The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, the 23rd day of 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.]

Fish-curing yards in the Presidency.

481 *Q.*—Mr. S. R. Y. ANKINEDU PRASAD: To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Development to mention—

(*a*) at what places in this Presidency the fish-curing yards have been opened ; and

(*b*) if they are successful, whether steps will be taken to investigate if such yards may be established on the Masulipatam coast.

A.—(*a*) Fish-curing yards are opened wherever there is a sufficient demand for them on behalf of the fishing community.

(*b*) There already exists one fish-curing yard at Mogalturru in the Kistna district.

Mr. S. R. Y. ANKINEDU PRASAD:—"With regard to my question as to the places in this Presidency at which the fish-curing yards have been opened, the answer given is somewhat ambiguous. I want to know specifically at what places the fish-curing yards have been actually opened."

The Hon'ble Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" A list will be supplied to the Honourable Member."

Applications under sections 92 *and* 114 *of the Madras Estates Land Act I of* 1908.

482 *Q.*—Sri M. V. APPARAO Bahadur : To ask the Hon'ble the Member for Revenue—

(*a*) if subordinate Revenue officers are required to submit any returns to show the disposal of applications made under sections 92 and 114 of the Madras Estates Land Act I of 1908 for the sale of movable property and holdings distrained for the recovery of arrears due to the landholder in cases where no suit is filed contesting the distraint or sale ; and

(*b*) whether the Government cannot issue orders for prompt disposal, taking into consideration the delay that is now made.

A.—No special return to show separately the disposal of applications under sections 92 and 114 has been prescribed. Annual and half-yearly returns are submitted showing the receipt and disposal of applications of all kinds under the Act and the necessary orders are issued wherever disposal is found to be unsatisfactory.

Zamindari work.

483 *Q.*—Sri M. V. APPARAO Bahadur : To ask the Hon'ble the Member for Revenue whether the Government have received any complaints from the zamindars in respect to the indifference of the village officers to do the zamindari work ; if so, what steps have been taken by the Government to remedy the evil.

A.—Some representations have been received from zamindars on the subject. Section 16 of Madras Act II of 1894 provides for the punishment of village officers for misconduct or neglect of duty.

Power to zamindars of fining village officers.

484 *Q.*—Sri M. V. APPA RAO Bahadur: To ask the Hon'ble the Member for Revenue—

(*a*) to state the number of the zamindars of this Presidency that have been entrusted with the powers of fining village officers; and

(*b*) whether it is the intention of the Government to extend such powers to other zamindars.

A.—(*a*) One hundred and twelve.

(*b*) The authority to confer on proprietors power to fine village officers under section 16 (1) of the Madras Proprietary Village Service Act, 1894, is vested in the Board of Revenue. The Board will doubtless consider applications from individual proprietors.

Mr. Yaqub Hasan's imprisonment.

485 *Q.*—C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU: To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member—

(*a*) as to whether the Government are aware that the commitment to jail of Mr. Yaqub Hasan and others has caused general dissatisfaction in this Presidency and that such dissatisfaction has found expression in numerous public meetings; and

(*b*) whether the Government will consider the desirability of releasing Mr. Yaqub Hasan and others immediately.

A.—The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the answers given to questions Nos. 524 and 527 put by M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu Garu and M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu Garu respectively at the last meeting of the Legislative Council.

Imprisonment of Mr. Yaqub Hasan.

486 *Q.*—SAIYID MUHAMMAD PADSHA SAHIB Bahadur: To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the commitment to jail of Mr. Yaqub Hasan and others has caused general dissatisfaction in this Presidency and whether such dissatisfaction has found expression in numerous public meetings; and

(*b*) whether the Government propose to consider the desirability of releasing Mr. Yaqub Hasan and others in Malabar immediately.

A.—The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the answers given to questions Nos. 524 and 527 put by M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu Garu and M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu Garu respectively at the last meeting of the Legislative Council.

Grant of lands to the depressed classes.

487 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU: To ask the Hon'ble the Law Member for a statement showing the extent of land granted to the depressed classes in each district in this Presidency during 1918–19, 1919–20 and 1920–21 and to place on the table the instructions given by the Government for the disposal of lands to the depressed classes.

23rd March 1921]

A.—The information asked for is not readily available and its compilation would take a considerable time. The following statement shows the total extent of land reserved for assignment and assigned to depressed classes in the several districts up to 31st December 1920 :—

Serial number and district.	Area of fields reserved. (In acres.)	Area of fields assigned. (In acres.)
1. The Nilgiris	181·37	..
2. Chittoor	7,070·99	404·04
3. Ramnad	1,392·15	3·29
4. Tanjore	332·86	..
5. Bellary	18,107·45	1,221·51
6. Vizagapatam	27·90	2·66
7. Guntūr	28,508·91	6,473·57
8. North Arcot	13,220·09	207·18
9. Anantapur	86,204·85	942·70
10. Nellore	27,942·35	1,736·75
11. Tinnevelly	2,592·46	139·72
12. South Arcot	21,298·07	148·97
13. Coimbatore	9,998·25	293·48
14. Kistna	20,660·07	787·26
15. Madura	Nil.	140·37
16. Salem	19,045·29	192·29
17. Trichinopoly	19,545·21	78·38

The instructions issued on the subject by the Government are those contained in the note under paragraph 9 (2) of Board's Standing Order No. 15. The matter continues to engage the close attention of the Commissioner of Labour who obtains quarterly returns from Collectors.

Subjects dealt with by the Chief Secretary after the creation of a separate Secretariat.

488 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu : To ask the Hon'ble the Finance Member for a statement of the subjects dealt with by the Chief Secretary to the Government after the creation of a separate Secretariat for Finance and whether there has been any reduction to the establishments of the Chief Secretariat in consequence of the constitution of the separate Secretariat for Finance.

A.—A list of the principal subjects dealt with by the Chief Secretary to Government since the appointment of a separate Secretary for Finance is laid on the table *; it is only provisional at present.

A separate Finance Secretariat has not yet been constituted; the former establishment of the Chief Secretary with some additions deals with the Financial part of the Finance Secretary's work.

Loan for housing evicted Panchamas of Mottucheri in the city.

489 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar : To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Local Self-Government whether—

(*a*) the Corporation of Madras applied for a loan of Rs. 30,000 for the construction of 100 tenements for the evicted Panchamas of Mottucheri in the Madras City, and, if so, what orders were passed by the Government thereon ; and

* Vide Appendix I on page 1024 infra.

(*b*) the Government received representations from the residents of other cheris in the city to secure for them permanent occupancy rights, and, if so, from what cheris, and what orders have been passed in each case.

A.—(*a*) The Corporation was informed that the Government were unable to sanction any loan for the purpose and that the Corporation might raise the loan in the open market.

(*b*) Memorials have been received from the inhabitants of Hall's Gardens, Thousand Lights, Flowers Road and Thundu cheris. The Commissioner of Labour has been directed to arrange proper terms with the landlords and, if this is not possible, to submit proposals for acquisition in all cases in which eviction is contemplated of tenants from the sites of which they have been in occupation for a long period and in which they have made substantial improvements.

Report of Collector of Bellary on season, etc., and that of Mr. Buckley.

490 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Member for Revenue to lay on the table the several reports of the Collector of Bellary sent from time to time during the current fasli on the state of the season and the condition of the people in the affected taluks of the Bellary district, and the reports from Mr. Buckley also, if he has sent any.

A.—The reports will be placed on the Editors' Table.

Tiffin-room for Secretariat staff.

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

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the tiffin-rooms provided for the Secretariat staff were demolished in 1909, when the Council Chamber was constructed; and

(*b*) whether new rooms have been provided for use of the staff in the place of the old ones demolished, and, if the answer is in the negative, when new rooms are likely to be built.

A.—(*a*) Yes. The tiffin-rooms were demolished about the year 1910 when the new Council Chamber was constructed.

(*b*) No, but the question of a suitable site for the construction of a tiffin-shed has been under consideration for some time past. As however the Military authorities have recently handed over a large block in the Fort for the use of the Secretariat, it is hoped now to provide accommodation for tiffin-rooms within the Fort 'without further building'.

Buckingham canal.

492 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Revenue Member to state the probable income from, and the expenses incurred on, the Buckingham canal during the last ten years.

23rd March 1921]

A.—A statement showing the receipts from and the expenses incurred on the Buckingham canal for the years 1910–11 to 1919–20 is laid on the table.*

Licences for firearms.

493 *Q.*—M. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI: To ask the Hon'ble the Home Member to state—

(*a*) what the total number is of licences for firearms which were in force in the months of December 1918, December 1919 and December 1920 in the Anantapur district;

(*b*) out of the total number of licences in force in December 1920 in the Anantapur district, how many were renewals for over ten years successively;

(*c*) what the total number is of applications for licences of firearms received by the Collector of the Anantapur district for the current year up to the end of January 1921; how many of them were for original licences and how many for renewals;

(*d*) of those rejected how many were from applicants who had their licences renewed for over ten years successively;

(*e*) out of the total number rejected how many were so rejected on ex-parte police reports;

(*f*) if the Government will be pleased to consider the advisability of appointing two or more of non-official advisers to help the District Magistrate in granting licences for firearms.

A.—(*a*) The number of licences in force during the year 1918 was 1,828.
" " 1919 was 1,758.
" " 1920 was 1,840.

(*b*) *to* (*e*) The Government have no information.

(*f*) The Government are unable to accept the suggestion.

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI:—"With regard to clauses (*b*) to (*e*), will the Government be pleased to call for information?"

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"If the Honourable Member can satisfy me that any useful purpose will be served by calling for all this information, I will consider the question; but I observe from the wording of the clauses of the question that the main point seems to be only about clauses (*d*) and (*e*)."

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI:—"Am I to do it by means of separate communication?"

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"Separate communication, I presume."

Pay of elementary teachers.

494 *Q.*—Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR: To ask the Hon'ble the Minister for Education what action the Government propose to take in connexion with the memorials of elementary teachers for higher pay.

* Vide Appendix II on page 1025 infra.

[23rd March 1921

A.—For the action taken with reference to the teachers under the employ of Government the attention of the Member is invited to pages 6 and 10 of G.O. No. 215, Finance, dated 4th March 1921, which has been furnished to him.

Promotions to grade of Assistant Commissioner of Salt, Abkāri, etc., department.

495 *Q.*—Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar: To ask the Hon'ble the Member for Finance to lay on the table a statement regarding promotions to the grade of Assistant Commissioner in the Salt, Abkāri and Customs department made since 1st April 1916 showing—

(1) the name of the promoted officer;

(2) his race;

(3) his educational and other qualifications, with information as to whether he has had to be exempted from any general or departmental test;

(4) the number of inspectors he superseded; and

(5) the race of such inspectors?

A.—A statement of permanent promotions is laid on the table. *

Appendix I.

[Vide answer to question No. 488 asked by M.R.Ry. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu Garu at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 23rd March 1921, page 1021 supra.]

Chief Secretariat.

Public Department.

Administration report—Presidency.
Air-craft.
Indian Civil Service and listed posts—
High Court Judges, Leave and appointments of—
Foreigners—
  Foreigners Act and Ordinance.
  Foreigners trading.
  Foreigners naturalization.
Government Servants' Conduct Rules.
Military—
  Garrisons.
  I.A.R.O.
  I.D.F., etc.
  Movement of troops.
  Roads of military importance.
  The Governor's Bodyguard and personal staff.
Office Procedure.
Precedence, Warrant of—
Publicity—
  Publicity Board.
  Editors' Table.

* Vide Appendix III on page 1026 infra.

23rd March 1921]

Press—
Indian Press Act.
Newspapers.
Public Service Commission and Service questions.
Registration of books.
Rewards for saving life and property.
Residences of the Governor—
Construction and maintenance of pictures.
Reports on matters of political or administrative importance.
Reforms—General.
State Prisoners.

Judicial Department.

Arms and explosives.
Criminal Tribes Act (excluding settlements and schools).
Criminal Justice.
Police—
Police—
C.I.D.
European Vagrancy Act.

Political Department.

Political.

Ecclesiastical Department.

Ecclesiastical.

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 492 asked by M.R.Ry. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar Avargal at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 23rd March 1921, page 1023 supra.]

Statement showing the revenue receipts from and the expenses incurred on the Buckingham Canal for the years 1910–11 to 1919–20.

Year.	Revenue receipts.	Expenses.		
		Capital account.	Revenue account.	Total.
	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
1910–11	70,147	123	88,322	88,445
1911–12	75,833	991	1,41,611	1,42,602
1912–13	72,679	..	1,36,860	1,36,860
1913–14	74,663	2,100	1,52,019	1,54,119
1914–15	68,359	..	1,65,685	1,65,685
1915–16	69,158	..	1,41,378	1,41,378
1916–17	67,215	..	1,28,889	1,28,889
1917–18	79,239	2,361	1,38,249	1,40,610
1918–19	87,457	15,229	1,92,483	2,07,712
1919–20	81,784	15,955	2,21,332	2,37,287

APPENDIX III.

[Vide answer to question No. 495 asked by M.R.Ry. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar Avargal at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 23rd March 1921, page 1024 supra.]

Name of the promoted officer.	His race.	His educational and other qualifications with information as to whether he has had to be exempted from any general or departmental test.	Number of inspectors superseded.	Race of such inspectors.
1. C. B. Beadnell.	European ..	Educated at an English school and passed Cambridge Local Examination. Exempted on first appointment from the requirement that only men who passed the Madras Matriculation or equivalent examination were eligible.	10	Seven Europeans and Anglo-Indians, two Hindus and one Indian Christian.
2. Wilson.	Anglo-Indian	Educational qualifications not known. Exempted from Test D-IV.	Nil.	....
3. E. J. Bower.	Do.	Matriculate	1	Hindu.
4. F. Hodding.	European ..	Educated at an English school and passed group 1 of Preliminary examination for R.M.C., Sandhurst. Passed also Proficiency Examination for Captain (Mounted Rifles). Exempted on first appointment from the requirement that only men who passed the Madras Matriculation or equivalent examination were eligible.	16	Thirteen Europeans and Anglo-Indians and three Hindus.
H. P. St. Clair Berlie.	Anglo-Indian	Matriculate. Passed the Volunteer Proficiency test.	9	Seven Europeans and Anglo-Indians and two Hindus.
6. V. G. Shunker.	Do.	Matriculate	1	Hindu.
7. P. Duraiyappa Ayyar.	Hindu ..	B.A. Competitive Examination, Salt Department.	3	Two Europeans and Anglo-Indians and one Hindu.
8. J. W. Borebank.	Anglo-Indian	F.A.	7	Six Europeans and Anglo-Indians and one Hindu.
9. S. L. Narayana Rao.	Hindu ..	Matriculate. Exempted from passing test E in second language and tests A and F by higher grade.	7	Six Europeans and Anglo-Indians and one Hindu.
10. A. J. H. White.	Anglo-Indian	Matriculate	3	Two Europeans and Anglo-Indians and one Hindu.
11. L. K. Fearon.	European ..	Educated at English schools and passed Oxford Junior Local Examination. Exempted on first appointment from the requirement that only men who passed the Madras Matriculation or equivalent examination were eligible.	12	Nine Europeans and Anglo-Indians and three Hindus.
12. C. F. Sharp.	Anglo-Indian	B.A.	4	Three Europeans and Anglo-Indians and one Hindu.

23rd March 1921] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

II

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

DEMAND VII—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—HEADS OF PROVINCES AND EXECUTIVE COUNCILS—*cont.*

The discussion of the demands for grants was then resumed.

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

'8. *That the provision of Rs.* 1,83,000 *under* 22-*A for the personal staff and the bodyguard of His Excellency be reduced by Rs.* 75,000 (*Budget, page* 62).'

"The details of this item are given at page 63 of the budget. I need hardly protest again in moving this reduction, against the insinuation that there is any idea of personalities or anything like that. Many of our friends had an opportunity to show their loyalty by making speeches last evening against reduction under the heading of furniture. I may say that in moving this proposal I am no less loyal than anybody else. As I said yesterday, my object in moving the curtailment of various items including expenses of our own travelling allowances is to show to the public at large and to the various departments in all districts that it is not as if we want to have all the luxuries and that we want the subordinate officers to suffer. So far as this item is concerned, I am sorry to say that the budget does not give us any information as to how much was spent last year or the previous years. The budget shows nil in those columns; but from what was said on behalf of the Government at the time of general discussion, probably there was some money spent on this account but it was not in the accounts of the local Government. Whatever that may be, I may say that unfortunately for us, we do not know how much is votable and how much non-votable. I therefore take it that the whole thing is votable."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—"The non-votable items are in italics as usual."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR (*continuing*) :—"I thank the Honourable Member for his information. That will guide us in all future things. So far as I am able to see, the first four items we cannot, of course, touch. But there are no italics lower down and therefore no items under those heads will come under non-votable. We see against various items large amounts by way of pay of Indian rank and file Rs. 12,300, for allowances Rs. 5,971, hire of transport Rs. 1,000, compensation to followers Rs. 1,800, feed of animals, Rs. 28,210, miscellaneous Rs. 3,000 and so on. Under these conditions, if there is really an earnest desire on the part of the Government as well as His Excellency to cut short the expenditure, it will not be difficult to curtail a few thousand rupees from this long list. We know how much His Excellency is popular and there is no necessity except to keep up his prestige and his position, for maintaining a large number of camp followers and a large number of soldiers and others including commissioned officers. We see also travelling allowances and other allowances for these people also. Therefore I submit that it is absolutely necessary, Sir, to set an example, as I said, to show to the public at large that even His Excellency and his Government are very anxious to reduce all possible things. After all I want only a reduction of Rs. 75,000. Government can very well assure us that they will curtail this expenditure. Whatever may be the result of voting to-day, I am confident that some reduction will be made by His Excellency. I have no doubt that members here will see their way to support this resolution because there is no question of personality, loyalty or any other thing of the kind."

[Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai] [23rd March 1921

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI moved :—

'9. *That the demand of Rs.* 1,83,000 *under* 22-*A. Staff and Household of the Governor be reduced by Rs.* 10,000.'

In doing so he said :—" Mr. President, Sir, in the budget discussion that took place the week before last one thing that was pressed upon this Council was the need for retrenchment. Retrenchment is the watch-word of the Council now. With that view many of us have been exploring every item in the budget to see if there is any corner in which retrenchment can be made. Under this head we find so much amount without any explanation at all. This seems to me to be a new item of expenditure provided for the first time. I gather that this charge was hitherto borne by the Government of India. And we have no idea as to what allotment there was during previous years and what the actual expenditure incurred till now was. To apply the pruning knife to allotments of this kind would make it easier for the Council to continue the operation in humbler quarters. All that I ask is only for the reduction of a very small amount. There are several items under each of which retrenchment can be made. We do not see here, as in other cases, any provision marked as probable savings. It seems that every pie under this head is going to be spent this year. Under these circumstances, I support this motion."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" I want to add only one thing, Sir. Here there is an item called good service and good conduct pay for Rs. 1,500. I do not understand what it is and why that amount should be provided for."

The HON'BLE Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—" Mr. President, I am very glad to have the assurance of the honourable mover of his loyalty to the King's representative and to know that he does not wish to reduce the status of the Presidency of Madras as I thought when I first saw his resolution. We all remember that when a certain Governor was snatched away from Madras to be the first Governor of Bengal, some people asked the question what was the net result of the change of status of that Presidency and it was replied that Bengal had gained 'a fresh mind, a bodyguard and a band.' And I thought when I saw this resolution that the intention was to remove from Madras one of these three things which distinguish the older provinces from the younger ones. I am glad to hear that it is not what is wanted. I must, however, point out to the Honourable Member that we could not cut down the cost of the bodyguard by so large a sum of Rs. 75,000 without practically abolishing it altogether.

" He is quite right in telling us that this item of expenditure has hitherto been charged to Imperial funds in the Army budget and that we have been suddenly called upon to pay it ourselves. We have protested against the charge but protested in vain. That having failed, we asked the various branches of the Army Department concerned to give us detailed figures for the items that make up the expenditure and we received the replies by telegram just in time to put them into the budget. I can, however, assure the honourable mover that His Excellency the Governor is just as anxious as he is to secure economics and at his instance I have been through all these figures received from the Military authorities with the Military Secretary to see whether every item was fully required, and the net result is that we have found it possible to reduce the estimate by Rs. 18,120. I should like to say here that it is not by reason of careless budgeting that we are able now to offer this reduction, but because, as I have said, the figures were

received from the Military offices by wire and we had no time to analyse them. We are quite ready to make this reduction of Rs. 18,120, but we cannot go further if we are to retain a bodyguard at all.

"It remains to answer the question that has been raised as to what is meant by 'good conduct pay.' It is part of the regular pay of a sepoy and is paid to the men in the bodyguard who are part of the Army."

11-15 a.m.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I have no objection to withdraw this resolution on the assurance that the sum will be cut down."

Both the motions were withdrawn by leave of the Council.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"The next batch of motions relates to the provision of Rs. 1,22,000 for special trains for His Excellency's use and haulage of his saloon carriages. I will now call upon the members who have notified the motions."

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"There is some inaccuracy in the figures, Sir. I wish to speak after others have spoken. I am not moving the resolution now but I want to speak on the subject."

The motion standing in his name—

10. *That the provision of Rs.* 1,22,000 *for special trains for His Excellency's own use and haulage of his saloon carriages in* 22-*A* (*c*) *General Administration—Tour expenses be reduced by Rs.* 1,16,000,

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

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"The resolution standing in my name reads thus:—

'11. *That the item of Rs.* 1,22,000 *under* 22-*A* (*c*) (*Tour expenses*) *be reduced by a sum of Rs.* 50,000.'

"I move this motion for the purpose of enquiring why this increase upon last year's expenditure is provided for in this year's budget. The Council will turn to page 65 and notice that the amount against 1919-20 is Rs. 45,976 for special trains for His Excellency's own use and haulage of his saloon carriages. In 1920-21 the budget estimate was Rs. 40,000 and the revised estimate shows Rs. 66,000. This year the proposed budget estimate is Rs. 1,22,000 and I should like to know the reason why this large addition is made. My objection is not on the ground that more carriages should not be constructed or anything of the kind. If the intention is that there should be a departure from the policy pursued hitherto and that there should be more touring by His Excellency the Governor in the next year than in the previous year then as I object to the policy I object to the increase in the expenditure. If it is for the construction of the special train, that is a matter of detail on which I am not going to place my resolution. If it is intended that His Excellency the Governor is going to tour more largely in the coming year, then I submit to the Council that the reduction ought to be made. With the introduction of the Reforms and the formation of Ministry in charge of transferred subjects, touring by His Excellency the Governor ought to be less and not more. Certainly no greater provision should be made. Ministers will have to tour as also all the Members of the Government and consequently there will be more touring expenses. There should be as little touring by His Excellency

[Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar] [23rd March 1921

as possible in order not to prevent the work of the Ministers. Therefore, when responsible Government is spreading I should not be prepared to support a policy of more touring by the head of the Province. For this reason I should object to it. Of course it is for the Council to decide what course it should adopt."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"In moving the resolution—

'12. *That the provision of Rs.* 1,22,000 *for "special trains for His Excellency's own use and haulage of his saloon carriage" under* 22-*A* (*c*) *General Administration* (*Tour expenses*) *be reduced by Rs.* 50,000.'

"I would point out that no reason has been shown for doubling the figure in the ensuing year. According to the revised estimate for 1920-21, a sum of Rs. 66,100 is put down but for the ensuing year it is put as Rs. 1,22,000. No details are given and for the reasons put forward by the previous speaker, I support this motion."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU in moving—

'13. *That the provision of Rs.* 1,22,000 *made for special trains for His Excellency's use and haulage of his saloon carriages in Detailed Account No.* 22-*A* (*c*) *General Administration—Tour Expenses, be reduced by Rs.* 42,000.'

said :—"Mr. President, I am aware that His Excellency has to tour round the Presidency in order to keep himself acquainted with the actual conditions though the Members of the Council and the Ministers are also expected to tour. His Excellency is supposed to be the head of all the subjects in charge of the Members as well as the Ministers. So he is no doubt bound to make tours to acquaint himself with the actual conditions. I am also aware that on account of famine conditions prevailing in certain parts of the Presidency he will have to go to these districts to see that relief is properly administered to the people who actually suffer from the famine conditions. I am aware of all these things. Yet it appears to me that the figure 1,22,000 seems too large. In my opinion one lakh will be amply sufficient because it is something like Rs. 40,000 more than the current year. Hence I have modestly estimated that one lakh will be quite ample for the coming year. I therefore request that Rs. 42,000 may be spared from this head."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—"May I explain before going further that the large increase in the next year's provision is for building a kitchen and dining saloon? The reason for that is that hitherto His Excellency has been using a saloon lent to him by the Railway Company. I think it was possible for them to lend it because the dining cars have not been running on the mails for some time past. But the Railway Company is no longer able to lend that saloon. Attempts have been made to purchase an old dining saloon and they have failed. Therefore the Railway Company has been asked to build a new one. It will be seen therefore that the bulk of the increased provision is not for increased touring but only for the new saloon. That being so, I do not propose to argue the general case."

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Mr. President, I thought that that might be he explanation but I wanted to make sure if that was so."

The motions were by leave withdrawn.

23rd March 1921] [The Hon'ble the President.]

The following motion standing in the name of Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

14. *That the provision of Rs.* 1,22,000 *under* 22-*A* (*c*) *General Administration for special train for His Excellency's own use and haulage of saloon carriage be reduced by Rs.* 60,000.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" Then we have got three resolutions regarding the provision of Rs. 1,63,000 for tour expenses. "

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

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

15. *That the provision of Rs.* 1,63,000, *tour expenses—vide* 22-*A* (*c*)—*be reduced by* 50 *per cent.*

16. *That the grant of Rs.* 1,63,000 *in* 22-*A* (*c*) *for tour expenses be reduced by Rs.* 60,000.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

17. *That the provision under* 22-*A* (*c*) *for the tour expenses of His Excellency be reduced by Rs.* 5,000.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" Then we have a set of four resolutions relating to the salaries of Ministers. We shall take them all together."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I formally move—

'18. *That the provision of Rs.* 1,92,000 *under* 22-*A* (*d*) *for the salary of the three Ministers be reduced by Rs.* 81,000.'

" I never thought that any claim that I am loyal is necessary but I find it necessary from the Hon'ble Mr. Todhunter's speech that originally he doubted my loyalty and my protestation of loyalty converted him and made him think that I was loyal. So far as this motion is concerned, it is unnecessary for me to say that there is absolutely nothing personal or communal or anything like that in this attempt to cut down the salary of the Ministers. As I have already said, I have begun from the top and gone down to the bottom and my idea is that we should curtail as much as possible. A few possible objections may have to be met. It may be said that for reasons of prestige and of equality of rank with Council Members the pay of Members must be given to the Ministers also and that therefore we ought not to move a proposition like this. One thing I want to say and it is this. It is most unfortunate that the Act as it is and the rules as they are do not allow us to vote upon the salaries of the higher services. But we can go on cutting down the supplies so far as the lower services are concerned, not necessarily so far as the pay of each person is concerned, but so far as their number is concerned, because a contented small number is more serviceable than a discontented large number. I think it is but reasonable, Sir, that we should show in the case of the Ministers also that although their rank, position and responsibility is equal to that of Council Members, we should agree to the reduction of the pay of the Ministers on principle in order to show that as the Ministers' pay has been cut down it is therefore very necessary that the Council Members' pay also should be curtailed. I have carefully read the papers that support the view that the Ministers' pay should not be curtailed. Some of them say that they are very much for retrenchment and that the pay of all people should be cut down except that of the Ministers. That is the

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.] [23rd March 1921

wording of one or two papers. I only want to say that we should curtail the pay of the Ministers on the ground that we believe that the pay of the seven Honourable Members on the front bench is high and we do this because we cannot touch the pay of the four Councillors and therefore we cannot reduce their pay. When the reduction of the pay of the Ministers has been voted on correct principles, we can appeal to the Secretary of State if possible and to the Parliament if necessary to curtail the pay of the Executive Council Members, or at least to give us the right to vote on it. One other question so far as this equality of rank is concerned remains. All that I can say is simply because a person draws a lower pay it should not at all be considered that that person is in any way lower in rank than the person who draws a higher pay. We, for instance, know that Provincial Civil Service Collectors whose pay we have got a right to vote have got the same powers, the same rank, the same duties, the same responsibilities and I may say enjoy the same regard as Indian Civil Service Collectors. I do not think that simply because these Provincial Civil Service Collectors draw a pay lower than that of the Indian Civil Service Collectors, therefore, either the Government or the public look upon them as in any way inferior to the Indian Civil Service Collectors. That is one point which I should strongly urge.

"One other objection that might possibly be raised is that a large number of Legislative Councils in other provinces have refused to vote a reduction of the Ministers' salary. We the members of this Council may claim, without any self-adulation or self-flattery, that in spite of all allegations that reached our ears originally that the Members of the Council were going to fall at one another's throats, we are more unanimous, more independent, and more businesslike than the members of other Councils. I think, therefore, that we shall be teaching a good lesson to the whole country and also to the Government in England that, so far as members of this Council are concerned, there is no question of personality, there is no question of class or community when the question of reduction of expenditure comes in, and that every one is prepared to make a little sacrifice. I request the Honourable Ministers not to say, as one Member in the Bengal Council is said to have stated, that he would make a sacrifice by giving Rs. 1,000 per month from his pay for charity, but that they will announce to the tax-payers their decision to return the amount to those from whom they received it. Looking at it from all standpoints I think it is but fair that there should be unanimity in regard to this question. This House has been urging for retrenchment from the beginning and I think we shall be leading the country if the Ministers themselves volunteer to make some reduction. On these grounds, Sir, I respectfully submit that the reduction I am proposing may be made and my motion will give Rs. 3,000 per month each to the Ministers."

11-30 a.m.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar :—"I was naturally reluctant to move my motion No. 19 and I should like to make my observations with as little controversy as possible. I have not the slightest hesitation in asking my friends, the Honourable Ministers, as well as those who think with them that they should agree to this resolution of mine and I say it entirely from their point of view and from the common point of view. I do not propose to make any apology for moving in this matter. If there is one party in this House which can be called a party, it is a party for retrenchment as the last two days' discussions of the budget have shown. That augurs well for the future of this province, and therefore I appeal to all members of this House to request the Ministers to accept this lower salary. It is only if they set this high example that they will be able to enforce it in the departments transferred to their control. Then they will be able to

insist on the other half of the Cabinet and on other departments making reductions all round. It is impossible for the Ministers to retain this large salary and at the same time to request the heads of departments to accept a lower salary. I think Rs. 3,000 which some of us have proposed is a good enough salary. I do not wish to enter into any personal question. I can assure the House that I do not imagine that any one of the three Ministers has accepted his office for the sake of salary. Putting this question aside altogether, it appears to me that no question of status ought to cloud our vision. From the constitutional and popular point of view, in my humble judgment, the Ministers do not occupy the same position as, or an inferior position to, that of the Executive Council Members. Their position and status is admittedly higher. That being so, I cannot understand how their status, constitutional and popular, as elected responsible Ministers is going to be pulled down by the reduction that I propose in their pay. The only question should be whether the pay proposed is sufficient to enable them to discharge their duties with comfort to themselves though not perhaps sufficient for the purpose of enabling any of them to save or to spend a portion of their pay in other directions, charitable or otherwise. I think Rs. 3,000 will certainly enable any Minister in Southern India to maintain the dignity of his office with comfort to himself.

"It has been stated at the outset that until the salaries of other officials have been pulled down, it is not right that Ministers should be asked to accept a lower salary or their friends should be asked to reduce their salary to Rs. 3,000. I do not agree. We must begin somewhere and let us begin with votable items. We can only begin with the departments entrusted to us. We cannot trespass beyond our province and that being the necessary limitation of our system, to say that we must postpone the very necessary reform till we rectify something which is not in our province is really to say that we will not agree to the proposition in question. That is not the excuse which this House can accept as a valid excuse.

"Then comes the question whether this motion is not really intended to be a censure on anybody. Certainly not. Section 52 of the Government of India Act says: 'There may be paid to any Minister so appointed in any province the same salary as is payable to the Member of the Executive Council in that province, unless a smaller salary is provided by vote of the Legislative Council of the province.' Therefore, in making this motion, I am making it purely in the interests of retrenchment and not for the purpose of casting any reflection upon the Ministers who have taken charge of the transferred subjects only a few months ago. That clears the ground of much controversial matter.

"Then I address myself only for one minute to another aspect of the question. We want money for the development of the country. We want money to tackle the multifarious problems of poverty probably in a hundred directions. May I not expect the Honourable Ministers of this House and their friends who support them to co-operate with us in reducing their pay, and in doing this it is not by virtue of a certain desire to compel them to do so that I am moving this motion. If there is to be any opposition in this House, that opposition must equally be pledged towards retrenchment. It is with that very definite desire that I have brought this motion and it is not with any idea that there should be any kind of competition between the two parties, a matter to which reference was made the other day. For these reasons, Mr. President, I would venture to appeal to the members of this House to dismiss all considerations except the truly patriotic consideration, the single consideration of seeking the betterment of the country and

seeking retrenchment in all directions. It does matter a great deal whether they will set a high example by accepting a lower salary. It does matter a great deal if they will go in for a policy of retrenchment. It is only in that desire that I would respectfully press this motion. I move my motion—

'19. *That the item of Rs.* 1,92,000 (*salary of Ministers*) *under* 22-*A* (*d*) *General Administration be reduced by a sum of Rs.* 84,000'."

Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai moved—

'20. *That the provision for the salary of Ministers under the demand* 22-*A* (*d*) *General Administration be reduced by Rs.* 84,000.'

In doing so, he said:—"While I wish to associate myself with everything that has been said by the previous speakers, I would like to add one or two words. I want to impress upon the House that the acceptance of this resolution is no reflection against any of our Ministers. They have our sympathy in the difficult task that they have to perform. One reason that was urged is that in prestige, power and all that they will suffer if they were to accept a lower salary. I must admit that there is some force in it. But then we will have to see from what point of view the prestige is to be determined. Is it from the point of view of the other half of Government or is it from the point of view of the general tax-payer or is it from the point of view of the Council Members who are assembled here and who represent the general tax-payers? Representing as I do the general tax-payer, I only feel the burden of heavy salaries and am not conscious of prestige or want of it anywhere. One irreconcilable feature of the Indian administration is that it is very costly, and it is admitted on all hands that if is our duty to see that this system is attacked wherever there is opportunity. The Government of India Act prohibits us from entering into other regions. We are powerless with respect to these appointments which come under this Act. Therefore so far as it lies in our power it is our bounden duty to see that retrenchment is effected. It is only in that view that I feel it my duty to support this motion."

Mr. P. Siva Rao:—"The resolution which I have in my name is slightly differently worded."

"It reads thus:—

'21. *That under the head of* 22-*A* (*d*) *the salary of the Ministers may be fixed at Rs.* 4,000 *per mensem and the allotment of Rs.* 1,92,000 *may be reduced accordingly to Rs.* 1,44,000.'

"The three amendments that have been now proposed suggest a salary of Rs. 3,000. The amendment in my name proposes a salary of Rs. 4,000 per mensem. I agree to speak on this resolution along with the other amendments, but this amendment may be put to the vote separately after the whole matter has been discussed.

"Before I proceed further, I disown all personal considerations in a matter like this. Let it not be understood for one moment that this question reflects any personal feeling. Let it not be understood that this resolution or this amendment, if carried out, will have the effect of a censure against the Ministers. Nor let it be understood that this amendment, if it is carried out, will have the effect of disapproval of any appointments of Ministers that have been made. If any such considerations are entertained by Honourable Members—I do not believe they are—

I take this opportunity of most emphatically repudiating them. I was solely actuated by the interests of the country, by the demand for economy and for retrenchment in other departments.

"Now, Sir, this motion, as I stated before, is slightly different from the others. It proposes a salary of Rs. 4,000. The only issue before the House is whether at this juncture we can afford to pay the Honourable Ministers on the scale on which we have been paying the Members of the Executive Council. The Hon'ble the Finance Member may get up and say that there is no deficit. He has been able to save only 70 lakhs of rupees. Whether in the face of this deficit—whether in the face of the cry that has been raised everywhere for increased allotments under various heads such as sanitation, medicine, recruitments to the subordinate services—whether in the face of all this we can afford to incur this additional expenditure, that is the sole issue for the consideration of the House. The House has also got to consider whether the salary of Rs. 4,000 proposed by myself or the Rs. 3,000 that has already been proposed by the three Honourable Members is sufficient to keep the Honourable Ministers in a fair degree of comfort and whether either of the two figures is commensurate with the onerous duties that they are called upon to perform. These are the only two issues for consideration and I would appeal to the Honourable Members to take a dispassionate view of the whole affair. It is stated that the status of the Members of the Executive Council and that of the Ministers should be the same. I submit, Sir, that status and salary do not go hand in hand. The status of an officer depends upon the exalted conscience which he has to maintain when he is called upon to perform the duties of his office. A clear distinction should be made between salary and status. A man may be receiving nothing and the duty imposed upon him may be honorary, but it does not mean that his status is small. I can multiply instances, but for the present I take this instance. The office of the President of the Madras Corporation is purely honorary, while a subordinate there gets Rs. 1,000. Can it be contended for one moment that the President commands a lesser status than the Engineer who gets Rs. 1,200 or so and in this instance I cannot do better than quote from the Select Committee's Report on the Government of India Bill where they draw a clear distinction between the status and pay of officers.

"From page 6 of the report it would appear that they advised that the status of the Ministers should be similar to that of the Executive Councillors but that the salaries of the Ministers should be fixed by the Legislative Council. It would thus appear that thereby a clear distinction is drawn between the status of Ministers and their salaries. In the case of status, they say that it should be similar to that of the Members of the Executive Council, but in regard to the salaries of the Ministers the discretion is solely vested in the Legislative Council. Later on in this report it was suggested that Indian members of the India Council in London should be paid a higher salary than the European Members of the Council domiciled in India. The same principle they suggest might be followed in regard to the salaries of Ministers. The same principle was suggested to the Legislative Council that it was reasonable for the Ministers of Provincial Governments to be paid a lower scale of remuneration than the European Members. It is also quite true that the European Members of the Executive Council have some reason to be paid higher salaries than Ministers under Provincial Governments. Quite apart from that question, Sir, there is one other consideration. The time will come, I

11-45 a.m.

am sure, when we may be entitled to reduce the salaries of the Members of the Executive Council but now at the present moment we find ourselves impotent and powerless because the matter is out of our hands. But to say that we are powerless does not mean that we cannot effect any retrenchment in other directions. To my mind it is not reasonable to say that because the members of the Executive Council are paid high salaries, the Ministers also ought to be paid the same salaries.

"Now, Sir, it is notorious that the administration of this country—not merely in this province but it is equally notorious in other provinces—is maintaining the most costly service in the world. It is also notorious that this country has been paying the highest salaries in the world. The only distinction to make is a comparative one. The salaries that are now proposed to be paid to the Ministers here are higher than those obtaining in any other country in the world. I may say, Sir, that no party or other considerations actuate the members of this House in regard to this motion. This is an opportunity for the Honourable Members to set an example to the country, when there is a very large amount of discontent in this Presidency especially among the non-gazetted officers. These officers say that the powers that be, the responsible authorities who are putting into their pockets large sums of money, when it comes to the question of paying these low-paid officers increased wages, have been invariably saying that money is not available. Now, Sir, by way of allaying that discontent the Ministers would do well to appreciate the position of the non-gazetted officers and practise a bit of self-sacrifice in the larger interests of the country. If they do so, they will set an example not only to the country and other officers but also to the members of the Executive Council that they should be satisfied with less. Now coming to the statute, it has been laid down in section 52 that 'there may be paid to any Minister so appointed in any province the same salary as is payable to a member of the Executive Council in that province unless a smaller salary is provided by vote of the Legislative Council of the Province'. Ordinarily the statute fixes the same salary for the Ministers as is paid to the Members of the Executive Council. It is not so very imperative. It only provides for a maximum, and this maximum is the salary that is now paid to the Members of the Executive Council. But the discretion is vested in the Legislative Council to fix it."

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI:—"Mr. President, Sir, you will kindly perit me to say a word upon this important subject. I have heard the arguments of the Honourable Members and I appreciate them. But there are other considerations, which weigh with me, and one is that I do not want a distinction should be made between the Executive Councillors and the Ministers. It is the pay that goes a great way in the estimation of the public to give status either to the Ministers or the Executive Councillors. If you make a distinction in the pay it will be something like the distinction that was made between the Civilian officers and the Statutory Civilians. We are aware of the sense of inferiority felt by the Statutory Civilians, and we are aware of the disabilities suffered by those officers, because their pay was only two-thirds of the pay of the Civilians. I think, Sir, the Ministers ought to draw the same pay as Executive Councillors. This conviction has been borne in on me from the time the scheme was first broached. Discussions have taken place in the Press, in conferences and in the Congress. All public bodies representing public opinion have urged that there should be no distinction whatever in the status and pay of the Ministers and the Executive Councillors. I would strongly urge on the Council to vote for the sum of Rs. 5,333,

the sum received by every one of the Executive Councillors. There was an appeal to the Ministers that they can, if they like, draw a sum less than the pay of the Executive Councillors, viz., Rs. 3,000. If they can make an effective appeal to the Executive Councillors to make them consent to receive Rs. 3,000, I think the Ministers will only be ready to receive Rs. 3,000, but so long as we cannot compel them and so long as they will not yield to take less pay, I do not think it is reasonable to ask the Ministers to accept only Rs. 3,000.

"I may at once state to the Council that my position is rather peculiar. As Deputy President I have no party. I am neither a Brahman, nor a non-Brahman nor a European. I am an Indian, and I may adapt quite appropriately the language used by the editor of the *Madras Mail* in last night's leader (last paragraph) under the heading 'Why'.

"As a Deputy President I take my stand as I have always taken it on the grounds of India's welfare. I am for no party. I am neither Brahman nor non-Brahman, European nor Indian. I am independent. My policy is dictated by my love for my country and my people and my desire is for order and rapid progress towards self-government within the British empire. If in the pursuit of that policy I offend any party, the offence is inevitable. I cannot sacrifice those principles which I hold dear. I shall support no party, but that which makes the good of India its aim.

"Actuated by these motives I make bold to rise in opposition to the motion for the reduction of the salary of the Ministers. I know that the ratepayers and taxpayers are very poor. There is no doubt about that. But I would like to say that their elected representatives, the Ministers, should be on the same footing as those that are appointed by the Sovereign, and I think the people would rather be proud of their Ministers being in the same position and status as the Executive Councillors. With these few words I oppose the motion."

Diwan Bahadur T. Desika Achariyar :—"Mr. President, Sir, I follow on the same lines as my predecessor Mr. P. Kesava Pillai. I belong to no party. But like him, I feel that since four members of the Executive Council are receiving a salary of Rs. 5,333 each, there could be absolutely no justification for saying that the three Ministers should receive anything less. Their status must be maintained and their position must be treated as equal to that of the Executive Councillors. The elected Ministers under the Reforms Scheme will form part of the Government and they must command the respect of the people. It is all very well to say that it is not money that makes a man's position but unfortunately it is common knowledge that it is the salary which ordinarily connotes the position and status of officers. It is I think therefore absolutely necesssary that the Ministers elected by the people should have the same status as the other part of the Government and also the pay which is fixed in the case of the Executive Councillors. I do not for a moment believe that the duties and responsibilities of the Ministers are going to be less than those of the Executive Councillors, having regard to the way in which the Ministers have to find money for the transferred subjects and to their precarious position in that their existence as Ministers is dependent upon the vote of the Council. In these circumstances I do not want to labour the point further. My position is that the Ministers should be maintained in the same position and accorded the same status as Members of the Executive Council. Therefore I oppose the motion."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—" Mr. President, I suppose most of the Honourable Members will remember that before the formation of the Ministry, I expressed my views in the Press advocating that Ministers should get no pay and that they should work gratis for the country, and if that is not possible, charge only the actual expenditure for living in Madras and going about. Somehow nobody took notice of my representations and later on it appears to me that under the existing rules it is obligatory that Ministers should be paid some salary. If that is not obligatory, I would even now press that there should be no salary, and that they should be paid only their expenses, but as it does not seem to be possible and as pay is to be paid to them I do not think there is any justification for reducing their pay as compared with that of the Executive Councillors. They carry on almost the same business. They command the same amount of respect from the people and from the officials concerned. Our saying that pay has nothing to do with status and that the President of the Madras Corporation, though he gets no pay, is certainly above the Commissioner and commands greater respect is very good. But this is not a case of an honorary appointment. The Ministers have got six to twelve hours work a day and they have got to command regard from a number of Imperial officers, small and big. If the pay of the Ministers should be less than the pay of the officer, who serves as his assistant, I do not think he can influence him. In these circumstances, I am strongly of opinion that until this Council can find means of getting the pay of the Executive Councillors and the Ministers reduced to Rs. 3,000, the Ministers will have to be paid at Rs. 5,333."

12 noon.

The Rev. E. M. MACPHAIL :—" I have had great difficulty in making up my mind on this subject. I naturally believe strongly in retrenchment. I am also as anxious as the members on the front bench that we should have money, and there are many objects for which money is required, notably education.

" Although I am strongly in favour of retrenchment, I must say that the argument put forward by the Hon'ble Member Mr. T. Desika Achariyar has appealed to me very strongly and it seems to me that it is necessary that we should put our Ministers as regards salary on the same footing as Members of the Executive Council My reason for saying that is this. It is perfectly true, as various Honourable Members have stated in their speeches, that there should be no connexion between salary and status. But that is constantly stated in theory and as constantly neglected in practice. We find constantly in this country that a man who does not receive the same pay as another man is looked down upon as being essentially inferior. I do not believe it myself but that is what I have found in my own experience.

" With regard to the question as to how much the Ministers should obtain, I personally should like to see all salaries cut down, all salaries of all people, if it could be done. But the question is : can it be done. It seems to me that at the present moment when prices have gone up enormously high, it is absolutely impossible to have very much of cutting down of salaries. Now it would be an anomaly if persons who are in the highest position and who are ranked as Ministers are paid practically no more or hardly any more than men who are their subordinates. I do not intend to go into the question whether the administration has been expensive in the past or not. There has been very often a great deal of nonsense talked on this subject. If we compare the salaries paid to people at Home and the salaries paid to people in the same position here, we don't find very much difference but we find here far too many officials, far too many people employed by

Government and there is a general tendency, whether it is a democratic bureaucracy like France or an autocratic bureaucracy as in this country to multiply the officials especially in the subordinate places. What we want to do is to get rid of a very large number of them and pay the men who are doing their work adequate remuneration. That is one solution.

"The Hon'ble Member Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar says that we need more money. We do want more money. If we want to get money we should put a heavier income-tax upon those who are drawing large salaries. I should like to say: tax all people in such a way that the tax will touch not merely the members on the front Government bench but also the members of the front opposition bench. This will enable them to contribute a very large portion of their income in order that we may be able to pay adequate remuneration to those who are doing the work of the State."

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB:—"I beg to oppose the motion before the House. When the Reforms proposals were before the country, nobody came forward with this retrenchment policy or said that a Minister's salary ought to be lower than that of an Executive Council Member. That was the proper time when this should have been done. If we had only made this proposal then, perhaps a lower salary to the Minister might have been embodied in the Government of India Act itself. Sir, on the contrary what do we find? All the distinguished politicians of this country and all the important political bodies came forward with their representations and suggestions that the status of the Ministers should be the same as that of the Executive Councillors. Now on the strength of these proposals it has been enacted that ordinarily the Ministers should be paid the same salary as is payable to the Members of the Executive Council unless the legislature reduces the salary of the former. By reducing the salary now, we would be showing to the world at large the hollowness and insincerity of the representations made by our political representatives in England and this would have a very adverse effect on future political agitation in this country. Whenever we go forward with our represenations, the people in England might say that Indian politicians do not practise what they preach. This insincerity might be quoted as an illustration. Therefore, Sir, at least in the interests of our own country, it is better that these resolutions are withdrawn.

"Yesterday with regard to the question of furniture to Government House, speaker after speaker rightly pointed out that His Excellency the Governor is the representative of His Imperial Majesty the King Emperor and that he should keep up his dignity by having proper furniture in the Government House. I should like that the same concession should be extended to the Ministers also to keep up their position and dignity before the public. Should we lower their salary, I think there will not be the same respect shown to them as to the Executive Councillors. The other day in reply to a question by the Hon'ble Member Mr. Ramachandra Rao, you, Sir, stated that this Council should look upon the Government as a whole and that they had no business to make any distinction between the two halves of the Government. Now this resolution attempts to bring about a distinction by lowering the status of the popular half of the Government. Therefore, Sir, since the Ministers are the elected representatives of the people, I think it is our bounden duty to support them and see that their pay is not lowered at all. I therefore very strongly oppose these resolutions."

Mr. M. D. DEVADOSS :—" Mr. President, I oppose this motion for the reduction of the Ministers' salaries. Sir, before I go into the principles let me premise—if you will pardon me—by saying that this matter was considered last year in a committee ; (I am not committing any breach of confidence). Then I was strongly of opinion that the Ministers should have the same status and pay as the Executive Councillors. This I am obliged to mention to show that it is not any particular circumstance now that has influenced me in coming to this conclusion.

" Sir, before the Joint Committee and when the Reform Bill was before the House of Commons, every attempt was made to make the Ministers equal in position and status with the Executive Councillors. Now, Sir, after the whole thing has come into being, it is not proper to go back upon what we tried to achieve before.

" My reason for opposing this motion, as has been pointed out by one Honourable Member, is that in this country, unfortunately a man's position is estimated by the salary he receives. It is within the knowledge of every one that when you happen to travel in a railway, some people ask ' what are you ? ' If you answer that you are a vakil or a doctor, they ask you ' how much do you make ? ' If you say you are a Government servant, they put you the same question.

" They do not value the man at anything more than the salary that he gets. That is the popular opinion. It may be unfortunate. But, Sir, we have to take circumstances as we find them. If the Ministers' pay is cut down, people will think that they are not doing the same work as the Council members or that their position is considerably inferior. I do not for a moment suggest that the Council Members themselves will look upon them as inferior ; but I fear that the world at large might think that these people are probably doing some inferior kind of work.

" There is another consideration which ought to weigh with us. The tenure of office of Ministers is not secure If they are men making a large fortune either at the bar or elsewhere, they have to sacrifice their practice and work for two or three years as Ministers for the good of the country. Is it proper Sir, under the circumstances, that they should forego all the advantages of their position at the bar or in the medical profession or anywhere else just for the sake of public good and at the same time be made to suffer temporarily ? The salary that they now get is nothing more than what they are entitled to. In this country there is a cry that the services are very highly paid. But in this country, we have to take into consideration a number of circumstances. The salaries of the members of the Civil Service were fixed with regard to conditions which existed years ago. I do not want to go into that question now. But we must remember that, if we reduce the salaries of the Ministers, we make it not possible for them to live in comfort. We must take that into consideration in voting upon this question. I do not think we can say that in the interests of economy, the salaries of the Ministers, who are our elected representatives, in whom we have confidence and in whom the House has confidence, should be cut down. There are a number of things which can be cut down in order to pay fair salaries to the Ministers. After all how much are we going to save, it is only Rs. 72,000 per annum. We certainly can find money to pay this. On the other hand if you cut down their salaries, many people who may be inclined to accept office may hesitate to do so. We should never place them in a position of irksomeness, or in a position of constant worry about their finance."

23rd March 1921] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" Mr. President, I need hardly say that I rise to oppose this motion for reduction of the salaries of Ministers. Only at the last sitting we were told by the Honourable Member for the University that there was no party in this House. I am glad the Honourable Member has recognized that he made a mistake and has changed that view and recognizes that there is a party for retrenchment. May I ask, is it in pursuit of retrenchment that he has been the President of lots of non-gazetted officers' associations who are clamouring for more pay, the President of elementary teachers' associations who are asking for more pay and of labour associations whose duty it is, or who make it their duty, to ask for more pay and thereby put a demand upon the tax-payer? Is that his practice of the doctrine that he has been preaching? May I draw the attention of the House to section 52 of the Government of India Act which says that ' there may be paid to any Minister so appointed in any province the same salary as is payable to Member of the Executive Council in that province, unless a smaller salary is provided by a vote of the Legislative Council of the province '? Was not that clause the result of the unanimous and united agitation that was carried on by all shades of political opinion in this country, whether it be in the Punjab, in Madras where the controversy as to Brahman and non-Brahman has been going on, in Bengal or in Bombay? Did not the united voice of the country find an expression and did not that principle find a recognition in the enactment of that section? What then has since happened that leads my honourable friend and the other speakers to think that the provision in the section ' unless a smaller salary is provided by a vote of the Legislative Council of the province ' should be put in motion? This power to reduce the salary was sought to be exercised in other provinces as was pointed out by other speakers, but it was not accepted. Then why is it sought to be exercised in Madras only? Is it because the ministry has beyond all expectations been formed out of a party which my friends on the opposite side least expected to come to power and to occupy the front bench? May I ask the Honourable Member, Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar, whether in all the political speeches that he has been making all over the country since he resigned the office of Advocate-General, either when he was a member of the Congress, or subsequently after he seceded from the Congress, he ever made the reduction of the salaries of Ministers a plank on which he was going to conduct his political activities in this Council? I ask, Sir, is it not after the non-Brahman party have come into power and after the ministry was chosen from them that he has embraced this opinion contrary to that of all political parties who said that the status and the pay of the Ministers shall be the same as those of the Executive Councillors? He is prepared to go further than all these parties and to say that the status of the Ministers is higher than that of the Executive Councillors. I am very thankful to him for that, but he is proposing that their pay shall be less. While he says that their status is higher, he says that their remuneration shall be in inverse ratio to the dignity which they occupy. May I ask, Sir, without meaning any offence, whether that is the tradition in the profession which he himself follows? Is it not a fact that lawyers who have been elevated to the office of Advocate-General have elected to increase their claims for fees. If that is so, where lawyers are concerned, why should only Ministers practise a virtue, which is no doubt very good, but which it is not easy to practise? May I again ask, if the interests of the country demanded that there should be economy in the administration and that the Ministers' salaries should be reduced, why did not my friend announce this view while the election campaigns were going on but kept his light hidden under a bushel until after the ministry was formed? "

12-15 p.m.

Khan Bahadur QADIR NAWAZ KHAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" Mr. President, Sir, we are all anxious to effect retrenchment and unless we do so, we shall not be able to meet the several demands we are going to have in the very near future. But with all that, I am afraid that some of us are putting our fingers in the wrong spot. For instance, I pointed out yesterday that we were attempting the reduction of a small item of Rs. 55,000 for furniture to His Excellency the Governor, forgetting the fact that it was not a grant made to His Excellency the Governor personally, but it was a grant made . . . ."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" Sir, I do not know if the member can make any speech about that Rs. 55,000 now."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" The Honourable Member is perfectly entitled to make that speech. Mr. Quadir Nawaz Khan will now go on."

Khan Bahadur QADIR NAWAZ KHAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" I find that now we are going to the wrong quarter again. Here again, Sir, I think that the question of the pay of the Ministers is not a thing that can be made a party question. The position of the Ministers must be exactly the same as that of Executive Councillors not only in regard to their status but in regard to their pay and everything else. As the Rev. Mr. Macphail and Mr. Desika Achariyar observed, the importance of an office is measured in India by the amount of emoluments that it carries and not by the position.

" Secondly, these appointments are considered to be the highest appointments and they should carry a salary which is sufficient to keep up their dignity. Again, as observed by Mr. Devadas, very often occasions may arise for people of great eminence to take up these appointments. I mean barristers, lawyers with extensive practice who are making Rs. 10,000 and Rs. 20,000 a month, and it will be simply idle to expect that such men would throw away such large incomes and take up an appointment to which a salary of only Rs. 2 000 and odd is attached. We have seen that Lord Sinha who took up the appointment of Executive Councillor had to throw it up on account of the insufficiency of salary. Then as regards my friend, the Hon'ble Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar, he went to the High Court and threw up the appointment."

The Hon'ble Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" May I ask the Honourable Member to leave me alone ? "

Khan Bahadur QADIR NAWAZ KHAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" I then withdraw it. These are appointments of great eminence and they should be made worth while for men of position to take them up. It is said that the salary of Rs. 3,000 is very high. Unless they are prepared to lead a life of *sanyasis*, I don't think that the salaries are high at all. I am a retired officer and I am not able to make both ends meet with Rs. 1,500. Times have changed, and our drivers who used to get Rs. 30 are now demanding Rs. 60 ; prices have increased ; everything has gone up ; so that I think even Rs. 5,000 is not at all too high a salary, and I shall not be surprised to hear some of the Members getting Rs. 5,300 being obliged to supplement their income in order to meet their expenses. For these reasons, I maintain that the salary of the Ministers must be kept on a par with that of the Executive Councillors. I do not wish to see any reduction made in the pay of the Council Members either, for I do not think they are high at all."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Sir, I also wish to say one word against this resolution. My friends who have moved this resolution and who have spoken in support of it have stated that their only object in moving it is to

effect retrenchment. So far as I am concerned, that assurance on the part of my honourable friends was quite superfluous. My respect for them is so high that even without any statement of that kind from any of them, I would not have thought that they had any other object in proposing this resolution. Arguments have been advanced both here and outside this assembly in support of this resolution and against this resolution, and I admit, Sir, that logical arguments can be found in support of both positions. But the world is very largely influenced by considerations of sentiment and I am not sorry that it is so. But for the great influence of sentiment in the conduct of human affairs, men would be soulless machines So that, apart from the question of argument and of being guided by sentiment alone, I feel strongly, Sir, that the people at large, the world at large, though not this Council, will certainly think that there is a difference in the status of the Ministers and the status of the Executive Councillors if their pay be different. It is the object of this reform that the two halves of Government should sit together and deliberate on all subjects which are to be administered either by the Executive Council Members or by the Ministers. It is only the final responsibility with reference to the decision concerning each of these subjects that rests upon either the Ministers or the Executive Councillors. It is specifically laid down that the deliberations should be joint, and when the deliberations are joint, when they sit as equals, is not the world justified in thinking that there is a difference in their status if their pay is different? For that reason I am opposing this resolution.

"Then, Sir, it has already been brought to the attention of this House that gentlemen for whose opinion I have very great respect and who have bestowed considerable thought upon political subjects, many, if not all of them, stated before the Joint Committee of the House of Lords and the House of Commons that the salary and the status—those are the words used by them—the salary and status of both Ministers and Executive Councillors, though they may differ from province to province, should be the same within each province, and in my opinion that opinion is a very sound one.

"I may also refer to one other consideration, though it is not a final deciding factor in the settlement of this question. I refer to the opinions of other Councils in India. The Legislative Councils of Bihar, Bengal, United Provinces and Bombay discussed this question at length and came to the conclusion that the pay of the Ministers and of the Executive Councillors should exactly be the same. And as that is the opinion of men whose opinions are entitled to some weight, I adduce that also as another reason for opposing this resolution. In fact much light has already been thrown upon this question so that there is no need for enlarging further upon it. But I may say this, Sir, that I am certainly of opinion that the pay of the Executive Councillors is certainly too high, but, as has been said, we have no power to touch it, and so long as it remains as it is now, the salaries of Ministers also, I am strongly of opinion, should be the same."

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, there is a proverb in our part of the country, in Ganjām మూడు సంలు సాముచేసి మూలనున్న ముసలమ్మను కొట్టినాడు.

"That is, a man after developing his strength by physical exercise to a particular stage used it against an old woman who was in a corner. So, we have developed and attained responsible Government and we are using it against our representatives and we are using it with great sympathy also. I don't base my arguments on what has been said before in opposing this motion, but I wish to

base my arguments in opposing this motion on the reasons stated by that very energetic exponent of public views in Western India, the *Indian Social Reformer*, a radical paper, with whose views I generally agree. The *Indian Social Reformer* advocated that the status and the salary of the Ministers should be the same as that of Executive Councillors. I would not reiterate here all the arguments that the *Indian Social Reformer* has stated. I don't want to take up the time of the Council, but it will be sufficient to say that they are so convincing, that if the Member for the University had only read them he would not have put forth the arguments which he has advanced to-day. I looked forward to a very able argument from him in support of this resolution, but I regret to say I was disappointed in his merely making an appeal to sentiment; and if sentiment is to control and govern us in our judgments, I am not sure what this House will do. We must be guided by reason and precedent, and if reason and precedent fail, then we must appeal to sentiment.

2-30 p.m. "Expressing, therefore, the views stated in the *Indian Social Reformer*, the radical advocate of India's progress, I oppose this motion. While public opinion in every part of the country is against this motion and while the reasons given by Mr. Paranjpye in his recent address, after he accepted the office of the Minister, are equally convincing, I think I need not make any further remarks. I do not base my arguments on any sentiment nor appeal to the Ministers to reduce their own salaries. But I base my arguments on public opinion and on what has passed in the discussions before the Joint Committee."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"May I know, Sir, if any Member on behalf of Government will speak on this motion?"

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"I have nothing to do with that. If the Honourable Member wishes to speak, he can do so."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I believe it is usual for some member of Government to stand up at an early stage of the discussion and to indicate to the House the views held by the Government on the motion under discussion. No Honourable Member of Government has taken this course. I am sorry that this debate is going on without any indication of the views of the Government. If these views are stated at a later stage I regret I shall have no opportunity to reply to the arguments of the Government Member. In the first place I wish to refer to the statements made by Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. He has taken my friend Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar severely to task and said that his practice was somewhat different from his professions. I am certain that my honourable friend will take very good care of himself. But may I remind my honourable friend, who is now pleading at this juncture that the salaries of the Ministers should be exactly the same as those of the Executive Councillors, of a passage in the *Justice*, the accredited organ of the party to which he belongs, dated the 9th February 1920? This was long before the present Ministry was formed. I regret to say that he has made an insinuation that this agitation about Ministers' salaries has come after the appointment of the present Ministry. I will just indicate to him the views held by his party before the appointment was made. The passage in question is as follows:—

'We are of those who think that the patriotic gentlemen who are brimming over with enthusiasm to serve their country and their countrymen and who look forward to be Ministers and other high officials under the new dispensation, will

accept but nominal salaries or sumptuary allowances, so that the humblest men in the country, blest alike with character and brains, may also have a chance of serving its best interests. Against fat salaries and things of that kind upon which the agitators who profess to be very altruistic are really keen we must protest. With the office, dignity and power associated with it the man must be satisfied. That is the true test of patriotism. We hope that the country will apply this test and not any other which will suit the self-seeking man's purpose. Salary is not often the true test of dignity, power and prestige. The Prime Minister of England who practically appoints the Lord Chancellor of England, the Viceroy of India, the Viceroy of Irelaud and other such high dignitaries in the British Empire, only draws a salary much less than what these high officers receive. His pay is on a level with that of any Secretary of State who serves as his colleague, but whose ministerial existence can be terminated by him. Let us see whether our politicians who aim at ministerships and other posts under the new system of diarchy will be satisfied with small salaries.'

"Now, Sir, I ask my Hon'ble friend Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar when and why this change of front on his part about the equality of pay of Ministers has come about. I do not wish to pursue this matter any further. I wish Honourable Members will see that this is the first occasion on which the question of salaries of the Ministers has come under discussion in this Council. The Council has for the first time to decide, taking into consideration all the circumstances, what emoluments should be attached to the office of Minister. We have to consider, taking all circumstances into consideration, what the salary of a Minister should be. Under those circumstances, I submit, with great respect, that the position taken up by Mr. Siva Rao is the correct one and that Rs. 4,000 ought to be regarded as quite ample, to keep up the dignity of the office. This pay, I fully believe, ought to attract men in the front rank of public life and I think that in this country Rs. 4,000 should be considered as quite ample to induce persons of ability, competence and character to occupy these offices. I am one of those who like Rev. Mr. Macphail believe that the salaries in this country are very high and some attempt ought to be made for reducing them all round. The Hon'ble the Finance Member stated the other day that the machinery of administration should be examined right through and I think we ought to begin at the top."

Mr. S. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI:—"Mr. President, Sir, what the past politicians had been trying to do, the present politicians are now trying to undo. For, from the year 1862 up to the time of the Congress which was held in Lucknow in 1916, the burden of the song of the politicians was that there should be equal pay, equal pension, equal leave, equal status, etc. But, here, we are now crying for equal status but less pay. My Hon'ble friend Mr. Ramachandra Rao said that salaries have nothing to do with dignity. I am very sorry that it took such a long time for him to understand that salaries have nothing to do with dignity. When he was giving evidence before the Parliamentary Committee, he was very anxious to see that Indian gentlemen were paid equally with English gentlemen. As regards the position, I must ask who are these Ministers? They are the right or left arm of the Government of Madras, the representatives of His Imperial Majesty the King-Emperor. My friend says that money has nothing to do with dignity. But I think, Sir, that everything is judged by the income which a man gets. 'What is the man worth,' they say; even independent States are judged by income and whichever Government gets more, it carries greater respect than others which get less. So what will be the status of the Ministers if they are paid

less? Of course, I do not blame our brethren who propose reduction, for they judge from the Indian point of view. In India, in this ancient land, high pay has never been the rule. They always lived upon the perquisites they got.

"Indians in former days were particular about Government posts and never cared for salary so much. Dr. Schwartz of Tanjore fame has written in his memoirs about the Government servants of Mysore under Hyder. When he went to Mysore, when Hyder was ruling, he found the Government servants of the State were paid very small pay about Rs. 6. But each servant was worth lakhs. The reason was they were living on perquisites and not on salary. Of course our people were not given equal status for a long time. It was said natives were not fit and Englishmen did not like to serve under natives. That was the objection raised by the English people then. But, on the other hand, politicians like Sir Robert Peel and Lord Lansdown were for granting equality of treatment to us and gradually we got it. When we have attained the highest position, our people want to pull us down. Mr. Dadabhoy Naoroji said that whatever money was paid to the Indian officer it would not go out of the country. We always complained that the English officials carried away all the money. Why should we object to our own Ministers, our own kith and kin, our own flesh and blood, being paid equally with the English officials? Further they have got many duties to discharge. The calls on their purses are many. I therefore oppose this motion."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—"Sir, as we have been asked for a statement as to the attitude of the Government, I think I ought to say a few words. I am glad to recognize that the proposers of these motions concede that we are discussing Ministers in the abstract and not Ministers in the concrete. I take it that what we are attempting to do is to settle what should be the proper salary of the Ministers for all time. What we shall settle now is what pay is suitable for Ministers of whatever party. When once that is done, any vote hereafter to reduce the salary of Ministers will be a vote of censure. Therefore I deprecate the making of personal appeals to the present Ministers to accept a reduction which will reduce the salary for all time.

"Now, as regards the question what is a suitable salary, we have already had all the precedents quoted to us—the National Congress, the Muslim League, the Moderate Conference, the Governments of Bombay, of Bengal, of the United Provinces and of Bihar."

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"There is the Central Provinces."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—"The Honourable Member reminds me of the Central Provinces. Does he wish the House to place Madras on a level with the youngest and smallest of the provinces of India? (Laughter). I take it he does not. That being so, I will spare the House further quotations except for one thing. We are all attempting to make retrenchments in all directions. There has been no greater apostle of retrenchment than the late Mr. Gokhale. The other day when discussing retrenchment we had extracts read to us from Mr. Gokhale's great speech on retrenchment in the Imperial Council in 1909—a speech which I had the privilege of hearing as a Member of that Council and which made a great impression on me at the time. I should like to read to the House a further extract of that speech. Mr. Gokhale said :—

My Lord, my third suggestion is that there should now be a more extended employment of the indigenous Indian agency in the public service. In this connexion I am free to recognize the necessity of paying as a rule the Indian at a lower rate of payment than the Englishman who holds the same office. I think this is part of our case. If we insist on Indians being paid at the same rates as Englishman, we cut away a large part of the ground from under our feet,—'

23rd March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter]

"I would like in passing to call the attention of Honourable Members who have referred to the difference in pay between the Imperial and Provincial services to this passage. Continuing, he said :—

'except in regard to those offices, with which a special dignity is associated such, for instance, as Memberships of Executive Councils, High Court Judgeships and so forth, where of course there must be strict equality, even as regards pay, between the Indian and the Englishman.'

"Sir, I claim the respected authority of the late Mr. Gokhale for this proposition of equality."

12 45 p.m.

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—"I am also one of those who first sent up a resolution to reduce the salary of the Ministers last month. I am sorry I have to change my opinion. My own reason is that if there should be any pay it should be a proper pay ; if not, there should be no pay at all. For example the President of the District Board which place had been hitherto occupied by the Collector has to control the District Board Engineer who is paid between Rs. 700 to Rs. 900 per mensem. If the District Board President were paid Rs 500, what would be his position ? The Ministers have to practically sit in judgment over the opinions of the Secretaries who are now paid about Rs. 2,700, Director of Public Instruction, Local and Municipal Secretary, etc. If these officers' opinions are to be considered and decided by the Ministers, the Ministers should be on a footing of equality with the Executive Council Members. But when time comes for reducing the pay of all the higher officers, then it will be proper to reduce the pay of the Ministers as well. With regard to the Provincial Civil Service, I know that Provincial Civil Service men, when there is a highly-paid Assistant or Sub-Collector under them, feel their position very much though their status is that of a Collector. I have heard of it myself. Especially when the elected representatives are being given this status, they should also be given their due salary so that they may command a position. Therefore I strongly oppose this proposition."

Mr. K. V. RAMACHARI :—"I rise to support the proposition before the House. I am really very sorry that almost all or many of the members of this House forget that there is no difference between the dignity and status and the salary of any office. But in one way we may say there is a difference. It may affect the status in one circumstance only. That is, if the same agency fixes the different salaries to persons carrying the same status then we may say that the less salary affects the status of the person drawing the less salary. Supposing the Parliament fixed different pay for the Members of the Council and for the Members of the Ministry, then sensible people would be led to think that they had reduced the status of the Ministers. Therefore it was the people of this country who agitated for the same status and for the same pay. The Parliament has done what the country wished and I do not know how Honourable Members of this House come to forget it. We agitated for their fixing the salary and status to be the same. If they had done otherwise the meaning would have been otherwise. And looking at the needs of expenditure in other directions, the House says that there must be retrenchment and the pay of the Ministers should be only three thousand or so. Therefore I do not think that that affects the dignity or the status of the Ministers. That is what I wanted to suggest and especially in these days when the House is for retrenchment in all quarters, wherever possible, and because the House has been given the opportunity of taking this into consideration, I believe that this is a just and proper occasion to do so. If the House has

been given the power of fixing the pay of the Executive Councillors as well as of the Ministers, certainly the House would have fixed the same salary even for Members of the Executive Council. In these circumstances, I think the mover of the resolution was quite just and I strongly support him."

Diwan Bahadur C. ARUNACHALA MUDALIYAR :—"I move that the question be now put."

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Before the question is put, may I rise to make a point of personal explanation with reference to Mr. Tanikachalam's speech?

"Mr. President, I was quite surprised that Mr. Tanikachalam should have referred to me in the way he did. But I feel perfectly certain that his argument was merely that of an advocate and he knew perfectly that there was very little inconsistency between what I preached and what I practised. As President of various associations I have demanded increase of pay for the poorer men. I am said to have moved in the matter only after the Ministry was formed. So far as I am concerned, I have been always committed to this and if he had not the opportunity of getting reports of my speeches or of reading them, it is not my fault. I have certainly taken this view and no speech of mine can be quoted to show that the Ministers should get the same salary as the Council Members. I have been always for retrenchment. There is no personal estoppel so far as I am concerned. I leave the judgment of the question in the hands of the House. But I am constrained to add it can only be approached from the high ideal of sentiment and cannot be approached....."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"I did not authorise the Honourable Member to deliver a speech but only to make a personal explanation."

The motion for closure was then put and carried.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"Before I put the main question, probably it will be convenient if I tell the Council how I put the resolution. Section 52 (1) of the Government of India Act says: 'That there shall be paid to any Minister so appointed in any province the same salary as is payable to a Member of the Executive Council in the province unless a smaller salary is provided by vote of the Legislative Council of the province'. I shall now put this to the vote in terms of the section of the Act. The Ministers are now drawing the salary of the Executive Councillors. A poll will be taken of those members who are in favour of a smaller salary, and of those who are not. If the majority are for a smaller salary, then the two motions before the House will be put in succession; otherwise, the motions will be considered lost."

A poll was then taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

1. Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.
2. ,, A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
3. ,, T. Sivasankaram Pillai.
4. ,, Suryanarayana.
5. ,, C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.
6. Sriman Sasibushana Rath.
7. Mr. Seshagiri Rao.
8. ,, Seturatnam Ayyar.
9. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
10. ,, T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
11. Dr. C. B. Rama Rao.
12. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao.
13. Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao.
14. ,, S. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
15. ,, A. S. Krishna Rao.
16. ,, P. Siva Rao.

Noes.

1. The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson.
2. ,, Mr. Todhunter.
3. ,, Muhammad Habib-ullah Sahib.
4. ,, Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
5. Mr. R. G. Grieve.
6. ,, A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
7. Dr. Subbarayan.
8. Mr. E. Periyanayagam.
9. ,, Adinarayana Reddi.
10. ,, Ankinedu Prasad.
11. ,, Appasami Nayudu.
12. ,, Appasami Vandayar.
13. ,, Arunachala Mudaliyar.
14. ,, T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.
15. ,, Devarajulu Nayudu.
16. ,, Ethirajulu Nayudu.
17. ,, Gopalakrishnayya.
18. ,, Gopal Menon.
19. ,, Muniswami Nayudu.
20. ,, Muttu Chettiyar.
21. ,, Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar.
22. ,, Narayanaswami Reddi.
23. ,, Natesa Mudaliyar.
24. ,, A. P. Patro.
25. ,, Ponnuswami Nayudu.
26. ,, P. T. Rajan.
27. ,, Ramayya Punja.
28. ,, Sarabha Reddi.
29. ,, Soundara Pandya Nadar.
30. ,, R. K. Shanmugam Chetti.
31. ,, Shanmugam Pillai.
32. ,, N. A. V. Somasundaram Pillai.
33. ,, S. Somasundaram Pillai.
34. ,, Suryanarayanamurthi Nayudu.
35. ,, Thangavelu Nayagar.
36. ,, Thangavelu Pillai.
37. Mr. Tanikachalam Chettiyar.
38. ,, Venkataranga Reddi.
39. ,, Venkataratnam Nayudu.
40. ,, Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.
41. ,, M. C. Raja.
42. ,, Kesavalu Pillai.
43. ,, Madurai Pillai.
44. ,, Guruswami.
45. ,, Kesava Pillai.
46. ,, M. Krishnan Nayar.
47. ,, Muttumanicka Achariyar.
48. ,, Sadasiva Bhat.
49. ,, Venkataramu Ayyar.
50. ,, Desikachariyar.
51. ,, T. Arumainatha Pillai.
52. ,, Arpudaswami Udayar.
53. ,, M. D. Devadoss.
54. ,, Mascarenhas.
55. ,, A. T. Palmer.
56. ,, Vandanam.
57. Rev. Macphail.
58. Mr. T. Richmond.
59. ,, Simpson.
60. ,, Govindoss Chathurbhuja Doss.
61. ,, McDougall.
62. ,, T. Namberumal Chettiyar.
63. ,, Venkatarangayya.
64. Hamid Sultan Marakkayar.
65. Qadir Nawaz Khan.
66. Saivid Ibrahim Rawuttar.
67. Muhammad Usman Sahib.
68. Abdul Razak Sahib.
69. Abdul Rahaman Sahib.
70. Munshi Md. Abdur Rahaman Sahib.
71. Ahmad Miran Sahib.
72. Mr. Bavotti Sahib.
73. Raja of Ramnad.

Neutrals.

1. The Hon'ble Mr. Subbarayalu Reddiyar.
2. ,, Ramarayaningar.
3. ,, Venkatareddi Nayudu.
4. Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.
5. Mr. Vellingiri Kavandar.
6. Sriman Biswanath Das.
7. Mr. T. M. Narasimha Charlu.
8. ,, K. V. Ramachari.
9. ,, M. V. Appa Rao Bahadur.

For 16; *Against* 73; *Neutral* 9.

The resolutions were declared lost.

After the motion for the reduction of Minister's salary was negatived, there was loud applause.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO:—"Is clapping of hands allowed, Sir"?

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"Yes".

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

'22. *That the demand for Rs.* 20,368 *being temporary addition to pay in Detailed Account No.* 22-*A General Administration—Executive Council, be reduced to one rupee.*"

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [23rd March 1921

'Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU moved—

'23. *That in the demand under* 22-*A* (*d*) *General Administration—Executive Councils, the grant Rs.* 6,200 *proposed for Hill journey allowance be reduced by Rs.* 3,100 (*Budget page* 65).

24. *That in the demand under* 22-*A* (*a*) (*d*) *General Administration, the grant Rs.* 10,000 *proposed for circulation expenses be reduced by Rs.* 3,000 (*Budget page* 65).'

In doing so, he said :—"I only wish that this Council will take up this question from where it was left after the discussion we had some time ago. We were then informed by the Hon'ble the Finance Member that it was decided that His Excellency would go to the Hills and summon the Cabinet on occasions when business required, and that only the necessary Secretariat establishment would be taken up. I do not find fault with Secretariat establishment, but after a statement that the Cabinet would be summoned only on occasions when the interests of business required was made, it should not have been necessary to increase the provision under the head of this allowance beyond what was actually spent in 1919–20. It is this that induced me to come forward with this motion and to suggest that the provision of Rs. 6,200 may be reduced by one-half. It will be found that Rs. 3,363 was spent in 1919–20 and even allowing for the increase in the number of Executive Council Members and Ministers, I think that the provision may reasonably be reduced to the figure which I have suggested. It is only under the head of hill journey allowance that I have suggested a reduction leaving the other items such as travelling allowance, etc., as they are at present. I think that there will be no objection to this reduction."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—"I hope I shall be able to set the honourable member's mind at rest if I give him rough details of this small entry of Rs 6,200. The sum of Rs 4,200 is sufficient to provide for each Member and Minister to go up and down once. The travelling allowance to the staff is Rs. 1,000 and the allowance for clerks who stay in Ootacamund is Rs. 1,000. I hope that in the face of this statement he will withdraw his motion."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I do not press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

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

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

'25. *That the grant of Rs.* 7,83,000 *under* 22-*A. General Administration—Heads of Provinces, Executive Councils and Ministers be reduced by Rs.* 1,00,000 (*Budget page* 61).'

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

That the following items of duty allowances be omitted :—

'26. 22-*C.* (*a*) *General Administration—Secretariats and Headquarters establishments, Civil Secretariats—*'

Duty allowance to Finance Assistant Secretary Rs. 1,800.

23rd March 1921] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

'27. *Delete Rs.* 1,800 *duty allowance to Assistant Secretary.*'

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

'28. *Duty allowance to Under Secretary, Revenue (Special), Rs.* 2,400.'

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

'29. *Delete Rs.* 2,400, *duty allowance to Under Secretary, Revenue (Special).*

'30. *Delete Rs.* 1,200, *duty allowance to Special Deputy Collector, Revenue (Special).*'

Diwan Bahadur M RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—

'31. *Duty allowance to Under Secretary, Local and Municipal, Rs.* 2,400.'

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

'32. *Delete Rs.* 2,400 *duty allowance to Under Secretary, Local and Municipal Department.*'

Mr. C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

'33. *To Under Secretary, Rs.* 2,400.'

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"The motion standing in my name runs as follows :—

'34. *That the provision Rs.* 2,400 *under* 22-*C (a) for duty allowances to Under Secretary in the Local and Municipal Department be omitted* (*Budget page* 71).'

"I have given notice of a similar motion as regards several other items of duty allowance and I would say only one or two words as regards that. I gave notice also to cut down the duty allowances of some civilian officers under the Government but under the existing rules, it seems it is privileged not to appear on the agenda paper.

"One explanation that was given for this duty allowance was this : if the pay of a particular person is Rs. 1,000 and he is got down here and is put on a particular work and that if subsequently he is found unsatisfactory he may be sent away and it is for that that the duty allowance is kept as duty allowance, and not added on to the pay. I want to ask only one question and that is this : if a Deputy Collector is brought here to Madras as Under Secretary and is given Rs. 200 as duty allowance, I want to know what becomes of his pay when he gets into a higher grade and I believe the salary of a Deputy Collector is Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 1,200. I suppose whether he is found fit or not, he will have to go away. The practice is that, if he gets into a higher grade and gets more than Rs. 1,000 a month for his pay he is sent away, and not as being disqualified, as seems to be the case in the case of Presidency Magistrates, and then another man is brought on the same grade of Rs 1,000. We should insist that the principle of duty allowance should be abolished whatever the circumstances may be and wherever that allowance is put up. Under these circumstances I move this motion as a matter of principle."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—"I have to trouble the House again with an explanation about duty allowance. I think some of the honourable members' elaborate arguments are based on wrong premises. The pay of a Deputy

Collector is incremental and is not fixed at Rs. 1,000. Let me take the instance of Under Secretaries. The pay of an Under Secretary, if he is an Indian Civil Service officer, is Rs. 1,000, and Rs. 700 if he is of the Provincial Civil Service. When the pay and the duty allowances were first started, we found that the officer who was getting Rs. 700 was too senior to do his work satisfactorily and therefore the device we adopted was to break the salary into Rs. 500 as pay and Rs. 200 as duty allowance. In point of fact this costs the Government less because a 400-rupees officer would get only Rs. 400 plus Rs. 200 as duty allowance. The Government is thus saving money instead of losing. In regard to this particular officer, he is an Indian Civil Service officer and this I hope will satisfy the honourable mover though it does not satisfy the officer in question."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I do not press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"The motion that stands in my name runs as follows :—

'35. *That Rs.* 22,000 *provided under* 22-*C* (*a*) *Secretariat, etc., for the Inspector of Municipal Councils and establishment be deleted* (*Budget page* 71).'

"Mr. President, the Inspector of Municipal Councils is a new appointment created on 17th December, just before the Hon'ble the Minister for Local Self-Government took charge. I know provision is made both in the Municipalities and Local Boards Acts for the appointment of an Inspector but we did not believe when such Acts were passed that an officer of this sort would be appointed permanently. There is already provision made in the budget for a more rigorous auditing by the Audit Department which will also be under the Local Government, I believe, from 1st April. So whatever control that may be necessary to be exercised on the local bodies can easily be exercised after getting reports from these auditors.

"Secondly with regard to the works that we are going to carry out out of the Provincial grants, the Superintending Engineer has to inspect the works, estimates and other things and he will have to send his reports to Government. I do not think the claim that was made at the time these Acts were passed that freedom was going to be given to the local bodies will be a just plea if the Inspector of local bodies is a Government officer, interfering with the affairs of local bodies. If the Inspector is going to do what he has been doing for the last three or four months, that is to say, he is going to remain for the greater portion of the period in the headquarters and do work practically as additional Secretary to Government, we have got no serious objection except to the name given to the officer. We in the mufassal will then have nothing to complain about the object for which he has been appointed. But the point is that he will not be inspecting the local bodies and municipalities, but will be an additional Secretary in the Local and Municipal department. I can understand the difficulties of the department. Several Acts have been newly passed and they are going to be brought into force. The Local Boards Act and the Education Act have to be dealt with particularly by the local bodies from the 1st of April and the Village Panchayat Acts will also have to be administered by this department. If the department feels that an additional officer is necessary, I have no objection to granting the same, but that does not seem to be the object of the creation of this office. If it is for the purpose of bringing into order the several institutions, as I have said, I have no objection to granting the appointment for a few months. If, on the other hand, he is going to be a permanent

officer in the name of the Inspector of Municipalities and Local Boards and not an additional temporary Secretary in the Local and Municipal department, I beg to submit that the office should be abolished. It will be a perpetual menace to local bodies, to their so-called freedom that is said to have been allowed under the new Acts. As I have said, if additional safeguard is necessary, the Act makes provision for the Collector to go into records and make inquiries and if at any time these local bodies require any special help and special inquiry of a serious nature then probably a temporary Inspector may be appointed for the time that will be necessary. Therefore there is absolutely no necessity for an appointment like that and it is in that view I move this motion."

Mr. P. Siva Rao :—" Sir, I have given notice of motion No. 36 which runs thus :

' 36. *That under the head of* 22–*C* (*a*) *Civil Secretaries the allotment of Rs.* 22,000 *for the Inspector of Municipal Councils may be omitted.*'

" It is a new appointment altogether. I am aware that under the District Municipalities Act there is a provision for the appointment of certain Inspectors to the Government and I do not think the provision contemplates an appointment of a regular staff in the shape of Inspector of Municipal Councils. The proviso says that Government can provide such inspecting staff as it deems fit from time to time. As regards the necessity for this appointment I do not see any necessity whatever and as regards what the functions are I do not think the Government Order which was communicated to the Municipal Councils enlightens us about the functions of the Inspector of Municipalities. I may take it that he is supposed to tour, study the condition of each local body and probably he is expected to give some sort of advice to them and he is also expected to be a sort of controlling authority. But now, Sir, we have got at the head of the department a Secretary, and the Hon'ble the Minister who looks after the Local and Municipal department. We have got an Under Secretary, the departmental Secretary and the Council Secretary and we have got the Collector who continues to be in spite of our loud protest even under the new Act a controlling authority. He can call for accounts and call for reports. In the case of Public Works there is a Superintending Engineer for each circle who advises on water works schemes. As it is, I see no necessity or utility in creating a new appointment as Inspector of Municipalities. I must say, Sir, that money voted on this officer is money ill spent. Under the new Act auditing of the municipal councils will be very stringent. We will see that municipalities have no freedom at all. In any view, Sir, I think the local bodies might be allowed to go on as they are and even during this year the Government have not made any grants to these local bodies. There is little or no necessity for continuing this appointment now. So for these reasons I want that the provision for that appointment to be removed."

1-15 p.m.

Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu :—" Mr. President, I gave notice of a similar motion to that moved by my honourable friend. But I understand the appointment is only temporary for one year and in view of what Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar has said we can find out whether there is any necessity for this appointment only at the end of the year. There is no reason why we should not try this appointment for one year only. Though I have given notice of a motion, I have now come to the view that we may try it for one year especially in view of the fact that under the new Act there is going to be some stringency and an officer of this

sort will serve the purpose by giving expert advice and bringing to the notice of the Ministry our needs and show how to finance them. Under these circumstances, I do not press the motion and I beg to withdraw it."

The following motion standing in the name of Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu was by leave of Council withdrawn :—

37. *That the demand for Rs.* 22,000 *for Inspector of Municipal Councils under the expenditure head No.* 22-*C* (*a*)—*General administration be reduced to Re.* 1.

Mr. F. J. RICHARDS :—"Mr. President, the appointment of the present Inspector of Municipalities was made in December last for a period of one year. The year will tide over a period of transition. The ship of Local Self-Government has passed from the old familiar routes followed during the past 50 years and has entered on unknown waters. The seas are unchartered. All we know is that they abound in rocks and shoals, and that possibly storms may be expected. Unless officers and crew work together with perfect harmony, shipwreck is certain. Our real anxiety (and the anxiety of this Council also, I hope), is, not so much the safety of the crew, as the safety, of the poor and the sick, the women and the children. There is not a man, woman, or child whose well-being is not involved in the safety of this ship.

"New Acts have recently been brought into force. They must be given effect to, and rules and by-laws have to be framed. There are new Acts for District Municipalities and Local Boards, Village Panchayats, Town Planning (compulsory town planning for some towns) and Education.

"The Financial Relations Committee raised many issues the full significance of which is only partially understood. We are face to face with a financial crisis due partly to the slump in trade, to the limitations on the sources of taxation and the amounts that can be borrowed and partly to the rise in prices and the demand which cannot be resisted that salary should be adjusted to the increased cost of living.

"Our accounts require revision and the Accounts Committee has just reported. The new accounts, it is hoped, will enable local bodies to obtain a clearer view of their finances, a clearer view of where further development is necessary and where retrenchment can best be effected ; in short, to get the best value for the money available.

"It is a hopeful sign that there is a growing interest in local and municipal affairs. There is a demand for a policy and a recognition of the need for a programme. The Local and Municipal Conference of July last was, I believe, generally welcomed, and stimulated interest. It provided an invaluable interchange of views and experiences. But it is only possible at a Conference to deal with general principles. There is no scope for individual hearing or for the detailed consideration of special local difficulties and disabilities. Again, it is costly. Only a few were selected out of 200 Presidents and Chairmen, and the cost of that Conference was Rs. 6,000.

"Again, new principles have recently been enunciated, and they require hard thinking and new machinery. Capital expenditure should be met from loans instead of from current revenues. Machinery has to be introduced for raising loans and facilities have to be provided for manipulating them. Payment for services rendered is another principle which it is proposed to substitute for doles, and a condition precedent to it is a definite policy and programme. There is, again the

23rd March 1921] [Mr. F. J. Richards]

development of resources other than taxation. Amazing differences exist between one local body and another in the extent to which these resources are developed and the possibilities of development are illimitable—markets, cart-stands, slaughter-houses, tree planting and the utilization of filth and rubbish for economic purposes. Above all there is land exploitation which should be a source of profit, instead of mere excuses for extorting grants from provincial funds. The only town extension schemes, as the Council has already been informed, that have prospered hitherto are those which are self-supporting. Lakhs, possibly crores, of potential revenues lie latent in these resources.

"Then again, there is the traditional antagonism which has to be overcome between Government and local bodies, between district and taluk boards, between local boards and municipalities. Local boards are already refusing to contribute to municipal hospitals and municipal councils are refusing to admit persons resident in taluk board areas and all over the presidency; disputes are cropping up as to the apportionment of toll receipts between municipalities and district boards. These antagonisms are fictitious, and the public cannot afford to lose sight of the fact that the interests of the Government, local boards and municipalities, union boards and village panchayats are one and indivisible.

"I need not detain the Council by reference to the various means that are being adopted to establish a closer touch between the Government and the local bodies. A Road Board, a Board of Public Health, a Consultation Council of Public Health have been erected and Joint Committees of local bodies are contemplated to deal with problems of giving maternity relief and medical relief generally in rural areas, rural water-supply in relation to water borne diseases, and the co-ordination of preventive measures to combat epidemics. A faithful record of the history and periodicity of epidemics has to be compiled and studied with a view to anticipate instead of merely following the outbreak of disease. There is no organization for preventive work now existing among the district boards except the provincial cholera parties. The boards are solely dependent on these provincial cholera parties for their preventive work, and these parties come down from headquarters and have to work blindfold for lack of knowledge of local facts and condition. Greater co-ordination is necessary in the control of fairs and festivals.

"The pilgrim tax is likely to be a bone of contention, as is also the levy of contributions from authorities having control over places of pilgrimage under section 156 of the District Municipalities Act. Then again measures against tuberculosis, and hookworm and probably medical inspection of schools have to be carried on and without the closest union, and, I may add, without the enlistment of voluntary aid no progress in these matters is possible. I have unlimited confidence in the readiness of Indians to help, if they are only shown the way. Excellent work has already been done by students, boy scouts, local health and welfare associations, house-to-house visitors, and ward committees, of which little is known.

"There has been a want of contact in the past between one local body and another and between the Government and the local bodies and there have been misunderstandings on both sides. Orders have some time issued which are unacceptable to local bodies or impracticable and have therefore become dead letters. What is wanted is informed opinion on both sides, a free interchange of views, the application of practical experience gained in one area to other areas which have not been so fortunate as to hit on useful expedients. What is wanted by the public is a frank representation to the Government of the grievances and difficulties and

disabilities which particular local bodies labour under. All these cannot be effected by mere correspondence or by the casual intervention of a district officer. That a real need exists for a *liaison* officer to establish union and harmony of effort cannot be denied, and I submit that the Rs. 20,000 allotted for this purpose, only for a year, will be money well spent, if this very difficult period of transition can be successfully passed through."

1-30 p.m.

Khan Bahadur Qadir Navaz Khan Sahib Bahadur:—"I rise to oppose this motion. After my long experience as Collector, I have come to the conclusion that there should be a separate officer for looking into the affairs of local bodies. No doubt the Collectors exercise supervision, but the Collectors' functions are too numerous and are growing far more numerous every day. They find very little time to attend to the local bodies. Then reference is made to other departments. Even they have their own legitimate duties and the attention they are able to pay is only a step-motherly attention. This is the kind of attention that these departments, which are expected to develop and improve, are getting now. I think the appointment of a separate officer will supply a long felt want and I believe I reflect the opinion of the honourable members here, when I say that a separate officer for the purpose of looking after the affairs of the district boards and the municipalities is a necessity. As has been pointed out by the honourable member Mr. Richards there are one thousand one hundred things for him to do. Again there are a thousand other things in which compromises have to be effected, small disputes have to be settled. In consideration of all these, the appointment of a separate officer for this purpose is not at all a luxury and not at all an item to which the pruning knife which is so readily put forward can be applied."

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu:—"I entirely associate myself with everything that my honourable friend Mr. Richards has said in this matter. I am afraid there is some misunderstanding in this matter and I therefore remind the honourable members of the terms in which the honourable member Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar has moved this resolution. He said that if this should go on for some months only, he would have no objection to the continuance of this officer. Therefore I would suggest that this officer be continued for this year and the question as regards further retention may be considered when the next budget comes up for discussion. This officer in my opinion is giving assistance of a very valuable kind to local bodies. In many respects we have to develop a land policy. That matter is engaging the attention of several local bodies in this country and has to be considered in the municipalities and the local boards; and there is also the Town-Planning Act which is compulsory in the case of some towns. I think the services of this officer would be required to go about and bring to the notice of the various local authorities all these new measures for adoption. Therefore, I would suggest that on the understanding that this question comes up at the next budget again for consideration, this item may be allowed to remain on the estimates."

Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar:—"I have been listening very carefully, Sir, to the remarks of the honourable member Mr. Richards and after listening to him it seems to me that the appointment of this officer is extremely objectionable. I came to that conclusion only after hearing my friend and my objection is not based on questions of economy or questions of pay. My opinion, is based upon the duties which according to my honourable friend Mr. Richards this officer has to perform.

23rd March 1921] [Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

"What are those duties? He has to be a sort of senior account officer advising municipalities and the district boards and then he has to be the general adviser on questions connected with development. He is to be the officer who has to give advice in land exploitation, he has to give advice to local bodies and municipalities on education, he has to advise them on questions connected with child welfare and maternity welfare and questions connected with water-supply, questions connected with fairs and festivals, pilgrim tax and in fact there is no duty which the municipalities or the district boards have to perform with which this newly appointed officer has not something to do."

Mr. F. J. Richards:—"My honourable friend in perfect good faith entirely misconstrued my remarks. I am extremely sorry to say that not one of the duties mentioned by my honourable friend is to be the duty of the Inspector. The local bodies and the Government are face to face with these problems and they are problems which cannot be worked up unless the closest touch is maintained, a touch closer than that which can possibly be effected by correspondence; and the officer who will maintain that touch will be the Inspector."

Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar (*continuing*):—"As far as possible I wish to use the very same words used by my honourable friend. What Mr. Richards just now stated was that the district boards and the municipalities have to perform various functions connected with these matters. The municipalities, the district boards and Government are face to face with questions connected with these and it will not be possible for these bodies to perform these duties satisfactorily by correspondence. I believe I am quoting him as exactly as possible. I suppose the duties of this Inspector will be to give advice."

Mr. F. J. Richards:—"Sir, a personal explanation again. My honourable friend has omitted one particular factor. These local bodies are face to face with these problems and the Government are also face to face with these problems. Their interest is one and indivisible and it should be established and maintained together during the period of transition between the Government and the local bodies which will be one of the functions of the Inspector."

Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar (*continuing*):—"I shall try again, Sir, to use the very words of my honourable friend. He stated these municipalities and the district boards and the Government are face to face with these questions and this officer has to maintain the contact or relationship with reference to these matters between the various bodies and the Government. How is he to maintain the contact except by advice oral or written? How is he to give advice? What is the nature of his advice? Is his advice binding and is it to be acted upon by the Government or the municipalities or the local bodies? It seems to me that instead of lubricating the machinery it will introduce friction and complicate matters considerably. Even now there are high officers, the Sanitary Commissioner, the Surgeon-General and many other officers who have to advise these local bodies and in addition to them why should we introduce a special officer for the purpose of maintaining the contact between the Government and the various local bodies? So that, it seems to me that instead of making the work of these bodies more smooth, it may be making the work of all this machinery highly complicated. I thiuk it will be money very badly spent if we appoint this officer. As I said already, it is not a question of economy but it seems to me that it will introduce a considerable element of friction and discord in these local bodies."

[Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu] [23rd March 1921

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" Sir, the only justification for my rising to speak on this subject is because I have had some personal experience of the work of this officer. In the actual administration of a district, we are face to face with certain difficulties. To clear them up, very often, we have to refer to other district boards for their opinion to ascertain the precedent in those districts. My own experience is that his visit was very serviceable to our district boards. It is stated that there is a Superintending Engineer, but he has to inspect only the trunk roads and other roads. The Collector very rarely interferes in the ordinary administration of the district board. There is the audit department which goes only into the question of actual accounts. As regards the question of policy, I think we are badly in need of an officer who will go about the Presidency focussing the experience of several districts. I think such an officer is really necessary for co-ordinating the work of these district boards in the presidency and also for keeping in contact, so to say the Government with the several district boards. As I had some personal experience of the officer, I make bold to say that his appointment is a desirable one in the interests of both district boards and the municipalities."

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"As the appointment was temporarily sanctioned for a year the time will expire in December. If the present provision which is made for one year is to be continued, then I shall certainly press for a division."

Mr. F. J. RICHARDS :—" I am rather anxious to say that the Government are prepared to accept that. It is only for a year."

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" The appointment was made temporarily and the period expires on 17th December."

The Hon'ble Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" I understand, Sir, that after the expiry of one year, if the appointment is found necessary, this question will be reconsidered ; but the present appointment is only for one year."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" Does the honourable member press his motion to a division ? "

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" I am not able to understand the point of view of the Government."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" I am extremely sorry. Whether the honourable member understands it or not, he will have to tell the House whether he is pressing his motion to a division. The Hon'ble the Minister for Local Self-Government stated that this is a temporary appointment for one year and that the Government are prepared at the end of that period to look into the whole question and that he did not want to commit the House to any extension of the period. That was what he stated "

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—" Sir, I understood Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar to say that he wanted to reduce the provision in the budget sufficiently to carry us on only till the end of December. If that is specially pressed for, I don't think there is any objection."

1-15 p.m.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" I think the honourable member had better withdraw his motion on the understanding that Government will utilize only that portion of the allotment which is necessary to keep on the establishment for one year for which it has been sanctioned."

23rd March 1921] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

Motions Nos. 35 and 36 were withdrawn by leave of the Council.

The following other motions under Demand VII were not moved and were deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar :—

38. *Delete* (*Rs.* 3,000) *duty allowance to Under Secretary, Home Department.*

Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar :—

39. *That the provision* (*Rs.* 3,000) *under* 22-*C* (*a*) *for duty allowances of Under Secretary in the Home Department be omitted.*

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu :—"The following items of duty allowance be omitted :—

40. *Duty allowance to Under Secretary, Home Department, Rs.* 3,000."

Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju :—

41. *To Under Secretary Rs.* 3,000.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu :—

42. *Advanced typewriting allowance to establishment, Rs.* 240.

Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju :—

43. *Duty allowance of Board's office establishment, Rs.* 240.

MOTION FOR REDUCTION OF TOTAL DEMAND.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu :—

44. *That the demand of Rs.* 5,58,120 *under* 22-*C* (*a*) *General Administration—Secretariat and Headquarters Establishments—Civil Secretariats be reduced by Rs.* 40,000 (*Budget page* 66).

MOTION FOR REDUCTION OF TOTAL GRANT.

General Administration—23. Audit, Rs. 1,92,600.

Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju :—

45. *That the lump provision of Rs.* 50,000 *for the re-organization of the Local Fund Audit staff in* 23. *Audit—Provincial, be omitted* (*Budget page* 74).

Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar :—

46. *That in* 23-*A. Audit—Provincial—Local Audit, Peripatetic, Rs.* 4,560 *local allowance—be deleted* (*Budget page* 74).

Demand VII, subject to a reduction of Rs. 18,000, was then put to the Council and granted *nem. con.*

The Council then adjourned for lunch at 1–45 p.m.

The Council re-assembled after lunch at 2–30 p.m.

DEMAND VIII—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—LEGISLATIVE BODIES.

The Hon'ble Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar :—"Mr. President, I move for the vote of the House for a grant not exceeding Rs. 2,64,000, under the head General Administration—Legislative Bodies. The figure is made up as shown in the notice paper at page 13. The details are found at pages 66 and 69 of the Budget."

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [23rd March 1921

Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar moved—

'1. *That the provision under 22-B for the travelling allowance of all Members of the Legislative Council be reduced by* Rs. 30,000.'

In doing so he said:—"You will see that in page 66 of the Budget a lump sum of Rs. 1,20,000 has been fixed for the travelling allowance of the members of this Council but I do not know as to how that figure had been arrived at. As I have said on previous occasions in viewing these questions of travelling allowances, I am for taking the average officer or person who is to draw the travelling allowance and to see that he neither makes any money nor loses anything out of his pocket. It is very difficult as I have said to arrive at the way exactly as to how the figure has been fixed. We, members of the Legislative Council, seem to be proclaiming our interest in the increase of pay of subordinate officers and of village officers and others, and even if others are not prepared to show an example, we, I say, must be prepared to show an example and after all it has been said by many people, by some of my friends, that the sum of Rs. 30,000 is very small. Taking it that there are about 100 members in the Council who come from the mufassal, on an average it will come to nearly Rs. 25 a month for each member. I am only giving an average and some may have to lose a little more out of what they get now and some may lose less. The conclusion that I have come to is this. I take it—I speak subject to correction—that probably out of Rs. 1,20,000, Rs. 70,000, might be taken up for travelling allowance and Rs. 50,000 for daily batta, and instead of getting double first class we might very well get a single first class, or as many of us bring our servants, a single first class and a single third class. In calculating that, I thought, taking Rs. 70,000 towards travelling allowance, that, if it is a single first class, the reduction might come to about Rs. 35,000, but if we are to make provision for a single third class also for servants which may come to about Rs. 5,000, the reduction may fairly come to about Rs. 30,000. This is a question, Sir, where we ought to show some self-sacrifice and I think it is after all worth while. I suppose all members will support this proposition at least, and I hope nobody will raise all sorts of side issues. I don't think any one will bring in a charge that it is a mandate from this community or that community, that it has been brought in the interest of any particular community or anything like that. It is brought simply in the interest of increasing our finances so that we may be true to what we say and show an example in the interests of the subordinate officers of the Government and village officers and others. Therefore with the full hope and belief that this proposition will be unanimously carried, I propose this reduction."

Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai:—"Sir, I rise to oppose the motion. The complaint is that the allowances now given are not sufficient for many people. Of course, there are certain gentlemen who live very frugally, who will live simply, just like my friends, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar and Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, but most of us are aged and want the help of servants. We find it difficult to meet our expenditure with the money that is given to us. Of course many of us will welcome such a sacrificing spirit on the part of the members, but I would speak on behalf of the House without reference to any party. All parties are agreed to get the batta they get now and not to lose one first class batta. I think, Sir, this sort of economy will only deter many of the members who are engaged in professions in the mufassal from attending, and we may not get enough of members to carry on the business here. It is not very easy to live in Madras

23rd March 1921] [Mr. P. Kesava Pillai]

with the allowance given, with its house-rents, motor expenses and so many other unexpected expenses. I therefore oppose this motion, and I am sure most of the members will vote with me and not with Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Sir, I also rise to oppose this motion. As it is, I am certainly speaking for myself and probably also on behalf of many of the members of this Council — so far as the actual expenditure is concerned, it is a case of partnership between the members and the Government now. The Government give us a very small portion of the actual expenditure that we have to incur and the other portion we have to meet out of our own pocket. Unless it be that we are asked to meet the whole cost out of our own pocket, I think all of us should vote against this."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, I rise to oppose both Mr. Kesava Pillai and Mr. Krishnan Nayar and to support this motion. I think if nobody else has set an example of retrenchment, at least the members of this House should begin to set the example, and I may assure the Council that if they do so, they will not be the first that have taken the initiative in this matter. I know, as a matter of fact, there are many district boards where members are only paid a single second-class fare for attending the meeting. If that is possible in the mufassal, I think it should be equally possible with us. We are not here concerned with how the amounts are spent by the members in Madras and on their journeys to the Council Chamber from their homes and back again. The expenses may include many items with which we are not concerned. The reasonable charges that we can claim are, I submit, the expenses that we are incurring in coming here and that, I think, is a single first-class fare and one third class. The ten rupees that we get daily ought reasonably to cover our expenses. At least, the well-to-do members should be agreeable to this. I have great pleasure, Sir, in supporting the resolution of Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, if I remember right, retrenchment and economy seem to be the watchwords of the new Reformed Council, and all these days, days in and days out, we have been strenuously, though unsuccessfully, fighting for retrenchment here, there and everywhere. We have attempted to apply the pruning knife in every conceivable direction. But, so far as this item is concerned, it comes nearer home. As Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar put it, it will affect each member individually only to the extent of about Rs. 25, and there is absolutely no reason why we should not make that sacrifice, set a good example in that direction and vote for the motion."

Diwan Bahadur T. DESIKA ACHARIYAR :—"Sir, the last three days we have been making very strenuous attempts at retrenchment and economy. So far, our attempts have not been very successful. I do not see why Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar need hope that the present attempt to cut down the travelling allowance of the members of this Council should alone be successful. I do not oppose the motion on account of any personal concern. There are many members who come here, who spend double the amount that they receive as allowances now. They hail from long distances, from Berhampur and Cocanada in the north and Tinnevelly in the south. They give up their practice, or important business, and lose a part of their income. Why should they add to their loss by being compelled to pay all the travelling expenses. I cannot at all understand the meaning of this motion. We expect all the members of this Council regularly to attend the meetings of the Council and to enable them to come and spend the session here, we must allow them proper travelling allowances. I therefore oppose the motion."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I rise to support this motion. While I am in agreement with my other friends who have said that the allowances given are quite inadequate, still I think that it will only be consistent with the policy which we have set before us from the commencement of this session of the Council that we should pass this motion. It will be remembered that at our first meeting in February we placed before the Council various motions suggesting an increase of expenditure in various directions. Then, Sir, again during the general discussion of the budget one member after another advocated various schemes of retrenchment of expenditure. I only wish that the members of this House would try to recall to their own memories whatever they stated in speaking on the general aspect of the budget on that occasion. Now, Sir, we are passing through the third stage of the discussion where we are concerned with votes for grants. If only we remember that we have been advocating a strict policy of retrenchment, it is clear that we cannot do it unless we show some spirit of self-sacrifice ourselves. We suggested some decrease of allowances of officers of other departments, though finally we did not adopt it.

" If the motion was passed, it would have required the officers concerned to undergo some inconvenience and some sacrifice in the larger
2-45 p.m. interests of the country. We have advocated that the Ministers' salaries should be reduced, with the object that some more money can be saved for other important purposes, though we did not succeed there. How on earth can we succeed in our policy of retrenchment if even the non-official members of this Council are not prepared to undergo some amount of inconvenience. Well, several of us who come here are put to some inconvenience ; but they must be prepared to undergo the same. They must face the question, the larger interests of the country. If we fail to do it, I believe that it may very well be said of us that we have not been quite sincere in this in advocating retrenchment of expenditure in other directions."

Mr. T. ARUMAINAIHA PILLAI :—" Mr. President, Sir, for the last two days we have been listening to speeches on the reductions of the travelling allowances of all sorts of officers and also we have been listening to speeches on the atrocity which the Government commits by giving these duty allowances to the officers. I believe I am right in saying that the Hon'ble Mr. Krishnan Nayar grew very warm on the duty allowance and several other allowances. It was stated that the Government should set an example by reducing all its needs. So far as the travelling allowances are concerned, the officers come out only for money—for salary—and they are expected to go round touring. We, members of the Legislative Council, profess to come here and work on behalf of the public sacrificing our interests and other pecuniary advantages. We proclaim to the whole world that we, here look after the interests of the public. Appeals were made to the Government, to this House and to you, Sir, not to squander the tax-payer's money by granting all kinds of allowances. May I ask the honourable members of this House to take that appeal themselves and set a good example by reducing their travelling allowances? After all we are only making a sacrifice of Rs. 25 a month and nothing more. Let us say to the world and to the people who sent us here—so far as I am concerned, it does not matter —that we are in right earnest in putting what we preach into practice. Example, Sir, is better than precept."

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—" Mr. President, Sir, as a previous member has said, we are in a very delicate position in regard to this proposition and it is so. I am for retrenchment, Sir, but not for scraping so as to draw blood. The idea that the travelling allowance paid to us at present is too much, is erroneous. Most of us

are feeling that it is touching our pockets to attend the Council. For myself I had to pay a medical bill of Rs. 40 for an illness that I got by coming to Madras last time. So, Sir, to cut the travelling allowance of the members is really a crime. Some say that we must do it for the sake of principle. But I am afraid that this principle will be similar to that of the jackal inviting the fraternity to dock their tails. Another point is, it is only much cry and no wool because after all the expected saving is very small indeed. Lastly I am afraid we are very pessimistic in regard to the finances of our budget. Those of us who have read the speech given by His Excellency at the Pachaiyappa's College, will understand that we are much better off than any other Presidency. There is no reason why we should raise such hue and cry with regard to retrenchment."

Mr. T. C. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I support this motion. My honourable friend Mr. T. Desika Achariyar said that we are already put to many difficulties and that we need not add another to them. I should like to know how many gentlemen coming from distant places feel that even this double first-class fare and the Rs. 10 allowance per diem go towards meeting their expenditure. Many come here for the honour of representing their constituencies at great sacrifice. These allowances are in reality no compensation at all and we have been all these three days advocating retrenchment here, there and everywhere. This House will lose its self-respect if it does not show an example by reducing these allowances."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—" One important point that I wish to bring to the notice of this House is that the members of this House have been urging reductions of the salaries and allowances which are to be increased during the current and coming years and not the original salaries. The travelling allowances which the members are now getting are what they were getting before. There are no additions made now. Members of the Legislative Assembly have claimed and got their rate increased from Rs. 10 to Rs. 20. We are sticking to our original rates. We never asked for an increment and I do not see the reasonableness of our cutting the allowances down because we are unable to get the Government to accede to our recommendations to cut down the extra allowances and salaries that were given during the current year. It is as if we should say that we will not attend a meeting, because we did not succeed in the last one. I therefore oppose this motion."

Mr. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR :—" Sir, there is a certain limit even to the demands of philanthropy and patriotism on a man. It must be recognized on all hands that many of the honourable members come here to attend to their duties as members of this Council at very great sacrifice both of money and of business. To add to these inconveniences and say that they must spend money out of their pockets to evince their enthusiasm in the public cause is I say too great a demand upon the spirit of patriotism and philanthropy. Sir, like Mr. Norton in the Legislative Assembly we do not ask for the privilege of bringing our wives here. But even those of us who come alone and stay in some bachelors' quarters or some club do find that we have to put our hands in others' pockets as Mr. Norton said. But, unfortunately in my case I must say when I put my hands in others' pockets I do not find anything there but a cigar or a cigarette. Well, Sir, when the discussion about the salary of the Ministers was going on just a few hours back we heard very energetic appeals from some honourable members opposite to the Ministers to make a self-denying ordinance and to reduce their salaries. Now, Sir, such of those honourable gentlemen who have brought this proposition, instead of asking other members to forego their travelling allowances,

might as well rise to the height of saying that they will forego all their allowances. I am sure some of them will come forward with that proposal. It will save not only Rs. 30,000 but even something more."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" I was one of those who said that double first class should not be allowed to first-class officers. So also I contend now that all the members of this Council need be paid only single first class. The amount of money that we have spent in election and the amount of time spent is enormous. Here the members are only asked to forego Rs. 25 each. It is a very trifling amount and they could very well afford to forego it ; so I support the motion."

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—" I wish to oppose the motion to allowing only one first-class fare to the members of this House. Personally it is a matter of absolute indifference to me whether the House votes for a single or double first-class fare. Neither the one nor the other would be adequate in a case like mine where the expenditure goes up to thousands of rupees every year by coming to Madras for attending the meetings and for no other purpose. It is generally understood everywhere that high-placed officials are allowed double first class. So on a question of prestige I think that the members of this House should not be denied the double first-class fares, as long as double first class is allowed to other high officials. I do not think that except a few members, others would view this question from a pecuniary aspect. I, therefore, strongly oppose this motion for reduction."

Mr. K. P. GOPAL MENON :—" Sir, the recent elections have shown that the country wants young men who have just started life to be heard in the Council. The proposition now brought forward for reducing the allowances granted to them would be very good if people of the stamp of Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar who have made a mint of money in the Madura-Ramnad districts and no others had been returned to the Council. But I am here a young man from the West Coast and settled on the East Coast, in a country where some Kallars and others had a fancy for me and returned me to the Council. When I go back home after each session of this House, my wife complains of cheques drawn on the bank for expenses incurred in Madras. Invariably that must be the case with everybody here, who does some sacrifice. Though some of us have a decent practice at the bar, we have to come here leaving it, and sit in Madras for ten or twelve days sometimes. Is it not a sacrifice that we are doing ? The resolution now brought forward, and the resolution for the reduction of the salary of the Ministers remind me of what happens when neighbur's children quarrel. The son of my neighbour comes and beats my son and because I find it impossible to do anything with the neighbour's son, I beat my own son. Wen we find that there are very high paid officers whose salaries and allowances we are unable to reduce we say we have our own Ministers, let us reduce their pay ; we have our own men as our representatives in the Council, let us reduce their allowances. I know some people may not care to travel in the first class. Even in that case I do not think there is any saving. It is a question of prestige when travelling through the Kallar tracts, most of the Kallars asked me, ' what do you get by going there ? ' It is only fit and proper that we must be given the allowance now given, viz., double first class and Rs. 10 per diem. I, therefore, say that the resolution is uncalled for. Such resolutions are not very serious in their nature."

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI :—" My sacrifice both personal and pecuniary is much greater than that of others. The double first-class allowance and ten-rupees batta is hardly sufficient to support me here in Madras. I wanted to save myself the inconvenience of travel and so was here all these days during the interval between the last and the present sitting of the

3 p.m.

23rd March 1921] [Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai]

Council, and I was obliged to live here at my own expense. This ten rupees will not cover even a small part of the charges. I have always to come here with a number of servants. So the allowance and the batta are nothing when compared with the actual expenses. We are all of us, gentlemen, members of the Council, who move on equal terms with the Members of the Government. We are in no way inferior to them in status and when they are entitled to and get double first class, why not we? This way of trying to save money by retrenchment, by cutting down the salaries of Ministers or by pulling at the pockets of brother members would seem quite unjustifiable. I strongly oppose the motion."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I move that the question be now put."

The motion for closure was carried *nem con.*

The resolution was put to the vote and declared lost 15 voting *for* and 42 *against.*

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR moved—

'2. *That the provision of Rs.* 25,740 *under salaries—Translators' Department be reduced by Rs.* 10,000.'

In doing so, he said :—" I find from the budget that two items making a total of Rs. 6,000 are italicised and therefore I can't say anything about it. With regard to others, four translators on Rs. 500 to Rs. 600 and three from Rs. 300 to Rs. 500 is too much when there are seven munshis of whom four are getting from Rs. 125 to Rs. 250. I will just refer to the case of the High Court translators and the interpretors where I find that the Translators' department manager gets only Rs. 265 and the others get only from Rs. 125 to Rs. 175. The Chief Interpretor gets only from Rs. 290 to Rs. 463 and all the others get less than Rs. 240. Therefore in the face of the highly paid munshis who assist them, I think the translators' pay may be reduced reasonably and a deputy collector's pay, namely, Rs. 300, may be fixed as the maximum. I therefore propose the reduction of Rs. 10,000."

The Hon'ble Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" There is really no comparison between the ordinary translators in the High Court and this very special establishment. In 1909 Government resolved to have a set of whole-time picked officers as translators. Their duties are not merely ordinary translation, but they have to translate Legislative Council enactments, and the various rules passed thereunder into various languages, so that there may be accurate translation of the various Legislative Proceedings for the benefit of persons who do not know English. Again these translators are also examiners for high grade officers including Indian Civil Service officers when they appear for the language examinations. Beyond this, these translators have to furnish absolutely accurate translations of passages appearing in the vernacular newspapers for the information of the Government. It was in 1909 that this Government proposed practically the same salaries they are now drawing. It was intended that these persons should have special qualifications, should have special learning both in the vernacular languages and also in rendering them into English and in rendering English into the vernaculars. It was only from last year that they have been getting a 15 per cent addition just like other gazetted officers also. (They are gazetted officers.) Now in the revision a much larger salary was fixed but the hard-hearted gentleman to my left, the Finance Member, reduced it to the present scale. The extra expenditure beyond what they are now drawing will come to a sum of Rs. 59½ per mensem for four translators.

[The Hon'ble Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar] [23rd March 1921

In these circumstances and considering that it is a special department, they are brought on the gazetted grade, and seeing that their salary was fixed so long ago as 1909 the provision which is made in the budget and the scale which is given to them is certainly not over-generous. It has been the opinion of some that it is not even adequate."

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—" In the face of the explanation given by the Honourable Member I beg leave to withdraw the resolution."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

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

'3. *That the demand of Rs.* 17,53,206 *under* 22. *General Administration—Provincial be reduced by Rs.* 100.'

"I move for this reduction with a view to invite attention to the great inconvenience felt for want of a library for the Legislative Council. I submit that Honourable Members of this Council have been feeling great inconvenience for want of a reference library and a general library. I do not wish to dilate at length on this matter nor to ask the Government for any grant at once. The present arrangement of consulting the Secretariat library is extremely inconvenient and I suggest that immediate steps should be taken for having a good reference library in close proximity to the House and for a general library containing all the necessary books, administration reports and the various parliamentary publications which would be useful to the Council. I have no intention of pressing this motion to a division. I make this motion with a view to bring this matter to the notice of the Government."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—" I may say that I have had no notice of the matter now raised. We are however at work trying to meet the Honourable Member's wishes. We are waiting, Sir, for the election of the House Committee to advise us on this and other matters. But meanwhile we are getting a portion of this building cleared in order to give more room for the Council and as soon as that is done we shall endeavour to provide a library and reading room among other comforts for members of the Council."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I do not press it, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR not being present, his motion,

4. *That the demand under* 22. *General Administration be reduced by Rs.* 1,000.

was deemed to have been withdrawn.

Demand No. VIII for a sum not exceeding 2·64 lakhs was then put to the Council and was granted *nem con.*

DEMAND IX.—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—MISCELLANEOUS.

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—" I beg to move demand No. IX. General Administration—Miscellaneous."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR moved—

'1. *That the provision under* 47 *be reduced as shown below—that the provision of Rs.* 38,000 *for subscriptions to periodicals be reduced by Rs.* 8,000.'

23rd March 1921] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

In doing so, he said :—" I simply wanted to move this proposition with a view to get the information, if that can be given, as to what are the periodicals for which Rs. 38,000 form the subscription. Are any dailies subscribed for? The word periodical is there and so I ask for this information."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—" Certainly a number of dailies are subscribed for. Each of us receives most of the dailies in Madras and we read them with much care."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" I do not mean the ordinary copies that are got. Are any subsidised? That is what I want to know."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—" I can assure the Honourable Member that we are not surreptitiously subsidising any newspaper under the guise of subscription."

The motion was then by leave withdrawn.

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

'2. *That in the demand under* 47-*D. Miscellaneous, the grant of Rs.* 1,40,000 *proposed for miscellaneous charges including discretionary grants by Collectors be reduced by Rs.* 1,00,000.

" I request the attention of the Council to page 200 of the budget estimate. Under the detail 47-D. Miscellaneous, members will find that a sum of Rs. 1,40,000 is included in the budget estimate for 1921-22. A reference to the previous figures will show that Rs. 1,29,000 was provided but the amount spent was only Rs. 15,000 ; and a reference to the accounts of the previous year will show that the amount provided was Rs. 1,26,000 out of which the amount actually spent was Rs. 14,961. I do not wish to refer to the accounts of the previous years where the amounts provided were possibly less. Therefore it is clear that the amount actually spent under this head has been about Rs. 15,000 though the amount provided in the budget was Rs. 1,29,000. I do not find any necessity for making a provision for so large an amount as Rs. 1,40,000 when the actual expenditure judged from the previous years has been Rs. 15,000. It will be found from the figure below in the budget that there is an additional provision at the disposal of the Government for a lakh of rupees and there is no proposal before the House to reduce that amount. So in view of the expenditure of the previous years, I do not understand why this large provision should be made."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU moved—

'3. *That the provision of Rs.* 1,40,000, *made at page* 200 *for Miscellaneous, including discretionary grants by Collectors, in Account No.* 47-*D. Miscellaneous and Unforeseen charges—Reserved, be reduced by Rs.* 50,000.'

In doing so, he said :—" Mr. President, my proposal is somewhat more modest than Mr. Krishna Rao's. I only wish to reduce it by Rs. 50,000. One reason was already anticipated by Mr. Krishna Rao, that so much amount has not been spent actually every year by Collectors. Another reason is : I wish to know whether any rules have been made on the subject by the Government under which Collectors exercise their discretion in spending the amount. What I mean is whether this amount is placed at their disposal to be spent according to their pleasure or whether any objects have been specified upon which they may spend it at their discretion. If there are no rules on the subject I wish to invite the attention of the Government to the fact that

3-15 p.m.

some rules are necessary on the subject and that the objects upon which they may exercise their discretion should be defined. But if no rules have yet been framed I submit it is high time that such rules are framed and the objects definitely specified. Otherwise there would be a tendency to spend this amount according to the sweet will and pleasure of a Collector. That is the second reason. So, my contention is that in the first place there must be rules; in the second place so much amount is unnecessary at the present moment when we are very much in want of funds.

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—"There are a number of resolutions on the same point."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I request the President will permit me, if necessary, to speak after hearing Mr. Sivasankaram Pillai."

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI :—"I should like to oppose this resolution. This is something like pocket money to the Collector. The Collector occupies a very responsible position. He is expected at any moment to go on circuit to any village and there may be necessity for instance for digging a well in that village for the Panchamas. He must be in a position to grant it as soon as possible. It is for this reason that the provision is meant. I believe that there are certain rules fixing the purpose for which this amount may be spent.

"Now, so far as my district is concerned, I may say that the allotment is absolutely necessary, for this reason. There is just now distress in the district and it takes some time before the distress is properly recognised by the authorities. Before actual relief comes in, the Collector has an anxious time in the interval. During that interval he must have some money in his hand so as to meet the situation. In this view the Collector ought to be given a larger amount."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—"I think I can set the mind of the Honourable Member at rest. In the first place, the reason why the expenditure is less than the grant, is that the expenditure is debited to the heads under which it is incurred. If it is incurred on educational objects, it goes under Education. If it is incurred on famine relief, it goes under Famine. It is not shown in this grant at all in the budget. It is all governed by certain rules. I will spare the Council an enumeration of these rules. Perhaps a list of the objects will satisfy the Honourable Member. The objects fall into 11 main groups :—

1. Rewards for individuals for services to the State.
2. Do. do. public.
3. Do. for carrying out schemes for the benefit of the public.
4. Rewards for the prevention and treatment of disease.
5. Rewards for other public objects.
6. Development, agriculture, horticulture and industries.
7. Preservation of ancient monuments.
8. Redemption of criminals.
9. Experiments of a minor character.
10. Relief in cases of certain calamities.
11. General help such as contribution towards maintenance of orphans.

"These are the various objects on which the Collector can spend the money, which has been aptly described as pocket money. After he spends it, he has to account for it through the Accountant-General and also to state the objects for which it has been spent."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I do not press the motion."

23rd March 1921] [The Raja of Ramnad]

The RAJA OF RAMNAD:—"I want to ask the Finance Member whether the Collector submits to Government a list of the items on which he spends this money."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER:—"I think the Honourable Member refers to a question which he asked two years ago. We had a compilation of the information for him. The Government do not call for all the details of this small expenditure. But, however, it can be obtained. Whether it is worth while collecting is the question.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"I do not press the motion."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"May I know from the Finance Member whether these rules have been published for the information of the public or whether instructions have been issued to the Collectors for their guidance?"

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER:—"I cannot answer that question on the spur of the moment. But the public are aware that upon the recommendations of the Decentralisation Commission rules were framed and they could ask the Collector with reference to the recommendations."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"The village public do not read the reports."

The motions were by leave of the Council withdrawn.

The following motion which stood in the name of Mr. M. D. Devadoss was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn:—

4. *This Council recommends that the provision miscellaneous including discretionary grants by Collectors (Rs. 1,40,000) under 47-D. Miscellaneous—Miscellaneous and Unforeseen charges—Reserved, be reduced by Rs.* 50,000.

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

5. *That the provision under 47 be reduced as shown below:—*

Reduction in Miscellaneous and Unforeseen charges to be reduced by Rs. 40,000.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"Honourable Members will kindly go to page 24 of the agenda, to the middle of it, item 212. 'That the sum of Rs. 7,660 provided for the examination of the Assistant Collectors be deleted in No. 37-E (Budget page 186).' That has to be taken up now."

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR:—"I beg to move—

'5. (*a*) *That the sum of Rs.* 7,660 *provided for the examination of Assistant Collectors be deleted in* 37-*E.*'

In doing so, he said:—"I believe the number of Assistant Collectors who are on duty (Sub-Collectors and Assistant Collectors only) is only about 76, as will be seen on page 28 of the budget. And the new Assistant Collectors that are being imported are only about four or five every year, never more than 10. I do not understand why a sum of Rs. 7,660 should be spent for the examination of Assistant Collectors though it includes some Abkari and Customs Tests. I should like to know what the cost of the examination of the Assistant Collectors a one comes to. If it is not a very big sum, I should not like to move the resolution."

[The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter] [23rd March 1921

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER:—"If the Honourable Member will kindly examine detailed account No. 37-E on page 186 of the Civil Budget Estimate, he will find a full explanation of the charges which are troubling him. With reference to these, I should explain in the first instance that the heading 'Examination of Assistant Collectors' is a heading of long standing which in reality covers all the charges of the Board of Examiners, who perform that function for Deputy Collectors and others as well as for the small number of Assistant Collectors who have been referred to. The details of the charges will be seen to be a small allowance to the Secretary and payment for four clerks and two peons, in addition to which there is a sum of Rs. 1,800 paid to officers who examine candidates for the Salt, Abkari and Customs departmental examinations. The officers who examine the Assistant Collectors give their services free, as do the whole of the Board of Examiners, so that, if the charges properly debitable to the number of Assistant Collectors referred to were distributed over them, the Honourable Member would find that the expenditure incurred by Government for examining each Assistant Collector came to a very small number of rupees indeed."

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR:—"I do not press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

DEMAND IX—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—MISCELLANEOUS—PUBLICITY BUREAU.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"On page 14, there are four resolutions relating to the pay of the Publicity officer. I propose to take them together."

Rao Bahadur K. S. VENKATARAMA AYYAR:—"I beg to move—

'6. *That the sum of Rs.* 24,000 *under* 47-*E for salary of Publicity Officer be reduced by Rs.* 12,000 (*Budget page* 201).'

"I do see some other resolution later that the whole provision for the Publicity Board should be deleted. But as the President has directed that this resolution should come up first, it is my duty to speak on this resolution. I find that the salary of the Publicity officer is fixed at Rs 2,000. Without committing myself to the question whether the Publicity Board is necessary and whether the sum of Rs. 1,21,600 spent on the Publicity Board is productive of sufficient return as gauged by the work of the Publicity Board, I think that if the Publicity officer should be in charge of the establishment, and if there is a non-official board to help the Publicity officer, such a high salary is quite unnecessary. I should think that a first-grade deputy collector drawing about Rs. 850 to whose salary some duty allowance or house allowance or presidency allowance may be added—about Rs. 100 or Rs. 150—making up a salary of Rs. 1,000, would amply suffice to give us a capable officer knowing the languages of the country and knowing also the details of the subject on which the Publicity Board is expected to give information to the public and dispel any false notions or false ideas that may be prevalent in the mind of the public. I am an honorary correspondent of the Publicity Board myself and I am receiving a monthly list of the Publicity publications, and I think I have even written recently to the Publicity Board that it is quite unnecessary that there should be a monthly list printed, because it is only one or two leaflets added to the publicity list already published. I should like that this House accept my motion that a sum of Rs. 1,000 is amply sufficient for the salary of the Publicity officer in view of the circumstances that I have submitted for the consideration of this House."

23rd March 1921] [Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—The resolution standing in my name is—

'7. *That the item of Rs.* 24,000 (*Publicity officer's salary*) *be reduced by Rs.* 12,000.'

"It seems to me that there is no need to have an expensive Publicity officer on Rs. 2,000 a month. For the reasons put forward by the mover, I support the resolution."

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI moved—

'8. *That the budget estimate of Rs.* 24,000 *for the pay of the Publicity officer under detailed Account No.* 47-*E. Miscellaneous—Publicity Board—Reserved be reduced by Rs.* 12,000.'

In doing so, he said:—"I beg to say a few words. The Publicity officer is doing good work, especially in disseminating ideas regarding the use of seed, agricultural improvements, etc. Pamphlets are widely distributed and people do take interest in reading them when they deal with such subjects as agriculture and sanitation. I can bear testimony to the universal appreciation of the work done by the Publicity officer. The pamphlets issued by the Publicity officer have produced sometimes a good effect on the people in counteracting mischievous rumours. However, it is a fact that as they are issued from a Government office, the people and even the karnams and reddis, do not always believe what is written in them. The Publicity Board can be very well continued but not with an officer on a grade carrying a pay of Rs. 2,000 a month. I would strongly urge this on the Government. In some provinces the Publicity Board has been abolished. I see it has been so done in Bengal and in the Punjab, but I am not for the abolition of the Board altogether. I am for appointing a high officer, if possible, an Indian who can enter into the feelings of the people, understand the state of things and interpret the intentions of the Government to the public. I think if an Indian officer of sufficient qualifications and sufficient experience of human nature, especially of Indian human nature, is appointed as Publicity officer, he can render more service to the people and would better promote the aim and object of the Government."

3-30 p.m.

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Mr. President, I have a slightly different motion which runs thus:—

9 *That the item of Rs.* 24,000 (*salary of Publicity officer*) *under* 47-*E. Miscellaneous—Publicity Board be reduced by a sum of Rs.* 13,800.

"But I do not intend making the motion."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT:—"If necessary, the motion of the Honourable Member will be put to the vote separately."

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"I do not propose to move that motion at all. But I wish to say a few words in this connexion.

"Mr. President, my objection to the Publicity officer on the present pay of Rs. 2,000 is that it should be made available only to Indians and this is a department which if it is to do any good work at all—I am reserving my remarks on the other motion—must be presided over by an Indian officer who must have a good knowledge of the political atmosphere and other important subjects beneficial to the people. With this view I associate myself heartily with the remarks made by the previous speakers and would welcome a reduction of Rs. 12,000 under this head as proposed by my friends. You have a new department, an infant department.

Surely you have to staff it. Make it Indian exclusively. It is not one of the listed offices; it is not one of those reserved for the services. If in such a case as that the Legislative Council is not going to insist upon an Indian being given charge of this department entirely, I do not know what else they are going to do. With these few words, I heartily support the motion."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER:—"I am surprised and sorry that an apparently innocent motion like this should be given a racial aspect. The only question which I propose to discuss now is what is the appropriate pay for the officer in charge of the Publicity Bureau. We are told that the work of the officer now in charge of it, whose pay is more than Rs. 2,000 a month, has been highly satisfactory. That figure is approximately the pay which is given in other provinces. At least in two provinces a return, which I have here, shows that the pay is Rs. 2,000 a month. Whether we can ordinarily secure an officer who is fit to carry on these very responsible and difficult duties for any lower figure is a question which I would ask the President of the Board to speak to us about."

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, I consider that the salary proposed, viz., Rs. 2,000, is just and adequate to obtain the services of a competent independent officer who will be able to conduct responsible work, whether that officer is European or Indian. The kind of work that a Publicity officer has to do is shown by the figures already circulated to the members of the Publicity Board. The Publicity officer has been dealing with agriculture, sanitation, public health, industries and elections. In all, he has to deal with about 6,000 honorary correspondents at the beginning of the year."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER:—"May I correct the Honourable Member? It is 14,000."

Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO (*continuing*):—"No; it was 6,000 at the beginning of last year and at the end of the year it is 14,000; it is estimated that there will be 18,000 correspondents this new year. In addition to this, the Publicity officer is in communication with about 25,000 village officers and 5,000 co-operative societies. Leaflets in all languages are issued to the people. About 67 leaflets were issued by the Publicity officer in the last year. Look at the amount of work that a Publicity officer has to do not merely in selecting subjects and drafting notes on these subjects or adding to the notes drawn up by other people and scrutinizing the same: the correspondents are not merely put up in order to have the volume of work increased. There are applications from correspondents from different parts of the Presidency who pay postage stamps themselves and require that these pamphlets should be supplied to them. The report also shows that there is much demand from persons who pay the postage out of their own pockets and want to read these pamphlets and circulate them. The kind of work that a Publicity officer has to do is a responsible one that is, to get information judiciously and furnish accurate information on which the rural population has to act. Therefore we find the conditions are such that there is a demand for work of this kind and the kind of work is the circulation of scientific information; I think nineteen pamphlets were issued dealing with agricultural improvement, the rotation of crops, application of manures; articles written by others are also scrutinized by the Publicity officer. He translates and circulates his pamphlets to the rural areas among the 14,000 honorary correspondents of the Publicity Board. In addition to this there is also a certain amount of political work to be done. We find that there are vernacular newspapers in the mufassal areas representing a particular aspect of the administration either criticising or presenting a highly-coloured picture of the administration. It is necessary

23rd March 1921] [Mr. A. P. Patro]

that it has to be tackled by an agency like the Publicity Board. The Publicity officer takes note of publications in the vernacular in different parts of the Presidency and he in reply endeavours to give correct information as against the false criticisms or misrepresentations in the vernacular newspapers. The House will be pleased to see that it is not merely translation or writing a note, it is a work of a responsible nature and much information and knowledge are required in order that correct information may be disseminated among the population of the Presidency.

"As regards the salary, if an officer of responsibility is to be placed—whether he is an European or Indian, I am not very particular—he must be an officer who must be conversant not only with the problems of the country and the languages but he must also know the international problems, that is, with reference to war grave economic problems like the currency have come up. The new tax now imposed by the Indian Legislative Assembly or the customs duties should be explained in relation to their effects on the product of this country and export to other countries. The vernacular papers represent a particular aspect of the case and the Publicity Officer has to consider the whole case and make a note and have it translated and disseminate correct information. This is an important work which the Publicity Officer is doing. He has to study the problems relating to exchange and currency and also international problems connected therewith. All this means a large amount of work requiring experience, study and research. and I think therefore that the pay provided for the post is not at all too high."

Dr. C. B. Rama Rao:—"I have been connected with the Publicity Bureau. I am not in touch with what is passing in other departments, but I know what has been done and is being done with regard to my own department. The volume of work turned out, the number of leaflets issued, the scrutiny that is exercised, the sifting that is made, and the inquiry that is instituted—all these are very amazing. I have often wondered how one officer has been able to do so much, and I do not know whether any ordinary man, whether European or Indian, can cope with the amount of work that is being done at present; and the work that is done is phenomenal. I can bear testimony to the thoroughness with which it is done in matters concerning medical relief and sanitation."

The Rev. E. M. Macphail:—"Mr. President, I understand that some remarks are going to be made later on on the proposal to abolish the Publicity Board altogether. So, I would reserve some of my remarks on that point till I hear what may be said in that connexion.

"The point I wish to speak on at the present moment is the one on which the Hon'ble the Finance Minister referred to me. It appears to me that the value of the work that is being done by the Publicity Officer should be judged independently, and I hope that the consideration of this question will not be marred by bringing racial feeling into the matter. I should like to say as regards the Publicity Board that when I joined the Board nearly two years ago I did not know the gentleman who has occupied the position of Publicity Officer, but during those 18 months as my acquaintance with him has grown, my admiration for him has grown also and I would like to emphasize every word that Dr. C. B. Rama Rao has said. I may say there is no one who has had anything to do with that Board who can fail to admire the extraordinary combination of qualities which the present Publicity Officer possesses. He has an extraordinarily wide knowledge of the different subjects he deals with. He has a most ready pen. He is able to publish leaflets written in a most clear and interesting style. But

[Rev. E. M. Macphail] [23rd March 1921

cleverness is not everything and I have been struck by the sympathy and the patience shown by Mr. Gwynn and by his extraordinary willingness to take pains in understanding and answering the people who write in to us. I should like to say in connexion with the Publicity Bureau that our honorary correspondents are continually sending to us requests asking for information on several matters. In fact people seem to regard the Publicity Bureau as something like a place where you may inquire within upon everything. Well what I have been struck most was the extraordinarily sympathetic way in which Mr. Gwynn has dealt with all these matters. I do not really feel that it is necessary for me to say very much because I am certain that every member of the Board who has been working along with Mr. Gwynn has exactly the same feeling with regard to the extraordinary energy and the extraordinary ability with which Mr. Gwynn is turning out his work. It is not a work that any ordinary person can do. The salary may seem somewhat high to some gentlemen. But I consider that every pie is thoroughly earned by the Publicity Officer.

3-45 p.m. "I should like to mention in this connexion that the Publicity Board is a means of getting an extraordinary amount of work done for nothing. I am not referring only to the Publicity Board which is composed of a number of men who are very busy men but who are able and willing to give advice to the Publicity Officer on all matters submitted to them and it is really turning out very useful work. I am referring rather to the great organization of voluntary workers which the Board has created by which it is possible to put into the hands of the people throughout the country information of all kinds on all subjects.

"In the Publicity Board we deal to a very small extent only with politics. On one occasion, in connexion with the Reforms scheme, we tried to explain to the people what the reforms were, and I am sure all the members of this Council have been in complete sympathy with what we did upon that occasion. But a very large part of the work is concerned with sanitation, with health questions and with all kinds of educational work. It will be a great calamity indeed if we abolish this organization and deprive the people throughout the country of the means of getting valuable information which they are now receiving."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I am one of those that have given notice of a little reduction, and after hearing all the speeches I congratulate myself that my reduction is the most modest. I may add that as regards the efficacy of the department concerned, I have also some personal experience, and I have absolutely no reason to doubt that it is doing very useful work. Sometimes the pamphlets they issue, especially the English pamphlets, are wasted. When I sent this motion—I speak subject to correction—I was told that the excellent officer who is at the head of that department was going away. If he is to continue, nobody will say that his pay is to be curtailed or that he should be transferred.

"If it is a fact that he is going away and that we have to choose somebody else, I appeal that a senior Indian officer may be selected. I am sorry to say that we have to raise the question of race. We have sometimes to raise this question because very often we are made to think that the European is fit for everything whereas an Indian is not fit for any responsible post. I think we can very easily find a senior Indian officer in the Deputy Collector's grade and can appoint him on a thousand rupees with a duty allowance of Rs. 200. Instead of having an officer on Rs. 2,000, we can go in for a Deputy Collector or a similar officer on

Rs. 1,000 with a little duty allowance and it is only with that view and not with any other view that I proposed a reduction of Rs. 10,000. If really then the present officer against whom nothing can be said is leaving the department, I request the Government to try to get an officer on a fairly low pay. An officer of the rank of a Sub-Collector or a Deputy Collector is enough, though it is preferable to have an Indian.

"One Honourable Member has been saying that the Board has been doing some political work. There is no objection to its doing general political work, but the Publicity Board should not become a department dealing with a particular political creed. That would lower the Board in the public esteem. I am sure it will be doing much more useful work if it does not enter the political arena. In my own case, I wanted some information, and I was surprised to get the information at very short notice. The present officer as well as the establishment is very good, and we have no objection to a lump provision of Rs. 50,000 being added over the expenditure of last year. All that I wish to say is that this should not be a regular political association, but that it should be a general association in which people of all ideas and people of all political views may have confidence and may get the necessary information and whose publications they may read with benefit. It is in these circumstances I sent up notice of reduction."

Mr. J. F. SIMPSON:—"Mr. President, I should like to say that the last speaker but one has been a member of the Publicity Board almost since its inception. He is the Chairman of the Publicity Board and he stated that it is not a political association."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I never said it was. It was only in reference to one speaker that I said so."

Mr. J. F. SIMPSON:—"Anyhow that was the impression that I gathered from him. I just wanted to say that it is not and according to the constitution it cannot be. In my knowledge it never has been a political association. I just want to add my tribute of praise to the Publicity Officer. An honourable member of this House, Mr. A. P. Patro, has very eloquently pointed out the qualifications necessary for the Publicity Officer. I do not propose to paint the lily and to add anything to what Mr. Patro stated. To get a suitable officer to run this office, I am strongly of opinion that the pay of Rs. 2,000 is not too much. I have no objection at all to an Indian being appointed as the Publicity Officer. I am quite content as a member of the Board to have the best man, whether he be Indian or European. I only want to say that in my opinion the amount of salary is not too much, and if an officer with the requisite qualifications is appointed he must have a decent salary."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"Mr. President, I do not support this motion for reducing the salary of the Publicity Officer. My reason is this. In these days of non-co-operation, it is absolutely necessary that correct information should be disseminated to people amongst whom a lot of misrepresentation is made as to the intentions of the Government and the representatives of the people and the Ministers. For that purpose we must have an officer who, as my hon'ble friend Mr. Patro pointed out, must be a masterhand able to grasp the several subjects which he is called upon to answer and to deal with people in a fair and impartial manner. To a person occupying that post, or competent to occupy that post, a good salary must be given. It was suggested that Deputy Collectors may be appointed. Deputy Collectors can look after a certain taluk in the district regarding the collection of revenue. A pay of Rs. 2,000 is not very much more than the pay of

a last grade District Judge or District Magistrate or Collector. If a District Judge passes an order which is considered illegal or wrong, there is the High Court to revise it and there are further courts to revise it. In the case of a District Collector, if he goes wrong, there is the Board of Revenue to set him right; over the Board there is Government. But if the Publicity Officer goes wrong, there is no one sitting in judgment over him. There is a great danger to Government if wrong information is disseminated. There is a great danger in appointing men who are content with small salaries. They will not be relied upon by all classes of people. The man who is appointed to the post must be not merely a competent man but also a man in whom all the communities will have great faith. Under these circumstances, to pay a sum of Rs. 2,000 per mensem is not far too much On the other hand, it would be penny wisdom and pound foolishness to reduce the salary to Rs. 1,000. The amount of work that this department turned out last year is simply amazing. The information that is ultimately intended to be communicated to the people must first be sent to this machinery which distributes the same broadcast. For the purpose of doing this work, a lump addition of Rs. 50,000 is not at all a liberal one. In these circumstances I oppose the proposition."

Mr. K. P. GOPALA MENON:—"From what we have now heard from the Rev. E. M. Macphail, the President of the Publicity Board, and from Mr. A. P. Patro, we got an idea of the nature of the work that the Publicity Officer has to do. From an admission made by some of my honourable friends who are in support of this resolution, it is clear that the present officer in charge of the Publicity Board has done his work miraculously well, and that he deserves the Rs. 2,000 salary. Why should we anticipate that the Government is going to choose one who is not so popular? Of course, as regards the present officer who happens to be a man chosen by the Government we all give a very good certificate and say that he deserves the pay given to him and that he has done his work well. Can we not trust the Government again and think that they will be anxious to choose a man of equal capacity to carry on the work in the same satisfactory manner as the present officer?

"It is not a question of pay; but the proper criterion on which we all should act is whether the work is done satisfactorily. We have heard that Rs. 2,000 is too much and that a Deputy Collector on a lesser pay can be selected. But when a Deputy Collector is appointed, the same honourable gentlemen would come forward and say 'While Mr. Gwynn was in office, you were paying Rs. 2,000. Why do you give this gentleman who turns out the same work a lesser pay?.' It is not a question of race but it is a question of principle.

"If the present officer is going away shortly, I am sure the Government will choose a man of similar capacity. I therefore strongly oppose this resolution to reduce the salary of the Publicity Officer.

"Another point that was raised was that leaflets are sent round and that some of the English leaflets are wasted. I myself had to send for these leaflets. When I wanted some, I wrote to the Publicity Officer to send me some leaflets in Tamil, some in Malayalam and a few in English and he sent them to me. It is our own look-out to see that these pamphlets are not wasted but are put to proper use. It is not the mistake of the Publicity Officer to have despatched English pamphlets, but it is our own folly if we do not take great care of them. This is my experience, and I cannot blame the Publicity Officer. We should all realize our own responsibility in the matter and we should all assist him in the discharge of his duties.

23rd March 1921] [Mr. K. P. Gopala Menon]

We want the Publicity Officer to be more or less a mediator between the Government and the people. I should say that the pay proposed is, in my opinion, rather too little. I would, on the other hand, be very glad to say that the Publicity Officer should be paid something like Rs. 3,000."

4 p.m.

Mr. S. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI :—"Mr. President, if anybody knows anything about the Publicity Board, it is I. For, when it was organized as a war measure for the correct dissemination of war news, I was appointed for translating the war news. Then when the war was over, this Publicity Board was continued and I know what sort of things are published. For, I was a translator till very recently and most important questions have been discussed there. I was consulted very often by Mr. Gwynn about many things and I was able to give correct information. Of course there are Collectors and Collectors who will be easily satisfied with any information given, but Mr. Gwynn is not a man of that sort. He wants correct information. He will not be satisfied with information given by any single gentleman but will consult many others. Moreover, as has been pointed out at this particular moment when there is so much misrepresentation and misinformation given to the illiterate public, it is necessary that the Publicity Board should be in existence under the guidance of a very able officer. I was intending to suggest that there should be another organization in connexion with the Publicity Bureau for the purpose of carrying on propaganda work of preaching against the non-co-operation movement, as their printing will reach only the educated people, but many of the illiterate people are still in the dark as regards the doings of the Government in this political state of the country. So to interfere with the Publicity Bureau is dangerous and if the Publicity Bureau is not strengthened in the nearest future, I am sure that the people who are not well-wishers of the present Government will do immense mischief. It is necessary to counteract this mischief not only with the publications of pamphlets but by preaching. I am quite willing to undertake it free of charge and to go everywhere. I am doing it already. Wherever I go, I take the opportunity of disabusing the minds of our countrymen as regards this non-co-operation. And Mr. President, to say that the Publicity Bureau is a waste or a burden upon society is, I may say, a great sin, and finding fault with our benefactors is, of course, condemned as a sin in every religion. It is difficult to find a Publicity Officer, like Mr. Gwynn, equal in integrity, equal in honesty, equal in carrying on his duties properly. Of course I know many of these high paid officials. When they want to get any information, they generally halt at a place, have dinner, or perhaps take a cup of coffee and take also a nap and then call out 'Who is there? Tahsildar, what is the matter in the village, man?' and get the reply 'What, Sir, everything is all right'—and report as if they had personally visited that place and seen everything. Certainly these people won't do for any responsible office. Whether it be an Indian or anybody else, he must be a man of real honesty. Otherwise there is danger. Therefore I strongly oppose any interference with the Publicity Bureau."

Sriman SASIBUSHANA RATH MAHASAYO :—"Sir, as in irrigation, so in publicity work there seems to be need for productive work and protective work. Protective work is to protect the Government against the attacks of non-cooperators and others, and productive work is a work that relates to sanitation, medical relief, etc. Well, naturally the Government, for protective work of that kind, will prefer one who has some experience of their policy and principle of administration. Therefore, we see that Mr. Gwynn is there as one of their accredited representatives and there is no complaint against him. His work has been very satisfactory and

for a new department, such as the Publicity Board that has been ushered into existence only about a year ago, his work is really very satisfactory. But why is it that in the revised estimate for 1920–21 you have Rs. 27,100 and in the budget estimate for this year you have Rs. 24,000 only? The reduction appears quite unusual because in every other department and for almost every other item we have got an enhanced amount while here we have got a reduction. I was curious to know the reason why and I was told that Mr. Gwynn was to go on furlough for one year and somebody has to be appointed on a slightly reduced salary and already the person who is to be appointed has been selected or is going to be selected and that is Dr. Gilbert Slater. I am subject to correction, but if that be a fact, I put it to the House whether this is not the time and place to discuss that matter and whether Dr. Slater could be given that appointment. It is for the House to discuss and decide whether he could do the same work as Mr. Gwynn was doing, whether his experience of India and theories of Indian economics . . ."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter :—" I rise to a point of order, Sir. The appointment of the Publicity Officer is a matter within the prerogative of His Excellency the Governor and not a matter for the discussion of this House. The appointment has not yet been made."

Sriman Sasibushana Rath Mahasayo (*continuing*) :—" This is the only occasion, Sir, on which we can discuss something about the Publicity Bureau. Otherwise it is a secret bureau."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter :—" I beg to deny that absolutely, Sir. There is nothing secret about it. It is a Publicity Bureau."

Sriman Sasibushana Rath Mahasayo (*continuing*) :—" That is a Board of eleven members and some of them have resigned."

The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson :—" May I ask, Sir, through you, who are these members who have resigned ?"

Sriman Sasibushana Rath Mahasayo :—" Mr. Nageswara Rao and Mr. Kasturiranga Ayyangar."

The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson :—" Exactly, thank you."

Sriman Sasibushana Rath Mahasayo (*continuing*) :—" Well, Sir, the Publicity Board is there. The proceedings of the Board are not open to the public nor are they published."

The Rev. E. M. Macphail :—" May I put a question, Sir, whether Mr. Kasturiranga Ayyangar did not attend a single meeting of the old Publicity Board though not of the new Publicity Bureau ?"

Sriman Sasibushana Rath Mahasayo :—" I may further add that very few Indian members attend ; sometimes Mr. Devadas attends and perhaps none else."

The Rev. E. M. Macphail :—" May I contradict that statement directly ? Mr. Ranga Achari very frequently attended the meetings ; Mr. G. A. Natesan attended almost every meeting ; Mr. Devadas and Mr. O. Kandaswami Chettiyar attended all meetings regularly."

Sriman Sasibushana Rath Mahasayo :—" I am subject to correction, but hat is my information."

The Rev. E. M. Macphail :—" Then I must ask the member to withdraw that statement."

23rd March 1921] [Sriman Sahibushana Rath Mahasayo]

Sriman SASIBUSHANA RATH MAHASAYO :—" When the President of the Board himself says that all these people attend . . ."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" I think Mr. Macphail knows the facts surely and his statement may be accepted."

Sriman SASIBUSHANA RATH MAHASAYO :—" I accept that statement."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Withdraw ! Withdraw !"

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" The Honourable Member has said that no Indian member has been generally attending the meetings."

Sriman SASIBUSHANA RATH MAHASAYO :—" I don't think I said anything that I should withdraw. Generally the attendance of Indian members is meagre. That is what I meant.

"I see the usefulness of the Department. I am myself the editor of a newspaper and as such I feel the necessity of such a department and the Government giving us information and all that. But what I want to know is this, whether the proceedings of the Board should not be open to the public. That is my point. Then in the appointment of the Publicity Officer, whether he be a European or an Indian officer, it does not matter, nor am I particularly for reduction of salary of that appointment, what I insist upon is that he must be an able officer who must have a large amount of sympathy and it is necessary that he must know the Indian mind. That is all. Another point is this, that while we have provided Rs. 24,000 to the Publicity Officer, a provision of only Rs. 12,000 has been made for the staff which is not enough. Rather it should be Rs. 24,000 for the staff and Rs. 12,000 for the Publicity Officer, because, in a newspaper office or in a Publicity office such as this, you have to do much of routine and miscellaneous work of typing and sending out leaflets and pamphlets to proper addressees and more of these clerks are required. In my district I know that certain Oriya villages are served with Telugu leaflets. They are of no use there and in certain matters we don't get the information we seek. Probably I may give one instance. There were a number of looting cases in Ganjam. I referred the matter to the Publicity Officer, but the information if any, which he collected on the subject was not made available to the public."

Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu applied for a closure of the debate.

The motion for closure was unanimously carried.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" There are four resolutions : the first motion is for reducing the salary of the Publicity Officer by a sum of Rs. 12,000 ; the second motion is also that it should be reduced by Rs. 12,000 ; the third is also to the same effect. Those three will have to be taken together for voting. The fourth motion standing in the name of Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar not having been moved will be deemed to have been withdrawn."

Motions Nos. 6, 7 and 8 (by Messrs. K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar, P. Kesava Pillai and R. Srinivasa Ayyangar) to reduce the salary of the Publicity Officer by a sum of Rs. 12,000 were put to the vote and lost.

4-15 p.m. The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. Todhunter demanded a poll.

The result of the poll was as follows :—

Ayes.

1. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
2. ,, P. Kesava Pillai.
3. ,, S. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
4. Sriman Bisvanath Das.
5. Dr. U. Rama Rao.
6. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
7. ,, K. S. Venkatarama Ayyar.
8. ,, C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.
9. ,, M. R. Ahmad Miran Sahib.

[Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu] 23rd March 1921]

Noes.

1. The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson.
2. ,, Mr. C. G. Todhunter.
3. ,, Md. Habib-ul-lah Sahib.
4. ,, Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
5. ,, Mr. A. Subbarayalu Reddiyar.
6. ,, Mr. P. Ramarayaningar.
7. ,, Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu.
8. Mr. F. J. Richards.
9. ,, R. G. Grieve.
10. ,, A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
11. ,, P. Subbarayan.
12. ,, E. Periyanayagam.
13. ,, Adinarayana Reddi
14. ,, S. R. Y. Ankineedu Prasad.
15. ,, R. Appaswami Nayudu.
16. ,, V. Appaswami Vandayar.
17. ,, C. Arunachala Mudaliyar.
18. ,, T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.
19. ,, B. P. Davarajulu Nayudu.
20. ,, S. Ellappa Chettiyar.
21. ,, Ethirajulu Nayudu.
22. ,, K. Gopalakrishnayya.
23. ,, K. P. Gopal Menon.
24. ,, B. Muniswami Nayudu.
25. ,, P. C. Muthu Chettiyar.
26. ,, A. T. Muthukumaraswami Chettiyar.
27. ,, C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.
28. ,, M. Narayanaswami Reddi.
29. ,, C. Natesa Mudaliyar.
30. ,, A. P. Patro.
31. ,, C. Ponnuswami Nayudu.
32. ,, W. P. A. Soundara Pandiya Nadar.
33. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar.
34. ,, S. T. Shanmukham Pillai.
35. ,, T. Sivasankaram Pillai.
36. ,, S. Somasundaram Pillai.
37. ,, K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu.
38. ,, A. Thangavelu Nayakar.
39. ,, T. C. Thangavelu Pillai.
40. ,, O. Tanikachala Chettiyar.
41. ,, R. Venkataratnam Nayudu.
42. ,, W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.
43. ,, M. C. Raja.
44. ,, L. C. Guruswami.
45. ,, M. Ramachandra Rao.
46. ,, Sadasiva Bhat.
47. Sriman Sasibhushana Rath Mahasayo.
48. Mr. M. Suryanarayana.
49. ,, T. Desika Achariyar.
50. ,, S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar.
51. ,, E. S. M. Moscarenhas.
52. ,, A. T. Palmer.
53. ,, G. Vandanam.
54. ,, Raja of Ramnad.
55. Sri. M. Y. Appa Rao Bahadur.
56. Abdul Razaq Sahib.
57. Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib.
58. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib.
59. Kunhammad Koya Sahib.
60. Hamid Sultan Marakkayar Sahib.
61. Qadir Navaz Khan Sahib.
62. A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttur.
63. Muhammad Usman Sahib.
64. Mr. J. F. Simpson.
65. ,, T. Namberumal Chettiyar.
66. ,, P. Venkatarangayya.
67. Rev. E. M. Macphail.

9 *ayes and* 67 *noes.*

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

'10. *That the lump provision of Rs.* 50,000 *made at page* 201 *for extending the operation of the Publicity Board in Detailed Account No.* 47-*E, Miscellaneous—Publicity Board—Reserved, be omitted* (*Budget page* 201).'

"When I bring forward this motion for omitting the amount of Rs. 50,000, I do it not because I see no use in the Publicity Board or its activities, but because I am not satisfied with the way in which the pamphlets are issued and circulated. The rel object of the Publicity Board is, I fancy, to make the peop'e, I mean the masses in the villages, actually acquainted with what the Publicity Board publishes. As I find, the Publicity Board publishes a lot of useful information by way of communiqués to the press, by way of issuing pamphlets and otherwise. But these pamphlets are brought only to *our* notice. We already know what is good and what is bad. But unfortunately, I speak only from my own experience of my tracts, these pamphlets and these information are not placed within the reach of the actual village people. What I say is that if this information, whether in regard to agriculture, or in regard to sanitation, or in regard to other things which are useful to the daily life of a villager, or even in regard to the activities of the Government, or even with regard to the activities of the mischievous non-co-operation movement—is actually brought home to the villagers in their

23rd March 1921] [Mr. T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU]

village, assembling them under the village pial or under the village tamarind tree and telling them these things in this manner, I can appreciate the value of the pamphlets of the Publicity Board. But they do not in many cases reach the villagers. They only reach *us* and many of us simply forget them or don't care even to go through them. This is a fact, Sir, which I have to place before you. I do not say for one moment that it is not useful. I only pray that it should be made as useful as it ought to be. If you want to extend the activities of the Publicity Board, by all means do so. But let the activities go to the very village and let them not stop with towns and cities and educated people or with the correspondents of the Publicity Officer. What I wish is that if you really want to do business bring it home to the masses. If you want to do it half-heartedly, let us not waste more money of the public. It is with that object that I move this motion and I hope that if the Member in charge will only assure us, I mean the public, that it will really be brought home to the masses, I certainly will have no objection to spend Rs. 50,000 and even more upon this particular head."

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR moved—

'11. *That the lump provision of Rs.* 50,000 *for extension of operations under* 47-*E. Miscellaneous—Publicity Board, be omitted.*'

In doing so, he said :—" Mr. President, Sir, I merely move this formally for the purpose of ascertaining the details of this lump provision."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR moved—

'12. *That the lump provision of Rs.* 50,000 *for the extension of the operations of the Publicity Board be reduced by Rs.* 38,000 (47-*E*).'

In doing so, he said :—" I do not want to cut down this item altogether, but my resolution proposes to reduce the allotment by Rs. 38,000. Turning to page 201, we find provision being made for the first time in the budget we are discussing, whereas we find no corresponding provision in 1920. Instead of doing away with this item, I think the figure will have to be reduced by Rs. 38,000 or thereabouts. I am awaiting fuller and detailed information from the Member in charge of the Department and my pressing the motion to a division depends upon the nature of the materials which will be placed at our disposal."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—" Listening to the first Honourable mover, Sir, I was rather puzzled whether what he wanted was not an increase rather than a decrease in the provision. He wants us to be in touch with every village. We want more money to do that. But he wants to take the money away. To show that we are both working for the same end, I cannot do better than read a very short passage from a note by Mr. Gwynn.

"With regard to non-co-operation he says: 'It must be remembered that the non-co-operation agitators are now doing their utmost to reach the remotest village and put their side of the case before the villagers, and the vernacular press is almost entirely on the side of the non-co-operator. Many of the non-co-operators who work in villages are non-co-operators of the baser sort who have no hesitation in distorting facts regarding the conduct of Legislative Councils and Legislative Council Members, taxation, Government budgets, prospects of war with other countries, causes of the increase in prices, etc., etc. It is our business to see that the villagers get a fairer view of these facts put before them. It is also our business to interest the villagers who are voters in the proceedings of the Councils to which they have returned members, and to let them know what their

representatives are doing. In fact it is clearly the duty of the councillors to supply this Bureau with the funds to enable it to report their proceedings to those to whom they are responsible. It is difficult to do this work at all without excessive expenditure. To do it by paid lecturers would be impossibly costly. The cheapest way is to work by leaflets and voluntary helpers. This is what we are doing. But if we are to work in this way, we ought to send our leaflets to at least one voluntary helper in every one of the 50,000 villages in the Presidency.'

"This, it will be seen, is almost a repetition of what the Honourable Member has been saying.

"Continuing, he says: 'I have not proposed to attempt this. this year, because there is no use in sending leaflets to people who don't want to receive them'—an exact echo of the Honourable Member's sentiment—'and I am not yet in touch with one man in each of the 50,000 villages who may be expected to display an interest. But we have already at least 14,000 men scattered throughout the mufassal who have shown themselves prepared to take some trouble in order to get our leaflets, and I have no doubt that before the end of the year we shall be in touch with at least 18,000.'

"That is the beginning of the expansion we want. We want possibly more leaflets. As a matter of fact Mr. Gwynn indented for less, because he did not want to put up the charges too high. We want more voluntary correspondents, and he has provided for another 4,000. Then we have got increased rates of postage to pay. That is going to cost a lot of money. Then there is the stationery, printing and so forth. All these make up the lump provision of Rs. 50,000.

"In this connexion may I remind the House of what Lord Selborne said about the necessity of publicity. I am reading a recent Reuter: 'He referred to the Joint Committee's recommendation that the Government of India should take steps to give the utmost publicity to their intentions and policy. He said he had heard that there had never been a greater, more malignant and more persistent stream of calumnies and lies than was at present flooding India against the intentions of the Government of India, the Imperial Government and the whole British policy towards India. He was told on authority which he could not doubt, that these lies were being believed because the Government of India remained dumb. The campaign of calumny might have direct consequences; yet, nothing really important in the way of propaganda was being done to counteract it. On behalf of the Joint Committee, he protested against this. He believed that it was not yet too late to do a great deal to counteract the dire mischief of this campaign, but if the whole case of the benefits of British rule and of the noble, magnanimous intentions of the British Government were allowed to go by default, the most tremendous responsibility would rest with Government.' If this House refuses to grant this sum, a tremendous responsibility will rest with the House. I hope that this House, instead of asking to reduce the amount, will follow the line taken by a Madras Member in the Imperial Assembly and urge an increase. The Hon'ble Mr. Rangachari has given the people at Delhi an account of what we are doing and urged that the provision should be increased as the amount is really inadequate. Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, in supporting him, said that it was a disservice to the country to ask for a reduction or omission of the provision allotted for the purpose of making the work of the Government and the representatives of the people known throughout the country. I do hope that the views of this House will be in favour of Mr. Rangachari and Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas and not of this motion to reduce this very necessary provision."

23rd March 1921] [Mr. P. Kesava Pillai]

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI :—" Mr. President, I also gave notice of a motion—

'13. *That the budget estimate of Rs.* 24,000 *for the pay of the Publicity Officer under Detailed Account No.* 47-*E. Miscellaneous—Publicity Board, Reserved, be reduced by Rs.* 12,000.'

" In the light of the explanation given by the Honourable Member I am not pressing it. I may tell him at once that the non-co-operation movement has had no effect whatever even on the people in distant villages. So far as our districts are concerned they have had no effect whatever except probably in the field of drink. They have managed to make people abstain from drinking, and get toddy and arrack shops closed. That is due to the overwhelming public sentiment in favour of abstinence. The public are against the evil of drink for the evil wrought by it is great, and so they are helping the non-co-operators in inducing the people to abstain from drinking. I don't move this."

The motion not being made was deemed to have been withdrawn.

4-30 p.m.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" My object in bringing this motion is to bring to the notice of the Government that at present the work of the Bureau has not effectively reached the villages and as the Member in charge of the department has read us some passages by which it seems to me that it is intended to carry the movement down to the village, I have great pleasure in withdrawing the motion."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I want to say a word to the Honourable Member. I understand that most of this Rs. 50,000 is for printing, postage and paper. May I suggest to the Honourable Member whether it is possible to reduce the postage? I am only suggesting it to him."

The Hon'ble Mr. C. G. TODHUNTER :—" We have been trying to persuade the Government of India to treat the leaflets as newspaper matter and we are trying other schemes, and I will assure the Honourable Member that everything will be done as cheaply as possible consistently with efficiency. What we will not try is sending leaflets in batches to Tahsildars and others which will only result in their being left to rot in corners of their offices."

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

All the motions were then by leave withdrawn.

The following motion standing in the name of Mr. P. Siva Rao was not moved and was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

14. *That under* 47-*E, the lump provision of Rs.* 50,000 *for the extension of the operations of the Publicity Board may be omitted.*

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" Motions for reduction of total grants will be taken up all together."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR did not press the following motion :—

15. *That the provision of Rs.* 1,21,600 *under* 47. *for expenses of the Publicity Board, be reduced by Rs.* 10,000.

The motion was therefore deemed to have been withdrawn.

Mr. T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" Mr. President, my resolution is of a different nature.

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [23rd March 1921

'16. *That in* 47–*E. Miscellaneous—Publicity Board, the provision of Rs.* 1,21,600 *for Publicity Board be deleted.*'

"My object in framing the resolution is this. The Publicity Board has begun only a year ago and already the expenditure has come to a very high figure. I fear that if the Board should remain a separate body, the cost will be going on increasing. After hearing Messrs. Patro and S. Somasundaram Pillai my fear has only been confirmed. From the list of works which the Publicity Officer has to do according to them, it looks as if that one gentleman in charge will not do. It may require half a dozen more. It won't be long before other officers are taken into this department. To avoid that and to meet the other objection raised by some of the speakers, namely, that we want a very responsible officer to be in charge of the office—we don't want a person whose honesty and integrity we do not know—it struck me that this department might be abolished altogether and all the work put under the management of the Chief Secretary to the Government. I thought the Chief Secretary will be the proper person to do it because the Financial Department which was under him hitherto has been taken away and he ought to be able to find time to attend to one or more important matters. I thought that this department would be the best. He is the most responsible Secretary of the Government and as such his capacity to manage the department cannot be questioned, if Mr. Gwynn or some other equally qualified officer were to be under him as Under Secretary. There will also be the security that everything issued from that office will be properly authorized and there will also be a guarantee that no politics would be brought in—one member raised that question that the Publicity Board might be a political body. That objection also will vanish because all publications will come under the Government and there will be no fear that there will be any party politics advanced. So, for the sake of greater supervision and greater responsibility and to avoid much expenditure and also owing to the reason that the Chief Secretary has been relieved of the financial work and can easily take over this work, I propose, that this provision for the Publicity Board be deleted. It was in that view that I gave notice of this motion and not that the publicity work should be stopped.

"I may also state that if such an arrangement is made, I don't think it likely that the cost will be going on increasing. In some cases I think only Government Orders are sent from the Board. In some cases they are summarized. Probably in the Secretariat this could be done better because it knows what actually has to be done. They also know the purport of the Government Orders and could do the work certainly well."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR.—"I am afraid that Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar's proposal will be quite impracticable. The Chief Secretary is one of the most heavily worked officers of the Government and the Secretariat also is one of the most heavily worked institutions. So that, if this work is to be attached to the Chief Secretary, the first result will be that he will not find time to attend to this work. However, if it is attached to him as a matter of duty he and his establishment will naturally attend to it. What will be the result? This is as good as abolition of the Board altogether. In order that the work turned out by the Publicity Board might be interesting there must be some freshness about it. The Publicity Officer must have time to think, to read new books, new productions, in fact everything, both in this country and other countries that is appearing for the first time and he should have time to digest these things and to abstract out of these what is useful and reject what is useless, to summarize what is useful and

propagate the result of his summary in the country at large. I doubt whether the Chief Secretary has any time to think even of his current duties. So that the result of carrying out of the suggestion of Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar will be the abolition of the usefulness of this department and at the same time retaining the cost of it."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Even assuming it is practicable to transfer it to the Secretariat, I think there are still graver objections to the transfer. Even as it is and notwithstanding the attempts made to associate with the Publicity Board a number of non-officials, it is still working at a disadvantage owing to the impression that it is an officialised body and that it is not correctly representing popular sentiments. If you transfer it to the Secretariat you take away even the little satisfaction that non-officials have an opportunity of making themselves understood by the officers. It will get into Secretariat with all the suspicion that it is a purely officialised body and that it won't consult public opinion. Therefore even assuming it practicable to transfer it to the Secretariat, it is much more useful to keep it as a separate body."

Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—" I move that the question be put."

The motion for closure was put to the vote and carried.

Motion No. 16 was then put to the vote and lost.

The following motions which stood in the names of the Honourable Members noted against them were not moved and were therefore deemed to have been withdrawn :—

Sriman SASIBUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—

17. *That under* 47-*E, the provision of Rs.* 1,21,600 *for the Publicity Board be reduced to Rs.* 1,00,000.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

18. *That the allotment of Rs.* 1,21,600 (*Publicity Board*) *be omitted.*

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

19. *That the grant of Rs.* 1,21,600 *under* 47-*E. Miscellaneous*—(*Publicity Board*) *be omitted.*

Demand No. 9 for a grant of Rs. 1,21,600 was then put to vote and granted *nem. con.*

DEMAND X—CIVIL JUSTICE.

The Hon'ble Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" I move for the vote of the House for a grant under this head of a sum not exceeding 42·51 lakhs. The figure is made up, as you will find from the notice of motions, of the demands at page 8, and the references to details are printed in the last column of that page."

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

'1. *That the provision of Rs.* 50,520 *made for* 26 *bench clerks in the High Court in Detailed Account No.* 24-*A. Administration of Justice at page* 76 *be reduced by the cost of fo* [illegible] *clerks.*'

4-45 p.m.

" Sir, if you turn to page 76 of the Detailed Account you will find that in the budget year it is proposed to employ 26 bench clerks as against 16 who are now employed. (I hope there is no printer's devil in the two numbers). This, no doubt, involves an additional cost. I confess I am not in possession of the facts which necessitate the employment of ten additional clerks. There must have been

some very good reason for the increase in the number. My proposal is simply to cut down 4 clerks and to retain 6. As has already been pointed out, in the present stringency of our finances I think we shall be content with 6 clerks and cut down the 4 clerks from the additional allotment of 10."

The Hon'ble Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Mr. President, there is really some misapprehension with regard to this matter and probably it may be of use to the Council if I should explain it. If the Honourable Member had read a little higher up, he would have found that there was one appeal examiner, one indexer, two assistant appeal examiners. They are abolished and they are added on to the number of bench clerks. The position is this : there were 13 bench clerks when 3 benches of the High Court were sitting. In 1912, there was an addition of 3 bench clerks temporarily which have subsequently been made permanent. In 1914, there were 4 additional temporary clerks who again were made permanent. Now the number of Judges has increased to 12 ; the Chief Justice wants 2 more bench clerks to be provided for, and that is all the addition that we are going to allow. I shall just read a paragraph from the Chief Justice's letter to the Government ; that, I believe, will satisfy the House :—

' When there were 3 benches of ordinary sittings on the appellate side of the Court, the number of bench clerks was 13. Three temporary appointments were added in 1912, and subsequently confirmed and 4 were added in 1914. The number of benches now sitting regularly on the appellate side is 5 and for one or two days in each two judges sit alone for the hearing of cases triable by single judges, the number of courts is 6. Before going into the Court the bench clerks have to make themselves familiar with the records of the cases so as to furnish the Honourable Judges with any information they may require in the course of the case. They are further required to examine draft judgments, decrees and orders and are responsible for the accuracy of the affidavits, etc., etc.'

" Then he goes to the various other matters. The only addition that is now asked for is only of 2 bench clerks."

Mr. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting the resolution of my friend, but I may say at the outset that I am doing it on grounds entirely different from those on which he has brought the resolution. I shall, Sir, take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the House to the way in which the affairs of the High Court are administered, especially the way in which recruitments are being made for the Judiciary. (Hear, hear). Even before I proceed, I anticipate, perhaps from certain quarters the objection whether the remarks I am going to make are relevant to the issue before the House. In reply to them I may say at the outset that the attitude of the House, and especially what some of us may be forced to take with regard to votable items, generally depends on the way in which the affairs are carried on in the High Court.

" Sir, even the most uncompromising opponents of communal representation must recognize the great principle of Mathew Arnold that ' things are what they are, and their consequences would be what they would be.' In the administration of the country, communal representation has come to be a recognized principle. No less a person than the acute thinker H. H. the Aga Khan has said that the administration of a country to be carried on in the proper spirit must take into account the principle that every important community must have its own share in the shaping of legislation and in the carrying on of every-day administration. Now, Sir, the High Court may be perfectly right in what it does."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU (*interrupting*):—" I rise to a point of order. The motion before the House is the necessity or otherwise of four additional clerks. In this resolution we cannot enter into a general discussion of the way in which the High Court is performing its duties."

23rd March 1921] [The Hon'ble the President]

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"At present the question before the House is that the provision made for 26 bench clerks in the High Court is to be reduced by the cost of 4 clerks. Other things do not seem to be relevant to this, as far as I can see."

Mr. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR :—"If the Hon'ble the President says I am not in order, I am prepared to resume my seat."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"I would appeal to the Honourable Member to consider whether he is in order or whether he is prepared to contend that he is in order. If it be said that he wants these 26 bench clerks to be distributed on a communal basis, then he will be in order."

Mr. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR :—"I can vote one way or the other if I know how the recruitment is to be made. So, I am taking this opportunity of drawing the attention of the House as to the attitude that it must take on the voting of these grants for the administration of justice. Am I not in order, Sir?"

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"The Honourable Member is technically in order if he takes that view. He would object to these 4 clerks on the ground that the distribution should be on a communal basis. If he does not wish to vote for the 4 clerks, then he will be in order, not otherwise."

Mr. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR :—"It is the general view that I take."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"I think it must be confined to these 26 bench clerks."

Mr. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR :—"I was remarking that the principle of communal representation in this country has been fully recognized by no less a person than H.H. the Aga Khan. Even the Public Services Commission in one of its recommendations has stated that in recruitment, with due regard to efficiency, the proper representation of communities should be seen to. I submit that this very good recommendation of the Public Services Commission has not been given effect to, in the recruitments made by the High Court. My statistics do not refer to the recruitment of the bench clerks. I see that the way in which the High Court have recruited district munsifs is not at all satisfactory."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"On the ground that the Honourable Member is making out a case for the bench clerks, he is going on to the recruitment of munsifs."

Mr. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR :—"I support the motion because I am not satisfied with the way in which the High Court is administering justice in the matter of recruitment."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"The Hon'ble the Law Member has stated that these clerks are absolutely necessary. I myself did not know that four clerks, one appeal examiner, one indexer and two assistant appeal examiners have been omitted and that this establishment is substituted. I withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

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

'2. *That in* 24. *Administration of Justice—High Court, duty and personal allowance to typists, Rs.* 984 *be omitted.*'

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

'3. *That Rs.* 2,580 *local allowance in* 24-*A. Administration of Justice be deleted.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU moved—

'4. *That the provision of Rs.* 28,200 *made for retaining fee of mufassal Government Pleaders and Public Prosecutors in the Detailed Account No.* 24-*B. Law Officers be reduced by Rs.* 10,680, *so that* 21 *of them may get only Rs.* 60 *each per month and* 5 *may get only Rs.* 40 *per month.*'

In doing so, he said :—" Sir, if you turn to page 78 of the budget, you will find that these gentlemen are proposed to be given, 21 of them Rs. 100 and 5 of them Rs. 60 each. I think that these are intended to be given to them as retaining fees, and I understand that hitherto they were getting, some of them Rs. 50 and some of them Rs. 30. In addition to this, they are getting their usual fees each time in criminal cases and according to the value of the suit and appeals in civil cases. I submit therefore there is absolutely no reason why this retaining fee should be enhanced to Rs. 100 in the case of the majority of 21, and to Rs. 60 in the case of some others. I am certain this small increase will not at all go to give them either enhanced status or increased remuneration. On the other hand, we can effect a saving and divert it to some other immediate object in view. Therefore my proposal is that Rs. 10,680 may be saved in this connexion."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" I rise to oppose the motion for this reason. Till now I never was a Government pleader or a public prosecutor, and I hope never to be one. Therefore I speak without interest or partiality that may otherwise be attributed to me.

5 p.m. " Hitherto, there were three grades of men, one class getting a pay of Rs. 20 a month, another getting Rs. 30 and the third Rs. 50, and, roughly speaking, in about 16 districts the public prosecutors get Rs. 50. I believe it was restricted to Rs. 20 with respect to 3 or 4 districts, and in the case of 2 or 3 districts whose work was supposed to be very heavy, there was a further increase which went to Rs. 50. I shall not disclose the name of the person—he is occupying a distinguished position—who has told me more than once that under the circumstances, having regard to the poor remuneration paid, it is impossible to accept such low sums. In five districts, the offices have been bifurcated and in other districts both offices are being held by one and the same person. And therefore a sum of Rs. 3,000 of the revised scale goes to the office of the Government Pleader and Rs. 25,200 goes to represent the pay of the Public Prosecutor. Of late the work has gone up and the number of references made to the Public Prosecutor and the Government Pleader have gone up not only in quantity but also in quality. There is no reason why these gentlemen whose claims have till now remained uncared for and unheeded should not expect to have the benefit of a small increase, and I would certainly congratulate the Government if they were to propose to enhance the daily fee known as the refresher so far as public prosecutors are concerned. Therefore I am sorry I must resist this motion."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—" Sir, I rise to oppose this motion."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" May I be permitted to withdraw the motion, Sir ? "

23rd March 1921] [Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai]

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—" I have no objection, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The following motion which stood in the name of Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu was not moved and was deemed to have been withdrawn—

5. *That the provision of Rs.* 63,000 *made at page* 79 *for fees to pleaders in civil cases in* ' *Contingencies* ' *in No.* 24-*B. Law Officers be reduced by Rs.* 13,000.

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

'6. *That in the demand under* 24-*B. Administration of Justice—Law Officers—the grant* (*Rs.* 2,73,000) *proposed for fees to pleaders in criminal cases be reduced by Rs.* 50,000.'

" It will be seen from the budget, page 79, that the amount provided for one year is only Rs. 2,026 lakhs and the additional provision of Rs. 70,000 is made in respect of criminal cases and an additional provision of Rs. 16,000 is made in respect of civil cases. If the Hon'ble the Law Member can satisfy the House as to the necessity for increase of Rs. 70,000 under the head of criminal cases, namely, whether any additional fees have to be paid, it is probable that the question need not be considered. If he cannot satisfy us as to the necessity for increase, I think we can as well save Rs. 50,000 from out of this head instead of locking it up in the budget under this item."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" Mr. President, I beg to move my motion also with reference to the same question."

" It runs thus :—

' 7. *That the provision of Rs.* 2,73,000 *made at page* 79 *for fees to pleaders in criminal cases in the same account be reduced by Rs.* 60,000."

The Hon'ble Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Owing to a large number of memorials received from the Government pleaders and the public prosecutors in the various districts in which reference was made not merely to what is called the retaining fee—which it is not—but to the fee paid for non-contentious business —and also to the daily fees and other fees, we had to raise the scale. That is the reason why we had to provide for an increased figure. The price of ordinary goods have risen and so likewise even of lawyers. We have got to recognize it and we have to pay more. There may be just a suspicion whether it is not the lawyer who has paid some more money to his tribe. Fortunately this grant was made by the Home Member who is not ordinarily generous to the lawyer community. '

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" After this information I do not think it necessary to press my motion "

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" May I know what the increased rate is ?"

The Hon'ble Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" I can give it."

The Hon'ble Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"May I say a word, Sir, while my honourable colleague is looking up that point ? On one or possibly two occasions I strenuously opposed any increase in the scale of fees to Government pleaders and public prosecutors in this Council, or rather in the late Council. I opposed it on the ground that a Government pleader should be paid only according to the market rate and that there were many people ready to take the post on the existing scale of remuneration. But it became clear that there was widespread

dissatisfaction on the point which was displayed all over the Presidency and accordingly I directed consultation of selected District and Sessions Judges and selected Collectors and it was on the consensus of their opinion that I agreed though not without reluctance to a revision of the case. As regards the 'generosity' in respect of which I have just been paid a compliment, I claim, Sir, that I try at all times to be just, though I may not be always generous."

The Hon'ble Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" The minimum fees in criminal cases payable at headquarters under the existing rules to public prosecutors is Rs. 25 for each case which does not last for more than a day and Rs. 25 for each day or part thereof when the case runs for more than a day. These will be enhanced to Rs. 35."

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

Both the motions were by leave withdrawn.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, I beg to move—

'8. *That the grant of Rs.* 4,26,700 *under* 24-*B. Law Officers be reduced by Rs.* 75,000.'

" If we refer to the budget we find an increase of Rs. 70,000 with reference to criminal cases and Rs. 16,000 with reference to civil cases. The proposal is to give a larger retainer's fee. Whenever an Honourable Member of this House comes forward with proposals to increase the pay of those who are paid very low the argument is advanced that there was any number who apply to take up the appointment on the low pay and when that is the case they ask why we should go and increase it. I ask, Sir, if there have not been many applicants for the posts of Government pleaders and public prosecutors on the existing pay. When we are able to get men with all the qualifications for these appointments, why should we go and increase their pay?

" Another thing which I wanted to bring to the notice of the Council is that there is a well recognized rule in the Audit department that Government officers when spending money connected with the Government should exercise the same care and economy as they would exercise if the money were their own. I am afraid that there are District Judges as well as public prosecutors—I do not say all of them—who do not observe this principle. For example, cases which might be finished in a day or two are allowed to go on for days together which results in considerable inconvenience to parties and witnesses to make it advantageous to the Government vakil or the public prosecutor. Again there is a rule that whenever they appear in a case they get daily fee to a certain amount. It sometimes happens that three or four cases are posted to a day and one witness is examined in each case and the Government vakil gets fee in each of them. It is more with the object of bringing this to the notice of members responsible for the administration of that department I have ventured to bring this motion to the consideration of the Council."

The Hon'ble Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" May I rise to a point of order Sir? This particular item as regards the retaining fee and special fee which has been increased has been withdrawn or voted against. Is the Honourable Member in order in raising under the guise of a general reduction a question already disposed of?"

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—" He is certainly in order as he is dealing with general reduction."

23rd March 1921] [The Hon'ble Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

The Hon'ble Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Sir he is proposing the very reduction, namely, in respect of Government pleaders."

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"My friend the Hon'ble the Law Member would be right if there was a vote taken and the motion negatived. But the motion was simply withdrawn and therefore I think the Honourable Member (Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar) is in order."

The Hon'ble Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I beg your pardon. It is so."

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT :—"What has the Honourable Member to say on the merits?"

The Hon'ble Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I have already dealt with the merits. We are not spending more than is absolutely necessary. It will be within the recollection of the members of the profession here that fees have risen enormously since the time when these scales were fixed, so much so that the fee paid to the Government pleaders is not ordinarily one half of what a leading vakil gets."

Mr. S. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I wish to oppose this motion that has been made for the reduction. I wish to support my opposition on the ground that Government pleaders and public prosecutors have really been underpaid. There was a conference of the Government pleaders and public prosecutors last year and I was fully convinced that they were really underpaid. It is not right that when leading vakils at various mufassal stations get more fees the public prosecutors and the Government vakils should get as a retaining fee a clerk's pay or a sum unduly low. I would appeal to my friend Mr. Ranganetham not to make too fine a point of it. He may object to lawyers making large incomes but I do not think, Sir, they make their fortune out of Government cases."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to support the proposition moved by my friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. My object in doing so is this. I wish to warn the House against the danger to which they are laying open the litigant public of the whole Presidency. When the non-gazetted officers complained that their salaries should be raised and that the higher paid officers had already been given increased salaries, the answer was that on account of want of funds the salaries of the underpaid officers could not be revised. Now this demand for revision is for the first time in a slow degree being introduced into the Judicial or the Legal services. The Government who are dealing with public money say that on account of the rise in prices a little more increase is necessary in the scale of fees for the Government pleader also. No doubt they can do so. The result of it is that when once increase is given to one set of people others will slowly ask for increase also. This does not rest with the Government pleaders only, but it affects the litigant population of the whole Presidency. Then the Honourable Member may say that the scale of fees hitherto paid, that is, the *ad valorem* fee of 5 per cent or 2½ per cent on the amount involved in litigation should also be revised. What is it that you are doing by this? You are stamping your approval on this demand of the Law Department for increased fees, and when the Government have done it, why not the High Court also follow the same? They may also increase the pleaders' fees. The result is that the litigant who employs the lawyer and who is obliged to pay the fees of the lawyers of the opposite side will have to pay more. We should now consider the question whether we are not opening the gate which will involve these unhappy litigants in an enormous cost in future. In consideration of all these circumstances, I oppose this grant."

[Mr. T. Balaji Rao Nayudu] [23rd March 1921

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"Mr. President, I support the motion made by Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. I would only say that we cannot take it to be a fact, that the public prosecutors and Government pleaders have been hitherto under-paid. The mere fact that they are continuing in their posts for 12, 14, 18 or more years altogether without making room for their juniors, shows that there is a lot of influence, if not much pecuniary gain, by their holding on to these appointments. There is no justification at all for raising the retaining fees intended for these Government pleaders."

5-15 p.m.

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—"I strongly oppose this motion. The Hon'ble Member Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu seems to have observed that there was no demand for extra pay. As a matter of fact, there is acute discontent amongst the Government pleaders and public prosecutors? so much so that the Government took note of the matter and made a reference to some of the Sessions Judges who have unanimously recommended an increment in the scale of fees. Further what is the pittance that the Government are going to pay? it is only Rs. 35 per diem for attending to a case. As the Hon'ble the Law Member put it, it is not even a half or one-third of what a leading lawyer gets as a day-fee in the mufassal."

Mr M. D. DEVADOSS :—"I strongly oppose this motion for reduction. It is a well-known fact that the scale of fees now paid was fixed years and years ago. Since that time practitioners have raised their scale of fees and it is a well known fact that in the mufassal, these practitioners get not merely four times but even six times as much as the Government pleader. If the matter goes on for two days, the Government pleader is paid only Rs. 60, whereas a leading vakil may get Rs. 300 or Rs. 400. Therefore it is necessary that the Government should have the best talent at their service, especially in criminal cases. In important cases where the life and liberty of a subject are involved, we should have the best legal advice possible. It is but fair that these Government pleaders and public prosecutors should get a decent fee for a day's work. It has been asked, 'if the position is not attractive, why should there be so many clamouring for the post?' Generally people who apply for the post of Government pleader are juniors and men with a good practice do not apply. The Government have sometimes to ask a leading man to take up an important case. That being so, I do not think that we would be justified in refusing this grant."

The motion for closure moved by Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu was carried unanimously.

The main motion (No. 8) was then put to the Council and declared lost, 26 voting *for* and 37 *against*.

A poll was then taken on the motion of Mr. O Tanikachala Chettiyar with the following result :—

Ayes.

1. Mr. Arunachala Mudaliyar.
2. ,, Balaji Rao Nayudu.
3. ,, Ellappa Chettiyar.
4. ,, Ethirajulu Nayudu.
5. ,, Muniswami Nayudu.
6. ,, Mu'hukumaraswami Chettiyar.
7. ,, Narayanaswami Reddi.
8. ,, Natesa Mudaliyar.
9. ,, Patro.
10. ,, Ponnuswami Nayudu.
11. ,, Ranganadha Mudaliyar.
12. ,, Soundara Pandia Nadar.
13. ,, Shunmukham Chettiyar.
14. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai.
15. ,, Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu.
16. ,, Tangavelu Pillai.
17. ,, Tanikachala Chettiyar.
18. ,, Venkataratnam Nayudu.
19. ,, Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.
20. ,, Raja.
21. ,, Guruswami.
22. ,, Palmer.
23. ,, Abdul Razac Sahib.
24. Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib.
25. Mr. Muhammad Usman Sahib.
26. ,, Venkatarangayya.

23rd March 1921]

Noes.

1. The Hon'ble Sir Lionel Davidson.
2. ,, Mr. Todhunter.
3. ,, Md. Habib-ul-lah Sahib.
4. ,, Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
5. ,, Mr. Subbarayalu Reddiyar.
6. ,, Mr. Ramarayaningar.
7. Mr. Richards.
8. ,, Grieve.
9. ,, Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
10. ,, Periyanayakam.
11. ,, Audinarayana Reddi.
12. ,, Devarajulu Nayadu.
13. ,, Gopala Menon.
14. ,, Narasimha Raju.
15. ,, Ramalinga Chettiyar.
16. ,, Ramayya Punja.
17. ,, Shunmukham Pillai.
18. ,, N. A. V. Somasundaram Pillai.
19. ,, Ramachandra Rao.
20. ,, S. Srinivasa Ayyangar
21. Mr. Krishnan Nayar.
22. ,, Krishna Rao.
23. ,, Siva Rao.
24. ,, Muttumanickachari.
25. ,, Narasimhacharlu.
26. ,, U. Rama Rao.
27. ,, Sadasiva Bhat.
28. Sriman Sasibhushana Rath.
29. Mr. Seshagiri Rao.
30. ,, Seturatnam Ayyar.
31. ,, R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
32. ,, T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
33. ,, Suryanarayana.
34. ,, Venkatarama Ayyar.
35. ,, Venkataramana Ayyangar.
36. ,, Arumainatha Pillai.
37. ,, Devadoss.
38. ,, Mascarenhas.
39. Ahmad Mirun Sahib.
40. Bavotti Sahib.
41. Hamid Sultan Marakkayar Sahib

26 *for* and 41 *against*.

The Council then adjourned to 11 a.m. on Thursday, the 24th March 1921.

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

TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS


தமிழ்நாடு சட்டமன்றப் பேரவை
TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS