The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Monday, the 21st March 1921, the Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR, 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.]

Roofing of Bezwada railway platform.

414 *Q.*—Mr. S. R. Y. ANKINEDU PRASAD : To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member—

(*a*) with reference to my question No. 249 and the answer given thereto, at the last sitting of the Legislative Council, whether he will inquire further of the Agent to the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Company : (1) which number of passengers is greater and is more inconvenienced of the two sets, viz., (i) passengers transhipping from north-going mail trains referred to in his answer, to His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Guaranteed State Railway trains, or (ii) passengers transhipping from the Calcutta-Madras Mail trains and the Nizam's Guaranteed Railway trains to the trains going to the Ceded Districts via Guntūr and Masulipatam and from these latter again to the former ; and passengers who tranship from the passenger and other local trains to the Madras-Calcutta and the Nizam's State Railway trains and those who get in and get out at Bezwada ;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that both the two sets of trains mentioned above used to be received on the same side of the old platform at a small distance between the two before the erection of the new station ;

(*c*) whether such arrangement inconvenienced the passengers in any way ;

(*d*) whether it is not possible to make the same arrangement even now so as to receive the said trains at the covered portion of the platform ;

(*e*) if these trains cannot be so received, whether it is not convenient to receive at least the Madras-Calcutta Mail trains on the covered portion of the platform in view of the fact that no trains are received on that platform at the time when the above mail trains reach Bezwada ;

(*f*) whether it is a fact that transhipping passengers are put to great inconvenience and expense in having to walk a long distance between the trains and to pay a large amount of coolie hire ; and

(*g*) whether any representation has been made by the passengers to receive the Calcutta-Madras trains and the Nizam's Railway trains at both sides of the same platform as now.

A.—The question will be transmitted to the Agent.

Sadler's report on secondary education.

415 *Q.*—Mr. S. R. Y. ANKINEDU PRASAD : To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Education—

(*a*) to state the approximate date when the Senate of the Madras University will publish their opinion on secondary education based on the Sadler Commission's report ; and

(*b*) whether he cannot urge on the University its early publication.

A.—From the discussion in the Senate reported in the newspapers, the Government understand that the Senate have completed their consideration of the Report of the Calcutta University Commission.

Headquarters hospital, Masulipatam.

416 Q.—Mr. S. R. Y. ANKINEDU PRASAD : To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Local Self-Government—

(*a*) whether any estimates have been submitted for re-building the Masulipatam headquarters hospital on modern lines ; and

(*b*) whether the Government will be pleased to consider the scheme favourably at an early date.

A.—(*a*) The answer is in the negative.

(*b*) The question will be considered by the Government.

Minors under the Court of Wards.

417 Q.—Mr. S. R. Y. ANKINEDU PRASAD : To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member to state—

(*a*) how many minors are now under the guardianship of the Court of Wards ; how many of them belong to the Telugu and Tamil sections respectively ; and

(*b*) what arrangements have been made for their education after Newington was closed.

A.—(*a*) There are thirteen minors now under the guardianship of the Court of Wards, of whom one belongs to the Telugu section and eleven to the Tamil section.

(*b*) Arrangements have been made for their education in their districts under suitable guardians and tutors. Most of them are studying in local schools or colleges.

Non-co-operation in the Presidency.

418 Q.—Mr. S. R. Y. ANKINEDU PRASAD : To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member to inquire and publish a statement as to how far non-co-operation has been found effective with regard to following particulars, mentioning in each case the taluk and district as far as possible :—

(*a*) the number of persons who have given up (1) titles and (2) honorary offices ;

(*b*) the number of pleaders who have (1) suspended practice and (2) given up practice entirely ;

(*c*) the number of (1) college students and (2) high school students who gave up studies ; and

(*d*) the number of national institutions started after the commencement of this movement, their strength and condition.

A.—(*a*) So far as is known 51 persons have resigned honorary offices, such as honorary magistrates and municipal councillors, and six persons have relinquished their titles.

(*c*) The Government understand that at the beginning of March 1921 the number of students actually absent from schools and colleges for reasons suspected to be connected with non-co-operation was 820.

(*b*) & (*d*) The Government have no information.

21st March 1921]

The Raja of Ramnad :—" With reference to question 418, will the Hon'ble the Home Member give the names of those members who have relinquished their titles ? "

The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson :—" We have a list of the names, of course, and I can give the Honourable Member this information if he wishes it."

Effect of non-co-operation on sale of country liquor, etc.

419 *Q.*—Mr. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad : To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Education (Excise) to mention how far non-co-operation has affected—

(i) the sale of toddy and country liquors ;

(ii) the number of shops closed, giving the districts and taluks in each case ;

(iii) the probable decrease in excise revenue ; and

(iv) whether there are any disturbances reported in these matters.

A.—The Government have no information as to the extent to which sales have been affected by and disturbances have resulted from the non-co-operation movement.

Village officials and servants in zamindari tracts.

420 *Q.*—Sri Meka V. Appa Rao : To ask the Hon'ble the Member for Revenue to state—

(i) the approximate total amounts spent as salaries to the village officials and servants in zamindari tracts ; and

(ii) the total amount that the Government gets on the enfranchised inams of the abovesaid officials and servants.

A.—The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the detailed figures given in the civil budget estimates for 1921-22 under the following heads :—

5-C. Land Revenue—Land Records—Establishment for preparing revenue and agricultural statistics—Village establishment—Proprietary estates,

5-E. Land Revenue—Allowance to district and village officers—Proprietary estates village service,

26 (d). Police—Village Police—Proprietary estates village service, and

5-A & B. Land Revenue—Ordinary Revenue and Miscellaneous.

Redemption of enfranchised inams.

421 *Q.*—Sri Meka V. Appa Rao : To ask the Hon'ble the Member for Revenue whether the Government are aware that certain suits have been filed by some zamindars (Kistna) against the Government for the redemption of such inams and that many of such suits have been decreed in favour of the zamindars.

A.—The Government are not aware of the fact.

Sri Meka V. Appa Rao :—" With reference to question 421, will the Honourable Member be pleased to make inquiries ? "

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur :—" There does not appear to be any immediate necessity to do so.

[21st March 1921

Estates Land Act Amending Bill.

422 Q.—Sri Meka V. Appa Rao: To ask the Hon'ble the Law Member whether it is the intention of the Government to bring up any amending Bill to the Estates Land Act of 1908 during the next session.

A.—The Government are unable to give an undertaking to introduce a Bill to amend the Estates Land Act next session, but they will do so as soon as possible.

Water-supply in Guntūr.

423 Q.—Mr. P. C. Ezhirajulu Nayudu: To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Local Self-Government—

(*a*) whether the Government intend to take up the question of augmenting the pipe water-supply for the Guntūr Municipality for providing house-to-house services;

(*b*) if it is a fact that the Guntūr Municipal Council applied for a loan of Rs. 63,000 for the purpose for the year 1921–22; and

(*c*) whether the Government could make a grant of similar amount from provincial funds with a view to giving relief to the town regarding water-supply.

A.—(*a*) The question will be considered when the estimates for the work are sanctioned.

(*b*) The answer is in the affirmative.

(*c*) At present the Government cannot commit themselves to a promise.

Justices of the peace.

424 Q.—Diwan Bahadur Govindoss Chathurbujadoss Avargal: To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member—

(*a*) to state the requisite qualifications to be possessed by persons in order that they may be nominated justices of the peace;

(*b*) whether in this presidency, non-officials, European or Indian, have been nominated as such and, if so, the number of each nationality;

(*c*) whether there is any rule debarring non-official Indians from being nominated justices of the peace and, if so, whether Government does not think it just and advisable to delete the rule;

(*d*) whether it is contemplated by the Government to appoint, in the near future, non-official Indians such as honorary presidency magistrates as justices of the peace; and

(*e*) whether in other presidencies, non-official Indians have not already been nominated as such.

A.—(*a*) The Member is referred to sections 22 and 23 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

(*b*) No non-official Indians have been appointed justices of the peace.

(*c*) In the mufassal under section 22 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, only European-British subjects are eligible to be justices of the peace. There is no such restriction in the Presidency-town and no rule to prevent the appointment of non-officials if for the purpose of administration such appointment is found desirable.

(*d*) No such proposal is under consideration.

(*e*) The Government have no information, but a perusal of the Bombay Civil List suggests that some of the justices for the town of Bombay are probably non-official Indians.

21st March 1921]

Panchama meeting at Nannimangalam, Lalgudi taluk.

425 Q.—Mr. R. T. KESAVULU PILLAI: To ask the Hon'ble the Law Member whether—

(*a*) the Government have perused a communication under the heading "a Panchama mass meeting" published in the *Hindu* of 3rd February 1921; and

(*b*) the Government have taken any steps in view of the action of the high caste Hindus of the village of Nannimangalam in Lalgudi taluk.

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The resolutions passed at the meeting were received by Government who have forwarded them to the Commissioner of Labour for inquiry. On the result of the inquiry, the Government will consider what action, if any, should be taken.

Occupancy rights to Malabar kanam tenants.

426 Q.—Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Law Member—

(*a*) whether Mr. C. A. Innes submitted to the Government, when he was the Collector of Malabar, a memorandum urging the need for granting right of permanent occupancy to the kanam tenants of Malabar in their holdings; and

(*b*) if so, to lay the memorandum on the table.

A.—(*a*) The Government received a note from Mr. Innes on the tenancy question in Malabar.

(*b*) They regret that they cannot comply with the request.

Government officers and clerks trained in Indian Defence Force.

427 Q.—Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member—

(*a*) how many officers and clerks in each department under the Government have undergone the training in the Indian Defence Force; and

(*b*) whether any preferential treatment has been accorded to them.

A.—(*a*) The Government are not in possession of the information.

(*b*) The Government in 1917 instructed heads of departments and offices to take service in the Indian Defence Force into consideration when making appointments. They have no reason to believe that this instruction has not been carried out, or that heads of departments have failed to give effect to the resolution* of the Government of India on the subject of the preferential treatment of persons who have rendered service in connexion with the prosecution of the war.

Breach of peace at Calicut.

428 Q.—Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU: To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that there have been no breaches of the peace at Calicut prior or subsequent to the arrests of Messrs. Yaqub Hasan, Madhavan Nayar, Gopala Menon and Mohideen Koya;

(*b*) whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to the expression of public feeling in the Presidency protesting against the arrest; and

(*c*) whether the Government cannot direct the immediate release of those persons.

* Published as a supplement to the *Gazette of India* and republished in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, Part I, dated 16th September 1919.

A.—(*a*) So far as regards the period prior to the arrest of Mr. Yaqub Hasan and his companions, the Honourable Member's question is not sufficiently specific to admit of an answer. It is not a fact that there have been no breaches of the peace in Calicut since the date of the arrest.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) The Government have no intention of issuing any such direction. The District Magistrate has power to direct release whenever that can be done without hazard.

Stipendiary students of the Veterinary College, Madras.

429 Q.—Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU: To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Development whether it is a fact—

(*a*) that students of the Madras Veterinary College holding stipends will forfeit their stipends if they fail even once in any of the two examinations;

(*b*) that students who are unable to finish their instruction for any default on their part have to pay a penalty of Rs. 400; and

(*c*) that students who fail once in the first year's examination and twice in the second and third years' examinations are dismissed from the Veterinary College.

A.—(*a*) Stipends in the higher classes are awarded on the results of annual examinations and students that fail in the examinations are not ordinarily awarded stipends.

(*b*) Students who leave the college without sanction are liable to refund the tuition fees at the rate of Rs. 400 per annum.

(*c*) The answer is in the affirmative.

Tenders for railway sleepers.

430 Q.—Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI: To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member—

(*a*) if it is a fact that the southern group of railways are inviting tenders for 4½ lakhs of sleepers aggregating in quantity 10 lakhs of cubic feet the value of which at Rs. 3 per cubic foot approximately would amount to 30 lakhs of rupees; and

(*b*) if the Government could not inquire why this large supply cannot be made either in full or in part by the Forest Department of this Presidency instead of allowing foreign markets to meet the demand.

A.—The Government have no information but will inquire.

Cost of agency administration.

431 Q.—Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU: To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member what the amount of extra cost is in the administration by constituting the Agency tracts of Ganjām, Vizagapatam and Gōdāvari districts into a separate Agency district.

A.—As stated in the answer to question No. 295, the reorganization of the Agency division is not yet complete. Consequently the extra cost to the administration cannot be stated definitely.

Famine at Vizagapatam.

432 Q.—Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU: To ask the Hon'ble the Member for Revenue whether in any part or parts of the district of Vizagapatam there

21st March 1921]

are famine conditions and what steps the Government have hitherto taken and what steps they propose to take to alleviate the distress.

A.— Famine conditions do not exist at present anywhere in the district.

Disafforestation in Vizagapatam.

433 Q.—Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU: To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member how far disafforestation has been effected or is proposed to be effected in the district of Vizagapatam in pursuance of the recent orders passed by the Government.

A.—If the Honourable Member will specify to what orders passed by Government he refers, the Government will supply him with any available information.

Mr. Yaqub Hasan's detention in custody.

434 Q.—Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU: To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member whether the Government consider it necessary to further detain Mr. Yaqub Hasan and three others in custody under the orders passed by the District Magistrate of Malabar and whether the Government will consider the advisability of releasing them.

A.—The Government have no intention of interfering with the discretion of the District Magistrate who has power under section 124 (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code to release the persons referred to if he considers that they may be released without hazard.

Recruitment to Agricultural and Veterinary services.

435 Q.—Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU: To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Development to state the number of superior appointments in the Agricultural and Veterinary services which were filled in this Presidency by recruitment from the United Kingdom in the years 1918-19, 1919-20 and 1920-21.

A.—

Agricultural Department.		*Veterinary Department.*	
1918-19	Nil	1918-19	Nil
1919-20	1	1919-20	Nil
1920-21	4	1920-21	1

Sugar manufacture.

436 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Development to state—

(*a*) if the Government have afforded any, and, if so, what facilities to Messrs. Parry & Co. for the manufacture of sugar;

(*b*) whether any Indian firm has applied to the Government for help, and, if so, what firm and how far have the Government been pleased to comply with its request.

A.—(*a*) A lease of certain lands in the Tinnevelly district for construction of tram lines in connexion with a sugar factory has been granted to a company of which Messrs. Parry & Co. are Managing Agents. The Government have granted no other facilities for the manufacture of sugar.

(*b*) The Government will consider such applications on receipt.

Loan to the Central Housing Association.

437 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Local Self-Government—

(*a*) if it is a fact that in the budget for 1920–21 a provision was made for a loan of 2·00 lakhs to the Central Housing Association;

(*b*) if any application for loan was received from that Association;

(*c*) if so, what orders did the Government pass thereon, with the reasons therefor; and

(*d*) if it is the intention of the Government to help organizations started for the purposes of improving the housing conditions of the poor and the working classes.

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) & (*c*) The Association requested that loans might be made to it by the Government at rates lower than those at which the Government borrowed. The request was negatived.

(*d*) The Government are prepared to consider the grant of loans to co-operative building societies for the benefit of the poor and working classes.

"*The Housing, Town-Planning, etc., Act*" *of* 1919 *passed by Parliament.*

438 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Local Self-Government whether—

(*a*) the Government have perused the Act recently passed by the Parliament with reference to the housing of the poor, called "The Housing, Town-Planning, etc., Act" of 1919; and

(*b*) it is the intention of the Government to pass a similar Act with the necessary modifications for the Madras Presidency.

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) A town-planning law has already been enacted for this Presidency —vide the Madras Town-Planning Act, 1920 (VII of 1920). The question of introducing a Housing Bill is under consideration.

"*Madras City and Suburban Town-Planning Trust.*"

439 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Local Self-Government to state—

(*a*) what the functions are of the "Madras City and Suburban Town-Planning Trust" constituted under section 45 of the Madras Town-Planning Act, and whether those functions include the building of houses for the poor and the working classes; and

(*b*) what provision has been made by the Government for the representation on the Trust of social service organizations of a recognized status and of the tenant communities.

A.—(*a*) The function of the Trust is to work out town-planning schemes in the areas entrusted to it, in accordance with the provisions of the Madras Town-Planning Act, 1920. Under section 4 (*l*) of this Act a town-planning scheme may provide for the construction of houses for the poorer and working classes.

(*b*) None.

21st March 1921]

Famine work in Bellary district.

440 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Member for Revenue to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have called for information promised in reply to question No. 96 put by me at the meeting of the Legislative Council, dated the 16th February 1921;

(*b*) whether the Government will now furnish the required information; and

(*c*) the average daily wages earned week by week by the coolies on the test works since started.

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Collector has been requested to furnish the information required and his report is awaited.

(*c*) The Government have no information.

Famine in Bellary.

441 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Member for Revenue to state—

(*a*) if the Government have perused the leader in the *New India* of the 9th February 1921 under the heading 'Is there famine in Bellary';

(*b*) if, and when, famine has been declared to exist in the Bellary district, and, if it has not been, the reasons for the delay in declaring it to be so affected; and

(*c*) whether any work, and if so what work, has been started in or near Kolur village, Bellary district (Bellary taluk), for the relief of the unemployed in the neighbourhood.

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Orders were issued on 7th March 1921 declaring as famine areas the eastern part of the Bellary taluk, the north-western part of the Alur taluk, the western part of the Adōni taluk and the Siruguppa taluk.

(*c*) No work has been started at Kolur. A test work was started in the second week of February at Sanavasapuram, near Kolur.

Grant of forest lands to private firms in Bellary district.

442 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member to state—

(*a*) whether entire forests, or disafforested lands, or large extents thereof, have been handed over in the Bellary district to private firms;

(*b*) if so, what reserves were so handed over, to whom and on what terms; and

(*c*) whether the Government satisfied themselves, before handing over the areas in question, that the interests of the ryots living in the neighbourhood were not prejudicially affected in the matter of grazing facilities for their cattle, or fuel for their domestic use.

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) No forest or disafforested lands have been handed over to any firm. But the reserves noted below have been leased since 1914 to Mr. Howes, Government grass contractor, Bellary, who harvests and supplies hay to the Military department. The present lease terminates in September 1921 and the rental is Rs. 350 per annum—

Mircheri reserve.
Bellary East reserve.
" West reserve.
Ubbalagondi reserve.
" extension (No. 3).
Marutla reserve.

(*c*) When the first lease was granted the needs of the Military department had clearly special claims to consideration. The Government understand that only one complaint on the subject of the reservations in favour of that department has since been received by the Chief Conservator. This related to an area not leased to Mr. Howes but in direct charge of the Military department, and in consultation with that department the area in question was thrown open to grazing. The Government are not aware of any complaints regarding fuel.

Rayadrug railway station.

443 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member to state—

(*a*) if it is a fact that there is only a small goods shed at the Rayadrug railway station and that there is no accommodation for the passengers who have to wait for the afternoon train to Bellary; and

(*b*) if the Government cannot instruct the railway authorities to provide suitable accommodation for the passengers of the first, second and third classes.

A.—(*a*) The Government are not aware of the facts but presume from the form of the question that they are within the knowledge of the Member himself.

(*b*) It is not within the power of this Government to issue instructions in the sense suggested, but they will bring the question to the notice of the Railway Administration concerned.

Establishment list of the Revenue Department.

444 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Member for Revenue to state—

(*a*) whether the establishment list of the Revenue Department is available for sale to the public; and

(*b*) whether the Government will make it available to the members of the Legislative Council on requisition.

A.—No consolidated establishment list for the whole Presidency is published. The printed establishment lists of each district are not available for sale to the public. They will be made available in the Chief Secretariat Library for the perusal of Honourable Members.

Cochin Harbour scheme.

445 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Finance Member to state—

(*a*) the progress made in regard to the Cochin Harbour scheme;

(*b*) the probable contribution of the British Government towards the above scheme;

(*c*) the arrangements made for the supply of materials required for its execution; and

(*d*) whether tenders were invited for the supply of such materials, and, if so, with what result.

A.—There is as yet no finally approved scheme for the improvement of the Cochin Harbour. As a preliminary it will be necessary to dredge a channel through the bar and the arrangements for the financing of this work are still under consideration.

21st March 1921]

Allotments under Grant I in Bellary, etc., district boards.

446 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Local Self-Government to state—

(*a*) the total allotments under Grant I in the district boards of Bellary, Anantapur, Cuddapah and Kurnool for the year 1920-21; and

(*b*) the amount spent in each district up to the end of January, or if possible, February 1921 on

(i) works, and

(ii) engineering establishment, including office and executive staff.

A.—(*a*) 'Grant I' is not a recognized head of account in a district board budget. If the member is referring to allotments for civil works, the figures are as follows:—

	RS.
Bellary	5,11,650
Anantapur	1,50,410
Cuddapah	2,34,030
Kurnool	3,32,210

(*b*) The Government have no information.

Inspectors of education of girls.

447 Q.—Sriman SASIBUSHANA RATH MAHASAYO: To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Education—

(*a*) to lay on the table a list of inspecting officers, with their qualifications and salaries, who are appointed to look after the education of girls and women of this Presidency; and

(*b*) to state whether there is a separate quarterly list of inspecting officers and teachers who are engaged in the education of girls.

A.—(*a*) The information required is placed on the table.*

(*b*) The answer is in the negative.

Oriya Police Inspectors.

448 Q.—Sriman SASIBUSHANA RATH MAHASAYO: To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member to state—

(*a*) whether all the Oriya Circle Inspectors of Police have now been serving outside the district of Ganjām; and

(*b*) if the Government cannot always keep a sufficient number of Oriya Inspectors in the Ganjām district.

A.—(*a*) A few Oriya Inspectors have been posted outside the district in the interests of the public service. The rest are serving in the district.

(*b*) I the Honourable Member's suggestion is that the number of Oriya Inspectors now employed in Ganjām is not sufficient for the needs of police administration, the Government have no information which would support such a conclusion. The posting of Inspectors is made by the Inspector-General and the Government see no reason to interfere with his discretion.

Revenue collection from Ganjām, Vizagapatam, etc.

449 Q.—Sriman SASIBUSHANA RATH MAHASAYO: To ask the Hon'ble the Member for Revenue to state the total revenue under all heads realized from the

* Vide Appendix on page 847 infra.

districts of Ganjām, Vizagapatam, Gōdāvari, Kistna and Guntūr during the last three years.

A.—A statement will be prepared.

Pay and allowance of sub-assistant inspectors of schools.

450 Q.—Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar: To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Education—

(*a*) whether he has received memorials from sub-assistant inspectors of schools praying for a time-scale of pay of Rs. 150—15—300—25—500, with an efficiency bar at Rs. 400 and for a fixed travelling allowance of Rs. 50 instead of the present allowance of Rs. 25; and

(*b*) what action Government propose to take in the matter.

A.—(*a*) The answer is in the affirmative.

(*b*) The attention of the Member is drawn to pages 6 and 10 of G.O. No. 215, Financial, dated the 4th March 1921, which has been furnished to him.

Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar:—"With reference to question 450, will the Hon'ble the Minister for Education be pleased to furnish the other Honourable Members a copy of the Government Order?"

The Hon'ble Diwan Bahadur A. Subbarayulu Reddiyar:—"Yes, if they apply for it."

Restrictions regarding application for water.

451 Q.—Mr. A. Subbarayudu: To ask the Hon'ble the Member for Revenue whether in view of the fact that the Government have repeatedly exhorted people to increase the output of paddy, he will be pleased to state whether the Government would remove the restrictions regarding applications for water and imposing penal assessment.

A.—The answer is in the negative. The adoption of the Honourable Member's suggestion would operate to the detriment of the registered ayacut which has first claim to the supply of water and tend to restrict the outturn of paddy rather than increase it.

Accounts in vernacular of assessees.

452 Q.—Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar: To ask the Hon'ble the Member for Finance whether in Bombay, Calcutta and Rangoon or in any of these cities there is any rule corresponding to rule 17 (*a*) purporting to be framed under section 43 of the Income-tax Act of 1918 requiring assessees who keep accounts in languages other than the vernaculars of those Presidencies or in the English language to produce under section 18 (2) of the Income-tax Act true translation of the accounts in English or in any of the vernaculars of the respective Presidencies.

A.—The Government have no information.

21st March 1921]

APPENDIX.

[Vide answer to question No. 447 asked by Sriman Sasibushana Rath Mahasayo at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 21st March 1921, page 845 supra.]

List of inspecting officers with qualifications and salaries appointed to look after the education of girls, etc.

Inspectresses of Girls' Schools.

1. Mrs. J. L. Drysdale, B.A. First Inspectress of Girls' Schools. B.A.; Cambridge Training University Diploma; Languages—Tamil and Telugu. Rs. 925 plus O.A. Rs. 50. On other duty as Deputy Directress of Public Instruction.

Miss M. C. E. Karney, B.A., L.T., acting. B.A. (Physical Science); L.T. (trained); Cambridge Teachers' Diploma; Certificate of Nature Study with distinction (Oxford); Educational Compulsory Test in Hindustani. Languages—Latin, Hindustani, Tamil and Telugu. Pay Rs. 400. Permanent Headmistress, Queen Mary's High School for Indian Girls, Vizagapatam.

2. Miss A. Sergeant, B.A., Second Inspectress of Girls' Schools. B.A. (Honours in Modern History, Oxford, London). Rs. 425 plus P.A. Rs. 25 plus C.A. Rs. 50. On other duty as temporary Chief Inspectress.

Miss A. deRozario, B.A., L.T., acting. B.A. (Physical Science); L.T.; Freehand Outline Drawing (Elementary); Sub-Assistants' Test. Languages—Telugu and Oriya. Pay Rs. 400. Permanent Second Assistant Inspectress of Schools.

3. Miss J. Patterson, B.A. Third Inspectress of Girls' Schools. B.A. Pay Rs. 450. On combined leave from 3rd January 1920.

Miss R. McLeod, acting. Language—Tamil. Rs. 425 plus O.A. Rs. 50. Permanent Superintendent, Presidency Training School for Mistresses, Egmore.

Temporary.

4. Miss A. Sergeant, B.A. Chief Inspectress of Girls' Schools. Rs. 600 plus C.A. Rs. 50. Permanent Second Inspectress.

5. Mrs. M. A. Srinivasa, B.A., L.T. Temporary Inspectress of Girls' Schools. B.A. (Philosophy); L.T. Languages—Telugu and Hindustani. Rs. 400. Permanent. First Assistant Inspectress of Schools.

Assistant Inspectresses of Girls' Schools.

1. Mrs. M. A. Srinivasa, B.A., L.T. First Assistant Inspectress of Schools. B.A. (Philosophy); L.T. Languages—Telugu and Hindustani. Pay Rs. 250 plus Rs. 40 plus P.A. Rs. 50. On other duty as temporary Inspectress of Girls' Schools.

Miss T. Lazarus, B.A., L.T., acting. Pay Rs. 250 plus Rs. 40 plus C.A. Rs. 30. Permanent Third Assistant Inspectress of Schools.

2. Miss A. deRozario, B.A., L.T. Second Assistant Inspectress of Schools. B.A. (Physical Science); L.T.; Freehand Outline Drawing (Elementary); Sub-Assistants' Test. Languages—Telugu and Oriya. Pay Rs. 200 plus Rs. 40. On other duty as acting Second Inspectress.

Miss Philip Smith, acting. Pay Rs. 200 plus Rs. 40. Permanent Sub-Assistant Inspectress of Schools.

3. Miss T. Lazarus, B.A., L.T. Third Assistant Inspectress of Schools. B.A. (Botany); L.T.; Educational Compulsory Test in Telugu. Languages—Tamil, Telugu, Hindustani and Latin. Rupees 200 plus Rs. 40. On other duty as First Assistant Inspectress of Schools.

Mrs. C. A. B. Bartols, acting. Pay Rs. 200 plus Rs. 40. Permanent Sub-Assistant Inspectress of Schools.

Sub-Assistant Inspectresses of Schools.

1. Mrs. C. A.B. Bartola, F.A. Sub-Assistant Inspectress. Language Branches of the B.A. Degree Examination; Trained Teachers' Certificate of the Upper Secondary Grade; Compulsory Test in Tamil and Telugu; Sub-Assistants' Test. Languages—Tamil and Telugu. Pay Rs. 175 plus Rs. 35. On other duty as Assistant Inspectress of Schools.

Mrs. M. Coultrup, acting. Rs. 175 plus Rs. 35, Permanent, Class II.

2. Miss Philip Smith, Sub-Assistant Inspectress. Higher Examination for Women; Trained Teachers' Certificate of the Upper Secondary Grade; Sub-Assistants' Test. Language—Telugu. Rs. 175 plus Rs. 35. On other duty as Assistant Inspectress of Schools.

Miss E. Vincent, acting. Matriculation; Trained Teachers' Certificate of the Upper Secondary Grade; Freehand Outline Drawing (Elementary); Compulsory Test in Malayalam. Languages—Tamil and Malayalam. Rs. 175 plus Rs. 35. Permanent Headmistress, Government Training School for Women, Calicut.

3. Mrs. J. U. Nory, Sub-Assistant Inspectress. Higher Examination for Women; Trained Teachers' Certificate of the Upper Secondary Grade. Language—Tamil. Rs. 175 plus Rs. 35.

4. Mrs. M. Coultrup, Sub-Assistant Inspectress. Intermediate in Arts; Needle-work and Dress-making (Intermediate), first class; Educational Compulsory Test in Tamil and Telugu. Rs. 150 plus Rs. 30. Acting in Class I.

Mrs. Briant, acting, Permanent Headmistress, Model School, Government Training School for Women, Nellore. Matriculation; Trained Teachers' Certificate of the Upper Secondary Grade; Educational Compulsory Test in Telugu. Languages—Tamil and Telugu. Rs. 150 plus Rs. 30.

5. Vacant, Rs. 150 plus Rs. 30—

Miss C. D'Souza, acting. Intermediate in Arts; Trained Teachers' Certificate of the Upper Secondary Grade (first class). Language—Kanarese. Rs. 150 plus Rs. 30. Permanent Headmistress, Government Secondary School for Women, Mangalore.

6. Vacant, Rs. 150 plus Rs. 30—

M.R.Ry. K. Sundaresa Ayyar, B.A., L.T., acting in Class III. B.A. (History and Economics); L.T. Distinction in the method of teaching History and Geography; Freehand Outline Drawing (Elementary); Account Test; Sub-Assistants' Test, Parts I and II (Telugu). Languages—Tamil and Telugu.

7. Vacant, Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25—

Mrs. F. L. Tremenheere, acting. Higher Examination for Women, first class; Upper Secondary Grade. Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25.

8. Vacant, Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25—

M.R.Ry. P. S. Rama Sarma, B.A., L.T., acting. First-grade Collegiate Certificate; Sub-Assistants' Test, Parts I and II; Account Test. Languages—Tamil and Telugu. Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25.

21st March 1921]

9. Vacant, Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25--

M.R.Ry. G. Venkateswarlu, acting. B.A. (University medallist in Telugu); L.T. (trained); Account Test; Botany (Elementary); Sub-Assistants' Test, Parts I and II (Kanarese). Language--Telugu. Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25.

10. Vacant, Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25--

M.R.Ry. M. Raghunatha Rao, acting. Matriculation; Trained Teachers' Certificate of the Upper Secondary Grade; Animal Physiology (Elementary), first class; Teachers' Certificate in (1) Freehand Outline Drawing (Intermediate); (2) Physiography (Elementary); (3) Botany (Elementary); and (4) Hygiene (Elementary); Account Test (Lower), first class; Sub-Assistants' Test (Clerical) and Part II (Telugu). Languages--Kanarese, Malayalam, Konkani, Tulu, Telugu and Mahratti. Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25. Permanent Sub-Assistant Inspector, Bellary.

11. Vacant, Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25--

M.R.Ry. M. D. Gopala Acharya, B.A., L.T., acting. B.A. (Mathematics); L.T. (trained); Sub-Assistants' Test, Parts I and II (Kanarese); Account Test (first class). Languages--Tamil and Telugu. Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25. Permanent Sub-Assistant Inspector, Cuddapah range.

Temporary.

12. Vacant, Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25--

M.R.Ry. T. D. Krishna Rao, B.A., L.T. B.A. (History); L.T. (trained); Freehand Outline Drawing (Elementary); Sub-Assistants' Test; Account Test; First-grade Collegiate Teachers' Certificate; Madras University Certificate on the teaching of History and Geography. Languages—Telugu, Kanarese and Tamil. Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25. Permanent Sub-Assistant. Inspector, Guntūr East range.

13. Vacant, Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25--

M.R.Ry. V. Muthuswami Ayyar, M.A., L.T. M.A. (Tamil and Malayalam); B.A. (Mathematics); L.T. (trained); Sub-Assistants' Test, Part I; exempted from Sub-Assistants' Test, Part II; Drawing (Elementary); Account Test (Higher); Madura Tamil Sangam gold medallist. Languages—Tamil and Malayalam. Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25. Permanent Sub-Assistant Inspector, Tiruppattūr.

14. Vacant, Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25—

M.R.Ry. N. Govinda Ayyangar, B.A., L.T. B.A. (Philosophy); L.T. (trained); specialized in Mathematics; Freehand Outline Drawing (Elementary); Hygiene and Botany (Elementary); Mensuration and Animal Physiology (Elementary); Account Test (Higher); Sub-Assistants' Test. Language—Tamil. Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25. Permanent Headmaster, Government Training School, Salem.

15. Vacant, Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25—

M.R.Ry. S. V. Ramanatha Ayyar, B.A., L.T. B.A. (Mathematics); L.T. (trained); Freehand Outline Drawing (Elementary); Sub-Assistants' Test; Linguist Test, Tamil; Account Test (Higher). Languages—Malayalam and Tamil. Rs. 125 plus Rs. 25. Permanent Headmaster, Government Higher Elementary Training School, Calicut.

II

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"Before the House takes up the disposal of the demands for grants I would invite the attention of the Honourable Members to the fact that within the period of nine days allowed for the purpose by His Excellency the Governor under rule 29 (1) of the Legislative Council Rules the

House will have to dispose of so many as 35 demands, each comprising several heads of accounts. Further the number of motions for omission or reduction of grants or items of grants has already reached a formidable figure of 360, and it is possible that some more motions may come on the list. It will be convenient to the Honourable Members if I indicate in advance the line which I intend to follow so that they can adjust themselves to it. The Council will ordinarily meet every day at 11 a.m. and will proceed with the voting of demands for grants immediately after questions: there will be half an hour's interval for lunch, generally from 2 to 2-30 p.m., and the Council will ordinarily adjourn at 5-30 p.m. And taking all the nine days together the Council will probably have 54 hours for disposal of all the demands. Honourable Members will thus see that considerable expedition will be needed and I would appeal to them to use that expedition. I would also suggest to Honourable Members to distinguish if possible between the more important motions and the less important ones. Neither the rules nor the standing orders prescribe any time-limit for the speeches to be made at this stage. The half an hour for movers of resolutions and Members of Government in charge and the quarter of an hour for other Honourable Members prescribed by Standing Order 57 does not apply to the case of these motions; and I have therefore resolved to use the general power vested in me by Standing Order 79, to fix the time-limit for the speeches to be made at this stage. After giving the matter my most careful consideration I have decided to give 10 minutes to the Honourable Members who move motions or reductions of grants or items of grants, and also 10 minutes to the Honourable Members of Government to answer these motions; other Members will have 5 minutes each. In exceptional cases, that is, in the case of motions of such importance and complexity where the time-limit of 10 and 5 minutes respectively will not suffice, I reserve to myself the power to enlarge these time-limits in which case the increased time-limit will be notified when the motions are taken up. I shall not be justified in allowing any Honourable Member to exceed the prescribed time-limit. I am sanguine that I shall have the co-operation of all Honourable Members in working up to the time-limits which I have laid down. Honourable Members will see that, under rule 29 (3), on the last of the nine days allowed for the purpose it will be my duty to put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of all outstanding matters in connexion with the demands for grants."

DEMAND 1—LAND REVENUE.

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Mr. President, I move for the vote of the House in respect of a grant of 216·64 lakhs for the Land Revenue Department. Honourable Members are aware that this is again subdivided into 5-A, 5-B, 5-C, 5-D and 5-E and the necessary details in regard to each subdivision are found in the budget estimate which is in their hands. The necessary detailed explanations are also available in the same budget. I therefore move for the vote."

MOTION No. 1.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, I beg to move—

1. '*That under 5-A. Land Revenue—Charges of District Administration the item of Rs.* 90,000 *for the provision of additional and temporary deputy collectors be omitted* (*Budget page* 29).'

"I will invite the attention of honourable members to page 29 of the budget estimate, from which they will see that in the year 1920-21 the provision under this head was for nine deputy collectors, additional and temporary; whereas, in

this year, the provision has been made for 25 additional and temporary deputy collectors. In the memorandum which was placed in our hands by the Hon'ble the Finance Member no explanation has been given as to why this increase of additional staff under this head was required. The Chief Secretary's memorandum was very useful to us in explaining the deviations from the figures of the current year. Unfortunately no attempt has been made to explain all these deviations except in a cursory manner in the memorandum of the Honourable Member in charge of Finance. Therefore we are at a loss to know as to why this additional staff of 14 deputy collectors are required, and so far as I am concerned I would deprecate the necessity or advisability of appointing temporary staff for any purpose whatever if it is possible to do so. I am aware that in previous years some temporary additional staff has been provided for. But unless the necessity for this staff is made out clearly, I propose to press this into a division. It may be that some portion of the staff is to be employed in the Department of Co-operation."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Mr. President, I would first explain by stating that from and after the year 1910 it was considered necessary to organize what we call a self-contained staff of deputy collectors—a staff which will be employed wholly and solely on duties appertaining to the Revenue Department. Accordingly, we find a provision of 143 deputy collectors made in the budget estimate on page 29 which merely consists of the permanent cadre which the Revenue Department is entitled to. These deputy collectors are intended for divisional charges, for treasury charges and for duties quite relevant to those of the Revenue Department. But besides this cadre, it becomes necessary from time to time to respond to the calls of other departments who have a great fancy for the employment of deputy collectors, and I take it that it is a compliment to that class of officers. And from time to time the necessities of the temporary deputy collectors have got to be determined merely with reference to demands which reach us. The 25 additional deputy collectors for whom provision has been made in the budget estimate have been intended for temporary employment in the Department of Co-operation, in the Department of Agriculture and in the Department of Commissioner for Labour. So many as 17 deputy collectors are wanted by the Registrar of Co-operative Societies for employment in his department, two deputy collectors by the Director of Agriculture, three are wanted by the Commissioner for Labour, one deputy collector is to be lent as Under Secretary to the Government in the Home Department, another has to be lent to the Finance Department as Assistant Secretary and one other as Personal Assistant to the Agency Commissioner. This makes up the total of 25. I may at once state for the information of the House that, after these figures were prepared, the Secretary of State has been pleased to sanction an additional cadre of ten deputy collectors for employment in the Co-operative Department, so that the permanent cadre of 143 as shown on this page 29 will be raised to 153 and the number of temporary deputy collectors will proportionately be reduced to 15. It all depends upon what demands the other departments make. If the other departments do not wish to employ deputy collectors on these special duties, we, in the Revenue Department, are in no way anxious to recruit temporary deputy collectors at all. But I take it that each case is scrutinized very carefully in the Finance Department before a single temporary appointment is sanctioned. I feel convinced that this additional 15 is absolutely necessary for meeting the demands of other departments. On the same page (page 29) it will be noticed that a corresponding deduction has been made in the salary and allowances of deputy collectors who have been lent to other departments. That explanatory note is self-explicit and I think that all that is necessary now would be to make a similar note with regard

[The Hon'ble Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [21st March 1921

to the additional 15 deputy collectors who, from the 1st April 1921, will be called temporary and to add 10 more to the permanent cadre of 143. The previous permanent cadre was 144, and it has been reduced by one. I simply mention that fact to indicate that we are perfectly alive to the need for adjusting our demands according to the necessities. In view of this explanation which I have offered, Sir, I think my Hon'ble friend, Mr. Ramachandra Rao, will feel perfectly satisfied."

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, I have listened to the explanation of the Hon'ble the Revenue Member with great attention. While I welcome the change in the policy for indianizing the administration and increasing the cadre of deputy collectors and the increased demands made for the services of deputy collectors, I am constrained to say that I am not satisfied with the explanation, because the deductions made in page 29 are with reference to 40 deputy collectors. Thus—

" Exchange compensation allowance—

Deduct pay of Assistant Secretary to the Board of Revenue.
Deduct pay of three Presidency Magistrates.
Deduct pay of two Under Secretaries to Government.
Deduct pay of Assistant Secretary to Government.
Deduct pay of five deputy collectors employed on settlement duty.
Deduct pay of deputy collector employed as Personal Assistant to the Chief Conservator.
Deduct pay of seventeen deputy collectors under Registrar of Co-operative Societies.
Deduct pay of two deputy collectors employed under the Court of Wards.
Deduct pay of two deputy collectors under the Director of Agriculture.
Deduct pay of three deputy collectors under the Agency Commissioner.
Deduct pay of three deputy collectors employed as Assistant Commissioners of Labour.

" Under the various heads these deputy collectors have been deleted and the pay that has been allowed for their permanent services is deducted.

" Nevertheless, it has not been made out that the additional staff is necessary. The expansion of the Development Department is provided with seventeen deputy collectors working under the Registrar of Co-operative Societies, and five deputy collectors employed on settlement duty. Therefore there is absolutely no need made out for the increased burden in the pay of the additional deputy collectors or temporary deputy collectors."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—" I rise to support the amendment moved by my friend Mr. Ramachandra Rao and, as my friend Patro told the House, I have also listened to the explanation given by the Hon'ble the Revenue Member. If you just take the budget of 1920–21 and the budget of this year 1921–22, you will find that there has been an increase of so many deputy collectors. I would very respectfully submit, with all my respect to the Revenue Member, that it is an unnecessary increase. Last year, 1920–21, only 26 deputy collectors were lent out from the deputy collector cadre, and this year we have got 40. If we take the calculation of how many new appointments were made, we see it makes 67. On page 29 itself it is stated in the 4th item 'Pay of the Assistant Secretary to Government shown under 22. General Administration.' That is also found at page 67 where we have—

One Chief Secretary.	One Under Secretary.
One Finance Secretary.	One Assistant Secretary.

21st March 1921] [Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai]

"And then the new appointment comes in, the Assistant Secretary on Rs. 500 plus 200 duty allowance. One does not understand why there ought to be this thing. There are the Chief Secretary, the Finance Secretary, the Under Secretary and one Assistant Secretary. Why there is one more Assistant Secretary nobody is able to understand.

"And then again, taking the other new appointments, we find at page 38 one Special Settlement Officer on Rs. 750. That is a new appointment, a deputy collector lent out from service, from the deputy collector cadre to the Settlement Department. I would submit that so far as settlement is concerned, in spite of the resolution that was passed at the February meeting of this Council that the settlement operations should be suspended till the Land Revenue Code is established, to go on increasing this cadre, I would submit, Sir, is not in the interests of the taxpayer. Again, if we take the cadre of two deputy collectors under the Director of Agriculture, it is stated at page 160 who these deputy collectors are. At page 160, so far as the Agricultural Department is concerned, we find last year there was only one Personal Assistant of the deputy collector grade and this year we find one additional Assistant to the Director of Agriculture, and I am afraid the Revenue Member has not at all explained why there is any necessity for this additional Assistant to the Director of Agriculture except the bare general statement of fact that the services of these deputy collectors are so invaluable that a large demand is made upon their services by the other departments. Then, so far as the pay of the three deputy collectors employed as Assistant Commissioners of Labour is concerned, at page 182 we find that three new men are employed. So far as the Labour Department is concerned, it is indeed a very good department but unfortunately the purpose for which that department has been created has not been fulfilled and that it was evidently not fulfilled to the satisfaction of the public was clearly shown by the sharp criticisms which were directed at the preliminary discussion of the Budget on the last occasion. The House will find that so far as the Labour Department is concerned, we have got one Commissioner, two deputy commissioners, two personal assistants, six assistant commissioners. Then out of the six, we find one on Rs. 550, one on Rs. 420 and one on Rs. 300. These are the three that are mentioned at page 29.

"Last year we were able to carry on the whole administration with only about 157 deputy collectors, out of which we have lent 26 to other departments and we were able to carry on the Revenue Administration with 131. This year we have created 172 with the intention of lending out 40 deputy collectors to other departments."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"The honourable member will please resume his seat as he has exceeded his time limit."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Sir, the Hon'ble the Revenue Member has stated that out of the 25 deputy collectors, 17 are intended for the Co-operative Department. I perfectly agree with the Hon'ble the Revenue Member in thinking that an additional staff of deputy collectors is necessary for the Co-operative Department. The other day at the time of general discussion my honourable friend, the Member in charge of that department, stated (page 169) that there are 17 deputy collectors now who are employed as assistant registrars. He said the figure (9) there is a mistake for (17). There are 17 already and he wants 5 more, and I believe the House will have no objection to granting it. But the Hon'ble the Revenue Member now states not 5, but that an additional number of 17 is required. That certainly requires explanation, and if the explanation is not satisfactory I think the Council will object to the voting of 12 deputy collectors

more for this department. It is admitted that 5 is necessary. Then the Hon'ble the Revenue Member states further that two deputy collectors for the Agricultural Department are necessary. That also is a Development Department and a department cannot be developed without additional staff so that probably the Revenue Member is also right in stating that he wants two more deputy collectors for this department. Then he states that three deputy collectors are necessary for the Labour Department. I am not convinced that this is necessary. I do not think the Labour Department has developed so far as to require an addition of three more deputy collectors. Then again the Hon'ble the Revenue Member states that one deputy collector is necessary as Under Secretary for the Home Department. With reference to this I am not at present convinced that there is any necessity for an additional hand to be employed in that department. If probably the Hon'ble the Home Member explains how it is necessary to have an additional deputy collector and is able to convince the House of the necessity, then there may be no objection, but as at present advised, I think the necessity for an additional deputy collector to be employed as Under Secretary in the Home Department has not been made out. So also with reference to one deputy collector for the Finance Department. Here again unless the Honourable Member or Finance Member satisfies the House that there is such a real necessity, I do not think the House will be justified in voting for this."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—"I rise to a point of order. It will be much more convenient if we discuss the details under the departments concerned. Otherwise we have to discuss the whole administration under this one head."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"There is no point of order. The honourable member (Diwan Bahadur Krishnan Nayar) proposes under the particular budget head to reduce the item by Rs. 19,000 provided for additional temporary deputy collectors. He is perfectly in order."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR (*continuing*) :—"I am in perfect agreement with the Honourable Member, but then there is this difficulty. Voting will have to be done now on this proposition and unless my friend shows the necessity for a procedure otherwise, voting will have to be done one way or the other at once. I wish to refer to another appointment of a deputy collector who, it is stated, is Personal Assistant to the Agency Commissioner. I do not think any reason has been given for this appointment. We heard a great deal the other day about the Agency Tracts and Commissioner's powers. Unless it is made out there is a real need for the appointment of a deputy collector, I do not think the House must vote for it. Thus out of these 25, the need for only 7 has been made out."

MOTION NO. 2.

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Mr. President, I have no doubt given notice of a resolution like this, viz.,

'2. *That under 5—A. the provision of Rs.* 90,000 *for additional and temporary deputy collectors be omitted* (*Budget, page* 29).'

"And my object was to find out exactly for what purpose these additional temporary deputy collectors have been shown on the budget. In the budget it has not been stated exactly for what purpose these additional deputy collectors were required. It has been explained that it is for the purpose of lending out to other departments. I think it will complicate matters to proceed further with the discussion. Before we drop it, I think it is necessary to remind the Honourable Member to agree with us that in case he makes a reduction in the budget of other

departments, to that extent the number of deputy collectors to be appointed as temporary deputy collectors is to be reduced. I think that is the proper course to follow; otherwise, we shall have to vote for provision of deputy collectors as assistant registrars, assistant directors of survey and everything else, which clearly is a complicated affair."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I oppose any reduction under this head. It has been clearly stated by the Hon'ble the Revenue Member that this is intended for temporary deputy collectors, and he has also given an undertaking that before appointing every temporary deputy collector, care will be taken to see that the appointment is absolutely necessary. My only fear is that, if we refuse to allow these temporary deputy collectors, the work will have to be done by Imperial officers in all departments. Now the practice is sometimes to post deputy collectors even to Sub-Collectors' or Assistant Collectors' divisions and also to ask the deputy collectors in special departments to do the work of particular officers who are covenanted. Unfortunately we have not been enabled to move the reduction of the pay of any of these officers who are covenanted or I.C.S. officers. If we take the number of Collectors and Sub-Collectors into consideration, the decrease mentioned in the budget is not very great. We will see that of 25 permanent Collectors we have got 22 and there is a reduction of only three. Out of Sub-Collectors and Assistant Collectors there is a reduction of 17. I do not know if it is correct to say there were no Collectors of the Provincial Service in the year 1920–21 for the column shows nil. I believe there were some permanent Collectors even last year. The Hon'ble the Revenue Member said that there were only 143 permanent deputy collectors now. I think it is a mistake. It should be 147. The total number of deputy collectors in 1920–21 was 157 including temporary officers but now the Government only ask for 172. There is thus only an increase of 15 in the total number and the Hon'ble the Revenue Member has also stated that sanction has already been granted by the Secretary of State for an additional number of 10 in the permanent cadre. Therefore there is only a question of 5 more deputy collectors. If we take the number of deputy collectors 1920–21 and 1921–22, we find as against them there is a large reduction of 15 civilian officers under the heading of 'Sub-Collectors and Assistant Collectors', and my only fear is that if we cut down the number of these temporary deputy collectors probably there will be no room for asking for any change in the number of Sub-Collectors and Assistant Collectors. Whenever there is a vacancy, as a matter of practice, a deputy collector is appointed sometimes to act as Sub-Collector and then we must have a temporary deputy collector to fill up his place. If a permanent deputy collector gets the post of Collector temporarily, we must have a deputy collector appointed temporarily to fill up that place. Therefore I think for the purpose of reducing as many Sub-Collectors and Assistant Collectors as possible and at least of preventing very recent Assistant Collectors from being promoted to take charge of big divisions of Sub-Collectors, I think it is desirable to provide for temporary deputy collectors and the Hon'ble the Revenue Member has given an undertaking that they will not be appointed unless it is absolutely necessary. Under these circumstances, I beg to oppose any reduction under this head."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER:—"May I submit, Sir, that the demand we are now discussing is the demand for Land Revenue? This includes all the deputy collectors in the first instance, but we then deduct from the total, the number of lent officers. Therefore what we are now voting is the remainder. What we are discussing is the amount which has been reduced and is now part of the demand for Land Revenue. I therefore want to raise this point of

[The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter] [21st March 1921

order, namely, that we are now voting only the amount to be spent under Land Revenue and that the question of how the lent officers are employed does not arise under this head."

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu :—" Sir, I see there is some difficulty in submitting this demand to vote. In the first place, there is a certain amount of confusion as to the number of additional officers to be employed. The Hon'ble the Revenue Member has stated that 17 deputy collectors are intended for the Department of Co-operation. May I ask him whether it is 17 or whether it is 5 as stated by the Hon'ble the Minister for Development at the last meeting ?"

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur :—"I may just make one statement, Sir. I am not quite sure if I made that statement on the last occasion, and if I did make it, whether it was sufficiently understood. But, however, one statement I think I would make and that is this. This number of 25 additional men which we are discussing so long is, after all, not the number which I wish to employ for the sake of other departments at the present moment, but it represents merely their withdrawal from the temporary duties which they are busy upon at the present moment, with a view to the restoration of 14 to the permanent cadre. With a view to supply their places after withdrawal from their special duties to their regular duties, it is proposed to employ 25 deputy collectors for the purpose of distributing them among various other departments. The entry of 17 against the Co-operative Department does not necessarily mean that 17 only will be employed in that department. Seventeen of the deputy collectors are now employed on co-operative work and the moment I withdraw them from the special duties which they are now doing, it will be necessary to recruit men to fill up their places in those special appointments. I would, therefore, like to recruit 25 additional deputy collectors and if I am not permitted to do so, the inevitable consequence will be that I will have to withdraw the 25 men and restore them to their permanent cadre and leave each department to struggle for itself. That is the exact position. Then, as has been pointed out by my honourable colleague the Finance Member, a deduction has been made from the total demand in respect of the cost of these deputy collectors, so that the additional cost of 25 deputy collectors will not be a charge on the Revenue Department but it will be distributed among the various departments to whom these deputy collectors will be lent. Technically therefore I am not proposing to increase either the permanent cadre of deputy collectors so far as the Land Revenue Department is concerned, nor am I proposing to increase the total expenditure of the Revenue Department under the head of 'Deputy Collectors,' but I am trying to fill up their respective places by withdrawing them from those departments."

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu :—" I submit that I am not at all convinced that these deputy collectors for the Department of Labour are necessary. Nothing has been stated about this matter. It may not be possible to adopt the Hon'ble Mr. Todhunter's suggestion for discussing this matter under the Department of Labour. I regret to say no resolution has been tabled to reduce the demand under that head. Therefore unless an explanation is forthcoming as to why three additional deputy collectors are required for the Department of Labour, I think I shall have to press this motion. I agree with my honourable friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar that it is probably necessary that additional hands are required in the Department of Co-operation and also in the Department of Agriculture and I trust that at the proper time the Honourable

21st March 1921] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

Member in charge of these departments will tell us why these men are required. That being so, I object to this item in so far as the Department of Labour is concerned."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"May I rise to inquire whether the Honourable Member's statement that there is no motion on the table under the head of Labour Department is correct? I see motion No. 401 which proposes that in 37-C. Miscellaneous Departments the voted items in the provision for Commissioner of Labour and his assistants and subordinates, establishment and allowances and contingencies amounting in all to Rs. 1,98,520 be omitted. This appears at page 29 of the Agenda, serial No. 401, in the name of Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. I merely rise to point this out, Sir, because it cuts the ground from underneath the argument of the honourable mover, and I think there is no necessity to press the motion now."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"May I invite the attention of the Honourable Member to page 182 of the budget estimate where these additions are not shown?"

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"Does the Honourable Member press his motion?"

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I withdraw my motion."

The motions were by leave withdrawn.

MOTION NO. 3.

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR then moved—

To omit—

		BUDGET PAGE.
1.	*Rupees 2,778 personal allowance*	29
2.	*Rupees 2,868* " "	30
3.	*Rupees 564* " "	30
4.	*Rupees 864* " "	30
5.	*Rupees 24* " "	30
6.	*Rupees 4,900* " "	30
7.	*Rupees 1,698* " "	30
8.	*Rupees 138* " "	30
9.	*Rupees 72* " "	30
10.	*Rupees 792* " "	30

In doing so he said:—"Mr. President, all the items here relate to personal allowance given to various officers found in budget pages 29 and 30. Now, personal allowance is given for various reasons. One is when an officer is prejudicially affected by a revision of the salary attached to his office, when there is no grade in the revised scale which will give him the pay that he has been drawing at the time this revision is made, the officer is given the grade carrying the nearest lower pay and the difference in the pay is given to him as personal allowance. If the provisions are made to meet such cases, I have no objection to them. On the other hand, there are cases in which heads of departments recommend personal allowances in excess of the salary fixed for appointments because the officers concerned deserve them. Grant of personal allowance in such cases is not, in my opinion, advisable. If the salary attached to an office

is small, that will be a ground for revising the salary of the office. The system of giving personal allowance in such cases is objectionable. The budget does not give the purpose for which the provisions are made. And so, I have raised this question. If the provisions are made for the first purpose, I would not press the resolution. Otherwise, I should."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :— "Sir, I would, for the information of the Honourable Member, tell him that his former presumption is quite correct, that these various allowances are all allowances given in those cases in which the scale of salary was revised. When the present salary drawn by the incumbent was slightly higher than the scale immediately below that in which he had to be put, this allowance had to be given to compensate him for the loss in his salary and I may assure the Honourable Member that as soon as its necessity ceases, this allowance will automatically disappear."

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"With that assurance of the Honourable Member I do not want to press my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION NO. 4.

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"Mr. President, I beg to move—

'That the provision of Rs. 5·36 lakhs for fixed tentage allowance of Collectors and Assistant Collectors and travelling allowance under 5-A. Land Revenue charges be reduced by Rs. 1·16 lakhs. (Budget page 31).'

"If we refer to page 31 of the budget estimates, we find that for the year 1921-22 a sum of Rs. 5·36 lakhs has been provided for and when we compare it with the revised estimates for 1920-21 we find the latter to be Rs. 4·2 lakhs. Thus there is a difference of Rs. 1·16 lakhs this year. The amount has been shown under these two heads, tentage allowance and travelling allowance, but it is not clear either from the revised estimates or the budget estimate or from the accounts, what amount is allotted to each head. I am not therefore able to separate the two and that is the reason why I move for a reduction in both these heads put together. It was stated by the Hon'ble the Finance Member that there was the question of increasing the travelling allowances of all classes of officers under consideration and that Government Order was recently issued to the effect that all officers drawing a daily allowance of more than Rs. 5 hitherto should get an extra amount of 50 per cent and that persons drawing more than Rs. 7-8-0 should get Rs. 10 as daily allowance. And the mileage allowance is proposed to be increased from eight annas a mile to 12 annas a mile. I presume that the total increase as compared with the previous year is entirely due to the new travelling allowances that are being sanctioned by the Government. How far this increase is necessary is a question to be discussed. Sir, the pay of all these officers has been recently revised and greatly enhanced and I do not see any reason why at the same time travelling allowances should be enhanced, and as far as our experience goes, real necessity exists only in the case of subordinate officers but not in the case of these well-paid officers who were hitherto drawing very fine and handsome travelling allowances. For these reasons I move this reduction."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—"Mr. President, at page 32 of the budget a sum of Rs. 5·36 lakhs has been provided for travelling allowance for these officers. I have been told that these first-class officers draw double first-class fare. I do not see any reason why they should be given double first-class allowance, whereas

single first-class is quite enough. When officers travel, they do not travel with their wives. Such being the case I do not see any reason why they should be given double first-class and I think it must be cut off."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :— "I think, Sir, the honourable mover of this motion has already explained the reason which has accounted for an increase under this head ; for I think he is aware that this question in regard to the grant of travelling allowances to all the officers employed under the Government was under their very serious consideration for some time past and the final orders which the Government issued on the matter were also placed on the editors' table, the date of the Government Order being 18th February 1921. From that order it would be evident that the Government were not solicitous about the increase of travelling allowance only in the case of those officers who are highly paid, but that they were equally solicitous to provide sufficient facilities to the subordinate officers also whose duties required compulsory travelling. I believe it will not be disputed seriously that the cost of travelling in these days, due largely to various contributory causes is much higher to-day than it ever was. It is rather unjust that Government should continue to pay to their subordinates rates of allowances which had been fixed a considerable time ago when the conditions were quite different from what they are to-day. It will be inequitable, Sir, that Government should expect their officers to bear a portion of these expenses from out of their own salaries, while the obligation of travelling is one of the conditions of their service. In view of these circumstances, the Government have quite recently taken into consideration the question of the revision of travelling allowances due to all classes of officers, the first-class officers, the second-class officers, the third-class officers, and the fourth-class officers, and laid down the standards of travelling allowances to be observed in future. This order has been before the public for some time past and we have not noticed any criticism on that matter, for I think the public is as much interested in the constant touring of these officers who are in charge of administration as the Government are.

"To enable these officers to tour as constantly as is necessary in the discharge of their duties, it is equally necessary that they should not be made to grudge the travelling because the expenses of travelling fall partially on their own pockets. In view of these reasons, Sir, the Government were pleased to revise the travelling allowances in respect of all officers, whether they were highly paid or low paid, and as a result of these rules it has become necessary to make an additional allotment of 1·34 lakhs of rupees under this head to enable the travelling allowance bills being passed by the Accountant-General on the revised scale that is now being sanctioned. I do not therefore think that there is any necessity to curtail this head."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I am sorry to submit that I was not at all impressed with the arguments of the Hon'ble Member for Revenue. Now, turning to page 31 of the budget, we find 3·20 lakhs shown in the accounts for 1919–20 and the figure as per the revised estimate for 1920–21 is 4·20 lakhs. Now it is proposed to take it up to 4·98 lakhs and odd. My submission to the House is this. Of late the pay of these Collectors, Sub-Collectors and Assistant Collectors have had a tremendous increase, and quite recently, if I remember right, last month, the rate of travelling allowances and also the ordinary daily allowances have undergone a change and a revision. If I remember right, the daily allowance for Collectors was Rs. 7 and under a recent G.O., it was raised to Rs. 10. I am speaking from memory subject to correction. I fail to understand why they should have the benefit of these things both ways, and in addition to the increments

they have had quite recently there is absolutely no reason why a corresponding increase should also be given them in the matter of the mileage. In the matter of ordinary travelling allowance the difference is very much. It comes to 1·36 lakhs and odd, and I think this is an item where we can with complete propriety vote for a reduction."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—" Mr. President, I only want to say a word about the double first-class ticket which has been referred to by the previous speakers. There is nothing new about the giving of a double ticket, and that is a rule which is common to the whole of India and which has always been common to the whole of India. The reason for this is that an officer who is touring is forced to take his servants and his camp equipment and he cannot carry the whole on his one first-class seat. It is a very common experience that when travelling by rail an officer is out of pocket. If an officer can possibly travel by road, he will never want to travel by rail, and I am sure that the officers concerned would be only too thankful if the Council would vote them their actual expenses instead of the double first-class ticket. To attempt to cut down the double first-class to a single first-class in the case of an officer with his headquarters at the Presidency-town, who has to tour to Ganjam to-day and to South Kanara to-morrow, and who has to carry the whole of his camp equipment with him, would be simply penalising him for the efficient discharge of his duties."

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—" Sir, I support the reduction on this ground. I do not think it will be proper now to question the Government order granting the allowance because that will have to be done by a separate resolution and whether that resolution can be given effect to is a different question.

" With regard to the travelling allowances, the Collectors are being asked to tour a certain number of days for the year and I do not know whether that is necessary. I believe discretion can be given to them. In certain cases, I know they have had to go because they have not made up the required number of days. With regard to the reduction in the travelling allowances, ample discretion will have to be given by the Government by passing an executive order removing the condition that they should travel a certain number of days every year. I take it that they should be on tour in all for 15 days in six months and if they fail to do so they are liable to be met with the criticism that they had not the required number of days of touring. Therefore I think a reduction can be made by removing the condition so that Collectors and other officers may have absolute discretion in the matter."

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI :—" I rise to support this double first-class. I support it on the score that the expenses of the officer will not fall on the poor villagers. If he is paid liberally, I do not think he would indent upon the villagers for anything as some of them are doing now. In his memorandum the Hon'ble the Finance Member states : ' With salaries, there have had to be raised also the travelling allowances of all classes of officers, as those in force have been found not to meet the actual expenses of travelling, a fact which is apt to react upon the villager, who supplies his carts at a fixed tariff which may be less than what he could secure by hiring them out for other purposes.' In the interests of the villagers, I would like that officers should be paid liberally so that they will not be tempted to prey upon the villagers ."

Khan Bahadur QADIR NAWAZ KHAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" I agree with th Hon'ble Mr. Todhunter that the expenses of travelling had increased a good deal and if the Government want to have efficient administration they should arrange

that their officers are liberally and most conveniently paid. It is not true that most of the officers travel from place to place merely for the sake of travelling allowance. Sir, I may at once confidently state from my own experience that an officer is not generally anxious to travel unless circumstances require him to do so. If he does so travel, the Government should not stint and it should not make it necessary for him to supplement what he gets from Government from his own pocket. It is false economy to curtail any amount that is given for travelling allowance expenses in order to save money out of that. As I stated already, the House will be wise in allowing liberal travelling allowances so as to encourage these officers to visit their charges as frequently as possible and to get into touch with the people. From the time I retired from service, the charges have very considerably increased. At that time 12 annas was being allowed to Collectors as tentage and camp equipment and that was considered quite insufficient. Now the railway charges are being increased.

"With regard to the double first class, it is not the case that the officers travelling spend only one first class and the other goes into their pockets. They have got to spend much more than the additional first class that they get in the shape of conveying their servants and their goods. In those good old days much of this work was done cheaply and without much expense to the officers concerned. Low prices and cheap travelling are all things of the past, so that I have no desire to economise in this direction as it would impair efficiency."

Diwan Bahadur T. Desika Acharyar:—"Mr. President, I am not an official, but I have had to do a good deal of touring during the last three or four years and I do think that it will be false economy to move for a reduction of the travelling allowance paid to those who are compelled to travel. I think it is absolutely necessary, in order to make officers independent while travelling, and in order to make them not pay from their own pockets for work that they are compelled to do, that they should be paid allowances not only at the present rates but even at higher rates. My own experience is that the travelling allowance that is allowed now does not cover even half the cost incurred by many officers during their tours."

Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar:—"Mr. President, I should like to have one point made clear. I do not know whether I would be in order in voting with regard to the allowances that are being paid to the Imperial Service officers."

The Hon'ble the President:—"Do I understand the Honourable Member to say that he wants to discuss a certain resolution which the Chair has disallowed?"

Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar:—"Certainly not. I only want to know whether my vote will be valid in regard to Imperial Service officers."

The Hon'ble the President:—"What exactly will be the validity of the vote will be a different matter. At present, I decide that Honourable Members will be in order in discussing the motion made by Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju."

Mr T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar:—"Before I give my vote, I should like to be enlightened by any member on the Government side whether our vote will be valid with regard to the travelling allowances drawn by Imperial Service officers. If it is not going to be valid, I will not vote for this resolution. If it is going to affect all officers alike certainly, I am in favour of giving my vote in favour of this proposal. That point should be made clear before our votes are taken."

Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar:—"This is only, so far as I see, for travelling allowances for the Collectors, the Sub-Collectors, the Assistant Collectors and probably Deputy Collectors also. I agree perfectly, as many of our

friends here will do, that Government officers should not travel at their own cost and therefore we have to see whether the rules now made are necessary for making these people travel. The Hon'ble the Finance Member said that there are some people—probably himself was one of them—some liberal officers who have been put to some loss by travelling. But many high officers make some profit out of these travelling allowances. I want to draw the attention of the House to one or two points. Now travelling allowance of Collectors has been raised from 12 annas to Re. 1 per mile, and I think it is a well-known fact that motor-cars can be hired at generally 8 annas a mile. So far as mufassal is concerned, many of my friends will support me on that point. So that when Collectors and others have purchased cars generally out of money lent to them by Government we should see if it is necessary when they have to travel to pay them 1 rupee per mile, I mean Re. 1 for going and Re. 1 for coming. Secondly, a question was raised whether double first class was necessary. I do say that it might be necessary, perhaps even treble first class. But what is allowed to a person who carries a tent by train, I believe, is 8 annas a mile, that is to say, five times the first-class charge—of course, I speak subject to correction. Suppose a certain A is a Collector and he carries a small tent with him ; he is allowed 8 annas per mile for railway travelling ; that means more than five times the first-class charge. I want to know whether within his own jurisdiction for going 20 or 30 miles a person is likely to carry a tent either by rail or by road. But in any case I do not think it would cost so much as 8 annas a mile when he carries a small tent. Therefore I think the proposed reduction after all is not much, and further, there may be unnecessary touring. I know a case where a high officer toured round to get about Rs. 70 a day by going in his car to two or three taluks. While on the one hand there should be nothing to induce an officer to curtail his travelling expenses, there should also on the other hand be no inducement to him to travel much more than what is necessary. If you give a large mileage, the result will be that he will go to one place, stop there for one minute and then to another place, so that the length of the tour might be increased. Therefore, I think the original charge will be quite sufficient. Anyhow the reduction made is only small and I think that may be easily made."

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" Mr. President, the question whether the officers are to be paid double first class or not is not at all involved in this motion because the practice of paying them double first class is in vogue and I have taken credit for that in deducting the amount as shown in the revised budget. The only question is whether the enhanced rate of travelling allowance now sanctioned by the Government is to be allowed or not. Diwan Bahadur T. Desika Achariyar has brought in his personal experience, but I am also a travelling non-official myself and my experience shows that I have not to incur anything from my pocket on account of the existing travelling allowance rules ; and it has not been said on behalf of Government that travelling officers—Collectors, Assistant Collectors and Deputy Collectors—are not travelling sufficiently on account of the low charges they were hitherto receiving. There is not any evidence produced before the House that any officers complained that they have been paying out of their own pockets for the travelling charges, in addition to the travelling allowance they were hitherto getting. In the absence of any such evidence, on the mere surmise that they will have to incur more cost, I do not think this House will be justified in sanctioning the new rates. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai pointed out that a great relief is to be given to villagers in making supplies to the travelling officers. I do agree with him there, but it cannot be said as a reason

21st March 1921] [Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju]

that hitherto the villagers were put to inconvenience in order to make supplies to travelling officers because their travelling allowance was low, and hereafter the villagers can expect better treatment because their travelling allowances are raised. I am not able to understand the logic in that statement. If officers were dishonest hitherto and were not paying villagers properly, they may continue to do the same hereafter. It has nothing to do with the amount they receive from the Government. If they are not able to pay out of the allowances they are already receiving, are we to expect that simply because their travelling allowance is increased they will pay to the villagers? Are we not to suppose that these people will become more greedy and tighten their purse as far as payments to the village officers are concerned? For these reasons, I am not convinced that the new rates are to be allowed."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Mr. President, I will simply add one or two words more. I may probably invite the attention of the House to the fact that the Madras Province is not the only province which is attempting to lapse into the so-called extravagance in the matter of dealing with its officers who travel, but that this decision for the purpose of raising the travelling allowances of officers was arrived at deliberately after consulting various other provinces which have also recently revised their travelling allowance rules. I will merely quote a few cases which I have got before me just now and they are these: in the Punjab, the travelling allowance has been raised by 50 per cent; in Bombay, it has been raised from 50 to 100 per cent; in Delhi, it has been raised to 50 per cent; and so on. We put the whole case before the Government of India and inasmuch as that Government had before them the recommendations which they had passed in respect of similar allowances paid to officers in other provinces, they gave us sanction to give effect to these allowances and that, I think, Sir, is one of the reasons why we ought not to interfere with these allowances thereby placing our officials on a scale absolutely different from the scale in vogue in other provinces, but let us prove that we treat our officers in the same way as other provinces do. One other matter which was very prominently mentioned was the fact that some officers, eager to make money out of their travelling allowances, resorted to the tactics of avoiding a railway journey and of going by road, for under the rules it is possible for them to get not less than Re. 1 as mileage, whereas by the most expensive car that might be engaged for transportation they would probably not have to pay more than 8 annas per mile. But may I invite the attention of the Honourable Member who raised that objection to the fact that mileage rules are subject to the condition that the minimum travelling ought to be not less than 20 miles. It is only for journeys of over 20 miles that an officer is entitled to draw mileage, and for journeys below 20 miles he cannot hope to draw any mileage. Therefore, it is not that he could hope to claim mileage in lieu of trainage when it is obligatory upon him to claim only trainage or a daily allowance in lieu thereof. Then, Sir, there was a suggestion made that we might tell our officers in future that it is perfectly optional for them to travel or not to travel. If that is a condition of affairs which will please the House—I suppose the Government from their standpoint will certainly have not the slightest objection—I cannot, however, think that that is the position which we are hoping to reach!

"Only one word more, and I have done. My honourable friend on the other side drew attention to the rapid increase under this head appearing on page 31 (of the budget) and he said that Rs. 3,20,083 in 1919-20 became Rs. 4,20,000 in the revised estimate for 1920-21, and now it is Rs. 4,98,272. But it must be

[The Hon'ble Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [21st March 1921

remembered that the amount of travelling allowance depends upon the number of officers who travel and upon the period for which they travel. It is one of those items of expenditure which we cannot fix unalterably but which will be always fluctuating according to the period of travel and the number of officers travelling."

At this stage Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai moved for closure of the debate.

The Hon'ble the President put the motion for closure to vote and declared it unanimously carried.

Then the motion for reduction of the provision on the budget was put to the vote and declared lost.

Mr. C. V. S. Narsimha Raju demanded a poll, and the same was taken with the following result.

The following voted *for* the motion for reduction :—

1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi.
2. ,, V. Appaswami Vandayar.
3. ,, C. Arunachala Mudaliyar.
4. ,, T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.
5. ,, S. Ellappa Chettiyar.
6. ,, P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu.
7. ,, K. Gopolakrishnayya.
8. ,, K. P. Gopala Menon.
9. ,, B. Muniswami Nayudu.
10. ,, C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.
11. ,, T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.
12. ,, A. Ramayya Punja.
13. ,, A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
14. ,, K. Sarabha Reddiyar.
15. ,, S. T. Shanmukham Pillai.
16. ,, T. Sivasankaram Pillai.
17. ,, N. A. V. Somasundaram Pillai.
18. ,, K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu.
19. ,, V. C. Vellingiri Goundar.
20. Mr. R. Venkataratnam Nayudu.
21. ,, L. C. Guruswami.
22. ,, R. T. Kesavulu Pillai.
23. ,, C. Madurai Pillai.
24. ,, M. Ramachandra Rao.
25. ,, S. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
26. ,, L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar.
27. ,, A. S. Krishna Rao.
28. ,, Sriman Biswanath Das.
29. ,, K. V. Ramachari.
30. ,, U. Rama Rao.
31. ,, Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath.
32. ,, M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.
33. ,, R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
34. ,, T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
35. ,, K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar.
36. ,, C. V. Venkararamana Ayyangar.
37. ,, A. T. Palmer.
38. ,, Ahmad Miran Sahib.

The following voted *against* the motion :—

1. The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson.
2. ,, Mr. C. G. Todhunter.
3. ,, ,, Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib.
4. ,, ,, K. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
5. ,, ,, A Subbarayulu Reddiyar.
6. ,, ,, P. Ramarayaningar.
7. ,, ,, K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu.
8. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell.
9. ,, F. J. Richards.
10. ,, R. G. Grieve.
11. ,, A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
12. ,, P. Subbarayan.
13. ,, E. Periyanayakam.
14. ,, R. Appaswami Nayudu.
15. ,, C. Natesa Mudaliyar.
16. ,, A. P. Patro.
17. ,, C. Ponnuswami Nayudu.
18. ,, P. T. Rajan.
19. ,, W. P. A. Soundara Pandia Nadar.
20. ,, R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar.
21. ,, S. Somasundaram Pillai.
22. ,, A. Tangavelu Nayagar.
23. ,, T. C. Tangavelu Pillai.
24. ,, W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.
25. Mr. P. Kesava Pillai.
26. ,, S. Muttumanicka Achari.
27. ,, D. Seshagiri Rao.
28. ,, T. Desika Achariyar.
29. ,, S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar.
30. ,, E. C. M. Mascarenhas.
31. The Raja of Ramnad.
32. Sri Meka V. Appa Rao Bahadur.
33. Mr. Abdul Razzaq Sahib.
34. ,, Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib.
35. ,, Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib.
36. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib.
37. ,, V. Hamid Sultan Marakkayar Sahib.
38. ,, Qadir Nawaz Khan Sahib.
39. ,, S. Muhammad Padsha Sahib.
40. ,, Muhammad Usman Sahib.
41. ,, J. F. Simpson.
42. ,, Govindoss Chatburbujadoss.
43. ,, A. M. MacDougall.
44. ,, M. C. Muttayya Chettiyar.
45. ,, T. Namberumal Chetti.
46. ,, P. Venkatarangayya.
47. Rev. E. M. Macphail.
48. Mr. A. E. Rencontre.

Thirty-eight voting *for* and 48 *against*, the motion was declared lost.

21st March 1921] [Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju]

Motion No. 5.

The following motion standing in the name of Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao was deemed to have been withdrawn as the Member did not move it:—

5. *That the following item relating to duty allowances be omitted (Budget page 31):—*

5-*A. Land Revenue—Charges of District Administration—*

	Rs.
Duty allowance to cash-keeper of the Deputy Collector's office, Wynad.	180
Duty allowance to typists	1,680

Motion No. 6.

Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju:—"I beg to move—

That the following items of duty allowances under the following heads be omitted (Budget page 31):—

5-*A. Land Revenue—Charges of District Administration—Collectors and Divisional Magistrates' Establishments—*

	Rs.
Duty allowance to cash-keeper	180
Duty allowance to typists	1,680

"Mr. President, Sir, these are very small items and I wish to know the reasons for which they are included here. In the case of a cash-keeper, an allowance of Rs. 180 is specially included and in the case of typists a duty allowance of Rs. 1,680 is included. In the Salaries Committee's Report, it is stated that typists need not be paid any duty allowance. I do not know whether the Government have given effect to the recommendations of the Salaries Committee or whether they only want not to give effect to the recommendations and to give allowance to typists."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur:—"Mr. President, I may at once inform the House that this allowance of Rs. 180 is in respect of a cash-keeper who is employed in the Malabar Collectorate. The rule is that in those districts where there are branches of the Imperial Bank, the pay of the treasurer is only Rs. 70. But before a branch bank was established in this place, the treasurer was getting Rs. 85. Even after that treasury commenced its transactions with the bank, it was found that the treasurer there had peculiarly heavy duties in other directions as compared with those of other treasurers. For these two reasons the Government decided that his pay should be retained at the original Rs. 85; but that inasmuch as, according to the recommendations of Mr. Knapp who was on special duty in connexion with salaries, the fifteen rupees were in excess of the average pay that was paid to other treasurers, the extra Rs. 15 was regarded only as personal allowance in view of the peculiar difficulties of his position in Malabar. It is called duty allowance because in Malabar his duties are much more than the ordinary duties of similar treasurers in other district treasuries. The whole question was very carefully examined and the Collector

was of opinion, in view of the duties which the treasurer has to discharge, that this minimum pay ought to be Rs. 125. But Government were not so liberal and gave him only Rs. 85.

"As regards the typists, I have again to refer to the report of Mr. Knapp. Mr. Knapp suggested in his report that all the typists might, for the sake of uniformity, be placed in one class and the class that he selected for putting them into was that of the lower division clerks. We have got typists of various grades and in cases in which it becomes necessary to take a typist of an advanced grade, he considered that the facts of the case could be met if in that special case alone a separate allowance, viz., a duty allowance of Rs 10, was paid to a man who possessed the advanced grade qualification and that other typists who did not possess that qualification should continue to be placed on the grade that is provided for the clerical staff. This is what he said, Sir : 'My proposal is that the typists who have passed the intermediate grade should be placed on the same scale as the lower grade clerks. It is for the advanced grade typist that I provide by means of a duty allowance, in addition to Rs. 30-1-60. The pay will depend very much on the supply and demand.' At the present moment, I believe there is a great demand for the men of the advanced grade. We have, therefore, in conformity with the suggestions of the special officer, provided for the duty allowance in respect of the typists of the advanced grade."

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"I beg to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 7.

Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar's Motion *No.* 7, *under* 5-*A*, *to omit provisions of Rs.* 1,920 *personal allowance to taluk establishment and Rs.* 14,340 *personal allowance* (*Budget page* 32) was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.

MOTION No. 8.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

That the provision of Rs. 6,55,000 *for temporary establishment made under taluk establishment in detailed account No.* 5-*A. Land Revenue—District Administration be reduced by* 2 *lakhs* (*Budget page* 33)

"Sir, my proposal is a modest one. The modesty consists not in proposing absolute omission but in proposing a reduction in the provision for temporary establishment by 2 lakhs. I have always been of opinion that the temporary establishment is no good. It has not got the status of permanency and its work will not be so very good as that of a permanent hand. Consequently there is no use in multiplying the temporary establishments attached to offices. The present temporary establishment is, I fancy, to be made under the taluk establishment. It consists of clerks perhaps with very indifferent knowledge of either vernacular or English and I submit that the provision made of Rs. 6,55,000 is too high. We see from accounts of the year 1919-20 that only a sum of Rs. 2,78,513 was spent on the temporary establishment. In the budget estimate of the current year, i.e., 1920-21, a sum of Rs. 4,38,172 has been provided for. But the revised estimate says that a much less sum was proposed to be spent, viz., Rs. 3,75,000. I fancy that this sum of Rs. 3,75,000 includes also the local allowance that has been sanctioned and in existence during the current year. While that is so, while the

present temporary establishment is estimated to cost till the end of this year only Rs. 3,75,000, I fail to see why a provision of Rs. 6,55,000 has been made for that purpose for 1921-22. I think, Sir, that this is rather too much and therefore my proposal is that it may be curtailed by 2 lakhs. Even in that way there will be ample provision of Rs. 4,55,000 which is Rs. 80,000 more than the revised estimate. So I think that these 2 lakhs may be curtailed and more usefully spent elsewhere. As I already submitted, this multiplying of temporary establishments adds neither to the efficiency of the service nor gratitude or status to the establishment itself. I therefore move that these 2 lakhs may be omitted. Again, I confess, I am not able to see from any of the papers supplied to me as to whether the Government wish to increase the number in the establishment or the pay or the allowance or both. And, therefore, I cannot make any observations on this point. Anyhow I can say that by a reduction of 2 lakhs we will meet the exigencies of the service especially under the present very stringent money market."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Mr. President, I fully subscribe to the theory propounded by my honourable friend on the other side, that it is always desirable to do our work through the permanent agency rather than have temporary establishments. But if my honourable friend at the same time would give me permission to employ permanent establishments even in cases where the work is of a temporary nature, I do not know whether that would be what I would call economy in the right direction. Perhaps if I give him the details of the expenditure for which this entry of Rs. 6,55,000 has been made, I dare say, he will see that every one of the items is of such a temporary nature that nothing more than a temporary establishment would be necessary for the purpose of getting the work done. The details of the establishments, so far as I have got before me, are temporary establishment for the disposal of suits under the Estates Land Act, temporary establishment to sort and re-write old records, temporary establishment for survey and settlement work, temporary establishment for loans work, temporary establishment for the demarcation of *mamul* wet lands, temporary establishment for the Rushikulya and other projects, temporary staff during kist months and temporary staff for the leave reserve of the North Arcot district. Now I may at once state that it is rather difficult to explain why in a particular year the cost of the temporary establishment stood at a particular figure and why in the following year it becomes necessary to increase that allotment. For, after everything is said and done, the total staff that has to be entertained for the discharge of temporary duties is dependent upon the nature of the temporary duties which we have to cope with in the coming year. I have now given details of the various temporary duties and all that I can say is that so far as these figures are concerned we have no more than reproduced them from the pay bills of the various temporary establishments as they stood on the 31st of December 1920. We have not made any additions to the pay bills of December 1920, but we have merely carried them forward after satisfying ourselves that the staff that was employed in the month of December 1920 will all be required during the course of the next official year as well. But if there are any vacancies, if there are any hands which can be done away with much earlier, and if there are any allotments which we find have been overpitched, we will certainly take them into account and withdraw the staff. I may draw the attention of the House to the fact that immediately below that same item they would notice a large lump sum of Rs. 1,80,000 entered as probable savings. Now, that takes into account all savings which might happen in the course of the year. We do not fix the allotment and then refuse to allow any

[The Hon'ble Mr. Muhammad Hubib-ul-lah Sahib] [21st March 1921

savings to occur, nor do we give anything like absolute order to the heads of the departments that they shall spend the money whether there is necessity or not. So far as the present necessities go, we are satisfied that the amount is necessary. Then as regards the leave reserve in the North Arcot district for which provision is also made, that question was investigated by Government some time ago. It was thought that that was more economical than the arrangement under which, as soon as vacancies occurred, additional men were taken and some men had to be paid the full pay of the appointment, and others in the same chain of arrangements which became necessary had got to be given particular acting allowances in pursuance of the Civil Service Regulations. With a view to see whether the creation of a leave reserve would be more economical where acting allowances are given, we have created, as an experimental measure, a leave reserve in the North Arcot district and we have sanctioned it for only a period of two years. We have asked the Board of Revenue to report at the end of the period of two years whether it is more economical than the existing arrangement. Their report is due to reach us very soon and when that is received we shall examine the proposals again and if we find that it is more costly than the other one which it is intended to replace, I can assure the House that we shall do the needful."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"Does the honourable member wish to withdraw?"

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"Yes, with only one more assurance, Mr. President. The honourable member assured us that he made no additions and that all these have been calculated from the pay bills of December 1920. I understand by that that there was no addition of staff; then how could it be explained that there is addition of amount here from 3·75 lakhs which is the revised estimate to Rs. 6,55,000 for the year? If the honourable member can tell me how this amount is proposed to be enhanced, I should certainly not press the resolution. But if employing the same staff he is going to pay larger amount, I certainly wish to press my resolution."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I can at once answer my honourable friend, Sir, by inviting his attention to the fact that while he wants me to compare Rs. 3,75,000 appearing in 1920-21 with 6,55,000, I would ask him to look a line below and add up the two amounts as the cost of the year 1920-21 and then compare it with the proposed cost of 1921-22; in which case he will find that we have proposed to work in the next year more economically. The temporary additions to pay that are referred to here, of course, appertain not merely to the permanent establishments as might be imagined but they will go right through the heading and therefore a large portion of that would also be paid to the temporary establishments who are employed on this work. I may at once make one statement, Sir, which will help the House. I believe they find from the agenda that it is the intention of His Excellency to appoint a Finance Committee and that motion will come up in due course. I believe that it will be one of the functions of that Committee to scrutinize all lump allotments and if they can advise us where we have erred on the side of extravagance, we will be quite willing to take advantage of their advice."

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

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

21st March 1921] [Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju]

Motion No. 9.

Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju :—"The motion which stands in my name, viz.—

'That the provision under 5-A. Land Revenue—Charges of District Administration be reduced by Rs. 2·17 lakhs for keeping in abeyance during the current financial year 1921–22 the scheme sanctioned in G.O. No. 1352, Revenue, dated 11th June 1920 (Budget page 28)'

is intended to find out whether the enhancement of salaries in respect of the Provincial services is finally to be given effect to or it is a matter for reconsideration. According to the budget proposals, the deputy collectors are to receive a new grade of salaries from Rs. 300 to 850 and from Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 1,200. I made some deductions—I am not quite accurate—and I find that a sum of Rs. 2,17,000 represents the extra cost. It may be incorrect and the Hon'ble the Revenue Member will be able to give us the exact extra cost. Of course, various members have put in questions regarding the extra cost and the statements are not yet ready. I take this figure of Rs. 2,17,000 as the extra cost involved in the revision of the deputy collectors' salaries. We are told that the extra cost of all Provincial services is 15 lakhs and odd, and what amount this particular service costs is not known as yet exactly. I think that there are other important services that are to be paid. There is no special hurry that these persons should be served first. We have got the question of payment of the subordinate services. The committee which was recently appointed by this House has recommended that the initial pay of clerks should be Rs. 35 in mufassal and Rs. 40 in Madras. I am told that this costs about 4 lakhs and odd. We have got the troublesome question of schoolmasters' pay and various other questions. In my opinion, these payments are more urgent and there is no hurry why the well-paid Provincial services should be paid first and others put back. For these reasons I have given notice of this resolution which I now move."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur :—Mr. President, I am very sorry indeed that the pruning knife about which we had heard so much the other day in connexion with the general discussion of the budget should be applied only in the case of those officers who, through some misfortune or other, were found to lag behind their brethren who have secured these advantages with effect from 1st December 1919. It was, as was already pointed out by my honourable friend, in June 1920, that the Government announced to the deputy collectors that they had revised their cadre as shown in the budget. In the meantime, they submitted their recommendations to the Government of India and the Secretary of State for formal sanction of the whole scheme; but it so chanced that certain questions in regard to the whole scheme had to be passed forward and backward between the Government of India and the Local Government; and not until those questions got settled finally was it possible for the Local Government to give effect to the scheme which they had announced in June 1920. Now, I should certainly think that it will be the unkindest cut of all that having promoted similar officers of other departments who enjoy higher scales of pay that have been placed within their reach by the Government of India and the Secretary of State, we should deny the same indulgence to the deputy collectors whose work I take it is no less important and who, I think, deserve no less, and whose case deserves equal consideration.

"Now, Sir, the question which my honourable friend on the other side asked me was whether he was quite accurate in certain calculations which he has

made as regards the present pay and future pay of the deputy collectors. All that I am able to tell him at the present moment, according to the existing facts is, that the total cost of 147 deputy collectors under the old scale was Rs. 7,10,150, whereas the pay of the same officers under the new scheme will be Rs. 9,62,760. We have been interpellated often in this very House as to why effect had not been given to the re-organization scheme. Despondency was expressed very often as to whether that scheme was going to be given effect to at all! Interpellations were also asked in this House as to the date from which the Government intended giving effect to it. But after we have announced our intention to give effect to it from 1st April 1921, we are told that we need not do so at all. I, Sir, representing as I do the interests of the deputy collectors, would strongly appeal to this House to be good enough to show to them the same kindness and the same indulgence which officers of other departments have secured. Well, if it is going to be a question of applying the pruning knife to all alike, I would certainly encourage my men to go along! But if it is going to be a case that they have to be treated differently from the officers of the other departments, I raise my strong voice of protest and I say that that is certainly not the way of dealing with a respectable class of officers who are discharging very responsible duties indeed. Therefore I should appeal to my friend on the other side not to extend his attempt at economy in this direction and select the deputy collectors as the object of his attack, but to be more generous until it becomes necessary to apply the pruning knife to all."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, while I am very anxious to effect all possible retrenchments in the budget I find it difficult to support this motion. If it were possible to consider ways and means of applying the pruning knife to all officers and to all services with impartiality, I would have been very glad to support this motion along with others for retrenchment in all those directions. Without any attempt being made to affect the officers of other departments similarly situated, to introduce retrenchment only in the case of officers of one class is, I submit, somewhat unfair and unsatisfactory. For these reasons, I think that with all our anxiety to retrench we must not apply the pruning knife in the case of this class of officers alone. We have been told that there will be a Finance Committee to consider all retrenchments. When the time comes let us examine the salaries of not only these officers but of all officers who are receiving salaries and allowances beyond the capacity of the tax-payer. I have always held and still hold the view that officers in this country are being overpaid beyond the capacity of the tax-payers."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—" Though I am in favour of retrenchment of the pay of the Provincial officers of all other departments such as judicial, medical, engineering, etc., all of whom have been getting their promotions, I am not for cutting out the salaries of one class of officers alone, who have unfortunately been kept back. I do not see any reason at all why they should be dealt with separately for the reduction. If deduction can be given effect to, by all means give effect to it in the case of all Provincial officers, and not only to this special department. So I oppose this resolution."

Diwan Bahadur D. SESHAGIRI RAO :—" I wish to know whether retrenchment cannot be resorted to in the case of other officers also. By simply taking out deputy collectors for retrenchment we do not mean to say that other officers will be let free. Is there anything to prevent us from applying the pruning knife to other departments also? That is what I wish to know."

21st March 1921] [Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Sir, I am as anxious as my friend Mr. Narasimha Raju to cut short expenditure wherever it is possible and to economize in all directions. However, with reference to this particular resolution, I am afraid, I must oppose it. The Hon'ble the Revenue Member stated that an interpellation was asked in this Council as to why increases sanctioned have not been given effect to in the case of deputy collectors. I am the questioner referred to by my honourable friend. I was anxious that the pay that has already been sanctioned to deputy collectors should be given to them as soon as possible, particularly because the deputy collectors find that their brother officers, such as district munsifs and others who have been referred to by my honourable friend had already received their sanctioned increases. The former have been looking with a jealous eye upon the increased amounts which the munsifs and others have been getting in a lump sum. I think it is unfair that it should not be paid to the deputy collectors as early as possible. And here I may be permitted to join issue with my friend Mr. Seshagiri Rao. There is, I think, no need to apply this pruning knife to munsifs and others to whom this money has not only been already sanctioned but also paid."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Mr. President, it seems to me that it would be invidious to single out the case of deputy collectors for the application of the pruning knife with a certain amount of vengeance. So far as they are concerned, their increments have been sanctioned and while they have been eagerly looking forward for practical effect to be given to them, all their hopes are sought to be dashed to the ground by the mover Mr. Narasimha Raju, with a vengeance to cut down that item of expenditure ; and this motion, if carried, will remind us of the old familiar saying 'there is many a slip between the cup and the lip.' I have great pleasure in joining with the Revenue Member in making a strong and earnest appeal to the mover of this resolution to save that mishap, and I beg leave to appeal to Mr. Narasimha Raju to withdraw this resolution."

Diwan Bahadur T. DESIKA ACHARIYAR :—" I beg to move that this question be now put."

The motion for closure was put and carried.

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" I wish to withdraw the motion."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" The honourable member cannot withdraw his motion. He is entitled to vote against it."

The motion was put to the vote and lost by 43 votes to 5.

MOTION No. 10.

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Mr. President, I move—

'*That the grant of Rs.* 55,63,113 *under* 5-*A. Land Revenue—Charges of District Administration—be reduced by one lakh* (*Budget page* 28).'

" This motion for the reduction of the grant as a whole is made by me from a desire to see that this Government, which, according to the Finance Member's statement, fully recognize 'that the most rigid economy will reduce expenditure by comparatively little, but that the beneficial effect of such economy is less in the sums immediately retrenched than in the spirit they produce, which, reacting throughout the administration, effects savings out of all proportion to the actual sums saved under specific heads' is obliged to accept the retrenchment. And the Honourable Member also stated that the policy should be one of retrenchment right through the machine. Member after Member of the Council who spoke in

the general discussion wanted that there should be retrenchment in all directions. I do not see how much it is possible to effect retrenchment unless you move for reduction of this modest figure of one lakh out of this grant which is asked for, viz., Rs. 55,63,113. Objections to specific items have been naturally raised. Owing to want of unanimity of opinion on that matter or owing to the Council not desiring that particular items should be either reduced or omitted, these motions have been negatived. Is the Council really for retrenchment under this head—Charges for District Administration—or not? Is the Government really for retrenchment during the next year or not? If it is for retrenchment, and if the House is for retrenchment, then I say that this sum of one lakh of rupees is a very modest figure and it cannot affect the efficiency of administration. The administration will be carried on even if this amount of one lakh is deducted from the total expenditure. What I want is that a spirit of economy should prevail and that it should be accepted as a matter of principle. At the same time I do not want to embarrass the Government or the members of the House unduly. Therefore I have fixed it at a very, very low figure. According to the accounts of 1919-20 the expenditure on charges of district administration was Rs. 54,82,415 and according to the budget estimate of 1920-21 it was Rs. 57,85,000 and according to the revised estimates it was Rs. 68·62 lakhs. Now the total of the non-votable and votable items comes to Rs. 68·33 lakhs according to the budget estimates now presented. Out of this, votable items aggregate to Rs. 55·63 and odd lakhs. Therefore I want really to ascertain whether the Government and the House are really willing that there should be retrenchment of the expenditure by one lakh of rupees, which will certainly not affect the soundness of the administration or the prosperity of the country. It is for these reasons and these reasons only that I move this reduction."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity that has been given to the Government of briefly convincing the House that we are as much eager to effect economy wherever it is possible to do so as members of this House are. I might at once invite the attention of the House to the fact that in the working out of these figures to which our attention has been drawn we have at the same time voluntarily surrendered certain amounts as probable savings under very many subheads. Honourable Members will notice that at page 28 the very last entry is 'Probable savings of Rs. 5,00,840'. Then going to page 29 it will be found again that the probable savings under that head amount to Rs. 1,99,160, and on page 33 it will be found that a probable saving of Rs. 1,86,000 has been shown. Now, therefore, we have taken into account the fact that, while we enter these allotments on certain data before us, we at the same time draw the pointed attention of our officers to the fact that we expect some savings to occur under the head by making the entry itself in the budget. We are not going merely to be satisfied by a paper entry of the figures that have been made here, but we intend carrying out the promise which the Hon'ble the Finance Member gave the other day. It is the intention of His Excellency to issue orders to all heads of the departments calling upon them to submit proposals with a view to secure economy in every department and expressing His Excellency's hope that it will be possible to effect economy of about one-fifth of the total expenditure in each department at the present moment. I hope this statement will satisfy the House that the Government have not been negligent in this matter, that they will not try to avoid the question of economy but that for the last few days they have been very carefully considering in what manner economy could be introduced without at the same time sacrificing efficiency. I take it that this House will certainly agree with

21st March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

me in saying that it will not allow efficiency to be impaired. We are, I repeat, doing everything that lies in our power to effect economy in every direction. Therefore with the assurance that I have given and with the further assurance which probably the House will receive from my Hon'ble Colleague the Finance Member when he brings up his resolution before the House after the discussion of the budget is over, I think there is no definite object achieved by voting in favour of this motion which is for a reduction of Rs. 1 lakh. It may be that after we have worked out the details we may be in a position to effect economy by more than one lakh under that head. I would assure the House, therefore, that the Government will approach the question with a spirit of economy and at the same time taking care that efficiency does not suffer. We have given the tentative figure of 20 per cent and directed the heads of departments to effect economies with that aim. Certain departments may be in a position to work up to that figure but certain others may not, and it may also be that in certain others economy would be absolutely dangerous. We will have to take all facts into consideration. This will be a matter which will receive the very careful consideration of His Excellency, for we all know he is very eager that this question of economy should be settled satisfactorily and soon.

"One word more, and I have done. It is not to be supposed that all schemes would be accepted. On every scheme heads of departments would be consulted, who would make inquiries and indicate the lines on which economies could be effected. If substantial economies can be effected in this manner, even if we may not be enabled to make very great savings, we may hope to get 20 per cent. However, we have drawn their attention to that necessity and I am quite certain that our officers will loyally co-operate with us and give us all possible assistance in effecting economy."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR:—"I beg to support the motion that has been made before this House partly for the reasons which the Hon'ble the Revenue Member has given us. But before I proceed to discuss his reasons, I may, in supporting this motion, say that it appears to me that this will give effect to a principle which, I think, this House is bound to impress upon the attention of the Government and that is, that the Government is bound, out of fairness to this House, not to force the hands of this House; they take certain resolutions in advance, promise people that their pay would be enhanced, and then come to this House and say that because a promise has been made and expectation has been raised, it will be ungracious, improper, unjust and uncharitable that that expectation should not be fulfilled and therefore the House is bound to act as Government has already indicated what they propose to do. This point, Sir, has been very forcibly borne in upon us when the previous resolution had been considered, namely, when we had made promise of increase of pay in respect of certain officers as made by a Government Order whether that promise has to be fulfilled or not. We were altogether in an invidious position. No doubt the voting with respect to that has been very small as you, Sir, must have noticed, but that was partly because . . ."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. I must beg of the Honourable Member not to go into a discussion on a vote which has already been disposed of."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR (*continuing*):—"That is not what I was doing, I beg your pardon. What I wanted to mention was this. One can very well understand the delicacy of feeling that honourable members do have when they are asked to cut down, for instance, in particular cases, promises of

increase of pay that have been made; but this is a general resolution and by this resolution we want to convey to the Government that it is the anxious desire of this House that before any payments are made which will ultimately come up for sanction to this House, the Government will be pleased to ascertain and consult the wishes of this House and make the payments. Particularly in the case of some of these orders the Government could very well have waited until the objections of the House had been heard.

"The next point to which the Hon'ble the Revenue Member drew our attention is this. The Government itself is proposing to make a considerable reduction in public expenditure and a committee is going to be appointed for the purpose, and he has told us that he is sanguine enough that there will be at least a reduction of 20 per cent. Now, Sir, the reduction that Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar has proposed by this motion is only Rs. 1 lakh out of Rs. 68 lakhs, that is a little less than 1½ per cent. Does not the Government itself believe in its own decision when it aspires to reduce expenditure to the extent of 20 per cent, and will it not be possible for it to reduce it to the extent of at least 1½ per cent? That is why I said that the Hon'ble the Revenue Member himself has partly supported the resolution. That is an excellent reason why the resolution of Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar should be accepted. We have been told, Sir, that there will be probable savings which will be given credit to and that as a matter of fact the Government are ever anxious to see that not a pie is asked for more than what is necessary. Now, Sir, even if we have taken into account the probable savings it is not that the difference between what has been actually expended in the previous year and the budgeted estimate of this year will be in any way decreased but on the other hand it will be very much more increased. As a matter of fact you will have noticed that these 68 lakhs of rupees asked for in the budget is the net amount that has been arrived at after deducting from the total amounts proposed various items of probable savings to which the Hon'ble the Revenue Member has drawn our attention. In these circumstances I think the Government would do well to accept the resolution of Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar because it merely means this, that there is a feeling that there is need for retrenchment and that they do not want to tie up the hands of the Government as to any particular direction in which retrenchment has to be made as the Government itself recognizes the need by the fact that a retrenchment committee is going to be appointed."

Mr. E. PERIYANAYAKAM:—"Sir, I have the greatest pleasure in opposing the motion. These two eminent lawyers know what pleading is. In law, there is what is known as pleading and if in any pleading there are statements which are vague and indefinite, they are not recognized. I think the motion brought by the Honourable Member for the University errs on the side being vague and indefinite. Sir, under this head the other honourable members of this House very cleverly brought details under which various items should be struck off. They were thoroughly discussed and this House came to the conclusion that none of those details could be safely retrenched. Now, Sir, they turn round and say that this House should make a general reduction of Rs. 1 lakh. I submit it is not conducive to good economy or to the efficient working of the department. So, Sir, on these grounds I beg to oppose the motion."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"I think that the motion brought forward by the Honourable Member for the University errs on the side of modesty and caution. I am rather surprised to find that the Hon'ble Member for Revenue should have chosen to oppose this resolution even though he is somewhat hopeful that when a fuller inquiry is made he might be able—of course, he does

not commit himself to a definite statement—to effect retrenchment even to a larger extent. What I find really difficult to understand is this. If we really accept the suggestion of the Hon'ble Member for Revenue, it is apparent that even the time allotted by His Excellency for the voting of grants, namely, nine days, will be more than enough. If we are to accept the assurance that when a fuller inquiry is made retrenchment might be effected to the extent of 20 per cent, we need not persist in these motions for reducing grants. Now that the Government have taken up the question of retrenchment, is it unreasonable to ask that this small reduction of one lakh may be made out of a total of 68 and odd lakhs and that the details may be worked out by the Hon'ble the Revenue Member? I think the Hon'ble Mr. Periyanayakam has not really understood the position taken up by the honourable mover. If details are lacking, it is not that we cannot suggest various details regarding these motions for grants. It is not that a detailed resolution is not suggested recommending to the Hon'ble the Revenue Member the particular item he could omit or reduce. If this resolution is accepted, instead of committing the Hon'ble the Revenue Member to a particular course of action, it will make him free to work out the details in the most convenient manner possible and to apply the pruning knife in a place he finds most suitable under the circumstances. That will be the only effect if the resolution is accepted. Before I sit down, I wish to appeal to the honourable members of the House that, if at all we can succeed in effecting any retrenchment for objects in which we are all deeply interested, we cannot ignore this item of land revenue with all its establishment charges, contingent charges, allowances and various other items for effecting retrenchment though to a small extent."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—"In answer to the motion for reduction, the Hon'ble the Finance Member has been good enough to give certain probable savings and also lots of assurances about retrenching the whole establishment. After all what we ask is this: instead of pointing us to probable savings, please give us one lakh at least as positive savings and nothing more. Even for giving the positive savings, we have to get the order of the Finance Committee which has to look into the whole thing. Even if the whole thing is wanted back, that committee will not stand in its way. There is no use of pointing out the probable savings. I submit, Sir, that if, as the Hon'ble the Revenue Member stated, they are going to save a good deal of the whole thing, why not we people ask them to save us outright one lakh of rupees and let us have one lakh sure in our hands, so that we can do with it as we like?"

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER:—"With reference to the last speaker's remarks, I should like to point out that the probable savings *are* in his hands. The probable savings are deducted from the charges of the department, so that they are already shown as positive savings in the budget. With reference to what has been said about the Government making demands, I would ask the House to realize that the Government cannot carry demands without the permission of the House in future. The question then is whether we can make a definite saving in addition to the probable savings already shown. Now we have considered a number of resolutions proposing specific savings and no mover of any of these resolutions has been able to carry the House with him. In fact we cannot effect any larger savings than we have done under the present arrangements.

"We have had numerous inquiries with a view to making savings and we have made many small reductions as a result of those inquiries. What we are now asked to do is to make root and branch retrenchment. That necessarily

means a change of policy and in all probability a sacrifice of efficiency. But we cannot carry through this change of policy on the budget as it stands at present.

"I should like here to say a word about the order that is being issued under instructions from His Excellency the Governor. What he is asking the heads of departments is this: 'Supposing you were required to manage with four-fifths of the present expenditure, how would you do it with the least sacrifice of efficiency?' When we have heard their replies to this question, we shall be able to say whether it is worth the sacrifices they indicate to make the changes they declare to be necessary.

"We hope also that some departments will suggest means of altering their systems which will be of general application. But honourable members are mistaken if they think that we are attempting to make an outright saving of 20 per cent. We have called for schemes on the lines I have indicated as a basis for discussion. As soon as we get those schemes, we propose to adopt the proposal which the Hon'ble Mr. V. Ramachandra Rao made at the last meeting of the Council that we should appoint a standing committee of this House to be associated with the Finance Department and to ask that standing committee to examine the schemes.

"At the same time, even supposing these schemes do involve a considerable saving, we cannot guarantee that the saving will take effect at once. We cannot cut down the staff of a large administrative department by a stroke of the pen. Even if we adopt radical changes of policy, we must give the heads of departments time to work them out in detail and even then it will take some little time to carry them into effect as vacancies arise, since it would obviously be uneconomical to dismiss men who are now at work and pay them compensation for the termination of their service.

"In these circumstances, I ask the Council to give us time to obtain schemes from heads of departments, to consult the Standing Finance Committee about them and then to set to work to give practical effect to whatever changes of policy are decided upon, and not to ask us to begin by making arbitrary reductions from the budget."

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu:—"We have heard with great pleasure the announcement just made that His Excellency the Governor has instructed heads of departments to scrutinize the expenditures in their departments and to suggest ways and means for economy. That is so far so good.

"When proposals are brought forward here for specific reductions, one honourable member after another stands up on behalf of the Government for demolishing the motion and a hundred reasons why that specific item should stand on the budget are stated. When a general proposal like this for the reduction of a lakh out of 55 lakhs is brought forward, my honourable friend Mr Periyanayakam says that the proposal is indefinite. I think this proposal is as definite as possible. It is in fact an appeal to the Government that during the next year they should spend one lakh less than they were doing now and I trust the Hon'ble the Revenue Member would see the reasonableness of such a proposal. Unless some such proposal is brought forward in this House, I do not think the heads of departments will realize the necessity of sending up proposals for economy. I think this proposal leaves absolute discretion to Government to adjust the amount for reduction to be distributed among the departments. That being so, I think there should be no difficulty in accepting this motion."

Diwan Bahadur T. Desika Achariyar:—"Mr. President, I think, the object of the resolution was to draw pointed attention to the necessity of effecting

retrenchment wherever possible and that object, I think, has been achieved. I do not believe there will be any further use in pressing this motion to a conclusion. May I be permitted at this stage to move that the question be now put?"

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"No, no, the Honourable Member is not right in putting the question at the end of his own statements. It is like saying 'I have spoken, nobody else shall speak.' I cannot permit him to move that the question be now put."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I have very great pleasure in supporting this resolution now before the House. Sir, from the deliberations of this morning, I think the House has seen very clearly that there is a decided tendency on the part of the Council to support the Government wherever it is possible to support it. A large number of resolutions suggesting reductions and omissions of various items have already been moved and I believe that even in those cases where the necessity for keeping those items in the Budget has not been clearly made out, the benefit of the doubt has been given if I may say so, in the language of lawyers—in favour of the Government. In other words, there has been no tendency whatever to embarrass the Government in any way, for I believe the House is fully conscious of the difficulties of the Government. Now this is a very general resolution and in respect of this general resolution, the Hon'ble the Revenue Member has stated that though he formally opposes the motion there is no objection in accepting the resolution. That is the interpretation that I put upon his speech. He says that His Excellency has been pleased to direct that retrenchment, wherever possible, should be effected. The Finance Committee will soon be appointed and he hopes that he will be able to make a reduction of more than 20 per cent. Thus practically he has given reasons for supporting the resolution."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I am being misquoted, Sir, I never stated that I hoped to be able to secure a saving of more than 20 per cent."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR (*continuing*):—"I never quoted him. I only interpreted his speech. My friend the Hon'ble the Finance Member contradicted the Hon'ble the Revenue Member and stated that he did not have hopes of any reduction. No doubt we suggest to heads of departments to make reductions, but it is quite possible that we may not be able to make any reduction ultimately. Knowing as we do human nature, and particularly the human nature of the heads of departments, we can only say that they will be against reduction generally. What we ask in this resolution is this: please try to economise and show by not opposing this resolution that you are really in earnest in saying that you like to effect retrenchment."

The Rev. E. M. MACPHAIL:—"I do not want to say very much, as we have taken up too much time already with this resolution. It seems to me that a proposal of this kind is of absolutely no use whatever for the reason that it is a very general proposition. We are all in favour of economising and I suppose there is not a single member of this Council that will not subscribe to that proposition. When however we are dealing with practical matters dealing with expenditure, it seems to me that it is essential that any one who wishes to propose a reduction of Government expenditure is bound to point out in what directions these reductions should be made. It is not desirable that we must discuss a general question of this kind. As I stated from this place the last time I spoke on this subject, my experience has been that every one gets up and talks in favour

of economy in general but at the same time he is desirous to get as large an expenditure as possible for his own particular department or the particular branch of the public administration he is specially interested in or for his own constituency. It is extremely difficult for us no doubt to know how to curtail expenditure. At the same time there is no use coming forward here and bringing a general proposal unless we can make actual recommendations and point out in what ways the expenditure should be cut down and saving should be made. Therefore, I strongly oppose this resolution."

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR: —" Mr. President, I just want to say a word by way of reply to the Rev. Mr. Macphail's speech. My motion is quite in accordance with parliamentary practice and what I want is really a reduction of one lakh of rupees, not that there should be some economy, but that the amount demanded is too much by one lakh of rupees and that it should be reduced by the very, very definite figure of one lakh. I do not suggest ways and means, but the statute and the rules allow me also to reduce the demand for expenditure that is asked for by a specific amount. It is not necessary for me to move for the reduction of any particular item. I have raised this question of principle as I have stated, Mr. President, for the purpose of bringing before the House the necessity for retrenchment and I hope the House will agree with me after it has heard the Revenue Member's and the Finance Member's statements that it is quite possible to reduce expenditure. The Revenue Member hopes it may be possible and the Finance Member is not able to give an assurance, but still he says some proposals are being made. Therefore it is that I do persist in moving this resolution because no assurance of any description can be given or has been given in such a way as to enable me to feel confident that any retrenchment will be made this year."

The President then put the motion to the vote and declared it carried by 45 against 31.

MOTION NO. 11.

The following motion which stood in the name of Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai was not moved by him and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

'*That the grant of Rs.* 3,45,000 *in* 5-*B. Land Revenue* (*Survey and Settlement*)—*Controlling Office, be reduced by a sum of Rs.* 6,500 (*Budget page* 35).'

MOTION NO. 12.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I move—

'*That in the demand under* 5-*B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement, the grant of Rs.* 10,61,700 *proposed for Temporary Establishment—Professional Survey Parties—Cadastral Survey* (*including resurveys and revision surveys*), *be reduced by Rs.* 1·50 *lakhs* (*Budget page* 35).'

" I would draw the attention of honourable members of this Council to the figures relating to the provision for revenue survey and especially temporary establishment, and I may state at once that I am not responsible for the figure Rs. 10,61,700 appearing in the printed resolution and the provision for the temporary establishment is only Rs. 3,42,736. It will be found that so far as the total provision for survey and resurvey is concerned the provision made in the budget estimate for 1920–21 was Rs. 10·37 lakhs and in the revised estimate it is 12·38 lakhs. But in the budget estimate for 1921–22 we have provided for 15·31 lakhs (Budget page 35). The particular head under which I am suggesting retrenchment is that of the temporary establishment appearing at page 36. In page 36,

21st March 1921] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

there is a provision of 4·30 lakhs in the revised estimate for 1920–21 and the provision in the budget estimate for 1921–22 is 5·88 lakhs. I am suggesting that 1·50 lakhs be cut off from this budget provision. The effect of this is that I do not recommend any increase under the provision made for temporary establishment. The effect of accepting my proposal will be that at least under the head of temporary establishment these resurvey parties do not go further than what we have done already. You may by all means continue the establishment to the extent of the provision of 4·30 lakhs, but do not again incur 1·50 lakhs more next year. At a time when we both official and non-official members of this House are anxious to effect retrenchment, let this item be chosen for the purpose of reducing the charge to the extent of 1·50 lakhs. May I draw the attention of this Council to certain facts dealing with this question of resurvey and resettlement? This is as old as the old Council under the Morley-Minto Reform scheme. From the year 1913 onwards a year did not pass when the attention of the Government was not drawn to increasing expenditure under resurvey and the policy of it was discussed on various previous occasions, and we were informed that *bona fide* attempts were being made to reduce the expenditure under resurvey. We were informed on behalf of the Government, especially in 1914–15 and 1916–17, by the Hon'ble Mr. Butterworth and later by Sir Alexander Cardew that this resurvey was due to various defects found in the old survey methods and that after the land records staff was placed on a permanent basis, attempts should be made to effect retrenchment. We were given hopes, Sir, in 1916–17 that as the result of attempts made by the Survey Committee, we might effect some retrenchment. I have stated so far about the principles which the Government themselves have adopted in dealing with this question of resurvey. But what has been the effect of their attempts in this direction? The figures to be given by me will be most discouraging. I have given now to the Council an idea of the figures relating to the year to come. We find that at the time of the discussion of the Financial Statement in 1916-17 a resolution regarding this subject was moved by the Hon'ble Mr. Sarma who is now in the Viceregal Council and in reply to that resolution, the Hon'ble Sir Alexander Cardew was good enough to state that though it was not then possible to effect retrenchment in survey charges, it may be possible to reduce a party and effect some retrenchment after 1919. That was a statement made on behalf of the Government at the time of the discussion of the Financial Statement in 1916-17. Well, Sir, I wish now to show what progress we have made from the year 1916-17 when a definite request was made to reduce charges and when a definite assurance was given that attempts would be made in that direction. The Council will be good enough to notice that the provision made for this resurvey in the budget for 1916-17 was only 7·72 lakhs, and the accounts of that year show only 5·90 lakhs. That was a year when a definite proposal was made and when a sort of assurance was given. Against 7·72 lakhs in the budget estimate for 1916-17 we have a budget provision of 15·31 lakhs in 1921-22. Coming to the specific item of temporary establishment under survey, the Council will be pleased to notice that the only provision made in the budget of 1916–17 under temporary establishment was 1 lakh and what we have now got is that from 1 lakh in 1916-17 it has come to 5·88 lakhs in 1921–22. I would therefore ask this House to consider whether in a case where the increasing expenditure of the Survey department has been repeatedly brought to the notice of the Government and in a case where the Government have already expressed themselves in agreement with the policy of effecting retrenchment at the earliest opportunity, we would in a year of financial stress allow a provision of 5·88 lakhs in excess of the provision made for 1920-21. Even if I ask for the deletion of the provision for temporary establishment

my resolution could have been justified in the circumstances. But I realize the difficulties of the Government in disbanding the establishments which are in existence to-day, as it will probably create further complications. Having that in view, I have been very modest and moderate in not suggesting the retrenchment far below the mark but in suggesting that we must cry 'halt' at the stage at which we are. Let us not increase the expenditure at this stage. The request is very reasonable and I think such a resolution will not be opposed by Government; but if they do oppose it, I shall be surprised."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Mr. President, I must confess that when I read this motion of the honourable member I was not quite sure what he was exactly aiming at; for, the motion by itself was far from being self-explanatory. However, I now find that he tries to raise his objection against the allotment which has been entered under the head of temporary establishment. He has drawn, I think, pointed attention to the fact that, in the Survey department, in respect of which some assurance was given so long ago as 1916 that the expenditure would be gradually reduced, while he now regrets to find that the expenditure is pulling up. But I would at once tell the House that the existing survey parties continue not merely for the purpose of carrying out, what we call the Government work, but we have also got two parties which are employed solely for doing work on behalf of estates. And if we are doing work on behalf of the estates, it is quite necessary, I suppose, that we should take on as much establishment as would constitute the complement of a party for the purpose of doing that work. It has been an accepted principle in the case of Survey and Settlement departments that we should retain on the permanent cadre only a fixed proportion of the men employed thereupon and that as necessity arises and as the bulk of work increases, additions should be made to that establishment, not to the permanent cadre but in the shape of temporary establishment. That principle, I take it, Sir, is financially sound, and I am not sure if I am going to be advised that I should take on everybody on the permanent cadre in future. Now turning therefore, Sir, to the large increase which my honourable friend on the other side has drawn the attention of the House to, which appears under Survey represented by a sum of Rs. 5,88,608, may I at once draw the attention of the House to the large recovery which finds a place under the same head, the recovery appearing on page 37 and being no less than Rs. 5,86,400? "This recovery is intended to be made from those estates and from those other individuals on whose behalf the surveys are conducted. This, therefore, would need to be deducted from the total expenditure that is incurred on that account. Then, again, Sir, may I draw the attention of the House to one other very relevant factor that the expenditure in the next year will by no means be larger than the expenditure that has been budgeted for, for the current year? My honourable friend wanted to show that there is a tendency on the part of the Government to increase the expenditure under temporary establishments from year to year. I am sorry to find that he probably compares the two figures appearing side by side without taking into account another item which appears down below, i.e., temporary additions to pay, which equally cover not only the permanent men but also the temporary men. There was an allotment of no less than Rs. 2,22,000 in the current year on account of additions to pay. Well, it may be unfortunate that we have not been able to disband all the survey parties as my honourable friend would have it. But at the same time it is to be realized that the Survey department has certain functions to discharge and not until the whole of the Presidency has been surveyed, not until all the proprietors who have applied to us for the survey of their respective estates

21st March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib.]

have undergone the survey, will it be possible for us to reduce or absolutely abolish the Survey department. It is true that the aim of the Land Records department has been very largely the replacement of the survey. I think the Land Records department could only work on such data and such materials as the Survey department would have put in their possession and not until the Survey department has done its duty fully in respect of all the tracts in the Presidency, will it be possible for the Land Records department to take the place of the Survey department absolutely. I suppose honourable members are aware that the Survey Party has invariably to proceed and do its work in districts where there has been resettlement. We have a number of districts which underwent resettlement recently and there are yet a number of districts which have to be resettled. It may be in pursuance of some policy to be adopted in future, but all the same the necessity for the existence of the Survey department has not yet disappeared. It will continue to be in existence until we feel that we can do without it, and we must go on budgeting according to our absolute necessities. The details for the sum of Rs. 5 lakhs and odd which my honourable friend on the other side disputes, are available in my hands. It is such a long statement that I shall not weary the House by reading it. But if my honourable friend wants to satisfy himself with the various details which comprise the total of Rs. 5 lakhs and odd, I am ready to show it to him at any time when he may find it convenient to do so. Similarly in the case of other temporary establishments, Rs. 3,42,736 which appear under the Settlement Parties. Therefore, Sir, I am unable to accept any recommendation for reduction of the temporary establishments. I again repeat that if, as a result of the Finance Committee which is going to sit very soon, my attention will be drawn to any items which can conveniently be eliminated, I will certainly be glad to abide by its advice."

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—"Under this head we see that instead of one Deputy and seven Assistant Directors in 1920–21, we have one Deputy and eight Assistant Directors now in page 36—i.e., one more than last year. We also find that the personal allowance of Rs. 36,132 is given and the large travelling allowance of Rs. 1,00,000 to about seven or eight Deputy Directors and probably some of these surveyors is also given. Again, we see that a charge allowance for four people instead of two, of Rs. 4,800 is also provided. So, from all these items, it is quite possible that a sum of Rs. 1,50,000 can be reduced. With regard to the surveys of the estates, it makes no difference, because the whole amount that is being spent is being recovered from the estates. Out of the total of Rs. 10,51,100 standing at the bottom of page 36, a sum of Rs. 1,50,000 can be very well saved by cutting off some of these items."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"May I inquire, Sir, if a reduction of the amounts just specified falls within the terms of this resolution, which relates only to a reduction in the *temporary* establishment and not under the other heads mentioned by the speaker?"

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"Will the honourable member tell me if he proposes any reduction other than the reduction moved by the Hon'ble Mr. Krishna Rao?"

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—"No."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—"As I have given notice of a motion for a similar reduction, I wish to speak on this motion. The Hon'ble the Revenue Member has been telling us that last year a sum of Rs. 2,22,000 was provided in addition to Rs. 4,30,000, but this year it has been omitted for this reason, that the salaries of all the establishments have been increased. The Hon'ble the Revenue

Member has been good enough to tell us also that this sum of Rs. 2,20,000 which is put just below the amount of Rs. 4,30,000 included the salaries of the permanent and of the temporary establishments. If we just go a little higher we find that the salaries have come up to Rs. 76,000. The addition of about two lakhs of rupees referred to by my honourable friend Mr. Krishna Rao has not been answered. Last year we passed Rs. 4,30,000 and this year we want Rs. 5,88,608. After this Council passed at the last meeting a resolution that the settlement operations should not be given effect to and after the deliberate pronouncement of the Joint Select Committee that as early as possible the land revenue system of this country should be embodied in a code, I beg to submit that without giving us any definite assurance as to the time when this Land revenue Code will come into existence, it is not at all right to go on increasing the cost of the survey establishment by lakhs of rupees. The Hon'ble the Revenue Member has not at all shown why he wants this lakh and fifty thousand. I submit, Sir, that this motion made by the Hon'ble Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao is a very modest one and I have made a more modest request that a sum of Rs. 1,50,000 be deducted.

"To a question put in this Council about the coming into operation of the Land Revenue Code, Government have been only able to give us an indefinite answer, viz., that it was not possible to fix any time, that the whole thing was under correspondence and that it might take five or ten years. Within these five or ten years, and until the Land Revenue Code comes into operation, Settlement Parties will be increasing and the revenue paid by the ryotwari landholders is being increased. May I, Sir, even though the subject is a reserved subject, not ask the Government to give some sort of consideration to the almost unanimous resolution of this Council to suspend the operations for some time? What I say is: Please do not increase the establishment, continue the old establishment, do not increase the salaries, do not add any temporary establishment but continue with your own establishment and please, for goodness sake, do not overburden us. That is the prayer made to the Government and I am sure the Government will accept that prayer."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju:—"Mr. President, Sir, in this connexion we may examine the increase in the Survey department year after year. In the year 1912-13 the expenditure under this head was Rs. 13,20,000. But according to the present budget it is Rs. 24,32,000. The increase is enormous. Even supposing we deduct the five lakhs and odd contribution from the estates, it comes to more than 19 lakhs and the increase is nearly fifty per cent. So whatever may be the contributions from the estates and the municipalities, there is the net increase of expenditure. Again, Sir, if we take into consideration the increase under this particular head, we see that in 1917-18 the expenditure under cadastral survey was Rs. 3,20,000, while according to the present budget proposal it is to be Rs. 5,88,000. Again, we see in this connexion there is an enormous increase in expenditure. It has been stated that the recoveries come to about five lakhs eighty-eight thousand. But I suppose that the recoveries from the estates are on account of all items of survey expenditure and not under any particular items. I am not able to understand the explanation given by the Hon'ble the Revenue Member as to how this particular item of recovery can be set against the expenditure under cadastral surveys temporary establishment. The question of resurvey is intimately connected with resettlement and also with Land Records establishments. In the year 1918, while the question of increase in the Survey department was under consideration, Sir Alexander Cardew was pleased to state: 'I think by increasing the staff of the Revenue Inspectorate, it may be possible to get the registers more

up-to-date, so that at the end of each resettlement period there may not be large amount of arrears to be cleared off'. In this year's budget we find a large increase in the number of revenue inspectors. The expenditure under settlement is also proposed to be increased. I do not see any reason why there should be increase under both the heads. If really, as may be expected from the statement of Sir Alexander Cardew on behalf of the Government, the increase of revenue inspectors necessarily decreases the survey expenditure, we are greatly disappointed in finding extra expenditure budgeted for under both the heads. If I have carefully heard the Hon'ble the Finance Member, I do not think he has answered satisfactorily the point raised by Mr. Krishna Rao regarding the statement made by Sir Alexander Cardew as to the probable reduction in the Survey department."

At this stage the Council adjourned for lunch and reassembled at 2-30 p.m. and resumed the discussion of the motion made by Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao (Motion No. 12).

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"The only point for consideration is whether any case has been made out for the additional temporary establishments. The present proposal is to reduce it by 1·50 lakhs. From the figures which have been quoted, it is quite clear that the temporary establishment in the coming year cost 5 lakhs and odd whereas in the revised estimate it is only 4 lakhs and odd (page 38). I do not see any explanation given by the Hon'ble the Revenue Member for this large addition of temporary establishments: we should like to have the establishments on the footing of the current year. That is the only point that is raised in this issue : it is unnecessary to discuss any further side issues with reference to the expenditure on survey and settlement. In previous years a good deal of time has been devoted to pointing out that the expenditure under survey and settlement has been mounting up day after day. Therefore unless there is some valid reason for this addition to temporary establishments it seems to me that this motion ought to be pressed upon the Council."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"Does the Hon'ble Mr. Krishna Rao wish to reply?"

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Yes."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I was not aware that you were going to call on the mover to reply, Sir, or I should have asked leave first to say a few words."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"The Honourable Member can speak after the mover has replied. The reply does not close the discussion. Sometimes the mover gets choked by the closure ; so I want to give him a chance."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, it was pointed out in reply to this resolution that sufficient notice was not taken of the recoveries from estates referred to in page 37 of the budget estimate. The Honourable Members of this Council will notice that on page 36 we find figures relating to Government villages and the charges incurred on account of cadastral surveys in Government villages are separately referred to. It is with reference to Government villages that we find temporary establishment at a cost of Rs. 5,88,000 provided for, the total coming up to over 11 lakhs in respect of Government villages alone in the budget estimate against that of the revised estimate Rs. 8,93,000, with an increase of two lakhs. So far as estates are concerned, the figure is separately shown. It will be found that 5 lakhs and odd is provided in the budget estimate in respect of estates as against 4 lakhs and odd in the revised estimate. The recoveries from estates practically cover that amount with a little surplus. Therefore, there is no force

in the argument of the Honourable Member for Revenue that in considering the question the recoveries from estates ought to be taken into account, because the figures are not to a substantial extent affected by the recoveries from estates which are only slight in excess over the expenditure. Then it was pointed out that it is not a correct principle to reduce the temporary establishment and increase the permanent establishment. Nobody suggested anything of that sort. What we are surprised to find is that there is an increase not merely in the temporary establishment, but also in the permanent establishment. If with this increase in the temporary establishment the Honourable Member was able to provide for a decrease in the permanent establishment we would be glad to accept the position. But that is not the case. The only other point regarding which some reply is necessary is this. My attention was drawn to the fact that provision has been made for temporary additions in page 36 of the budget. My Hon'ble friend Mr. Arumainatha Pillai has drawn attention to the fact that temporary additions to pay do not necessarily refer to the temporary establishment. It is not possible to apportion as between the various portions of the establishment temporary and permanent so far as temporary additions to the pay are concerned. Even assuming that a portion has to be included, what do we find? The effect of the resolution is that, instead of about 6 lakhs provided for in the budget estimate, provide only 4½ lakhs. Is it anything unreasonable I ask, for in 1916-17 you were able to get on with about 1 lakh and odd for temporary establishment for revenue survey. Now I would ask why we may not be satisfied with 3 lakhs or even more than that, 4½ lakhs. I submit it is a very reasonable proposal and I fear I may be charged with having been too considerate and too cautious in allowing any increased expenditure under this head. I think, Sir, that if at all my resolution errs it errs on the side of undue moderation and modesty; and I hope that this Council which can only exercise its powers by reducing grants will take advantage of its powers for this purpose. We are certainly glad to hear that His Excellency the Governor and the Members of his Government are going to consider it. But this will only strengthen their hands and enable them to work on these lines."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I understand from what Mr. Ramachandra Rao has said and from what has fallen from the lips of other Honourable Members that their main object is to obviate any increase in the quantity of temporary establishments entertained. The idea is that the establishment of the coming year should be on the same footing as that which obtained in the current year; and it is assumed by a comparison of the two figures on page 36 of the budget estimates that there is a substantial increase, because whereas the revised estimate shows 4·30 lakhs the budget figure is 5·88 lakhs. That is the basis of the motion now under consideration proposing the reduction of a lakh and a half. Now, Sir, immediately below the entry 4·30 in the revised estimate is the entry of 2·02 lakhs for 'temporary additions to pay'. If this year's budget could have been prepared on exactly the same lines as last year's budget and supplemented by a Chief Secretary's memorandum indicating the reasons for differences, we should have known precisely what proportion of that Rs. 2,02,000 relates to temporary establishments and what proportion to establishments not classed as temporary. I wish I could say exactly what amount does appertain to temporary establishments. Let us, however, suppose for the purposes of argument that the amount is X rupees. Then the increase under temporary establishments will not be 1·58 lakhs but (1·58 — X) and may be only a comparatively small sum. Is it not possible, Sir, that the revised scales of pay, which have produced increases

in the permanent establishments all along the line in the budget estimate as compared with the revised estimate apply also to the temporary heads? This leads me to the possible conclusion that, so far as mere figures are concerned, 5·88 lakhs may conceivably represent the payment necessary in the coming year for precisely the same number of hands as were found on the temporary pay list of last year. It is conceivable, as it seems to me, that there is no absolute increase whatever in the number of hands. I should have liked to be able to say positively what the position is but details are wanting. I understand, however, from an inquiry which has been made of the Board of Revenue this morning over the telephone that as a matter of fact the difference is made up partly of increase in hands and partly of increase in pay. I am not able to give the precise figures, but I throw these remarks out in order to warn this House that the proposed reduction of 1·50 lakhs will not secure the object in view, namely, of retaining the temporary establishment in the coming year at the same figure as it now stands, but will undoubtedly have the effect of reducing that establishment next year. I think the House ought to realize that a reduction of 1½ lakhs cannot lightly be made. It might incidentally deprive the temporary staff of the increase in pay for which they are eligible and to which they are as justly entitled as the members of the permanent staff."

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"I move that the question be now put."

The motion for closure was put and carried.

The motion for reduction was then put to the vote and carried.

MOTION No. 13.

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—"I do not move the motion standing in my name:—

That the grant of Rs. 10,61,700 *in* 5-*B. Land Revenue* (*Survey and Settlement*) *be reduced by Rs.* 1,30,000 (*Budget page* 35).

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION NOS. 14 AND 15.

The following motions were not moved and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn:—

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—

That in the demand under 5-*B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement the lump provision of Rs.* 33,000 *for the reorganization of the Survey Department be omitted* (*Budget page* 35).

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—

That the grant of Rs. 7,12,000 *in* 5-*B. Land Revenue* (*Survey and Settlement*) *be reduced by a sum of Rs.* 1,10,000 (*Budget page* 35).

MOTION No. 16.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Motion No. 16 which stands in my name runs as follows:—

'*That the following items under* 5-*B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement—Survey be omitted*:—

1. *Rupees* 8,000 *lump provision to meet the extra cost on account of the application to the Deputy Collectors in the Settlement Department of the revised time-scale of pay sanctioned for Deputy Collectors* (*Budget page* 35).

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [21st March 1921

2. *Rupees* 4,800—*Photographic and Printing Expert* (*Budget page* 35.)'

"It has been pointed out this morning in regard to the first item by Honourable Members that the Government sanctioned the scales of pay to provincial services, and that these scales of pay having been already sanctioned it would be unjust and uncharitable to cut out these provisions. I wish to know from the Honourable Member for Finance whether there is any idea or intention of subjugating all the scales of provincial service sanctioned during the last year for any revision in the coming year. If he says there is any such intention, I do not propose to press item No. 1 in the motion which I have just moved. In regard to the second item I wish to know what necessity there is for this photographer and printing expert. As I said, we are all very much in the dark about many items of expenditure which have been proposed in the budget and this is one."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Mr. President, I think it will relieve my Honourable friend's anxiety considerably if I tell him that the item of Rs. 8,000 which has been referred to is a printers' devil. Therefore, I agree to the deletion of that item absolutely. It was eliminated in the totals.

"As regards the other item, I am sorry I cannot agree to the deletion of Rs. 4,800 that is entered here. For I think Honourable Members of the House are aware that this question formed the subject-matter of a very careful inquiry by a committee called 'The Madras Survey and Land Records Committee'. That committee consisted of various officers representing various interests and the decision of that committee was that an officer of this description was absolutely necessary. This decision to appoint a separate expert, who possessed not only expert knowledge of photography but also expert knowledge of printing has been under consideration of the Government for some time past. They have been trying to secure the services of an officer locally and for some years they have been applying to various places for the purpose of enabling them to appoint a man at once but it so chanced that no one officer in India was able to offer himself for appointment with a knowledge of both photography and printing combined. We also applied to the Survey of India and we could get no help from them. Therefore we had to apply to the Secretary of State to recruit an officer on our behalf, and I think he will soon be appointed. While on this subject, I may also tell the House that it is the intention of the Government to train an Indian officer for this work. We are getting a specialist from Home for a temporary period only. We are sending an Indian to England on a scholarship, so that he may undergo the necessary training there both in photography and printing and come back to us and after he arrives it is expected that he will be appointed to this position. I think those Honourable Members of the House who know the importance of printing of maps and who know how it is necessary to possess correct and accurate maps will also feel the need for the strengthening of the Survey office with a specialist who could devote his whole time to the production of correct and useful maps. The provision that is entered is, after all, the minimum that we could have offered to an officer of that position. We had originally expected to get a man locally from somewhere in India and we had budgeted for a sum of Rs. 300 to be given to him per mensem. But after making all efforts in this country we found we were not in a position to secure the services of one who combined both kinds of technical knowledge. Then it became necessary to advertise in England to secure a specialist like that and we are offering a salary of Rs. 400 per mensem to begin with. That cannot, I think, Sir, be regarded as extravagant. I will simply read what the Madras Survey and the Land Records Committee said in the year 1915—

21st March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

'A necessary addition to the Central Survey office, in our opinion, is that of a Printing and Photographic Expert, to be in charge of the work of printing and photographic reproduction of maps. At present, a Sub-Assistant Director is in charge; he was trained for a short time in Calcutta, but he is in no sense an expert, and the results in this branch of work are by no means as satisfactory as they should be. A non-gazetted officer of this class could probably be obtained from the Survey of India at a salary of Rs. 300 rising to Rs. 500. In any case, the Survey of India would be in a position to give valuable advice as to the best method of recruitment. Under the control of this expert, economy could be effected by substituting one or more power machines in place of the hand-presses now in use.'

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu :—"May I know for how long a period this man is to be appointed? I understand that there is an attempt to train indigenous talent."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur :—"For the present, Sir, we are entering into a contract with an expert only for a period of five years. The Indian whom we are deputing to England for a training should be there for three years. After three years when he comes back fully qualified we want him to learn details of practical work. Then the expert will revert and the Indian will be appointed in his place."

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu :—"I understand that the first item should be put to the Council. I do not wish to press the second."

The Hon'ble the President :—"I take it that the Government agree to the deletion of Rs. 8,000. I will put these two things separately to the House.

Item No. (1) was put to the vote and carried.

Item No. (2) was by leave withdrawn.

Motion No. 17.

Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar having been absent, the following motion standing in his name was deemed to have been withdrawn :—

That under 5-B. Land Revenue, the provision of Rs. 4,800 *for a photographic and printing expert be omitted* (*Budget page* 35).

Motions Nos. 18 and 19.

The following motions were not moved and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu :—

That the item of Rs. 1,96,770 *shown as temporary establishment under Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement—Revenue Survey be reduced by Rs.* 1,00,000 (*Budget page* 35).

Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu :—

That the provision of Rs. 1,96,770 *for temporary establishment made under lithographic department in detailed account No. 5-B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement—Survey be reduced by one lakh* (*Budget page* 35).

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [21st March 1921

Motion No. 20.

Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar :—" Sir, my motion reads—

' That in 5-B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement the following provisions be deleted :—

(i) *Rs.* 4,800 *provided for a new photographic and printing expert* (*Budget page* 35).

(ii) *Rs.* 1,200 *charge allowance* (*Budget page* 35).'

" Item No. (i), I cannot move as it has been discussed already. With regard to item No. (ii), I would like to be informed to whom this charge allowance is to be paid. Is it going to be paid to the expert? If so, for what reason? "

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur :—" I think, Sir, it is the intention to pay this charge allowance to the officer who is going to be imported from England."

Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar :—" I do not press it then."

The motion was then by leave withdrawn.

Motion No. 21.

Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar having been absent, the following motion of his was deemed to have been withdrawn :—

21. *That under 5-B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement the provision of Rs.* 18,000 *for five Assistant Directors be reduced to Rs.* 3,600 (*Budget page* 36).

Motions Nos. 22 to 29.

The following motions were not made and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar :—

22. *To reduce Rs.* 18,000 *provided for five Assistant Directors by* 3,600 *for four Assistant Directors* (*Budget page* 36).

Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu :—

23. *That the provision of Rs.* 5,88,608 *for temporary establishment made under executive subordinates in Detailed Account No.* 5-*B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement—Survey be reduced by one lakh* (*Budget page* 36).

C. V. S. Narasimha Raju :—

24. *That the item of Rs.* 5,88,608 *shown as cost of temporary establishment under cadastral survey in* 5-*B.* (*a*) *Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement—Revenue Survey be reduced by Rs.* 1,00,000 (*Budget page* 36).

Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar :—

25. *Delete Rs.* 36,132, *personal allowance* (*Budget page* 36).

Delete Rs. 4,800, *charge allowance* (*Budget page* 36).

Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu :—

26. *That the provision of Rs.* 2,85,000 *for establishment under* (*b*) *Estates in Detailed Account No.* 5-*B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement—Survey be reduced by one lakh* (*Budget page* 37).

Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar :—

27. *To omit Rs.* 3,600 *provided for one Special Assistant Settlement Officer* (*Budget page* 38).

21st March 1921] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

28. *That the provision of Rs.* 3,42,736 *for temporary establishment in Settlement parties in Detailed Account No. 5-B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement—Settlement be reduced by one lakh* (*Budget page* 38).

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

29. *Reduce the provision of Rs.* 3,42,736 *provided for temporary establishment by Rs.* 50,000 (*Budget page* 38).

MOTION No. 30.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" I have the honour to move—

' *That in the demand under 5-B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement the grant of Rs.* 3,42,736 *proposed for temporary establishment—Settlement Parties be reduced by* 1·70 *lakhs* (*Budget page* 38).'

" Honourable Members of this House are aware that the previous resolution which this House carried was with reference to the temporary survey parties. This is with reference to the temporary survey establishment under settlement parties. The circumstances relating to the settlement parties are such that this Council need not have any hesitation whatever in accepting this resolution. The Council will kindly remember that on a former occasion, almost unanimously was it resolved that the resettlement operations be practically kept in abeyance pending land revenue legislation. Whatever decision the Government might arrive at upon this question as a result of the recommendations of this Council, it has adopted a policy which I hope it will not depart from, and we need not incur any extra heavy expenditure on re-settlement operations. That is the view the Council has already taken and it is only my duty to remind it to carry it a step further from a practical standpoint. To a resolution on matters of general public interest in this Council, answer was given that the Government would reconsider the position and see in what respects and to what extent they could carry out the wishes of the Council. I wish to place before the Council how the matter stands, so far as this question is concerned. It was at the time of the Revised Financial Statement for 1917–18 that the Hon'ble Mr. V. K. Ramanuja Achariyar asked that reduction of 1 lakh be made in re-settlement parties, the provision then made having been Rupees 3,90,000. It will be interesting to the Council to note the reply given by the Hon'ble Sir Alexander Cardew, Member for Revenue. And this is what he said :—

'I shall be very glad indeed if it were possible, if it could be found possible, to reduce the expenditure on re-settlement. It constitutes a very considerable inroad into the increased revenue obtained by re-settlement. It costs a great deal which is set off against any sum which the Government may obtain as a result of the re-settlement operations. If it is possible to reduce the amount in any way, as the Honourable Member proposes, the Government, I am sure, will be glad to do it. I would be quite prepared to examine the Honourable Member's suggestion about it; but I cannot at this moment say there is anything in his proposals. I am quite prepared to examine them and we shall be glad if we can find room for effecting a saving. It is impossible to go further. I think that will meet the wishes of the Honourable Members.'

" This is the reply given by the Government at the time of the discussion of the Revised Financial Statement for the year 1917–18 and are we not to-day in a position to state that there is no justification for an increase in expenditure under re-settlement operations? As regards the cost of re-settlements, I have now drawn

the attention of the Council to the Financial Statement of 1917–18 and I will give the figures relating to that year. In that year the budget provision was Rs. 4·20 lakhs and in the accounts it was shown as Rs. 4·55 lakhs. In the budget estimate for 1919–20 it was Rs. 6·15 lakhs and in the revised estimate it was shown as Rs. 7·81 lakhs. But we have now budgeted for 9 lakhs under the revised estimate. Coming to the temporary settlement parties regarding which alone I now make this motion, it will be found that the budget provision in the year 1917–18 at the time of the discussion of which Sir Alexander Cardew stated that he would examine the matter, the provision was Rs. 1,03,000, under the temporary establishment, and the accounts showed only Rs. 92,000. We find that in the revised estimate it is Rs. 1·70 lakhs plus some addition to be taken into consideration on account of temporary additions to pay, but in the budget estimate for 1921–22, it will come to Rs. 3·42 lakhs. The effect of accepting my proposal would be to fix the expenditure of the re-settlement operations at Rs. 1·70 lakhs. I am not now suggesting that as the result of the resolution accepted by this Council some time ago, we have to do away with all settlement operations. If that is to be accepted, it would be a drastic provision. I want to be as modest as possible and only urge that these re-settlement operations should be put off as much as possible pending legislation. But I would ask whether there is any necessity for providing for a grant of Rs. 3·42 lakhs. I am quite aware that if we take into account the temporary additions to pay, the figure in the revised estimate will have to be increased to some, though we cannot say, to what extent. But even then, it will have the effect of reducing some expenditure under re-settlement. Even that is quite reasonable in view of the attitude taken by the Council and in view of the fact that the Government have for a long time been suggesting that steps would be taken to reduce the expenditure on re-settlements. I need not say anything more on this subject because whatever the Government might do so far as this Council is concerned, it would not be committing itself to any heavy expenditure in regard to these re-settlements."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:— "Mr. President, I think I might start by joining issue with my honourable friend Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao when he told us that the resolution which this House passed the other day in the matter of re-settlement was that all further settlement work should stop. On the other hand, the resolution of this House was that all re-settlement schemes should not be given effect to until the principles of re-settlement were embodied in an enactment. That, I take it, is quite a different thing from saying 'stop all re-settlement operations'. On the other hand if we will examine the speeches delivered in this House by various Honourable Members who brought forward the resolutions or who spoke on previous budgets, the only thing that I am able to glean is that they have all urged that no effect should be given to the re-settlement schemes but that spade work connected with the preliminary investigations must go on. I think that was a point that was made absolutely clear even on the last occasion to which reference has been made by my honourable friend. Now what is it that we are actually doing at the present moment? We are only carrying on certain preliminary investigations and these preliminary investigations, I may assure the House, are not merely with the object of arriving at certain conclusions which are relevant wholly and solely to the re-classification of the soil or the revision of the assessment rates but most of the information which is gathered by the settlement parties is of immense value for the purpose of bringing up the revenue administration of the country to the modern standard. I am surprised to find that the attitude now adopted is that we

21st March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

should disband all the settlement parties and stop all settlement work. But I should certainly think, Sir, that this has never been the intention of this House. If we are to continue the settlement work, if we are to continue to do the spade work, i.e., preliminary investigations for which we had the permission of the House, all I would contend is that it is impossible to effect any reduction. Well, a good deal has been said by the other side and indeed I find to-day we are being taken back to the earlier decades of 1912–13 and 1917–18 and we are asked to institute comparisons between the expenditure of those years and the present expenditure. I only wish to say that a similar analysis would have to be applied to all departments and to all other activities of life and perhaps to other provinces as well, and it will then be seen, I believe, that the expenditure in the different provinces or in the different activities of life, including, of course, our own private household affairs, has in no direction remained stagnant and stationary, and it will inevitably be that the expenditure of 1912–13 and 1917–18 will be less than the expenditure of to-day. I think, Sir, that expenditure has increased not by reason of the extravagance of the Government, not by reason of a desire on the part of the Government to take more establishment than is absolutely necessary, but on account of causes absolutely other than those which the Government could control. Sir, I have the assurance of the Board of Revenue that this particular increase under this head is not due to any increase of establishment but it is merely due to the revision of salaries of the establishments and therefore the whole ground on which the objection is based, the whole ground of supposed extravagance, the whole ground that we have flouted, as it were, the previous recommendation of this House and the whole ground that we are determined to carry on the re-settlement operations at a considerably higher expenditure than we have been doing in the past, must vanish. I assure the House all the same that we are taking the greatest interest and that we are proceeding, at the greatest expeditious speed as we possibly can, in the direction of pushing on the Revenue Bill and bringing it into force. I have now got the draft Bill in my hands which has been given to me by the Board of Revenue. My friend the Hon'ble Law Member and myself are busy in putting our heads together. We are feeling, I need not conceal the fact from the House, that it is better, before a final decision is come to as regards the principles to be embodied in that Bill, to consult public opinion. We intend to appoint a committee or a court of inquiry to elicit public opinion as regards the lines to be adopted in the matter of our future revenue policy. We are doing all that and let not the administrative machinery be absolutely paralysed pending something not yet in definite sight. The existing machinery must go on. It has its utility; it has its usefulness. It is not directed merely for the sake of swelling the revenue but it is directed also in various other channels conducive to general administrative efficiency in various departments. This increase is not deliberate nor is it extravagant. It is due to causes entirely beyond our control. It is due to the same causes as the expenditure in other departments is due to, namely, the revision of salaries of the establishments. I would therefore ask the House to vote this motion down."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"Mr. President, I agree to some extent in the position taken up by the Honourable Member for Revenue. The resolution passed at the last meeting was no doubt in different terms. But at the same time I will take the liberty of reminding the Honourable Member of the speeches made by certain members on behalf of the Government. They then complained that without knowing exactly what the new Act was going to be, what principles that Act would embody, it would be difficult for them to go on with the investigation on the present lines. Their line of argument was that the new Act may require

certain information which they were at the present moment not collecting or it may be that certain information which they were collecting may, in the end, prove quite unnecessary. With reference to the suggestion of some Honourable Members that the preliminary operations need not be delayed, pending the new Act, it was asked how that could be done, if nobody knew what the new principles of settlement were going to be. It was further argued that the work during the next few years may be completely thrown away. It seems to me that the Government are now shifting their ground. The Act would not come into force in less than a year. In the light of what the Hon'ble Member for Finance said on the last occasion, is it wise to increase the establishment unnecessarily and is it not our imperative duty to curtail it to the lowest possible limits? Such curtailment can easily be effected especially when there are a number of people of other departments who, I think, would be very willing to go back to their respective places in their permanent cadre and be spared the worry and the arduous work in the Settlement department. I do not think the Honourable Member for Revenue has advanced any argument to meet those advanced by the mover of the resolution. I think it is but right that no further expenditure should be incurred under this head and if possible reduction should be effected on the lines suggested."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I only wish to point out, Sir, that I deliberately suggested a retention of Rs. 1·70 lakhs because even according to the resolution passed at the last meeting, some preliminary work would have to be going on. If it were a case in which the abolition of all settlement parties could be urged, I would have asked for the omission of the whole temporary establishment. But that is not my motion. If I prominently brought to the notice of the Council the facts relating to our resolution on resettlement, it is because I found it necessary to convince the House that such a large amount of expenditure was not necessary for mere spade work or preliminary work or for merely carrying on preliminary operations. It cannot be contended that for such work an expenditure of Rs. 1·70 lakhs is not enough. If it should necessitate the reduction of establishment, by all means let us face that position. I have not asked for a reduction of the permanent establishment. What does the temporary establishment denote if not that whenever necessary or reasonable or desirable, the establishment should be disbanded? It is only against the temporary establishment that I have ventured to make this suggestion, and as the Hon'ble the Revenue Member also stated that no one would advocate an increase in the permanent establishment so long as it is possible to do the work with the temporary establishment. That is certainly a reasonable view to take and the reasonableness of it lies in our being free to reduce the temporary establishment whenever we do not require that establishment and whenever it is not necessary. I therefore feel that there ought to be no difficulty in effecting retrenchment in this matter."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"I think I might assure the House that this amount which has been entered in the Budget (Rs. 3,42,736) is exactly the expenditure which would be incurred on the staff as existed in December 1920. We have proposed no increase whatsoever. Then as to the possibility of anything like an indiscriminate reduction in these temporary establishments, it would be very difficult to accomplish. For we have got at the present moment a certain number of settlement parties working in certain parts of the provinces. Each settlement party is at present busy at a certain stage of preliminary work. It will be very difficult to decide which settlement party should be abolished and which should be retained. I am however able to assure the House that every one of these settlement parties is doing very useful

21st March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

work and they would be necessary even though the settlement operations may not come into force for two or three years more. Then there is the other suggestion of my honourable friend that he did not touch the permanent establishment but that he aimed only at reduction of the temporary establishment thus leaving the permanent establishment seriously alone. I would remind the Honourable Member that the number and the salary of the temporary establishment are always determined by the number of parties at work and in each party there are what are called permanent establishments. These permanent establishments have got to turn out a certain quantity of work and the temporary establishment is added on with a view to turn out the work that is expected of the former during the period. If, therefore, a reduction is made in the temporary establishment alone, the permanent men will not have sufficient work to turn out without the full complement of the temporary staff. It will be very difficult therefore to work a scheme like that into operation and I must therefore think that it will be rather impossible to accomplish, because I find that the proposed reductions amount to nearly 50 per cent. We should remember that out of the 50 per cent that would be left, the number of establishments to be entertained will not be necessarily 50 per cent; for, this reduced 50 per cent allotment would not really mean the salary of the 50 per cent men of the old, but of a far less number at the present rate of the enhanced salaries. It would practically come to no more than 30 per cent of the whole staff for whom provision has been made here. I think it will be landing the Government in a very serious difficulty in having to work with a third only of the temporary staff, while we have in operation six settlement parties whose work has been programmed for and approved by the Government up to 31st March 1922. I must also remind the Honourable Member that we have also entered a probable saving of Rs. 30,000 under that head. All the saving that it is possible to effect, we shall be glad to do. There is again the possibility of the proposed Finance Committee coming to my help."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"May I say a word."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"The Honourable Member can rise only to a point of order or for giving a personal explanation but not by way of making a third speech. Is it a point of order or a personal explanation?"

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"In his explanation the Honourable Member stated that 50 per cent was proposed to be taken from the establishment staff. The whole of the expenditure under resettlement is 7·12 lakhs and it would come only to less than 25 per cent though above 20 per cent. It is not 50 per cent as the Honourable Member stated."

The motion was then put to the Council and declared lost.

MOTION No. 31.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Sir, I move this resolution—

That the duty allowance of Rs. 15,000 *in Detailed Account No.* 5-*B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement—Settlement, be omitted.*

"Rupees 15,000 which is given as duty allowance is granted to three officers at the rate of Rs. 150 each, to two officers at the rate of Rs. 100 each, to ten other officers also at Rs. 100 each, and to two others again at Rs. 100. I have no objection, Sir, as I said in my preliminary observations on the Budget, to grant duty allowance to comparatively poor persons and non-gazetted officers who really

deserve them. I do not object to duty allowances of 50 rupees and below. I can also understand, Sir, why duty allowances should be granted to officers in exceptional circumstances. For instance, if a medical officer is put in charge of a leper asylum which involves special dangers, or if an engineer is put in charge of a factory which manufactures dangerous explosives, nobody, I suppose, would object to some duty allowance being given to them in consideration of the serious risks to health and life. But I cannot understand why duty allowance should be granted to officers who are employed in settlement work. I do not think that settlement work involves any special danger to life or health. I do not think that those who are employed in the settlement work and are given a duty allowance of Rs. 100 are officers who, when they took up service, entered into a covenant with Government that they should not be called upon to perform duties like settlement work. Indeed, I can conceive of no reason whatever why duty allowances at this high rate should be granted to officers who are employed in the Settlement Department. For these reasons I make the motion."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I think, Sir, I have great respect for the opinion of the Honourable Member, Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, for he does not generally speak and whenever he speaks he does so with great personal experience on these matters. I think it is only a little while ago I heard him remark that the Settlement officers would be very glad indeed to revert to their respective appointments owing to the extra worry and arduous duties involved in the life of a Settlement officer. Here, I take it, Sir, is the best certificate I am able to produce from this House in favour of the arduousness and the dangerous nature of the duties they have to perform every day. I think my friend is in touch with the administration of the Madras Province for the last few years and I think he is also aware of the fact that during the last few years we have lost a number of very valuable lives who were working in the Settlement department on account of the nature of the work and we have paid our own little tribute to them. While that is so, I am entirely surprised to hear that the duties of the Settlement department are assumed to be of such an ordinary nature or of such a routine character as not to merit anything like a recognition when officers are pulled away from their respective duties and stuck up to settlement work. I think anyone that is in touch with the settlement duties will bear me out when I say that it is one of the most unpalatable duties which any officer has to do. The greatest pluck, the greatest courage and the greatest industry are required of a settlement officer, for I think the nature of the investigations he has to conduct within a given time takes him from place to place, from village to village, and even through infected areas where there may be plague, cholera or all epidemics put together. Now while that is so, it is absolutely necessary that he should be given some kind of inducement to accept the appointment of a special settlement officer. Not only has he got to face arduous duties and probably very unpleasant experiences when he is employed in settlement work, but his work is one of those which is subjected to the searchlight of criticism from all quarters. No resettlement scheme that has been produced until now—it may be by the best officer—has been accepted as being based on equity or justice. On the other hand, every conclusion that he arrives at, every deduction that he draws, every premise upon which he bases his opinion, every recommendation he makes, is demolished. He has therefore to be prepared for the most adverse criticism. We want therefore the man to possess the courage and nerve with sufficient initiative about him to work the scheme. He will, of course, be thankful if he is taken back to his ordinary division work as has been rightly stated. If he is taken out of his usual work and put into

21st March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

special work some compensation must be given to him. His range is not that of a division. He has to go sometimes outside the district to conduct economic surveys. Recently a settlement officer had to visit the Nizam's Dominions for the purpose of economic survey to compare notes, because the district in which he was working bordered on the Nizam's Dominions. They have got all these diverse duties and I think the Government considered it absolutely necessary to grant them a duty allowance. I am thus surprised that the duty allowances particularly of the settlement officers are made the subject of criticism."

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu :—" After hearing the Hon'ble Member for Revenue, one would suppose that every settlement officer in this Presidency is carrying his life in the hollow of his hand and that these officers are endowed with pluck and courage, and that almost every one is a genius. Well, I cannot understand this special pleading on behalf of officers who are doing their duty like all other officers in districts and subject to the same conditions and more or less engaged in compiling statistics and going and studying the economic condition of the people. I do not understand why my honourable friend has taken this particular line of depicting the settlement officer as an object of aversion and hatred and subject to great hardships in the villages. I regret to hear all these remarks. But apart from this, our point is this, that there are in the budget estimate, at present, duty allowances to all kinds of officers and this is a typical instance of a duty allowance which, I presume, has been granted to officers this year more generously than in previous years.

"I have a small complaint to make, Sir, in connexion with this matter. There are also duty allowances given to Indian Civil Service officers and I gave notice of a resolution also to delete that item of Rs. 7,800. I have heard nothing about its disallowance and have had no information regarding the matter. My object is not to subject one set of officers to any disability and place another set of officers who are doing the same kind of work at an advantage. And therefore, with that intention, I gave notice of a resolution to delete the duty allowance to Indian Civil Service officers as also to provincial officers. One resolution which has been placed in the agenda is the one relating to provincial officers. Therefore I should like to know whether there is a difference between the duty allowance paid to one set of officers and that paid to another."

The Hon'ble the President :—" It is I that removed the one motion from the agenda and put the other on. The allowance and disallowance of resolutions is not done by Government; it is done by the President. The other was considered to be a non-votable item and therefore removed."

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu :—" Are we not to be informed of this, Sir ?"

The Hon'ble the President :—" I am glad to take this opportunity of saying that a statement is under preparation in the office in which all the resolutions which have been vetoed will be exhibited ; the authority under which the veto was imposed, whether by His Excellency the Governor or by the President, will be stated, and the section of the Government of India Act, or the Government of India Rules or the Standing Orders, under which the matter was disallowed, will be quoted in the last column. That, I hope, will be communicated to the Honourable Members very soon. That, as well as this agenda, will completely exhaust all the resolutions which have been notified. I may also say that the object in communicating the

reasons for disallowing motions is purely educative, that is to say, that the list is not intended to be a matter for controversy between the President and the Honourable Members because the President's decision is final; but I consider it necessary the Honourable Members should know on what grounds these disallowances in question were made so that the information may be of use to them later on."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"May I suggest to you, Sir, that in a case like this, as the Standing Orders have recently been amended it would be of great benefit to us to have had an opportunity of expressing our views before the motion is disallowed. I am suggesting this as your decision in these matters is final. The Standing Orders now provide that the President may give an opportunity to Honourable Members who have given notice of resolutions to show cause before disallowance—"

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"The Honourable Member is not quoting any Standing Order that I am aware of. I should like to mention to the Honourable Member as well as to other Honourable Members that after the list has been issued, they can certainly come and see me or the Secretary, and I shall be very glad to hear what they have to say. But when the total number of resolutions which came in on a particular day exceeded 400 and the whole thing had to be analysed, classified and tabled within a period of 24 hours, honourable members will follow me when I say that the task was something stupendous and that it would not have been possible to communicate to honourable members immediately, as I should otherwise have liked to have done, the reasons why certain resolutions were vetoed; but as I have said, a detailed statement is under preparation and I hope to put it into the hands of Honourable Members very shortly."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Therefore, we are now in this unfortunate position that duty allowances to special settlement and assistant settlement officers are non-votable and therefore will continue to be paid and duty allowances to provincial officers are now the subject matter of this resolution."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"I believe they have been entered as non-votable in italics."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Nobody told us that the figures in italics were non-votable items."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"His Excellency says that items in italics are non-votable."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I do not question the decision of His Excelelency or of yourself, Sir. The point is that we are at a disadvantage. I do not want to pursue this matter further.

"I submit to the House to consider whether these duty allowances should be paid or should not be paid. There are a number of duty allowances which are coming under discussion and we have to decide this question on some principle. If duty allowances are merely allowances which will reconcile officers to their unfortunate position and are intended to give them a little more courage to get on with their unpleasant duties and to offer them some amount of temptation to undertake duties which otherwise they would refuse to perform, I suppose there may be some justification for their continuance. But so far as I can see, I

have a list of duty allowances some of which are on the agenda and in their appropriate places I shall try and show that none of these grounds apply to allowing these duty allowances. I regret that there should be any difference between one set of officers and another, but I have no other alternative except to adhere to the principle to a view to see that these duty allowances are abolished for all classes of officers. The only other remark that I would like to make with reference to duty allowance is that in regard to the subordinate services the question came up before the first Salaries Committee. We went into it at some length and came to the conclusion that an examination of all classes of duty allowances should be undertaken and wherever possible the duty allowances should be merged in the salaries and that heads of departments should undertake an examination of these duty allowances. If the Honourable the Finance Member will give us an assurance that all these duty allowances which are now tabled here will come before the committee which he is proposing to set up, it will be some justification for my withdrawing from the position taken up in this motion."

Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar:—"I beg to associate myself, Sir, with the objection raised for the payment of duty allowances. If the definition given by the Hon'ble the Revenue Member is correct as to the dangers of the occupation of these officers, I suppose equally dangerous is the occupation of the assistant settlement officer and supervisor who draw salaries of Rs. 200 and 250 or Rs. 100 to 200. Likewise they are open to danger, and I suppose that some sort of insurance should be made for their lives. All I say is, that no provision has been made for lower grade officers but an allowance is provided for highly paid officials for doing their duty. On that ground I support this resolution."

Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu:—"I also support this motion. I believe there is a question of principle involved here and the earlier it is settled the better. If the question of revision of salaries has been coming up before the Government from time to time and if they have been very liberal in giving increase of salaries and also allowances to all officers working in various departments of Government, the question arises whether there exists any necessity for giving any duty allowance in addition. If there has been so much special pleading in the case of officers of the Settlement department working in unhealthy places, what more would be said of persons of the Forest department who are working in forests and jungles it is not possible for me to imagine. I think that it was in view of these conditions that their salaries and their allowances have been fixed and in addition to that, why there should be any allowance for doing one's own duties passes my comprehension. It is on this principle that the House should refuse its assent to these duty allowances. The Hon'ble the Revenue Member has stated that duty allowance is paid to these officers not because of any partiality to them. Now the turn of settlement officers has come and the claim of some other officers for duty allowance will next come up. But all the same I believe this Council will not give its assent to duty allowances especially in view of the fact that during last year and this year there have been very liberal increases of the salaries of high-paid officers and that we cannot afford to give this increase now."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter:—"Mr. President, as the question of principle has been raised, I think perhaps it will be well if I explain what is the meaning of this term 'duty allowance.' Honourable members have read the report of the Salaries Committee which Mr. Ramachandra Rao has referred to, and in regard to which I would observe that no objection was taken there to the principle of duty allowances. They will see from that report that prior to 1915 there was only one kind of allowance which was called a 'local allowance' and that

that was given either for increased work or for the difficulty of living in particular localities. The Government of India then made a distinction between these two classes of allowances, calling one of them 'remunerative' local allowances and the other 'compensatory' local allowances, the remunerative local allowances being those which were paid for special classes of work, and the compensatory local allowances, those which were paid for living in unpleasant places. Subsequently they got rid of those two cumbrous terms and they called the compensatory allowance simply a 'local' allowance, that is, an allowance for living in a particular locality, and the remunerative allowance a 'duty' allowance for doing a special class of duty.

"Now the question has been raised why these latter allowances are given at all. I may answer that in the first place by reading the formal definition of the term: 'Duty allowance is an allowance given to an officer, in addition to pay or salary, in consideration of the specially arduous nature of his duties or of increased work or responsibility or for the discharge of duties which do not properly belong to his office and for which there is no sanctioned appointment.'

"Now what really happens is this. We have a number of officers more or less in the same class. It is very much more convenient from the point of view of recruitment and transferability to recruit all of them into one big cadre. Let me take an example. We had a second Presidency Magistrate on Rs. 800 a month. We used to fill that office by posting a Deputy Collector. But, if you promote a man to Rs. 800 and he turns out to be unsatisfactory, you can only get rid of him by reducing him. If instead of giving him a fixed pay of Rs. 800, you give him a duty allowance, you can leave him there as long as he does his work properly, or you can fix a period for his tenure of the post, and when he goes back he loses the duty allowance. In the same way with the Under Secretaries. Some time ago we had one post of Under Secretary on Rs. 1,000 and we used to fill that post by appointing a Deputy Collector, and in order to be fair we had to take one of the very senior officers for that post. But we found that unsatisfactory for the reason that the most senior men were too much set in their ways to be suitable for such a position. Therefore, we found it better to provide that we might pick a man of any grade who was suitable and give him a duty allowance. I could give a number of similar instances. Well, as I said, the Salaries Committee found no fault with this principle. It is not that we are paying a man extra for no special reason, it is that we have grouped a number of appointments under one cadre, but we supplement the pay in accordance with the difference in the qualities of work required to be done in some of those appointments. In fact, the Reforms Commissioner in his recent proposals suggests going much further by providing a duty allowance for Revenue Inspectors. What will happen in that case is this. In the days when the minimum pay for a clerk was Rs. 20, the minimum pay for a Revenue Inspector was Rs. 35. Now the Reforms Commissioner has proposed that we should class both sets of men as clerks on incremental salaries, but that when they go out as Revenue Inspectors they get an allowance of Rs. 10 for the special work done which they will lose again when they revert to clerkships and there is no longer any necessity for their travelling. This particular case is very similar. One officer ranked as a Deputy Collector sits in a treasury in comfort from year's end to year's end, while a Settlement Officer of the same grade has to expose himself to all sorts of inconvenience and hardships in unhealthy localities. If honourable members will read the administration reports of the Settlement Department, they will see that at least two Settlement Officers have died in

21st March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter]

harness from exposure. That is the difference between the Settlement Officer and the Deputy Collector who spends his life sitting in an office."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"When I was listening to my honourable friend, the Revenue Member, I thought that these Settlement Officers were exposed to dangers to which those who were actually engaged in the front during the late war were exposed. I am afraid in depicting the 'dangers' to which these Settlement Officers are exposed; the colours were put on very thick with the result that his arguments are thoroughly unconvincing. Then the Hon'ble the Revenue Member stated that the Settlement department is one in which people are exposed to special kinds of risk. In fact the Hon'ble the Finance Member stated that two of the officers died by exposure in the course of their work. How many other officers, how many non-officials die on account of exposure and other causes in the course of their work? In fact we do not know how many medical officers die of septic poison. We do not generally hear of duty allowances being given to them. Some years ago when a medical officer was attending on a case of bubonic plague, he himself caught the contagion and died. He was a young promising man of high academic qualifications in Bangalore. We are all exposed to such dangers. There is no reason why duty allowances should be given to some officers. The work of the ordinary Deputy Collectors and Munsifs is certainly very heavy and is of a very arduous nature. Nobody thinks of granting duty allowances to such officers. I feel unrepentant ever after hearing my honourable friend on the other side."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"Sir, I only wish to bring the Council down to realities if I can. It was my fortune for a year or two to serve in Tinnevelly when that district was under resettlement. I had under me a number of Divisional Officers and two distinguished Settlement Officers, Mr. Chadwick and Mr. Gwynn. I saw personally the nature of the duties they had to do and I say, as emphatically as I can, that there was no comparison between the duties of the ordinary Divisional Officer and the Settlement Officer. During a great portion of the period to which I refer, Mr. Chadwick and Mr. Gwynn were constantly in camp in remote villages. They began their work at 7 in the morning and continued it till 7 or 8 in the evening. The ordinary routine of their day's work had to do with the receipt of the petitions from the inhabitants of those villages at their tent doors. They were in camp in April, May and June, and I ask members to realize what conditions these officers must have had to face in tents at that season of the year and in remote villages. I know they frequently received as many as one hundred petitions in a single day and dealt with those petitions throughout that day carrying out essential resurvey work on the spot. There are in this House at present one or two gentlemen who were in Tinnevelly at that time—I mean Dr. C. B. Rama Rao and Mr. Shanmukham Pillai. If there were opportunity to cite evidence on the point, I should like to call those gentlemen into the box and ask them if they would not confirm my description of the arduous nature of the work devolving upon Mr. Chadwick and Mr. Gwynn. It requires very great physical strength—or rather perhaps strength of constitution—to stand the heavy work falling upon a Settlement Officer. One of the chief duties means continuous field work involving very severe strain. It very nearly broke Mr. Gwynn; and Mr. Chadwick, who was as strong as a horse, only just got through it. If ever duty allowance is to be given, it should be to the man who has to push through a settlement."

The motion was then put to the Council and lost.

A poll was taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

1. Mr. Adinarayana Reddi.
2. ,, T. Balajirao Nayudu.
3. ,, K. Gopalakrishnayya.
4. ,, K. P. Gopala Menon.
5. ,, B. Muniswami Nayudu.
6. ,, C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.
7. ,, Narayanaswami Reddi.
8. ,, T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar.
9. ,, Shanmukham Chettiyar.
10. ,, T. Sivasankaram Pillai.
11. ,, N. A. V. Somasundaram Pillai.
12. ,, Tangavelu Nayagar.
13. ,, Vellingiri Kavandar.
14. ,, Venkataranga Reddi.
15. ,, M. Ramachandra Rao.
16. ,, S. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
17. Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar.
18. ,, L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar.
19. ,, A. S. Krishna Rao.
20. Sriman Biswanath Das.
21. Mr. T. M. Narasimha Acharlu.
22. ,, U. Rama Rao
23. Sriman Sasi Bhushan Rath.
24. Mr. D. Seshagiri Rao.
25. ,, M. R. Seturathnam Ayyar.
26. ,, R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
27. ,, K. S Venkatarama Ayyar.
28. ,, C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.
29. ,, A. T. Palmer.
30. ,, Vandanam.
31. Ahmad Miran Sahib.

Noes.

1. The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson.
2. ,, Mr. Todhunter.
3. ,, Md. Habib-ul-lah Sahib.
4. ,, Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
5. ,, Mr. Subbarayulu Reddiyar.
6. ,, Mr. Ramaravaningar.
7. ,, Mr. Venkata Reddi Nayudu.
8. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell.
9. ,, F. J. Richards.
10. ,, R. G. Grieve.
11. ,, A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
12. Dr. P Subbarayan.
13. Mr. E. Periyanayakam.
14. ,, Appaswami Nayudu.
15. ,, V. Appaswami Vandayar.
16. ,, C. Arunachala Mudaliyar.
17. ,, P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu.
18. ,, C. Natesa Mudaliyar.
19. ,, A. P. Patro.
20. ,, Ponnuswami Nayudu.
21. ,, P. T. Rajan.
22. ,, Ramayya Punja.
23. ,, A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
24. Mr. Saraba Reddiyar.
25. ,, Soundara Pandiya Nadar.
26. ,, S. T. Shanmukham Pillai.
27. ,, S. Somasundaram Pillai.
28. ,, Thangavelu Pillai.
29. ,, W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.
30. ,, P. Kesava Pillai.
31. ,, Muttumanickkachari.
32. Dr. C. B. Rama Rao.
33. Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar.
34. ,, Mascarenhas.
35. Raja of Ramnad.
36. Abdul Razac Sahib.
37. Md. Abdur Rahman Sahib.
38. Mr. Bavotti Sahib.
39. Md. Koya Sahib.
40. Hamid Sultan Marakkayar Sahib.
41. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar.
42. Md. Usman Sahib.
43. Mr. J. F. Simpson.
44. ,, T. Namberumal Chettiyar.
45 ,, Venkatarangayya.
46. Rev. Macphail.

Thirty-one voting *for* and 46 *against*, the motion was declared lost.

Consequent on the result of voting on the previous motion, the following identical motions Nos. 32—35 were not moved and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Motion Nos. 32 to 35.

Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar :—

32. *Delete Rs.* 15,000, *duty allowance* (*Budget page* 38).

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu :—

33. *That the following item relating to duty allowance be omitted* (*Budget, page* 38) :—

5-*B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement—Settlement—Duty allowance to Special and Assistant Settlement Officers, Rs.* 15,000.

Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar :—

34. *That under Land Revenue* 5-*B. Survey and Settlement, the duty allowance of Rs.* 15,000 *be omitted* (*Budget, page* 38).

21st March 1921] [Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu]

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

'35. *That in the demand under* 5-*B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement, the grant of Rs.* 15,000 *proposed for duty allowance be omitted* (*Budget page* 38).'

MOTION No. 36.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

'36. *That the provision of Rs.* 20,500, *made under " other contingencies " in detailed account No.* 5-*B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement—Settlement, be reduced by Rs.* 10,000 (*Budget page* 39).'

" Sir, if we turn to page 39 of the budget we find under the detailed account this provision made against 'other contingencies.' It will be seen that under this head, that is, Settlement Parties, there is only one Special Assistant Settlement Officer who is newly to be entertained temporarily for one year. The other establishment is the same and as regards the temporary establishment we have been assured by the Hon'ble the Revenue Member that there will be no increase in the staff. Consequently it passes my comprehension as to how such a large provision as Rs. 20,500 for 'other contingencies' has been made for the coming year, whereas in the revised estimate of 1920-21 it was Rs. 3,500 and under the budget estimate of that year it was Rs. 4,800, and in the previous year the total amount came up only to Rs. 2,651. I can understand that on account of the rise in the prices of some of these things which are necessary for making up the contingencies some enhanced provision might be made; but I cannot understand why this increase of nearly six times has been provided for. However, making some allowance for the increase in the prices and other things, I have only modestly proposed to cut this figure by nearly Rs. 10,000. I submit that this must be acceptable to the Hon'ble the Revenue Member."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" Mr. President, I am afraid that that item which finds a place on page 29 has not been understood. I confess that probably it was not possible for the honourable member who sent the motion to have exactly understood what the object of that item was. I may explain to the House that the real intention of that allotment is to make payments to village karnams who are employed for work in settlement offices. The karnams are utilized in settlement offices for the preparation of a number of registers. They prepare what are called the Settlement *Adangal*, the rough *chittas*, *chitta* abstract as well as rough pattas, fair *adangals* and fair *chittas*. And they are doing this extra work outside the range of their ordinary duties. We do not pay them in the shape of duty allowances but we are giving them something like a daily remuneration for the extra work that they do. That daily remuneration, until quite recently, was a pittance of two annas a day. The Board of Revenue naturally raised a very strong protest against this insignificant sum being paid to the karnam as a daily allowance for this extra work which involved his remaining in the settlement office sometimes for days and sometimes for weeks together for assisting in the preparation of these registers; and to have expected him to live on these two annas was expecting him to be no less than a *sannyasin*. Therefore the Board of Revenue rightly recommended that the allowance be doubled up, but even that, of course, is not quite adequate. The Government have sanctioned that proposal and called for a special report at the end of the year 1922 whether the system should be continued after that. However, I would appeal to the honourable members to say whether four annas paid to a karnam for this work is large at all. That is one intention of the allotment of this rupees

20,000. Besides that a lump sum of Rs. 10 is also paid to karnams who are continuously employed on settlement duties. The payment of the two annas now raised to four annas is only on those days when they are employed in the settlement offices for the preparation of these registers. But besides that there is also, as I said, a lump allotment of Rs. 10. When the accounts of their villages are satisfactorily completed and as a reward for good work, they are paid this ten rupees. These are the two principal items which necessitate this lump allotment of rupees 20,500. Inasmuch as it did not on its face carry the explanation which I have now given, my honourable friend, I think, had to raise that point and I am perfectly certain that he is satisfied with the explanation that I have now given."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHA ACHARLU :—" I beg leave to withdraw my motion."

The motion was then by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 37.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" In view of the statement made by the Hon'ble the Revenue Member, I do not wish to make my motion—

That the sum of Rs. 20,500 *allotted for 'other contingencies' under* 5-*B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement, be reduced by Rs.* 17,000 (*Budget page* 39)."

The motion was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.

MOTION No. 38.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I beg to move :—

'*That the demand of Rs.* 24,32,000 *under* 5-*B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement—Survey, be reduced by Rs.* 100 (*Budget page* 28).'

" This is the usual form of the motion but on the present occasion I would only ask for some information and that is whether in consequence of the resolution passed at the last meeting in regard to the keeping in abeyance of settlement operations any reduction of establishment is possible and secondly whether any effect would be given to that resolution and if so, whether there would be any reduction in the establishments. I am rather surprised at the construction which the honourable member has placed upon the resolution in the course of his speech. But I would have liked to have a clear statement as to what the Government intend to do in regard to that resolution. I do not wish to raise any other point."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" In answer to the definite question that has been put to me by the honourable proposer of this motion, I think at this stage I could assure him that immediately after the last resolution of this House was passed, which, I believe everybody is aware, is merely of the nature of a recommendation, Government have put themselves into correspondence with the Board of Revenue as regards the various aspects of the questions involved in that resolution. We have called for some statistical information based on the number of the settlement parties now at work, their range of operations, the particular re-settlement that they are engaged upon, the years in which these resettlements are expected to mature, the preliminary work that has already been accomplished and yet to be accomplished and so on. Now, these questions have been asked with a view to arrive at a definite conclusion on the resolution. I have some tentative statistical information from the Board of Revenue but I have yet to examine these details and to obtain some more information from the Board of Revenue. It will then be time for the Government to consider what attitude it will adopt in regard to that resolution. In the

21st March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

meantime everything is being done, every human effort is being made, for the purpose of expediting the Revenue Bill. I have already explained how matters stand in regard to that proposed measure. I can only tell the House that we have not simply recorded the resolution that was passed by this House but that we have since carried on a volume of correspondence but have not yet come to any definite conclusion. We cannot reach a hasty conclusion on an important matter like that. I suppose the House will give us credit for doing things always with great discretion and he will bring the same discretion to bear in the disposal of this matter. After all the facts have been placed in my hands, it will be my duty to advise the Government who will then come to the conclusion as to what it will do. For the present, I am not in a position to say what the attitude of the Government will be in regard to this matter."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I do not press my motion, Sir. I only wish to know whether any conclusion will be reached before the end of the next financial year."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" So far as this is concerned, I can assure my honourable friend on the other side that expeditious disposal in my dictionary does not mean twelve months but much less than that."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I do not press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 39.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" In view of what has been said by the Hon'ble Member for Revenue, I do not wish to move the motion standing in my name :—

That the provision of Rs. 24,32,000 *under* 5-*B. Land Revenue—Survey and Settlement, be reduced by Rs.* 3,00,000 (*Budget page* 28)."

The motion was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.

MOTION No. 40.

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" Mr. President, the motion that I beg to move runs thus :—

' *That the provision of Rs.* 2,57,200 *in* 5-*C. Land Revenue—Survey—Land Revenue, for the maintenance of Land Records—District charges, be omitted* (*Budget page* 39).'

" Now under this head of Land Revenue we have got three main items of expenditure ; first is direction, the second, establishment for preparing Revenue and Agricultural statistics, under this head we have got the expenditure on account of the karnams and the revenue inspectors. The third head is the maintenance of land records. The third item contains that department which is generally known as the Land Records Department. My proposal is that this should be omitted entirely. My reasons are these. With regard to the first portion, I find that the number of Revenue Inspectors has been proposed to be increased during the next year by 200. And it may be noted that the karnams who were hitherto receiving a sum of 16 lakhs as salaries are proposed to receive more than 26 lakhs as salaries in the next year. So under the first head there is an increase of

14 lakhs in all. When there is such an enormous increase, I think it is just and reasonable that we should expect a decrease in the other department that is generally known as the Land Records Department. The work of the Land Records Department and that of the karnams and the revenue inspectors generally overlaps each other and with this expenditure under one head we may abolish the other department entirely and the work can be managed by the existing karnams and the revenue inspectors. Most of the work that has to be done by these is to reserve the survey stones and to see that that stone of each division is correctly stated in the revenue registers. The maintenance of the revenue registers is mainly a duty thrown upon the ordinary revenue establishment and when their salaries are increased the karnams may be expected to do this extra work of keeping and maintaining the survey stones and seeing that proper registry of the owners is maintained in the revenue accounts. For these reasons I propose to make this motion."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I am unable to agree with the honourable mover that the whole of the allotment appearing under this head should disappear. Probably he thereby means that we can in future carry on the administration without anything like a Land Records establishment. I think he is aware that the Land Records establishment forms more or less the basis for the purpose of determining what we call the record of rights of every villager in a village. The Land Records Department does not exist for the purpose of doing Government work alone. On the other hand it exists for the purpose of doing the ryots' work as well. After survey has been completed in a place, after the boundaries of particular holdings have been determined and after stones have been planted to indicate those boundaries, it is the duty of the Land Records Department to see to it, that the land-marks which have been fixed by an elaborate process by the Survey Department are not obliterated. These factors constitute the protection more of the rights of private individuals, as between ryots and ryots than the protection of the rights of Government. I may tell the House that we may somehow go on without this department with the recovery of land-cess. But it is not merely for facilitating recovery of the land-cess that the Land Records Department is intended for; it is more for the preservation of the record of rights relating to the village; and that I take it, Sir, is so much in the interests of the ryot, or rather I should say, it is more in the interests of the ryot than it is in the interests of any other individual.

"My attention has been drawn to the fact that, in lieu of the revenue inspectors who find a place on the same page, the regular cadre of land revenue inspectors might be made to do this work. I would invite attention to the fact that it is one of the intentions of Government, after we had secured the full complement of revenue inspectors on the revenue side, as far as possible, to curtail the jurisdiction and the firka of the latter and to entrust to them the discharge of all the manifold duties which appertain to that firka. We have instructed the Board of Revenue to start that scheme in two selected districts and to try that experiment by abolishing the Land Records revenue inspectors therein and see whether the work turned out by the regular revenue inspector would be as good as the work that had until now been turned out by the Land Records revenue inspector. That experiment is being conducted now in two districts. It is now premature for us to say what the result of that experiment will be. If it is found successful, Government will certainly like to introduce it, in the interests of economy, in the other districts as well. At the present moment, until the results of that experiment are known, it is not at all possible to abolish the whole department. I can assure you that the ryots will hear

21st March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

this decision with almost tears. It is mostly in the interests of the ryot that this department is intended. I should be very sorry if we do anything militating against the interests of the ryots in general."

Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu :—"I simply want to submit to the House that though these items are shown under maintenance of land records on page 39, the establishment begins with 'Direction.' Then come the village karnams, inspectors and so on. These are the people who practically do the work, keep the record of rights, examine the survey marks, maintain the registers and practically do the whole work ; the other portion of the establishment does only the supervision work. The other portion of work as done by this establishment is shown to cost Rs. 37,68,968 (on page 40). But what my friend Mr. Narasimha Raju wanted was to do away with the other portion—maintenance of land records —which costs Rs. 2,57,200. As we are increasing the number of inspectors in the regular Revenue Department from 757 to 944, where is the necessity for our keeping on the other staff of inspectors called the Land Records Inspectors, surveyors and so on ? So I would only submit that the Hon'ble the Revenue Member's explanation does not seem to be quite to the point, and I am in favour of supporting Mr. Narasimha Raju."

Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar :—"I also support this motion. The Hon'ble the Revenue Member was very anxious to protect the interests of the ryots and objected to the deletion of this extra establishment. I fear he has forgotten one of the biggest ryots of my part of the country, Mr. Vellingiri Goundar, who made a speech last week and raised this very question. This Land Records Department gives any amount of trouble to the ryot himself. He wanted in the interests of the ryot that the supervision portion of the Land Records section should go. So, I beg to submit that portion of the argument of the Hon'ble the Revenue Member cannot hold good.

"Then, Sir, what we find in the department is this. It is the karnam who is doing the permanent work of the village. He is the man who is keeping the records. It is not proposed by the mover that the system of keeping land records should be abolished altogether. That is what the Hon'ble the Revenue Member wanted to oppose. That is not the idea at all. The karnam can go on keeping to his work and the Revenue Inspectors, with the addition to their number now provided, will go on supervising the work of the karnams. The question is about the higher supervision. We have got the Land Records Tahsildar. He does the same work as the ordinary Tahsildar. It is practically two people going about the same business. The Land Records Tahsildar is in charge of the whole district. His supervision is very inefficient. The Tahsildar is supervising in his own taluk. If he is to supervise the work of the Revenue Inspector and the karnam, the work will be done more efficiently. The present system of having separate Land Records Tahsildars is not maintainable either on the ground of economy or of efficiency. I do not think it will be said that the Taluk Tahsildar will not be able to discharge this additional task. He is going to each village and is looking after other work. So if this extra portion is added he will not grumble. With regard to the Deputy Collectors who are above Tahsildars, they will have a small portion of the supervision work to do also. They will easily find the time necessary for supervising the work of these Tahsildars. So there is no necessity for extra Inspectors, Tahsildars and Assistant Directors. The Assistant Director is a gentleman who is in charge of several districts. The attention he can pay to individual cases is very little. So by abolishing these people and centering the

work in the permanent staff, I think efficiency will be increased and the extra cost saved. For these reasons I have great pleasure in seconding the motion."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" The Hon'ble the Member for Revenue paid me a complement for speaking with a certain sense of responsibility. I do not know whether he will hold the same opinion of me at the end of my speech. I am afraid that, so far as the Land Records Department is concerned, Government do not seem to have any settled policy at all, or, if they have one, they do not know how to carry it through. What is the object with which this department was started and how far has it fulfilled the purpose for which it was established? The Hon'ble the Revenue Member said that if there is a Land Records Department it would protect the interests of the ryots. It is urged that if there is once an accurate survey, the Land Records Department afterwards obviates the necessity for further survey except perhaps in regard to certain areas. Now I ask if that hope has been fulfilled in any of the districts in which this Land Records Department has been so long in existence. Is the demarcation up to date? Have all the changes in the holdings been carefully registered? I am afraid, not. Karnams are supposed to attend to the foundation work and any one possessing slight experience of the department, has no doubt that the work of the karnams leaves much to be desired and that the supervision over that is equally unsatisfactory. It cannot be anything else in the nature of things. So I think it best that the Government face the facts squarely and try to curtail the expenditure instead of spending more money year after year. Far from the expenditure on survey going down, it has gone on increasing along with that on land records. In 1919–20, the expenditure on survey and settlement was Rs. 15 lakhs and odd; in 1921, it is Rs. 24 lakhs and odd. Under land records the expenditure in 1919–20 was Rs. 24 lakhs and odd and in 1920–21 it is Rs. 43 lakhs. I think it is time that we make the necessary retrenchment in some directions at least."

Mr. VELLINGIRI GOUNDAR :—" Sir, the Hon'ble the Revenue Member has stated as regards the work of the Land Records Department that it is in the interest of the ryots. I have some little experience of the old surveys and of the new surveys. A mere comparison of plans of land under the new survey with those under the old survey will show that the recent plan is quite unsuitable for an ordinary ryot. Details are now completely omitted and if any particular information is wanted we have to refer to some professional man, to the revenue inspector or the karnam or somebody else. There are also many small holdings that are not marked at all. Our district is said to be notorious for these boundary disputes and murders have been committed in connexion with boundary disputes. This Land Records Department has not even once helped us in any way and after all it has resulted in an increase in the officers of the Revenue Department and karnams, and with all these establishments the people are unable to get real help in disputes which in many cases ruin the ryot and his holdings are lost. So comparing the original survey and settlement with the present one, we have to say that the ordinary ryot is unable to find the real state of things and he does not know to whom he has to apply and how he has to get rid of these troubles and difficulties. Therefore I submit that the interest of the ryot will be better served by total abolition than by the continuance of this department. So, I heartily support the resolution of the mover for total abolition and urge that no grants be made under the head ' Land Records '."

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—" Sir, I do not say that the Land Records department has not done any useful work though it has not done

more useful work. But the question is whether any separate department should be maintained for the maintnance of land records. We have got many ordinary revenue inspectors who go about in villages in *azmaish* duty and we have also got a number of Tahsildars who go about for inspection and who can see whether the stones are maintained in proper order or not and if there are any mistakes in their maintenance. We do not know what the Land Records inspector does. He says that one stone is covered with prickly-pear and charges eight annas. He says that another stone is raised a foot higher and that it has been discovered by him and he charges six annas. That is why I see in the budget Rs. 1·86 lakhs and odd have been provided as fees to be recovered by the Land Records department. But there are also entered charges for the time and labour of the Land Records staff. I believe that this sum is made up of these small recoveries which are being made without the knowledge of the landholders. I do not think it could be said that the ordinary revenue inspectors could not cope with the duties in connexion with land records. This can certainly be done by the ordinary revenue inspectors whose number has been increased and who have been provided with increased pay. Why should not so many inspectors and Tahsildars go and inspect this maintenance work ? I do not see why there should be a duplication and why each Land Records Tahsildar should go and inspect the area of nine ordinary Tahsildars and why the Assistant Director of Land Records should spend a lot of money by way of travelling allowance when he has to go round five or six districts, whereas there is already a Revenue Divisional officer who is expected to go about on tour and there are many revenue inspectors to look after these things. I think, therefore, that the large sum of two lakhs and odd is not an expenditure which can be justified and it can be very well utilised for augmenting the resources of other departments."

Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu :—" I would submit that, whatever difficulty there may be in dealing with the whole provision for the maintenance of land records, the honourable member has himself furnished grounds for my motion being accepted. I will ask for a sum of Rs. 50,000 to be omitted from the provision made for the maintenance of land records. He has just now said that it is under contemplation to reduce the establishment of Land Records as soon as Government have a permanent staff of revenue inspectors. It will be found that in the Budget for 1921–1922, provision has been made for 944 revenue inspectors against 757 of the previous year, with an increased cost of one lakh and odd, and provision has already been made for duty allowance in respect of these 944 inspectors at Rs. 10. Therefore, it is clear that in the year to come, a substantial addition will be made to the expenditure incurred for additional revenue inspectors as also for their duty allowance. I will just follow up the Hon'ble the Revenue Member's argument that with the increase in the revenue inspectorate, they will see their way to curtail the land records inspectors and reduce the expenditure on that account. Therefore, it follows as a corollary that in the face of the increased provision of one lakh and odd rupees for additional revenue inspectors, it must at least be possible to omit Rs. 50,000 from the provision for the maintenance of land records."

Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi :—" We have had a sufficiently long discussion of this motion and I propose that the question be now put."

The motion for closure was put to the Council and agreed to.

The original motion was then put to the vote and declared carried, 49 voting *for* it and 15 *against*.

Motion No. 41.

The following motion which stood in the name of Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

That in the demand under 5-C. Land Revenue—Land Records, the grant proposed for the maintenance of Land Records—District charges be reduced by Rupees 50,000 (*Budget page* 39).

Motion No. 42.

Diwan Bahadur M Ramachandra Rao Pantulu :—" Sir, I beg to move—

' *That the following item under 5-C. Land Revenue—Land Records, be omitted* :— *Rs.* 30,000—*Lump sum provision for the formation of a quasi-permanent party of surveyors* (*Budget page* 39).'

" I do not understand what a quasi-permanent party of surveyors is. But whatever it might be, whatever they are to be, I wish to bring to the notice of the Council that lump-sum provisions in the budget under the various heads amount to ·21 lakh. I have a list of them here and I wish to raise the question under this resolution as to whether it is advisable for this Council to pass lump provisions without further examination. I would suggest if the Hon'ble the Finance Member's motion for the constitution of a Finance Committee is passed that that committee should examine the new schemes and all proposals for new expenditure. If the honourable member agrees to this course, I would suggest that this, along with other lump provisions in the budget, be referred to that committee for further examination and if that suggestion is accepted, I do not propose to press this motion, but if otherwise the Hon'ble the Revenue Member is not prepared to have this question of lump-sum provision further examined and the necessity for the quasi-permanent party is not explained, I would certainly press this motion for the consideration of the House, and would ask the House not to commit itself to the expenditure, the details of which or the necessity for which has not been made out."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur :— " I may at once say that I quite agree to have the lump provision referred to the Finance Committee for investigation."

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu :—" I with draw the motion. The demand will stand part of the budget, subject to that understanding."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion No. 43.

The following motion standing in the name of Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao was not moved :—

That in the demand under 5-C. Land Revenue—Land Records, the lump provision of Rs. 30,000 *for the formation of a quasi-permanent detachment of surveyors be omitted.*

It was hence deemed to have been withdrawn.

Motion No. 44.

The following motion standing in the name of Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar was not moved :—

That under 5-C. Land Revenue the lump provision of Rs. 30,000 *for the formation of a quasi-permanent detachment of surveyors be omitted.*

It was hence deemed to have been withdrawn.

21st March 1921] [Mr. Muhammad Usman Sahib]

MOTION No. 45.

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" Mr. President, I beg to move that—

' That under 5-C. Land Revenue—Land Records, the provision of Rs. 5,76,204 for revenue inspectors be reduced by one lakh of rupees.'

" We find from the budget that in the year 1920–21 there were 757 revenue inspectors, and it is now proposed that that number should be increased to 944, thus showing an increase of 187 inspectors. The sum provided in the revised estimate for the current year is Rs. 3·94 lakhs and that for the coming year, according to the present budget, is Rs. 5·76 and odd lakhs, thus showing an increase of Rs. 1·80 lakhs. What I wish to point out, Sir, is this, that if Government wants, a slight increase may be made, and I think it would be too much to increase the number to 944, which seems to me to be a very large number. With regard to the increase in the establishment, I took it to be the general sense of the House at the time of the general discussion of the budget that there should be no such increase at all. I think as regards such a question it is much better that Government should proceed with a certain amount of caution and hesitation rather than at a break-neck speed. I therefore think it is better that the number 187, which represents the proposed increase, should be reduced by 100. Thus we will be able to save about one lakh of rupees which may be utilised for other useful purposes such as the revision of the pay and prospects of the non-gazetted officers. I therefore commend this motion for the acceptance of the Council."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" I may assure the honourable mover that the Government have not in this case gone at anything like a ' break-neck speed,' but on the other hand they are going the other way. There has probably been some misunderstanding in the mind of the honourable mover by reason of the number of revenue inspectors which appears under the year 1920–21 as 757 and that under the year 1921–22 as 944, and thus assuming that the Government are intending to increase the number of revenue inspectors from the 1st April 1921 from 757, to 944. On the other hand, I may assure the honourable member that that is not the case. On the other hand, 944 revenue inspectors are in working order now. But the figure 757 as shown there under the year 1920–21 merely represents the figure as per the sanctioned budget estimate of 1920–21. After the budget estimate was sanctioned, proposals were submitted to the Government of India and the Secretary of State for the reorganisation of the revenue inspectors' cadre. That is a matter which was under discussion for the last half a dozen years. Officer after officer condemned the work of the revenue inspector on the ground that he had not sufficient time at his disposal to go round his range, inspect everything that he ought to inspect and to attend directly to the various duties that devolve upon him. For some time past the Government had been considering the desirability of reducing the range of the revenue inspectors, which as you all know is called a firka, so as to permit the revenue inspector to pay more direct attention to the interests of the villages than he had been in a position to do. So it was early last year that proposals were sent up to the Government of India with the request that as the matter was urgent they might be pleased to expedite orders. The Government of India in the month of June last were good enough to communicate to the Madras Government their sanction for the increase of the number of revenue inspectors by 68 at once so as to permit one revenue inspector being increased in every taluk immediately. Subsequently, the whole scheme was sent up to the Secretary of State who

kindly sanctioned the scheme in its entirety. That scheme has practically come into force. We have now got nearly all the 944 revenue inspectors working throughout the province in restricted firkas as against the extensive firkas of old. There is therefore no increase whatsoever proposed for the next official year. Seven hundred and fifty-seven, I repeat, is merely a number which is shown there as having been sanctioned in the budget of last year and 944 is the number for which we have the sanction of the Government of India and the Secretary of State. No doubt, there has been some criticism as regards the increase in cost, but honourable members will remember that until now the revenue inspectors consisted of no more than two grades, some on Rs. 35 and others on Rs. 40. According to the reorganization scheme, it is proposed to put the revenue inspectors on the same cadre as clerks, so that opportunity may be given to these people either to serve in the clerical line or in the outdoor line according to their tendencies. Sometimes it so happens that you send out a man as revenue inspector, but he is found absolutely unfit for that kind of work. The only thing that is possible at present for the Tahsildar and Revenue Divisional Officer to do in such a case to get rid of him is to frame charges against him, to get him suspended and eventually to get him dismissed. But if the superior officer finds that he is unfit for revenue inspector's job, he can revert him to the clerical line and pick out another young man who has got sufficient intelligence, energy and capacity and appoint him as revenue inspector. It will thus be possible that clerks and revenue inspectors may exchange their places under the new scheme. Now the proposal is to put them not on Rs. 35 and Rs. 40, which was the old scale, but to put them on a general scale of Rs. 35 to 80, which is the scale adopted in the case of the clerical staff in the Collectors' offices and in the sub-divisional offices. All the revenue inspectors in future will be on the clerical cadre transferable from one to the other, according to their inclination, just as the head of the office may find them fit for this work or that work. There is, therefore, no possibility of any reduction whatsoever under this head, because it represents the minimum that is required from the 1st of April 1921."

Rao Bahadur T. Bajaji Rao Nayudu :—"In this newly sanctioned establishment, I do not think that all the appointments have been made and all the men have joined. Of course, the sanction order was communicated some time back and I take it that these appointments are to be made now in the districts. I was myself a Tahsildar for 13 years and a Divisional Officer for 15 years. I know very intimately what the work of a revenue inspector is. I know the days when there were only three inspectors for each taluk, and I also know the days when there were 6 inspectors for each taluk, the number having been doubled. In all my experience I do not think that there was any loss either to the Government or to the rate-payers owing to the inadequacy of the number of revenue inspectors. It may be that a few petitions were left unanswered or a few references were not promptly replied ; but, as far as the rate-payers and the Government are concerned, I think there was absolutely no loss by the insufficiency of hands. When we are now raising the salary of the inspectors much more than they were hitherto drawing according to the general scale, what is the necessity just now for increasing their number also? I do not believe for a moment that any revenue will be lost by Government, or the ryots will be unnecessarily taxed if the number of revenue inspectors is not increased. This may be done only when the Land Records establishment is entirely abolished. When the cost of that establishment is saved there may be a justification for increasing the number of revenue inspectors. Otherwise I must support the resolution."

21st March 1921] [Mr. A. P. Patro]

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" A previous resolution was accepted by the House after the argument of the mover that with such a large addition in the cadre of the revenue inspectors, the work of the maintenance of the land records would be conducted by the revenue inspectors. Therefore that proposition was necessary. The House was convinced of the argument, and it therefore accepted that resolution. Now this motion for reducing the cadre of the revenue inspectors on the strength of which the previous resolution was carried seems to be quite inconsistent and I am sure the mover is convinced of this inconsistency and he will withdraw his motion."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" As one who has given notice of an exactly similar motion, I wish to say this. As my Hon'ble friend Mr. Patro stated a few minutes ago, this Council voted in favour of a motion for the omission of the amount for land records maintenance and the main reason on which the Council voted for this omission was that the ordinary Revenue staff, particularly the revenue inspectors, would and should be able to attend to the land records maintenance work also. Inasmuch as that resolution was carried mainly for that reason, I think it will be thoroughly inconsistent on our part to press this resolution. So far as I am concerned, I am certainly prepared to withdraw my motion on this question, namely the motion for the reduction of 187 revenue inspectors. I believe that for the same reason, my honourable friend who has moved this resolution will be prepared to withdraw it."

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB :—" After the assurance given by the Hon'ble the Revenue Member that there has been no real increase at all, I withdraw my resolution."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 46.

The following motion which stood in the name of Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar was owing to his absence deemed to have been withdrawn :—

That under 5-C. Land Revenue—Land Records the provision of Rs. 5,76,204 *for revenue inspectors be reduced by one lakh of rupees* (*Budget page* 40).

MOTION No. 47.

The following motion which stood in the name of Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar was not moved and it was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

That the cost of the additional 187 *revenue inspectors be omitted from the provision of Rs.* 5,76,204 *in the first item at page* 40 *of the Budget.*

MOTION No. 48.

The following motion of Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Delete Rs. 9,588, *personal allowance to revenue inspectors* (*Budget page* 40).

MOTIONS NOS. 49 AND 50.

The following motions which stood in the name of Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu were not moved and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

That the provision of Rs. 1,54,070 *made for jamabandi allowances to karnams under Village Establishment—Government villages in Detailed Account No.* 5-*C. Land Revenue—Land Records, be reduced by half* (*Budget page* 40).

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [21st March 1921

That the provision of Rs. 1,13,280 *made for duty allowance for* 944 *revenue inspectors at Rs.* 10 *each in Detailed Account No.* 5-*C. Land Revenue—Land Records, be reduced by half* (*Budget page* 40).

Motion No. 51.

The following motion which stood in the name of Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar was, in the absence of the honourable member, deemed to have been withdrawn :—

That under 5-*C. Land Revenue—Land Records, the item of Rs.* 1,13,280 *for duty allowance be omitted.*

Motion No. 52.

The following motion of Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar was not moved and was hence deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Delete Rs. 2,059, *personal allowance to revenue inspectors and deputy surveyors* (*Budget page* 40).

Motions Nos. 53 and 54.

The following motions which stood in the name of Rao Bahadur K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar were not moved and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

That Rs. 2,16,315 *under 'Maintenance of Land Records No.* 5-*C.' be reduced to Rs.* 1,00,000 (*Budget page* 40).

That Rs. 81,500 *under* 5-*C. Land Revenue—Land Records—District Charges—Travelling allowance be reduced to Rs.* 30,000 (*Budget page* 41).

Motion No. 55.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu :—"I move :—

That the following item relating to duty allowance be omitted :—

5-*C. Land Revenue—Land Records—Maintenance of Land Records—*

Duty allowances to office establishment for preparing Revenue and Agricultural statistics—Executive subordinates (*Budget page* 40)—*Rs.* 1,13,280.

"We have already heard the other day about the necessity for giving two allowances. We have heard of the duty allowance of Rs. 10 for each of the 944 revenue inspectors. Their pay was recently graded as 60—4—80. That being so I should like to know from the honourable member whether these duty allowances are also given to the 944 revenue inspectors for their work, for meeting unforeseen dangers or for developing the high quality with which all these special settlement officers are endowed."

The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson :—"May I enquire, Sir, whether the Rs. 21,720 is not part of the larger sum of Rs. 2,57,200 that has been already cut off ?"

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu :—"I agree, Sir, but I am not moving the second part of the motion."

The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson :—"But the honourable member was reading the second portion."

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu :—"No, only the first portion."

21st March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter]

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER:—"May I point out, Sir, that the first item has been dealt with in resolution No. 50, which has already been disposed of."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"Resolution No. 50 was not moved. It is perfectly open to the honourable member to move the first item of motion No. 55."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I think I must make myself quite clear to the honourable member. I am referring to Rs. 1,13,280 at page 40 of the Budget. This is the item I am referring to. I think we must have an explanation as to why every one of these 944 revenue inspectors should be paid Rs. 10 as duty allowance. We had already the absurdity of accepting the explanation given regarding the allowances for the settlement officers for these duty allowances also. For I do not understand why the pay which has been recently settled should be supplemented by an addition of Rs. 10. I suppose another explanation, another interpretation, of duty allowance, would now be given."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I already explained in dealing with the whole subject of duty allowances that we are replacing the revenue inspectors by clerks on deputation. When employed as clerks in the office, they draw their usual pay and when detailed as revenue inspectors they draw a duty allowance. As I explained now, when the old minimum pay of clerks was Rs. 20, we were paying revenue inspectors Rs. 35 and Rs. 40. Instead of keeping them in two separate grades, we get them all in one grade. They draw the ordinary pay when they are in office and an extra allowance when they are doing the revenue inspector's duties."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I do not wish to press the motion."

The motion then was by leave withdrawn.

The second item of motion No. 55, *to omit duty allowances to revenue inspectors* (*Budget page* 41)—Rs. 21,720 was not moved by Mr. Ramachandra Rao and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.

MOTION No. 56.

The following motion which stood in the name of Rao Bahadur K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn:—

That the following item be deleted under 5-*C. Land Revenue—Land Records —District charges*:—

Duty allowance of Rs. 21,720 *for revenue inspectors* (*Budget page* 41).

MOTION No. 57.

The following motion which stood in the name of Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn:—

That the following items of duty allowance be omitted:—

5-*C. Land Revenue—Land Records—Establishment for preparing revenue and agricultural statistics*:—

Establishment (*Budget page* 40)	.. ..	*Rs.* 1,13,280
District charges—		
To Revenue Inspectors (*Budget page* 41)	..	*Rs.* 21,720

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [21st March 1921

Motion No. 58.

The following motion of Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar was not moved and was hence deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Delete Rs. 616, *personal allowance to surveyors* (*Budget page* 41).

Motion No. 59.

The following motion which stood in the name of Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

That the demand of Rs. 46,32,000, *under* 5-*C. Land Records be reduced by Rs.* 100 (*Budget page* 28).

Motion No. 60.

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar :—"I beg to formally move the following motion :—

That the allotment of Rs. 46,32,000 *under* 5-*C. Land Revenue—Land Records be reduced by Rs.* 2,50,000 (*Budget page* 28).

"If the resolution that has already been accepted is carried out, then mine will be taken to have been given effect to. But the original resolution is only under a specific head. This is under the total grant. If for any conceivable reason the former resolution is not given effect to, I like to be on safe ground, and I therefore formally move the resolution."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur :—"I am sorry, Sir, that I cannot give any undertaking on the 21st of March that I shall be prepared to abolish a staff which is now in working order with effect from the 1st of April with only a ten days' notice. If it comes to that extreme step of having to deal with the abolition of an entire department, the Council will have to face the possibility of having to give the subordinates concerned either pensions earlier than the time when they will be entitled to it, or compensation pensions, and probably other kinds of compensation in lieu of the usual notice of discharge. So it is rather very difficult for a Government Member on the 21st March to agree to the proposed abolition of a whole department with effect from the 1st April. But this much, certainly, I can assure the House, that I shall be perfectly prepared to communicate the result of the discussion and the feelings on the matter to the Board of Revenue, who in common with all other heads of departments are now dealing with the general question of the proposed reduction in pursuance of the directions of His Excellency the Governor. I shall ask the Board of Revenue to consider this question also in view of the feelings that have been expressed in this House and to let us know how much reduction is possible and feasible. To that extent, Sir, I can assure the House. I cannot say anything more."

The motion was then put to the vote and declared carried.

Motion No. 61.

The following motion which stood in the name of Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Delete Rs. 123, *allowance to temporary establishments* (*Budget page* 42).

Motion No. 62.

Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib :—"I move—

'That under 5-*E. Land Revenue the provision of Rs.* 11,99,328 *for munsifs in ryotwari villages be reduced by Rs.* 5 *lakhs* (*Budget page* 42).'

21st March 1921] [Mr. Muhammad Usman Sahib]

"This resolution is to elicit a reply from the Revenue Member. The other day before the Salaries Committee that was appointed from this Council the village munsifs appeared before it and said that they would prefer to be honorary rather than low-paid officials. So, if the Government would examine this question of making them honorary, I think it will be a very valuable information and also will guide us in retrenching expenditure. Therefore, if the honourable member would promise to that effect, I do not want to press this."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Mr. President, I can assure the honourable member who has brought up this resolution deliberately with the intention, as he tells us, of eliciting a statement from me as to what I intend doing with regard to these village munsifs, whether I intend to keep them as paid servants or as honorary officers, that the matter is receiving my attention just at the present moment. I have undertaken to receive a deputation from some of the village officers, presumably early in April after the legislative session is over, so as to be in a position to ascertain for myself whether honorary offices with no emoluments or paid offices with the loss of the hereditary right would be elected by them. However, my own mind is absolutely open. I should like the village officials themselves to discuss the question with me as to which they would prefer, but if the House wants a reduction to be made on that head, I should certainly not have any objection. That would show how the demand of the village munsifs for increased remuneration has been responded to by the House. I will certainly investigate into the question and see what I can do to better their case."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTIONS NOS. 63 TO 66.

The following motions were not made and they were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn:—

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—

63. *That under Land Revenue 5-E. the provision of Rs.* 11,99,328 *for munsifs in ryotwari villages be reduced by* 5 *lakhs* (*Budget page* 42).

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—

64. *That under Land Revenue 5-E. the provision of Rs.* 31,10,448 *for vettis be reduced by* 15 *lakhs* (*Budget page* 43).

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB:—

65. *That under Land Revenue 5-E. the provision of Rs.* 31,10,448 *for vettis be reduced by* 15 *lakhs* (*Budget page* 43).

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—

66. *That under Land Revenue 5-E. the provision o Rs.* 2,04,168 *for nirgantis be reduced by Rs.* 50,000 (*Budget page* 43).

MOTION NO. 67.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"Mr. President, I beg to move—

'*That the provision of Rs.* 50,612 *made for anticipated increase owing to revision of village establishments under ryotwari village services in Detailed Account No. 5-E. Land Revenue—Allowances to District and Village Officers—be omitted for the present* (*Budget page* 43).'

[Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu] [21st March 1921

"At page 43 it will be noticed that this provision is made in the ryotwari villages for the revision of village establishments. What I submit is this, that in the present state of our finances this may be postponed for the next year. This is under the revision of village establishments. They will perhaps divide the villages, add some more karnams, munsifs, vettis and talaiyaris. All these things are not at all necessary in the present state of our finances. These may be done later on when our finance improves. I only submit that this provision may be deleted for the present."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I would agree to remit this question to the Board of Revenue for an examination of the fact whether they would want any portion of Rs. 50,612 for the revision of the village establishments in the year 1921–22 at all, and if not, I would advise its elimination absolutely."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"On this assurance I beg to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 68.

The motion '*That under 5-E. Land Revenue the provision of Rs.* 54,504 *for vettis in proprietary estates be omitted* (*Budget page* 43)'
was not moved by Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar, and it was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.

MOTION No. 69.

The motion '*That under 5-E. Land Revenue the provision of Rs.* 3,92,484 *for headmen in proprietary estates be omitted* (*Budget page* 43)'
was not moved by Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar, and it was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.

MOTION No. 70.

The motion '*That the provision of Rs.* 15,91,812 (*made up of Rs.* 11,99,328 + *Rs.* 3,92,484) *in 5-E. Land Revenue—Allowances to district and village officers, for munsifs, including potails in South Kanara* (*Ryotwari village service*), *and headmen* (*Proprietary Estates village service*), *be omitted* (*Budget pages* 42 *and* 43)'
was not moved by Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju, and it was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.

MOTION No. 71.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I beg to move—

That the lump provision of Rs. 12,000 *made for revision of village establishments under Proprietary Estates village service in Detailed Account No. 5-E. Land Revenue—Allowances to district and village officers, be omitted for the present* (*Budget page* 43).

"The same arguments that I adduced in the case of revision of village establishments under ryotwari village services will also apply to these services."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I am prepared to give the Honourable Member the same assurance."

The motion then was by leave withdrawn.

21st March 1921] [Mr. K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar]

Motion No. 72.

The motion '*That the grant of Rs.* 1,99,82,000 *under* 5. *Land Revenue be reduced by Rs.* 5,50,000 (*Budget page* 28)'
was not moved by Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, and it was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.

Motion No. 73.

The motion '*That the provision of Rs.* 11,000 *under* 22-*C* (*b*) *for travelling allowances be reduced by Rs.* 2,000 (*Budget page* 73)'
was not moved by Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar, and it was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.

Motion No. 74.

Rao Bahadur K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar:—"I beg to move—

'*That the sum of Rs.* 22,61,184 *for ryotwari talaiyaris in No.* 26-*D. be reduced by Rs.* 11,30,702 (*Budget page* 109).'

"In the face of the fact that the allotments under vettis have been allowed to stand and in consideration of the fact that there are nearly four or five servants in each village creating a good deal of heart-burning between the village munsifs and the karnams, it is quite necessary that there should be some reduction which can be utilized for any other purpose which the Government may intend to do. Therefore I think that the establishment should be reduced by half. The ryotwari talaiyaris, who, I understand, are at least two in each village, are not necessary. Therefore, I think, one may be taken away. As a matter of fact, these talaiyaris are not doing any duty whatever."

The Hon'ble Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur:—"Mr. President, Sir, there are a few principles which guide the fixation of the number of these village menials appointed in each village. It is not merely that we allow two vettis to each village indiscriminately, but we take into account the population, the size, the beriz, the nature of crime, the land under cultivation in each village, etc. All these factors enter into the determination of the number of vettis, and if my honourable friend will look into the Board's Standing Orders he will notice that the number of vettis is fixed on these principles. However, we welcome the suggestion that has been made by my honourable friend that the vettis are too many in some villages and they exist more to attend to the personal service of the village munsif than that of the Government. We have already started a sort of enquiry as to whether a reduction in the number of vettis is possible, and if it is possible we will certainly carry it out. For we do not want to add to the village establishment at this particular juncture when we are faced with increased expenditure in every direction. I shall be quite ready to remit that question also to the Board of Revenue."

Rao Bahadur K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar:—"In view of the assurance given, I beg leave to withdraw the motion."

The motion then was by leave withdrawn.

Motion No. 75.

The motion '*That the provision of Rs.* 58,172 *made for fixed allowance for jamabandi attendance under* 26-*D. Village Police—Ryotwari Talaiyaris, be omitted* (*Budget page* 109)'
was not moved by Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu, and it was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.

[The Hon'ble the President] [21st March 1921

Motion No. 76.

The motion ' *That under* 26-*D. Police the item of Rs.* 22,61,184 *for ryotwari talaiyaris be reduced by Rs.* 5 *lakhs* (*Budget page* 109) '
was not moved by Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar, and it was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.

The Hon'ble the President :—"I shall now put to the Council Demand I which has been moved by the Hon'ble Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 216·64 lakhs. The proposition will be that such sum be granted after deducting those amounts which the House has already resolved to omit or reduce. That is the proposition now before the House."

The motion, as altered, was then put to vote and was carried *nem. con.*

The Council then adjourned to meet at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, the 22nd March 1921.

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

TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS