

[10th March 1923]

Babu DEVAKI PRASHAD SINHA: But the practice followed in the case of other demands has been that the motion which suggests the largest increase in the demand has been taken up first. These two motions—items Nos. 211 and 200—relate not only to one item but to all the items that compose the whole demand.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT: The relevant rules are—

When several motions relating to the same demand are offered, they shall be discussed in the order in which the heads to which they relate appear in the budget.

No motion shall be made for the reduction of a grant as whole until all motions for the omission or reduction of definite items within that grant have been discussed.

Babu DEVAKI PRASHAD SINHA: In order to avoid a detailed discussion on all these demands, may I request the Inspector-General of Police, to let us know what amount he is willing to concede to us, that is, to what reduction he would willingly agree? (laughter).

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT: I must decline to be a party to this bargain (laughter).

TEMPORARY FORCE.

Babu GANESH DATTA SINGH: Sir, I beg to move:

That the item of Rs. 54,801 for "Temporary Force" (Page 86 of the Civil Budget) be omitted.

Sir, it appears that in 1919-20 the amount for this item was Rs. 14,809; in 1920-21, it was Rs. 8,000; in 1921-22, Rs. 18,000 but the actual came to Rs. 19,000; in 1922-23, the budget was Rs. 21,691, but the revised estimate shows Rs. 46,800. In 1923-24 it is still increased to Rs. 54,000. It appears that 500 out of the total number of constables have been reduced. What is reduced there, is increased here. If you do not require constables, where is the justification for having this temporary force. Then, Sir, whatever may be the condition of the province in the year 1922-23, the province is very quiet now. Then for emergency you have made a provision for Rs. 5,000. That Rs. 5,000 will remain at the disposal of the Head of the Department for such expenses as may be required. Just now we have been told that the

[B. Ganesh D. Singh]

rearrangement of the police force is being done. If this is the case—and there is a promise of reduction somewhere if the force in the capital area is sanctioned—what for you have increased the item from last year's figure of Rs. 46,800 to Rs. 54,801. I thought first it would be better to reduce it, but looking into the circumstances, I thought that it would be better to omit it totally, because if it remains in the budget, it is quite possible that it will come in the shape of a supplementary demand and I do not know where we shall be placed then. Therefore I ask for the omission of the whole amount as there is no justification for it.

Mr. W. SWAIN : Sir, my hon'ble friend is labouring under a misapprehension. It is clear that he does not understand what this provision for "Temporary force" is for, or what those temporary forces are. Roughly, they fall under three heads and they are made with reference to the actual needs of the year so far we can foresee them. I may tell him at once that the reason for the marked increase this year is on account of the increased activity in railway construction and railway surveys. This is the first reason, and the second is the necessity of continuing in Purnea the additional police sanctioned for dealing with the dacoity problem. The total of Rs. 54,801 is made up of Rs. 23,704 for railway cash guards, the cost of which is entirely recoverable from the Railways and will eventually be credited to Government ; then there is Rs. 19,517 for the Purnea additional police who are dealing with dacoity. During the last two years and a half dacoity has been rife in Purnea. In 1921 the number of cases was 129 and in 1922 the number of cases was 136. Government have sanctioned a small additional investigating force of one deputy superintendent, three inspectors, eight sub-inspectors, and a few head constables, and I have also lent from other districts 165 constables and 18 head constables for patrol duty. The cost of this extra force and the cost of lending these forces, that is to say their travelling allowance, halting allowance and other items of the lent force, make up a total of Rs. 19,517. Then, there are other guards who remain for part of the year only, and perhaps it will be necessary for me to give details in order to disarm the suspicion. Those temporary guards are employed for a portion of the year only and are the following :—

- (1) A guard for guarding the canal collections at Bikram in Patna and Daudnagar in Gaya.

[10th March 1923]

- (2) A guard for the Secretariat building at Ranchi.
- (3) A guard for the Khajuria labour corps depot.
- (4) A guard for salt duty collection—sanctioned under Bengal Government order No. 6705A., dated the 31st December 1900.
- (5) A guard for the Mokameh Agrotis campaign.
- (6) A guard for the Car festival at Bhubaneswar, Puri.
- (7) A guard at the Accountant-General's office to guard the Government promissory notes.
- (8) A guard for guarding the railway embankments of the Bengal North-Western Railway in Bhagalpur and Monghyr districts.

That, Sir, is a complete explanation. I trust that in view of this explanation the hon'ble member will see his way to withdraw his motion.

Babu GANESH DATTA SINGH: Sir, I withdraw my motion.

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

PURCHASE OF PONIES.

Chaudhuri BHAGABAT PRASHAD SAMANTARAI MAHAPATRA: Sir, I beg to move:

That the item of Rs. 1,000 for "Purchase of Ponies" (page 87 of the Civil Budget) be omitted.

Sir, for the current year, the demand was for Rs. 3,200 for this purpose, but subsequently Mr. Dundas accepted or agreed to reduce it to Rs. 1,500. I will read out to you his reasons for it in his own words:

"That shows that we have done several replacements in the past year and in the present year. I recognized that fact when I was working the budget and I actually budgetted for a lower sum—a lower sum than Rs. 3,200. Now the estimate is fixed with reference to the actuals of the previous years and for that reason the Accounts Department has increased my budget to the present figure which stands at Rs. 3,200. But as I have said we did a number of replacements in the year before and a number of replacements this year I shall be content with a smaller figure than that budgetted for."