhs and that in a

27th March 1922] [Mr. T. Desika Achariyar]

year in which we cannot find even 10,000 for the collection of oriental manuscripts, is a matter open to question. This is said to be going to cost Rs. 60 lakhs. I have had some experiences of estimates and I know that original estimates double and triple themselves and even become ten times more than the original estimate. Before we reach the end of this speculation it is just possible we shall have spent 12 crores. Whatever may be the utility of this new venture I do not think it is wise policy to enter upon a speculation of this kind without making the House know everything connected with the different bearings of the scheme and without making the House have sufficient information of everything connected with it. Situated as we are we do not know anything about it and in a stringent financial year of this kind it is not right that we should be asked to embark upon capital expenditure of 12 lakhs upon such a scheme.

"I should therefore advise the House to vote for the omission of this Rs. 12 lakhs from the budget. This amount of money could very well be utilized for the various things which are nearer at hand for which money is needed for expenditure. I have been repeatedly urging on the House the claims of communications, education, medical relief and rural sanitation and the carrying out of the recommendations of the Financial Relations Committee, and all that the hon. the Finance Member was pleased to tell me was that it was not possible to find the money; yet we are asked to spend Rs. 12 lakhs upon a thing about which we know nothing. This scheme has been brought up on the score of employing the Mappilla prisoners. I do not desire to repeat what has fallen from other Members of the House relating to the advisability of embarking upon this scheme for the sake of finding work for these prisoners. I strongly urge the House to omit this amount from the budget."

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—"Sir, I do not want to take up much time in speaking on this question, especially after having heard the cogent and convincing reasons advanced by Mr. Ramalinga Reddi and other previous speakers. All that I find is that this scheme is brought before us only on one account, namely, to provide work for the Mappillas who are now prisoners. If that is the real reason, there are ever so many schemes out and dry, ready for the last so many years on which they may be employed. This House has sanctioned a railway scheme for the district board in Tinnevely. These people can very well be employed there immediately, instead of bargaining over this scheme which is, I should say, more or less a speculative one and about which complete facts and figures are not before us. Therefore, it will be very ill-advised for us to sanction this expenditure. Even if it is merely for providing employment to the Mappillas, there are ever so many other schemes of sanitation, roads and railways where they may be employed at present. For these reasons, I support the motion."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I believe, the frank and free statement made by the hon. the Finance Member has furnished sufficient reason for our accepting the motion before the House and for omitting the provision of Rs. 12 lakhs entered in the budget. He has been good enough to tell us that the investigation is not yet complete and that the estimates have not yet been framed. Simply because we are making a provision out of the loan amount, are we justified in accepting a scheme which is

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [27th March 1922]

in such a nebulous condition and in making a provision for it in the budget? We have also been informed with reference to the report of the committee that the majority were of opinion that the canal scheme alone would not be a profitable concern. We are now concerned with the canal scheme and the only information before us is that by itself it is not likely to be profitable. Are we to give our assent to that scheme on account of the fact that there are other schemes still in store for us, schemes for the improvement of a harbour or a port, which will involve larger expenditure, which will come in the wake of this scheme? Again, we have been informed by the hon. the Finance Member that it is likely to affect the Tuticorin port. With this information before us, I think we should be taking a leap in the dark if we should give our assent to this proposal. I am somewhat surprised that my hon. Friend Mr. Namburumal Chettiyar has found it fit to give his blessings to the proposal. I thought that he, with his considerable business experience, would have rather condemned the scheme as one which no business-man can think of, a scheme which has not been shown to be profitable and which will involve us in a further expenditure of several crores. That such a scheme should be thought of, I submit, is a matter which passes my comprehension. We have been informed that it has been under consideration for the last fifty years and that only shows that those gentlemen who have been considering it did not think it to be so urgent. And, if we have waited for fifty years, we can afford to wait for some years more before we give our assent. Considering it from many stand-points, I think it would be setting up a very bad precedent which might cause considerable inconvenience, if we allowed the provision to stand."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, a good number of observations have already been made on this subject of the Rameswaram canal scheme. I think it is unnecessary at present to examine the merits of that scheme. I am not at all blind to the advantages of doing everything to develop our harbours as far as possible and to afford all facilities for reducing our freight charges. But, Sir, these are questions of far wider importance than those which relate to the provincial Government. My hon. Friend, Sir Charles Todhunter, said that this certainly would save some days' run for some of those ships to Calcutta and to Rangoon. There seems to be nothing particularly provincial about this scheme and, if this scheme is going to be of benefit to all India shipping, I think it is a scheme which ought to be taken up by the Government of India with all its financial advantages and risks in regard to this scheme. I think, therefore, Sir, it would be right on the part of the Government to press this on the attention of the Government of India itself instead of making it a provincial scheme. That is one of Tuticorin will be affected, for it would, certainly be a matter of an all-India policy. I think therefore we need not be very much alarmed by the protests from Tuticorin.

"Reference has been made already to the opinion which has been elicited from the committee which has been appointed with reference to the port of Tuticorin, and that is that the canal by itself will not be commercially a success. That adds to our difficulties, apart from this being more than a provincial concern. Apart from these two considerations, the acceptance of this grant would commit us to take shares in a company which has not yet been formed and to continue to be allied to that company with the option of

27th March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

purchasing that company out. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter said that legislation would be required. It may be possible. I do not know whether he has been in correspondence with any of those gentlemen who wish to form the company. It remains to be seen, when the matter comes up for legislation and for putting it in the form of a statute, whether any of those gentlemen will back this scheme. We must know what expenditure will have to be incurred in anticipation of the formation of a company. Is there going to be a definite guarantee either by agreement or by contract? I merely suggest the possible difficulties. Sir, I feel very strongly that if we pass this vote it means that we are committed to a company about which we know nothing at present. The legal position has not been ascertained properly and reduced to writing. Legislation is required, and the amount expected to be spent is about Rs. 60 lakhs. Perhaps after partly proceeding with the work, various difficulties may be experienced; perhaps monsoon winds will be filling up the canal and more expenditure will have to be incurred. We do not know what is to come at all out of this business. We know the history of the Madras harbour, the estimated cost of which was very small at the beginning and as years rolled by it swelled up to several crores. There was another irrigation project, the Kurnool-Cuddapah canal, that was given to a syndicate. The whole thing ended in a loss, but it was covered by a guarantee by the Government of India, and the Government of India ultimately purchased the concern at a great loss. It is now paying 2½ per cent in our provincial estimate. I do not think it is wise, whatever may be the merits of the scheme, to vote for this expenditure at this stage without any further details.

"There is only one other point and that is the Mappilla prisoners. We cannot for the sake of the Mappilla prisoners commit ourselves to a scheme which will cost us immediately Rs. 12 lakhs in the coming year and which will commit us to several crores of rupees hereafter. I therefore think that without going into the merits of the scheme the Council will not be well-advised in accepting this provision. That does not in any way mean that our hon. Friend the Finance Member cannot proceed with the investigation of this scheme and bring it up later on if he finds it financially a sound proposition."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I do not want to object for a moment to the criticism that the scheme is still in a somewhat nebulous form and has been put forward in somewhat of a hurry. These criticisms are quite justified though I hoped I had met them by saying that the reason why we are in such a hurry about this scheme was that it seemed likely to save us large and wasteful expenditure in some other direction in providing employment for the Mappilla prisoners. In other words, this Rs. 12 lakhs which we proposed to borrow in order to spend on the employment of the Mappilla prisoners we hoped to recover from the company. It seems also to be supposed that we are going to plunge rightaway into this scheme for Rs. 60 lakhs without taking any guarantees or otherwise making ourselves at all secure of the future. I should like to say that the Government are not quite so unbusinesslike as some hon. Gentlemen seem to imagine.

"However, to sum up the discussion, as far as I can gather, the Council have no objection to the scheme in itself, if the company chooses to take the

[Sir Charles Todhunter] [27th March 1922]

risk in spite of the discouragements that various members have put in their way. Their only objection is that Government should find other means of employing these Mappilla prisoners. If that is the view of the Council, we shall endeavour to do so. But, as I have said, we have only selected this scheme after a careful inquiry and we have been able to find no large irrigation work on which to employ these men. We have got one railway project in contemplation, and so far as I can see that is the only one in which we can suitably employ them, and I am afraid that if the Council reject the proposition we will have to employ the rest of the men on some unremunerative work."

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—"There are new irrigation projects made ready by the Chief Engineer and pending execution, because the House has cut the grants for them."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I inquired about it, Sir. I was told that there is no project in hand on which these persons could be employed, especially any irrigation project in the Tanjore district."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"I may say that, if the Council do not permit us to anticipate this scheme by employing the Mappilla prisoners upon the canal, they must be prepared to find the money for employing them in some other way or for feeding them without employment; in other words, we must spend the money without even the chances of the return which this scheme offers us."

"As regards the chances of the scheme, I should like to say that the company who have asked for the concession are a company of business men and they are certainly not likely to go into this thing if it does not promise a fair prospect of return. We have no idea of proceeding with it either without completing the estimates and the investigations, or without securing such guarantees as we can that the company will proceed with the work which we propose to commence. I quite recognize, as I have said, that the Government are not all business men. That is why I said in my opening speech that we were quite ready to agree that we would not spend one rupee on the scheme until the matter has been thoroughly examined by business men. We have on the Council representatives of commerce and industry in Sir James Simpson, Diwan Bahadur Govindoss Chaturbhujadoss, Mr. Alexander, Sir M. C. T. Muttayya Chetti, and Mr. MacDougall. We have also Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar who has spoken to-day and Diwan Bahadur Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu from Cocanada. We have a great array of business talent here, and if the Council think that the matter is worth further examination, I would suggest to them that they should ask these business men to examine the scheme and that they should tell us not to proceed with it unless these gentlemen advise us that the scheme was good enough. But I would point out that, if they strike this out of the budget now, it is extremely unlikely, in the last degree unlikely, that we shall be able to get any more money for it this year. If it goes out now, we have got to leave the project to the company and to find some other means of employing these Mappilla prisoners. We have done a great deal of work in getting estimates prepared and trying to arrange for water-supply, and therefore, I do ask the Council to consider whether it is not worth while to let the provision to stand subject to the most

27th March 1922] [Sir Charles Todhunter]

absolute prohibition that they like to impose on our spending one single rupee of the money unless a committee of business men selected from the Council, after examining the scheme and every paper put before them, says that it is good enough."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I rise to a point of order, Sir. I wish to have your ruling on the question whether it is in order to impose such conditions on a budget motion like this."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"That is not a point of order. I understand the hon. Member to mean that the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter cannot impose a condition that the Government would do certain other things in relation to the motion. It is open to the Council, however, to accept it or not. But there is nothing out of order in what the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter has said."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"That is all I wish to say, Sir. I would ask the Council before they reject this motion to remember the alternative we have to face, that we have to employ the Mappilla prisoners, to remember that we are perfectly ready to give them a guarantee that we will not spend a rupee unless the thing passes a most critical examination by a committee of business men and with these words, I leave the matter to the vote of the Council."

Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu moved the closure which was put and carried.

The motion was then put and declared carried.

The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter demanded a poll and the same was taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 24. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. |
| 2. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankineedu Prasad Bahadur. | 25. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 3. Dr. M. Appalarasayya Nayudu. | 26. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |
| 4. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 27. Mr. P. Siva Rao. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 28. Diwan Bahadur T. Desika Achariyar. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu. | 29. Mr. S. Muttumanicka Achari. |
| 7. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 30. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 8. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 31. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 9. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 32. Mr. A. Kanganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 10. Mr. K. A. Kandaswami Kandar. | 33. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo. |
| 11. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 34. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. |
| 12. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 35. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 13. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 36. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar. |
| 14. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 37. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 15. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | 38. Rai Sahib E. C. M. Mascarenhas. |
| 16. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 39. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 17. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. | 40. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib Bahadur. |
| 18. Mr. A. Subbarayudu. | 41. Mr. A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar. |
| 19. Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 42. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar. | 43. Mr. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib. |
| 21. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. | |
| 22. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. | |
| 23. Diwan Bahadur B. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | |

[27th March 1922]

Noes.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 11. Mr. R. Littlehales. |
| 2. „ Sir Charles Todhunter. | 12. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 3. „ Khan Bahadur Muhammad | 13. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai. |
| Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 14. Mr. K. V. Ramaobari. |
| 4. „ Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 15. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Campan. |
| 5. „ Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 16. Mr. R. T. Kesavulu Pillai. |
| 6. „ Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi | 17. Mr. G. Vandanam. |
| Nayudu. | 18. Sir James Simpson. |
| 7. „ Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 19. Mr. W. Alexander. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 20. Mr. A. M. MacDougall. |
| 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 21. Rao Bahadur T. A. Namberumal Chetti. |
| 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. | |

The motion was carried, 43 voting for and 21 against.

Motions 779 to 792.

The following identical motions consequently fell through :—

Mr. R. APPASWAMI NAYUDU :—

779. To omit the allotment of Rs. 12 lakhs for Rameswaram canal scheme.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

780. To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,00,000 for Rameswaram canal.

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

781. To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,00,000 for Rameswaram canal scheme.

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI :—

782. To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,00,000 for Rameswaram canal scheme.

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

783. To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,00,000 for Rameswaram canal scheme.

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

784. To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,00,000 for Rameswaram canal scheme.

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—

785. To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,00,000 for Rameswaram canal scheme.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

786. To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,00,000 for Rameswaram canal scheme.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

787. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,15,816 for loans to co-operative societies in connexion with the acquisition of house-sites for Panchamas by Rs. 100.

27th March 1922]

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

788. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,15,816 for loans to co-operative societies in connexion with the acquisition of house-sites for Panchamas by Rs. 100.

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

789. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,15,816 for loans to co-operative societies in connexion with the acquisition of house-sites for Panchamas by Rs. 100.

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

790. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,15,816 for loans co-operative societies in connexion with the acquisition of house-sites for Panchamas by Rs. 100.

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—

791. To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,25,000 for loans to co-operative societies for the acquisition of house-sites for Panchamas.

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—

792. To omit the allotment of Rs. 25,000 for advances to Kallar co-operative societies.

Demand XXXV that a sum of Rs. 97.83 lakhs minus 12 lakhs be granted was then put and granted *nem. con.*

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I should like to know, before we adjourn for lunch, what the wishes of hon. Members are in regard to the demands for grants which have been tabled by the Government, copies of which have been furnished to hon. Members. If they are not contentious, I will put them now to the vote ; but if hon. Members would require time, I would take them after lunch. Are they generally non-contentious ? ”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“ Sir, I have given notice of motions regarding two demands.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I think we had better adjourn for lunch.”

The House then adjourned for lunch.

VI

FURTHER DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

The House re-assembled after lunch at 2-30 p.m. and the consideration of the further Demands for grants made by Government was taken up.

DEMAND XXXVI—LAND REVENUE.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“ Sir, I beg to move Demand No. XXXVI pertaining to Land Revenue and aggregating in all to Rs. 21,65,000. As the House will see this amount is made up of three items, the largest of which represents expenditure owing to the revision of the salaries of the village officials. It is unnecessary for me, Sir, to once more reiterate the fact that Government had hoped that in view of the financial stringency and in view also of the large uncovered deficit which they had to carry forward in the financial transactions of the next.

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

[27th March 1922]

year, this expenditure could easily have been found by the re-imposition of two cesses which existed in this province until a few years ago. Bills in respect of those two measures were introduced in this Council, but were turned down at their very first reading. Even after these Bills were turned down, suggestions have been made from time to time by the hon. Members of this House that the claims of the village officials in the matter of increase of their salaries should no longer be deferred, but that they ought to be taken up with effect at least from the next year. In response, therefore, Sir, to the wishes of the House, I am asking them to vote a large sum of Rs. 20,14,600 which is necessitated by the revision of their salaries. While doing so, I feel that it will have the inevitable result of mounting up the already heavy deficit of this province. At one of the previous sittings I have made it sufficiently clear that I would certainly have no objection to bring up this demand before hon. Members, provided they would be prepared to accept the responsibility incidental thereto, in that it would tend to increase the deficit and I felt that the Council was willing to encourage me to go forward in that direction. So, if this vote is now passed, it will merely mean, Sir, that we shall be raising our deficit by that amount and it will practically be at the suggestion of the House that I shall have to request my hon. Colleague the Finance Member to go to the Government of India and secure me a loan to that extent for what is a recurring expenditure.

"The other two items included therein, Sir, are small and the brief note which has been attached below the demand gives a sufficient explanation in regard to them. But if any of the hon. Members would still want any further information, I am prepared to furnish them."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, all that I wish to say in seconding this demand is to ask the House to realize that if this demand is voted, the House takes the responsibility for an addition now to our deficit which has to be covered by loans and for an addition of 34 lakhs to our recurring expenditure."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, I understood the hon. the Revenue Member to say that by voting for this demand the deficit will be increased by this particular sum. I take it that the deficit which was in his mind is the deficit shown in the budget presented to the House. In that case, I should like to know, Sir, what has become of the deliberate opinion expressed by this House as regards the reductions effected in several departments, as the 5 lakhs under the Land Revenue Department, one lakh under Forest, etc. Are we to understand then that those reductions which we have indicated should not be given effect to or are not going to be given effect to? Further I am not able to hear from the hon. the Revenue Member as to what minimum pay he is going to fix in the case of village officers and what would be the minimum pay for the proprietary estates village munsifs. On these points I would like to have information."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"Mr. President, if I correctly understood the attitude of the Government in regard to this motion, it appeared to me to be on the part of the Government a half-hearted motion for a grant. Their attitude seems to be that if we commit ourselves to this grant for the enhancement of the salary of village officers, we must be prepared for additional taxation in years to come. If that is the idea behind

[27th March 1922]

[Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju]

the Government's mind I do not think we should commit ourselves to any particular policy of that sort. The House has expressed time after time that the way in which Government are spending money on salaries and in various other directions is very extravagant, and that the Government must see their way to curtail expenditure in those directions. That view has been several times expressed and I hope before the budget for the next year is prepared, Government will move in that direction and show sufficient saving in various directions and will not come forward with any other bill for additional taxation on this account."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I should like to answer the question that has been asked as to what has become of the saving which the House has effected. The total of the amounts cut out of the budget up to this morning is a little over 11 lakhs. The total of the further demands that have now been put forward, excepting those relating to village officers, is 9½ lakhs, so that the net saving, if these demands are passed, will be comparatively small. As to the prospect of our being able to reduce salaries next year to the amount of another 34 lakhs, I must say that I am not one of the irresponsible optimists who expect a result like that."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"In any case, it seems to me, Sir, that it is very desirable, as has been often expressed in this House, that the pay of village officers should be enhanced and it is expressly with that object that this demand has been mainly brought forward. The other two items are comparatively small and I think that we as a body should vote this grant."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I only wish to make myself clear, Sir, that in consenting to this demand I do not consent to any measure of taxation which my hon. Friend may have in view. It has been stated here in this Council more than once that economy should be practised and that this amount should be found by trying to economize in other departments. Therefore, if my hon. Friend puts forward any measure of taxation to-morrow in order to meet this new impost on our recurring expenditure, I cannot take the responsibility of having consented to it. That again depends upon the measure of taxation and they will have to satisfy us that they have done their level best to retrench in order to find this money. I would therefore make that position clear."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—"Sir, I wish to have information on two points. What is the scale of pay which the hon. Member is going to fix? Secondly, is it a supplementary grant for 1921-22?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"No; for 1922-23. I will first try to say in one word, Sir, in answer to the question of my hon. Friend opposite to me that in regard to the possibilities of future taxation all I can say is that I am not a prophet to say what the future will be nor can I commit myself as to the policy of taxation of my successors. Of course, it is obvious that the House will see that the amount involved is not only 20 lakhs and odd that I now ask for which represents the pay for eight months. I believe that the increase on account of expenditure per year will be nearly 35 lakhs. Then, Sir, as to the question of scale proposed to be fixed in respect of these officials, so far as the ryotwari village officials are concerned, the House is already aware that revision in respect of karnams and other menial subordinates have already been carried out and

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [27th March 1922]

given effect to. It is only the village headman whose salary has not yet been raised and it was on their behalf that there was almost a demand from this House that their salaries should be increased to Rs. 15 per mensem. In the revision that I have now carried out I have duly given effect to the recommendation of the House and fixed the salary of the village headman in the ryotwari tract as Rs. 15 per mensem. Now in regard to the proprietary areas there was no justification whatsoever to have their pay fixed on the same scale as that which is in vogue in the ryotwari villages. We have taken into account the salaries that are being drawn by the various classes of officials at the present moment in the proprietary areas and we have tried to increase it as substantially as it is possible to do. In the case of the monigars, as they are called, their present salaries are Rs. 4, Rs. 5 and Rs. 6 and they will in future get Rs. 8 and the karnams who get now Rs. 15 will be left severely alone. Those who get Rs. 12 will be left severely alone. The karnams who get Rs. 8 and Rs. 11 have been pulled up to Rs. 12. Those who were drawing Rs. 4, Rs. 5 and Rs. 6 have been pulled up to Rs. 8 each. The triune officers have been brought on the same level namely, Rs. 8. Their present salaries range from Rs. 2 to Rs. 6. The assistant karnams who were drawing Rs. 5, Rs. 6 and Rs. 7 have been pulled up to Rs. 8. The talaiyaris getting Rs. 3, Rs. 4, Rs. 4½, Rs. 5 and Rs. 6 have been equalized, the minimum now being Rs. 6. The vettians have been likewise pulled up to Rs. 6 each while they have been drawing now Rs. 3, Rs. 4 and Rs. 5. The financial effect of the whole of this scheme, Sir, per year will be, as I have already said, nearly 34 lakhs."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"There is some difficulty in the provision made under this item. We have been informed that the provision has been made for 8 months from fasli 1332. What is to become of the case with regard to the remaining months from April to June? We have already received notice of a demand for 33.40 lakhs for the whole of that year. Is it the object to give the whole pay for 1921-22 or to allow the existing scale for three months."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"The demand which I have tabled in respect of 1921-22 has no reference whatsoever to the salaries of the village officials."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXXVII—POLICE.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I have the honour, Sir, to move for an additional grant for 0.74 lakh. This relates to two main items. One is provision for the continuance of the special assistant in the Criminal Investigation Department who was employed during the whole of last year, who was sanctioned for the special purpose of scrutiny of non-co-operation and other political movements and whose principal duty is to gather material for reports to the Government of India. The reports sent up from the Madras Presidency have been characterized by those responsible as being among the best that have been received. I have made very careful examination, including personal consultation with the Deputy Inspector-General, as to the feasibility of dispensing with this appointment during the current year. I have also discussed it at some length with my hon. Colleague the Finance Member. I came to the conclusion that it was absolutely essential to keep

27th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

it on and that view has been approved by the Government. So much for that item. The other items consist of special police quartered in the Guntur district for a period of twelve months, special police at Rayachoti in the Cuddapah district for a period of twelve months and an addition to the special police in the Gōdāvari district in the Rajahmundry taluk in regard to which an entry will be found at page 115 of the budget. The addition is for the purpose of bringing the quota of head constables up to the standard proportion of one to ten constables. In the case of Rayachoti the quartering of this additional police was sanctioned by Government in an Order, dated the 28th January 1922, on a very forcible report from the District Magistrate, Mr. Upendra Pai, and in the case of the Rajahmundry taluk the sanction order was dated the 2nd February 1922 and passed on a report from Mr. Bracken, the District Magistrate, drawing attention to the very serious trouble that was being given in respect of civil disobedience and the non-payment of taxes in a group of villages on the banks of the Gōdāvari, 12 miles up stream from Rajahmundry. In each case notice of the quartering of special police has appeared in the Gazette. In the case of Gōdāvari the mere threat was almost sufficient to bring about the restoration of order; and I am not in a position to say whether the additional police have actually been entertained. In the case of Guntur I must ask for full provision because it is idle to issue a proclamation of that description and not to provide the funds, though there is no reason why the force should not be disbanded if the need for it ceases."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"In view of the information given by the hon. the Home Member, I do not wish to move the first portion--

To omit the provision for the salary of a special assistant to the Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Criminal Investigation Department.

"But with your permission I will move the second portion, namely :—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 74,000 by Rs. 100.

"So far as this motion is concerned, it is for the purpose of ascertaining whether there is justification or necessity for continuing the punitive police force either in Guntur or in Cuddapah for a period of 12 months as suggested by the hon. the Home Member. I really do not know in the first instance why this provision was not made at the time of the presentation of the budget. Is it to be understood that it was then thought not necessary to make provision for the continuance of punitive police in the Gōdāvari or Cuddapah district for 12 months and that subsequently the Government found reasons for changing their view? My submission is, Sir, that if at the time of the presentation of the budget it was thought unnecessary to make that provision, the things which have happened since then must have induced them to disband the force rather than order its continuance. We learn that in Guntur the situation is well in hand and that order has been restored."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I remind the hon. Member that the preparation of the budget commences in October?"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"These orders were passed in January or February."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I thought that the budget prepared in the beginning of October must have been brought up to

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [27th March 1922]

date. Now I do not wish to pursue that point. Still, Sir, I think that owing to the trend of events during the past month, and owing to the fact that the situation has been brought under control in the Guntūr district, I am not satisfied that there is any need or justification for continuing the police force for 12 months more in the next year. Coming to the imposition of a punitive police force in Cuddapah, the justification is much less. All the information which we have, subject to any verification by the hon. the Home Member, is that on account of various troubles and non-co-operation it was thought necessary to have a punitive police force in Rayachōti in the Cuddapah district. It is not necessary to consider the justification or otherwise of the notification issued by Government. We are now concerned with the question as to the necessity for continuing the police force during the next year also, when things will have fairly settled themselves and when there is not much fear from any quarter whatever in either of these places. Because I feel that there is no justification for continuing this police force, I make this motion for a reduction."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I am afraid I cannot share the hon. Mover's sanguine expectation as to the condition of affairs in the future. I am sure no one wishes more sincerely than I do that his expectation may prove true. But in regard to the Cuddapah district I may say that I have seen to-day a report from the District Magistrate, dated 26th March, in which he presses for this measure. He does not say that it is no longer necessary. His original justification covered four pages of print, and I can assure the House that it was a very full justification for the measure. The situation in that part of the Cuddapah district was very serious indeed, and I am assured that the effect of the announcement of the quartering of special police has been excellent."

"In the case of the Guntūr district, the circumstances are much the same. 3 p.m. As a matter of fact our first information indicated that it would be necessary to recruit at least 300 special police. But in consequence of the very efficient measures taken by Mr. Vernon for the restoration of order it has been found possible not only to arrange for the troops to be sent away almost immediately—I believe it is only a matter of days—but also possible to restrict recruitment of the special police by limiting the number to something like 200. Whether it will be necessary to continue their employment for the whole period of 12 months I cannot at this moment say. But it is obviously necessary that provision should be made. I do ask the House to give Government the powers which, after a very careful consideration, they believe to be necessary in order to secure the State against any recrudescence of the very serious troubles which broke out in the Guntūr district. I can assure the House—I am speaking for my successor—I can confidently assure the House that if the necessity for this additional police disappears at any time the Government of Madras will be the first to dispense with it. But I do ask that we should not be deprived of that form of assistance now."

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU:—"Mr. President, I find in this demand a provision made for a special assistant to the Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Criminal Investigation Department. May I request the hon. the Home Member to say whether this officer has been asked to retire originally, because I do not find any provision made in the budget?"

27th March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"The late incumbent of this post has, I believe, actually retired, or will retire at the end of this month. But the question of the personnel of the appointment does not arise now; it is the continued existence of the appointment on a temporary basis for which we are asking."

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU:—"What I want to ask is whether at a time when we have not got funds it is not advisable to have an officer on a lower salary."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I think that is probably what will happen. But I am not aware yet exactly what officer will fill the post."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, so far as the Cuddapah district is concerned, I am rather afraid that an exaggerated view has been taken of the situation there. I do not know what report the Collector has made in the matter. It will be, I think, an advantage to the House if a copy of the report is placed on the table so that we may judge for ourselves how far its conclusions are justifiable. The member for the Cuddapah district has assured the House that imposition of the punitive police in his district is not at all justifiable, and I think one can safely take Mr. Narasimhachari, the member for the Cuddapah district, as one who is not at all likely to underestimate any danger that may exist there. So, I do appeal to the hon. the Home Member not to make up his mind that punitive police is absolutely necessary there or that it should continue there for a long time to come. I hope he will be very glad to know soon that the reason for this does not exist, and if he is convinced of that I hope he will surely take away the police from that area."

SAIYID MUHAMMAD PADSHA SAHIB Bahadur:—"As one representing the Ceded Districts constituency, I think it my duty to raise my voice of protest against any attempt to continue the punitive police in the district of Cuddapah. Sir, there is not any member of this House who does not regard the maintenance of law and order as the primary duty of the Government. But, Sir, this proposal to continue the punitive police for 12 long months in some of the districts is absolutely inexpedient."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I have already said that they will be dispensed with if at any time the district authorities can satisfy the Government that they are not required."

SAIYID MUHAMMAD PADSHA SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, it is not definitely known how long this force will be continued. But the amount of grant demanded goes to show that the force is to continue for something like a period of 12 months. On that ground I make my observations. Now, in view of the present state of affairs, I think it is altogether unnecessary that this punitive force should be continued in the Cuddapah district. It is a plain fact that the situation has improved everywhere. It is also admitted that even in those parts which were the most recalcitrant and where there was disturbance, there is such an improvement that there hardly seems to be any necessity for the imposition of such a force. It has been said that the District Magistrate of Cuddapah recommended the continuance of this force. I should like to know whether he has given any tangible circumstances; whether he has given any account of the present state of things in Rayachōti which necessitate the continuance of this force there. In the absence

[Mr. Saiyid Muhammad Padsha Sahib] [27th March 1922]

of anything definite, in the absence of any further disturbance there, in the absence of any concerted attempt on the part of the people there to disobey law and authority, I believe we will not be justified in imposing this hardship upon the people of a district like Cuddapah, which is already very hard hit on account of frequent famines that visit that district. Now, Sir, it is a fact that there were some disturbances in Rayachōti, that some village officers did resign; but all that thing is now gone. The disturbances are now quelled and the village officers are resuming their duties. Under such circumstances, Sir, it seems to me that the House will not at all be justified in persisting in continuing the punitive force there when it is no longer required."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I only wish to add a few words in regard to the situation in the Guntūr district. I do not know whether the hon. the Home Member made a statement also in regard to the Guntūr district that as soon as conditions are reported to be favourable by the district authorities, the Government will withdraw the punitive police from that district. All that I can say is that from various communications that have appeared in the press from time to time, there is no doubt that the situation in Guntūr has materially improved, that the special collection establishment that was appointed has been withdrawn and that almost the whole revenue of the district has been collected and the Government themselves have been furnishing us information through the district gazette which shows that things have so materially improved that the question as to the appointment of punitive police should be considered by the Government again. I think, Sir, that it is conceivable and it is borne out by experience, that while things are settling down and people are returning to their normal occupations, the presence of a punitive police would itself be a source of irritation. I am sure the hon. the Home Member would have noticed the statements made in the press from time to time. I do not wish to say anything about them at present, but I know from past experience that the punitive police while they are discharging their unpleasant duties are not discreet in their actions. I do not wish to dilate at length on the terms of the notification that has been published recently. But for the present I should like the hon. the Home Member to consider whether in view of the improved situation in the Guntūr district, it would not be doing a wise thing not to impose the punitive police there. The hon. the Home Member says that it is quite likely that people may think that it is only an idle threat of the Government. But I am sure people in Guntūr do not think that the Government are in a mood to indulge in idle threats and I do think that this question of taking punitive steps may defeat the very object of the Government and may end in the promotion of disturbances. Under these circumstances, I trust that the hon. the Home Member will be able to say that this punitive police will be removed as early as possible from Guntūr. The provision is for 12 months and there is always a tendency that when once a provision is made for 12 months it is more than likely to continue till the end of the period. It is quite likely that the hon. the Home Member may receive some report on the state of things in Guntūr justifying the continuance of the punitive force. People will have to pay for the whole of this and the discriminating treatment which that notification provides will cause further trouble in that locality. Therefore, without referring to the terms of the notification on the present occasion and confining myself strictly

27th March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

to the financial position, I trust that the hon. the Home Member will hold out an assurance that even if he appoints the punitive police, they will be quickly withdrawn."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, I cannot bind my successor by definite assurance in such a matter. In another four days 3-15 p.m. I shall be gone. But I have no doubt that my successor, whoever he may be, will look at it from the same standpoint as myself. That is to say, if he does not deem it desirable to retain the police force either in Cuddapah or in Guntūr, and if the necessity for their presence is clearly gone, then they will be disbanded. But with reference to the suggestion that there is no longer any such need, may I say again, that in respect of Cuddapah I have information from the District Magistrate, dated 26th March, and it is not in accord with that put forward by the hon. Member from Bellary. I may also say that the disturbance in Rayachōti taluk reached its climax only in December last and that it is not a mere case of non-payment of taxes. There were successive acts of brutal violence particularly against forest officers."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Did any of them end in conviction?"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"One particular case against six leaders of the movement ended about the middle of December and heavy security was taken from all six accused. That is one case. In another case a village munsif who was the ringleader in the matter was arrested in a raid admirably planned at the dawn of day by the gallant District Superintendent of Police, Mr. Saunders, whose behaviour throughout the troubles in Cuddapah has been beyond all praise. The result was that 17 other persons were arrested and identified as having taken part in a brutal assault on a forest range officer, who was severely assaulted, beaten and robbed of his revolver. They were all charged and I believe a majority of them were convicted. I have not the exact information. But I do know that in the house of a village munsif, there was found an unlicensed gun. He is now on his trial for the possession of this. I need not go any further with the case for additional police in Rayachōti taluk except to say that I think it will probably be quite possible to publish the District Magistrate's report *in extenso* but that is a point which requires some further examination though I see that the papers were sent to the Publicity Officer. As a rule, the Government do not publish *in extenso* matter which is not of sufficient importance. But I see no reason why the bulk, if not the whole of this report, should not be published. I will again examine that question."

"In regard to Guntūr I placed implicit trust on Mr. Vernon and I think he has justified the trust reposed in him. His judgment has been sound and his action restrained throughout and discreet. I saw him immediately before he went there and again afterwards when he came to Madras for a few days. It was on Mr. Vernon's suggestion that we reduced the additional police from 300 to 200. But as to withdrawing them immediately, it is only right that I should remind this Council that very shortly I shall be coming forward with an application for an additional allotment for the purchase of four 'Ford' vans for the purpose of facilitating the transport of small bodies of armed police from one place to another so as to reduce the necessity for adding to their number by making them more mobile. The intention is that some at

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[27th March 1922]

least of these four 'Ford' vans should be located temporarily in the Guntūr district. We had experience of the necessity for some such form of transport in Madras throughout the months of July, August, September and October 1921 for the purpose of moving troops and police. Motor transport of some kind was found to be very necessary in those days. Hon. Members who read the newspapers will have noticed that the United Provinces have provided no less than 54 'Ford' vans."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" May I ask the hon. the Home Member whether he published the report of the District Magistrate as he received it? We are as anxious as the hon. Member for the maintenance of peace and order. We should like to know whether there is real necessity for the continuance of the punitive police."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I do not think there is any one in this Council who wants to weaken the hands of the Government in the maintenance of law and order. The only point for consideration is whether there is any necessity for the continuance of the punitive police force. The hon. the Home Member stated that if he or his successor was satisfied that there was no necessity to continue the police, they would take steps to disband the force.

"I wish to ask whether in the light of the information he has placed before the House, it is necessary to make full provision for twelve months. I cannot really understand why provision should be made for twelve months. Provision might be made for some shorter period and in the interval if some unfortunate incident should occur, then the Government may come to us for supplementary grants. Why I object to the continuance of this force for a longer period is because, even in normal times when there is peace in the country a punitive force is likely to cause provocation and irritation. It is in the interests of the maintenance of law and order that they should not be continued beyond the actual necessities of the case and their continuance is likely to cause breaches of peace. There is still another difficulty when one goes to the question of apportioning the cost of the punitive police among the persons in the affected locality. We know that the solving of that question often gives rise to further discontent and irritation which it is not easy to comprehend or measure. In the matter of the distribution of the levy of cost, the district officers are given a wide discretion. They have to act upon the recommendation of the subordinate officers which I have not the slightest doubt is causing, has caused and will cause extreme dissatisfaction. If we believe in some of the reports published in the press last night, it will be found that persons who were wearing 'kaddar' are called upon to pay punitive tax on the mere ground that they are wearing 'kaddar'. I am only speaking from the reports published in the press and I do not know how far they are correct. If these reports are true, it is not a matter to congratulate the Government upon. No civilized Government can raise any objection for a person wearing any dress he likes. After all 'kaddar' is only swadesi. If the report in the press is true, it only goes to show that a person is put down as non-co-operator for the mere reason that he is wearing 'kaddar'. Can anything be more unreasonable than to call upon a person to pay punitive tax for the mere reason that he is wearing a particular kind of dress? Incidents of that kind due to the acts of officers in whom the Government have confidence tend to create grave dissatisfaction and discontent in the minds

27th March 1922]

DEMAND XLII—GRANTS TO LOCAL BODIES.

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 5,00,000 for grants to local bodies. The amount is required to enable the Local Self-Government Department to subsidise the specially poor local bodies which in spite of their efforts to improve their sources of income have not themselves been able to make both ends meet. I would request the House to pass this demand."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I should like to ask the hon. Minister whether this is really a compassionate demand to make up the deficit in the balance of the local bodies."

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" This amount is intended to meet special cases. If local bodies in spite of their efforts are unable to find their way to make up the deficiency in their budgets the Government may have to help them."

The demand was put to the vote and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XLIII—CIVIL WORKS—PUBLIC WORKS OFFICERS (RESERVED).

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I have the honour to move for an additional grant of Rs. 5,000. The object of this additional grant of Rs. 5,000 is to bring the total of Rs. 20,000 shown on page 6 of the Public Works Budget estimate in the tabular statement under the heading 'Residences of the Governor' to a sum of Rs. 25,000, which represents the annual allowance for what are called 'Minor Original Works'. These are items which it is within the power of the Military Secretary to sanction. The defect which is found in the original provision lies in the fact that Rs. 7,000 is entered against the Nilgiris, and Rs. 13,000 against South Presidency, but nothing against the third and last head, namely, the Electrical Engineer, who ought to have some funds available for minor works classed as 'original'."

The demand was put to the vote and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XLIV—CIVIL WORKS—PUBLIC WORKS OFFICERS
(TRANSFERRED)

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 1,51,000 for Civil Works—Public Works officers—Transferred. This demand is in addition to the amount already sanctioned for Civil Works. This is to provide for alterations to the Central Jail, Coimbatore, and to the barracks at Bellary which are being used for jail purposes. The object of the alteration is to use them for Mappilla prisoners. My hon. colleague, the Law Member, has already explained the need for the expansion of these buildings. The labour of the Mappilla prisoners will be utmost in the construction of these buildings and in the adjustments of the various portions of the barracks. Therefore I move for this grant of Rs. 1,51,000 is no

The demand was put to the vote and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XLV—PENSIONS.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Sir, I move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 21,000 under the head of Pensions, the object of which is to pay Rs. 300 each to the families of the Mappilla prisoners concerned in the train tragedy."

or two
I do not believe
this small
persons who
as extremely
come before
of Mr. Knapp's

[27th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

To reduce the demand of Rs. 21,000 for Pensions by Rs. 100.

"In making this motion it is not my object to suggest that these unfortunate persons belonging to the families of the Mappilla prisoners should not be given this pension; but it is to draw prominent attention to the fact that we are called upon to vote this amount even before we know anything of the orders of the Government upon the Committee's report. In the ordinary course we should expect the Government to place the final orders on the now well-known train tragedy as a result of which 70 Mappilla prisoners died, and then come forward for a demand for pensions to the families of the prisoners. I need hardly draw the attention of this House at this closing day of our session to the circumstances which led to the tragedy. There was a full dress debate in this House on the motion for adjournment on the train tragedy, as to the circumstances which led to that unfortunate affair. Objection was taken to the very constitution of the Committee from various quarters. After that incident we have got an inkling of what is now known as the white-washing report of the Committee appointed to inquire into that matter. It has earned the unenviable reputation of being a white-washing report."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" May I ask, Sir, whether all this is in order? Does the hon. Member desire not to pay any pensions? "

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The motion is perfectly in order. One of the ways by which an hon. Member can show his disapproval of the Government is to propose the reduction of a grant."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Thanks, Sir. It was after a definite discussion in this House regarding that question that we had an inkling of the report of the Committee. It caused grave dissatisfaction in this country that some idea of that report was published by the medium of the English papers in England, that we should not be aware of anything till after we got it through Reuter's agency. Shortly afterwards the Government explained their position and made us understand the circumstances under which the report found its way home. Sir, we were anxiously expecting even afterwards that the Government would finish their examination of the various incidents, arrive at a definite conclusion and inform the public of their conclusions. There is no question in recent times which has caused so much consternation as the incidents relating to these unfortunate Mappilla prisoners who died. It was, I believe, in the month of February that Mr. Ramachandra Rao raised the question as to what was done in regard to this incident. We were informed by the hon. the Home Member that orders would be passed at an early date, probably in the course of a week."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" That I hoped, Sir."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Yes, that he hoped. A month has elapsed, and we have not had any idea whatever as to the orders of the Government relating to this important incident. The Council is about to be prorogued and the Council will not have any chance of discussing the orders of the Government till it again meets in August. If we move the matter in August we may be told, and we have to be satisfied with that, that

[27th March 1922] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

it will be a belated discussion on the report. We are placed in this unfortunate position. The anxiety of this Council in raising the urgent motion was apparent to every one. The Council was anxious to induce the Government to pass orders on it to enable it to deal with it. Notwithstanding the anxiety, and whatever excellent reason the Government might have, the Council has not succeeded in eliciting any information in regard to this matter even on the last day of the session. I must say that it is certainly unreasonable on the part of the Government to come forward with a motion for the grant of pensions to the families of the Mappilla prisoners at this stage of the discussion. If they thought that this was an urgent matter, which required a vote of this Council, they must certainly have hurried the publication of their orders and thus satisfied the Council as to the reasonableness of their proposals. Without doing anything of that sort, to come to this Council for a vote of the pensions is, I submit, quite improper. It is to protest against the manner in which this question has been dealt with by the Government that I have given notice of this motion, not that I am so unreasonable as to suppose that this money should not be granted to the families of the Mappilla prisoners."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the report on the Mappilla train tragedy for the excellent reason I gave before, namely, that it is not possible to discuss those issues until the Government have arrived at a definite conclusion. It is perfectly true that I said I hoped the Government would be able to arrive at a decision in a week's time. I do not remember the exact date of that statement, but my recollection is that His Excellency the Governor had almost immediately afterwards to proceed to Delhi and that two or three members of the Cabinet did the same, while on their return to Madras the sittings of this Council began and have since continued almost from day to day. My own idea about this matter was that it would have been emphatically preferable to announce the decision of the Government to compensate the families of the deceased Mappilla prisoners simultaneously with the publication of orders on the report. But I felt, and I feel, that it would not be fair to the dependents of these persons to delay the payment which we believe is reasonably due to them in the circumstances of the case, merely because it has been found impracticable to publish the final decision of Government on the questions raised in the report as early as personally I had hoped. For that reason I specifically urged that the grant of compensation should form the subject of a separate order. It would clearly be unjust to the families affected to keep them waiting indefinitely, if they are to receive anything at all. I for one see no reason whatsoever why the question of giving compensation to the families of these prisoners who lost their lives owing to this most regrettable incident should be mixed up with the responsibility for it. It seems to me that the two issues are perfectly distinct and that there is no reason to delay the settlement of the one because the immediate settlement of the other has been found impracticable."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I want to say one or two words in connexion with this demand. I do not believe that any member in this House will be for refusing this small amount of Rs. 300 to each of the families of the unfortunate persons who died in that train tragedy. But at the same time we regard it as extremely unfortunate that the Government should have deemed it fit to come before this House with this demand before publishing the report of Mr. Knapp's

3-45 p.m.

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

[27th March 1922]

committee and also the conclusion at which the Government have arrived or propose to arrive. My friend the hon. the Home Member says that this House should not mix up these two questions, namely, the grant of this compassionate allowance of Rs. 300 each to the families of the deceased persons and the occurrences connected with the tragedy. I cannot, for a moment, understand how my hon. Friend the Home Member regards these as two distinct issues. They are so inseparably connected one with the other that to my mind it is not possible to dissociate the one from the other. Suppose a person is hanged after a judicial trial. Nobody would think—and the Government would not think—of giving any money to the family of that person who has been hanged and who is dead. The very fact that the Government thought it necessary to give this amount of Rs. 300 each to the families of these deceased persons shows that they are conscious that there was some wrong at the bottom."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"That point has never been disputed from first to last. It was always recognized by the Government that that was a regrettable, a most regrettable incident, and that is the reason why it is now proposed to give recognition to those who have suffered from it beyond the penalty allotted by the law. That is a perfectly simple question distinguishable from the question of disciplinary action and the affixation of responsibility. I cannot understand any one holding that the two issues are not separate."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"The hon. the Home Member said that it was admitted by them that a regrettable tragedy had happened. If all of us recognize that a regrettable tragedy has happened, I cannot understand the reason of the hon. the Home Member losing his temper, getting up and interrupting me when I was making a statement which was accepted by himself."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I rose because of the inference drawn."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I still adhere to this inference, and I repeat it. And that inference is that the very fact that the Government have thought it necessary to give this sum of Rs. 300 to each of the families of those unfortunate victims shows that they are convinced that there has been something very unfortunate in connexion with that incident. My point was and is that the grant of this compassionate allowance and the verdict of the Government and, I suppose, of the public with reference to the main incident are so inseparably connected, one with the other, that they cannot be separated. So that, as I said, I do not want to use very strong language in connexion with this matter particularly as the hon. the Home Member said that he would be leaving this country—"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I have no desire to ask the indulgence of the hon. Member if he wishes to criticise me, on the score that I shall be leaving shortly. I am quite prepared to stand any criticism."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"But it is not with reference to his willingness that I am making that remark."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Then, what, Sir, may I ask, was the point of suggesting indulgence to me personally or the reference to the fact that I am shortly leaving this country?"

[27th March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I am not prepared to answer that question. In spite of my hon. Friend the Home Member losing his temper—I wish to regard him still as my friend—in spite of that, I continue to hold that there is an inseparable connexion between the two, and that is, as I was submitting before I was interrupted, in the case of the families of members who are hanged or who die in prison after conviction, we do not think of granting compensation to their families. So that I emphasize—and I repeat it—that this very fact that the Government have thought it necessary to grant this amount shows that there is an inseparable connexion and that it is very unfortunate that the Government have thought fit to come before this Council without publishing the Knapp Committee's report and the conclusion arrived at by that committee. My object is not to oppose the motion. Indeed, I should have been very glad to vote even a larger amount than this sum of Rs. 21,000 if the Government had come before this House in the proper way."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I should like to make a few remarks on the position that has been created by the non-publication of this report. Sir, as you have remarked on the point of order, this is the only way in which we the members of the Legislative Council can express our dissatisfaction with the Executive Government in a matter of this kind. The broad facts are that this incident, this unfortunate incident took place some time about the 19th of November. The Government immediately appointed a committee, almost the same day on which this incident was brought to their notice. That committee has not yet published the report of their deliberations. I believe, at the February meeting, I tabled a question, with your special permission (that was at the end of the meeting) whether the Government would afford us facilities for the discussion of that report, whether they would afford facilities for expressing our opinion on that report and whether steps would be taken to give us that guarantee because it was almost at the end of the session. The answer was in the negative. Sir, this attitude taken up by the Government came upon me as a very great surprise. In all constitutional assemblies, when matters of importance have to be discussed, the Government afford facilities for those who do not agree with them for the discussion of those matters and to come to a mutual understanding. And knowing the constitutional practice elsewhere, I suggested to my hon. Friend whether he would afford us an opportunity for that discussion. The hon. the Home Member told us that he was not prepared to give us that opportunity. In a supplemental question I elicited information as to whether they had come to any conclusion on that matter. He then said that, as far as possible, they would try to expedite orders and that it would be in a week or so. My hon. Friend Mr. Moir, on more than one occasion expressed disappointment with the reforms—"

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"I do not remember any single occasion on which I expressed disappointment with the reforms."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I am quite willing to bring to his notice what he said in referring to duty allowances. He said the proceedings of this Council have given no justification for the misapprehensions which they have raised. That was one instance. Again, speaking on the question of depressed classes, my hon. Friend made a reference to the protection which the reforms was expected to give—"

[27th March 1922]

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"The hon. Member has misquoted and misinterpreted what I said. I do not know whether my views as to the success or otherwise of the reforms are relevant. If they were, I should be quite prepared to explain what I did say. But I cannot see what my views as to the reforms or protection of the depressed classes or anything else have to do with the question of grants to the unfortunate families of these poor men."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"If my hon. Friend had waited a little he would have seen my point. I was going to express our apprehensions as to how the reforms have been worked."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"I should be glad if he would quote me correctly."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"To the best of my recollection, I did not want to misquote any member. Here is a new assembly set up, which is a new departure of Government by discussion. Hon. Members have been trying to get at the report in order to express their opinion on it. What is the attitude of the Government in an occasion like that? It is an attitude of absolute blocking up of this matter without giving an opportunity for discussion. I do not want to go into the exact grounds for this delay. There the fact remains. We are now on the last day of this session and we shall not meet for four months. So I wanted to give the hon. the Home Member and to the House an opportunity of raising a debate on a point which has led to considerable discussion already in this House. I expressed my own apprehensions. It was not Mr. Moir's apprehensions. Should not this House be given an opportunity of stating its views on a matter of this kind? Is it not the duty of this Government to give us those facilities for an expression of our opinion? That is the essence of the reforms scheme. It means that we are going exactly the same way that we were going in the pre-reform days. I was expecting that a change would come in the procedure of the House, in the attitude of the Government and of the non-official members of this House. I trust several hon. Members will share my disappointment that this change has not come over the Executive Government of this Province. That is the point of my friend Mr. Moir's apprehensions and my apprehensions."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"Mr. President, I do not propose to deal with the point raised by Mr. Ramachandra Rao in regard to my apprehensions about the reforms. I will only say that he has misquoted and misinterpreted me, and if he will wait for the official report of my speech to be published, and if he is not yet convinced that he has unintentionally misquoted and misinterpreted me, I am pretty sure that I shall be able to convince him."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I shall be very glad to have my friend's interpretation."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"The point now in question is whether this grant to the families of these deceased Mappilla prisoners should be given or not, or whether it should be reduced. I cannot follow the mental processes of my hon. Friend sitting opposite by which he arrived at the conclusion that the question of this grant is inseparably connected with the question of the report on the train tragedy and that the Government ought not in advance of their decisions to put forward a demand for some recognition of the sufferings, which, beyond the intention of the law, have been inflicted on the families of those unfortunate people. I cannot understand the suggestion that a grant should not be given until the Government have pronounced their

[27th March 1922]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

decision on this report. I would ask the hon. Member whether he does assert that the question whether such compensation should be given or not could possibly depend on what the Government's decision is on that report, on whether one or more or no one can be held responsible. The hon. the Home Member has endeavoured to explain to the House the circumstances which have led to the postponement of the announcement of their decision, and I have nothing more to say on that point. But surely the hon. Member would not say that the provision of this relief to the families of those unfortunate victims should be further postponed. The relief is wanted now and I trust the House will not defer consideration of the questions whether that relief is wanted till it can meet again after the announcement of the decision on the report; it may be four months or five months hence. I sincerely hope that the House will consent to this grant of relief to the unfortunate families on its own merits and not with reference to any other issue which would be entirely irrelevant to the consideration of a small act of mercy and consideration."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"I want to show the inseparable connexion between this motion and the orders of the Government on the Knapp Committee's report. We know that the families of the Mappilla prisoners who died owing to the train tragedy ought to be compensated because it is admitted now that it took place on account of the negligence of some official or other. If the report of the Committee says that a certain set of persons is really responsible for the incident and if these persons are not properly mulcted with due punishment, this House has a right to judge whether the Government Order has properly been passed or not. If this House were to approve the order of the Government it would be perfectly justified in accepting this demand. If the order of the Government is not in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the House, it would be perfectly justified in rejecting this demand. I, therefore, submit that this demand is premature."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Before the House proceeds further, it would probably be advantageous if I say just a word or two in continuation of what I have already said when the hon. the Finance Member rose to a point of order. Mr. Krishna Rao is perfectly entitled to move a motion like this, i.e., to reduce the amount of Rs. 21,000 by Rs. 100 and by so doing to enter his protest against the delay on the part of the Government in not publishing the report. I have of course nothing to say on the question whether the protest is right or wrong, or whether the Government were justified in bringing forward this demand or not. Now that the protest has been entered, and in view of the fact that no hon. Member really proposes to reduce the allotment and time presses, it is a matter for the consideration of the hon. Member Mr. Krishna Rao and other hon. Members who act with him, whether he may not withdraw the specific proposal, i.e., to reduce the allotment of Rs. 21,000 which is the only issue before the House."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"We have had a discussion as to the circumstances under which the report was not published and I did raise my protest about the delay in the matter of publication of the orders of the Government; and although the hon. the Home Member promised us that he would be able to have the matter disposed of in the course of a week —"

[27th March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I did not promise, Sir. My words were 'I hope to have the matter disposed of at the end of this week'."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Though the hon. the Home Member hoped that the orders would be issued in the course of the week, still owing to incidents which subsequently passed it was not possible for him to prepare that report, the two incidents referred to being His Excellency's absence at Delhi for some time, and also that of the hon. the Ministers at the end of last month. It will be remembered that the hon. the Minister returned from Delhi on the 4th March and that, as the matter was of an urgent character, it should have been possible for the hon. the Home Member to dispose of that matter.

"The other point which I wish to state is that nobody need be under any misapprehension as to whether there is any connexion between this motion and the publication of the report. I say there is inseparable connexion because much will depend upon the findings of the Committee. Now that we are called upon to vote for the payment of money out of the provincial funds if it is found that some particular persons are responsible for the train tragedy, it is a matter for consideration whether those persons should not be called upon to pay fines for their mistakes or be dismissed from their services. Because these Mappilla prisoners died as the result of mistakes committed by some persons, are we to vote pensions from the provincial funds, if the result of the inquiry has shown that there were some persons who were found really responsible for this incident and who can be justly called upon to pay compensation for the death of the prisoners? If that is the view to be taken, opinions would be entirely different. Now, knowing all those circumstances, we are called upon to vote funds from the provincial revenues. That is why I say there is inseparable connexion between the two incidents. I hope that no further time will be lost in the publication of this report. Notwithstanding the delay that has been caused, I do not think the hon. the Home Member, so far as I can judge, has been in a position to give us any reason to ignore the long delay in the publication of the orders of the Government, and if the Government will give us an assurance that they will publish the report without any further loss of time, I think the House will be justified in passing this grant.

"I do not want to deprive these unfortunate families of this small pittance being given to them, and while I am prepared to vote for a larger sum which might be necessary to relieve them from their sufferings, I do not think it necessary to press this motion."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Mr. Ramachandra Rao has complained that in all constitutional assemblies facilities are given for the discussion of matters in regard to which a large section of the assembly is at variance with the Government of the day. I quite agree with him and I am quite ready at the proper time to give full opportunity to discuss the decision at which the Government may arrive in regard to this matter. I regret as much as he does that it has not been possible for the decision to be arrived at and to be published before the adjournment which will be taking place to-day. But I never gave the least indication that there was any intention on the part of Government to permit anything in the nature of a discussion of the merits of the case before the report was published and before the Government themselves had arrived at their conclusions. Any such discussion of

[27th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

questions of personal responsibility would be entirely out of place in a tribunal such as this. It is quite another matter to discuss and attack the decision at which Government may arrive, apportioning blame here and exonerating from blame there. It is for that sort of discussion alone that the Government will be ready to give facilities. They are not ready to allow a report of this description to be thrown open to the world and discussed by the newspaper press, on the platform and in this Council, before they themselves have arrived at a decision. Any such course would be grossly unfair to the officers whose conduct has been impugned.

"I remain entirely unconvinced as to the supposed inseparable connexion between the question of compensation for the families of these unfortunate Mappilla prisoners and the decision that we may pass on the report as to the cause of the train tragedy and the responsibility for it, notwithstanding the ingenious arguments which have been advanced by the hon. Mover Mr. Krishna Rao, whose suggestion, as I understand, is that it might be possible to allocate the cost of this compensation to the officers who may be responsible or perhaps to the railway company. I am by no means convinced, Sir, even if that ingenious explanation were accepted, that it would not still be necessary to enter this amount on the debit side of our budget."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Demand XLV was then put to the vote and carried, and the grant was made.

DEMAND XLVI—AGENCY.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I have the honour to move for a grant not exceeding 0.58 lakh. There was allotment for the purchase of additional transport animals in the current year, but owing to the postponement of the Sonepur fair it was not possible to expend it during the year. Consequently it has lapsed and the Agent has asked for a similar allotment for next year. It is merely the sum required to bring the staff of transport animals up to the standard scale. There is also another item which relates to the establishment of two temporary dispensaries at Lammasinghi and Anantagiri which are required for the purpose of securing sufficient medical relief for the large number of coolies who are employed on important public works in those malarious localities. We must provide some measure of medical relief for them."

Demand XLVI was put to vote and carried, and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXVI. CIVIL WORKS (TRANSFERRED).

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"Sir, I move for a reduction under grant 'XXVI. Civil Works—Transferred' not exceeding 0.34 lakh. The motion has been necessitated owing to an error in the entries in the budget. Two entries amounting in all to 34 of a lakh have been made under head 'Demand XXVI.' In order to correct the mistake I make this motion."

The motion was put and carried and the reduction was made.

DEMAND XLVII—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 10,300 under 'Demand XLVII. General Administration,'

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[27th March 1922]

The House reduced the demand for Publicity Bureau by Rs. 20,000 and in doing so they expressed the desire that we should reduce the pay of the Publicity Officer. We have arranged to do that, but in order to do so we have to provide for a voted amount in lieu of the non-voted amount of Rs. 24,600 which we shall omit. There is one small error however in the note on the agenda paper. We cannot omit the whole. We must retain one-twelfth of it because we have to pay salary for the month of March."

Demand XLVII was put to the vote and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XLIX—LAND REVENUE.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir, I beg to move for a small demand amounting to Rs. 2,060. This is necessitated on account of the three motions in regard to the Land Revenue Department having been accepted by the Council on the 17th of this month. One of them related to the abolition of the post of one of the assistant directors in the Central Survey office, the other related to the abolition of presidency allowances granted to the officers employed in Madras and the third related to the abolition of duty allowances to the Indian special and assistant settlement officers. While giving effect to the resolutions of the Council it is necessary all the same to pay the salary and allowances respectively of these officials for the month of March and that could not be done without a vote of the House."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND L—FOREST.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 200. This amount is required under similar circumstances in order to pay the duty allowance of the personal assistant to the Chief Conservator of Forests for the month of March 1922."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND LI—REGISTRATION.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"I beg to move, Sir, for a grant not exceeding Rs. 225. This sum is required also for similar reasons. The Council passed motions Nos. 306 and 314, that is, motions relating to the abolition of the post of Inspector of Registration Offices as well as the duty allowance of the personal assistant to the Inspector-General of Registration. Their pay for the month of March has to be paid and this necessitates an allotment of Rs. 225."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND LII—CIVIL JUSTICE.

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 900. This is a similar motion for the allowances payable to Provincial Service officers who are now acting as District Judges."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

[27th March 1922]

DEMAND LIII—POLICE.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 1,695, which represents the pay for the month of March of the special police employed at Kamudi, but I think it right to say that the disbanding of that force is a matter on which an immediate decision is quite out of the question. It will be necessary to consult the local officers as to whether this is feasible, but what the Government ask now is provision for one month. I do not wish in any way to obscure the fact that I have no intention of sending out early orders for the disbandment of that force."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND LIV—AGRICULTURE.

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"I beg to move, Sir, for a grant not exceeding Rs. 200 for a purpose similar to that already mentioned. The House will remember that hon. Members were pleased to cut down the duty allowance of the personal assistant to the Director of Agriculture and of the statistical assistant. The pay of these officers is allowed to remain, but their duty allowances are taken away. Since their pay for the month of March has to be drawn (with duty allowance), since this budget is to come into force on the 1st April, and since there is no provision for it in the budget, this allotment has become necessary."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

DEMAND LV—LABOUR AND ALLIED DEPARTMENTS.

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 5,000. This amount is a consequential grant because, when we are discharging these four assistants, we have to pay them their duty allowance for the month of March. Besides, we are making provision for an office manager as we have cut out the personal assistant."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

DEMAND LVI—POLICE.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, I move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 16,000. I mentioned a little while ago, in connexion with a resolution under discussion earlier in the day, the reason why the Government desire to have a certain number of 'Ford' vans in order to increase the mobility and efficiency of the reserve police in the districts. Four such vans are deemed necessary in the first instance and their cost will be Rs. 16,000."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

DEMAND LVII—AGENCY.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, I move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 51 lakh for the Agency. This at least should not excite any controversy, for it merely represents arrears of Agency allowances due to subordinate officers in the Agency tracts at rates which have been approved by the Finance Department and formally accepted by the Finance Committee."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

DEMAND LVIII—CIVIL WORKS—PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
(TRANSFERRED).

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 1,750. This allotment is found necessary also in consequence of a resolution passed by the House abolishing the post of the personal

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[27th March 1922]

assistant to the sanitary engineer. The pay of this officer is to be paid for the month of March, and also for a further period of three months in 1922-23 for which notice is necessary."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

IV—cont.

FINANCE COMMITTEE.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Before proceeding to the next order of the day I may inform the House that, as a result of the ballot held at 1-30 p.m. to-day for the election of six members of the Finance Committee, the following members have been duly elected :—

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.

Dr. P. Subbarayan.

Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.

Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar.

Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar.

Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar."

VII

SECTION 201 OF THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT.

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" Sir, I beg to move that the following draft of the rule proposed to be made by the Local Government under section 201 of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, altering rule 15 (1) of Schedule X of the Act be approved :—

Draft Rule.

In exercise of the powers conferred on them by section 201 (1) of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, the Local Government, with the approval by resolution of the Legislative Council, make the following rule altering rule 15 (1) of Schedule X of that said Act :—

In rule 15 (1) of Schedule X of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, as amended by notifications No. 918, published on page 505 of Part I-A of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 6th September 1921, and No. 78, published on page 44 of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 24th January 1922, for the words 'twelve months' occurring in the first line, the words 'fifteen months' be substituted.

"Sir, I have already moved resolutions for the extension of the statutory period. I have explained the reasons for asking for extension. Similar reasons hold good in the present case."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu seconded the motion.

The resolution was put and carried.

VIII

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1921-22.

Grant I—Land Revenue.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" Sir, I beg to move for a supplementary grant to the extent of Rs. 33.40 lakhs under the head 'Land Revenue'. I would first wish to make it sufficiently clear that this does not in the least indicate that excess

27th March 1922] [Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

expenditure during the current year has been incurred to the extent of Rs. 33.40 lakhs under Land Revenue. A sum of Rs. 29,34,283 out of this amount represents a mere book adjustment. Hon. Members may be aware that until the year 1920-21, three-tenths of the expenditure that was incurred by the Land Revenue Department was debitable against Law and Justice. But since 1921-22 a new classification of accounts has been introduced. Even though the establishment may be employed for more purposes than one, their pay ought to be debited to that particular minor grant in the cadre of which they are borne, and inasmuch as the divisional officers and others who discharge magisterial functions are shown in the Land Revenue budget, the entire expenditure should appear in that budget only. Similarly, we eliminate a corresponding sum of Rs. 29,34,283 from the head of Administration of Justice where it would otherwise have found a place and transfer it to Land Revenue. It is merely a plus and minus entry causing no extra expenditure at all.

"Then, Sir, there are a few other items where there has been extra expenditure to the extent of Rs. 3.88 lakhs. This is an unavoidable expenditure; the increase under the head of salary of the deputy collector is due wholly to the arrears of pay having been paid to him in the year 1921-22 as the same was very kindly sanctioned by the House on the strong plea that I had to put forward on their behalf at the time of the last budget. Another cause is the revision of the salaries of establishments of the treasury deputy collectors due to the fixation by Government of the minimum pay of a clerk at Rs. 35 instead of Rs. 30 as before. Then under general establishments, Collectors' establishments, and subdivisional establishments, and other establishments, there is likewise an increase on account of the pay of the subordinates having been raised from Rs. 30 to Rs. 35. These are the reasons, Sir, for the increase."

The following motions were not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—

(1) To omit Rs. 1,300, the excess required under 22-U (b) General Administration, Secretariat and headquarter establishment—Board of Revenue.

(2) To reduce the sum of Rs. 33,22,953 required under 22-E. General Administration, Commissioners and District officers, by Rs. 14,400.

The demand was put and the grant was made.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—

"I also move, Sir, that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 600 under the head XVI. Interest. This is a very simple item, and is required for the purpose of refund of excess collections of interest from parties to whom loans were given. Until now this amount was regarded as non-votable, but now it is regarded as votable."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant III—Stamps.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—

"Sir, I beg to apply for a grant of Rs. 2.46 lakhs under Stamps. This is due to the fact that the contractor who supplies stamp papers to us from England has been allowed a higher rate than was entered in the original agreement on account of certain circumstances entirely beyond his control

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [27th March 1922]

The High Commissioner in London, through whom we secure our stock of stamp papers, has certified that he has satisfied himself about the reasons which justified the demand of the contractor for an enhanced rate and that he has also paid the excess amount. The Government of India have now asked us to bear our proportionate share of the extra payment that has been made to the contractor. We have accordingly calculated the amount that we have to pay on that account. Until the year 1920-21 our share was only an exact moiety of the total expenditure inasmuch as Stamps was until then a divided head. From 1921-22 it is no longer a divided head, and we have therefore to pay the full expenditure for 1921-22. All this amounts to Rs. 2.46 lakhs, and I would ask the House to vote that sum."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant V—Registration.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, I beg to move for a grant of Rs. 3,000 for the excess expenditure over the budget grant under 'Transferred—9. Registration.' Last year no provision was made in the budget in connexion with extra expenditure for polling and census duties, to the officers who were conducting the polling. Provision has therefore to be made now."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant VII—General Administration.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" I beg to move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 11,540 under '22. General Administration—Executive Council and Ministers—Provincial—Reserved.' The particular items are Excess Service Postage and Telegram charges due to the Mappilla rebellion and the general political situation in the Presidency, contingencies which include the payments made in 1921 for two bills for news agency telegrams supplied during 1920 and travelling allowances due to the extensive and most valuable touring of the hon. the Ministers."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I move for the grant of Rs. 8,751 under '22. General Administration—Provincial—Reserved' on account of tour expenses. This amount represents the difference between the actual allotment, including additions to the original budget estimate which has been duly sanctioned, and the revised figure supplied by the Accountant-General on the basis of nine months' actuals. I believe the figures have been placed before the Finance Committee."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant VIII—General Administration.

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" I move for an additional grant of Rs. 20,000 for the travelling allowance of non-official members of the Legislative Council. The original estimate was Rs. 1,20,000, and they have now absorbed nearly Rs. 1,60,000. This additional grant also includes the payments to non-official members who went to Delhi to induce the Government of India to reduce the contributions. We do not expect the Government of India even to pay the travelling expenses."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

[7th March 1922]

Grant XII—Jails and Convict Settlements.

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" I move for an additional sum of Rs. 24,500 for meeting the excess expenditure anticipated under the head '25. Jails and Convict Settlements.' This extra amount is required after making the necessary reappropriation owing to the influx of Mappilla prisoners into our jails."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XIII—Police.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I move for the grant of an additional sum of 8.53 lakhs under 'XXVI. Police.' This is made up of a variety of items, and I do not think the House will desire me to go into the various details which I understood have been placed before the Finance Committee. I propose to mention only two or three. Under 'Presidency Police' there is an item of Rs. 65,000 which was mainly spent on the employment of additional police in connexion with the labour troubles. Under 'Salaries and establishments' we had to meet the introduction of the revised scale of pay for deputy superintendents of police including a large arrear sum. Under 'Police force' an amount of 3.73 lakhs represents a series of additions sanctioned during the year for which there was no budget provision. We had to provide *inter alia* for additional police in Guntur consisting of 20 head constables and 200 constables, for the special police force in Kamudi consisting of five head constables and 51 constables and an Inspector from the 30th of September 1921. There is also a sum of 2.10 lakhs for travelling allowance, which is due to the increased rates of travelling allowance and also to the general rise in railway fares. There is finally an amount of 3 lakhs and odd which represents the Mappilla rebellion charges. Altogether the items of charge make up a total of 11.80 lakhs, and there are savings to the extent of 3.27 lakhs on the other side to be set off, resulting in a net increase on the revised estimate of 8.53 lakhs."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XIV—Scientific Departments—Donations to Scientific Societies.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I move, Sir, for the grant of a sum of Rs. 2,600 under 'XXX-B—Scientific Departments—Provincial—Museums—Transferred' for expenditure on account of the revision of the scales of pay of the establishment in the Government Museum. The scales have been recently revised and hence the deficit, and we have to meet it."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, I move for a grant of Rs. 1,000 under XXX-C—Scientific Departments—Donations to Scientific Societies (Transferred) for grant to the Bandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, for the preparation of a scientific and critical edition of the Mahabharata. A similar grant was made for the year 1921-22, and this is for the year 1922-23."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XVII—Medical.

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" I beg to move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 3,68,457 for meeting the excess

[Mr. P. Ramarayaningar]

[27th March 1922]

expenditure anticipated under the head '32. Medical—Voted Charges.' Sir, in adjustment of the accounts of the current year, the deficit has been anticipated as certified by the Accountant-General."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XXII—Cinchona.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"Sir, I move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 10.64 lakhs under 'Cinchona.' This is a large sum but has to be paid for goods supplied by the Government of India. They sent us a supply of 31,350 lb. of quinine, when, most unfortunately, the Government Cinchona Factory at Naduvattam was burnt down. We have now to meet the payment due to the Government of India for that supply."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XXVI—Contribution to Local Funds.

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR:—"I move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 2,684 under '47-C. Contribution to Local Funds.'"

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XXIX—Superannuation Allowances and Pension.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I move for a sum of Rs. 61,648 under '45. Superannuation Allowances and Pension—Provincial—Voted Charges.' The bulk of this amount is due to the introduction of a more liberal policy in the matter of commutation of pensions. There are other minor items under 'Gratuities', the amount of which exceeded our estimates."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XXXI—Stationery and Printing (Transferred).

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"I move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 1,04,600 under '46. Stationery and Printing (Transferred)—Provincial—Voted Charges'. For similar reasons given by the hon. the Finance Member, I move for the grant of this amount."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XXXII—Miscellaneous.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I move for a sum of Rs. 100 under '47. Miscellaneous—Provincial (Reserved)' on account of travelling allowance of official and non-officials attending darbars. Sir, with the combined assistance of the Chief Secretariat and the Finance Department, I have not been able to find out exactly how this large deficit of Rs. 100 was occasioned. All that I can say is when a bill of ours was sent up to the Government of India they struck out this Rs. 100 and ordered us to pay the amount from Provincial funds."

"The next item is for a grant of Rs. 25,200 under the head '47. Miscellaneous—Miscellaneous and unforeseen charges.' This amount has to be paid as compensation to public servants who have lost their property during the rebellion in Malabar. The House may remember the instance of Mr. Chandy whose claim alone amounts to many thousands."

[27th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

"The third item is for a grant of Rs. 14,240 under '47. Miscellaneous for expenses in connexion with the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales.'"

The three items were put to the House and granted.

Grant XXXIII—Miscellaneous.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, I beg to move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 1,000 4-45 p.m. for the excess expenditure under the budget grant under '27. Miscellaneous—Rewards for proficiency in Oriental languages.' This expenditure is mainly due to the scheme of the Government of India which allows ladies of the families of officers in the I.C.S., Medical and other services to appear for a test in the vernacular and gives Rs. 100 to each when they pass. A large number of ladies having appeared and passed, we have had to incur an additional expenditure of Rs. 1,000."

"I also move that the Government be granted the following additional sums for excess expenditure over the grants under 'Miscellaneous':—

(1) Rupees 2,515, the excess expenditure over the grant under 47-A. Miscellaneous—Donations for charitable purposes—Langarkhanas and Indian Choultries.

(2) Rupees 4,900, the excess expenditure over the grant under 47-A. Miscellaneous—Donations—Donations for charitable purposes—Miscellaneous—Miscellaneous."

The demands for Rs. 1,000, Rs. 2,515 and Rs. 4,900 were put to the House and granted.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I beg to move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 2,808 under petty establishments and Rs. 40,000 under expenditure in England for the year 1921-22 under the major head 47. Miscellaneous. The bulk of the latter amount is due to the fact that the Secretary of State has held that the charges on account of the candidates selected in India and sent home for training in England are to be treated as voted charges."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XXXIII-A—Exchange.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I beg to move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 12,60,000 under 40. Exchange. This is asked under circumstances which are explained in the memorandum attached to the budget."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XXXIII-B—Miscellaneous—Adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I beg to move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 19,10,000 under 52. Miscellaneous—Adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments. This sum represents the result of a long series of adjustments in connexion with income-tax collections and payments and charges on account of staff ranging over the past three years. It would take a considerable time to explain this item in detail, and I therefore hope that at the present late hour the Council will accept it."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

[27th March 1922]

IX

PROROGATION OF THE COUNCIL.

His Excellency the GOVERNOR, in proroguing, addressed the Council as follows:—

“Mr. President and hon. Members of the Madras Legislative Council,—

“Before proroguing the Council, I am very glad, as head of the Government, to have this opportunity of thanking hon. Members for the assistance they have given us in the work of the administration of our Presidency during the past year, and of congratulating hon. Members warmly on the sense of responsibility they have shown in carrying out their important duties.

“I think we may all feel that the good ship ‘Reforms’ has fairly successfully completed her maiden voyage, and though I think we have discovered already that certain alterations in her structure require to be made in order that she may prove to be a more sea-worthy vessel, still the skipper can very truly say that he would have found the difficulties of navigation much greater if it had not been for the loyal and devoted work of the whole of the crew.

“It has been a matter of much regret to the Government that we have been unable to carry out the full programme of legislation that I outlined when I addressed hon. Members at the beginning of the session, but our time has been much occupied by the various disturbing influences of which hon. Members are well aware, and it has been found quite impossible to undertake all the rather comprehensive programme which I then hoped we might complete. I trust, however, that the coming year may be productive of peace and good-will among all communities in all parts of the Presidency, and that Government may be able next session to bring forward important measures of legislation which will help towards the better administration of our province.

“It is hardly necessary for me to refer to the serious nature of the financial situation, for hon. Members have probably, during the past month while the budget has been under discussion, had this matter constantly before their mind, but I wish generally to express my keen satisfaction at the manner in which hon. Members have exercised their powers in regard to the various proposals which have been laid before them, and assure them that Government will abide by the decisions which have been arrived at by the votes of the majority of the Council (cheers). There are one or two points, however, which I should like to refer to which have come to my notice during the budget debate. I observe that hon. Members have decided on a reduction in the amount proposed for expenditure on the Publicity department. I only refer to this matter in order to say that if the reason for that reduction lies in the fact that hon. Members intend to do much more publicity and propaganda work themselves among their constituents (laughter) during the recess which I much hope and have often urged, then there is every justification in the action which they have taken on this head.

“But another matter is one which is to my mind of such far-reaching importance if it is allowed to develop that I venture to deal with it fully and make certain suggestion to hon. Members which I am sure they will

[27th March 1922] [His Excellency the Governor]

accept as given by me in the best interests of the working of the Council itself and of that intelligent control over the Government in financial matters which the Council is expected to exercise.

“Under the Instrument of Instructions there is laid upon the Governor the following duty, viz., ‘to ensure the probity of public finance and the solvency of the Presidency.’ There is, I need hardly say, no question of the probity of the financial administration, but the solvency of the Presidency is one as regards which I and my Government have had many searchings of heart. I need not recapitulate the financial history of the last few years. We started with great expectations, based upon what appeared to be the firmest of foundations, and with the full approval of the Council of the day proceeded at the close of the war to try to make up leeway with the aid of the balances that had been accumulated during the war. Not only, however, have we lost our expected increase, we have lost in addition a very large part of the revenue which we thought was already ours; and we have had to ask the Council to assent to taxes to meet the deficit. Hon. Members have passed some of these and while they have rejected others, they have still insisted upon the incurring of the expenditure which they were designed to meet. I do not propose in any way to interfere with the action the Council have taken, but in view of the instruction to me to safeguard the solvency of the Presidency, I feel bound to sound a note of warning.

“I know it will be replied to me that the Council’s idea is that solvency should be secured by stringent economy. I do not contest that proposition. But I do ask hon. Members to realize that if they, having the power of the purse, consider that that is the only way by which to attain solvency then it is for them to put forward and carry the measures necessary to that end. I lay stress on this point, because, although as many as 794 resolutions have been moved on the budget, most of them dealing with points of detail, I have noticed that there has been a general tendency to withdraw these resolutions after discussion, but to press and carry only a small number which involve lump deductions from total grants. Now, I venture to say to the Council that this is not a correct procedure. It has been suggested that it is a desirable one because it gives the Government discretion to make such reductions as they think fit, and I know it may be argued that this is a principle which has been adopted in other Legislative Assemblies in India. As the head of the Government, I must say that I cannot accept either of these arguments. We have carefully examined the budget and put forward what appeared to us to be the minimum demands necessary for carrying on the administration. It is open to the Council in the exercise of their responsibility and their power of the purse, if they consider any details of these demands excessive, to reduce them or cut them out, but I do not think that it is proper to ask the Government, who regard the whole as essential, to choose which of the essentials they will do without.

“I think hon. Members will agree that the object of budget discussion is to give the opportunity to any member of moving to reduce or cut out individual items under any head of the budget and take the responsibility for it himself. The danger of these omnibus reductions is that, if the system is permitted to develop, they would cause the budget discussion to deteriorate into a scramble for lump sum deductions; that the Government

[His Excellency the Governor] [27th March 1922]

would be tempted to ask for more than what they need so as to meet the contingency of omnibus reductions, and that the interest in and the educative value of budget discussion would suffer and the consequences would be more far-reaching than is probably now realized.

"I have expressed myself fully and freely to hon. Members on this matter and am sure they will accept such advice as I have ventured to give in the spirit in which it is given as coming from one who is eager and anxious as I have already said, for the best interests of the future working of our Council. (Applause.)

"The reasons for our large deficit are, as hon. Members are aware, mainly three in number. In the first place, the very great cost of the increase in salaries particularly among the more low-paid officials owing to the general increase in prices during the past few years; in the second place the loss of revenue that has occurred owing to the violent activities of the non-co-operation propaganda and in the third place the payment of Rs. 3½ crores to the Central Government under the arrangement which has been forced on us notwithstanding our strongest protests as a result of the report of Lord Meston's Financial Relations Committee. The effect of this adverse financial position has necessarily been the postponement of many projects which would be of great advantage to the people, a practical stoppage of much necessary development in all departments. I need hardly say that this has been most disappointing not only to myself and to every member of my Government but to departmental officers as well, and very especially to my hon. Colleagues, the Ministers, who are in charge of most of the developing departments, and to whom it has been a very great blow that in the first year of the life of the Reforms scheme they who control the transferred departments have been unable to start many schemes which I know well they are eager and anxious to develop. I trust we may see an improvement in the financial situation during the coming year; hon. Members may rest assured that Government will do everything in their power to secure that desirable end.

"I must refer, having regard to recent happenings, to the position of Government in regard to the non-co-operation movement. I can assure hon. Members that Government have no desire to take drastic action against any one, but law and order must be maintained, in order that the law-abiding citizen may feel safe and secure in carrying on his ordinary avocations. I wish, however, to point out how extraordinarily difficult is the position of Government in a matter of this sort. It really seems to be this. If any dangerous outbreak occurs owing to the activities of any revolutionary agitators, Government are taken severely to task for not having taken strong action to prevent it; but if that strong action is taken, they are told that the moment for such action is inopportune and that it will have disastrous consequences. The difficulty of our position is very much evidenced at the present time. I think that the firm action which Government has taken with regard to civil disobedience and non-payment of taxes has been generally approved; but when the prime-mover and leader of that policy is arrested, action which I consider to have been amply justified and which Mr. Gandhi appears to think fully justified himself, it appears from what I read in the press that in several quarters the arrest is considered most impolitic and undesirable. I can but say that it is impossible

[27th March 1922] [His Excellency the Governor]

for Government to be on both sides of the fence at the same moment. We believe that law and order must be firmly maintained, we are acting up to that belief and expect to receive the support of all law-abiding and peace-loving citizens in our efforts to take a straightforward course to that end. And we are also firmly of the opinion that, while the revolutionary agitation of non-co-operators with all its resultant destruction of property and bloodshed, while their persistent and ill-mannered efforts to minimise the good effects of the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, have created an unfortunate impression as to the state of India in the minds of my countrymen in England, the vast majority of the people of India are true and loyal to the British Throne, and we are clear that these unfortunate incidents should not deter us from pressing forward towards the achievement of India's ambition, absolutely equal partnership in the commonwealth of nations that make up the great British Empire. (Cheers.)

"But this ambition, I am convinced, will never be achieved unless we are all determined to work together in a spirit of loyal co-operation and goodwill, and with this in my mind may I ask the Council to exercise forbearance in the discussion of questions relating to the services, both English and Indian, whether inside this House or out of it? I am sure hon. Members do not bear the services any ill-will, in fact, that there exist the best of feelings between many members of this Council and members of the services with whom they have come into contact. But I do ask them to consider what may be the effect in small stations in the mufassal of brief, and perhaps not too accurate, reports of statements made in controversy here which all of us who hear them understand. Members of the services have had much to unsettle them in changes in the system of control in the prospect of further change in policy in which they were brought up in the absence of personal knowledge of their new masters and in numerous other ways. They are in certain quarters the subject of constant aspersion and attack, some of which may be justified if directed to the system, but which is quite unfair when applied to individuals, and above all their future is very uncertain. The Council need in this present year of stress the very best work they can secure from the trained officers, and I ask them to recognize that the best class of work will not be secured from men who are harassed by criticism, who feel that their efforts are not appreciated and who feel keenly this uncertainty as to their future. Believe me, I know what I am saying when I tell hon. Members that the European officers who are staying in India under the new constitution are out to help, that they are willing to give of their best in the future as they have done in the past, and having accepted the new order of things they are only too anxious to see the new machine running smoothly. I appeal to all therefore to be generous in their judgments of officers of Government to believe the best and not the worst, to look upon officials as friends and not enemies, and they on their part I know will be only too ready to respond in that spirit of goodwill and friendship for which I am now appealing.

"Before I conclude, I wish to refer to the departure to England of two of our highest officers of the Council, I refer to the President and to the Leader of the House, Sir Lionel Davidson. The departure of the former is, I am glad to say, only for a period of a few months, and he is going, accompanied by his Legislative Council Secretary, to gain knowledge at first hand of the procedure and methods of the Houses of Parliament. I am sure we all wish

[His Excellency the Governor] [27th March 1923]

them a safe journey, and trust that they will return to us full of useful information which will increase the efficiency of the working of our Council. Sir Lionel Davidson is leaving us at the end of a service career extending over thirty-two years which he has devoted to the best interests of the administration of this Presidency. From his wide knowledge of the affairs of this Presidency and from his transparent sincerity and straight forwardness in all his actions (cheers), I can very truly say that I shall much miss his counsel and advice. I am sure every hon. Member would wish to join me in expressing our gratitude to him for his long and faithful service to our Presidency, and our hope that he may enjoy a well-earned rest from his labours and maintain his interest in the well-being of the people of this country among whom he has spent so many years of his life. (Cheers.)

"I hereby declare this Council prorogued and trust that hon. Members may enjoy rest and relaxation and return full of Vigour and energy to undertake their duties for the coming year." (Applause.)

At 5-10 p.m. the Council adjourned *sine die*.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

