

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Saturday, 19th February, 1921.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber at Eleven of the Clock.
The Honourable the President in the Chair.

The Honourable the President: Members desiring to take their seats, will please advance to the table to take the Oath or to affirm in the manner prescribed.

There being no further Members to take the Oath, we will proceed to questions.

The Honourable the President then called upon Lala Girdhari Lal Agarwala to put Question No. 143.

The Honourable Mr. Moncrieff Smith: The Honourable Member is not here.

The Honourable the President: When a Member is absent, unless, under Standing Order No. 19, the Member of the Government, in charge of the Department concerned, wishes to answer the Question, the Question will lapse, and notice will have to be given of it anew.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

ALLAHABAD HIGH COURT.

143. Lala Girdhari Lal Agarwala: Do the Government of India propose to consider the question of securing the appointment of an Additional Indian Judge to the Honourable High Court at Allahabad and transfer the judicial work hitherto disposed of by the Board of Revenue to that Honourable Court?

(This Question was not answered as Lala Girdhari Lal Agarwala was not present.)

CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY COMMISSION.

144. Babu K. C. Neogy: (a) Will the Government be pleased to state when the report of the Calcutta University Commission was submitted to them, and when the report was published?

(b) Is it a fact that on the publication of the report the Secretary of State for India asked the Government of India for a reasoned despatch containing their proposals, and suggested that sufficient time should be given to him to consider the same?

Mr. H. Sharp: (a) The report of the Calcutta University Commission was published on the 9th August 1919. No definite date can be specified on which it was submitted to the Government of India; but before its publication, proofs of it were received by some of the Government officers concerned.

(b) The Government of India are not prepared to give any information on this subject.

REPORT OF THE CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY COMMISSION.

145. Babu K. C. Neogy: (a) Is it a fact that on or about the 27th January 1920, the Government of India published a Resolution on the report

PROVINCIAL EXECUTIVE COUNCILS.

183. **Babu K. C. Neogy**: What are the factors that have determined the numerical strength of Members of the Executive Council and Ministers in the different Governors' province.

Mr. S. P. O'Donnell: The strength of the Executive Councils in the provinces of the Punjab, the United Provinces, the Central Provinces and Assam has been fixed at two Members which is in accordance with the recommendation of the Joint Committee on clause 5 of the Government of India Bill and is the minimum necessary for the discharge of the duties devolving on the Councils. As regards the Executive Council of Bihar and Orissa, I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer given to the question asked by Khan Bahadur Saiyid Muhammad Ismail, and as regards the Executive Councils of Madras, Bombay and Bengal, to the answer given to the question asked by Lala Girdhari Lal Agarwala.

EXECUTIVE COUNCILS IN MADRAS, BOMBAY, ETC.

184. **Babu K. C. Neogy**: (a) Will Government be pleased to state the reasons for appointing a larger number of Members to the Executive Council in the provinces of Madras, Bombay, Bengal and Bihar and Orissa, than in the United Provinces and the Punjab?

(b) In what manner, and to what extent does the work of administration differ in these provinces so as to justify such disparity?

Mr. S. P. O'Donnell: I would refer the Honourable Member to the answers given to the question asked by Khan Bahadur Saiyid Muhammad Ismail and Lala Girdhari Lal Agarwala.

BENGAL EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

185. **Babu K. C. Neogy**: Is it a fact that, so far as Bengal is concerned, the total number of Members of the Executive Council was at one time proposed to be fixed at two? If so, will Government state when and under what circumstances was the said number fixed at four?

Mr. S. P. O'Donnell: The question whether a Council of two would suffice was considered and decided in the negative. As regards the reasons for fixing the strength of the Council at four Members, I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer I have given to the question asked by Lala Girdhari Lal Agarwala.

PORTFOLIOS OF MEMBERS IN EXECUTIVE COUNCILS.

186. **Babu K. C. Neogy**: Will Government be pleased to make a statement showing, province by province, the distribution of portfolios as between the different Members of the Executive Council, comparing the same in the case of Madras, Bombay, Bengal and Bihar and Orissa, with the distribution obtaining just on the eve of the inauguration of the reformed constitution?

Mr. S. P. O'Donnell: The distribution of portfolios between the Members of each of the Provincial Executive Councils is a matter entirely for the Governor of each province. The Government of India have not the information asked for, and I would suggest that the Honourable Member should address this question to the Local Governments concerned.