

[10th March 1923]

Now, the allowances which we budgeted for in the budget estimate of 1922-23 were allowances actually sanctioned from the 1st April last year, and they have been drawn and paid regularly: whereas the Accountant-General's revised estimate is only Rs. 20,500. But what I budgeted for has been drawn and has been paid. The Council may take it as a fact and I will show you what has happened if you will turn to page 86 of the budget, you will see that is where it has been shown. Whereas I budgeted for Rs. 15,40,000 under the head "Executive Subordinates", the Accountant-General, you will observe, has raised the revised to Rs. 15,93,000. Now what I budgeted for was the pay of the men actually in the force on the 1st April last. There have been some variations due to the accrual of increments, but on the other hand there have been the usual number of casualties and in fact it always happens that there is a saving which the Accountant-General takes into account and deducts, as you will see he has done in the bottom of the page. So that as my force has not been increased, in the revised estimate of 15 lakhs 93 thousand, the increase of Rs. 53,000 has to be .....

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

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

#### PETTY CONSTRUCTION.

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

That the item of Rs. 1,72,000 for "Petty Construction," (page 89 of the Civil Budget) be reduced by Rs. 72,000

Sir, I see the Police building budget for the next year exceeds past records. The buildings budget of the Police is shown in page 15 of the Public Works Budget—Buildings and Roads Branch as Rs. 55,100 for works in progress and Rs. 2,51,500 for new works making a total of Rs. 3,76,600, and this amount which exceeds previous records, has been passed by the Standing Committee. In consideration of this heavy allotment under this head I do not see any reason why such a further heavy amount should be with the Inspector-General for "Petty Construction". I see the actual expenditure in the last year was 1 lakh and 9,000 rupees, and so in consideration

[Ch. Bhagabat Pd. S. Mahapatra.]

of the actual of the last year, Rs. 72,000 may be conveniently reduced and the budget brought to one lakh.

Mr. W. SWAIN: Sir, may I ask one question before I start? Where has the hon'ble member got his figure of 1 lakh and 9 thousand?

Chaudhuri BHAGABAT PRASHAD SAMANTARAI MAHAPATRA: At page 89 of the Budget.

Mr. W. SWAIN: Sir, the hon'ble member who represents South Balasore wishes to reduce my demand of Rs. 1,72,000 for "Petty Construction" by Rs. 72,000. One of his grounds is that there has been a liberal provision passed by the Standing Committee under the head "Civil Works" in the budget of the Public Works Department. On that point I would say that the provision is not so liberal as he appears to think. The average for the past five years which I have here shows that the average grant was Rs. 3,42,656, so that it is only an increase of Rs. 30,000 above the average of the last five years, and he must remember that during these five years on account of the financial position we had on several occasions to restrict the expenditure on buildings. Actually in the year 1921-22 the grant was Rs. 4,28,380: so that his first plea of liberality of the provision in the Public Works budget is not a very strong one.

His next plea was that as the actuals for 1921-22 were Rs. 1,09,000 only, therefore there is no necessity to provide Rs. 1,72,000 this year. He possibly may have noticed that the Accountant-General's revised estimate for 1922-23 is Rs. 1,50,000. Now, Sir, this is taking advantage of the effort that we have made to meet the wishes of this Council. We had urgent demands of other nature. We were asked to economise and therefore in the year 1921-22 we did not spend our money on buildings, money which had been sanctioned for us, and I do not think it is fair for any hon'ble member of this Council to urge that as a reason why we should not spend money in the current year when you have a surplus budgeted for. When the Transferred departments are taking nine-tenths of the extra expenditure, I do not think it is fair for any hon'ble member to urge that as an argument for cutting down my budget. As regards the needs of the Police Department in buildings I fancy the hon'ble member was here in 1921 when I spoke on the subject, and I cannot help feeling amazement and dismay that anyone who was here and heard on that occasion the account I gave of police buildings should come forward with a motion to reduce my demand,

[10th March 1923]

Now, the official view of the state of police buildings is this: I am quoting from the Government resolutions on the Administration of the Police Department for various years.

In 1912 the Government resolution stated that the present condition of many police buildings was very unsatisfactory,

In 1915 Government regretted that the condition of police buildings was still indifferent and that their improvement had been retarded by financial stringency.

In 1918 Government stated that a large programme for new construction was urgently required.

In 1919 Government stated that a rapid improvement in the health of the force would probably take place if the conditions under which the bulk of the force were housed could be set right; that an increased expenditure on police buildings had long been an urgent necessity, that the condition of many of the buildings was most unsatisfactory and that their improvement constituted an urgent demand upon the public purse.

In 1920 Government stated that lack of suitable accommodation for the police and the absence of warm clothing and waterproof coats are contributive, if not the principal cause of the sickness of the force and there can be no doubt that the housing of the police presented an acute problem, that a large number of new buildings were required and that many of the existing buildings had fallen into bad disrepair.

In 1921 Government stated that much of the sickness of the force must still be ascribed to the unsatisfactory housing conditions and until financial conditions make it possible to spend money on this urgent need, the health of the forces cannot be expected to improve materially.

I ask whether any member who has read these resolutions which are open to every member of this House to read can come forward with a motion of this description? Possibly hon'ble members have no conception of what the country loses in sickness. I will give them a few figures.

In the last year, 1922, the number of police constables who were admitted to hospital as in-patients was 1,200 that is to say 33 per cent. of the force and the country lost 58 thousand working days, costing in pay alone half a lakh of rupees. Those figures only relate to admissions to hospital. They take no

[Mr. W. Swain]

account of men sick in quarters: they take no account of the loss of services due to men taking leave on account of sickness and it will be difficult indeed to frame an estimate of what that amounts to. But I may mention one district, the district of Champaran. In that district there are 444 head-constables and the average number of men on leave owing to sickness, not sick in hospital, not sick in quarters, but actually on leave due to sickness was 29 per mensem and that represents 7 per cent. of the force. You have it on the best authority, on the authority of the officers who are responsible for the welfare of the force that the present appalling sickness and suffering is due to a great extent to the miserable condition under which the men live.

In opposing a similar motion in 1921 I stated that in 1920 my predecessor when preparing the figures for a Committee had shown that no fewer than 285 sub-inspectors' quarters, 484 head-constables' quarters, 83 new barracks and 67 new investigating centres were urgently necessary and that an expenditure of 8 lakhs a year for 5 years was required in order to house the police adequately and suitably. The position is very much the same to-day.

I need only mention two instances. In the Santal Parganas 33 out of 75 sub-inspectors and writer-head constables, that is to say, nearly 50 per cent. of them have no Government quarters. It may surprise the hon'ble member to know that in the district which he himself represents 32 out of 34 writer-head constables have no Government quarters. They have to live in the bazar in rented houses. It may also interest the Council to know as we were talking about Nathnagar, that when addressing His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in the year 1905, I mentioned that the provision of quarters there was an urgent necessity, that is, 17 years ago; and this year for the first time I have been able to include provision for 3 of those quarters that have been required since 1905. Now, Sir, I have given a long list compiled by my predecessor and stated that the position is no better to-day. Now that list took no account of the claims of constables and writer-head constables and head constables to family quarters. They are entitled to family quarters and it is the duty of Government to provide them. The hon'ble member who come from Orissa and those who come from Chota Nagpur will realise that provision of family quarters for certain class of constables is absolutely essential. But what about Bihar? Is it not equally essential for constables in Bihar? Is it not a disgrace to the administration of

[10th March 1923]

any civilised country that you are taking the flower of your youth and separating them absolutely from their wives and children between the ages of 20 and 50, because you cannot provide them with quarters. Is it any wonder that the Hon'ble Mr. Das has made provision for the treatment of contagious diseases in constables, and I think if my hon'ble friend had known the real conditions in which they live, he would have referred to the matter in more sympathetic terms.

Babu GANESH DATTA SINGH : Then why do you want only Rs. 1,72,000 ?

Mr. W. SWAIN : I have only asked Rs. 1,72,000 because there is little chance of getting more. What I want is 8 lakhs a year for five years.

Is it any wonder that that form of disease is common in constables ? In pleading the cause of my men in 1921 I gave many examples, and I will repeat none of those ; but I will give some of those which have come to my notice recently since 1st January 1923.

In Gaya constables of the kotwali are living in the verandah because there is insufficient room for them in the barracks.

At Rajgaon in Bhagalpur no quarters are available for the head constables and no house is available for hire, so the Superintendent of Police, rather than require this officer to live in a verandah, has withdrawn him.

At Jharia in Dhanbad, the junior sub-inspector lives in a rented house which has only one living room although the rent is Rs. 25 a month, and he is unable to bring his family there.

In Jharia two writer head constables are occupying a wretched house in which there are only two rooms although the rent is Rs. 20 per month.

The officers and staff at Chitkora within two miles of this palatial Council Chamber, spent the whole of last winter and hot weather under canvas, and in the rains were kindly permitted to occupy the stables of the Escort of His Excellency the Governor.

In Muzaffarpur a barrack is overcrowded. The health of the men is suffering in consequence. Some men are living in open sheds, there are not even walls to protect them from sun,

[Mr. W. Swain.]

rain, wind and dust, cooksheds have neither walls nor doors to keep out dogs and chickens, I have seen this with my own eyes.

In Monghyr the officer in charge is living a mile away from the men whom he is supposed to control.

At Begusarai, the barrack is insanitary and unhealthy. The mud walls are cracked and infested with snakes. A constable was killed by a snake in 1920. The accommodation here is insufficient and so bad that the general health of the force is suffering. A sub-inspector, the son of a sub-inspector, the nephew of a sub-inspector and the wife of a sub-inspector died here in the years 1919-1920.

At Ichagarh, in Manbhum, the Magistrate reported in January that the police buildings are a "perfect disgrace". They have been washed away by floods in 1919, I can give many more such examples.

Babu GANESH DATTA SINGH: No further explanation is needed.

The Hon'ble Mr. H. McPHERSON: Then perhaps the hon'ble mover will withdraw his motion.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT: The only question is, does the hon'ble member intend to proceed with his motion?

Chaudhuri BHAGABAT PRASHAD SAMANTARAI MAHAPATRA: Yes, Sir, I cannot.....

Mr. W. SWAIN: Very well, Sir, I am quite ready to proceed with my explanation.

I can give many more instances. If the hon'ble members will look at the photographs with which I have provided them they will see the state of the constables barracks at Pakaur in the Santal Parganas. The constables' barrack became uninhabitable in 1920. Since that year those unfortunate constables have been living in a chaukidari shed which has no walls of any description and they are exposed to the rain, the dust, the heat and the cold. They have suffered these conditions since 1920 because funds are not available to rebuild their barrack.

Now I referred to Balasore whence the hon'ble mover comes. I mentioned that 32 out of 34 writer head constables have no Government quarters to live in. They live in such hired houses

[10th March 1933]

as they can obtain. In this district too, a District Magistrate, I think it was an Indian gentleman, described the sub-inspectors quarters at Simulia as a cow-shed.

Rai Bahadur DVARIKA NATH: I once more appeal, Sir, to my friend Mr. Mahapatra that he will kindly withdraw his motion.

Chaudhuri BHAGABAT PRASHAD SAMANTARAI MAHAPATRA: But I wish to say a word.....

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT: If the hon'ble member is not prepared to withdraw it, the Inspector-General of Police has the right to reply.

Maulavi HAFIZ NURUL HAQQ: Sir, I move that the question be now put.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT: The question is that the question be now put.

The motion for closure was adopted.

The Hon'ble the PRESIDENT: The question is:

That the item of Rs. 1,72,000 for "Petty construction" be reduced by Rs. 72,000.

The motion was negatived.

Rai Bahadur DVARIKA NATH: Sir, I beg to move:

That the item of Rs. 1,72,000 for "Petty construction" (page 89 of the Civil Budget) be reduced by Rs. 10,000.

I know Mr. Swain is against it. But I would give him a last chance and see whether he has got some pity for the poor and oppressed taxpayers or whether his sympathies are only confined to the police constables. If he agrees so much the better otherwise I shall withdraw.

Mr. W. SWAIN: Sir, I am placed in a very awkward position. I am asked to consider the interest of my men—the necessities of my men as compared with the desire of the hon'ble mover to go to the electorates in November next and say that he has succeeded in cutting Rs. 10,000 from the police budget. I very much regret that under the circumstances I must consider thus the necessities of my men are greater, and therefore I cannot agree to the reduction proposed.

[R. B. Dvarika Nath]

Rai Bahadur DVARIKA NATH : I withdraw my motion.  
The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

#### RECLAMATION OF MAGAHIYA DOMS.

Babu DEVAKI PRASHAD SINHA : Sir, I move :

That the item of Rs. 9,805 for "Reclamation of Magahiya Doms" (page 89 of the Civil Budget) be omitted.

My object in moving this motion is to elicit some information from the Inspector-General of Police on this subject. In the first place the very idea of reclamation of any human being through the police agency seems to be a contradiction in terms. Well, I do not know if the amount that is demanded under this head will go to finance the work of the Salvation Army which is carried on in some districts of North Bihar. If that is so, I have no intention of pressing this motion, but if it is meant to contribute to the various police outposts in the interior in order to enable them to keep under their surveillance and supervision a number of Doms for the fear that if they are set at large they would commit theft, then I would submit that it is a policy which needs revision. I do not know if the Inspector-General of Police can certify that any of those persons who have been kept for a number of years under the direct supervision of the sub-inspectors of police, in front of the thana have after a period of years come out as reclaimed human beings. With these words Sir, I propose my motion.

Mr. W. SWAIN : Sir, I think that if the hon'ble member from Palamau merely wanted information it would have been more graceful on his part to avoid making statements of a derogatory nature in connection with the police force. I should have felt inclined to say very little but for that. He wants to know whether any person could be reformed by police agency. If he will put himself in my charge for some time I undertake to change his outlook in respect of that point.

Babu NIRSU NARAYAN SINHA : For worse ?

Mr. W. SWAIN : I merely said to change his outlook. It is a matter of opinion whether it is for better or worse, but I have full confidence in my ability to reform him. I may say that it is within my knowledge that persons particularly Magahiya Doms—some of whom have been under police