लाल बहादुर शास्त्री प्रशासन अकादमी
Lal Bahadur Shastri Academy of Administration
मसूरी
MUSSOORIE

पुस्तकालय
LIBRARY

अवाप्ति संख्या
Accession No. ~~592~~ 119650

वर्ग सख्या
Class No. R 328.5402

पुस्तक संख्या
Book No. Ind-1935
V.3.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Saturday, 9th March, 1935.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

CLOSING DOWN OF COTTAGE MATCH FACTORIES SINCE THE IMPOSITION OF THE EXCISE DUTY.

761. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** In view of the answer given by Government to starred question No. 261 on the 14th February, 1935, will Government please state how many factories where matches were being made as a cottage industry have been closed down since the imposition of excise duty on matches?

Mr. A. J. Raisman: As explained in my reply to the Honourable Member's question No. 261 in this Session, the production of matches in India was tremendously increased in anticipation of the levy of the excise, with the result that for some months, after the imposition of the duty and until the accumulated stocks were worked off, production practically ceased both in large scale factories and in cottage establishments. The number of cottage establishments which ceased working was, according to the information at present available, 132, but 39 of these have since re-opened and 23 new factories have been opened.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know what is the number of cottage factories that have ceased to produce matches?

Mr. A. J. Raisman: I was explaining to the Honourable Member that practically all the match factories in India closed in April last. They ceased working, and only recently we have been finding out which of them are going to continue, and, as I say, 39 of these have since re-opened and 23 new factories have been opened. I might mention that one of the effects of the excise is to make very small scale working unprofitable and the tendency has been for small scale factories with machinery to be started, with a larger number in one establishment. It does not pay now to run a sort of one man factory.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Am I to understand that under this excise, cottage factories cannot work?

Mr. A. J. Raisman: What I was pointing out was that the excise does not make it remunerative for a very small cottage factory to work. I would also point out that the Tariff Board, which went very carefully

into this question, recommended that Government should not regard production of matches in cottages as a thing to be encouraged on grounds of public health and safety. There had been some very nasty accidents because of the careless handling of the explosive material necessary and Government accepted that view.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In view of the excessive rise in the price of matches, will Government consider the advisability of restricting the price fixed on a box of matches?

Mr. A. J. Raisman: No, Sir, Government do not consider that the present circumstances justify such a degree of interference with ordinary trade.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know the amount of unemployment that has been caused by the stoppage of these cottage factories?

Mr. A. J. Raisman: I pointed out just now to my friend that although the number of factories may have declined, I have reason to think that the actual degree of employment in the production of matches has not declined.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Is it not a fact that in these cottage industries only safety matches are produced,

Mr. A. J. Raisman: Sir, a safety match is one which can only be ignited by striking against a box, but the material used in its production is by no means safe.

EFFECT OF THE EXCISE DUTY ON MATCHES.

762. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will Government please state the effect of the excise duty on matches on:

(i) the production of matches in India; and

(ii) the import of matches from foreign countries, as compared with the previous year?

Mr. A. J. Raisman: (i) Exact statistics are not available. On the basis of certain figures, compiled by the Department of Commercial Intelligence and Statistics, the average monthly production in 1933-34 has been estimated at approximately two million gross of boxes. The latest returns of excise duty show a collection of 23 lakhs a month, which indicates that the present rate of production of matches is not lower, and is probably higher, than two million gross boxes a month.

(ii) Imports of matches into India, during the nine months, April to December, 1934, were 30,575 gross of boxes as against 54,875 gross in the corresponding period of 1933. These imports represent considerably less than one per cent. of the estimated production of matches in India.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know from the Honourable Member if mechanical lighters are being imported into India?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That does not arise.

Mr. H. P. Mody: Will the Honourable Member tell me what arrangement the Government of India made with the Indian States with regard to the excise duty. I am asking that in order to lead up to my next question.

Mr. A. J. Raisman: The Government of India have invited the Indian States to levy exactly similar excise duty on matches produced in their territory and the vast majority of the States have come into a pooling arrangement in which the duty will be distributed on the basis of population.

Mr. H. P. Mody: Is it not a fact that various exemptions and concessions given by one Indian State with regard to the excise duty are affecting the production of matches in British Indian territory adjoining that State?

Mr. A. J. Raisman: There has been a difficult position in the first few months, because it was not possible for the excise scheme to start off on exactly the same date in all the Indian States and in British India, and there is no doubt that during the period in which the excise was in force in British India but was not in force in certain match producing States, the latter had an advantage, but I am not aware of any permanent exemptions or concessions which give match producers in the States an advantage as against British India. If the Honourable Member will give me concrete information on that subject, I shall be glad to look into it.

Mr. H. P. Mody: Are the Government of India aware that in the Hyderabad State certain exemptions have been given to small manufacturers?

Mr. A. J. Raisman: If the Honourable Member refers to exemptions in the nature of rebates of excise other than those given to cottage industries in India, I should be glad if he will give me concrete information, because it seems to me that it might have to be taken up with the Durbar.

Mr. H. P. Mody: I will.

MAGAZINES SUPPLIED TO STATE PRISONERS.

763. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** (a) With reference to the supplementary questions and answers to starred question No. 185 asked on the 13th February, 1935, will Government please state whether the magazines, etc., referred to therein have since been included in the list of approved books supplied to State Prisoners?

(b) Will Government please lay on the table a list of periodicals, monthlies, weeklies or dailies, ordinarily supplied to State Prisoners?

(c) Will Government please state which body or committee, or which official, approves the list of periodicals that are to be supplied to such prisoners and whether any non-officials are associated with such committee? If not, are Government prepared to consider the advisability of including some non-officials, especially the non-official visitors to jails, in the respective provinces to sit on the body or committee which approves such periodicals?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) I have taken up with the Government of Bengal the question of including the periodicals mentioned in part (e) of Mr. Giri's question No. 185. The Bengal Government are taking steps to add the *Uttara* and *Bharata Barsha* to the list, and the question of the inclusion of the remaining three periodicals is under their consideration.

(b) I lay a list on the table.

(c) As mentioned by me on a previous occasion, the Government of Bengal compile the list. No committee exists for the purpose nor do Government consider one necessary.

List of Newspapers, Periodicals and Magazines supplied to State Prisoners.

Newspapers.

1. Statesman.
2. Star of India.
3. Pioneer.
4. Leader of Allahabad.
5. Statesman (overseas weekly edition).
6. The Illustrated Weekly of India.
7. Panchayet of Dacca.
8. Mymensingh Samachar.
9. Hindu Ranjika of Rajshahi.
10. Kashipur Nivasi of Barisal.
11. Sisir (weekly edition).
12. Al-Aman of Delhi (Urdu).
13. Aftab (Urdu).
14. Haq (Urdu).
15. Hansa of Benares (Hindi).
16. Jagaran of Benares.
17. Sudha of Lucknow (Hindi).
18. Madhuri (Hindi).
19. Sudha (Hindi).
20. Utkal Deepika.
21. Hindu Illustrated Weekly.
22. Hitavadi (Bengali).
23. Midnapur Hitaishi (Bengali).
24. Whip.
25. Sanjivani.

Magazines and periodicals.

1. Indian Review.
2. Calcutta Review.
3. Hindustan Review.
4. Indian Historical Quarterly.
5. (Indian) Medical Gazette.

Magazines and periodicals—contd.

6. Homeopathic Director.
7. Economic Journal.
8. Udbodhan.
9. Krishak.
10. Utsava.
11. Matri Mandir.
12. Bhandar.
13. Krishi Sampad.
14. Prabuddha Bharat.
15. Sangit Vignan Prabeshika.
16. Saurabh.
17. Pushpa Patra.
18. Galpa Lahari.
19. Archana.
20. Bangabhumi.
21. Banga Lakshmi.
22. Janmabhumi.
23. Pancha Pushpa.
24. Viswa Bharati.
25. Bichitra.
26. (Indian) Medical Journal.
27. Abahan.
28. Udayan.
29. Industry (English).
30. Sahakar (Oriya).
31. Review of India (English).
32. Krishi Lakshmi.
33. Chikitsa Prakas (Bengali).
34. Maspaila.
35. Calcutta Weekly Notes.
36. Chhota Galpa.
37. Film Land.
38. Capital.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: What is the harm in supplying State Prisoners with whatever periodicals they like to have?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have said—"I lay on the table a list of the periodicals which are ordinarily supplied to the prisoners". The prisoners have not a complete choice as to what periodicals they may read. As I made it clear, Government compile a list of the periodicals considered suitable.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is the *Modern Review* included in the list?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, I do not think so.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is the *Indian Review* published by Messrs. Natesan included in the list?

Mr. H. P. Mody: What other "Reviews" are included?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Honourable Member should see the list.

Seth Govind Das: Is it a fact that several of the State detenus applied for having the *Modern Review*?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I do not know.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Do Government permit any unsuitable "Reviews" to be printed in this country at all? The Honourable the Home Member said that he does not permit certain reviews or papers, because they are unsuitable. My question is: do Government permit any unsuitable reviews or papers that are considered unsuitable to be printed at all in this country, and, if they do not, whether any such review as we have referred to can be made available to the prisoners?

Mr. H. P. Mody: And if not, why not? (Laughter.)

An Honourable Member: Is the *Modern Review* considered to be a seditious paper?

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: Will the Honourable Member consider the desirability of including the *Modern Review* now?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The matter is for decision by the Government of Bengal.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: In part (c) of my question, I asked:

"Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of including some non-officials, especially the non-official visitors to jails, in the respective provinces to sit on the body or committee which approves such periodicals?"

Are Government prepared to consult them?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have said that "there is no committee that exists for this purpose, nor do Government consider it to be necessary."

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the principles on which Government decide what magazines or reviews are suitable for State Prisoners?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The general criterion is to exclude any paper which encourages or supports subversive or unlawful activities or class strife or the subversion of the existing economic order by methods of violence. That is the general criterion. There are other criteria as well.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the fact that the Press Act is functioning in this country, do Government admit that such papers are being allowed to be published?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Anyhow, if they are, they are excluded.

Seth Govind Das: Is the *Modern Review* considered such a paper?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have never read it.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

COTTAGE MATCH INDUSTRIES IN INDIA.

764. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** With reference to the supplementary questions and answers to starred question No. 261, asked on the 14th February, 1935, will Government be pleased to state:

(i) the quantity of matches produced as cottage industries in India during 1932, 1933 and 1934;

(ii) the amount of excise duty collected on such cottage matches ever since the duty was first introduced; and

(iii) how many such cottage factories have been closed down since the imposition of the excise duty and where?

Mr. A. J. Raisman: The information has been called for and will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

DEVELOPMENT OF AIR SERVICES IN INDIA.

765. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that the delegates of the British Post Office and the Air Ministry have discussed with the Government of India plans for further development of air services in India? If so, have any decisions been reached?

(b) In the case of any decisions having been reached, will Government please place the same on the table of this House?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The Government of India held discussions recently with delegates from the British Post Office and the Air Ministry regarding India's participation in the proposed scheme to increase the frequency and speed of Empire Air Mail Services. The discussions were intended to clear the ground and to avoid lengthy correspondence. No decisions were reached, and the proposals are still under consideration.

(b) Does not arise.

PILOTS AND AIRMEN IN THE POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT.

766. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) What is the total number of pilots and airmen in the service of the Government of India in the Posts and Telegraphs Department? How many of them are Indians?

(b) In view of the contemplated development of such services, will Government need the services of more pilots and airmen? If so, do Government propose to immediately provide facilities to Indians to qualify themselves for these services?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Government do not operate any Air Services and, therefore, do not employ any pilots. The agreements with the three companies operating air mail services in India, *viz.*, Indian Trans-Continental Airways, Ltd., Tata Sons, Ltd., and Indian National Airways, Ltd., provide that these companies should employ the largest percentage of Indian personnel, reasonably possible, as soon as suitably qualified Indians are available. A statement giving the number of Indian pilots and engineers employed at present by the three companies mentioned is laid on the table.

(b) As I have stated above, Government do not employ pilots; but with the development of air services in India, a greater number of qualified pilots will naturally be in demand by the operating companies. In regard to facilities for training, Government administer a Fund, called the Petrol Tax Fund, derived from the proceeds of the additional tax on petrol used for aviation purposes, which is utilised *inter alia* for the grant of scholarships and financial assistance to Indians for advanced training in aviation. Facilities for training are also provided by the flying clubs in India, which are subsidised by Government. In addition, Indian National Airways, Ltd., have established a flying school in Rangoon.

Statement giving the number of Indian Pilots and Engineers employed by three Air Transport Companies operating at present in India.

Indian Trans-Continental Airways, Ltd.—	
Probationary First Officers	2
Licensed Engineers	2
Other skilled Engineers	30
Unskilled Engineers	26
Total	60
Tata Sons, Ltd.—	
Pilots	4
Engineer	1
Mechanics	8
Total	13
Indian National Airways, Ltd.—	
Pilots	2
Ground Engineers, Fitters, Carpenters and trained Ground Engineers	24
Aerodrome Officer	1
Total	27

CLOSING OF THE GATES AT LEVEL CROSSINGS NEAR THE PATNA JUNCTION RAILWAY STATION.

767. ***Mr. Anugrah Narayan Sinha:** (a) Are Government aware that the closing of the gates at the level crossings on both sides of the Patna Junction Railway station, specially on the western side, for long periods for shunting and other purposes has been causing great inconvenience to traffic?

(b) Are Government aware that not infrequently doctors on urgent calls in serious cases are held up for a pretty long time by the closing of the gates and that not infrequently passengers hurrying to catch trains are deprived of the opportunity because of the obstruction thus caused?

(c) Are Government aware that Patna Junction is an important Railway Station and that heavy traffic passes over the western railway crossing because of the proximity of the New Capital area and the gradual development and extension of the town on the southern side of the crossing?

(d) Is it not a fact that because of this heavy traffic and the increasing inconvenience caused to the people, the Railway authorities were at one time seriously considering the advisability and urgency of having an overbridge or a sub-way and the extension of the shunting limit to more convenient sides?

(e) Will Government be pleased to state what stage the proposal has reached and do they propose to take steps to expedite the matter?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for the information required from the Railway Administration and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

MOLASSES THROWN OUT BY THE SUGAR MILLS.

768. ***Mr. Anugrah Narayan Sinha:** (a) Are Government aware that the non-utilisation of the annually increasing quantities of molasses thrown out by the sugar mills in the various provinces are proving injurious to the health of the people in the locality of the mills and may lead to epidemics in the areas concerned?

(b) Are Government aware that such non-utilisation of molasses is also a great economic waste, and that it could be easily prevented by some suitable scheme of utilising this bye-product, such as, its conversion into some sort of alcohol?

(c) Have Government in view any such scheme to be started in the near future? If not, do they propose to examine the matter?

Mr. Ram Chandra: (a) Government have received no complaints.

(b) and (c). The question of the disposal of molasses is receiving the attention of Government.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is it true that some foreign companies are stipulating to take these molasses from the Government just now?

Mr. Ram Chandra: The question whether an outlet for the exportable surplus can be found in countries outside India is being considered.

NON-OBSERVANCE OF FIXED TIMINGS ON THE KISHUNGUNJ-SILIGURI BRANCH OF THE DARJEELING HIMALAYAN RAILWAY.

769. *Maulvi Badi-uz-Zaman: (a) Are Government aware that the employees of the Kishungunj-Siliguri branch of the D. H. R. generally do not observe and have no regard for the timings fixed by the authority for the arrival and departure of the trains, and the trains are generally late both in arrival and departure, specially at intermediate stations?

(b) Are Government aware that the trains are very often detained at some particular station much longer than the time fixed for their stoppage?

(c) Is it not a fact that the number of carriages in the trains of the D. H. R. are quite inadequate to accommodate all the passengers?

(d) Do Government propose to ask the Railway authority concerned to look to the matters mentioned above?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a), (b) and (c). Government have no information.

(d) I am bringing the Honourable Member's question to the notice of the Managing Agents of the Darjeeling Himalayan Railway for such action as they consider necessary in regard to parts (a) and (b) and for a report in regard to part (c).

MUSLIM STENOGRAPHERS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA DEPARTMENTS.

770. *Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim: (a) Will Government please state the number of stenographers in each Department of the Government of India Secretariat, separately, and how many of them are Muslims?

(b) Is it a fact that the percentage of Muslims in the stenographers service is far short of their proportion? If so, what special steps do Government propose to take to make up this deficiency? If not, why not?

(c) Is it a fact that Government have issued a letter to all Secretaries of the Government of India regarding the recruitment of stenographers?

(d) If the answer to part (c) above be in the affirmative, will Government please state whether communal representation will be considered only in the case of outside recruitment and neglected in the case of departmental candidates? If so, are Government aware that by doing so the Muslims will not get their due share in the appointment of stenographers?

(e) Do Government propose to fix communal representation for departmental stenographers also, as is laid for outsiders in the Government of India, Home Department Resolution of July, 1934? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the statement laid on the table of the House in reply to starred question No. 1005 on the 31st August, 1934.

(b) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given to part (b) of starred question No. 365 on the 6th August, 1934.

(c) Yes.

(d) and (e). The whole question of the future recruitment of stenographers is under consideration and, in so far as direct recruitment to these posts is concerned the claims of Muslims, as of other minority communities, will not be overlooked. The rules about communal representation do not apply to departmental promotions, which are made solely on merit, as stated in the Resolution to which the Honourable Member refers.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know from the Honourable Member if these stenographers are recruited through the Public Service Commission?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes.

EXAMINATION FOR ENTRY INTO THE KING'S COMMISSIONED RANKS OF THE ARMY, THE ROYAL AIR FORCE AND THE ROYAL INDIAN MARINE.

771 ***Munshi Iswar Saran:** (a) Will Government please state if a Press Communiqué was issued by the Army Department of the Government of India, from Simla, on the 25th July, 1931, giving particulars about the examination for entry to "the King's Commissioned ranks of the Army, the Royal Air Force and the Royal Indian Marine" to be held in Delhi, on the 17th December and subsequent days?

(b) Is it a fact that certain candidates on the strength of the said Government Communiqué appeared at the examination held in Delhi for entry to "the King's Commissioned ranks of the Army, the Royal Air Force and the Royal Indian Marine"?

(c) Is it a fact that before the publication of the results of the said examinations, the parents or guardians of the candidates were circularised to keep themselves in readiness and to arrange for sufficient funds for sending the successful candidates to England at short notice?

(d) How many Indian candidates were sent to England after passing the said examinations for training, giving the numbers separately for each of the three examinations?

(e) Are they holding Kings' Commissions?

(f) Are they getting the same pay as British officers *minus* the over-seas allowance, and is their status the same as that of British entrants of the same year?

(g) Is it a fact that another Government Communiqué was issued on 8th July, 1932, announcing certain changes in the military policy of Government?

(h) Were these changes made applicable even to those Indians who had appeared at the examinations in 1931 on the strength of the former Communiqué long before the declaration of the new policy?

(i) Will the said successful candidates be junior to British Officers who will enter the said services in subsequent years?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) Yes, except that the date of the examination was the 17th November and not the 17th December, 1931.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes, in the case of candidates for the Air Force examination.

(d) Thirteen for the Indian Army and six for the Indian Air Force. No candidate for the Marine was successful.

(e) Yes.

(f) Those who entered the Indian Army receive the same pay and allowances and have the same status as the British officers who were trained at Woolwich or Sandhurst with them. Those who entered the Indian Air Force receive the rates of pay sanctioned for that force, which are practically identical with the rates of pay of the Royal Air Force officers serving in England, but, in addition, they have also been given a special personal allowance to bring their pay more into line with that of the Royal Air Force officers serving in India, in consideration of the fact that the Indian Air Force rates had not been published before they proceeded to England for training. There are no British officers in the Indian Air Force.

(g) Yes.

(h) They were only applied to those who entered the newly formed Indian Air Force through the 1931 examination, and as I have just explained, a concession has been made in the matter of their pay.

(i) No

OFFICIAL NATIONAL FLAG.

772. ***Munshi Iswar Saran:** Are Government prepared to take immediately such necessary action as may enable India to have a distinctive official national flag?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I wold refer my Honourable friend to the speech made in the Council of State by Sir Herbert Emerson on September 31, 1931, on a Resolution moved by the Honourable Mr. Rangaswamy Aiyangar. In that speech Sir Herbert Emerson, while expressing the sympathy of Government with the suggestion that India should have, as other Dominions have, a distinctive flag under the British flag, explained that Government felt that this proposal could best be considered when the Federation had been established, so that the responsible government could decide the question of the most suitable flag for India not merely for British India.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is that the position of the Government today also, Sir?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes.

MEMBERS OF THE DEPRESSED CLASSES IN THE COMBATANT RANKS OF THE ARMY AND IN THE POLICE FORCE.

773. ***Munshi Iswar Saran:** Will Government please state the number of the Members of the depressed classes (i) in the combatant ranks of the Army and (ii) in the police force in the territories directly under the control of the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The information is being collected and will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

SCHOLARSHIPS AWARDED TO DEPRESSED CLASS STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITY OF DELHI.

774. ***Munshi Iswar Saran:** Will Government please state the number of scholarships awarded to students belonging to the depressed classes in the years 1930 to 1935 (i) in the Delhi University and (ii) in the High Schools of Delhi?

Mr. Ram Chandra: A statement showing the number of scholarships awarded to students belonging to the depressed classes in the high schools of Delhi is placed on the table. Information regarding the number of scholarships awarded to students in Delhi University is not available as the University does not keep a record of the religion or caste of a student or a scholar.

Statement regarding the number of Scholarships awarded to Students belonging to the Depressed Classes in the High Schools of Delhi.

1930-31	...	...	..	18
1931-32	...	...	...	9
1932-33	...	...	. .	9
1933-34	.	...	...	5
1934-35	...	...	.	5

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE DEPRESSED CLASSES IN THE DELHI MUNICIPALITY.

775. ***Munshi Iswar Saran:** Are there any representatives of the depressed classes in the Delhi Municipality? If so, what is their number?

Mr. Ram Chandra: The reply to the first part of the question is in the negative The second part does not arise.

Munshi Iswar Saran: Will Government take necessary action for the representation of the depressed classes on the Municipal Board of Delhi?

Mr. Ram Chandra: The door of election is open to members of the depressed classes.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know from the Honourable Member if there is representation on the Delhi Municipality also by communal and class representation?

Mr. Ram Chandra: Sir, the Delhi Municipality is divided into twelve wards and a Hindu and a Muhammadan Member is returned from each ward.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Are they returned by a joint electorate or a separate electorate?

Mr. Ram Chandra: Hindus may vote for Hindus and Mussalmans for Mussalmans.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Is it joint or separate?

Mr. Ram Chandra: I do not know . . .

Mr. M. S. Aney: My friend has yet to learn?

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Are the electorates divided into Hindus and Muhammadans or into Muslims and non-Muslims?

Mr. Ram Chandra: I have not got the actual regulations before me, but, from the papers I have in my possession, it is clear that Hindus may vote for Hindus and Muslims for Muslims.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Have the Christians and the Parsees no right of votes?

Mr. Ram Chandra: They may vote for members of either community.

Haji Seth Abdoola Haroon: Have Government got the right to nominate members to the Board?

Mr. Ram Chandra: Yes. Government have not nominated any member of the depressed classes on this occasion, but I may point out that in the last Municipal Committee there were two elected members of the depressed classes. They got in through the door of election.

Munshi Iswar Saran: In view of the fact that there is no member of the depressed classes on the Board of the Municipality of Delhi, will Government consider the advisability of nominating a member of the depressed classes when a suitable opportunity occurs?

Mr. Ram Chandra: The suggestion will be brought to the notice of the Local Administration.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: On what electoral rolls Parsees and Christians are shown in Delhi?

Mr. H. P. Mody: Depressed classes. (Laughter.)

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: I think I may answer that question on behalf of Government.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. The question is not put to the Honourable Member.

STEPS TAKEN TO SPREAD EDUCATION AMONG THE DEPRESSED CLASSES.

776. ***Munshi Iswar Saran:** What steps have the Government of India taken to spread education among the depressed classes in the territories directly under their control?

Mr. Ram Chandra: I lay a statement on the table.

Statement regarding steps taken by Government to spread Education among the Depressed Classes in the centrally administered areas.

Government are unable to give a complete list of the steps taken to spread education among depressed classes in centrally administered areas, but the following lines of action have been taken :

Delhi.

(a) Schools are not retained on the list of recognised and aided schools if the management refuse admission to depressed class students.

(b) 32 Government scholarships are awarded to students belonging to the depressed classes.

(c) Preference is given to depressed class students in respect to admission and award of Government stipends in the Government Normal Schools, Najafgarh, and the Government Training School for Women, Delhi.

(d) Delhi University have exempted candidates of depressed classes from the payment of examination fees until the examination of 1940.

Ajmer-Merwara

(a) 15 scholarships have been reserved in rural schools for award to depressed class children

(b) Preference is given to students of depressed classes in the matter of admission to the Normal School, Ajmer and the Central Training Class attached to it

GIRLS BELONGING TO THE DEPRESSED CLASSES IN INSTITUTIONS OF DELHI.

777. ***Munshi Iswar Saran:** What is the number of girls belonging to the depressed classes in Government or Government-aided institutions of Delhi?

Mr. Ram Chandra: The number of girls belonging to the depressed classes in Government or Government-aided institutions of Delhi was 509 on the 31st March, 1934.

Munshi Iswar Saran: How many of them were in the primary section and how many in the secondary section?

Mr. Ram Chandra: I must ask for notice of that question.

Munshi Iswar Saran: Is there any ban on the depressed class girls in regard to their entry into Government schools?

Mr. Ram Chandra: There is no ban whatever.

Munshi Iswar Saran: Is their number increasing or decreasing?

Mr. Ram Chandra: I must again ask for notice.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Is any special encouragement given to the depressed classes?

Mr. Ram Chandra: I think the answer will be found in the statement which I have laid on the table in answer to Mr. Iswar Saran's preceding question.

Munshi Iswar Saran: Have you discussed the question of giving special encouragement to the girls of the depressed classes in that statement?

Mr. Ram Chandra: I have got the statement before me here. There it is said:

"Schools are not retained on the list of recognised and aided schools if the management refuse admission to depressed class students."

That is one of the things that I find in the statement.

Munshi Iswar Saran: Is it the only encouragement that Government give to the girls of the depressed classes?

Mr. Ram Chandra: There are a certain number of Government scholarships also which are awarded to students belonging to depressed classes.

Munshi Iswar Saran: Will you kindly tell us their number?

Mr. Ram Chandra: Their number is 32 according to this statement, but I am not sure how many of them are for girls and how many for boys.

DIVISIONS IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ON THE JOINT PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE REPORT.

778. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** (a) Will the Honourable the Law Member be pleased to state:

(i) whether any correspondence has passed between the Government of India and the Secretary of State in respect of the attitude of the Government in the voting in the divisions on the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report in the Legislative Assembly;

(ii) whether it is a fact that the Secretary of State directed the Government of India to decide this question themselves; and

(iii) the reasons why Government decided to take part in the voting?

(b) Will the Honourable the Law Member be pleased to state:

(i) whether the Government of India have communicated to the Secretary of State the results of the voting in the Legislative Assembly on the motions in respect of the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report;

(ii) in what form they have communicated the same;

(iii) whether they have heard from the Secretary of State in answer to the communication; and

(iv) whether Government will place the entire correspondence on the table of the House?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) (i) and (ii). No.

(iii) Government Members have right of vote, which right they thought fit to exercise.

(b) (i) and (ii). The Government of India informed the Secretary of State of the substance of the amendments voted on and the number of Members who voted for and against each amendment.

(iii) No.

(iv) Government consider it is not in public interest to lay on the table the confidential correspondence which is asked to be laid on the table.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the fact that, to the best of my knowledge, practically all the Local Governments did not vote in their Legislative Councils on the motions or amendments in connection with the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report, may I know the reasons why the Government of India decided to take part in the voting?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Members in Local Councils, having the right of vote, thought fit not to exercise it, but Members here exercised the right which they have under the Statute.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know if one of the reasons why the Government decided to take part in the voting was that they had felt that, if they did not so vote, this House was bound to pass the Congress Resolution?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: My friend can draw such inference as he chooses. But if any Member who exercised his right and thought fit to exercise that right, because the Resolution was objectionable, he must have done so.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Did the official Members adopt that course individually or was it done on behalf of the Government?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am not prepared to disclose that until I know what my friend did. Did he exercise his right individually?

Mr. M. S. Aney: I have asked my Honourable friend a question, and I want its answer?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I was not present at any meeting at which consultation was held.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Was any whip issued by the Government in this House?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: No.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: What was the number of votes contributed by Government in the division on the motions?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That will be available from the proceedings of the House which have been published.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know what was the "substance of the amendments" which were carried in the House, which was communicated by the Government of India to the Secretary of State?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I meant by substance the exact language of the amendments.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it that no word was put in there by the Government, which was not already in the amendments?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That was my reply, as regards the language of the amendments.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if the Government had made up their mind from the very beginning to vote on that question in a particular way or did they make up their mind after hearing the debate in the House?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am not aware as to at what exact hour and exact date each particular Member thought he was going to vote in a particular way.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know, therefore, that Government Members voted each according to his own conscience and according to his own judgment, or whether they voted as a party?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Government Members vote according to their conscience.

Seth Govind Das: Do the Government Members ever vote on the Congress side?

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Did the Local Governments take the advice of the Government of India when they decided not to take part in the voting in their respective Provincial Councils?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I do not follow the Honourable Member.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Did the Government of India advise the Local Governments to restrict the voting in their respective Councils only to non-official elements in the House?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I would like to have your ruling, Sir, as to whether this supplementary question arises out of this question?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It does not arise.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: The point is this . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has given its ruling.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government state why they will not place the entire correspondence between the Secretary of State and the Government of India on the table of the House, especially in view of the Honourable the Law Member's statement that not one word was put in in the "substance of the amendments" which was not already there?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has already said that he did not consider it desirable to do so in the public interest.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Were the Government of India asked by the Secretary of State to ascertain non-official opinion in the matter of the proposals contained in the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That does not arise. If my Honourable friend would put down a separate question, I shall answer.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Were the Members of the Government of India free to vote against the proposal of the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That depended on their individual conscience which they always exercise most conscientiously.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Do they ever have a conscience?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

DEBTS INCURRED BY KING IBN SAUD FOR PURCHASE OF ARMS.

779. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will Government please state whether it is true that a share of the debts incurred by King Ibn Saud for purchase of arms was paid by the Government of India?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: The answer is in the negative.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Did Government see in the *Hindustan Times* a statement to that effect?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: I did not see actually the thing to which the Honourable Member refers.

MANUFACTURE AND FREE DISTRIBUTION OF QUININE.

780. ***Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta** (on behalf of Dr. P. N. Banerjea): Are Government prepared to consider the desirability of:

(a) taking all necessary steps to promote the manufacture of quinine in India at cheap cost, and

(b) the distribution of quinine to the masses free of charge or at a nominal price?

Mr. Ram Chandra: (a) As the Honourable Member is aware this will be a matter for the provinces under the new Constitution.

(b) This is already a provincial matter as Public Health is a transferred subject. I may add that the Government of India have certain surplus stocks of quinine and are prepared to consider proposals from Local Governments for its sale on reasonable terms.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What is the reason for the retention of this surplus stock of quinine with the Government of India while all over India there is such a great demand for quinine?

Mr. Ram Chandra: The Government of India have to retain certain stock in order to deal with emergent situations.

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh: Do the Government of India keep quinine for mercantile purposes or for the purpose of distributing to malarial patients?

Mr. Ram Chandra: The stock is kept for sale to Local Governments for the treatment of patients suffering from malaria.

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh: Is quinine supplied in sufficient quantities to Local Governments to be distributed to malarial affected population of India?

Mr. Ram Chandra: It all depends upon the demand received from Local Governments. No demand has ever been refused.

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh: Is it because that there has been no malaria and that is why there has been no demand for quinine?

Mr. Ram Chandra: There has been a certain amount of demand. But the demand must depend upon the financial situation of the provinces. We asked the Local Governments in 1932 whether they would be prepared to spend larger sums of money to popularise the sale of quinine which was in Government stock, but their replies were generally disappointing.

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh: How do you mean to popularise quinine by keeping their price high?

Mr. Ram Chandra: The price of quinine is Rs. 18 per pound, which does not compare unfavourably with the price of quinine in the open market.

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh: What would be the ordinary price if there was no middleman's profit?

Mr. Ram Chandra: The price of imported quinine in September, 1934, was Rs. 23 per pound which shows that the Government price is very favourable.

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh: Is it not that the price of quinine would come to Rs. 12 per pound and that the Government of India want to sell it at a profit of more than 33 per cent, and that is why the stocks have gone up while the malarial affected patients are suffering all over the country?

Mr. Ram Chandra: The average cost of manufacture of quinine comes to roughly Rs. 15 per pound.

Mr. B. Das: At what price did the Government of India sell their surplus quinine to the Kina bureau? Was it not at Rs. 12 per pound?

Mr. Ram Chandra: I do not know of any sales to the Kina bureau.

Mr. B. Dass: Did not the representatives of the Kina bureau come to India last year to negotiate the sale of the surplus stock of quinine?

Mr. Ram Chandra: I understand that certain negotiations are still going on.

Mr. B. Das: So far there has been no sale of quinine?

Mr. Ram Chandra: Government sold a certain amount of quinine on a tender system. The minimum price fixed at that time was Rs. 15-8-0 per pound. That was in 1933.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: When the cost price is said to be Rs. 15 per pound, why do Government insist on selling it at Rs. 18 per pound?

Mr. Ram Chandra: The real reason is this. If Government sold it at very much less than what they are doing now, there is every danger that quinine might get into the hands of wholesale dealers who would not be willing to pass on the profit to the consumer. They will make all the profit themselves and will pass on the article to the consumer only at the rate which prevails in the open market.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do Government wish to make a profit at the expense of these unhealthy people in the country who are crying out for cheaper quinine?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is argument.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: What is the quantity of quinine produced locally?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Next question.

NON-WITHDRAWAL OF BAN ON CERTAIN CONGRESS AND ALLIED ASSOCIATIONS.

781. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will the Honourable the Home Member be pleased to state:

(a) the number and the names of Congress and allied associations against whom the ban imposed by Government has not yet been withdrawn;

(b) the reasons why the ban has not yet been withdrawn; and

(c) whether Government propose to withdraw the ban, and if so, when?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer given by me on the 14th February, to Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena's questions Nos. 272 and 273 on the same subject.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know, with regard to the Hindustani Seva Dal, what is the information in the possession of the Honourable the Home Member that certain branches of this organisation are teaching their members rifle practice? In what province is it done, and what is the information on which the Honourable Member relies?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I said in at least one instance,—I cannot remember which province that was in, I think it was in the United Provinces—the use of the rifle was taught.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: Was any member of the Hindustani Seva Dal prosecuted under the Arms Act?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I am not aware of that.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the Honourable Member make enquiries and find out why the Local Governments consider the branches of the Hindustani Seva Dal revolutionary in their provinces, revolutionary in the sense that they are advocating or practising violent methods?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have no intention of making any further enquiries.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Why has he no intention? In view of the persistent demand from this side of the House that the Hindustani Seva Dal is a Congress organisation and that the ban on the same ought to have been removed long ago, why should not the Honourable Member make enquiries?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have already received information which satisfies me that it is not purely a Congress organisation.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: What happened to the rifles of the Hindustani Seva Dal? Did the police take hold of them?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: As part (a) of question No. 782 was already very fully answered by the Honourable the Home Member, I wish to put today only parts (b) and (c) of that question.

RELEASE OF PERSONS CONVICTED IN CONNECTION WITH THE CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE MOVEMENT.

782. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will the Honourable the Home Member be pleased to state:

[(a) the number of prisoners convicted and sentenced in connection with the Civil Disobedience Movement, who are still in prison;]

(b) the reasons why they have not yet been released; and

(c) whether Government propose to release them, and if so, when?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (b) and (c). As I have already explained in answer to a supplementary question by Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, the decision regarding releases rests with Local Governments who examine these cases from time to time in accordance with the policy of premature release referred to in the Government of India's communiqué of the 6th June, 1934.

IMPORT OF SAFETY MATCH BOXES INTO INDIA.

783. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** (a) Are Government aware that nearly 29,000 gross of safety match boxes were imported into India from April 1934 to November 1934?

(b) Are not safety matches of like quality manufactured in India? If they are manufactured, how is it that there are still large quantities being imported?

(c) Are Government aware that the excise duty on matches is adversely affecting the match industry in India?

(d) Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of taking effective steps to encourage the entire production locally of matches required for use in India?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) I am unable to express an opinion as to the quality of matches manufactured in India as compared with the quality of those imported but, as the Honourable Member has just been informed, imports now represent considerably less than one per cent. of the estimated Indian production

(c) No, Sir.

(d) In view of the comparatively negligible quantity of imports the question of taking any further steps beyond the tariff protection already afforded does not arise.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF THE COTTAGE MATCH INDUSTRY IN INDIA.

784. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** What steps have Government taken to encourage the cottage match industry in India?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I would refer the Honourable Member to paragraph 4 of the Commerce Department Resolution No. 235-T (24) published in the Gazette of India of 1st September, 1928, on the Report of the Tariff Board regarding the grant of protection to the Match Industry. As stated there the Government of India accepted the Board's finding that the manufacture of matches is not a fit industry for development on cottage lines. I would point out, however, that in the matter of excise duty a rebate is allowed to factories whose daily output does not exceed 100 gross boxes.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know how many cottage factories have taken advantage of that rebate?

Mr. A. J. Raisman: Every cottage factory is entitled to the rebate, and I have no doubt they automatically take advantage of it.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: How many have taken advantage?

Mr. A. J. Raisman: As many as exist.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: What is their number?

Mr. A. J. Raisman: I have already answered a question on that subject this morning.

AMOUNT SPENT IN MAKING NEW SIDINGS AND YARDS FOR THE ARMY AND NEW ROLLING STOCK IN THE SHAPE OF AEROPLANE WAGONS.

785. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the amount spent in making new sidings and yards for the army and new rolling stock in the shape of æroplane wagons so far and for the last five years each?

(b) How much rolling stock have the Army Department to carry troops and how many wagons have they for troop train purposes alone?

(c) How much are the Army Department paying for it?

(d) If no payment is made, are concessions allowed even without payment?

(e) Do Government propose to stop the concessions?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Government regret that the information regarding the amount spent year by year on new sidings and yards for the army is not readily available.

There are four aeroplane cars which are reserved for the exclusive use of the Army Department. They were built in 1925 at a total cost of Rs. 1,10,536.

(b) Excluding the saloons reserved for the use of high military officials the following stock is reserved for the exclusive use of the Army Department:

Military Cars	62
Ambulance vehicles	9
Military Kitchen cars	11
Petrol Tank Wagons	10
Military Canteens	2
Military First class carriages	4

(c) In addition to haulage, the Army Department pay interest, maintenance and depreciation charges at 9½ per cent. per annum on the capital cost of the vehicles reserved for the exclusive use of the Army Department. The amount that is paid annually by that Department is Rs. 2¼ lakhs approximately.

(d) and (e). Do not arise.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: Arising out of the answer to (b), may I know how many saloons are maintained and what is the number of military officers who use these saloons?

Mr. P. R. Rau: If my Honourable friend desires, I shall obtain the information and communicate it to him.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: Arising out of the answer to (c), who pays the capital cost of these saloons and other vehicles?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I think the capital cost is charged to railways. The Army Department pays interest, maintenance and depreciation.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is this account debited only to the accounts of the strategic railways or do they receive a cheque directly from the Army Department?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I must have notice of that question.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are these paid for by the military authorities?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The military authorities pay interest, maintenance and depreciation at 9½ per cent.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: And the capital investment is made by the railways?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Yes, Sir.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What is the amount?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I should like to have notice of that question. The total charge of 2¾ lakhs amounts to 9½ per cent. of the capital cost, which can easily be calculated.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: To which account is the cost of sidings and yards for the army debited?

Mr. P. R. Rau: That information is not readily available. It will take some time, because the accounts are not kept separate.

SELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE ADVISORY COUNCILS ON RAILWAYS.

786. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state how members are selected to the advisory councils on Railways?

(b) Was any one selected to the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Advisory Committee on behalf of *ryots* of the Madras Presidency?

(c) How was the selection made?

(d) Was it by the Recommendation of the Chief Minister, Madras Government?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given by the Honourable Mr. (now Sir John) Woodhead to parts (2) and (3) of the Honourable Babu Jagdish Chandra Banerjee's question No. 20 in the Council of State on the 11th February, 1931.

(b) The Agent, Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway, advised the Government of Madras on the 30th May, 1933, that there was a vacancy for one additional member on the Local Advisory Committee and that he had no objection to the appointment of a non-official to represent agricultural interests.

(c) and (d). The selection was to have been made by the Government of Madras. I am unable to say how it was actually made.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: Is it reasonable to refer to an answer given years ago in another place?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The answer was given in 1931.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Perhaps the Honourable Member will give a substance of that answer.

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have the answer here which is two pages long, but I can say that the general lines on which these committees should be constituted were, two Local Government members nominated by the Local Governments, three representatives of the Legislative Council, one member from the local Municipality or Corporation of the railway headquarters, five members representing industries, commerce and trade.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: Will this two page answer be published in the Assembly proceedings?

Mr. P. R. Rau: It is already there in the Council of State debates, and it is easy, if the Honourable Member is interested to get a copy of those debates.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In view of the fact that none of these members happen to be representative of agricultural interests, will the Government of India be prepared to consider the advisability of reserving some places on these Advisory Councils for representatives of agricultural interests?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have already answered that question so far as the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway is concerned. One member has been, so far as I know, nominated by the Madras Government to represent agricultural interests.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if the Central Advisory Council is going to be re-formed and re-elected, and, if so, when?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I think a motion will be made by the Honourable the Railway Member next week with regard to the election of the Central Advisory Council.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: May I ask if Government are prepared to consider the advisability of giving some places on these Advisory Councils for the representation of railway passengers' associations also?

Mr. P. R. Rau: In order to prevent these committees being too large and unwieldy, it is necessary to have a maximum, and the question of different interests to be represented was carefully considered when they were first constituted on the recommendation of the Ackworth Committee. They have not been reconsidered since then.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Is there any provision for the representation of third class passengers?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Not directly.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask whether the Government of India propose to devise some method by which third class passengers may be represented?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: May I ask whether they can be represented by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask whether there is any objection to my representing third class passengers?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I do not see any.

ECONOMIC QUESTION OF INDIAN RAILWAYS.

787. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Have Government secured the services of Mr. Pope to go into the economic question of Indian Railways, and has any report been prepared by him?

(b) Will Government be pleased to place the report on the table of this House?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Mr. Pope visited India, at the invitation of Government, in the winters of 1932-33 and 1933-34 and submitted two reports on the methods of effecting economy and increasing efficiency on Indian Railways. These reports are available in the Library of the House.

EXPIRY OF LEASE OF CERTAIN COMPANY-MANAGED RAILWAYS.

788. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) What are the Company-managed Railways whose periods of lease will expire, and if so, when?

(b) Are Government aware that the Mysore Government intends taking up the Bangalore-Hanthar line from the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway? If so, when and under what terms?

(c) Do Government contemplate extending the lease period of any of the railways? If so, will Government be pleased to state why they do not take up these railways under their management?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Assuming that my Honourable friend is referring to the contracts of Companies managing State-owned Railways, the dates

on which contracts can be terminated, after twelve months' notice in each case, are as follows:

1.	Madras and Southern Mahratta. . .	31s December, 1937.
2.	Bengal and North Western and Rohilkund and Kumaon	31st December, 1937, or 1942.
3.	Bombay, Baroda and Central India. . .	31st December, 1941.
4.	Assam Bengal	31st December, 1941.
5.	South Indian	31st December, 1945.
6.	Bengal Nagpur.	31st December, 1950.

(b) The Mysore Government have expressed a desire to take over the Bangalore-Haridar line as early as possible. The question of terms, etc., is under negotiation.

(c) The question of taking over a line to State management is considered near the time when notice of termination has to be given—a year before the date of purchase.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: What is the general policy of Government with regard to this matter of taking up these lines into State management?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The policy depends on the circumstances existing at the time.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Have Government given any thought to the acquisition of the Rohilkund Kumaon Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: This question will be considered very shortly, because notice is to be given on the 31st December, 1936, if it is going to be acquired.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Are Government aware of the fact that the administration of that railway is very unsatisfactory?

Mr. P. R. Rau: That is a matter of opinion.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: What is the view of Government so far as the question of administration goes?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That too is a matter of opinion.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are Government considering the question of acquiring the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway management?

Mr. P. R. Rau: That will be taken up at the same time.

Seth Govind Das: What about the Bengal and North-Western Railway

Mr. P. R. Rau: Notice is to be given on the 31st December, 1936. The question whether notice should be given or not will be considered very shortly.

TRANSPORT RATES ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE ON EACH RAILWAY.

789. *Mr. C .N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: (a) Will Government be pleased to state what are the transport rates on agricultural produce on each Railway?

(b) Do Government propose to keep the rates uniform on all the Railways?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) For the purpose of freight rates commodities are placed in ten different classes, the maximum rate for the lowest class being 0·38 pie per maund per mile and for the highest class 1·87 pie per maund per mile. Most agricultural products are in the lowest class, the principal exception being cotton. Within the maximum rate of 0·38 pie and a minimum rate of 0·10 pie, authorised by Government for this class, Railway Administrations are empowered to quote such rates as circumstances require. It is in the exercise of these powers that the actual rates charged for agricultural produce on the various railways are considerably lower than the maximum permissible. The rates charged are notified by the different Railway Administrations in their goods tariffs. To compile the information which my Honourable friend requires showing the variations and also the numerous special rates that are charged for the different commodities covered by the term "agricultural produce" would involve the publication of a bulky volume.

(b) Uniformity in rates is not practicable owing to financial and other conditions on different railways varying.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: With regard to the answer to part (b), why is an uniform rate not fixed for a particular commodity on all lines?

Mr. P. R. Rau: That means that you will have to scrap all existing rates and build up a rates structure anew.

Seth Govind Das: Is it not advisable to do so?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Does the Honourable Member mean, when he says that agricultural commodities are carried at the lowest rate, that cereals are included in that term?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have said that the actual rates charged for agricultural produce on various railways are considerably lower than the maximum permissible.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: There is another statement that he has made that most of the agricultural products are in the lowest class: does that term include also cereals, like rice, wheat and other grain?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am afraid I must ask for notice of that question.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: What is the reason for this difference of rate on certain railways?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Differing conditions?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it a fact that the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway has not so far made any attempt to reduce the railway freight on agricultural produce?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am not sure of that: I should like to have notice of that question before I attempt to reply to a statement like that.

RESULTS OF THE ROAD-RAIL CONFERENCE.

790. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the results of the Road-Rail Conference?

(b) Has any policy been formulated for combating and developing the Road and Rail transport? If so, will Government be pleased to state what it is?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The Conference adopted eight Resolutions which will be found at the Appendix to the Proceedings, copies of which are in the Library. Briefly, these Resolutions recommended the co-ordination of road and railway development and traffic and the creation of machinery at the Centre and within the Provinces to secure this. These Resolutions have been the subject of correspondence with Local Governments as a result of which there is now, it is believed, a Provincial Board of Communications in every Province upon which railways are represented, and which will, it is hoped, result in a larger measure of co-ordination within the Provinces. There has also been brought into existence a Transport Advisory Council consisting of the Member or Members of the Government of India concerned sitting with Provincial Ministers and their advisers.

(b) A concise statement of policy adopted by the Transport Advisory Council at its first meeting, held in January last, was laid on the table of this House in reply to unstarred question No. 108 asked by Professor N. G. Ranga on the 22nd February, 1935.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is the Honourable Member aware of the fact that the development of road communications in the Madras Presidency is being restricted in order to help the railways?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Might I ask the Honourable Member to repeat his question? And in view of his industry in asking supplementary questions, may I venture to suggest to the Leader of his Party, as a personal favour to us, that Prof. Ranga might be brought to a seat nearer the front than the one he now occupies?

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: That matter will be considered.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I am perfectly prepared to accept the Honourable Member's compliment: but the Honourable Member is just as inaudible to me as I am to him. My question is: is he aware of the fact that the Madras Government are trying to restrict the development of road communications in that province in order to help railways?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No: I am not aware of that: my Honourable colleague, the Railway Member, will be very interested to hear that fact.

AMOUNT SPENT ON PERAMBUR SHOPS ON THE MADRAS AND SOUTHERN MAHRATTA RAILWAY.

791. *Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: (a) What is the amount spent by Government on Perambur Shops on the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway?

(b) How much more do Government propose to spend?

(c) What is the expenditure required for Salt Locomotive yard in Madras and Hubli station yards?

(d) Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of constructing the metre gauge workshops for both Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway and South Indian Railway broad gauge and metre gauge?

(e) If Government are not able to connect Madras with metre gauge of Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway, are they prepared to take up Madras-Tirupati metre gauge line construction?

(f) Is it a fact that the survey of the Madras-Tirupati metre gauge line has been completed?

(g) Are estimates prepared, and if so, at what cost, and what is the cost of laying the new line?

(h) With a view to lessening the cost of the workshops construction in so many places, do Government propose to consider the advisability of having all the workshops at Madras and connect Tirupati or any metre gauge station to Madras by a metre gauge line?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Rs. 258 lakhs.

(b) Rs. 6 lakhs.

(c) Salt Locomotive Yard Rs. 15·65 lakhs; Hubli, Rs. 16·60 lakhs.

(d) No. There is nothing to be gained by doing this.

(e) Government are taking up the re-consideration of all the projects which were considered remunerative but which were dropped for the time being owing to financial stringency. If this project is likely to be remunerative it will be one of the projects that will be reconsidered.

(f) A survey was made in 1912-13 and re-examined in 1928.

(g) The 1912-13 survey cost Rs. 67,000. The re-examination about Rs. 9,000.

In 1928 the cost was estimated at about Rs. 81 lakhs, but this figure will require revision before it can be accepted as the cost, if the line were to be built now.

(h) No.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: May I know whether Government have not considered it remunerative even before they started the survey?

Mr. P. R. Rau: It is only a survey that can enable us to predict whether the line is likely to be remunerative or not: before we start a survey, we cannot say whether it is likely to be remunerative.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: Is it not necessary to consider the remunerative nature of a scheme before they made the second survey at least?

Mr. P. R. Rau: It was only a re-examination the second time.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: How many more re-examinations will be necesary?

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Is it not a fact that if the Tirupati line is carried as far as Madras, the Hubli workshops can be abolished and there can be only one central workshop at Perambur?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I cannot understand the connection between the Tirupati-Madras line and the Hubli workshops.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: When the metre gauge line is taken to Madras, there need be only one workshop, and the extra cost can be avoided?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Hubli is more near the centre of the metre-gauge system of the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.

ELECTION TO THE COMMERCE AND LANDHOLDERS CONSTITUENCIES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

792. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if election to commerce and land holders constituency is conducted by post?

(b) Are Government aware that such method of election has given scope for coercion on voters by parties in power and their subordinates?

(c) Did Government send all voting papers to the respective voters in all provinces by registered post?

(d) Was this the case with the Madras Commerce constituency?

(e) Will Government be pleased to state if they are aware that voting papers sent by unregistered post were received by Local Board officials and others direct from Post Office and coercion was exercised on voters?

(f) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the charges and counter-charges made by the leaders of Justice Party regarding coercion on voters, which was published on the 11th December in *Hindu*?

(g) Are Government prepared to direct such method of election to be adopted as may put an end to this complaint and voting may be done by ballot?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) The relevant regulations provide for postal voting in most but not all of the constituencies of the descriptions to which the Honourable Member refers.

(b) No.

(c) and (d). It rests with the Returning Officer, not with Government, to despatch voting papers. The regulations applicable to the constituencies in Madras, where postal voting is prescribed, differ from those in force in certain other provinces in not requiring ballot papers to be sent by

registered post, and Government presume that they were sent by ordinary post.

(e) Government have no information, but they presume that the Returning Officer complied with regulation 35 of the Legislative Assembly (Madras) Electoral Regulations which requires him to issue through the post a declaration paper and a ballot paper to each elector.

(f) Government have seen the Press report to which the Honourable Member refers.

(g) Government will address the Government of Madras with a view to receiving suggestions for amendment of the Regulations relating to postal elections.

Mr. Deep Narayan Singh: May I suggest that letters be addressed to other provinces also—not only to the province of Madras—in this connection?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Is the Honourable Member's question directed to some other province?

Mr. Deep Narayan Singh: Yes, Bihar.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I have not got anything here relating to Bihar.

Mr. Deep Narayan Singh: The same system prevails in the landholders' constituency there, and if any advice is to be given by the Government of India, I want to know whether the Honourable Member will kindly address that letter to other provinces also?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I shall certainly consider the suggestion of my Honourable friend.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Arising out of the answer to part (f) of the question, were Government informed of any postal official having delivered these postal articles to persons other than the voters?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: We have no such information, Sir.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: What is it that the Government of India have perused in regard to the charges and counter-charges by the leaders of the Justice Party?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: My Honourable friend's question, or rather the Honourable Mr. Mudaliar's question was:

"Has the attention of Government been drawn to the charges and counter-charges made by the leaders of Justice Party regarding coercion on voters, which was published on the 11th December in the *Hindu*?"

The answer was that attention has been drawn and Government have seen the press report to which the Honourable Member refers.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Were allegations made of coercion in those attacks?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That can be found out by a perusal of the article.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Government seem to have perused the article, according to their reply: I ask the Honourable the Law Member whether he knows if in those charges and counter-charges any charge of coercion has been made?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I do not recollect every line of that press publication, but when I say that the Government have seen press reports, it means the entire report, including such charges if any were included in the report, must have been seen.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: May I know what were the charges made in these attacks?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: They must be found in that press writing which I have not got before me.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Further Action taken on the Recommendations of the Railway Retrenchment Sub-Committee.

144. **Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Will Government be pleased to lay on the table of this House a statement showing details of the further action taken by the Railway Board in respect of the recommendations of the Railway Retrenchment Sub-Committee for reduction in railway expenditure since the publication of the last statement in November 1931?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I would refer the Honourable Member to the statement circulated to all Members of the House in February, 1932, with the Budget Papers, showing the further action taken in respect of the recommendations made in the report of the Railway Retrenchment Sub-Committee. In December, 1932, Mr. Pope's investigation was started and the results of his investigations were summarised in statements placed before the Standing Finance Committee for Railways in February, 1934, and in August, 1934.

Grant of an Allowance to the Family of Mr. Arun Chandra Guha, a State Prisoner.

145. **Mr. Suryya Kumar Som:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the principle and procedure followed in granting allowances to the State Prisoners?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state if allowance once granted is withdrawn subsequently? If so, on what principle?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state if Babu Arun Chandra Guha, a prisoner under Regulation III of 1818, was ever granted any allowance? If so, what was the amount granted?

(d) Will Government be pleased to state if Babu Arun Chandra Guha is still granted the same allowance? If not, why not?

(e) Will Government be pleased to state why his insurance premium, once granted, is now withdrawn?

(f) Are Government aware that Babu Arun Chandra Guha used to draw a substantial allowance from the Saraswaty Press and Saraswaty Library of Calcutta, as the Managing Proprietor, for the maintenance of his family and payment of his insurance premium, before he was arrested in 1930?

(g) Will Government be pleased to state why no allowance is granted to his family, including his aged mother, of which he was the main prop?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) Allowances are granted to State Prisoners with reference to their status in life and their wants and those of their dependents, if any. The amount in each case is fixed on the recommendation of the Local Government concerned

(b) to (d). The allowances of the State Prisoner, Arun Chandra Guha, have not been curtailed but, owing to his having, at one time, over-drawn his allowance, the amount is being recovered by deduction of Rs 12 a month from the monthly allowance.

(e) The payment of premia has been discontinued in view of the principles observed by Government in this matter, as explained in my predecessor's reply to Mr. S. C. Sen's questions Nos. 226 to 229 on the 18th September, 1932

(f) and (g). I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer given to Mr. S. C. Mitra's question No. 952 on the 15th September, 1933.

EMPLOYMENT OF A WATCHMAN ON THE SHEDBAL LAKUR ROAD LEVEL CROSSING OF THE MADRAS AND SOUTHERN MAHRATTA RAILWAY.

146 **Mr. S. K. Hosmani:** (a) Is it a fact that there were two accidents between Kudchi and Shedbal on the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway on the Shedbal Lokur Road level crossing during the last two months?

(b) Is it a fact that there is no permanent watchman on this level crossing? If so, do Government propose to ask the Railway administration to have one, at an early date, to prevent accidents?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Information is being obtained and a reply will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

BURMANS WITH KING'S COMMISSIONS IN THE ARMY.

147. **U Thein Maung:** (a) Will Government please state how many Burmans have received His Majesty the King's Commission in the Army and how they are employed now?

(b) Will Government please state why they are no longer in the Army?

(c) Will Government please state whether they would be retransferred to the Army in the near future?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a), (b) and (c). Seven Burmans have so far been granted the King's Commission in the Indian Army. Of these one has retired, four have resigned their Commissions and two are still serving. It is not known how those who are no longer in the Army are employed, but as they left the service of their own accord they have presumably no desire to return to it.

FACILITIES FOR TRAINING OF BURMANS FOR THE ARMY, INDIAN MARINE AND AERIAL FORCES.

148. **U Thein Maung:** Will Government please state:

(a) what facilities there are for training Burmans for:

(i) the Army,

(ii) the Indian Marine, and

(iii) the aerial force.

(b) what are the qualifications required for such training:

(c) whether any Burman is being trained for them; and

(d) what steps Government have taken, or are going to take, to get them trained in the near future?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) All Burmans are eligible for admission to the Indian Military Academy, Dehra Dun, and to the Royal Air Force College, Cranwell, as well as for entry to all ranks of the Royal Indian Navy. They are also eligible for enlistment in the Indian Air Force. The four battalions of the 20th Burma Rifles are recruited entirely in Burma from Kachins, Karens and Chins.

(b) The qualifications are given in the following pamphlets copies of which are in the Library:

(1) Provisional Regulations respecting admission to the Indian Military Academy, Dehra Dun, 1932.

(2) Regulations respecting entry of Indian gentlemen to the Indian Air Force through the Royal Air Force College, Cranwell, 1933.

(3) Conditions of service, rates of pay, etc., of airmen of the combatant Branch of the Indian Air Force.

(4) Regulations respecting the recruitment, training, etc., of commissioned officers of the Royal Indian Navy.

(c) None at present.

(d) In the opinion of the Government of India, this is a question that must be left to the future Government of Burma.

PROMOTIONS OF INDIAN GUARDS ON THE GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY.

149. **Mr. V. V. Giri:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Indian Guards on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway have sent a representation to the effect that no Indian has been appointed as yet as a permanent A grade passenger guard on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the number and percentage of Indian, Anglo-Indian and European guards classified according to community and employed on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway in the following posts:

A grade passenger guard;

A grade goods guard;

B grade goods guard;

C grade goods guard;

Branch Line guard—grades I and II;

Pilot guard?

(c) Is it a fact that upto now all permanent posts of passenger guards on the main line have been denied to Indians on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway and the services of Indian guards have been mostly utilised only in the Branch Lines for passenger service?

(d) Is it a fact that very few Indians have been appointed as A grade goods guards on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway?

(e) Will Government be pleased to state whether the representation of Indian B grade goods guards for promotion to Main Line passenger guards grade on the basis of seniority in the combined A and B grade goods grades instead of A grade only, will be favourably considered?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

WORKING HOURS OF THE TRICHY FORT POST OFFICE.

150. **Mr. V. V. Giri:** Will Government be pleased to state whether they have received any communication from the merchants at Trichinopoly to alter the present working hours of the Trichy Fort Post Office? If so, will Government be pleased to state what action they propose to take in the matter?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Government have received a copy of a resolution, passed at a meeting of the merchants of Trichinopoly, requesting the Superintendent of Post Offices, Trichinopoly, to make certain alterations in the working hours of the Trichinopoly Fort Post Office. Government do not propose to take any action as the Superintendent of Post Offices, Trichinopoly, to whom a copy of the resolution has been sent direct, is fully competent to deal with the matter.

REDUCTION IN THE EARNINGS OF THE PIECE-WORKERS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

151. **Mr. V. V. Giri:** (a) Are Government aware that the earnings of the piece workers have been considerably reduced in the Government of India Press, New Delhi, owing to the serious shortage of type, material, galleys and case? If so, what compensation do Government propose to give to the piece workers?

(b) Is it a fact that a large number of compositors has been added to the staff of the Government of India Press, New Delhi? If so, has there been any corresponding increase in the type and material? If not, why not?

(c) Are Government aware that piece workers are threatened by the Assistant Manager that if they agitate in the matter, they will be turned out of the gates? If so, have the piece workers who are also Government servants, no right to get their grievances redressed?

(d) Is it a fact that thousands of pounds of brand new type was melted in the Government of India Press, New Delhi, during the last five years? If so, why and what was the quantity melted down and what was its cost?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) No. The latter part of the question does not arise.

(b) The reply to the first two parts is in the affirmative. The third part does not arise.

(c) The reply to the first part is in the negative. The second part does not arise.

(d) 8,016 lbs. of unused foundry cast type, purchased between 1924 and 1926 and costing approximately Rs. 9,300, was melted during the last five years as it was surplus to requirements and the metal was required for use as Mono metal, which was then in demand.

REFUSAL OF COMPOSITION WORK AT PIECE RATES TO PIECE-WORKERS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

152. **Mr. V. V. Giri:** (a) Is it a fact that composition work payable at piece rates is totally refused to piece workers who are being paid at rates arbitrarily fixed which brings down their income?

(b) If Government cannot find piece rate work for their piece workers, what is the necessity of continuing the piece work system instead of substituting it by fixed rates of pay as in the Government of India Press, Simla?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) No.

(b) The Honourable Member's assumption that there is no piece work is not correct. The latter part of the question does not arise.

CREATION OF POSTS OF READERS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

153. **Mr. V. V. Giri:** Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that several higher grade posts of readers have been created in the Government of India Press, New Delhi? If so, have the posts been filled? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Six posts of readers were created and they have been filled.

DISTRIBUTION OF WORK TO PROOF READERS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

154. **Mr. V. V. Giri:** (a) Is it a fact that work is not distributed to proof readers in the Government of India Press, New Delhi, according to their grades and pay drawn? If so, why?

(b) Is it also a fact that some readers in the grade of Rs. 200—10—250 are not doing any proof reading at all and are deputed in sections on duties which are either clerical or concern the supervising staff only?

(c) Is it also a fact that junior readers are being compelled to perform work of a highly responsible nature and senior readers drawing higher salaries are either given author's reading or engaged in burning waste papers?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given by me on the 22nd December, 1933, to Mr. S. C. Jog's unstarred question No 370.

(b) No: all the readers in the grade of Rs. 200—10—250 do press readings. One is also employed on supervision.

(c) No.

RECRUITMENT OF A READER IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

155. **Mr. V. V. Giri:** (a) Is it a fact that an apprentice in the Calcutta Press has been recruited as a seniormost reader in the grade of Rs. 200—10—250?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government state why an outsider has been appointed affecting the future prospects of the readers in junior grade against the decision of the Works Committee?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) and (b). An apprentice who is a graduate and successfully completed his course of training in the Government of India Press, Calcutta, has been appointed as a senior reader, as he was better qualified than readers in the lower grades to hold that post.

TRANSFER OF A RAILWAY EMPLOYEE FROM HIS NATIVE DIVISION TO OUT-DIVISION STATION.

156. **Mr. N. V. Gadgil:** Will Government be pleased to state the rules, conventions and considerations which are usually observed in effecting a transfer of a Railway employee from his native division to out-division station?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Transfers are made in the interests of service.

NON-RECOGNITION OF THE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION OF INDIAN WOMEN'S UNIVERSITY, POONA.

157. **Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta:** (a) Has the attention of the Government of India, been drawn to the note in the *Hindustan Times*, of the 16th February, 1955, under the caption "our C. P. letter" to the effect that Government of India, have turned down the recommendation of the Nagpur University, for the recognition of the Entrance Examination of the S. N. D. T. Indian Women's University, Poona?

(b) Is it a fact that the Nagpur University did recommend for the recognition referred to above?

(c) Is it also a fact that both the Academic and Executive Council of the Nagpur University recommended that?

(d) Is it also a fact that the recommendation was unanimously made by the two bodies?

(e) Is it a fact that the Government of India turned down the recommendation?

(f) Will the Government of India kindly state the reasons for this step?

Mr. Ram Chandra: (a) to (e). Yes.

(f) The recommendation of the Nagpur University was not accepted by the Government of India as the "Entrance" examination of the Indian Women's University, Poona, is not recognised either by the Government of Bombay or by Bombay University as equivalent to the Matriculation examination of the Bombay University. In fact the standard is said to be lower than that of the Bombay Matriculation examination.

PROHIBITION OF MUSIC WITHIN THE LIMITS OF NEW DELHI MUNICIPALITY.

158 **Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta:** (a) Is it a fact that music of all description has been banned within the limits of New Delhi Municipality?

(b) If so, will Government kindly inform:

(i) the terms of the prohibition order;

(ii) the authority issuing the same; and

(iii) the circumstances necessitating this step?

Mr. Ram Chandra: (a) and (b) (i). No. I lay on the table a copy of a prohibiting order which has been issued, from which the Honourable Member will see that it relates only to the playing of certain kinds of music under certain conditions.

(b) (ii). The New Delhi Municipal Committee under section 184 of the Punjab Municipal Act, III of 1911.

(b) (iii). The prohibition is designed for the convenience of residents and is in accordance with the practice in force in most cities in India.

Statement.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 184 of the Punjab Municipal Act, III of 1911, the New Delhi Municipal Committee direct that beating of drums or tom-toms, blowing of horns or trumpets and sounding any brass or other instruments or utensils within the limits of New Delhi Municipality along the streets and in public parks of New Delhi is prohibited except wth the previous written permission of the Secretary, New Delhi Municipal Committee and subject to the following provisos :

(1) This prohibition will not apply to any Orchestra, Band or Music organised by the State or Military Departments in Government buildings or in public streets.

(2) This prohibition will not apply to any Band or music played in or at a recognised Public Club House, Hotels, Cinemas and Restaurants.

(3) This prohibition will not apply to any musical ceremonies conducted in any religious edifice in accordance with the customs of that religion.

2. In private residences, any organised Band or Orchestra will not be played during the following hours without the previous written permission of the Secretary, New Delhi Municipal Committee :

(a)	April to September	10 a. m. to 4 p. m. 10 p. m. to 5 a. m.
(b)	October to March	10 a. m. to 4 p. m. 10 p. m. to 6 a. m.

3. Permission will be granted by the Secretary, New Delhi Municipal Committee, in every case subject to the concurrence of the Senior Superintendent of Police.

4. Any person disobeying this General Prohibition order will render himself liable to the penalty of a fine of Rs. 25 as laid down in Section 184 of the Municipal Act.

POSTING OF ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO HOSPITALS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

159 **Mr. B. B. Varma:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state what hospitals of the East Indian Railway are under the charge of Sub-Assistant Surgeons only?

(b) Is it a fact that Sub-Assistant Surgeons on the East Indian Railway are not qualified to perform major operations?

(c) Are Government prepared to post Assistant Surgeons to such Railway Hospitals as are now under the charge of Sub-Assistant Surgeons only at present, in view of the disability suffered by employees owing to the absence of qualified Assistant Surgeons in the Railway Hospitals?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

STAFF CLASSIFIED AS INTERMITTENT ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

160 **Mr. B. B. Varma:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the staff on the East Indian Railway to whom the Hours of Employment Regulations are applicable are permitted to leave their places of duty, if classified as intermittent and no work is immediately available?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state how many staff on the East Indian Railway among those classified as intermittent workers are housed in railway quarters near their respective places of work?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state the actual number of rest days allowed to different classes of intermittent workers on East Indian Railway in different divisions according to the records available with the Supervisor of Labour?

(d) Will Government be pleased to state the number of staff who received overtime payment under the Hours of Employment Regulations and the total amounts paid in each Division every year since the Regulations were enforced on the East Indian Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a), (b) and (c). I would refer the Honourable Member to section 71A (a) of the Indian Railways (Amendment) Act, 1930, which lays down the conditions under which the employment of a railway servant may be declared to be "essentially intermittent". Government have no information as regards the exact practice on the East Indian Railway, but are making enquiries.

(d) Government understand that during 1932-33, on the East Indian Railway, 620 railway employees were paid overtime under the Hours of Employment Regulations, the total amount paid during that year being Rs. 3,170.

WORKING HOURS OF STATION MASTERS ON CERTAIN STATIONS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

161. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Station Masters in the following stations are working 84 hours per week:

Zamania, Chousa, Saidraza, Karamnasa, Chandouli, Majhwar, Twinganja, Sakaldiah, Fatehpur?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government have no information but are making enquiries. A reply will be laid on the table in due course.

COMPLAINTS UNDER THE HOURS OF EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

162. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Will Government be pleased to state the number of complaints received under the Hours of Employment Regulations, by the Labour Inspectorate and found to be correct on the East Indian Railway during 1934?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government understand that three complaints were received by the Supervisor of Railway Labour during 1934 from the staff of the East Indian Railway and that these are, at present, under investigation.

STAFF PERFORMING CONTINUAL NIGHT DUTY ON EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

163. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Will Government be pleased to state the number of staff performing continual night duty on East Indian Railway according to the information of the Labour Inspectorate?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government understand that this information is not available in the Labour Inspectorate.

STAFF GETTING LESS THAN EIGHT HOURS' REST ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

164. Mr. B. B. Varma: Will Government be pleased to state the number of staff found to be habitually getting less than eight consecutive hours' rest in the 24 by the Labour Inspectorate under paragraph IX of their periodic report to the Agent, East Indian Railway upto now?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government understand that this information is not available in the Labour Inspectorate.

TREATING OF LOCOMOTIVE ASSISTANT RUNNING SHED FOREMEN AS CONTINUOUS WORKERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

165. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Locomotive Assistant Running Shed Foremen at Bandel, Ondal, Allahabad and Tundla are required to perform daily 12 hours duties on the ground that they are supervisory staff although Yard Masters, Assistant Yard Masters, Head Train Examiners, Assistant Station Masters, supervising stations classified as "supervisory staff" under Railway Board Regulations are treated as continuous workers and given the benefit of 60-hour week?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether on the advice of the Labour Inspectorate, they propose to treat the Locomotive Assistant Running Shed Foremen in the aforesaid stations as "continuous workers"?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am calling for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

DAILY ALLOWANCE OF SECTION BOILER MAKERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

166 **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Is it a fact that section boiler makers of Locomotive Department on East Indian Railway receive only ten annas as daily allowance although their grade is Rs. 500, while fitters are entitled to Re. 1 per day as allowance and if the reply is in the affirmative, are Government prepared to raise the rate of daily allowance to section boiler makers on this Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government are not prepared to interfere in the fixing of wages for individual classes of workmen, which they have left to the local Administration.

NIGHT DUTY ALLOWANCE OF PERMANENT WAY INSPECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether they propose to remove the existing anomalies?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Government have no information.

(b) This is a matter entirely within the competence of the Agent, East Indian Railway, to decide, and a copy of the question has been sent to him.

JUDGING OF THE WORK OF THE TRAVELLLING TICKET EXAMINERS.

168. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the work of the Travelling Ticket Examiners is judged by the earnings shown and not merely by checking of the tickets of the travelling passengers?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given to part (b) of question No. 1366, asked by Sardar Sant Singh on the 11th December, 1933.

NON-SUPPLY OF WINTER UNIFORMS TO TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS AND INSPECTORS IN THE HOWRAH DIVISION.

169. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that winter uniforms have not been supplied to Travelling Ticket Examiners and Travelling Ticket Inspectors in Howrah Division only on the East Indian Railway?

(b) If the reply to the preceding part be in the affirmative, will Government state the reasons for this special discrimination?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government are enquiring and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

RUNNING ALLOWANCE ADMISSIBLE TO TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS AND INSPECTORS ON CERTAIN STATE RAILWAYS.

170. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) the rates of running allowance admissible to Travelling Ticket Examiners and Travelling Ticket Inspectors on East Indian Railway, North Western Railway, Eastern Bengal Railway and Great Indian Peninsula Railway;

(b) whether they are paid on a different basis;

(c) if so, for what reasons?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Running or mileage allowances are not admissible to Travelling Ticket Examiners and Travelling Ticket Inspectors on any of the Railways mentioned

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

PROMOTION OF ASSISTANT STATION MASTERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

171. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Is it a fact that formerly Assistant Station Masters on the East Indian Railway were eligible for promotion to B grade guardships and that this practice has been recently stopped? If so, why?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course

FILLING UP OF RELIEVING VACANCIES ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

172. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Is it a fact that opportunities for filling relieving vacancies as Platform Assistants or Controllers at important stations are now mainly thrown open to relieving guards and not senior Assistant Station Masters on the East Indian Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course

UNIFORMS SUPPLIED TO INDIAN ASSISTANT STATION MASTERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

173. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Is it a fact that an Indian Assistant Station Master on East Indian Railway is supplied with a coat only whereas other staff who are supplied with uniforms get better treatment?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

ABOLITION OF POSTS OF RELIEVING GUARDS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

174. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Is it a fact that since 1933 according to the orders of the Railway Board, the posts of relieving guards have been abolished and changed to Relieving Assistant Station Masters on the East Indian Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No such orders have been issued by the Railway Board.

PROMOTION OF "A" GRADE GUARDS AS RELIEVING GUARDS IN THE ALLAHABAD DIVISION.

175. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Is it a fact that in Allahabad Division of the East Indian Railway, there is still in existence the practice of promoting 'A' grade guards as relieving guards without allowing Assistant Station Masters any opportunities for promotion to those posts?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government have no information.

Posting of Guards as Gunners at Moghulsarai.

176. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Is it a fact that in Moghalsarai, guards are posted as Gunners and Travelling Ticket Examiners are utilised as guards to the great detriment of the former class of employees resulting in considerable loss of over-time earnings?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government have no information.

Rest available to the Ticket Checking Staff at Gaya, Patna and Dinapore.

177. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Will Government be pleased to state what average period of rest in the roster of 12 hours' shift duties is available to East Indian Railway ticket checking staff at Gaya, Patna and Dinapore?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am calling for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course

Seventy-one Hours' Duty Programme of Travelling Ticket Examiners in the Dinapore Division.

178 **Mr. B. B. Varma:** (a) Is it a fact that on the 26th October, 1934, the Secretary of the East Indian Railway Union, Dinapore, sent a telegram to the Labour Supervisor, Railway Board, Delhi, protesting against the 71 hours' duty programme per week enforced on the Travelling Ticket Examiners of the Dinapore Division?

(b) Was any enquiry held in the matter and if so, what was the result of the enquiry?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Yes

(b) The matter was enquired into by the Supervisor of Railway Labour early in December, 1934, and it was found that the East Indian Railway Administration had themselves set the matter right arranging for the staff concerned to work to a weekly limit of 56 hours with effect from the 1st November, 1934.

Right of Appeal to Railway Staff in Cases of Forfeiture of Gratuity.

179 **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Will Government be pleased to state whether the Railway Board are prepared to allow right of appeal to staff in all cases of forfeiture of gratuity as in the case of Provident Fund Bonus?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Gratuity stands on a different footing from Provident Fund bonus. The former is essentially an *ex gratia* payment as a reward for good, efficient, faithful and continuous service. The rules provide that only the Agent can reduce or withhold gratuities and Government do not consider it either desirable or necessary to allow any right of appeal.

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN ASSISTANT STATION MASTERS ON THE BOMBAY, BARODA AND CENTRAL INDIA RAILWAY.

180. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** With reference to their reply to starred question No. 1033, given in the Legislative Assembly on the 20th March, 1931, will Government be pleased to state what action the Agent, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway has taken in the matter?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government have no information.

PROMOTIONS OF ASSISTANT STATION MASTERS IN THE DELHI DIVISION.

181. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** (a) Are Government aware that several Assistant Station Masters in Delhi Division of the North Western Railway who could not be sent to pass Station Master's examination in time due to administrative inconvenience are applying for their due promotion with arrears, for the last two years? Has any representation been received and if so, with what result?

(b) Is it a fact that due to this, junior men are getting more pay while seniors less? If so, how do Government propose to remove the anomaly?

(c) Is it also a fact that the Agent, North Western Railway under his letter No 520-E /202, dated the 27th April 1934, has replied that since the system was in existence since long, it cannot be remedied?

(d) Is it a fact that the grade I of the Assistant Station Masters over the North Western Railway is Rs. 95, and if so, why are they stopped for three years on Rs. 75?

(e) Is it a fact that Assistant Station Masters are responsible for the duties of train passing and for all duties of Station Master in his absence, and if so, how is it that the Station Masters get sixth or seventh grade while an Assistant Station Master is of grade I on the same station?

(f) Is it a fact that commercial clerks who are supposed to be under him get far higher pay than an Assistant Station Master and if so, for what reasons?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No representations have been received by Government The matters referred to in the question are all within the competence of the Local Railway Administration to decide, but I have sent a copy of the question to the Agent, North Western Railway, for his information and such action as he may consider necessary.

SENIORITY LISTS OF ASSISTANT STATION MASTERS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

182. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** (a) How is the seniority of the lower subordinates on the North Western Railway governed, whether by pay or by service?

(b) Are Government prepared to arrange for maintenance of seniority lists of Assistant Station Masters in the same way as maintained in the Traffic Audit Branch of North Western Railway (*vide* Appendix A, Legislative Assembly Debates, 23rd February 1934) and made available for perusal of the staff concerned?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

PASSES GRANTED TO STAFF ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY BEING RESIDENT OF PLACES ON OTHER STATE RAILWAYS.

183. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Are Government aware that over North Western Railway many of the staff being resident on other State Railway stations cannot take the advantage of the local passes, and are Government prepared to allow discretion to such staff to take passes over any State Railway on home line privilege basis?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government are not aware that there is any considerable number of North Western Railway employees who come from areas other than those served by that Railway. The rules for the issue of passes provide for a certain number being issued annually over the line to which an employee belongs and for two passes for a journey involving travelling over other Railways Government do not consider that these concessions can be considered illiberal and are not prepared to extend them in the manner proposed.

REFUSAL OF CERTAIN PRIVILEGES TO STATION MASTERS ON THE DELHI-UMBALA KALKA SECTION.

184. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** How is it that on certain stations on the Delhi Umbala Kalka sections permanent-way inspectors are sanctioned pankha coolies in hot weather and coal in winter but the station masters on the same stations are refused this privilege?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course

NON-SUPPLY OF WINTER UNIFORM TO THE STATION MASTERS, ETC., IN THE DELHI DIVISION OF THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

185 **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Is it a fact that over the North Western Railway in Delhi Division, Signallers and the Yard Foremen who have no public dealing are given winter uniform annually, but the Station Master and the Assistants are not? If so, why?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for some information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

IMPORT OF COTTON VESTS WITH COLLARS BY JAPAN AND GRANT OF PROTECTION TO THE INDIGENOUS HOSIERY INDUSTRIALISTS.

186. **Dr. Thein Maung:** (a) Are Government aware:

(i) that of late, the Japanese Hosiery Manufacturers have been importing cotton vests, with collars, made from knitted fabric, in large quantities, and that the import has increased from month to month;

(ii) that the cotton vests, with collars, being classed as "apparel" have to pay only 35 per cent. Tariff duty and not annas 12 per pound as the ordinary vests have to pay;

(iii) that by such increase of imports of cotton vests, with collar, the local hosiery manufacturers are hard hit?

(b) If the answer be in the negative, do Government propose to consider the desirability of enquiring into the matter, with a view to remedying the defect?

(c) If the answer be in the affirmative, will Government please state what steps are being taken to give real protection to the hosiery industry in that particular line?

(d) Is it a fact that representations have been made by the hosiery industrialists to the Government to have this defect remedied, and that no steps have been taken by the Government? If so, why?

(e) Are Government aware that "Interlock Fabric", that is cotton knitted fabric made on "Interlock Machine" is made in Burma and thus hosiery industry in Burma is the hardest hit by the Japanese competition in that particular line?

(f) If so, are Government prepared to consider the desirability of amending the rules with a view to giving protection to the indigenous hosiery industrialists?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f). Enquiries have shown that no serious attempt has been made to evade the protective duty on cotton undervests by the importation of such vests with collars attached. Representations have, however, been received to the effect that since the protective duty was imposed the Indian hosiery industry is being affected by the importation of new lines of cotton knitted apparel, such as, sports shirts and pullovers, which are entirely different in character to undervests and which are rightly classified for customs purposes as apparel dutiable at 35 per cent. *ad valorem*. The question of the protection, if any, required by the hosiery industry in India and Burma is now under the consideration of Government.

RATE WAR STARTED BY THE IRRAWADDY FLOTILLA COMPANY, LIMITED.

187. **Dr. Thein Maung:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the information supplied by the Burma Launch Owners' Association, Rangoon, as desired by the Joint Secretary of the Department of Commerce, in his letter dated the 15th September, 1934, has been duly received, and if so, what action Government propose to take in the matter?

(b) Are Government aware that the rate war started by the Irrawaddy Flotilla Company Ltd. since 1st August, 1934, is having a disastrous effect on the Burmese and Indian Launch Owners in the Delta Division of Burma, and that unless urgent steps are taken to extend the provision of

Act XIII of 1930 to Burma, the owners of the small launches will come to grief before the year 1935 is over?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) and (b). The information referred to by the Honourable Member has just been received and the whole matter is under consideration.

SAFEGUARDING OF THE SILK INDUSTRY IN BURMA.

188. **Dr. Thein Maung:** (a) Are Government aware:

(i) that the *ad valorem* value of the Chinese silk,—for example Yellow Shanghai or other kinds,—is fixed at Rs. 3 or Rs. 2-14-0 per pound, whereas the value of Siamese silk is fixed at Rs. 5 per pound, *i.e.*, the tariff rate of the Siamese silk is higher than that of the Chinese silk, and

(ii) that on that account the silk weaving industry in Burma, which uses Siamese silk generally, is undergoing much hardship as it cannot compete with the Chinese silk goods?

(b) If the reply to part (a) be in the affirmative, are Government prepared to consider the desirability of amending the rates enumerated in Serial No. 45A of No. 157A in the Statutory Schedule of the Indian Customs Tariff, with a view to safeguarding the silk industry in Burma?

(c) If the reply to part (a) be in the negative, are Government prepared to enquire into the matter?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) The Honourable Member is referred to item No. 46 of the Import Tariff in the first Schedule of Indian Customs Tariff (eleventh issue) copies of which are in the Library. It will be observed that from the 1st January, 1935, the tariff valuations of raw silk have been recast and Siamese raw silk is not assessed to duty on a tariff valuation since that date.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

INDIAN OFFICERS IN THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

189. **Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will Government please state the number of Indians in the Finance Department in the following posts:

(i) Secretary,
(ii) Joint Secretary,
(iii) Deputy Secretary, and
(iv) Under Secretary,

from the year 1928 till the present day?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: A statement is laid on the table.

Statement showing the number of Indians in the Finance Department in the Posts of Secretary, Joint Secretary, Deputy Secretary and Under Secretary from the year 1928 onwards.

Year.	Secretary.	Joint Secretary.	Depuy Secretary.	Under Secretary.
1928	..	..	1	1
1929	..	..	..	1
1930	..	..	..	1
1931	..	..	..	1
1932	..	..	1	1
1933	..	..	..	1
1934	..	..	..	..
1935	..	..	..	..

SUPPLY OF PRINTED ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS TO MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ONE OR TWO DAYS IN ADVANCE.

190. **Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta:** (a) Is it a fact that answers of Government to questions proposed to be asked by the members of the Central Provinces Legislative Council are printed along with questions?

(b) Is it a fact that printed questions and answers are supplied to the members a day or two in advance?

(c) Is it also a fact that the questions and answers are not actually read out?

(d) Will Government please state which other Provincial Legislatures follow this practice, and which of them do not?

(e) Will Government please state the practice followed with respect to this in the Provincial Legislatures, where answers are not printed along with questions?

(f) Are Government aware that this saves a lot of time and facilitates the speedy disposal of business?

(g) Have Government any objection to the Central Provinces practice being followed here?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) Government have no information.

(d) and (e). Government are aware that the practice obtains in some of the Local Legislative Councils but are not in possession of complete information in the matter.

(f) and (g). The Honourable Member is referred to my reply to Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena's starred question No. 657 asked on the 5th March, 1935.

PROPOSAL TO CONSTRUCT A RAILWAY LINE FROM DRUG, BENGAL NAGPUR RAILWAY, TO BASTAR AND SALUR.

191. **Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta:** (a) Was there a proposal to construct a Railway line from Drug (Bengal-Nagpur Railway) to Bastar and Salur?

(b) How far has that proposal matured, or has that proposal been finally abandoned? If not, what is its number in the list of proposed Railways?

(c) When is the construction likely to begin?

(d) What is its estimated cost?

(e) Has the alignment been made?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Yes.

(b) This proposal has been shelved as it was considered not financially justified, and the construction of the Raipur-Vizianagram line has altered the position. It is thought that the areas in question would be better served by roads or short branch lines from the latter.

(c), (d) and (e). Do not arise.

ACCOMMODATION AVAILABLE AND PASSENGERS TRAVELLING IN RAILWAY TRAINS.

192. **Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta:** Will Government please lay on the table a statement showing the following information with respect to each of the Railways for each of the last five years, separately, with respect to first, second, intermediate and third class passengers:

(a) available accommodation (their number);

(b) actual number of passengers travelling;

(c) the ratio of (b) to (a)?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The information asked for by the Honourable Member can be obtained from the statements Nos. 10,34,12 and 36 in Volume II of the Reports by the Railway Board for the years 1929-30 to 1933-34. Copies of these reports are available in the Library of the House.

PREFERENCE FOR RICE IN CEYLON AND MALAYA.

193. **U Thein Maung:** With reference to paragraph 5 (a) of the Report of the Committee appointed by the Legislative Assembly to examine and report on the working of the scheme of Mutual Preferences between India and the United Kingdom, arising out of the Ottawa Trade Agreement, will Government please state:

(a) what steps they have taken to secure a preference for rice in Ceylon and Malaya, and

(b) what are the results thereof?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) and (b). The Government of India are still negotiating with the authorities concerned for a preference on Indian rice in Ceylon and Malaya.

BURMANISATION OF UNITS IN THE ARMY.

194. **U Thein Maung:** With reference to the statements laid on the table by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in connection with question No. 90, asked by the Honourable Sir Phiroze Sethna in the Council of State on the 14th August, 1934 (now published at pages 16-17 of the Council of State Debates, 1935, Vol. I), will Government please state:

(a) whether it is their accepted policy:

(i) to Burmanize any of the units in the Army, and

(ii) to raise new Burmese units:

(b) whether any, and if so, which of the existing units have been earmarked for Burmanization and how Burmese officers would be trained and provided for them;

(c) what other steps are being taken by Government to Burmanize the army in Burma and what the rate of progress would be;

(d) what steps Government are taking

(i) to train Burmans for the Air Force and the Royal Marine and to employ them therein, and

(ii) for the general training of the Burmese people to defend themselves and their country?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a), (b) and (c). The whole question of the future defence of Burma is under consideration and no information can be given at present.

(d) Attention is invited to the reply to the Honourable Member's unstarred question No 148 of today's date.

OLD LOWER CLASS CARRIAGES USED BETWEEN MUZAFFARPUR AND PALIZA GHAT RAILWAY STATIONS AND PLYING OF SOME STEAM BOATS FOR DIGHA GHAT.

195. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that within the last three months the Bengal and North Western Railway has again begun to run old type third and intermediate class compartments between Muzaffarpur and Paliza Ghat Railway stations?

(b) Are Government aware that in the afternoon and evening, the same steam boat is plied for both the stations Digha Ghat and Mahendra from Paliza Ghat thus causing great inconvenience to passengers?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) The Agent, Bengal and North Western Railway, states that composite third and intermediate class carriages run between Muzaffarpur and Paliza Ghat as heretofore, and that there has been no change in this respect.

(b) The same steamboat serves both the stations as the traffic offering does not justify the running of two separate steamers.

ABSENCE OF WAITING ACCOMMODATION FOR PASSENGERS ON THE CHUPRA KATCHERY RAILWAY STATION.

196. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** Is it a fact that a very large number of third and intermediate class passengers are booked from Chapra Katchery Railway station on the Bengal and North Western Railway every day and

there is no waiting accommodation for third and intermediate class passengers on that station?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government are not aware of the exact arrangements at Chupra Katcheri. They are sending a copy of the Honourable Member's question to the Agent, Bengal and North Western Railway, in order that he may have the matter examined.

East Indian Railway Union at Dinapore.

197. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** (a) Are Government aware whether there is any East Indian Railway Union at Dinapore?

(b) Is it a fact that the Agent, East Indian Railway in his letter No. 1884/21, dated the 1st April, 1927, said he had no objection to the employees of East Indian Railway becoming members of a trade union organised and conducted under Act 16 of 1926?

(c) Is it a fact that in spite of the assurance given in the above letter of the Agent, the representations made by the above Union are not entertained? If so, are Government prepared to order that the representations made by the Union be given consideration to in future? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

Treatment of Indian Staff in the East Indian Railway Hospital at Tundla.

198. **Mr. B. B. Varma:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state how many nurses are employed in the East Indian Railway Hospital at Tundla?

(b) Is it a fact that these nurses are employed to look after European Ward only and that their services are not available for Indian patients, both male and female?

(c) Is it a fact that on account of the absence of mid-wives or nurses to look after Indian ladies, many serious cases of confinement have been refused admission into the hospital?

(d) Will Government be pleased to state the number of Indian and non-Indian maternity cases treated in the Tundla Railway Hospital and the respective number of cases which ended in mortality during the last three years?

(e) Is it a fact that the services of a qualified private doctor are not available in or about Tundla and that there is no Assistant Surgeon employed in the Railway Hospital, and are Government aware that Indian patients do not obtain adequate medical assistance in serious cases?

(f) Is it a fact that the District Medical Officer mostly attends to European cases, and will Government state the number of Indian patients personally examined by him in the Railway Hospital during the last three years?

(g) Will Government state the present scale of fees charged and concessions allowed to low-paid employees in the said hospital?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

RECRUITMENT OF LOCAL SERVICE TELEGRAPHISTS.

199. **Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) With reference to the reply to question No. 40(j) of Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen in this House on the 25th February, 1933, is it not a fact that seniority and experience which the forced station service telegraphists possess was wanting in those outsiders recruited direct to the general service?

(b) If the reply to the above be in the affirmative, and in view of the replies given in this House to question No. 40(j) on the 25th February, 1933 and question No. 367(i) on the 6th March, 1934, will Government please state why no provision could be made for transfer of these forced station service telegraphists, declared fit on examination, to the general service and who were surplus when they recruited Anglo-Indians at the same time?

(c) Will Government please state why the remaining 100 men or so of this particular group are made to suffer?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a) Yes, except that the experience of the forced station service telegraphists is confined to the conditions of station service.

(b) The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given to part (g) of the question No. 40 mentioned by him.

(c) The Honourable Member is referred to part (c) of the reply given to Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen's unstarred question No. 42 in this House on the 25th February, 1933.

FIXATION OF THE SCALES OF PAY OF STATION SERVICE TELEGRAPHISTS.

200. **Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that the reasons for fixing the scales of pay of a station service telegraphist at a much lower rate than his colleague in the general service, are that the former is allowed the option to choose a station of his liking and is not liable to be transferred? If not, what are the reasons?

(b) Is it a fact that some of the station service telegraphists who chose Barisal Telegraph Office as their station had to be transferred to Calcutta on conversion of the former into a combined Post Office?

(c) Is it a fact that the scales of pay of a station service telegraphist at Calcutta are much higher than those of a Station service telegraphist of Barisal?

(d) Is it also a fact that these different scales of pay had been fixed in consideration of the cost of living prevailing at the respective places?

(e) If the reply to the above be in the affirmative, will Government please state if it is not a fact that under the existing conditions of service of station service telegraphists, these men are entitled to choose a station of their liking for the second time?

(f) If the reply to part (e) be in the affirmative, will Government please state the reasons for refusing to adjust the pay of these men according to scales prevailing at Calcutta where they have been transferred to on conversion of Barisal office?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a) The reply to the first part is in the affirmative. The second part does not arise.

(b) The fact is not exactly as stated. On the conversion of the Barisal telegraph office into a combined post and telegraph office the station service telegraphists of that office were given their choice of another station. One of them volunteered for any station except Chittagong and the rest for any station without reservation. They were accordingly provided for in the Calcutta Central Telegraph Office. Subsequently they were given another choice of station but they preferred to remain in Calcutta.

(c) Yes.

(d) Yes.

(e) Does not arise in view of the reply given to part (b) above.

(f) The pay of the men was fixed in the station service scale of the Calcutta office strictly in accordance with Fundamental Rule 22 which is statutory.

COMPULSORY PERFORMANCE OF OVERTIME BY THE TELEGRAPHISTS AND CLERK IN TELEGRAPH OFFICES.

201. **Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that under the existing rules, telegraphists and clerks in Telegraph Offices can be compelled to perform overtime after completion of full term of duty by heads of offices?

(b) Is it also a fact that a telegraphist or a clerk cannot be paid for any overtime performed in a week in which he happens to take leave on average pay for sickness or urgent business?

(c) If the reply to parts (a) and (b) above be in the affirmative, do Government propose to modify the rules for proper regulation of the same? If not, why not?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a) Telegraphists and clerks in telegraph offices can be called upon to perform duty on payment of overtime allowances on occasions of extraordinary pressure and emergency.

(b) Not necessarily. Overtime is paid for duty performed in excess of 50 hours in one week.

(c) In view of the reply to parts (a) and (b), Government see no reason to modify the existing rules.

INCREMENTS GRANTED TO GOVERNMENT SERVANTS.

202. **Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if increments are granted to the staff if their work and conduct are considered satisfactory?

(b) Is it a fact that cases occur where increments are withheld by the heads of offices if they consider that the conditions therefor are not fulfilled?

(c) Is it a fact that the order withholding any official's increment may be upset on appeal, if there be no good grounds to withhold it on the due date?

(d) If so, will Government please state if in such cases the official will be entitled to draw this increment from the original date, as if there was no order for withholding it?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) to (c). The reply is in the affirmative.

(d) The matter is one for the decision of the appellate authority concerned.

SPECIAL INITIAL RATES OF PAY IN THE POSTAL BRANCH AND TELEGRAPH BRANCH.

203. **Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the date from which special initial rates of pay were introduced in the Postal Branch and Telegraph Branch, separately, and when it was discontinued in both, and lay a copy of these orders on the table?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state why it was not extended to the Telegraph Branch from the date of amalgamation of the two Branches, or from the date of issue of the order to the Postal Branch, whichever is earlier?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) By the expression "Telegraph Branch", the Honourable Member presumably refers to the clerical cadre of the Telegraph Branch, and by the term "special initial rates of pay" he presumably refers to the higher starting pay formerly given to Graduates and passed Intermediates. The concession was granted in the Postal Branch from 1st December, 1919, and in the Telegraph Traffic Branch from 7th December, 1929. The concession was discontinued with effect from the 24th December, 1930. Copies of relevant orders are attached.

(b) By the expression "amalgamation of the two Branches" the Honourable Member presumably refers to the equalisation of the pay of the clerical staff in all Branches of the Department which took place with effect from the 1st March, 1927. The concession of higher initial rates of pay was granted to officials in the Postal Branch on the recommendation of the Postal Committee of 1920. It was not granted in the Telegraph Traffic Branch as the Telegraph Committee of 1920 made no such recommendation. The concession was extended to the latter Branch from the 7th December, 1929 though the scales of pay were equalised from the 1st March, 1927. This delay was due to the fact that in view of the increased scales of pay, the question of the necessity for the continuance of the concession was under consideration and was only finally decided in December, 1929.

Resolution by the Government of India, Department of Commerce, No. 6458, dated Simla, the 23rd September, 1920.

In continuation of the Resolution in the Department of Commerce No. 4737, dated the 30th July, 1920, the Government of India, agreeing generally with the recommendations of the Postal Enquiry Committee, are pleased to pass the following orders with regard to the clerical establishments in Post Offices the pay of which does not exceed Rs. 200—20—300, Inspectors of Post Offices, Head clerks to Superintendents of Post Offices, Departmental Branch Postmasters and Overseas.

Paid probations as a separate class will be abolished. When a person is selected for employment in the Post Office, he will ordinarily be placed on the minimum pay of the time-scale applicable to the office to which he is attached, and will remain on that pay for a period of 2 years during which he will be regarded as under training and on probation. If the recruit is a man who has passed the Intermediate Examination, his starting pay will be that admissible from the beginning of the 3rd year of service under the appropriate time-scale, while if he is a graduate he will start on the pay admissible from the beginning of the 5th year of service under the same time-scale.

* * * * * *

3. Date of giving effect to the new scales of pay—The Committee have recommended that the new scales of pay together with the local allowances proposed in certain districts in the Central Circle should be introduced from the 1st December, 1919, in view of the fact that revision of pay of the Telegraph Department was introduced from that date, and the Government of India have decided to accept this proposal.

Resolution by the Government of India, Department of Commerce, No. 6584, dated Simla, the 29th September, 1920.

In continuation of the Resolution in the Department of Commerce, No. 6458, dated the 23rd September, 1920, the Government of India are pleased to pass the following orders on the recommendations of the Postal Enquiry Committee, with regard to the clerical establishments in the Railway Mail Service whose pay does not exceed Rs. 200—20—300, Assistant Superintendents, Railway Mail Service, and Inspectors of Sorting. The recommendations of the Committee have been generally accepted.

If the recruit is a man who has passed the Intermediate Examination, his starting pay will be that admissible from the beginning of the 3rd year of service under the appropriate time-scale, while if he is a graduate he will start on the pay admissible from the beginning of the 5th year of service under the same time-scale.

3. Date of giving effect to the new scales of pay.

The new scales of pay, together with the local allowances shown in paragraph 1 (1) will be introduced from the 1st December, 1919. From the arrears of pay which will become due under this order, the advance of one month's pay sanctioned under the orders passed by the Government of India in this Department on the 31st May, 1920, shall first be deducted. If the advance already drawn exceeds the total arrears due, if any, the balance shall be recovered from the monthly pay in three equal instalments.

Memorandum from the Government of India, Department of Industries and Labour, Posts and Telegraphs Branch, to the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs, No. 74-Est. A./28, dated Simla, the 19th September, 1930.

SUBJECT.—Status of Diploma and Degree holders in Commerce.

For the purposes of the orders contained in this Department Memorandum No. EA-213/28, dated the 7th December, 1929, the Government of India have been pleased to order that the B. Com. degree of a University established by law should be recognised as equivalent to the B.A., or B.Sc., degree and that the Intermediate Examination in Commerce of such a university or of a statutory board of secondary and intermediate education (*e.g.*, the Board of High School and Intermediate education, United Provinces) should likewise be regarded as equivalent to a university

Intermediate Examination in Arts or Science. It must be understood that the old Commercial Diploma Examination of the Board of High School and Intermediate Education, United Provinces, is equivalent to the present Intermediate Examination in Commerce of the said Board.

No. 74-Est. A./28.

A copy (in duplicate) is forwarded to the Accountant-General, Posts and Telegraphs, for information.

Memorandum from the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department, Office of the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs, to all Postmasters-General, the Director of Posts and Telegraphs, Sind and Baluchistan Circle, Karachi, No. 628-Ests. A./30, dated Simla, the 2nd May, 1932.

Fixation of number of graduates and "intermediates" recruited on special initial rates of pay.

With reference to the Government of India, Department of Industries and Labour memorandum No. EA 213/28, dated the 7th December, 1929, which was published in this office General Circular No. 20, dated the 29th September, 1930, the Director-General has been pleased to fix the number of graduates and "intermediates" recruited on the special initial rates of pay, *viz.*, the 5th and 3rd stages respectively of the ordinary time-scales of the clerical cadre, in respect of each Circle during the period from the 1st April, 1929, to the 1st September, 1931, as shown in the attached statement. The concession of giving the special initial rates of pay to graduate and "intermediate" recruits was discontinued in accordance with the instructions contained in paragraph 2 of this office letter No. 628-Ests. A//30, dated the 24th December, 1930, as supplemented by letter No. 628-Est. A/30/Staff, A, dated the 2nd September, 1931. An order of the Governor-General in Council on this subject will also be issued in due course.

2. The numbers shown in the attached statement include only those officials who were actually allowed to draw special initial rates of pay pending the settlement of the question regarding fixation of the number of recruits for each Circle. The names and other particulars of these officials should be intimated to the Audit Office concerned. No such concession in the matter of pay should now be allowed to officials who became graduates and "intermediates" while holding substantive posts in the Department, or to graduates and intermediates who received substantive posts in the ordinary clerical cadre, on and after the 24th December, 1930, the date from which the concession was stopped All pending cases in this connection should be disposed of accordingly.

No. 628-Est. A/30, dated New Delhi, the 2nd May, 1932.

Copy, with copy of statement, is forwarded for information to :—

The Accountant-General, Posts and Telegraphs, Delhi.

All Deputy Accountant-General, Posts and Telegraphs.

Copy also forwarded to the Director of Wireless, New Delhi, the Controller of Telegraph Stores, Alipore, Calcutta, the Superintendent of Telegraph Workshops, Alipore, Calcutta, and the Electrical Engineer-in-Chief, Alipore, Calcutta, for information.

Statement showing the number of graduates and "intermediates" recruited on higher initial rates of pay during the period from the 1st April, 1929 to the 1st September, 1931.

Circles.	No. of graduates recruited on higher initial rates of pay.				No. of 'intermediates' recruited on higher initial rate of pay.				Remarks.
	From 1-4-29 to 6-12-29.	From 7-12-29 to 31-3-30.	From year 1930-31.	Year 1-4-31 to 1-9-31.	From 1-4-29 to 6-12-29.	From 7-12-29 to 31-3-30.	Year 1930-31.	Year 1-4-31 to 1-9-31	
P. M. G., B. & A. .	29	20	13	...	22	10	13	...	
,, B. & O. .	3	1	7	...	4	2	3	...	
,, Bombay .	9	2	10	...	1	...	7	...	
,, Burma .	3	1	1	...	4	...	1	...	
,, C. C. .	4	2	4	...	4	...	4	...	
,, Madras .	34	12	26	...	20	11	11	...	
,, Punjab .	12	5	2	...	13	6	7	...	
,, U. P. .	8	8	7	...	8	7	12	...	
D. P. & T., Karachi	1	...	..	...	3	...	2	...	

Recruitment of Graduates and Intermediates in the Telegraph Branch.

204. **Sardar Sant Singh:** Has the attention of Government been drawn to pages 361-362 and 20-21 of the Telegraph Review for October, 1934, and January, 1935, in which Director General's letter No. Es. A.-3/33 (q), dated the 27th August, 1934, and Union's reply No. R. P.-2/1, dated the 8th December, 1934, were published? If so, will Government be pleased to state:

(a) when Government's orders contained in Department of Industries, Labour Memorandum No. E. A.-213/28, dated the 7th December, 1929, were notified to different offices for fixation of the number of graduate and intermediate recruits in the Telegraph Branch, and whether office heads issued any notice to that effect to the staff, or recruited any of these classes of men, and, if so, when;

(b) whether it is a fact that after issue of Government's order in 1929, Director General's Memorandum No. Es. A./30, dated the 2nd May, 1932, is the first order to regulate the number of such recruits; and

(c) if so, the number of the employees in the Traffic Branch included in the list;

(d) what steps the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, took from 7th December, 1929, (the date of issue of Government's order) and 23rd December, 1930 (the date from which the concession was withdrawn) in giving effect to the concession;

(e) whether it is a fact that there was no direct recruitment of clerks in class II in the Central offices of the Traffic Branch of the Telegraphs;

(f) whether it is a fact that new class III was then the only channel of recruitment of clerks in the Traffic Branch; and

(g) how many graduates and intermediates were recruited in class III between the dates of introduction and withdrawal of the concession to the Traffic Branch?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Government have seen the communications referred to by the Honourable Member.

(a) As regards the first part of the question, the rules were notified for general information in Director General's General Circular No. 20, dated the 29th September, 1930. As regards the second part, the General Circulars of the Director General are circulated to the staff of all offices. As regards the remaining part, Government have no information.

(b) The Honourable Member apparently refers to the Director General's Memorandum No. 628-EsA/30, dated the 2nd May, 1932. If so, the reply is in the affirmative.

(c) Government have no precise information.

(d) During the period referred to the question of the issue of recruitment rules to determine the limitations subject to which the concession was to be extended and other cognate matters were under consideration.

(e), (f) and (g). Government have no information and do not propose to collect it. If any individual official has a grievance it is open to him to represent in the usual manner.

OPTION TO ELECT NEW LEAVE RULES TO THE STAFF ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

205. **Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** (a) Is it a fact that before any new rules are introduced, which adversely affect the service conditions of staff, an option to either continue to remain under the old rules or to elect the new rules is given to the staff already in service prior to the date from which it is intended to enforce the new rules?

(b) If the reply to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government please state why on the North Western Railway, the option referred to above was not given to staff who were appointed between the 1st April, 1927, and the 22nd August, 1927, the latter date being the one on which the Agent, North Western Railway issued his very first instructions that declarations should be obtained from all staff appointed on and after the 1st April, 1927 that they would automatically come under the new State Railways Leave Rules from the date of their introduction?

(c) Is it a fact that on all the other State Railways these new Leave Rules have been enforced from the 1st April, 1930 and that no such declarations were obtained from the staff in service prior to the 1st April, 1930 on those Railways?

(d) Is it also a fact that all staff appointed prior to the 1st April, 1930 in the Accounts Branch of the North Western Railway have been allowed to remain under the Fundamental Leave Rules?

(e) Will Government please state the reason why this difference has been made between (i) the Accounts Department and the other Departments of this particular Railway and (ii) between the employees of the other State Railways and the employees of the North Western Railway?

(f) Do Government propose to give necessary options to the staff on the North Western Railway, who were made to execute declarations, referred to in part (b) above, before the introduction of these rules on the 1st April, 1930 and in particular to those who were appointed between the dates 1st April, 1927 and 22nd August, 1927?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) So far as pay is concerned, this is generally the case, but not necessarily so with regard to other conditions of service.

(b) and (f). I am obtaining certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

(c) The Revised Leave Rules apply to Railway servants who are appointed on or after 1st April, 1930, or who were appointed prior to that date on the condition that when Revised State Railway Leave Rules for employees are introduced they will be brought under them. As regards the second part of the question the Railway Board issued instructions on 1st September, 1928, to the effect that all subordinate staff who may be recruited on or after 1st September, 1928 should be required to sign a declaration to the effect that when the Revised Leave Rules for the railway establishment are promulgated they would be liable to be brought under their operation.

(d) No. The accounts staff appointed before the 1st April, 1929, were given the option of remaining under the Fundamental Rules if they had not been apprised of the fact that the Revised Leave Rules were applicable to them.

(e), (i). The difference is due to the fact that the staff of the old combined Audit and Accounts Department which was under the control of the Auditor General before the 1st April, 1929, were in fact not given a warning as to their liability to come under the New Leave Rules while staff in other departments of the North Western Railway were given such warning.

(ii) The difference is due to the fact that the staff on the different railways were warned on different dates as to their liability to come under the New Leave Rules.

LIEUTENANT COLONELCIES GIVEN IN CERTAIN DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY

208. **Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Will Government please state the number of Lieutenant Colonelcies given to men in the following Departments during the past ten years:-

Indian Unattached Lists,

Indian Miscellaneous Lists,

Indian Army Service Corps,

Indian Army Ordnance Corps, and

Indian Medical Department?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: If the Honourable Member is referring only to Departmental Officers, the numbers are:

India Unattached List, which includes the Indian Army Service Corps and Indian Army Ordnance Corps	8
India Miscellaneous List	4
Indian Medical Department	2

ACTION TAKEN ON THE RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE CONFERENCE OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY EMPLOYEES' ASSOCIATION.

207. **Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Will Government be pleased to state what action has been taken on the resolutions adopted at the first annual conference of the East Indian Railway Employees' Association held at Albert Hall, Calcutta, on the 25th August, 1934, which were sent to the Agent, East Indian Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

STAFF QUARTERS AND HOUSE ALLOWANCES, ETC., AT HOWRAH.

208. **Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Will Government be pleased to furnish a statement on the following points:

(i) how many staff quarters are at Howrah both for Indian and European;

(ii) how many are occupied by ministerial staff;

(iii) how many are occupied by station staff;

(iv) what is the total amount of house allowances paid each month to the station staff of Howrah in lieu of free quarters;

(v) what amount is collected as rent from staff; and

(vi) how many members of the staff, who are required to be on duty at any time, have to live in private quarters at distant places for want of Railway quarters?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am making enquiries from the Railway Administration and will lay a statement on the table in due course.

FILLING UP OF THE POSTS OF TRANSPORTATION INSPECTORS AND TRAIN CONTROLLERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

209. **Mr. N. M. Joshi:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state how many posts of Transportation Inspectors and Train Controllers were filled up on the East Indian Railway during the last two years?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state if the cases of staff who worked in the capacities of Transportation Inspectors or who were demoted to lower grade on account of economy, were considered at the time of filling up the posts of Transportation Inspectors or Train Controllers?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government have no information, but are making inquiries and I will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

LAWS GOVERNING THE MARRIAGE AND INHERITANCE OF INDIAN BUDDHISTS.

210. **U Thein Maung:** With reference to the answer to the unstarred question No. 55, dated the 22nd February, 1935, will Government please state:

(a) whether it is not a fact that what is referred to therein as the personal law of Indian Buddhists is really Hindu Law; and

(b) whether Government are prepared to take action, legislative or otherwise, to remove the anomaly?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) The Government of India think it most improbable that the position is as suggested by the Honourable Member but they cannot undertake the responsibility of pronouncing on a question which could not be authoritatively decided otherwise than by the Courts.

(b) Government do not propose to take any action.

PROTECTION OF THE INTERESTS OF BUDDHISTS IN INDIA.

211. **U Thein Maung:** (a) Will Government please state what action they have taken and what orders they have issued:

(i) to protect the interests of Buddhists who are in minority in India, and

(ii) to secure proper representation of Indian Buddhists in the services, local bodies and legislatures?

(b) If no such action has been taken and no such order has been issued, will Government please state whether representations therefor have not been received and why no action has been taken on them?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) and (b). A representation has been received from the All-India Buddhist Conference urging consideration of all the matters referred to in part (a) (ii) of the question. So far as the representation of the Buddhist community in the services under the control of the Central Government is concerned, rules exist for the protection of the interests of the minority community as a whole and are applied in accordance with what appear to be the practical equities of the circumstances. As regards representation in the Central and the Provincial Legislature, the Honourable Member is aware that the whole question is under consideration in connection with the Government of India Bill. Representation in the local bodies is not primarily the concern of the Governor General in Council.

INCREASED EXPENDITURE OF THE AJMER MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE.

212. **Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur:** (a) Is it a fact:

(i) that in making provision for expenditure the Municipal Committee, Ajmer, has calculated to utilise all the savings, including the fixed deposits; and

(ii) that the expenditure of the said Committee has increased enormously?

(b) If what is stated in part (a) above be correct, do Government propose to abolish the nominated committee and to appoint Colonel Howson as the administrator of the Ajmer Municipality during the period of supersession of the Ajmer Municipal Committee? If so, when? If not, why not?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: The information asked for has been called for and a reply will be given to the House in due course.

AFFAIRS OF THE AJMER MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE.

213. **Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur:** (a) Will Government please state whether it is a fact:

(i) that about Rs. 3,000 have been found short regarding the imprest money fund entrusted to Dr. S. N. Wasti after his discharge from the post of the Assistant Health Officer of the Ajmer Municipality; and

(ii) that Dr. Abdul Shakoor, the subordinate of Dr. Wasti, recently tendered his resignation after the discharge of the said Dr. Wasti and after the discovery of the missing of the said amount of about Rs. 3,000?

(b) If what is stated in part (a) above be correct, what steps do Government propose to take in the matter?

(c) Is it a fact that a large number of relations of superseded members of the Municipal Committee, Ajmer, are still retained in the municipal service?

(d) Is it a fact that the relatives and friends of the newly nominated municipal committee members have been recently taken into the municipal service?

(e) Is it also a fact that a large number of persons discharged or removed from the Railway or Government services have been able to secure lucrative jobs in the service of the Ajmer Municipal Committee?

(f) What steps do Government propose to take in the matter?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: The information asked for has been called for and a reply will be given to the House in due course.

WORKING TILL LATE HOURS OF THE DELHI HEAD POST OFFICE STAFF.

214. **Bhai Parma Nand:** Is it a fact that some of the staff of Delhi Head Post Office has to work till late hours? If so, are Government prepared to sanction some overtime allowance for them or sanction extra staff?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: I deal with questions Nos. 214 and 215 together. Government have no information. Copies of the questions are being sent to the Head of the Circle who is competent to deal with the matters referred to therein.

ALLEGED MISAPPROPRIATION AND FRAUD IN THE DELHI HEAD POST OFFICE.

*215. **Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Is it a fact that several cases of misappropriation and fraud were brought to light in the year 1934 in Delhi Head Post Office and what steps were taken to punish the offenders to discourage their recurrence?

(b) Are Government prepared to order proper investigation to be made?

*For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 214.

†216.

USE OF GENERAL POST OFFICE BUILDINGS AS HIS RESIDENTIAL QUARTERS BY THE POST MASTER GENERAL AT SIMLA.

217. **Bhai Parma Nand:** Are Government aware of the fact that since Mr. Smith joined Simla General Post Office, Major A. Angelo, Postmaster General, is using a portion of the General Post Office buildings as his residential quarters as well as office for the summer? If so, why?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: Yes; on payment of rent and under the sanction of competent authority, as the arrangement is in the interests both of the officer concerned and of the department.

ILLNESS OF PROFESSOR JYOTISH CHANDRA GHOSE DETAINED IN THE DAMOH JAIL.

218. **Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Professor Jyotish Chandra Ghose, M.A., now under detention under Regulation III of 1818 in Damoh Jail in the Central Provinces has been suffering from:

(i) paralysis all over his body,

(ii) palpitation of heart,

(iii) diabetes, and

(iv) troubles arising from affectation of lungs?

(b) What is the present age of Professor Ghose?

(c) What is the total period of his detention?

(d) What is the period of such detention and under what law?

(e) Are Government prepared to consider the desirability of releasing him? If not, are Government prepared to:

(i) make suitable arrangement for his diet, and

(ii) allow him to see his old mother who is now in a dying condition and whose only son Professor Ghose is?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) No. On the contrary, the State Prisoner's health is reported to be satisfactory.

(b) About 49 years.

(c) and (d). He has been detained under Regulation III of 1818 since the 4th December, 1931.

(e) (i). The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative. As regards the second part, I have no information to suggest that the arrangements for diet are not suitable.

(e) (ii). The state prisoner has not, so far as I am aware, made any request in this matter.

†This question was withdrawn by the questioner.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

ARRESTS IN CALCUTTA OF PROMINENT WORKERS CONNECTED WITH THE ALL-INDIA TRADE UNION CONGRESS.

12 NOON.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has received a notice from Prof. N. G. Ranga that he proposes to ask for leave to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely:

"The policy underlying the raids in Calcutta on the offices of the various Labour, Peasants and Socialists organizations, including the Railway Workers Union, and arrests of prominent workers, connected with the All-India Trade Union Congress."

The Chair has to inquire whether any Honourable Member has any objection to this motion.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): Yes, Sir, I oppose this motion on a point of order. My submission to you is this. The motion, as it has been drafted, a copy of which is with me, relates to the policy underlying the raids in Calcutta on the offices of the various Labour, Peasants and Socialist Organizations. In so far as the policy is concerned, it is not a matter of very recent occurrence. As a matter of fact, similar raids were carried out in the Punjab, and the notification in the Punjab is dated the 10th September, 1934. Similar action was taken in Bihar in September 1934, and also in Bombay on the 24th September, 1934. My first point is, in so far as the policy is concerned, it is not a matter of recent occurrence. My second point is this. This is a matter which really ought to be debated in the local Provincial Council which is now sitting. Further, this is a matter on which we have got no information at all, except that certain offices have been declared to be illegal, and, I would draw your attention, Sir, to two rulings which will be found in this Book "A Selection from the Decisions from the Chair". The first ruling will be found at page 17. It is Ruling No. 19, and I propose to read it to the House:

"On Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya's motion for adjournment to discuss the attitude of Government in relation to an Akali Jatha which was proceeding to Jaito, which was ruled out on the same ground as the motion of the 25th February, 1924, Dr. H. S. Gour contended that as the Jatha was still in British territory the former ruling did not apply, and Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha, quoting from May's Parliamentary Practice, pointed out that in doubtful cases the Speaker referred the matter to the judgment of the House

The President ruled: The Honourable Member does not seem to be aware that in the House of Commons the maintenance of order rests on the close association between the House and the Chair and that the House has certain duties and the Chair has certain duties. Under our Rules and Standing Orders, the entire responsibility of maintaining order and interpreting the Rules and Standing Orders unfortunately rests with the Chair. I advise the Honourable Member to read the book he is looking at.

I address myself now to the point raised by Dr. Gour. In so far as he informs the Assembly that a matter is now proceeding in British territory, he is drawing attention to something which has not arisen, and if the departure of the Jatha from Amritsar were a matter on which public opinion was likely to attach great importance and to anticipate results, the place in which in the first instance it should have been raised was the Punjab Legislative Council. For the Government of the Punjab is in the first instance responsible for law and order within the limits of the province."

I would draw your particular attention to the last sentence, namely:

"For the Government of the Punjab is in the first instance responsible for law and order within the limits of the province."

The other ruling which I wish to read without comment is No. 28, at page 29 of the same book:

"On the 16th July, 1930, Mr. Nehal Singh sought to move the adjournment of the House to discuss the beating of Congress volunteers by the police on the Simla Mall. Mr. Haig, speaking on behalf of Government, objected on the ground that the matter was not of sufficient public importance and suggested that the matter could be more conveniently dealt with by question and answer.

The President upholding the objection ruled as follows:

I quite agree with my Honourable friend, Dr. Nand Lal, that at this stage we need not go into the details of the case but should confine ourselves only to the constitutional issue of the motion before the House.

The matter to which this Motion relates is, no doubt, a definite one, and also a matter of recent occurrence. But the mere fact of its being definite and of recent occurrence is not sufficient for allowing a discussion on the motion. It must also be shown that it is 'urgent' and of 'public importance'."

The action of 'pushing' and 'beating', etc.—I am not reading, Sir, this portion, because I am not going to argue that this matter is of no public importance, but I will read the next paragraph:

"Motions for adjournment are meant for obtaining an immediate debate on grave and serious matters, which cannot otherwise be immediately and effectively dealt with, and the very object of such motions will be lost if they are permitted to assume the character of an ordinary course of action of every day occurrence. 'The formal moving of the adjournment of the House as a tactical method of introducing new matter into the day's work has during the nineteenth century been gradually but steadily discouraged by the rules of the House', says Joseph Redlich in his Procedure of the House of Commons. Further on, the same author says, 'By the present rules such a motion for adjournment can only be permitted in case of special urgency'; and I am anxious that the same principle should be established in this House. 'The Speaker has repeatedly refused to allow a Member to move the adjournment of the House', says Joseph Redlich, 'on the ground that the matter proposed to be brought up by him was obviously not important or not urgent'."

Then, the next paragraph reads:

"Moreover, distinction should also be drawn between matters to be discussed in this House and the matters to be discussed in the Provincial Councils, and to my mind, it would be too much interference on the part of this House as regards provincial affairs if matters for which Provincial Governments are responsible are debated in this House by means of the extra-ordinary method of motions for adjournment It would not be right and proper to condemn the provincial executive behind their backs in a place where they cannot defend, explain or justify their conduct. The matter referred to in this motion is certainly a provincial matter, which is not primarily the concern of the Governor General in Council."

Now, Sir, if I may stop there for one second, so far as these raids are concerned, the position will be the same here today, because there is no one here from the Bengal Government to explain or defend or justify the conduct of the Government, nor are we in a position to say what has happened there. In so far as it is said that the Honourable Member wants to discuss the policy underlying the raids, then, Sir, no new policy has been laid down. That is the only matter which he wants to discuss. As a matter of fact, the proposals of the Bengal Government were never placed before us. They have acted on the old policy, and as I showed the

[Sir Nripendra Sircar.]

House when I began, the policy had been acted upon in September, in August and in October, 1934, in the different provinces. I submit, Sir, that the Bengal Legislative Council is now in session, and it is not desirable that we should discuss this question here and raise a debate on which we shall be able to give no information to the House.

Prof. N. G. Ranga (Guntur *cum* Nellore: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I am glad to notice that the Honourable Member has admitted the fact that this is a matter of public importance and of recent occurrence. ("No, no," from Official Benches.) His objection is only on the point that the policy is not of recent occurrence or of recent urgency. But in view of the fact that the Honourable the Home Member stated only yesterday that the Government of India had been following, ever since the withdrawal of the Civil Disobedience Movement, a policy of conciliation and a policy of peace, and that they had given up their policy of repression and did not propose to take to a further policy of repression again, it is rather strange that an incident like this should have been allowed to happen.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is only to state his point.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: And that is why I consider that this House has a right to take up this matter as a matter of further execution of that repressive policy, according to which associations can be banned, persons can be imprisoned and offices can be raided. Merely because certain raids were allowed to be made with impunity by the Government of the Punjab and other Provincial Governments in 1934, it does not follow that this House should allow these unhappy happenings to go on without taking cognisance of them and without trying to censure this Government for that repressive policy.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik (Home Member): Which Government?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Again, Sir, the Honourable the Law Member maintains that this is entirely a matter for the Local Governments, that the Bengal Government is specially interested in it and can be expected to look after itself and can be expected to carry out its laws properly and sensibly, and, therefore, if this House were to try now to discuss that matter, it would be passing an *ex parte* decree. But he does not seem to realise that this Assembly has taken advantage of the procedure that I wish the House to take now, on several other occasions when similar happenings had happened. When, in 1927, there was the Bengal Nagpur Railway strike, and, again, in 1928, when there was the Bengal Nagpur Railway lock-out, there were adjournment motions moved in this House and they were allowed by the then President. They were discussed and the Government policy was then attempted to be censured. Again, this is a central matter. Here are a number of associations which are of an all-India significance. There is the Trade Union Congress, the Railway Workers' Association and several other workers' associations, there is the Railway Workers' Union, the R. M. S. Union, the I. G. N. Workers' Union and several others. Labour is a central subject, and, under the Trade Disputes Act, the Government of India alone are competent to

administer it, and, as such, I maintain that this raiding of a number of labour associations of all-India importance and arresting a number of labour leaders and also this declaring unlawful of a number of labour associations is a matter of central importance, a matter of all-India importance. It will affect the railways and their revenues. If these Railwaymen's Unions continue to be banned like this and if the railwaymen's leaders continue to be arrested and continue to be kept under lock-up, certainly the peace of the minds of the railwaymen will be disturbed and the railways will have to face some difficulty and may have to face some strike or some other sympathetic action. Therefore, I consider this to be a matter of all-India importance, a matter of extremely intimate interest to the railways.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has asked the Honourable Member only to state his point. Any other point?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: It is a matter of recent occurrence, because it was only the day before yesterday that these raids were effected by the Government of Bengal and these 30 persons of all-India importance were imprisoned and 13 well known organisations of intimate interest to workers and peasants were banned. I, therefore, maintain that this adjournment motion is entirely in order. Lastly, this action of the Bengal Government affects very seriously the freedom of association of Indians in this country, the freedom of association specially of trade unionists and workers in this country and also of socialists. I am sure that if we were to follow the line of action proposed by the Honourable the Law Member, namely, that everything that is being done in this direction by Local Governments ought not to be taken up and should not be taken up by this House merely because it is provincial. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is argument. The Chair asked the Honourable Member only to mention his points on this question of order.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I, therefore, suggest that the precedents that the Honourable the Law Member has quoted and the rulings that he has cited do not really apply to this particular matter, and this motion ought to be allowed to be taken up by the House.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): May I say a word about this point of order? I am really sorry to find that recently the Government of India are raising points of order which are intended to restrict the freedom of discussion in this House. I am a believer and a very firm believer in constitutional and parliamentary methods. If objections are to be taken to free discussion of matters in which the whole country is interested, in which this Legislature is interested, it is much better to shut up the Legislatures. "(Hear, hear" from the Congress Party Benches.)

An Honourable Member: Is that the point of order?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better restrict himself to the point of order that has been raised.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I am coming to the points under discussion. The Honourable Member does not deny the fact that this is a definite matter. He does not deny that this is a matter of recent occurrence. . . . .

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: He does.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: He cannot deny that the raids have taken place very recently. The only objection that he takes is a very technical one. He objects to the word "policy". If that is the objection, I am sure, you will permit my Honourable friend to re-word his motion for adjournment. But, at the same time, I want to place before you this consideration. These raids are made under a central legislation, the legislation under which these raids are made is not a provincial legislation. Secondly, Government cannot deny the fact that this campaign against communism is a campaign made under the control and direction of the Government of India. What is the earthly use, then. . . .(Interruption by Sir Cowasji Jehangir.) Mr. President, I do not want to be interrupted by the Honourable Baronet on this matter. I am not making a speech. When I make a speech on the motion for adjournment, then he can certainly interrupt me. . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is really making a speech.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: My first point is this, that the legislation is a central legislation. The policy is a central policy, the control is a central control. ("No, no," from Official Benches.) In these circumstances, it is much better that this question should be discussed here than in the local Legislative Council.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does the Honourable Member suggest that this is a Central subject?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: That is exactly what I am suggesting—that these raids have taken place in the different provinces as a part of the policy laid down by the Government of India, and the Government of India are controlling this movement.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): When was that policy laid down?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: That policy might have been laid down some time ago, but the event has taken place very recently. If it is a technical objection that the Honourable the Mover uses the word "policy", I suggest to you that you should permit this discussion as it is the policy of the Central Government and you should permit the Honourable Member to change the word in his notice. I hope that the Government will not shirk discussion on this matter.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq (Bakarganj *cum* Faridpur: Muhammadan Rural): On a point of information, Sir. The Honourable the Law Member said that the Bengal Legislative Council is sitting and that the matter may be discussed there. I may remind him that the Council is not sitting today. Tomorrow is Sunday and by the time the Council meets again the matter will have lost its urgency.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I want to put a question to the Honourable the Law Member. I do not fully understand his position. Have the Government of India laid down any policy for raiding offices and institutions like these and declaring them unlawful? If so, when? If not, then would I be wrong in concluding that no such policy was ever enunciated by them previously and that these raids are not in accordance with any policy prescribed by them?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: The policy initiated is to be found in the different notifications regarding certain associations which, in the opinion of the Local Government, would come within the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1908. Against them the Act was put into operation. There is no question of our directing or raiding. Whatever follows, follows from the Act being put into operation.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): As regards the point of order raised, the first point that has been raised by the Honourable the Leader of the House is that the motion wants to raise a question of policy which was laid down sometime ago, and, therefore, it cannot be said to be a matter of recent occurrence. The Honourable Member who has given notice of this motion has not informed the House when that policy was laid down, but the Honourable the Leader of the House says that there have been raids of a similar character some time ago in the Punjab and in some other provinces in pursuance of the same policy. It has been suggested by Mr. Joshi that permission may be given to delete the word "policy", so that the mere occurrence may be discussed in this House, but, so far as the Chair understands, the intention of the Mover is to discuss the policy in pursuance of which these raids have taken place and the particular occurrences which happened during those raids. Therefore, the Chair holds that on an adjournment motion, the policy which has been pursued for sometime past cannot be discussed. The Chair might just as well say one word as regards the other objection raised, that it is really a matter of provincial concern, and, therefore, this Legislature is not the proper forum in which an adjournment motion of this character can be discussed. As regards that, the Chair has gone through the rulings and practice and it finds that there is really no uniformity. The Chair does not think that, having regard to its ruling on the one question, it should give any ruling upon the other question. The point regarding it, the Chair may mention, really is whether the President has been given any power to disallow a motion for adjournment on the ground that it is not primarily the concern of the Governor General in Council. That power has been expressly conferred on the Governor General himself, but, as the Chair has said, there are different rulings on this question and the practice has also not been uniform. The Chair, therefore, does not decide that point now. The Chair rules, the motion is not in order upon the first point raised.

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): With your permission, Sir, I desire to make a statement of the probable course of Government business in the week beginning Monday, the 11th March.

[Sir Nripendra Sircar.]

That day and Tuesday, the 12th, are allotted for the completion of the Voting of Demands for Grants. On Wednesday, the 13th, motions will be moved for the election of members to the following:

(1) Central Advisory Council for Railways;

(2) Committee on Public Accounts;

(3) Standing Committee for Roads for the financial year 1935-36;

(4) Imperial Council of Agricultural Research and its Governing Body; and

(5) Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore.

Thereafter, the Honourable the Finance Member will move that the Finance Bill be taken into consideration, and it is hoped that the debate on this motion will be concluded on Friday, the 15th. If this hope is fulfilled, Government will give time to Sir Cowasji Jehangir to move a motion agreeing to the Resolution of the Council of State to appoint a Joint Committee on the Bill to amend the law relating to marriage and divorce among Parsis.

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur (South Madras: Muhammadan): As regards the statement just now made by the Leader of the House, I have to bring to your notice that Friday is a fasting day for Haj Muslims. Therefore, it should be declared a holiday. That is a very important day, and we cannot sit on that day. No Muslim will sit here, including yourself.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, your predecessor gave a ruling that all the days which are observed as holidays in the Delhi Province will be observed as holidays in the Assembly.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am not standing in the way of any of my Muslim friends from observing that as a holiday, but the gazetted holiday is Saturday and that has been declared as such in the province of Delhi.

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: Saturday is *Id* day and Friday is a fasting day in Mecca.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Will my Honourable friend allow me a little time to make inquiry into that matter?

THE GENERAL BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—*contd.*

SECOND STAGE—*contd.*

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The discussion of the budget demands will now be resumed. According to the announcement the Chair made last evening, Babu Baijnath Bajoria is called upon to move his motion.

(The Honourable Member was absent.)

Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim has got cut motions Nos. 44 and 45 under this demand. Does the Honourable Member wish to move them?

Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim (Chittagong Division: Muhammadan Rural): No, Sir.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): We go on then to demand No. 17. Does U Thein Maung want to move his motion No. 83?

U Thein Maung (Burma: Non-European): No, Sir.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim. Does the Honourable Member wish to move his cut motions under this demand?

Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim: I want to say, Sir, that I have got motions practically under all the Demands, and as my constituency wants me to bring these matters to the notice of the Government, if you will kindly permit, I should first like to move my cut motion under Demand No. 79. This is the motion which I want to speak on first.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): But the Chair is now asking the Honourable Member whether he wishes to move his motions under Demand No. 17?

Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim: No, Sir.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): No. 18?

Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim: No, Sir.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): U Thein Maung. Is the Honourable Member moving his motion?

U Thein Maung: No, Sir.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Demand No. 19. (No Honourable Member moved any motion under this Demand, neither under Demand Nos. 21 to 22.) Demand No. 23. Sir James Grigg.

DEMAND NO. 23—INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT (INCLUDING WORKING EXPENSES).

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): Sir, I beg to move:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,55,95,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of the 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,55,95,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of the 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)'."

Grievances of the Inferior Services.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. President, my position of being an unattached Member placed me this morning at a great disadvantage. (Laughter.) Till yesterday afternoon I thought that my motion would come up for discussion the morning, but when I went home I got a notice from the Secretary of the Legislative Assembly pointing out a certain order in which the motions for cuts will be taken. From that list, Sir, I never thought I would get any opportunity this morning to move any motion, but fortune has favoured me, and I propose to make the best use of the opportunity which has been afforded to me. Mr. President, I am asking this House to reduce the demand under the Posts and Telegraphs Department by Rs. 100 in order to lodge a protest against a certain policy which this Department, along with other Departments, is following in the matter of the treatment of their lowest class of servants. In this Department, Sir, there are some people who are considered to belong to the "superior" service, some people are considered to belong to the "subordinate" service and there are some people who belong to what are known as the "inferior" service. I propose to speak this morning on the position of the inferior services in this Department, and the one complaint, which I propose to place before the Legislature on behalf of them, is the old complaint regarding the pensions of the inferior services.

Sir, people who belong to the inferior services of the Department have been given the small pension of four rupees a month since I do not know for how many years; perhaps if one goes back and digs into the old records of the Government of India, he will find that these pension rules were made about the year 1860. At that time, this maximum rate of Rs. 4 was fixed. At that time the monthly salaries paid to these people were small, perhaps some people may not have been getting more than Rs. 5 or Rs. 6 or Rs. 7 monthly and it was quite natural at that time that the monthly pensions paid to these people should have been fixed at the small maximum figure of Rs. 4 a month.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce (Member for Industries and Labour): I am sorry to interrupt my Honourable friend. I would venture to ask your ruling, Sir, whether he is in order in discussing this matter on this particular grant, as the question of pensions of inferior services is one which is common to all Departments of the Government of India.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Because a particular grievance is common to the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department and other Departments, the Chair does not think that is a sufficient reason for disallowing a discussion on a motion like this.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I thank you very much for permitting me to place before you this great grievance of the people belonging to the inferior services of the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department. Sir, my remarks refer to the Postal Department for the present. For the present, if my remarks are also applicable to other Departments, they apply to other Departments . . . .

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): For my own information, does it really apply to all Departments?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Yes, to all Departments. Sir, in the Government of India, there are people belonging to superior service who get a fixed pension of £1,000 a year. Of course, they are heaven-born people and we cannot compare the people belonging to the Indian Civil Service and the people belonging to the inferior services. Then, Sir, there are the subordinate services in which people generally get a pension equal to one half of their salaries, but in the case of people belonging to the inferior services, they do not get a pension equal to even half their salaries: they get a fixed pension of a maximum of Rs. 4,—which has been increased, I think, by a rupee or two as a temporary measure,—but their pension is not anywhere near one-half their salaries and they then suffer under another disadvantage. In the case of the subordinate services, they can get a proportionate pension after ten years' service, and, in the case of the superior services, they can get a proportionate pension after one year's service.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: That is not so, Sir. There is no proportionate pension after one year's service.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Then, may I ask what the rule is?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I cannot tell the Honourable Member definitely after what period of service a proportionate pension is given, but I can state very definitely that it is not given after one year's service.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I say that members belonging to the superior services have got the right to retire at any moment they like and they can get proportionate pension.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I must definitely contradict my Honourable friend. His statement is absolutely inaccurate. No members of any service can get a proportionate pension after a service of one year. They can retire at any moment they like. It is possible they can get a gratuity, but I very much doubt whether even a gratuity is given after one year's service. I do most emphatically state that no members of any service can get a proportionate pension after one year's service.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: The truth is gradually coming out. The Honourable Member admits that they may be getting some gratuity. For my purpose, it is the same whether it is called pension or gratuity. They do get some money after retirement. What does it matter whether you call a certain amount of money given to people as pension or a certain amount of money as gratuity. The fact remains that the Government care for the superior services to such an extent that even if a man retires at any moment he likes, he is provided with some money in the shape of gratuity.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: That, again, is not correct. An officer of the superior services gets a gratuity under certain special conditions, but it is not true that every officer of the superior services who retires at any given moment gets a gratuity.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: The Honourable Member may protest and that very hard. At the same time, he cannot deny the fact that a man belonging to the superior services gets superior privileges as regards the provision against retirement. Let him say so. If he can contradict that statement, let my Honourable friend get up and say that he has not made a better provision against old age and retirement for superior services as against inferior services.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I never wish to contradict my Honourable friend on any statement he makes which is accurate

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I have not made any such statement. The Honourable Member has not yet made any definite statement as regards the rules which provide for gratuity or pension to men belonging to the superior services.

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Or allowances.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I do not wish to waste my time, as I have to make a few important points. The point is that people belonging to the subordinate services get pension equal to half their salary, and, secondly, they also get proportionate pension after ten years' service. It is useless to expect me to read out all the pension rules within the 15 minutes allotted to me. I, therefore, make a general statement that the men belonging to subordinate services get pension equal to half their salaries and they generally get a proportionate pension after a service of ten years retirement. This privilege is denied to people belonging to inferior services. My claim is that if there are any people who deserve better pension rules, it is the people belonging to the inferior services. They get small salaries and it is on account of that fact that they cannot save any money while in service and so some provision after their retirement is all the more necessary than in the case of men belonging to superior or subordinate service. Unfortunately, Sir, this question has not been taken up by the Government at all. Since the time I came to this Legislature, myself and several other Members have been drawing the attention of the Government of India to this injustice. The reply given is not that they do not deserve better: they cannot say so. Nobody can say that these inferior servants really do not deserve a little better pension rules than the pension rules given to the superior services or subordinate services. Therefore, they do not deny the fact that it is necessary to consider. For more than 14 years this question is being considered, and the argument for not doing justice to these inferior service people is want of money. But, Sir, since I drew the attention of the Government of India and since their attentinon was drawn by other Members, palaces were built in New Delhi. I have seen them rising before my eyes, crores and crores of rupees were spent on the palace for the Governor General, palace for the officers of the Secretariat, palaces for the Members of the Executive Council and the services, palaces for the Members of the Legislature. We have created a New Delhi.—a heaven on earth. We find money for all these. During these 14 years, however, we have not found money for increasing the pension of the inferior services by a few rupees. Might I, Sir, ask the Honourable Member in charge as to when he is going to find money for this? I hope the Government of India

will take this matter seriously into their consideration. It is not true that they do not have the money for increasing the pensions. They have the money, but they spend it for other purposes. I have shown that even in this very budget money has been spent in improving the gardens, in renewing æroplanes and in buying furniture, and, if money could be found for such purposes, I hold there is money enough for increasing the pensions of the men belonging to the inferior services. What is wanted is the will, and I want the Government of India to make up their minds to do justice to the people belonging to this service.

May I say, Sir, a word to the men who are sitting to my left. These people belonging to inferior service have been serving the men who are sitting to my left. I want one of them to stand up in his place and say a word in favour of these inferior servants. These servants have served them honestly, they have served them most industriously and I would like some one among them to rise and speak a word in favour of the men who have given their life service for them. The other day, Sir, one of the Honourable Members sitting to my left got up in his seat and profferred fulsome praise to the Honourable the Finance Member for restoring the salary cut to the men belonging to the superior services. May I ask that some other man in that service will get up today and say a word. It is wrong for them to say that they do not take part in these discussions for fear of breach of service discipline. If service discipline does not come in the way of your offering fulsome praise to the Honourable the Finance Member for restoring the wage cut, surely there will be no breach of discipline if one of them gets up in his place and says whether these people belonging to the inferior services deserve better pension or not. I would like one of them to get up. It is wrong for them to expect me to speak on behalf of the people who have given them their life service. I hope, Sir, whatever may be the attitude of the Government Benches, whether they care to appreciate the services of the people who have served them faithfully or not, I want the Legislature to give one promise, one pledge. Whatever may have been the pledges given by the Government to the superior services, to the income-tax payers, to the payers of surcharges, I would like the Legislature to give one pledge to the men belonging to the inferior services, and that pledge is that, before next year, the pensions of the inferior services will be increased. Sir, that is the meaning of the motion which I have made and that will be the meaning if this motion is carried. The mandate which I want the House to give to the Government is that pensions of the men belonging to the inferior services shall be raised before the end of the year. (Applause.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury (Bengal: Landholders): Sir, I am glad that my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, has got the chance of moving this cut this morning. I am also glad that his disappointment has been removed. I am also grateful to him for placing this motion before the House to consider about the grievances of the postal employees, and I endorse my views entirely on the side of my Honourable friend. I want to confine myself to the grievances of the postal employees with which I am associated and very closely associated.

[Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury.]

Year after year we have been hearing of retrenchments on a vigorous scale. But the simple figure shows that for the current year the budget estimate for the retrenched personnel was 3 lakhs and 59 thousand, whereas, in the revised estimate, the figure has risen to 11 lakhs and 90 thousand. That clearly indicates how the retrenchment policy is being pursued vigorously and with a vengeance. Now, Sir, I have gathered from discussions here that these retrenchment measures were only confined to the subordinate services. A large number of clerks, postmen and subordinate officers have been retrenched in the post offices as well as in the R. M. S. Another thing is that this retrenchment was not confined to persons of 30 years' service, and above, but also included persons with five or six years' service. I ask in all humility whether it was a fair thing to do, because it is evident that these people first accepted and entered Government service with great hopes in their hearts, and without any rhyme or reason they have been asked to go. I believe it has affected the efficiency of the administration itself and I do not understand why Government pursue the policy of retrenchment on those lines. But this same policy was not adopted in the case of the Telegraph Department. There it was suggested that reductions will be made only on the occurrence of vacancies, and I appeal to the Honourable Member that a similar policy should also be adopted in the case of the post office.

Then, I will come to the traffic inspectors. One thing I may point out here, and that is that Government are pursuing the policy of retrenchment where there is reduction of traffic. But they are not pursuing the same policy where there is increase of traffic. As a matter of fact, in the Calcutta General Post Office, and in other places, in the money order and savings bank department, and in other departments, there has been a regular increase of work, and no sufficient hands have been provided, with the result that the work is suffering. Now, in dealing with the officers of the Postal Department, they have reduced only 34 Postal Superintendents and one Deputy Post Master General against 12 thousand subordinate employees. What is this proportion? A complaint was made last year about drastic reductions in selection grade posts in many offices of Calcutta and in the General Post Office in particular. I asked Sir Thomas Ryan to leniently consider the question of these postal inspectors, and, as a matter of fact, I am glad that our present Director General, my Honourable friend, Mr. Bewoor, has made some concrete suggestions on that. He also suggested that some supervising staff is necessary for the good management of the work and he suggested that one supervisor should be maintained for five savings bank clerks, one for six money order clerks, and one for seven or eight registration and parcel clerks: and I will be very glad if this suggestion is translated into action.

Then, I want to draw the attention of the Director General to the system which is going to be introduced to fill the posts of town inspectors. I am told the Department contemplates to fix a maximum age limit of 40 years. That will really stop the chances of other employees, who are senior in service, but they will thus get no remuneration for their services. This is a matter of vital concern, because, if you fix the age limit at 40 years, many senior officers, who are senior and able people, will not get any chance. Why should you stop them? You should make a provision which will be applicable only in the case of efficiency, and let the senior people who have served with ability and efficiency be given a

chance in this matter. I am told that in Bombay and Calcutta, some junior men have been appointed as town inspectors. I think this ought to be stopped; and I am informed that people attached to the administrative offices of the officials there get preference over other senior men. This is not fair; those who are senior and able officers ought to get a better chance, and I think this policy should be accepted.

Another thing that I will bring to your notice is about the administration of the higher grades. In my own district of Mymensingh, there are 66 sub-offices and 210 branch offices, but there is only one Postal Superintendent who is conducting the work. Also in the Dacca Division, there are about 93 sub-offices and 250 branch offices, but there is only one Postal Superintendent. But in the Assam Circle, where there are only 24 sub-offices and 150 branch offices, they are also controlled by one Superintendent. So the Department has fixed some data according to which every clerk must perform some amount of equal duty; but probably it is not applicable in the case of higher officers. In dealing with these things, they seem to have adopted the dictum, "Head, I win; tails, you lose".

Now, I shall come to the Telegraph Engineering Department. Last year, in my observations in connection with the general discussion of the budget, I concentrated my whole attention on these postal matters, and I raised the question of the extravagance of the Telegraph Engineering Department. I can say frankly that that branch is a branch of vested interests. It maintains as many as 166 officers, all drawing high salaries, against 490 officers for the whole department. It has got one Chief Engineer drawing Rs. 3,000 a month, and, over and above that, he gets his allowances. It has also got five Directors of Telegraph Engineering drawing a pay from Rs. 1,750 to Rs. 2,150. There are three branches of Telegraph Engineering, namely, the General Department, the Telephone Department and the Radio Department. In the General Department, there are 129 officers costing Rs. 10 lakhs and 99 thousand for pay only; in the Telephone Department, there are 11 officers getting a salary of Rs. 71,000 per year as pay; and, in the Radio Department, there are 26 officers who get Rs. one lakh and 64 thousand. The following figures for the Radio Branch will prove interesting. These 26 officers carry a salary of Rs. one lakh and 64 thousand, whereas 237 subordinates carry a salary of Rs. 4,68,700. Besides these, the officers also get their house-rent allowances, passage money and other expenses. I have excluded the Controller of Stores from consideration, otherwise the expenditure would have been much more. I raised this question of extravagance last year and no response was made after that. The Director General replied that there may be a fall in traffic, but the wires of the Department and the instruments have to be maintained, and so it is not reasonable to suggest that there should be retrenchments in the Engineering Branch like this. I have made inquiries as to how many are supervising the wires and other requisities, and I have found that there are 151 engineering supervisors, 444 line inspectors, 3,151 line men, looking into the telegraph lines. Besides, that, there are 86 electrical supervisors and 135 *mistries* and mechanics to look into the instruments. Is it necessary that besides these things there should be a number of Directors of Telegraph Engineering to look into the matter? As a matter of fact, they do this work very rarely. To my mind, this maintenance of a huge staff is absolutely detrimental to the interests of the Indian tax-payer. I make a suggestion which I hope will be accepted by the Honourable Member, and it is this.

[Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury.]

1 P. M. If these five Directors of Telegraph Engineering are dispensed with, it will give a saving of Rs. 1,16,000; and, similarly, if the posts of these 22 assistant engineers are abolished, it would result in a saving of another Rs. 1,12,000. The Telegraph Establishment Committee also made a similar suggestion, but it is a pity that the Government do not pay any attention to this recommendation of that Committee. In this House, a number of Committees are formed and a number of suggestions are made by these Committees, but it is a pity that, whenever any concrete and reasonable suggestions are made, they are not accepted by the Government, in spite of the fact that the suggestions are reasonable. I want to ask if there have been any suggestions for amalgamating these offices. As a matter of fact, my information is that even in London there has been amalgamation of engineering supervisors. Why should not a similar policy be adopted here? I think it is high time for the Government to see that the interests of the lower grade officers, who are paid much less than the higher grade officers, are properly looked after; and if they are not looked after properly, there will be great dissatisfaction which will stand in the way of proper administration. I appeal to the Honourable Member that he will make it a point to look into the grievances which I have just now set out and that he will redress them, so that there may be peace and amity in the whole of the administrative services. With these words, I support the motion.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, perhaps I may be allowed to intervene now for one minute to deal with the speech of Mr. Joshi; and, before I do that, I must apologise for not having been in my place to listen to that speech: but urgent business called me elsewhere. I have, however, informed myself as to the purport of his remarks. This problem of the pensions of the lower paid Government servants is one which has been brought actively to my attention now for the first time. I understand that the attitude of the Government in the past has been that there is an undoubted grievance, but that it has been impossible to meet it in the past adequately—something has been done to meet it, but not as much as the advocates of a change would wish—because of financial stringency. The budget proposals which I presented to the House a few days ago will at any rate have shown that we are past the worst of the financial stringency, and, therefore, Government can no longer fall back upon the argument that there is no money to make this change. I think, therefore, that Government owe it to so stalwart and invariable a supporter as Mr. Joshi (Laughter) that I should promise him that Government will take up this question and consider it very carefully and sympathetically and with every desire to do something to meet the grievance which has been admitted for some time.

Mr. V. V. Giri (Ganjam *cum* Vizagapatam: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I rise to make a few observations with regard to the subject matter under discussion. I would first like to refer to the retrenchment policy adopted in the Postal Department. I find that, during the last few years, retrenchment has occurred and nearly 12,000 posts have been abolished. The figures are, post office clerks 2,706, postmen 5,155, sorters 897, mail runners, etc., 3,213, and inferior servants 1,009. I am told that the number of postmasters retrenched is nearly 1,500. I desire to state that,

in these days of economic stress and starvation, the poor workers are much affected by the policy of retrenchment adopted by the Government of India . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair may remind the Honourable Member that the Honourable the Mover confined himself to the question of pensions

Mr. V. V. Giri: If such is the case, I have nothing more to add.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official): I rise to a point of order: have you, Sir, ruled that our remarks can only be confined to the question of pensions of the Postal Department? I ask this, because, I believe, the motion under discussion refers to all the grievances of the Postal Department?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) As regards the point of order, so far as the motion is printed on the Order Paper, "Grievances of the postal department" it is put in general terms, and, therefore, the Chair does not wish to rule it out of order as entirely irrelevant The Chair merely wanted to point out to the House and to the Honourable Mr Giri that one specific grievance was mooted by the Honourable the Mover of the motion and, therefore, the Chair thought perhaps it would be more convenient to the House if that specific motion was dealt with under this head; but the Chair does not rule out any other grievance being discussed

Mr. V. V. Giri: I, therefore, desire to suggest to the Honourable Member in charge of Labour and Industries that he should look into this matter and see that no poor worker is retrenched: the policy of the Department should be to absorb the workers Recently there was a Committee, presided over by an officer of the Department, named Mr. Pasricha, and that Committee's report is about to be published I request the Honourable Member in charge of the Department to give the fullest opportunity to the workers and their unions to express their views and put forward constructive proposals I also desire to suggest to the Department that, so far as postal workers and their organisations are concerned, they should have half-yearly meetings, year after year, so that the representatives of the workers can meet the Honourable Member or the superior officers and discuss, from time to time, the grievances relating to the workers I hope the suggestions that have been made by me will be accepted by the Honourable Member I do not think I have got anything more to say.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting this motion, and, in doing so, I am glad I have your ruling allowing me to criticise grievances other than pensions. As President of a large postal employees' union which embraces Bengal, Bihar and Orissa and Assam, I have come into close contact with the men with whom I have sat for hours and discussed their grievances, and so the criticisms I am making today are not done in any hostile or carping spirit. My desire is to ask the head of the Department and the Honourable Member in charge to review the entire situation sympathetically. The question of pensions, my friend, Mr. Joshi, has very ably presented to the House. All I can

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

do is to support it in its entirety. I am very glad to have had the assurance of the Honourable the Finance Member that the matter would receive his sympathetic consideration, and with that, Sir, I must pass on to certain other matters.

There is one matter, Sir, that I should like to bring to the notice of the head of the Department who, I know, since he assumed office, has given it his most careful and sympathetic attention. I pay him no empty tribute when I say that he is seriously giving his attention to these matters. But, there is such a thing as comparative official expediency and urgency, or priority, and so, I am afraid this question of pensions to which I am referring may not receive the early attention it merits and be delayed. Sir, I had the honour of leading a deputation of postal employees before the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs when I represented among other matters, a matter relating to provincial postal recruitment. Sir, there is, as you know, with the advent of provincialisation and autonomy of the provinces, a universal cry in this country of "Bengal for Bengalis", "Bihar for Biharis", and so on. Now, much as this will satisfy the residents and inhabitants of Bengal and other provinces, it certainly has a very unfair effect on certain Government servants. The Director General of Posts and Telegraphs, I know, is aware of my point of view, and it is this. The new recruitment rules demand a domicile or birth in a province before a recruit can be accepted in any Province. Sir, we know,—and the memories of several Members of this House can easily be taken back to a time when it was very difficult to get employees for the Postal Department, especially postmen. Employees, who have, by assiduous labour, risen to be classified as intelligent workmen and are not called "menials" today,—these men have worked and lived for years in provinces which they have served, such as the capital cities of India, and it is not fair to these employees whose families have been compelled to live in their places of birth, such as Bihar, etc., that their children should be disqualified from employment in a province where their fathers and grandfathers had spent the best part of their lives in the service of the Postal Department. I know the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs has promised to give this matter his early and sympathetic consideration, but Sir, as yet no orders have been passed on this matter, and I do think that those employees who have served in the capital cities of India should not have these prohibitory laws placed on the employment of their issues in the provinces which they have legally served for years.

The next point relates to the compensatory house rent allowance while on leave. Sir, a compensatory house rent allowance of Rs. 5 per mensem is granted by the Government of India to postmen and the members of the lower gazetted staff in post offices in Calcutta, but, unfortunately, this allowance is not allowed, when an official is granted leave, notwithstanding the fact that there is a clear ruling in the Supplementary Rules (Vide No. 6), and to the extent he takes leave, he is deprived of the said compensatory allowance. This matter has been represented to the authorities, but, so far, there has been no redress. I bring this matter to the notice of the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs, so that he may give his most sympathetic consideration to it.

The next point to which I wish to draw the attention of the Government, and particularly of the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs who deals with such matters, is about the confirmation of those employees

appointed or promoted after the 16th July, 1931. Owing to financial stringency, all appointments and promotions made after the 16th July, 1931, are not confirmed as yet, and difficulties arise when men apply for leave, inasmuch as when they do so, they are reverted to their original substantive posts, and, in consequence thereof, most men do not take leave for fear of reversion to their substantive appointments. This difficulty occurred in the Railway Department a few years ago, but it has since been righted. I would ask the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs to review this matter in a similar way.

Then, there is another matter which has become a hardy annual. The number of people who claim this privilege are annually getting less and less. I am referring to candidate postmen who are offered employment in certain capital towns as a sort of reserve to meet urgent rushes of work. The Honourable Member in charge, who has had experience of this matter in the capital towns, realises the difficulties with which both the Department and these employees are faced. He realises the grievances of these seasonal candidate postmen who have been so acting or officiating for seasonal periods for years and years. The Department has always at hand a supply of experienced men when needed, and although these men have been waiting for years and years for the fruit of their labours, they are denied confirmation. I know the Honourable Member will say that he has reduced the staff of postmen and he has no vacancies, but, I ask, why appoint new men when you have these experienced people waiting, men who have rendered many years of good seasonal service. men who have kept the Department going during these seasonal periods? I ask the Honourable Member kindly to consider sympathetically the prior claims of these people when filling in new vacancies. They have certainly earned such recognition.

I now turn to something of a different nature. There are many other grievances of the subordinate staff which I could detail, but I would only weary this House; moreover, those details are already before the Director General, indeed, I believe, it forms a big part of his daily duties.

The other point which I desire to refer to is the colossal expenditure of this Department on its audit and accounts side. Those who are familiar with the history of this Department will know how, after the Finance Department assumed control over the expenditure of the Postal Department, the expenditure has been raised, retrenchment has been the order of the day and efficiency has been generally impaired The first false step taken was the appointment of a financial expert, Mr. Heseltine, as Chairman of a Committee of Inquiry about 15 years ago which suggested an amalgamation scheme . . . . .

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: May I ask, Sir, if the Honourable Member is relevant in bringing up the question of expenditure on a motion which refers to the grievances of postal employees?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: May I reply to that, Sir? Do I understand the Honourable Member correctly in that he means that the term "postal employees" is confined to postal subordinates only? Sir, I should say that the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs is also a postal employee, so also are all postal officials from the highest to the lowest; and this motion includes all their grievances and the causes that have led up to them.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): As regards that, the Chair does not think such a wide interpretation can be put on the interpretation of the Mover himself.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I bow to your ruling in this matter. Of course, Sir, I could indulge in what is called the periphrastic conjugation and in a devious manner come back to the issue, I desire to raise. No one who has studied the history of the Postal Department will deny that this huge expenditure has had its direct and reflex action on the postal employee. I would, therefore, recast my remarks and say that it is all very well for Government to say we must reduce the staff, we must reduce this when the very nucleus of the whole trouble has been due to this extravagant expenditure since it came under the control and purview of the Finance Department. The origin of that was,—as I was about to mention when the Honourable Member interrupted me,—the appointment of a financial expert, Mr. Haseltine, about 15 years ago, as a result of which various extravagant reforms were introduced into this Department which has necessitated ruthless retrenchment in the subordinate staff to be able to pay the increased top heavy additional expenditure. Sir, the next thing the Finance Department did was to place all officials from postmen upwards under certain Statutory rules thus encouraging them to take long vacations in the country without due notice and often on false medical certificates from local practitioners before arrangements for their relief could be made. The result was that duplication of appointments was necessary . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has only two minutes more.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I shall finish within these two minutes, Sir. Further, committees demanded by and directed from the Finance Department, consisting of members with no practical experience or knowledge of "postal" affairs have produced reports which are mere eyewash.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: What committees is my Honourable friend referring to?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I mean the large number of committees that have sat on the Postal and Telegraph Department, they are innumerable.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I should be very glad if the Honourable Member would give me some details. He stated that these committees consisted of people who knew nothing about the Postal Department. That is a categorical allegation which I should like to hear substantiated.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: May I substantiate in general terms without going into it in detail? A recent departmental Committee of Enquiry, just over, was naturally afraid to make suggestions to lower the cost of financial control and so their deliberations have resulted in a fiasco except perhaps in the direction of imposing further retrenchment of subordinate postal staff which must adversely affect efficiency; already at

a low ebb. A comparison of the senior staff on the postal side in the blue lists for April, 1932, and January, 1934, reveals the following:

	1932.	1934.
No. of Asst. Directors General.	2	Nil.
No. of Dy. Postmasters General	14	13
No. of Supdts. of Post Offices . . .	147	144

I have not included the large number of postal inspectors who are non-gazetted. When they were retrenched the number of Deputy Postmasters General and Superintendents should have been increased in order to maintain efficient control and stop blocks in promotion. In the British and South African Postal Services, the proportion of supervisory officers to working staff is much higher than in India, and the numbers in both classes increase automatically as business grows. How can efficiency be maintained in a huge country like India with its present comparatively indifferent workers by reduction of supervision personnel and limitation of activities of officers, by curtailment of travelling allowances to figures below actual touring costs? If this kind of retrenchment were practised in the police and railways, crimes would increase and serious mishaps on lines of communication multiply. When the axe is applied indiscriminately in the post office, letters are lost or destroyed and the public put to much annoyance at post offices, despite the excessive rates charged for postage. Postal staff is strictly regulated in numbers by application of time tests and other devices for gauging the amount of work to be done, and if the number of employees is reduced to a figure below that justified by these regulations, the public interests suffer injury. I am sorry I have no personal postal administrative experience in this matter, but I have been in contact with this problem for some time, and I say there is no doubt in my mind that if you compare the various items in the profit and loss accounts (Appendix 11), my allegations regarding the increase of account and audit charges in the last decade or two in the Postal Department will be proved by a scrutiny of past and present figures.

I have very little more to add. It is all very well to say that this department today needs a large highly paid audit and accounts staff to control its finances and so saddle it at the top with a very heavy expenditure. But, in olden times, what did you have? Did you have this large checking and controlling Department? No, you did not. What did you have at that time? Is there any necessity for the continuance of the post of Financial Adviser, Posts and Telegraphs, on a salary of Rs. 3,000 per mensem and in addition, over 20 Deputy Accountants General etc ? Is it not possible to revert to the procedure in force, ten years ago, when the Accountant General, Posts and Telegraphs, and the Secretaries of the Department of Industries and Labour and of the Finance Department of the Government of India, in consultation with the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, watched and controlled the financial policy of the Department?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has exceeded his time limit.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: May I just say this? Ten years ago, this Department was run with a profit on commercial lines—so far as the post offices were concerned—under the advice of experienced administrative officers, but, since the newly appointed financial experts at headquarters have assumed control of the financial policy of the Posts and Telegraphs Department, it has lost its surplus revenue and is working, even with its resultant compelled retrenchment of staff, at a serious loss to the detriment of the public interest. This is not the case in other countries. I ask, what are the grounds for employing no less than twenty Deputy and Assistant Accountants General and other accounts officers, besides clerical staff, when a large reduction has been made in the cadre of Assistant Directors General and the subordinate staff has been considerably reduced? Cannot the head post offices throughout India, which possess fully qualified and experienced accountants, undertake the local audit of paid money orders to save the high cost of audit staff employed under the Accountant General? Despite the reduction in the total staff employed, the gazetted and clerical staff of the Finance, Accounts and Audit Branch of the Posts and Telegraphs has increased in the past twenty or thirty years out of all proportion to the growth of the monetary work of the Department. To arrest and reduce this expenditure, it would be worth while introducing the experiment of local audit of paid money orders in head post offices. These vouchers and documents could be sent after payment to the issuing post offices for the necessary checks, before being filed for inspection by the postal supervising staff. The reduction of the postal audit staff is quite feasible, and with the abolition of the posts of some of the Financial Adviser of the Posts and Telegraphs, there would be a saving of quite a lakh and a half annually.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is really not relevant.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: My time prevents me from developing the other points of economy that I can place before this House in support of my contention. I see my Honourable friends on the Government Benches are laughing. While my criticisms may evoke their laughter, may I hope that they will evoke also a little serious attention? Sympathy goes a long way. But laughter, Sir, creates laughter in the other side.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till a Quarter to Three of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at a Quarter to Three of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): Sir, I want to make a statement about the suggestion that there should be no work on Friday. I have ascertained the views of the Honourable Members, and the position we take up is this. If it is the general desire of this House that there should be no work on Friday, we shall not oppose it, but that will involve our working on Monday. I would remind this Honourable House that Monday was originally allotted for the transaction of official

business, and it is to suit the convenience of many of my Honourable friends here that we agreed to take off that Monday. So, the position now is this—if there is no work on Friday, then we shall have to sit on Monday, and as I cannot expect an answer just now, I suggest to the House through you that my friends will decide the matter among themselves and they will let you know, so that I can know from you in this House as to what is the general desire of the House—as to which alternative they would adopt. Then, we can definitely make up our mind.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not find in his seat the Honourable Member who made the suggestion about the holiday. The Chair thinks what has been stated by the Leader of the House will suit the convenience of all—that the Honourable Members will decide among themselves as to what will suit them, whether they would have a holiday on Friday and sit on Monday. The Chair might inform the House that the *Haj-i-Akbar* does not occur every year. It occurs once in, say, seven years. It is not in the list of gazetted holidays, but if the House generally agrees that in the special circumstances the Assembly might not sit on that day, in that case we will have to sit on the 18th and transact official business as was originally intended. There is time yet for the Honourable Members to consult among themselves and let the Chair know in time.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: I just want to say a word on this motion I sympathise with what my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, has said with regard to the increased pensions of postal employees.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: You have done it in Bombay?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: I am not opposing you. Don't get so nervous. The Honourable the Finance Member gave the financial stringency through which we have passed as a reason for not having increased these pensions, and he said that as better times had come, he would reconsider the matter. This Department is a commercial department, and undoubtedly the loss that the Department makes may have to be made good out of the general revenues, but if you increase the expenditure permanently, as you would have to do if you give increased pensions, you must make the Department self-supporting and not rely upon the general revenues to make up the deficit year after year, and, therefore, I suggest that the House should be prepared for higher rates and I for one would be quite prepared for it if these pensions are to be increased. I would be prepared to give the Department a larger revenue provided Government increased these pensions and did justice to these poorer classes of employees, but I would not agree to make good this loss from the general revenues from year to year.

An Honourable Member: Why not?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Because it is a commercial department. It has been an established principle that this Department has got to be self-supporting. In bad times, you do get deficits which may have to be made good, and it was never intended that this Department should make a profit. You must render service to the public at cost price, and, therefore, if to increase these pensions, is a legitimate charge upon the Department, and I believe it is a legitimate charge, then I trust that it will not be a question of whether we are going through bad times or good times. It will be a question of an increased income to meet the extra expenditure.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think it will probably be more convenient if I intervene in the debate at this stage instead of waiting until the close. My Honourable friend, the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs, is obviously in a better position to deal with specific grievances than I can hope to be, and I, therefore, propose to confine myself to a few general observations. The general impression I have gathered from the debate so far is that the grievances of postal employees are neither so numerous nor as deep seated as we might have had reason to fear, and I think also that I am not going too far when I say that there is general recognition of the willingness of the Director General to examine those grievances carefully and to deal with them sympathetically. The most important grievance which has been voiced today was that put forward by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, and I can assure him that the interruptions I made in the course of his speech this morning were made entirely in the interests of accuracy and not in any desire to criticise his main point with which I have had the very greatest sympathy ever since I first took over charge of the Posts and Telegraphs Department. He has, I hope, received what he will consider a sufficiently satisfactory reply from my Honourable Colleague, the Finance Member. All I need say in that connection is with reference to the point just raised by my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir. We have, of course, to examine how much the grant of this concession will cost us. I need hardly assure him that there can be no question of the cost of it being met from general revenues. It must be met from the revenues of the Postal and Telegraph Department. I can only hope that it will be possible to meet it without any increase in rates. We shall continue in the coming year, and I hope, in the years to come, to pursue the same policy of economy that we are following today. It has I think been successful. The budget we have placed before the House, which I shall have further opportunities later on of explaining, though not as satisfactory as we could wish, still shows very definite signs of improvement. I trust that the financial position will sufficiently improve in the course of the coming year to enable us without difficulty to meet the extra charge that will be involved when we give these increased pensions to the inferior servants.

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali (Lucknow and Fyzabad Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): May I just put a question. I suppose it will not be by ruthless retrenchment that the economies will be obtained.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: There is no question of ruthless retrenchment. I am not quite sure whether I have answered questions in the House on that subject yet. There are certainly some on the order paper which I shall be answering in the course of the next few days, and I am stating that the retrenchment campaign comes to an end on the 31st of this month, and that any further savings by reduction of appointments which may be justified in future will be made in the ordinary course, as vacancies occur. I was rather surprised to find if I may say so that my Honourable friend Mr. Giri, voiced no special complaint and had only one very reasonable request to put forward. He asked that, when the report of the Postal Enquiry Committee is pubilshed, an opportunity should be given to the various unions concerned to make representations to the Director General. I can assure him that that will be done. We shall deal with the report of that committee in exactly the same way as we did with the reprot of the Varma Committee. Ample opportunity

will be given to all unions to put forward their representations and these will be carefully considered by the Director General before his recommendations are submitted to Government. I propose to leave all the other specific points to my Honourable friend, the Director General, but, before doing so, I would turn for a few moments, more in sorrow than in anger, to my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney. Sir, if my Honourable friend were as eminent a lawyer as he is a doctor, he would, I think, have studied his brief rather more carefully (Laughter.) He put forward the unsubstantiated statement that the Posts and Telegraphs Department had from time to time been flooded with committees of people who knew nothing about either postal or telegraph work. I asked him to substantiate that statement but he was unable to do so, and he then went on to talk about the Postal Enquiry Committee, the result of which, he said, was going to be a fiasco. Sir, if there is one committee that is absolutely free from the condemnation of consisting of people who know nothing about the work of the Department it happens to be the Postal Enquiry Committee, which consisted entirely of postal officials with long and varied experience of all branches of postal work.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: On a point of personal explanation, Sir, with an equal sense of sorrow and not of hostility, may I explain to the Honourable Member that when I criticised those committees, I did so in a generic way, I did it mainly with a desire to show that the financial implications of the report of the members who were on that committee in regard to audit and accounts expenditure of the Department showed that they were unmindful of these requirements.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I must confess, Sir, I do not appreciate the point raised by my Honourable friend. I asked him to give me instances of committees which did not consist of postal and telegraph officials . . . .

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Take the last Varma Committee.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: That committee consisted, if I recollect aright, of five members, and, all those five, with the exception of the Chairman, Mr. Varma, were telegraph officials That hardly bears out the assertion of my Honourable friend. He went on to say that the Report of the Postal Enquiry Committee would probably be a report in favour of "vested interests", because they were afraid of doing anything else. Well, if that committee reports in favour of vested interests, that is exactly the point of view, I should have thought, that would appeal to my Honourable friend. (Laughter.) Sir, one reason why I have risen now is to make some reference to his attack on the Financial Adviser. He suggests that we should abolish the Financial Adviser and that we should distribute his pay among the postal employees.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I did not say anything of the kind. I never said anything about vested interests or that you distribute the pay of the Financial Adviser among the postal employees. I said—you stop the expenditure of your heavy audit and accounts department and revert to the old system under which you audited your accounts.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Again, Sir, I regret I am unable to agree with my Honourable friend. I may not have quoted his exact words, but he certainly, to the best of my recollection, said, towards the end of his speech, that if we abolished the Financial Adviser, we should be able to redress the grievances of the postal employees, and, at any rate, one way of doing that is by raising their pay.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: May I for the last time, for my Honourable friend's information, say that, when I advised that, I meant this: do not saddle your Postal and Telegraphs Department with this heavy over-head Finance Department Reduce it and use that money for the relief of your lower paid postal employees and not for the entertainment of highly-paid officers. (Hear, hear.)

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: That is exactly what I said that the Honourable Member did say. (Laughter.) There is really no point of difference between us two.

3 P.M.

Now, I shall leave it to the Director General to explain the system of audit in the Postal Department and the necessity for it. All I wish to do is to refer to the Financial Adviser himself. I am quite certain that my Honourable friend said that, if we had no Financial Adviser, we might be in the happy position of having a big surplus in the Postal and Telegraphs Department, and that the drastic retrenchments during the last few years would not have been necessary. Sir, he admitted that he has no administrative experience. Well, I have, and I can assure him that that is not the case and that the Posts and Telegraphs Department is under a deep debt of gratitude to the Financial Adviser (Hear, hear), who has helped it to weather the economic storm as successfully as it has done. The position, Sir, of the Financial Adviser is not an easy one. He might, with some reason, be regarded by myself and by my Department as the watch-dog of the Finance Department and it is quite possible that we might have suspicions of him on that account, but I can assure the House that the Financial Adviser is a tower of strength to the Department and that no one could have been more successful than Mr Varma and Mr Coburn before him in discharging the extremely difficult task of serving two masters.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: That is so, but, why have over 20 Deputy Accountants General and a big staff?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: That is a point which, as I have already explained, I must leave to the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs to explain. I consider that the Financial Adviser and his staff have saved the Department their pay many times over. I can only express my satisfaction once again that the House has so little criticism to make of the working of the Department from the point of view of its employees, who have their own unions—very efficient unions some of them—to represent their grievances and I am glad to say, do so in reasonable and temperate fashion; and, in conclusion, I and my Department would express our willingness always to hear those grievances as sympathetically in future, as we have tried to do in the past. (Loud and Prolonged Cheers.)

Some Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I am very much thankful to you for after all allowing me to open my mouth. (Laughter.)

An Honourable Member: You are not making your maiden speech.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Sir, what I mean to say is that I have after all now got an opportunity of speaking on this budget matter. It is no grievance that I make of it at all, but I do feel that an opportunity should be given to Members to place any grievances they may wish to represent by means of their cut motions, though, of course, according to the arrangements between the Leaders of Parties certain individual cuts are being discussed and time is being exhausted upon them. I do not take any objection to that, but, all the same, when we come here to ventilate so many grievances by means of our cut motions, I think some arrangements might be made in some manner or other by which the time should be adjusted in such a manner that some time should be left for each grievance to be placed before the House. Otherwise, it amounts to this, that we have to put forward several grievances.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. The Chair must point out to the House and to the Honourable Member, who, it is believed, is a Member of the Nationalist Party, that all the Leaders of Parties and several representatives of others represented to the Chair that this is the best arrangement in which these motions could be taken.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I do accept that position. I have no grievance against the Chair at all. What I want is to draw the attention of the Leaders to it that they should consider in what manner these other grievances could be ventilated I do belong to the Nationalist Party, and I do abide by the decision of my Leader. But what I mean to say is that some method should be found out in which other grievances also could be placed before the House.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Now, here is your chance.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Only on the post office! Now, Sir, I wholly support the motion moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, the champion of labour. The point is that the Honourable Member has not moved a motion under which all the grievances of the postal employees could be ventilated. I know that he confined himself only to one point, that is with regard to pension. But I do take it that it could not be his intention that the other grievances should not be exposed and ventilated. I know that fully well. It is only on account of the time limit that he has not been able to pay any attention to other grievances. He did very well in drawing attention first to a very long standing grievance. I am also glad that the Government have after all come to their senses. They have now thought fit to give an assurance that this pension question would be revised. What I want to submit is that while we are thankful for this assurance to ameliorate the condition of inferior servants, I should suggest that the rates of pension should be adjusted in such a manner that it may not cause

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

invidious distinction as regards any one particular class. We find half the salary is given as pension after thirty years service. I submit the rules should not be revised in such a manner that it would half the salary in the case of one class of public servants and a different rate in the case of another class of servants. There should be one rate for all. That is what I want to ward against. While on the question of revision of pensions, I would draw the attention of the House to a resolution passed by the Bombay Posts and Telegraphs Workmen's Union which runs thus.

"Owing to the fact that the scale of pension represents Rs. 4 per month, which was fixed 75 years ago by the Government of India for their inferior servants retiring on the completion of their service, it has now become totally inadequate to maintain them in their old age and that in some parts the inferior servants in provincial employ are now granted a pension equivalent to half average pay."

This is the portion to which I want to draw the attention of the Government and the attention of the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs:

"This Union recommends that in view of the financial improvement, Government will be pleased to revise as quickly as possible the pension rules applicable to inferior servants so as to qualify them on retirement to draw a pension equivalent to half their average salary."

The next point is in regard to the communication I received from Karachi. There they say there are classes of inferior servants who are called packers. Their business is to clear letter boxes, stamp letters, pack the mails in the boxes and carry them to the stations and do all sorts of miscellaneous work. Now, these packers are being treated differently from the postmen. I do not understand why this should happen. I am open to correction on this point. But my information that has been conveyed to me is that the postmen do get a pension which comes to half their average pay and these packers do not get at the same rate. I cannot understand that. I, therefore, suggest that in framing or revising the pension rules, no invidious distinction should be made as at present. This will be causing bitterness among them. With regard to packers, I may also say that their pay requires revision. I hope the Director General will pay consideration to that point also. Coming to their uniforms, it is only one pugree and a shirt given to them, whereas to others it is different. Though this is a small point, yet it is very painful to these packers to have only one pugree and one shirt. With regard to leave also they are very much inconvenienced. Ordinarily it is one month's leave that they get after putting in a service of eleven months, whereas in the case of packers, they are not given leave at all even for emergent purposes. I hope the Director General will verify this point also, and, if my information is correct, the packers do require some relief in the way of leave. Passing on to the smaller inferior staff, the messengers of Telegraphs, they are also sufferers on that score with regard to pension.

Coming to the grievances having reference to the Karachi General Post office, I would place before the House the question of the postal union of Karachi. That union is not being very well attended to and their grievances are not attended to and redressed. The other day, in this House, my Honourable and gallant friend, Colonel Gidney, was very rightly speaking that there has been opposition to these unions from the Government officers. I have given now an instance.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I was not referring to postal unions. I was referring to the railway unions.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I know that my Honourable and gallant friend was referring to the railways. I have now brought a similar instance in regard to the post office also. It is my duty to place before the House this grievance, and I do expect the Director General, who is personally known to me and who has been paying attention to the grievances of the postal employees, to attend to this grievance also. It is with that idea I am drawing his attention just now. Whenever we bring certain facts to his notice, he has been courteous in his replies. I know he is trying his best to see that all these grievances are removed. I now say that the grievance I have just mentioned about the Karachi postal union should be removed. With regard to these unions, they say that whenever they go to the Government officers with respect to certain grievances, the reply always given to them is this, that they are the grievances of one or two individual men. If you do not care to attend to the grievances of one or two men, that will lead to greater grievances hereafter on the part of others, and it is always good to nip it in the bud. Therefore, I submit that the Karachi union should be given attention, and their grievances heard.

Then, Sir, coming to one more question with regard to this union, there is a class of inferior servants who are messengers in the Telegraph Department. With regard to that, I say that they have got their own union in Karachi and they have applied that their union should be recognised. But, up to this time, it has not been done. The point is that the clerks and other inferior persons have got their own union and that has been recognised, and there is no reason why this should not be recognised also. I think at some places these messengers have joined the union of the clerks and the inferior staff. But here they have got their own union, they are very large in number, they have their own office and they have their own President. Why should not their union be recognised? I hope this grievance too will be redressed by the Director General.

Mr. G. V. Bewoor (Director General of Posts and Telegraphs): Sir, I wish to acknowledge first the very friendly criticism which has emanated from all the Honourable Members who have spoken on this cut motion. I am accustomed to listen to complaints about post and telegraph matters wherever I go, but they are always accompanied by a feeling of friendship and liking for the Department . . . .

Dr. F. X. DeSouza (Nominated Non-Official): For you personally.

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: ...and I hope for me also. It is somewhat unfortunate that this particular cut came on today when it was least expected. I never thought that the large number of cuts which stood before Demand No. 23 would be passed over in the course of a few minutes. The subject, again, is so vast that it is almost impossible to do justice to it. My Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, raised the question of pensions for inferior servants and this has been already dealt with by the Honourable the Finance Member and the Honourable Member in charge of the Department. But, about the other grievances, I should like to say this.

We have in the Department a very large number of all-India unions. I have here a list of 13 such unions which have been recognised by the

[Mr G. V. Bewoor.]

Department. They are of an all-India character. Every one of these has got circle branches, divisional branches and town branches. Under the organisation which we have got and the rules laid down, every local branch can represent its grievance to the local officer. If it finds that it cannot get its grievance redressed, it refers the matter to the provincial branch. The provincial branch then approaches the head of the circle. If it is unable to get the grievance redressed, the provincial branch addresses the all-India head office. The all-India head office then approaches the Director General. If the all-India union is unable to get this grievance redressed by the Director General, it approaches the Honourable Member in charge of the Department. My point in describing this is to show that in the Department we have provided for the representation of grievances in a manner which should ensure that every grievance is thoroughly examined by more than one officer I am glad that my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, gave me credit, or gave the Department credit, for the cordial relations which exist between the officers and the unions in the Department. That has been the outstanding feature in the Department. I remember that in the beginning of the organisation of these unions, there was some suspicion in the minds of these unions that the officers of the Department did not like the unions But that is no longer the case. My reason for mentioning this fact is not to deny the existence of grievances, but to show that these grievances have been thoroughly considered time and again, and if we have not been able to remedy them, it is either because we do not recognise them to be grievances or because it is impracticable in the present financial position of the Department to remedy them.

In the criticisms which were made, some Honourable Members went so far as to question the basic policy of the Department. But, Sir, this basic policy of the Department which has been announced in this House more than once, namely, that the Posts and Telegraphs Department, while not being a source of revenue to Government, should pay its way, is a very sound policy, and I do not think that any Honourable Member would, after careful consideration, deny the soundness of this policy. The remedy, therefore, for all grievances must depend upon the finances of the Department, on the question whether the revenue earned would cover the expenditure that has to be incurred in running an efficient system of posts and telegraphs.

There has been also criticism from my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, about what he calls the financial expenditure. I found it somewhat difficult to understand what he meant by financial expenditure. But I can see that he refers to the commercial system of accounts which we have adopted in order to see whether the service as a whole is working at a profit or at a loss. I do not propose to enter into an examination of this system, but I would merely say that this system which was devised about ten years ago has been subjected to extremely careful and expert examination by the Postal Accounts Inquiry Committee which was presided over by my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir. That system has been made as accurate as it is possible to do in dealing with a Department which serves such large areas and gives such a variety of services

I think Sir Henry Gidney had further in his mind the expenditure incurred on the Accounts and Audit Department. He seemed to think

that the expenditure incurred on the Accounts and Audit Department had increased far too much. All I would point out to him is this. In our Department, we deal with very large sums of money which are collected and disbursed all over India and Burma in about 22,000 offices. It is essential that there should be an excellent system of accounting and audit, and, in the absence of such a system, the dangers of loss or misappropriation are very great. He referred to the increasing cost of accounts and audit in recent years, but I should like to point out to him that this increase has been due to the increasing work connected with Savings Bank and Cash Certificate transactions. For doing this work, the Posts and Telegraphs Department receives credit from the general revenues, and this sum, which we receive from the general revenues and which was Rs. 44½ lakhs in 1930-31, is expected in the budget estimates for 1935-36 to be Rs. 56½ lakhs—an increase of nearly 12 lakhs. As we are receiving payment for work done for the Savings Bank and Cash Certificates, it is no wonder that our expenditure has gone up in the Accounts and Audit Department. I may assure Sir Henry Gidney that, as the custodian of the Department, I watch very carefully every debit that is raised against the Department; and the increase in expenditure, whether it occurs on the part of the general budget of the Department or on the side of the accounts and audit, is examined by the Director General very carefully before it is agreed to . . .

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: But your expenditure has increased while the income is reduced.

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: I was only referring to the expenditure on the accounts and audit side, where owing to the increase in the number of savings bank transactions and cash certificate transactions, we receive additional credit from the general revenues . . .

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Before you leave this subject, will you please answer two questions? One is whether you debit the expenditure on experiments in telegraphy to revenue account or to capital account: the second is, have you got separate accounts for post office and telegraphs? Our impression is that the post office pays its way: it is the telegraphs department which is a white elephant to his Department

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: May I just say that we are now dealing with the grievances of the postal employees and not with the accounting system which has been adopted in the Department? I only brought it in in order to show that the criticism made by Sir Henry Gidney to the effect that what he called the financial expenditure was excessive is not a justifiable one.

We have been criticised in connection with the retrenchment policy adopted by the Department; and we have been told by my friend, Mr. Lahiri Chaudhury, that the Department has treated the lower paid employees most unfairly in that the retrenchment has been excessive with regard to the lower paid staff, but not sufficient as regards the higher officers. This criticism has been made before. My predecessor, Sir Thomas Ryan, dealt with this criticism at great length in this House last year. I do not wish to traverse all the arguments which Sir Thomas Ryan brought forward here. I hope my friend

[Mr. G. V. Bewoor.]

Mr. Lahiri Chaudhury, will take an early opportunity of refreshing his memory with the record of that debate; but I would like to point out very briefly that in the retrenchment which has been carried out in the department since the 30th November, 1931, and up to the end of the current financial year, we have retrenched 84 officers, 10,794 non-gazetted staff and 3,543 inferior staff. I admit that the numbers of the last two classes are very large, but we must look not to the numbers in themselves, but to the percentage which they bear to the total staff. If that is examined, it would be found that while 14·74 per cent of the gazetted staff has been retrenched, the percentages for the non-gazetted superior staff and for the inferior staff are 11·5 and 10·29 respectively. I submit that that is a proof that in carrying out retrenchment we have not been treating the lower paid staff unfairly Mr. Lahiri Chaudhury told us that there are too many officers in the department. That again is a criticism which has been made often before and explained more than once in this House. We have taken special trouble to explain in our annual report what exactly is meant by the superior officers, that is to say, the administrative staff which looks after the general administration, as apart from the executive staff I sent a copy of the annual report to every Member of this House on page 29 of that report, it is explained that there are really 107 officers holding higher posts such as are commonly regarded by the general public as controlling the business of the department. I wish to submit that a staff of 107 officers for a department which has got about 100,000 employees scattered over the whole of India and Burma is by no means excessive. I should like further to draw the attention of Honourable Members to the magnitude of the business carried on by the department. Apart from the question of the number of letters and postcards handled, which I do not wish to mention here, I would like to draw attention to the fact that Rs. 75 crores worth of money orders were issued and the same amount paid; and in the savings bank we have 3,000,000 current savings bank accounts with a total balance of Rs. 52 crores; and we have 87,000 postal life insurance policies covering an aggregate assurance of over 16 crores. Apart from the amount of cash or the number of articles handled, there is this point that our officers are not merely officers supervising the work of their staff: they have to deal with the public, with commercial bodies and business houses, and they have to watch the necessity for greater postal facilities or for restricting them where they are no longer necessary. I would, therefore, for the last time I hope, convince the House that the staff of officers employed in the Posts and Telegraphs Department is not excessive. . . .

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: You want more supervising staff.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury: What about the Telegraph Engineering Department?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: I am coming to that. My friend, Mr. Lahiri Chaudhury, stated that in the Telegraph Engineering Department we had not carried out the same amount of retrenchment that we have carried out in the other branches. This question, again, was dealt with by my predecessor, Sir Thomas Ryan, and I really am very sorry that I have merely to repeat what he stated last year. The point is this: that even if the

telegraph traffic of the department has fallen slightly, the number of miles of wire that have to be maintained is still the same. To ensure efficient service, supervision and control is necessary. Our telephone branch is expanding very rapidly: everybody is aware that we are now giving trunk connections right from one end of India to another. We are fast expanding and we have in the next year a capital programme of over 55 lakhs.

There are a few more points. Mr. Lahiri Chaudhury referred to the fact that certain postal divisions were very large with a very large number of offices, and that certain others had a smaller number of offices. Here, again, I would point out that this question was very carefully examined as a result of a recommendation made by the Posts and Telegraphs Department Retrenchment Sub-Committee, and we have re-arranged all the divisions in India so as to ensure to each officer a proper day's work or rather a proper year's work.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai referred to a very large number of grievances and he made certain statements which, I am afraid, are not quite correct. Packers and mail peons constitute what we call the inferior service. Postmen constitute superior service.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Is there any difference in their work and of the postmen?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: There is an enormous difference in the work. Postmen are literate people; they handle cash, deliver letters, money orders and insured articles; they have to keep an account of the money they take with them; they are really doing responsible work. A packer, on the other hand, does not do much more than a coolie's work; he is not required to read and write, though he is expected to be literate; he merely carries mails from one place to another, stamps letters, seals packets in the presence of the officers concerned. . . .

Mr. M. Asaf Ali (Delhi: General): They object to the word 'coolie'.

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: If the Honourable Member will suggest to me some other word, I shall be glad to use it.

An Honourable Member: Why not use the word labourers?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: As regards the question of uniform, the matter is under consideration. As regards leave, it is not a fact, Sir, that packers are not entitled to leave; they are entitled to leave. . . . . .

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: But you don't give them leave.

An Honourable Member: Will the Honourable Member see that uniforms are in future made of Khaddar?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: As regards the complaint which my friend, Mr. Lalchand Navalrai, made that some local union was not listened to by the local officers, all I have to say is that the local union should refer the matter to the All-India Union, and the All-India Union can address me. I shall then certainly inquire into the matter

[Mr. G. V. Bewoor.]

I do not wish to take up any of the other grievances mentioned by the various Honourable Members. As I said before, every grievance which Honourable Members have brought before this House today has been considered in the Department, and we are always considering in the Department all these grievances very carefully and very sympathetically. It is sometimes our regret that we are not able to remedy certain grievances which undoubtedly are genuine. I am prepared to admit that fact, but certain circumstances, like the financial position, make it impossible to remedy things at once, but we do keep all these matters prominently in view, and I can assure Honourable Members that representations received from the unions are considered very carefully and remedied whenever possible. (Applause.)

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, I shall be very brief in my reply to the discussion that has taken place. In the first place, I should like to thank the Finance Member as well as the Honourable Member in charge of the Department of Industries and Labour for the sympathetic assurance they have given as regards the revision of the pension rules of the employees of Government belonging to the inferior services. I should, however, like to express the hope that the Government of India would take immediate steps to implement that assurance, and secondly, Sir, I hope that the assurance will be adequately implemented. I would not like the Government of India to maintain hereafter any discrimination in the treatment given to inferior servants and to others as regards pensions. I am very grateful to the Honourable Members of this House who have taken part in this discussion.

There is one satisfactory feature that exists in this department, and it is this. The relations between the associations of the employees of the postal department and the Government have for several years been very cordial. Great credit is due to the several Honourable Members who have been in charge of the Department and also to the several Directors General as well as to the officers of the associations of the postal employees. I feel that if other employees of Government in this country were to follow the example of the Postal Department, we should not hear the complaints which we often hear about the unions and the officers of the unions. The responsibility for maintaining friendly relations lies upon both the parties. I, therefore, hope that the example set by the Postal Department and also by the postal organizations will be followed by employers in other industries as well as other Departments of Government and by their organizations.

There is one remark which I would like to make about the speech of the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs. He said, Sir, that as regards retrenchment in the Telegraph Department, they could not effect the same amount of retrenchment as in the Postal Department. I am not suggesting that there should have been a retrenchment in the Telegraph Department, but I am not satisfied with the argument which he advanced. My own suspicion is that the Telegraph Department is a department which is used more by people who have got political influence. The Government of India are not willing to restrict facilities which are given to people who have political influence. But, whenever the Government of India want to reduce expenditure, they do it by taking away the facilities given to people in the rural areas. The first thing which the Government

do when they want to effect a retrenchment is to close down the post offices, not in the cities and towns where people can kick up a row, but in the rural areas. I hope, therefore, the Government of India will not allow this kind of discrimination to go on in the treatment given to rural areas and urban areas.

Then, as regards my motion, my object in proposing this cut was to protest against the delay which the Government of India have caused in coming to a satisfactory solution of the grievances which I had placed before this House. I have no desire, Mr. President, to censure the Government on account of the sympathetic assurance we have received today. I, therefore, propose to ask the leave of the House to withdraw my motion. But if the House insists upon having a vote on this motion, I want to make it quite clear that my motion will give a mandate to the Government of India to revise the pension rules satisfactorily within one year's time.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Has the Honourable Member the leave of the House to withdraw the motion?

Some Honourable Members: We are indifferent, Sir.

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then, there are 18 other motions standing in the name of Mr. Anwar-ul-Azim.

Position of the Bengal Mussalmans in the Office of the Postmaster General, Bengal and Assam Circle.

Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim: Sir, I wish to move No. 203. I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Sir, this is a very small cut . . .

Khan Sahib Shaikh Fazl-i-Haq Piracha (North-West Punjab: Muhammadan): On a point of order, Sir. My motions on Demand No. 18 have been passed over.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Notice must have been given after the other motions.

Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim: Sir, when Federation is looming so large, I shall be excused for being a little parochial. I am certain, I shall not offend the susceptibilities of my friends on my right, for, after all, I know they will consider the very hard plight in which the Muslim community is placed in India today, and if these people have not received proper and sympathetic consideration at the hands of Government, I am certain, my friends will bear with me for a few minutes when I plead on their behalf. You will remember,—am I audible?

Some Honourable Members: Go on.

Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul Azim: You will remember, this Department has got a unique history of its own, and, within human memory, I should say that it existed in the province of Bengal from a very early period. When the Government of India had their headquarters in Calcutta, this Department was housed in Calcutta. Calcutta was the provincial Capital where the Mussalmans formed 42 per cent of the whole population. Though in the whole Circle Assam was included, for practical purposes Assam does not account, because the Muslim population there is very small indeed, and I should be forgiven if I do not take notice of them in talking on this motion. The House may remember that in 1923, at the instance of a Madras gentleman, a Member of this House, a Resolution was passed for balancing the administrative inequalities by communities of the Departments of the Government of India, I mean the services controlled by the Central Government. It is, of course, a matter of history. 1923 does not exist now; it is too late in 1934. From the facts at my disposal, I find that the Government of India in the Home Department came out as late as July, 1934, with a certain amount of story stating that the Mussalmans would have a certain representation in the Central Services. But I may be pardoned if I say that in spite of these loud talks and professions of kindness for the minority communities, the position has not much changed, especially in the case of the Mussalmans, for that reservation is no reservation at all. I should like to be pardoned by my Honourable friend, the Director General, with whom my relations are very cordial, because I respect him and we all like him, but I may tell him that the pace of recruitment in the Bengal and Assam Circle has been very slow. I am sure that one whose geographical situation is not so far to the North, I can assure him—his blood would boil. I do not want the moon in a day, but my humble submission is, how do you propose to justify it? I can tell my Honourable friends that if they want the right type of Mussalmans, the right type of good, loyal Mussalmans from the Bengal and Assam Circle, they would get a plethora of them to fill in any number of posts. The only thing that is wanting is goodwill. Here is the initial mistake and no amount of circular that the Government of India may send round will be of any use. I would like to suggest to the Government for their consideration that unless they hit on some method by which these important cases will not be overlooked, I am certain we shall not be in a position to come into our own even in 500 years.

Coming to other matters pertaining to my motion, let me deal with retrenchment of Muslim officials. As I have said already, we have had no chance to come in, but as regards the few that got in, what is the position with regard to retrenchment? The policy of the Director General in Bengal and Assam Circle has been to recruit by the Circle, but at the time of retrenchment, they have retrenched on divisional lines. May I ask the Government who are responsible for this state of affairs? If you wanted to recruit through the medium of the Circle, on a circle basis, I should have thought that you would stick to that for all purposes. But the procedure they have adopted would only lead to one conclusion, and that is that they wanted to get rid of those Mussalmans in the service who had only six or seven years' service and retain others. I would like to have a cogent and reasonable answer from my Honourable friend the Director General on this matter. If my remarks are not pleasing to a certain gentleman, I hope he will have at least patience enough to hear me.

Now, coming to the office of the Postmaster General, Bengal and Assam Circle, in Calcutta, what is the position that you find there, Mr. President? As a matter of fact, in the whole Circle, we have got only two Mussalman Superintendents of Post Offices. I may be told that the recruitment is on an all-India basis. It may be anything, but what is the justification for this? I want my place in the administration. I have a stake in this Department, you get tons of revenue from me in this Circle, and I claim to have experience of your business. It would not please me if you said that you had 500 Mussalmans in the Punjab and 600 Mussalmans in Madras in the service. My submission to the Government is that, if they respect for the sentiments of my people, who are 42 per cent. of the whole population, they should give their serious attention to this matter. Coming to the office of the Postmaster General, as a matter of fact, my relations with the present Postmaster General are very cordial; we all like and love him, I mean Rai Bahadur P. N. Mukherji. I have talked to him about this. But he says, he is guided by the policy dictated from here in Delhi and Simla, and, if there is only 1½ per cent. of Muslims in the whole office consisting of nearly 1,000 men or more, while we are 42 per cent. of the whole population, I am certain, you will find that my grievance is a very genuine one in that matter also. Coming to the General Post Office of Calcutta, there the things are in no way very much better. The position there is about 3 per cent. These are a few of the matters which I wanted to bring to the notice of the House through the medium of this motion We, the minorities in this country, are peace-loving temperamentally, and believe in gradual evolution. But there is a limit even to that. One Honourable Member said that we had been befooled by the Government to a certain extent, but even if it be so, I hope they will not do so again.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq (Bakargunj *cum* Faridpur: Muhammadan Rural): It is somewhat embarrassing to emphasise the needs of communities in a House like this where we should more properly devote our energies to the consideration of questions of an all-India character and policy. But when a question like this is raised, especially by a Member from Bengal, regarding the grievances of Bengal Muslims, I feel it my duty to place before the House certain facts which may help the Government in coming to a true appreciation of the Muslim position. Personally, I would very much prefer to see a matter like this settled by negotiation in the sense of personal talk regarding the grievances that may exist, because, I believe, there are many cases in which grievances have only got to be brought to the notice of the authorities to be redressed. We do not mean for a moment to imply that there has been anything like a studied neglect of Muslim claims on the part of the officers, but there are various causes which may have contributed to a state of things to which we take objection. I would place before the House certain facts, in addition to those that have been placed before the House by the Mover of this motion. These facts I have been able to collect after some amount of inquiry before I came to Delhi, and I collected these figures from responsible persons in Calcutta. I am told that the percentage of Muslims in the Bengal and Assam Circle

[Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq.]

has gone down in the year 1934, and, as a matter of fact, inquiries go to show that there are no apparent reasons why that should have taken place. In the matter of retrenchment, 133 Muslims were retrenched in excess of the number which would have been justified according to the ratio by which retrenchment should have been made on a communal basis.

Then, Sir, as regards the existing situation in the office of the Postmaster General, Bengal Circle, the Muslim representation is only 3 per cent. In the selection grade out of 26 posts there are only two Muslims. In the office of Superintendent of Post Offices, there is only one Muslim in the total strength of 25 and two Muslim inspectors out of a total strength of 102. In the Calcutta General Post Office, there are 80 Muslim clerks out of a total strength of about 1,500. Now Sir, I do not for a moment wish to imply that the Muslims should be appointed *ad hoc*, whenever they come and simply because they are Muslims, but, I take it that Government in recent times has been trying to take members of the minority communities who have not had proper representation at the present moment, provided they are qualified and fit to discharge the duties of the posts in which they are appointed. Subject, therefore, to a minimum test of efficiency, it is the policy of the Government to throw open these posts to the minority communities as much as possible. I am not personally acquainted with the present Director General of Posts and Telegraphs, but, since he is here, I make a personal appeal to him to look into the figures and to satisfy himself whether proper justice has been done to the Muslims of Bengal. For my part, I am quite prepared to wait and see. I have every confidence that if he looks into the figures, he will be satisfied that the grievance is genuine, and once he is satisfied about it, I have got every reason to be satisfied myself that he will do all he can to redress our grievances If an assurance like that is given, I would ask my friend, Mr. Anwar-ul-Azim, not to press this motion nor the other motions of a similar character standing in his name. It is not our purpose to antagonise the officials, but to give them a fair chance, and I would, therefore, ask my friend to wait and hear the reply that will be given by the Government officials, and, if that reply is of a sympathetic character, I would advise my friend not to press the motion.

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: Sir, the cut motion, as it stands, refers to the position of Bengal Muslims in the office of the Postmaster
4 P.M. General of the Bengal and Assam Circle. The speeches of the two Honourable Members refer generally to the question of the recruitment of Muhammadans in Government service. I should like, first of all, to point out that the existing percentages in the staff of any one particular office or in the staff in any one particular area are the result of recruitment over the last 30 years. Honourable Members must be aware that rules regarding recruitment on communal basis are of comparatively recent origin. It is natural, therefore, that in any particular office at the present moment the percentage of one community is far in excess of the percentage it would be entitled to under the recent orders. I would, therefore, beg Honourable Members not to draw any unfavourable conclusion by examining the staff of the office of the Postmaster General, Calcutta, or the staff of the Calcutta General Post Office or of any other office. Reference has been made to selection grade posts. It is laid down by Government that the rules regarding recruitment on a communal basis

refer to direct recruitment only and not to promotions and that promotions in the Department must be made on considerations of merit, and, when once a person comes into the service, his promotion should not depend upon his community or his race.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: On a point of information. We are told that that being the rule, sometimes it happens that recruitments directly are made in one or two instances and then other recruitments of staff are made by promotion in order to stop the application of the Government rule. Is that correct?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: No, Sir. We do our promotions on rules which are clearly laid down in the Departmental Manuals. Seniority and merit are the only qualifications. The Honourable Member again spoke of the number of Superintendents of Post Offices who happen to be in the Bengal and Assam Circle. Now, this cadre is an all-India cadre and the fact that at any given time there are more Muhammadans or more Hindus or more Europeans in one particular Circle is an entirely fortuitous circumstance. We must take into consideration the particular cadre as a whole in order to consider whether the porportionate number of any one particular community exists or not. The present rules of the Department clearly provide for local recruitment, that is to say, recruitment for an office from the local area—a principle that ensures that in Bengal, Bengal Muslims are taken and Bengal Hindus are taken. This principle was attacked by Sir Henry Gidney in his speech, but I need not deal with it at the present moment.

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi (Assam Valley: Non-Muhammadan): Is the same principle followed in Assam?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: Yes, Sir. The question of the recruitment of Assamese in Assam was debated at great length in the Council of State at its Session in Simla, and, if the Honourable Member will read the debate on that question, he will find the whole position fully explained.

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi: I want information on one point. Just now the Honourable Member said that in Bengal, Bengali Muslims and Bengali Hindus will be taken. I am asking whether in Assam, Assamese Hindus and Assamese Muslims are appointed or men from Bengal, the United Provinces and Bihar and other parts are appointed?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: The rules on the subject are exactly the same for Bengal as for Assam. I would like, Sir, to mention to the Honourable the Mover of this motion that the question of communal recruitment is always kept in the forefront in this Department and we obtain very detailed statements from the officers in order to ensure that the rules of the Department are being observed. I would now mention a few figures from which he would, I think, be satisfied that these orders are being properly observed. In the annual report for the year 1933-34, Appendix No. XVII, the Honourable Member will find the number of recruits classified according to different communities. He is aware that during the last few years the number of new recruits taken was extremely limited. It

[Mr. G. V. Bewoor.]

will be seen that among the clerical staff in the lower division recruited in the Bengal and Assam Circle, out of 138 clerks who were recruited, 90 were Hindus, 44 were Muhammadans, one an Indian Christian and three belonging to other communities. As regards the lines staff, out of six linesmen who were recruited, two were Hindus and four were Muhammadans. Among the postmen and other miscellaneous classes, out of 84, 54 were Hindus and 28 were Muhammadans. Among the inferior staff, out of 408 who were recruited, 216 were Hindus and 131 were Muhammadans. I hope, Sir, the figures I have read out will satisfy him that we are watching the interests of the minority communities very carefully. Recently, Government have in their Resolution of the 4th July, 1934, laid down further detailed instructions as to the principles on which recruitment of the different minority communities should be made. I may assure the Honourable the Mover of the motion that these rules are being very carefully observed: and, if in any particular instance, he or any other member of his community has reason to believe that these rules are not being observed, all he has to do is merely to draw my attention to this fact, and I wish to assure him that I shall have a very careful inquiry made into the matter.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Sir, I do not want to make a speech, but I just want to put two questions. May I just ask whether my Honourable friend, Mr. Bewoor, has ever solved the mathematical problem which I am just going to give him, and it is this.

Firstly, considering the rate of progress of Mussalmans, as it is, how long would it take for them to achieve twenty-five per cent? Will it take 30, 40 or 50 years, or how long? I just want to give him that problem—I repeat, considering the rate of increment, how long will it take before the Mussalmans can obtain the figure of twenty-five per cent? My friend can solve this problem and let me have the result later on. (Laughter.)

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Then he will take as much time as the Army is taking over Indianisation.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: *Secondly*, he said just now that the promotions are made on the consideration of merit and seniority. Now, will it not be right for me to request him that whenever you make a promotion on the strength of efficiency and pass over senior officers, then a report must always be given to the Head of the Department as to why such and such a person has been passed over, and this fact should clearly be noted. There is a feeling on this side of the House that in order to have a particular individual appointed, you sometimes adopt the principle of seniority and sometimes the principle of efficiency, as you wish, in order to have the required man at the required place. (Laughter.) That is the impression that we have got. It is, therefore, very desirable that whenever you pass over any person on the ground of efficiency of another person and set aside the principle of seniority, then a report must always be given to the Head of the Department. And he should be satisfied that that is the right course. These are the two points to which I wanted to draw the attention.

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: Sir, I must confess to not being a mathematician, but the Honourable Memeber is. I would draw his attention to Appendix XVII of the Report which shows that the Department has a staff of 97,826 employees, of whom 21,508 are Muhammadans and 67,150 are Hindus.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Officers?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: I am giving the number of the total employees of the Department, and I would leave it to him to calculate, after how many years we shall reach the twenty-five per cent. at the present rate and ratio of recruitment.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Give me the rate of progress for different classes of services.

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: That is all given in the report, a copy of which has been supplied to every Member of the House. As regards promotions, promotion is always made, as I have stated, on grounds of efficiency and seniority. If any senior officer is superseded on the ground of inefficiency, he has always his remedy of representing to his superior officers through the usual official channels.

Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim: Sir, I have listened to the speech of the Honourable Member carefully, but I must say I am not satisfied with his explanation. This is practically not a new affair, but a hardy annual—this grievance of ours,—and we hope that a changed administration will in future remedy our grievances. When the virile Mussalmans will get into the Legislature, they will see that justice is done to them, but, under the present Constitution, we are absolutely helpless, Mr. President. I am very liberal in all matters, Sir. I do believe in conciliation, but even to a man like me in my temperament it is intolerable that there is such criminal negligence on the part of the Government of India, so far as we are concerned, in all spheres of public services. But after listening to my esteemed friend, Mr. Bewoor, the Director General, I think I had better ask the leave of the House to withdraw the motion and give him a chance to better our position.

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There are other motions also in the name of the Honourable Member, Mr. Anwar-ul-Azim under Demand No. 23.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, I have a motion under Demand No. 28—cut No. 295.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member will have to wait for that.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: There is nobody else, Sir.

Maulvi Sir Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): There are so many.

DEMAND No. 18—SALT.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I beg to move:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 72,82,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Salt'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 72,82,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Salt'."

Damage done to the poor Zamindars of the Khushab and Pind Dadan Khan Tahsils in the District of Shahpur and Jhelum in the Punjab on account of the Salt Range and the Khewra Salt Mines.

Khan Sahib Shaikh Fazl-i-Haq Piracha: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Salt' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Sir, in moving this cut, I mean to lay before the Government and this Honourable House the damage done to the poor zamindars of the Khushab and Pind Dadan Khan tahsils in the districts of Shahpur and Jhelum in the Punjab on account of the Salt Range and the Khewra Salt Mines. Sir, hundreds of tons of salt are being excavated from the Khewra Mines every year and the rain water that flows from over and inside these mines with a mixture of salt flows over the agricultural lands and destroys them all. No arrangements have so far been made to check this evil, nor have the people been compensated in any way for the loss. Sir, vast tracts of land situated in the neighbouring area of the Salt Range, specially the Khewra Mines have altogether become uncultivable, and the zamindars have been deprived of the little holdings they had. This question has been under the discussion of this House, twice before, but nothing has so far resulted. In 1927, the Honourable Raja Ghazanfar Ali, Member of the Council of State, then a Member of this Assembly, moved the question of the appointment of an enquiry committee to investigate into the causes of the damage done to the lands adjacent to the Khewra Mines and to devise ways and means to mend it.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta).]

Sir Basil Blackett, the then Finance Member, promised to take up the question and to appoint a committee of enquiry. The committee was no doubt appointed, but it simply enquired into the grievances of the salt miners and the other and the much more essential part, to enquire into the causes of the damage to the lands and to make good those losses, was left out. Then, again, the same Honourable Member of this House moved the matter in 1930. Sir George Schuster was pleased to give the same promise as Sir Basil Blackett had done, but with no result. Sir, the

people of the part of the country who are affected and who have been deprived of their small holdings have always been law abiding and have always constituted the best part of the army in India. But, I think, as they are very loyal and never raise a hue and cry and have willingly sacrificed the lives of thousands of their people in the Great War for the sake of Government, it is probably on that account that, in gratitude to their services, the Government have ignored their interests and have done nothing for them. The Government are quite certain that their interests are quite safe and that there will be no disturbance in that part of the country as far as the question of non-co-operation or non-payment of taxes is concerned. I think my Honourable Colleague, Nawab Malik Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, a Nominated Member of this House, would be able to give a true and detailed account of the plight of the zamindars who have been deprived of their little holdings, as he is resident of one of the districts concerned and has been a sub-divisional officer and for sometime the Deputy Commissioner of the *ilaqa* where the Khewra Mines are situate. He has a good experience of the people of that part of the country and knows the condition of their lands. I hope, if he gets time to speak, he will explain to the House in what condition these lands are. Sir, the most important town, Pind Dadan Khan, in the district of Jhelum, has almost become a ruin on account of the Salt Range. The surrounding lands have become waste lands and the town has even been deprived of good drinking sweet water of its own soil. The importance of this cut is evident from the fact that a notice of this cut has been signed by almost all the Members from the Punjab. I do not see, Sir, why should Government have sat tight with closed eyes and deaf ears so long without enquiring into the reasons what damages are caused by the Khewra Salt Mines and to make good those losses especially when the Government get such a large income as 40 lakhs every year from those mines. Sir, I would strongly request that a committee, with a majority of non-official Members of this House, should be appointed to enquire into the causes of the damage done to the lands in the Salt Mine areas and some means should be adopted to compensate the agriculturists for the loss done to their lands. Sir, I move.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Salt' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty (Madras: Indian Commerce): Sir, while on the question of salt grievances, I desire to bring to the notice of the Honourable the Finance Member the case of very unfair treatment by the Government to the licensees of salt factories in the Madras Province. I trust, Sir, the Honourable the Finance Member is aware that in the Madras Province, particularly in the Chingleput district, there are many salt pans which are worked by private persons under a system called the *kudivaram* system.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan (Nominated Non-Official): On a point of order, Sir. This cut motion refers to the Salt Range in the Punjab and not in Madras.

Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri Lal Chand (Nominated Non-Official): Salt Range is the name of a territory in Jhelum district in the Punjab.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member is not in order in referring to Madras. The present cut relates to the Salt Range in the Punjab province.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: The cut relates to damage caused by the Salt Range in general, and Khewra Mines in particular, to the cultivable lands of zamindars in neighbouring areas.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): In any case, the Honourable Member was not called by the Chair to speak.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: When I began to address the House, you, Sir, kept quiet and allowed me to continue.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): On a point of order, Sir, when a Member is in possession of the House and allowed to speak for some minutes, can he be asked to sit down on the ground that he was not called upon?

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member is out of order, because this does not relate to Madras at all and is restricted to the Punjab.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Then, I ask for your leave to support this cut motion. I heartily sympathise with the grievance which has been stated by the Honourable the Mover, and I may also add some other grievances of a more serious nature which exist in my own Presidency. (Laughter.) I do not know if the Honourable the Finance Member is aware that there is a system called *kudivaram* system prevailing in Madras Province, but, I am sure, Sir Frank Noyce who comes from Madras is aware of it. Under that system, private persons are licensed to manufacture salt. The lands themselves are owned by private persons and a certain quantity of salt is always allowed every year to these license holders. Government seem to have in view the ultimate abandonment of the manufacture of salt by these private owners. Therefore, they have been reducing the licenseable quantity of manufacture year after year, so much so that, during the present year, it has practically reached to a very low figure, thereby intending to curtail the value of these lands which they want to compensate ultimately. Sir, Government are always very keen on criticising the Members on this side that we have been advocating the repudiation of debts or appropriation of property and all that kind of thing. And, for that reason, my Honourable friends of the European Group have always been demanding safeguards. I hope Honourable Members of the European Group will now support me in asking for a safeguard against appropriation by Government without adequate and proper compensation to those persons who owned these lands for a long time and who have spent lots of money in the purchase of that property. I beg the Honourable the Finance Member to kindly examine this matter and give as much importance to this grievance as the grievance which has been put forward by the Honourable the Mover of this cut motion.

Sardar Mangal Singh (East Punjab: Sikh): Sir, I wish to congratulate the Honourable Member who has moved this cut. This grievance of the

zamindars of the Jhelum district is genuine and is of a very long standing. As the General Secretary of the Zamindars' League, I know personally that this matter has been brought before the League several times and we have passed resolutions urging upon Government to remove these grievances and to compensate the zamindars adequately. Sir, I do not wish to make a long speech, but I wish only to add that an immediate inquiry should be made and this grievance of those zamindars should be removed as soon as possible. Those zamindars are not vocal people, they do not know the ways and methods of modern propaganda, they do not go to the meetings and lecture. They are simple people, and, if I may say so, dumb people. They are suffering silently. I know they used to come to our meetings; they could not even relate the nature of their grievances. Once I went to that place and made inquiries from the villagers, and I saw that their grievance was very much stronger than they could express by their language. I, therefore, urge upon Government that this matter should be taken in hand immediately and their grievances removed. With these words, I support the cut.

Khan Bahadur Nawab Malik Allah Baksh Khan Tiwana (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I had no intention to speak on this motion, but, as my Honourable friend, the Mover, has referred to me, I must corroborate him in this respect that I was in charge of the Pind Dadan Khan sub-division for 4½ years. I fully corroborate the Honourable the Mover in this respect also that saltpetre has done great damage to the tract lying in the Pind Dadan Khan tahsil between the hills and the Jhelum river, a tract which is very valuable otherwise. It is about seven or eight miles in breadth and about 50 miles in length. However, I cannot agree with the Honourable the Mover that the main mischief has been by the operations of the Khewra Salt Mine though there may be some effect of it in its vicinity. Its effect could not go in the length of fifty miles in the Pind Dadan Khan tahsil and, then, further on, to the Khushab tahsil in the Shahpur district as mentioned by the Honourable the Mover. Really the mischief lies elsewhere. There are several streams from the Salt Range which flow towards the river Jhelum. They pass through the saltish zone of the hills which extend throughout the southern part of that Range. There the water mixes up with salt and then it passes through the lower lands, and it is on that account that saltpetre is increasing day by day. I do not think this motion is meant to censure Government, and I do not think the Honourable the Mover also has any intention to move this motion with that object.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, on a point of order. Are cut motions moved without any idea of censuring Government? Is it parliamentary for the Honourable Member to get up and move a cut motion just for the fun of it and not to cesure Government?

Khan Bahadur Nawab Malik Allah Baksh Khan Tiwana: It is a motion to bring facts to the notice of the Government and the House and he has asked only for the appointment of a committee of enquiry.

Sir, as I have submitted, these springs which pass through the Salt Range bring saltish water and are increasing saltpetre day by day. I do not think the House would like to censure Government on this account.

[Khan Bahadur Nawab Malik Allah Baksh Khan Tiwana.]

I should also like to bring to the notice of the House that Government were not sleeping over this matter. The Punjab Government in my time considered various schemes in this connection. One of the schemes, as far as Government were concerned, was completed. The idea was to tap the water from these springs, bring it down in pipes for the use of the different villages for drinking purposes and also save it from the effects of the salt. This process would certainly help in the reclamation of the lands too. However, I understand that full use of this scheme has not been made. The water has been brought down and collected in big tanks, but the villages have not yet taken for drinking purposes on account of financial difficulties. I may submit here that this tract suffers more from the shortage of drinking water than any other part of that country. Most of the villages have to depend on filthy tanks and sometimes they go without water altogether if monsoon is not sufficient, and, then, they have to bring water from long distances from the river. This scheme had to serve, a double purpose, *i.e.*, that the spring would not affect adversely the tract in question, while sweet water could be brought for drinking purposes for the different villages in the Thal. Another scheme which was considered, and I had great hopes that it would be completed, was to bring down water for the Pind Dadan Khan town. That town suffered immensely on account of practically no water-supply. Government seemed inclined then to sanction it for the Pind Dadan Khan town and also to save the eastern tract of that tahsil from its bad effect. I am sorry to say that it has not yet been completed for reasons not known to me. The third scheme which the Punjab Government in my time considered was to open a new canal from the Jhelum river to irrigate this tract and naturally this would have reclaimed the saltpetre tract; but the Irrigation Report did not support it for insufficient returns. Though I am not prepared to support a censure motion but I fully agree with the Honourable the Mover that something should be done for this tract. It is a very unfortunate tract on account of nature's unkindness, but there may be some scheme to disallow springs bringing down saltish water. If some action in this connection is successful, this poor tract may prosper again.

Nawab Sahibzada Sir Sayad Muhammad Mehr Shah (North Punjab: Muhammadan): Sir*, I am glad that instead of speaking in a foreign tongue, I rise to speak in my own language, and in this respect at least I happen to be even more Swadeshi-minded than my Congress brethren. The motion put before you by my Honourable friend, Mr. Piracha, relates to that part of the Punjab to which I myself belong, and I have personal knowledge of the distress and difficulties of the people concerned. I, therefore, consider it my duty to bring to the notice of the Honourable Members and the Government the grievances of those poor zamindars who have lost their fields, their landed property and even the houses in which they lived, as a result of the operations of the Salt Range generally and of the Khewra Mines particularly. The people of the locality are extremely peace-loving and loyal. It is for this reason that up to this day they never made any agitation, but have rather been passing their time in the hope that Government might one day turn their attention to their distress.

The locality, Sir, is one where, not long ago, there were green fields all over, and gardens yielded every kind of fruit. But if you looked at it now, you would find it all barren, not even a blade of grass would be

*English translation of the speech delivered in the vernacular.

seen growing. The water in wells, which once fertilised fields, is today as bitter as poison, and people cannot find water even to drink. It is no exaggeration to say that for the major part of the year women bring water from as far away as six or seven miles from the river Jhelum. The chief town of the locality is Pind Dadan Khan which is only four miles from the Khewra Mines. This town is in ruins today and its population of 30,000 has now dwindled down to only 8,000 people. The income earned by Government from the Khewra Mines stands approximately at half a crore of rupees annually. While Government are gaining so much from the Salt Range, is it not their duty to spend a few lakhs on some useful scheme which would keep these people alive and save them from the present process of destruction?

Sir, if Government really have sympathy for the zamindars, then surely measures can be found for these poor people to prosper. My Honourable friend in the Council of State, Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan, when in the Assembly, had invited the attention of the Government to this important matter, but I notice that nothing practically has since been done by Government. I would, therefore, request the Government immediately to appoint a committee from amongst the elected Members of the Central Legislature with an officer or two from the Punjab Government and the Honourable the Finance Member as its President to go into the matter. The Honourable the Finance Member, by making a provision of a crore of rupees for rural re-construction, has given proof of the fact that he has every sympathy for the rural population, and I trust he would accept my suggestion. Should Government agree to appoint a committee, I would advise my Honourable friend, Mr. Piracha, to withdraw his motion and would request Honourable Members to let him do so. Else, all Honourable Members, I believe, would support his motion.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: Sir, coming as I do from the Jhelum district where these mines are situated I know fully what damage is being done to the cultivators' land near this Salt Range. The details of this question have been discussed fully and my friend, Mr. Joshi, is keen to move his cut motion. I know what the Government's difficulty is in meeting these demands of these people from the Salt Range, but if the suggestions were invited, I would venture to make a suggestion to the Honourable the Finance Member, that directly this Assembly Session is finished he should go himself and see the Salt Range with his own eyes: I cannot draw a picture of the desert before this House, but it is much better for him to see the land himself and then consult the Local Government. I have got another concrete suggestion for the Honourable the Finance Member. That after consulting the Local Government he should set aside three pies per maund of salt exported from the Jhelum district, this will give us roughly Rs. 40,000 and this sum should be put annually at the disposal of the district board who could spend this money in making roads and spreading education among the people of the Salt Range. (Interruption.) Land is a very extensive question, and, as my Honourable friend, Nawab Mehr Shah, has suggested, a committee should be appointed to go into the matter. The question under discussion can be easily settled if the Honourable the Finance Member, after consulting with the Local Government, simply sets aside three pies per maund on the salt which is exported from the Jhelum district, and this sum could be utilised by the district board for the benefit of those cultivators who have suffered by the Khewra Mines.

Some Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): Sir, it is really very refreshing that when once in a blue moon a cut is given by a Nominated Member or a quasi-Nominated Member . . . .

An Honourable Member: He is an elected Member.

Sardar Sant Singh: . . . . or even by an elected Member, a habitual supporter of the Government, we find that their head pulls one way while their loyalty to Government pulls them the other way. They cannot have the courage to tell the Government what the facts are or what remedy they suggest in order to remove the grievances.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) resumed the Chair.]

They have the courage to speak out their minds about the grievances of the people, but when they come to suggest remedies, they come down from their high pedestal, which a cut motion involves, to the making of requests to the Government to do this and to do that. I do not propose to look at this question from that point of view. I quite admit, Sir, that my friend, Mr. Alla Baksh Khan Tiwana, has been in that Range as a sub-divisional officer, and that the direct first hand knowledge he possesses about the conditions prevailing there far surpasses the knowledge that I may claim to possess, but, all the same, I have not been able to understand what he meant when he said that though several schemes were prepared to remove the grievances, none of these schemes materialised and the grievances have remained as before. I understand, Sir, that this question was first raised in this House in 1927, again it was agitated in 1930. At that time assurances were given by the Government that the question would be sympathetically considered. But what do we find after eight years? Not a committee has been appointed, nor any inquiry made into the grievances, and the grievances have remained the same as before. As far as I could gather, the people of that place have two grievances, one is that saltish water of Khewra Mines is pumped out and thrown out indiscriminately, with the result that it spreads upon the culturable lands and makes those lands unculturable. The second is that the refuse of salt is taken out of the mines and thrown on the sides of the hillocks there, with the result that, when the monsoon breaks out, the rain water spreads over this saltish refuse and works havoc on the culturable lands of the neighbouring fields. These are the two simple complaints which the Department could easily remedy if they only looked into the matter sympathetically. I do not deny the utility or the benefit the Salt Range confers upon the Punjab as a whole, and on that district in particular, but my complaint is that even in working a good department the public servants work in such a manner as to cause the greatest inconvenience to the persons living there. There can be no doubt that the town of Pind Dadan Khan was a great centre of trade, and it was a thickly populated town with many industries flourishing in it, but today that town is in ruins. This fact has been admitted by the various speakers who have half-heartedly supported this motion. Why then steps are not taken to remedy these grievances?

Lastly, Sir, I should like to say that the area affected by the careless administration of the Khewra Mines is within my constituency, and I consider it my duty to bring the grievances of my Muslim countrymen to

the notice of the authorities. Sir, the fact that the sufferers are my Muslim brethren does not affect me the least. My duty towards them is, on that account, not the less, if not greater, than if the sufferers had been my co-religionists. I hope the House will not look upon this question, though it affects a very small area, from a narrow point of view, as, to my very great regret, was done by some of the Honourable Members of the House, the other day, when they walked with the Government into their lobby, probably against their better judgment, because the Deputy Leader of my Party referred to the grievances in connection with the Communal Award in his speech on a cut the other day. Sir, I carefully read the statement issued by some of these gentlemen justifying their conduct on that occasion. I must say, they are the masters of their own actions, Sir, and these Honourable Members are at full liberty to act in a manner best suited to their interests, but I beg of them to concede the same liberty to our Party. Sir, I wish, with your permission, to conclude by saying that our duty towards our countrymen should transcend. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is the Honourable Member discussing the motion before the House?

Sardar Sant Singh: Yes, Sir, I am supporting it. I am adding salt to the salt motion.

Our duty towards our countrymen should transcend our personal vanities, likes or dislikes. In the performance of that duty alone, we can succeed in raising the morale of the public outside this House. Sir, the grievance is a grievance, whether the persons affected happen to be Hindus, Muslims, Anglo-Indians or even the Sikhs. We are here to work for all and to serve all. Sir, I support the motion.

Several Honourable Members: Sir, the question may now be put.

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah (Sind Jagirdars and Zamindars: Landholders): Sir, I think, as a representative of the zamindars, I shall be failing in my duty if I do not support this Resolution, after hearing the elected Members as well as the Nominated Member from that part of the country. All the motion asks for is a Committee. Now, it has been clearly proved to the satisfaction of this House that these mines have damaged the fertile lands of the people inhabiting the neighbouring areas, and they cannot get even drinking water, so much so that most people are leaving the village, which was at one time a great trading centre, as was pointed out by the last speaker, and the population which was at one time about 30,000 has dwindled down to 3,000. That is an admitted fact. Even the Government Benches cannot deny that fact . . . .

Khan Bahadur Mian Abdul Aziz (Punjab: Nominated Official): The decline in the population of Pind Dadan Khan has nothing to do with the question.

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah: I am sorry for my friend the Commissioner. When the people cannot bear the sufferings, they naturally leave the place. Why do they leave their villages? Because of their sufferings.

Khan Bahadur Mian Abdul Aziz: Trade diversion.

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah: I heard the speech of the official or Nominated Member, who by his halting admissions supported the statements of the elected Members. It has been admitted by the Nominated Member that the evil is there, and these mines are the contributory cause of that evil. Therefore, from what has been said so far by Honourable Members, I think a case has been made out for the appointment of a Committee to go into the whole question, in response to the demands made by the most loyal zamindars of the Punjab, who have been supporting the Government both inside and outside this House. (Hear, hear.) And I trust all sections of this House will support this small motion to show that they are always ready to support any reasonable demands.

Mr. A. J. Raisman (Government of India: Nominated Official): Sir, there are many curious reasons for which Honourable Members of this House think that Government deserves to be censured, but this is the first occasion on which the natural configuration of India has served as a whipping block for Government. The mountains which are known as the Salt Range have been in existence in the Punjab for a considerable time, and it has also, as far as I am aware, been the habit of the climate for rain to descend periodically and for that water to dissolve a certain amount of salt which exists in the soil and carry it down to the fields below. About twenty-five years or more ago the effect of this salinification of the soil became more marked, but nobody has yet discovered why or how it works or what exactly is the cause. But there is one thing which I can assure this House, and that is, that my Honourable friend, Mr. Sant Singh's statement that there were two simple reasons for all that has happened and that they are both connected with the Khewra mines, is based on a theory which is certainly untrue. The amount of water which actually passes over the Khewra mine is an infinitesimal fraction of the salt water which damages the lands in question. And as for the dumps, they are an even more infinitesimal faction of the salt over which the water passes and carries brine into the agricultural lands. Several Honourable Members have alluded to the fact that this question was previously discussed in this House and that undertakings were given by Government. I do not deny that for a moment; on the contrary, I shall be very glad to draw the attention of these Honourable Members to the history of this case which is associated with the activities, the perfectly legitimate desire of Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan, to bring this matter to the notice of Government. In 1927, that Honourable gentleman, who is now a Member of the Council of State, was a Member of this House and he represented two matters connected with the Khewra mines to Government. One was the grievances of the miners employed in the mines and the other was the question of damage done to agricultural lands. Government proceeded to appoint a committee—and there is a moral to this, because more than once has a committee or conference been held on this particular subject. The Government proceeded to appoint a committee which included, I may say, not merely the Honourable gentleman who had raised the question, but also several officials who had considerable local knowledge. They went into the matters which had been raised with considerable care, and at lunch time today, which was the first occasion on which I became acquainted with this particular subject, I read, amongst other things, the results of the discussion of that conference. In

a note consisting of some 14 paragraphs, the one which deals with agricultural land and the damage caused by salt, says, this subject was mentioned but was not pressed. I leave it to the House to judge as to the extent to which it was then felt to be an urgent public grievance. In 1930 the same gentleman moved a cut motion at the time of the budget, and this time he drew the attention of the Government solely to this particular question. On this the Finance Member, Sir George Schuster, gave an undertaking to look into the matter and to have a conference to discuss what could be done. As a result of that, the Government of India took steps to consult the Government of the Punjab and to endeavour to arrange for a discussion amongst officers who had local experience and were able to speak on this question. It was naturally desired that Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan should be present at that conference in order to press the point of view which he had put forward. There was some difficulty in getting that conference together, but the last thing that happened, I may say, was this. The Commissioner for the Division in which the Jhelum District is situated was then Mr. F. L. Brayne, and he was, unfortunately, unable to come to this meeting because he had other more urgent work. Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan, on being informed that Mr. Brayne was not able to attend this meeting, for some reason, chose to drop the whole matter. The Government of the Punjab had nominated and were prepared to send other officers who also had considerable familiarity with the question, but the Honourable Member who had moved the cut motion at the time of the budget was not, I suggest, sufficiently interested in this matter to carry on the proceedings, because a particular officer could not be present although officers who, in the opinion of the Government of the Punjab, were fully capable to discuss the matter, were available and could be sent. That, Sir, happened in 1930. I have no doubt that the Honourable gentleman who was at the back of this movement had very important pre-occupations between 1930 and the present time, but the fact remains that it was not until a few days ago that this subject was again raised or brought to the notice of the Government in any way. I do not suggest that, because this is the history of the matter nothing should be done. Far from it. I am only concerned to indicate that if this question has been previously brought before the Government and if it has not been proceeded with or has not led to any result, that is not primarily the fault of the Government.

Coming to the merits of the subject, we have, again, in connection with the last occasion, a few days ago, on which the matter was brought to our notice,—we have communicated with the Punjab Government. It is quite clear that, unless the damage done to these lands is a result of any carelessness or anything connected with the actual working of the Khewra mines, it is not primarily a matter for the Central Government. The fact that owing to any natural causes the local agricultural land is undergoing a process of deterioration is not a matter which directly concerns the Central Government, and although the subject has not been fully investigated, we strongly incline to the opinion that the damage, if any, contributed by the Khewra mine itself is only a very small fraction of the whole damage.

5 P.M.

Now, what the Government of the Punjab proposes to do is to have an expert investigation of the matter and I suggest, that until an expert investigation has been made it is quite useless, with all respect to Honourable Members of this House, for a number of Honourable Members to

[Mr. A. J. Raisman.]

come together and talk about Pind Dadan Khan or the Jhelum district or the Khewra mine. The question will remain at the end 'what are you going to do about it', and if you do not actually know what is happening, it seems to me it is going to be extremely difficult to decide what you are going to do about it. It has been suggested, and I am afraid that here my Honourable friend, Captain Sher Muhammad Khan, showed what I might call the cloven hoof, that a certain amount of money should be paid to somebody. I am not quite clear how that is going to solve the problem or exactly how that comes into the picture. It is said that the Central Government makes a large amount of money out of the salt mines in the Jhelum district. Well, the Central Government can obtain salt from other sources and the money which the Central Government obtains has nothing to do with the Jhelum district. It is obtained from the consumers of salt by way of duty. There is no profit to Government in the manufacture of salt. As members of the Standing Finance Committee know, the salt is sold at a price which is only intended to recover the average cost of production, so that we cannot admit that the Jhelum district has a particular claim to receive alms from the Central Government because a certain amount of duty is levied on the salt mines there. Now, the suggestion was made that so many pies per maund—three pies per maund I think it was— . . . . .

An Honourable Member: Only three pies!

Mr. A. J. Raisman . . . . should be handed over to the Jhelum District Board. By the way, I am not aware that the Jhelum District Board is the owner of all this agricultural land which has been damaged. However, the Jhelum District Board will be in the position of *tertius gaudens* as far as I can see. The Central Government would hand over some money, the local zamindars would sit on their damaged land and the Jhelum District Board would show a very handsome surplus! I must say that that kind of financial arrangement does not seem to carry any particular equity with it, nor do I see how the Jhelum District Board, having got its three pies, would proceed to rehabilitate the land or to stop the rain from falling on the Salt Range, dissolving the salt and continuing to run down to the lands below. Sir, I do not wish to suggest that we are unsympathetic to what has been happening in Pind Dadan Khan: I feel that it is within local knowledge—I am myself not a local expert—that the decadence of that historic village is not attributable entirely to the droppings of the Salt Range I believe that owing to the construction of the railway line which now passes in that locality, trade was diverted and Pind Dadan Khan like many other places has found itself high and dry and left aside by the main stream of trade. One has, I believe, only to look at Pind Dadan Khan to see that that is what is happening. It is not merely the outcroppings of salt or the salt of the brine carried down from the hills that has killed Pind Dadan Khan. I was saying we are not unsympathetic. It will naturally be said "what do Government propose to do"? Well, Sir, we have addressed the Punjab Government again in this matter, and I trust, that the Honourable gentleman who has seized this occasion to bring it forward will not, in a few weeks' time, forget all about it and then say that Government have done nothing. We have asked the Punjab Government and the Punjab Government have said that they are now investigating the desirability of putting an expert on special duty to ascertain the cause of

salinification. I suggest that when the report of that expert has been received then will be the time for my Honourable friend to meet with Members of the Government of India and to consider the facts as reported and to make suggestions. Might I, in this connection, point out, while I am on this subject, that the existence of Khewra Mines in the Jhelum district cannot be regarded as an unmixed calamity for that district. I would point out that we employ a few thousand miners there and that the income which goes into that district by way of wages and so on is probably considerably higher than the incomes which accrue in any comparable area in the neighbouring district. However, that is by the way. I merely wished to indicate the other side of the picture. With all sympathy for the grievances of the zamindars, I suggest that until we have collected facts which will enable us to approach this in a practical manner it would not be suitable to have a committee and discuss the thing in the kind of debating society way in which it would naturally be discussed. For these reasons, I trust that the Honourable Member who has moved this motion will realise that Government are prepared to take up the matter in any way which is likely to lead to a useful result and will not press his motion.

Khan Sahib Shaikh Fazl-i-Haq Piracha: I am very thankful to the Honourable Members who have supported this motion, especially Nawab Allah Bakhsh Khan, who, in a very clear way, explained the state of affairs in and about Khewra and pointed out that on account of the water mixed with salt coming out of the springs in the Salt Range, the lands in the neighbourhood are damaged. This shows that some action or other must be taken by the Government to save the poor people of that locality. Mr. Raisman has narrated the history of this case from the last 25 years. I am sorry he has not been able to show what practical steps the Government took in meeting the grievances of the people of that locality. What was the result of those inquiries? He has simply stated that he has got a note of 14 paragraphs and has not given us the substance of it. And what was the result of the inquiries and what action did the Government take? In my opinion, the Government Member has not satisfied me or any other Member of this House either I am not, therefore, prepared to withdraw my motion.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Salt' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was adopted. (Applause.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The next motion stands in the name of Mr. Joshi, but the Chair does not think there is sufficient time to take up this motion. Before the House is adjourned, the Chair wishes to ask the Honourable Members that, as regards the proposal that the 15th should be a holiday and that the 18th should be a working day of the Assembly, the Chair should get information as to what is the decision arrived at by the different Groups concerned by noon on Monday next; otherwise it will be difficult for the office to arrange the order papers, etc.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 11th March, 1935.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 11th March, 1935.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair

MEMBERS SWORN.

Mr. Girja Shankar Bajpai, C.I.E., C.B.E., M.L.A. (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands); and

Mr. Alan Hubert Lloyd, C.S.I., C.I.E., M.L.A. (Government of India: Nominated Official).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

PLACES CONNECTED BY TRUNK TELEPHONES IN INDIA AND IN THE MADRAS PRESIDENCY.

793. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state how many places have been connected by trunk telephones so far in India and in the Madras Presidency?

(b) What other places do Government contemplate connecting in India and in the Madras Presidency?

(c) What amount of money has been spent so far on the construction of trunk telephones?

(d) How much more do Government propose to spend in the future?

(e) Is the installation of the trunk telephones done departmentally, or through contractors? If the latter, will Government be pleased to state who the contractors were and by whom they were appointed?

(f) Are the wiring and other materials used purchased in India or in foreign countries? If the latter, in what country?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) 178 of which 19 are in the Madras Presidency.

(b) I lay on the table a statement giving the information required by the Honourable Member.

(c) Trunk telephones are provided by utilising telegraph plan to the fullest extent possible, the wires being thereafter utilised jointly for telegraph and telephone purposes. It is regretted, therefore, that it is not possible to state the amount so far spent on the construction of trunk telephones.

(d) With a rapidly expanding business of this kind it is not possible to say how much Government will spend on trunks in future. The cost of the telephone programme for 1935-36, approved by the Standing

Finance Committee of the Legislative Assembly at their meeting of February 1st, 1935, is estimated at about Rs. 37 lakhs of which about Rs. 20 lakhs is on account of telephone trunks.

(e) The installation of trunk telephones is done departmentally except in the case of proprietary articles in which case all the firms manufacturing such apparatus are invited to tender for the supply and installation of the plant in accordance with the Stores Purchase Rules. The firms whose tenders have been accepted by the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, up till now, are Messrs. Siemens Brothers (India), the Indian Radio and Cable Communications Company and Messrs. Standard Telephones and Cables, Limited.

(f) The wiring and other materials are purchased in India. The second part does not, therefore, arise.

Statement of places proposed to be connected by Trunks in the Madras Presidency before March, 1936.

1. Rajahmundry.
2. Ellore.
3. Gudivada.
4. Narasaravupet.
5. Arkonam.
6. Conjeevaram.
7. Vellore.
8. Bangalore.
9. Katpadi.
10. Cuddalore.
11. Kumbakonam.
12. Negapatam.
13. Virudhunagar.
14. Trichur.
15. Pollachi.
16. Mettupalayam.
17. Tellicherry.
18. Cannanore.
19. Mangalore.
20. Salem.

Statement of places proposed to be connected by Trunks in other parts of India excluding the Madras Presidency.

1. Shahdara.
2. Badamibagh.
3. Tandhianwala.
4. Tobateksingh.
5. Gidderbaha.
6. Jagadhri.
7. Karnal.
8. Shamli.
9. Khatauli.
10. Gurgaon.
11. Bhiwani.
12. Hissar.
13. Khurja.
14. Chandausi.
15. Kasganj.
16. Pilibhit.
17. Etawah.
18. Shahjahanpur.
19. Sitapur.
20. Barabanki.
21. Gorakhpur.
22. Balrampur.
23. Gonda.
24. Basti.
25. Mirzapur.
26. Jalpaiguri.
27. Gauhati.
28. Mymensingh.
29. Chittagong.
30. Jamnagar.
31. Wadhwan.
32. Kalol.
33. Godhra.
34. Petlad.
35. Navsari.
36. Lonavla.
37. Nasik.
38. Jalgaon.
39. Dhond.
40. Gadag.
41. Hubli.
42. Dharwar.
43. Belgaum.
44. Satara.

Mr. B. Das: Why should not Government consider the allocation of capital expenditure according to the services rendered by the telegraph lines to telegraphs and telephones?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I pointed out that the telegraph wires are also used for trunk telephones. It is not possible, therefore, definitely to allocate the expenditure between the two branches.

Mr. B. Das: Why not allocate the expenditure proportionately?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The telephone branch pays the telegraph branch for the use of the wire. That seems sufficient.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know with reference to part (f) if these wiring and other materials are made in India or they are imported from outside and purchased in India?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think the position is that, except in the case of proprietary articles such as the actual telephones, the other apparatus, including the wires, are manufactured in this country.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Is there no factory here which makes 'phones?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I gather not at present.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Are Government prepared to reduce the rate of trunk call charges when they are making a profit from it?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: We have recently made some reduction and that quite a considerable reduction.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Among the companies mentioned in part (e), are there any Indian companies?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The Indian Radio and Cables Communications Company is an Indian company and Messrs. Siemens Brothers have an Indian branch.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: May I know if the introduction of this system is likely to be remunerative?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Yes, undoubtedly.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: In view of the profit in this direction and also to encourage the industries and commerce, will Government consider the desirability of further reducing the charges on telephone?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Yes, Sir, as the general financial position of the Department admits.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will the Honourable Member say whether the capital and management of the companies referred to in part (e) are Indian?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The Indian Radio and Cables Communications Company is, as I have said, definitely an Indian company. I think it has a majority of Indian Directors. I have no information as to the extent of capital held by Indians and others but I should have very little hesitation in saying that a majority of the capital is held by Indians. I have no particulars about the constitution of Messrs. Siemens Brothers.

DELIVERY OF LETTERS POSTED IN DELHI FOR MADRAS.

794. *Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: (a) Are Government aware that letters posted in Delhi for Madras are delivered on the fourth day, in spite of the train reaching Madras on the third day at 4-10 A.M.?

(b) Are Government prepared to arrange for the delivery of the letters in Madras on the same day?

(c) If it is not possible, are Government prepared to consider speeding up the Grand Trunk Express so as to reach Madras by 3 P.M. and arrange for delivery of letters in the evening?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a) Yes. Articles posted in Delhi in time to catch the Grand Trunk Express train, to which the Honourable Member is presumably referring and which leaves Delhi station at 5-10 P.M., are delivered at Madras in the early morning of the fourth day. The Grand Trunk Express train is due to reach Madras on the third day at 4-30 P.M. and not at 4-10 A.M., as stated by the Honourable Member.

(b) As the last delivery is issued from the Madras General Post Office at 4 P.M. and from town sub-offices between 3-45 P.M. and 4-45 P.M., it is not possible to make a delivery through postmen of the articles received by the Grand Trunk Express on the day of their arrival at Madras. A window delivery of these mails on the day of their arrival is, however, being arranged.

(c) The matter is under consideration.

Mr. F. E. James: May I ask whether he is aware of the fact that there is no such thing in Madras as delivery of the post in the early morning. The post is invariably delivered between 10 A.M. and 11 A.M., unless that is considered early morning?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: I am afraid I have not got exact information as to when the early morning delivery is made in Madras. If necessary, I shall obtain the information.

MR. MENON'S REPORT TO SAFEGUARD THE INDIAN INTERESTS IN ZANZIBAR.

795 *Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: (a) What action do Government propose to take on Menon's Report to safeguard the Indian interests in Zanzibar?

(b) Is it a fact that a few paragraphs in Menon's Report have been expunged?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state what subjects they relate to and why they were expunged?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to the statement on the subject made by His Excellency the Governor General in the course of his address on 24th January.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: Is the Honourable Member sure that no part of the report has been expunged?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I can give my Honourable friend an assurance based on personal editing of the report that not a comma or full-stop has been altered.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: Was the report submitted to the Government of India or to the Secretary of State in the first instance?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The report was made to the Government of India who deputed the officer to Zanzibar

Mr. B. Das: May I inquire if any further progress has been made since His Excellency made his statement in this House?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The position now has developed to this extent that we have now received not merely the comments of the Resident at Zanzibar, but also the comments of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. We hope to be able to convene a meeting of the Standing Emigration Committee on the 18th or 19th of this month to review the whole problem and advise us as to what the nature of our representations to the Colonial Office should be.

Mr. B. Das: May I inquire also if Government have applied pressure on the Colonial Secretary that Indian opinion feels very strongly on the Zanzibar question and the Colonial Secretary must take strong action?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The pressure of Indian opinion and the arguments of the Government of India is being consistently applied on the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Have the Government of India received any reply from the Secretary of State for the Colonies?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: That is what I said just now that we received a reply from the Secretary of State for the Colonies recently and are considering it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have the Colonial Government been asked to stay their hands, and not to carry out this policy till the Government of India make their representations?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: When the legislation was passed in July, we made a representation to the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the effect that no action be taken until the representations of the Government of India have been considered, but unfortunately that was not acceded to by the Colonial Office.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the Government of India renew their efforts in that direction, and see that the hands of the Colonial Office are stayed, till they have considered the Government of India's representations?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: From the practical point of view, the question now is not of immediate importance, because the operations of the Clove Growers' Association relates to the clove crop and the last crop is already on the market. The next crop does not come on the market until July.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In the meantime, will the Government of India take necessary steps to protect the interests of Indians before the next crop comes on?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I have informed my Honourable friend that we propose to convene a meeting of the Standing Emigration Committee within the next few days with a view to formulating our representation.

Maulana Shaukat Ali: May I ask if the Government of the Sultan of Zanzibar and the people there have been consulted in this connection?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: It is the Legislative Council of Zanzibar which passed the decrees.

EFFECTS OF THE FLOODS IN THE DISTRICTS OF NOWGONG AND SYLHET.

796. ***Mr. Basanta Kumar Das:** (a) Were the Government of India made aware by the Government of Assam of the effects of the floods in the districts of Nowgong and Sylhet during the last rains? If so, did Government receive, and are they still receiving, reports from time to time from the Government of Assam about the nature of the distress of the people caused by the said floods and also about the measures the said Government took for relieving the distress of the people?

(b) Have Government been made aware of by the Assam Government that acute distress is still prevailing in the flood-stricken areas and specially in the Habiganj Sub-division?

(c) Have Government been made aware by the Assam Government that there were reports of some deaths from starvation in the Sunamganj, Sadar and Habiganj sub-divisions of the district of Sylhet?

(d) Did Government of Assam apply to the Government of India for financial assistance for the relief of the distress of the flood-stricken people of Nowgong and Sylhet? If so, will Government please state the extent of the financial assistance, if any, granted to the Government of Assam by the Government of India?

(e) Are Government aware that the Government of Assam did not accept the survey reports of the various non-official relief organisations about the extent of the distress of the people due to floods, and are Government aware that there was a general complaint published in the newspapers of Calcutta and of Assam that the Government of Assam minimised the effects of the floods in Nowgong and Sylhet and that the relief that was granted to the people was very inadequate? If so, are Government prepared to make an enquiry into this complaint?

(f) Did the Government of Assam get any grant from the Government of India out of the Famine Insurance Fund in the years 1929 and 1934? If so, what was the sum received in each of these two years by the said Government?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a), (b), (c) and (e). The Honourable Member is referred to the answer given to Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury's short notice question on the 23rd July, 1934. The main piece of information received by the Government of India since has been that Rs. 49,000 was sanctioned for gratuitous relief in Nowgong and Rs. 30,000 in Sylhet, that construction of roads at a total estimated cost of Rs. 35,000 was taken up in Nowgong as a means of relief to the able-bodied, and that money was also placed at the disposal of Deputy Commissioners for distribution in agricultural loans, but the amount required for the purpose is not known.

(d) The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative. The second part does not arise.

(f) Famine relief being a provincial subject, the Government of India do not maintain any famine insurance fund.

Mr. Basanta Kumar Das: With regard to (b), are Government aware of any distress now prevailing in the district of Sylhet?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I have already informed my Honourable friend that we have had no further report from the Government of Assam as regards the prevalence of distress. The only report that we have had is as regards the steps taken to continue the relief work which was started in July.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In what circumstances and subject to what rules do the Government of India come to the rescue of the Local Governments in times of such local distress?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The rule of necessity, I take it, Sir.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Who manages the Famine Insurance Trust?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I have informed the House that as famine relief is a provincial subject, the Government of India do not maintain any famine insurance fund. There is a people's famine fund which is an entirely separate and independent organisation, and that organisation did make a grant of 1½ lakhs of rupees to the Government of Assam for this particular distress.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do the Government of India pay anything to that trust?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: No, Sir; the Government of India do not pay any money to that trust.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Have the Government of India any voice in the management of that trust?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Not as the Government of India.

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi: Have the Government of India received any report regarding the state of crops in the affected areas now after the flood?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: No, Sir; we have not had any recent report as regards the state of crops in the affected areas, but if my Honourable friend would like to have information on the subject, I will obtain it.

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi: Are loans granted to the people whose crops and households have been damaged by the floods?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The Government of Assam at the time sanctioned something like a lakh of rupees for the grant of loans to the *raiyats* for purchase of seed and for purchase of cattle. Their estimate was that they might have to spend as much as four lakhs. What actually they have spent I am not in a position to say.

REPORT OF THE ASSAM FLOOD ENQUIRY COMMITTEE.

797. ***Mr. Basanta Kumar Das:** (a) Did Government receive any copy of the report of the Assam Flood Enquiry Committee that was appointed in pursuance of a resolution of the Assam Legislative Council in its September Session of 1929?

(b) Is it not a fact that one of the main points of enquiry was how far the railway alignment of the Sylhet-Kulaura Branch of the Assam Bengal Railway was responsible for the inundation of a considerable tract of land between Fenchuganj and Sylhet town during rains, causing every year a failure of crops in that area? If so, will Government be pleased to state what were the findings and recommendations of the Enquiry Committee on that point?

(c) Did the Assam Bengal Railway Company take any action in carrying out the recommendations of the Enquiry Committee on the said point? If so, will Government be pleased to state when and how these recommendations were given effect to by the Assam Bengal Railway?

(d) Are Government prepared to enquire if the railway alignment between Sylhet and Fenchuganj is still the cause of the failure of paddy crops in a considerable area of land between Fenchuganj and Sylhet?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Yes.

(b) Yes. It was one of the points of enquiry; but the contention that a failure of crops was caused every year does not appear to have been generally accepted. The Committee agreed that the provision of more waterways in the bank, along the section Fenchuganj to mile 236, was a matter for further examination and that additional openings should be given to drain the area round about miles 230-232 of the Kulaura-Sylhet Branch, the size of the openings required to be worked out after a detailed examination.

(c) I will obtain the information required from the Assam Bengal Railway and shall lay a statement on the table when it is received.

(d) Government have no reason to believe that this is the case, but are making enquiries.

Mr. Basanta Kumar Das: How long will the railway take to open up further passages for water?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for the information from the Assam Bengal Railway. I have not got it at the present moment.

Mr. B. Das: With reference to part (b), will the Honourable Member kindly state whether he did or did not accept the finding that railway alignment was not responsible for the floods? And does the Honourable Member bear in mind the report of one of the former Railway Chief Engineers, Mr. Rallia Ram that railway embankments are responsible for a good deal of floods in Bengal, Assam and Orissa?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I do not remember to have seen any statement from the Chief Engineer whom my Honourable friend quotes to that effect.

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi: Are Government taking any steps to have more waterways on the Assam Bengal Railway on the Nowgong section and between Chaparmukh and Silghat stations, because that is the part most affected on account of there being no waterways?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I shall call for a report from the Assam Bengal Railway on that point also.

CIRCULARS ISSUED TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS REGARDING TOURS OF DISTRICT OFFICERS.

798. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will the Honourable the Home Member be pleased to state:

(a) whether any circular to the Local Governments, asking them to impress on District Officers the need for touring in the districts, specially in out of the way places, was issued by the Government of India from the year 1931 to the end of 1934, except the circular referring to Mahatma Gandhi's Village Industries Association;

(b) if so, the date or dates of such circular or circulars; and

(c) whether it is not a fact that the above mentioned circular was the only circular on this matter issued in recent years by the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a), (b) and (c). I cannot trace any letter to Local Governments dealing specifically with the question of touring by district officers. But the necessity of effective touring has, so far as I am aware, been frequently impressed upon district officers by the Local Governments, and such instructions have the full support of the Government of India.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it, therefore, that, so far as the Government of India are concerned, this is the very first circular on this matter?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I said I cannot trace any letter, but letters are not tabulated under the heading of "Touring", and so possibly there may have been some letter which I have been unable to trace. But anyhow I have not traced any letter since the date mentioned in the question, that is, 1931.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Therefore, may I take it that Mahatma Gandhi's statement about forming the Village Industries Association was the first occasion, to the best of the Honourable Member's knowledge, on which

the Government of India issued a circular, asking the Local Governments to direct their officers to go to out-of-the-way places, and get into contact with the villagers in those places?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: As I explained, Local Governments have frequently impressed upon their officers the necessity of touring. The question of touring by district officers is a matter mainly for the Local Government.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Are the Government of India aware of the fact that a Minister of the Madras Government, Diwan Bahadur Kumaraswami Reddiar, has stated in a speech of his that he has already issued the necessary instructions to all the local officers and District Collectors that effect should be given to this Hallett circular?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, I am not aware of that.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will the Honourable Member make inquiries and ascertain if it is a fact or not?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, I will.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it, therefore, that so far as the Government of India can give any information to the House now on the materials with them, but for the one about Mahatma Gandhi's forming this Village Industries Association, there is no other circular?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) That question has been answered.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do the Government of India propose . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

IMPORT OF JAPANESE TILES INTO INDIA.

799. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the Honourable the Commerce Member be pleased to state:

(a) whether any Japanese tiles have been imported into India up to date since the beginning of last year;

(b) if so, the prices of such tiles compared with Indian tiles; and

(c) whether Government propose to take any action in the matter?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) to (c). Information is being collected and will be laid on the table in due course. Government will also review the position in the light of that information.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: When?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: As soon as it is received.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will it be before the danger to the tile industry becomes serious?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I am not aware that there is any danger at the present moment to the tile industry.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has the Honourable the Commerce Member examined any materials, before coming to that conclusion?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I can reply definitely to the Honourable Member and tell him that, to the best of my recollection, we have received no representations on that point.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Have the Government of India received any report from the Madras Government regarding the imports of Japanese tiles?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Not to the best of my recollection.

NON-RECOGNITION OF THE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION OF THE INDIAN WOMEN'S UNIVERSITY, POONA.

800. ***Mr. M. S. Aney:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the Nagpur University submitted to the Government of India for sanction any recommendation for the recognition of the Entrance Examination of the S. N. D. T. Indian Women's University, Poona, as equivalent to the Central Provinces High School Certificate Examination?

(b) Is it a fact that the Academic Council and the Executive Council were unanimous in making the above recommendation?

(c) Will Government be pleased to inform this House whether the above recommendation is approved by the Government of India? If not, why not?

(d) Are Government aware of the fact that the rejection of the above recommendation will virtually result in the denial of collegiate education to a considerable number of girls in Central Provinces and Berar, who are studying in the High Schools affiliated to the above S. N. D. T. Indian University and thus adversely affect the progress of higher education of girls in the Central Provinces and Berar?

(e) Will Government be pleased to state whether in the interest of the cause of female education, they propose to reconsider the question, in the case the above recommendation has already been rejected by them?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) The recommendation of the Nagpur University was not accepted by the Government of India as the "Entrance" examination of the Indian Women's University, Poona, is not recognised either by the Government of Bombay or by the Bombay University as equivalent to the Matriculation Examination of the Bombay University. In fact the standard is said to be lower than that of the Bombay Matricualtion Examination.

(d) If girls in the schools in question desire to proceed to the Nagpur University, the authorities of the schools are at liberty to seek association with the appropriate authority in the Central Provinces.

(e) For the reasons mentioned in reply to part (c) above, Government regret their inability to re-consider the question.

Mr. M. S. Aney: The Central Provinces High School Certificate Examination is equivalent to the Entrance Examination of the S. N. D. T. Indian Women's University, is the conclusion of the Nagpur University. May I ask, on what ground does the Honourable Member challenge that conclusion?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The Honourable Member might be interested to hear that on receipt of the communication of the Government of the Central Provinces, which was against acceptance of the recommendation of the Nagpur University, the Government of India asked for a copy of the deliberations of the academic body concerned. They found that the academic body concerned had agreed to accept the Entrance Examination of the University mentioned as equivalent to the Matriculation or the highest standard examination of the Nagpur University on the statement of the University authorities in Poona that the Government of Bombay accepted the Matriculation Examination as equivalent to theirs: then an inquiry was made from the Bombay University, and they said it is not so: on the contrary, the Entrance Examination of the University is definitely on a lower standard.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Is it not a fact that the Entrance Examination of the Indian Women's University at Poona has been recognised for certain purposes as equivalent to the Matriculation Examination, for example, for the purpose of admitting candidates to the Secondary Teacher's Examination in Bombay?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: On that point also we made an inquiry from the Government of Bombay, and the report of the Director of Public Instruction was that only in individual cases had permission been given for appearing at this examination, and that generally the standard was not accepted as equivalent.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Have the Government of India sent for the curriculum of studies of both these examinations and compared them?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The Government of India have information as regards the curricula of those examinations: but my Honourable friend will agree that it is not merely on the paper examination of subjects that one can decide whether the standards are equivalent or not.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Do the Government of India mean to say that those who were responsible for the decision of the Nagpur University were not competent to come to any conclusions on this point?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I am not submitting that at all. What I am submitting is that the University of Nagpur came to what we consider to be a wrong conclusion based on incomplete information.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Was that the sole reason or one of the reasons?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: No: that is the sole reason: we are merely concerned with the equivalence of educational standards: there is absolutely no other consideration present in the mind of the Government at all, and if this University can satisfy the University of Bombay of the equivalence of its standards, I can assure my Honourable friend that we will reconsider the matter.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Is it not a fact that Government have got a certain bias or prejudice against a non-statutory body?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: No.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Is not that fact mentioned in its letter to the Nagpur University?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: We have not said in our letter to the University of Nagpur or, for that matter, to anybody, that because this University is a non-statutory University, therefore we are not going to recognise its examination as equivalent to other University examinations.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Will the Government of India be pleased to publish the whole of the letter addressed to the Nagpur University on this point?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I shall consider that suggestion, certainly.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it that the Government of India, therefore, have not examined the equivalence of the standards of these examinations of the Women's University and the Central Provinces High School Certificate Examination?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The Government of India have no machinery for the purpose of examining the equivalence of standards—they can send down the Educational Commissioner to attend the examinations and then report to them; but it seems to be an unnecessary procedure in this particular case, because it is open to the University in Poona to get recognition by the University of Bombay.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: But what about the Nagpur University? Why is not the Nagpur University allowed to set its own standards of admission? What are the reasons on which the Government of India have interfered with the academic freedom of the Nagpur University, which has agreed to accept this examination?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: We are not in any way disputing the freedom of the Nagpur University to determine its own standards of examination: but, as I have already explained to this House, our opinion is that in this particular case the Nagpur University had incomplete information. It was told that the University of Bombay and the Government of Bombay had accepted the entrance examination as equivalent to the Matriculation Examination: on the other hand, the report of the Government of Bombay is that neither they nor the University of Bombay had accepted it as equivalent.

Mr. M. S. Aney: May I ask whether, on receiving information from the Bombay Government and the Bombay University, they referred this point to the Nagpur University once more for their explanation, before they came to their conclusions?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: It was not necessary to refer that letter to the University of Nagpur. The Government of India, on the basis of material facts before them, came to the conclusion, and they reported that conclusion to the University of Nagpur. There is nothing to prevent the Nagpur University from approaching the Government of India again.

FRANCHISE FOR NON-CEYLONESE RESIDENTS IN CEYLON.

801. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that in the case of non-Ceylonese residents in Ceylon, the franchise is limited by the application of (i) a literacy test, as a result of which proficiency in Indian vernaculars (barring Tamil which is recognised as a vernacular of Ceylon) does not qualify one for the vote, while a smattering of English does, and (ii) an income test which nearly 95 per cent. of the Indians in Ceylon are unable to satisfy?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: No, Sir.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Have Government taken any action on the Resolution passed by this Assembly in 1930 on the motion of Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: As a matter of fact, it was in consequence of the action taken by the Government of India on the Resolution passed by this House that the Secretary of State for the Colonies revised the original terms of the Order in Council so as to make five years' residence with declaration of intention to reside in the Island sufficient for eligibility for the vote.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: What about the literacy test?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: This is only an alternative test: that is to say, for those people who do not qualify residentially they may seek election under this.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Am I to understand that people who do not reside there for five years but who are literate are eligible for votes?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: There are two qualifications—they are alternative to each other. One is the residential qualification: five years' residence and intention to continue to reside in the island permanently or indefinitely. The other is the possession of a literacy qualification coupled with a property qualification. These are the two qualifications.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Even if they do not reside?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: That is so.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Regarding the literacy qualification, is it not a fact that there are a large number of Telugus in Ceylon and they do not have the advantage of satisfying this literacy test, as the only recognised vernacular of Ceylon is Tamil?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: We have had no representations on that subject from anybody in Ceylon.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: May I know, Sir, if the income test is the same for the Ceylonese as it is for Indians?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: It is a general test; it applies to everybody equally.

DISCHARGE OF INDIANS IN CEYLON.

802. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Is it a fact that a certain Ceylon Local Board discharged without grant of pension or gratuity, 180 Indians who had been employed under it for a considerable length of time, and that other cases of the same nature have happened not only in Local Boards but in other departments of Government as well?

(b) Is it a fact that representations were made to the Director of Education in 1931 on behalf of some Indian teachers against an Assistant Inspector of Schools who had shown pronounced anti-Indian bias, and that no enquiry was held?

(c) How many Indian teachers employed in Ceylon have had to leave service since 1930?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) In 1931 the Urban District Council, Moratuwa, decided as a measure of economy, to have the work of scavenging and road-sweeping done on contract and as a result discharged 180 labourers. They were not given any gratuity because they were not eligible for it. Government are not aware of any other case of that nature.

(b) In 1930, representations were made to the Agent of the Government of India in Ceylon alleging that a District Inspector of Schools had shown bias against certain Indian teachers employed at Jaffna, which were brought to the notice of the Government of Ceylon. The Director of Education enquired into the allegation and found it groundless. The Government of India are not aware whether any representations were also made to the Director of Education direct.

(c) Government have no information; but have made inquiries.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is it not a fact, Sir, that the person who was asked to inquire was the same person against whom allegations were made? I have the facts before me.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Well, Sir, I have no further information that I can give to the House. If my Honourable friend is in possession of any facts which give rise to the thought that the inquiry was incomplete, I shall be glad to communicate the facts to the Agent of the Government of India in Ceylon for such action as he may desire to take.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will the Honourable Member try and ascertain the number of Indian teachers employed in Ceylon who have had to leave that service in 1930?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Well, Sir, I can assure my friend that if any attempt at racial displacement of any section of Indian teachers or others had been attempted, the Agent in Ceylon would have brought the matter at once to the notice of the Government of India.

DISQUALIFICATION OF INDIANS FOR COMPETITION FOR SERVICES IN CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

803. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Is it a fact that Canadians, Australians, South Africans, Ceylonese, etc., can compete for the Indian Civil Service, and that Indians cannot compete for their services or get any other equal rights?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Canadians, Australians, South Africans, and Ceylonese, in common with other British subjects, can compete for the Indian Civil Service in London. As regards the admission of Indians to the Ceylon Civil Service, I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to my reply to Mr. Samuel Aaron's question No. 456 on the 22nd February. So far as the Government of India are aware, there is no statutory bar to the appointment of lawfully resident Indians to the civil services of the dominions mentioned.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: May I know, Sir, if there are any Indians in the Civil Service of other Dominions?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Not so far as I am aware.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will the Honourable Member kindly read the answer to Mr. Samuel Aaron's question?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It was answered only a few days ago, but the relevant portion was this. I was asked:

"Do Government propose to consider the advisability of addressing the Government of Ceylon for granting reciprocal rights to Indians in this regard?"

My reply was:

"The question of asking the Government of Ceylon to reconsider their policy in this matter was fully examined some years ago, and the conclusion reached was that it was very doubtful if any useful purpose would be served by such an attempt. I may add, however, that the question of the exclusion of the Ceylonese from the Indian Civil Service under the new Constitution is under discussion with the Secretary of State."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would point out to the House that when an answer was given to the House only a few days ago, it is sheer waste of time of the House to ask the Honourable Government Member to repeat the answer.

DISQUALIFICATION OF INDIANS TO GET CROWN LANDS IN CEYLON.

804. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Is it a fact that owing to recent legislation, Indians cannot get Crown lands in Ceylon?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the answer given by me to Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury's question No. 1 on the 5th February, 1935.

SAFEGUARDING THE INTERESTS OF INDIAN EMIGRANTS TO CEYLON.

805. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Has the attention of Government been drawn to the debate in the Ceylon State Council on December 18, 1934 and,

if so, do Government propose to take any steps to safeguard the interests of Indian emigrants to Ceylon?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I would refer the Honourable Member to the replies given by me to Professor N. G. Ranga's question No. 428 and Mr. Samuel Aaron's question No. 457, on the 22nd February.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Has any reply been received from the Colonial Secretary to the representations made by the Government of India?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: No occasion has arisen for any representation on this question to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN IN GOVERNMENT OF INDIA DEPARTMENTS.

806. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Will Government please state in what departments and for what kinds of work they employ women?

(b) Is there a bar for the employment of a married woman in any of these?

(c) If not, are Government prepared to see that married women are employed for lesser number of hours than others and are given proper leave, with full pay, for sufficient periods at times of confinement?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) I presume that the Honourable Member's question refers to the Departments of the Government of India Secretariat. If so, ladies are generally employed as clerks, and sometimes as stenographers.

(b) There is no bar to the employment of married lady clerks on the civil side of the Secretariat, but in Army and Royal Air Force Headquarters it is the rule that lady clerks should resign on marriage.

(c) Government do not consider it necessary to reduce the number of working hours for married lady clerks. The contingency contemplated by the Honourable Member is provided for in the rules under which maternity leave on full pay is admissible up to a period of three months, and leave of any other kind may be taken in continuation thereof on production of a medical certificate.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: What about the women employed in the Telephone Department?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: There is no bar against the employment of married women in the Telephone Department; there is, in the Telegraph Department.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: What about parts (b) and (c) of my question as regards women employed in the Telephone Department?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I should require notice of that question.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Notice has already been given.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir; I said I presumed that my Honourable friend's question related to the Departments of the Government of India Secretariat, and my answer only covered the women employed in the Secretariat.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: I did not mention the Secretariat at all.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Then, you should have asked the question to the Department concerned.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Why is this discrimination made? Are not married women allowed to continue as clerks in the Royal Air Force?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I have explained before that both in the Army Headquarters and in the Royal Air Force, the view held is that when these lady clerks get married, they have other interests which occupy their minds to the exclusion of official matters.

CENSORING OF PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE.

807. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Will Government please state on what principle they censor private correspondence?

(b) Are Government aware that in the process of censorship, large numbers of letters get inordinately delayed or even lost or are put in wrong envelopes?

(c) Are Government aware that the regumming after censorship is so clumsy that letters have to be torn out of their envelopes?

(d) Are Government prepared to offer any relief to those who may feel that they are being unnecessarily harassed and wronged by the censorship on their correspondence?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to the provisions of section 26 of the Post Office Act which provides for the interception of correspondence.

(b) and (c). No.

(d) Does not arise.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is the Honourable Member aware that the correspondence of a large number of Honourable Members of this House is tampered with by the postal authorities and the police?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the principles on which the Government are now enforcing the sections of the Indian Post Office Act in respect of censoring correspondence?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I would refer the Honourable Member to the provisions of the Act itself.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I want to know how it is being worked, for instance, in respect of the correspondence of Members connected with the Indian National Congress?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I am not prepared in the public interest to disclose any further information on the subject.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is there any censoring at all being done?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have nothing to add.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Is the Honourable Member aware that the correspondence of certain Honourable Members of this House is censored at the Delhi Post Office?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir; I am not aware of it.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Will Government make an inquiry into the matter?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have said, Sir, that I am not prepared to disclose any further information regarding the working of the provisions of certain sections of the Post Office Act.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I am not asking for any disclosure to be made. My question is whether Government will be pleased to make an inquiry into the matter as to whether the correspondence of any Honourable Member of this House is tampered with by the Censor?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: May I know if the Home Member's correspondence also is censored?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Possibly.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Will Government be pleased to instruct the post offices to regum the letters that they censor, more properly than they do now? It is very hard to pull these letters out. I can lay a number of those letters on the table if the Honourable Member wants.

(No answer.)

IMPORT OF WHEAT IN INDIA.

808. ***Mr. Sri Prakāsa:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the figures regarding imports of wheat in India during the period April, 1934 to January 1935, as published in the *Indian Trade Journal* of February 14, 1935?

(b) Is it a fact that Calcutta imported 2,968 and Bombay 4,464 tons of foreign wheat during that period? If so, what was the protective duty realised on this? If anything has been realised, how is it that under the Indian Customs Revenue Return up to the 31st January, 1935, published

in the *Indian Trade Journal* of February 14, there is no mention of the realisation of any income from this source?

(c) What quantity, if any, was exported out of this to cover the terms of the Finance Department (Central Revenue) Notification No. 14, dated April 9, 1932? If it is true that Calcutta exported only 141 tons during this period, why was protective duty not realised on the balance?

(d) Is it a fact that the duration of protective rate of duty ends on March 1, 1935? If so, do Government propose to bring in a Bill to continue that or any enhanced duty on foreign wheat?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) Yes.

(b) The reply to the first portion is in the affirmative. As regards the second portion, no duty has been realised. The entire quantity imported into Calcutta was passed free under the Finance Department Notification No. 14, dated the 9th April, 1932. Of the 4,464 tons of wheat imported into Bombay, 1,068 tons were allowed free entry under this Notification and the balance is still lying in bond. The reply to the last portion does not, therefore, arise.

(c) Information regarding the first portion of this part is being obtained and will be supplied to the House in due course As regards the second portion, the figure of 141 tons mentioned by the Honourable Member represents Indian wheat and not wheat flour exported from India.

(d) The present operation of the Wheat (Import Duty) Act is up to the 31st March, 1935. The question whether it should be extended is under consideration.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: How long will Government take to consider this matter? There are not many days left now?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: The consideration is almost complete.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: When do Government expect to reach a decision regarding the extension of the import duty on wheat?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I have already given a reply to that question in answer to my Honourable friend, Mr. Sri Prakasa.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What is the result of the consideration?

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Is it not a fact that Government have already granted protection to wheat?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: My Honourable friend knows that there is an import duty on wheat and it extends up to the 31st March this year.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: May I know whether Government will enhance the import duty on wheat, or do they propose to have an excise duty on wheat just as they have an excise duty on sugar?

An Honourable Member: Do you want an excise duty?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I am afraid I cannot follow my Honourable friend at all.

SELECTION GRADE POSTS ABOLISHED OR CONVERTED INTO TIME-SCALE APPOINTMENTS IN THE POST OFFICES AND THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

809. ***Mr. V. V. Giri:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the number of the selection grade posts in each designation that were abolished or converted into time-scale appointments in each designation in the Post Office and Railway Mail Service up to the 31st December, 1934?

(b) Was the abolition or conversion effected in accordance with any fixed tests? If so, what tests?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state how many additional selection grade posts were sanctioned and in what offices according to requirements during the period from the 1st April, 1932 to the 31st December, 1934?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Information has been called for and a reply will be placed on the table of the House in due course.

APPOINTMENTS RETRENCHED IN CERTAIN CADRES OF THE POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT.

810. ***Mr. V. V. Giri:** (a) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing, Circle by Circle, the number of appointments retrenched in each of the following cadres since the commencement of the retrenchment operations up to the 31st December, 1934:

(i) ordinary time-scale clerks and sorters;

(ii) Lower Division clerks and sorters;

(iii) Postmen;

(iv) Village Postmen;

(v) Overseer Postmen;

(vi) Runners;

(vii) Packers;

(viii) Mailguards; and

(ix) Van peons?

(b) Has the retrenchment in the cadres of Postal clerks and sorters been regulated according to the standards laid down in the Bewoor Time-tests? If so, will Government please state if additional staff is also sanctioned in the Post Office and Railway Mail Service if justified by those standards? If not, what agreement is made to make up the shortage of staff caused by the one-sided application of the Bewoor Time-test for the purpose of retrenchment only?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Government regret that they are unable to furnish the information as its collection would involve an undue expenditure of time and labour.

(b) The standards laid down in the Bewoor Time Test were used as guides for determining the reductions justified in the strength of an office or establishment. As regards additions to staff, Heads of Circles were ordered to make a careful review of the work and actual conditions in each case and if they were satisfied that additional staff was necessary for any office or establishment they were authorised to transfer to that office or establishment posts found to be surplus elsewhere.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if the retrenchment in the Postal Department has stopped or it is still going on?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think there is a question on that later on the paper.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that as many as 1,500 postmasters have been retrenched because of the abolition of the village branch post offices?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I am sorry I cannot give my Honourable friend definite figures on that point.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do Government propose to increase the number of village post offices?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That question does not arise.

SELECTION GRADE APPOINTMENTS IN THE POST OFFICES AND THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

811. ***Mr. V. V. Giri:** (a) Will Government please state the total number of selection grade appointments in the Post Office and Railway Mail Service?

(b) What is the percentage of such appointments as compared with the total number of:

(i) clerical appointments both in the ordinary and lower division time-scales, and

(ii) sorters' appointments both in the ordinary and lower division time-scales?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Information has been called for and will be placed on the table of the House in due course.

REPORT OF THE POSTAL ENQUIRY COMMITTEE.

812. ***Mr. V. V. Giri:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state when the Report of the Postal Enquiry Committee will be published?

(b) Will Government please place on the table a brief summary of the recommendations of the Committee pending publication of the full Report? If not, why not?

(c) In view of the assurance given by the Honourable Member for Industries and Labour in his speech on the floor of this House on the 10th March, 1934, will the report of the Committee, when published, be examined by the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs in close consultation with the All-India (including Burma) Postal and Railway Mail Service Union and other recognised Service Unions, most affected by the recommendations made therein? If not, why not, and what procedure do Government propose to follow?

(d) Do Government propose to give an opportunity to this House to discuss the recommendations made by the Committee before arriving at any final decisions on them? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) It is not the intention of Government that copies of the report should be made available for purchase by members of the public, if this is what the Honourable Member means by the term "published".

(b) The report is now being printed and as soon as printed copies are available, copies will be placed in the Library of the House. In the circumstances Government do not consider it necessary to accept the Honourable Member's suggestion.

(c) Government understand that the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs will supply a copy of the report, when printed, to the All-India (including Burma) Postal and Railway Mail Service Union and other recognised service Unions, the members of which may be affected by the recommendations of the Committee, and will await their views for a reasonable period before submitting to Government his views on those recommendations. The latter part of the question does not arise.

(d) The Committee was a departmental committee and its report is of a highly technical character. For these reasons Government do not consider that any useful purpose would be served by a formal discussion of the report in this House. It will, however, be open to any Honourable Member to call the attention of Government or of this House to any particular recommendation of the report in the usual way.

Mr. V. V. Giri: Will Government be pleased to place it before the Standing Finance Committee before passing final orders?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No. I hardly think that the Standing Finance Committee would be a suitable body for a discussion of this report. I may point out to my Honourable friend that we now have a Posts and Telegraphs Advisory Committee, and if the Government of India pass orders or propose to pass orders vitally affecting the interests of the staff, that is the Committee which they would naturally consult.

Mr. V. V. Giri: Then, does the Honourable Member propose to place it before the Posts and Telegraphs Advisory Committee?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: As I said, if we find that we propose to pass any orders vitally affecting the interests of the staff, we should certainly place the matter before that Committee. In any case, I think it is but natural that we should discuss with that Committee what we propose to do before any orders are definitely promulgated.

RETRENCHMENT CONCESSIONS IN THE POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT

813. *Mr. V. V. Giri: (a) Will Government be pleased to state why the retrenchment concessions were continued in the Posts and Telegraphs Department, while they were withdrawn from other Departments after the 31st March, 1934?

(b) Do Government propose to continue the concessions in the Posts and Telegraphs Department beyond March 31, 1935? If so, what are the reasons? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Retrenchment concession in the Posts and Telegraphs Department were extended up to the 31st March, 1935, because all retrenchments had not been completed by the 31st March, 1934.

(b) The reply to the first part is in the negative. The second part does not arise. As regards the third part, the reply is that it is expected that general retrenchment will have been completed by the 31st March, 1935. Such decreases in staff as may be justified in future, as the result of reorganisations, changes in methods of procedure, fall in traffic or for any other reasons, will be carried out in the ordinary course as vacancies occur

DAILY SPREAD-OVER OF WORKING HOURS OF EACH FACTORY.

814. *Mr. V. V. Giri: (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether any record of the daily spread-over of working hours of each factory is required to be submitted to the Factory Inspectors under the present regulations?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether they propose to take any action to limit the spread-over of work so as not to result in the abuse of the existing provisions of the Factory Act?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes. The notice of periods for work which must be prepared under sections 39 and 55 of the Factories Act has to be sent to the Inspector and it shows the spread-over for both adults and children.

(b) Government do not propose to reduce the limits of spread-over which came into force as recently as 1st January last.

Mr. V. V. Giri: Have Government received any complaints from the workers or workers' organisations in the provinces that there have been abuses in this matter of spreading-over?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No. I hardly imagine that the Government of India would receive any complaints on that point. They would more correctly be addressed to the Local Governments who administer the Act.

GRANT OF A PASSPORT TO MR. J. M. ADHIKARI, INTERNED AT BIJAPUR, FOR MEDICAL TREATMENT IN LONDON.

815. *Mr. V. V. Giri: (a) Is it a fact that Mr. J. M. Adhikari, who is now interned at Bijapur, applied to the District Magistrate, Bijapur, for a passport to Europe to obtain proper medical treatment in London?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether they propose to afford him necessary facilities for getting proper medical treatment in Europe and not available in India, by granting him a passport to Europe?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) and (b) Mr. Adhikari applied for a passport last year to proceed to Europe for medical treatment, but his request was refused by the Local Government; in view of his past communist activities and his previous record it was considered undesirable to permit him to go abroad there being good reasons to believe that the real object of his journey was to attend a meeting of the Communist International at Moscow. The Government of India see no reason to interfere with the Local Government's decision in the matter I should add that in December, 1934, the Bombay Government granted him permission to proceed to Bandra for medical treatment for a period of one month.

Mr. V. V. Giri: Are Government aware that Mr. Adhikari is suffering from a disease by name Hemophilia, for which there is no remedy in this country, but only in England, and in those circumstances, will they be pleased to consider the advisability of granting his request?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I am not aware of that.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government make an enquiry, and find out what his health is like?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The matter is entirely within the discretion of the Local Government, and I do not see why the Government of India should make any enquiry.

AMALGAMATION OF CLASSES II AND III OF CLERKS IN THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ACCOUNTS OFFICER, NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

816. ***Mr. K. M. Jedhe:** (a) Is it a fact that classes II and III of clerks employed in the office of the Chief Accounts Officer of the North Western Railway have been amalgamated, thereby raising the maximum of the lowest grade of clerks of that office to Rs. 90 per mensem?

(b) Is it a fact that the maximum of the lowest class of clerks employed under the Agent, North Western Railway, is Rs. 60 per mensem?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state if they have in contemplation a similar amalgamation of the two corresponding classes of clerks of the said parallel organization of the same Railway? If not, will Government be pleased to state the reasons of so vast a difference in the scales of pay of the lowest class of clerks of the two Departments of the same Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I would refer my Honourable friend to the reply given by me in this House on the 22nd February, 1935, to Bhai Parma Nand's unstarred question No. 64.

ABOLITION OF DUPLICATE SETS OF REGISTERS MAINTAINED BY THE DIVISIONAL SUPERINTENDENTS OF THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

817. ***Mr. S. K. Hosmani** (on behalf of Mr. N. V. Gadgil): Is it a fact:

(i) that the duplicate sets of Registers of Works and Revenue Allocation Registers maintained by the Divisional Super-

intendents of the North Western Railway were abolished some three years ago;

(ii) that this resulted in the amplification of the corresponding sets of these Registers maintained by the Accounts Department;

(iii) that the strength of the staff employed on the upkeep of these registers in the Accounts Department was augmented by transferring some of the staff of the Divisional Superintendents rendered surplus due to the abolition of the said duplicate sets; and

(iv) that the staff so transferred to the Accounts Department is still not entitled to the privileges granted to the Accounts staff; if so, why?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (i) Yes

(ii) Yes; the Works Registers were amplified to a slight extent.

(iii) Yes.

(iv) The staff so transferred continue to be part of Divisional Superintendents' offices and the Government see no reason to alter the rates of pay and other privileges merely because for administrative convenience they are asked to work under a particular Divisional Officer, *viz.*, the Divisional Accounts Officer instead of the Divisional Engineer.

SUBSIDY OR FINANCIAL HELP GIVEN TO THE ASSOCIATED PRESS NEWS-AGENCY.

818. ***Pandit Nilakantha Das:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state how much subsidy or financial help is given, directly or indirectly, by Government to the Associated Press news-agency, and for what services?

(b) How much subsidy or financial help is given by Government separately, to other news-agencies and newspapers?

(c) Is any financial help given by Government to the *Free Press* and the *United Press*? If not, why not?

(d) What is the criterion of judging the desirability of giving financial help to news-agencies and newspapers?

(e) Is pro-official and anti-Congress propaganda a necessary qualification for a paper or a news-agency to receive Government help?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) and (b). The Government of India do not subsidise any newspapers or news agencies. They, however, pay the Indian News Agency, on ordinary commercial terms, for the supply of its news telegrams to certain selected officers.

(c) The Government do not subscribe to the news-service of the Free Press or the United Press as they do not consider it necessary to supplement that of the Indian News Agency.

(d) and (e). Do not arise.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What it the amount that the Government pay the Indian News Agency every year?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Government of India pay Rs. 12,000 a year *plus* Rs. 360 a year from the Posts and Telegraphs and Rs. 170 a year from the Army Department. The total is Rs. 12,530.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: What is the subscriptions of Rs. 71,000 for News Agencies under the "Miscellaneous" Demand for Grant?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have said that total amount paid to the Indian News Agency is Rs. 12,530.

Mr. M. S. Aney: The Honourable Member is referring to an item of Rs. 71,000 under the "Miscellaneous" Demand.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That has got nothing to do with the Indian News Agency. It possibly includes Reuters. That is an entirely different service.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Is not the A. P. I. a branch of the Reuters in India?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I understand Reuters is an entirely different organization.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Is it a monopoly price that is paid to the Indian and other News Agencies, or is it done by tender?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I must have notice of that.

Filling up of Vacancies in the Posts of Readers in the Government of India Press, New Delhi.

819. ***Mr. N. M. Joshi:** (a) Is it a fact that all the newly created posts of Readers in the Government of India Press, New Delhi, are being filled only by promoting copy-holders?

(b) Are Government aware that under Hand Book Rule 184 it is laid down as follows:

"To read proofs efficiently the Reader must possess a good general education and a practical knowledge of the art of typography, Readers have peculiar duties and they require special qualifications for the efficient performance of those duties. It is therefore a mistake and one of not infrequent occurrences in India for any tolerably well educated man to imagine that with a little practice he would become a Reader notwithstanding that technical knowledge is lacking."

(c) Is it a fact that the Manager, Government of India Press, New Delhi, does not follow the Hand Book Rule and has appointed non-technical men as Readers? If so, why?

(d) Is it a fact that technical men with long service and drawing maximum of the scale for years, possessing both educational and technical knowledge of the work of typography, are not being appointed as Readers? If so, what action do Government propose to take so that the technical men shall secure some of the appointments as Readers?

(e) Is it a fact that the Controller, Printing and Stationery, has passed an order that non-technical copy-holders shall always be given preference as Readers, no matter whether they may be junior in length of service and pay, etc., compared with senior technical men of other Branches?

(f) Is it a fact that under Rule 27 of the Hand Book of the Government of India Presses, even outsiders are eligible for appointments as

Readers after a proficiency test? If so, why are men, already in the service of the Press and working in the technical Branches, not appointed as Readers?

(g) Is it a fact that the Manager of the Government of India Press, New Delhi, had just recruited an outsider as a Reader in the top-most grade without any proficiency test, in spite of the joint petition of Senior Readers protesting against that recruitment? If so, why are the men already in service in the Press not appointed as Readers?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) No.

(b) Yes.

(c) No.

(d) I am not clear to which men the Honourable Member is referring, but I am asking the Controller to consider the question of framing some definite rule for appointments to the Reading Branch.

(e) To safeguard the interests of the men of the Reading Branch, the Controller of Printing and Stationery directed that the men of the other Branches, who qualify in the examination for readers, should not be given preference on account of their length of service, pay, etc., over the men of the Reading Branch who also qualify.

(f) The reply to the first part is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, men working in the other Branches of the Press who have qualified are eligible when qualified candidates are not available in the Reading Branch.

(g) The man appointed is a graduate who had completed five years' training as an apprentice in the Calcutta Press and is better qualified for the post than others in the Reading Branch.

EARNINGS OF THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY FROM PASSENGER TRAFFIC.

820. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** Will Government be pleased to state the earnings of the North Western Railway from passenger traffic during 1934 as compared with 1933, together with the number of passengers carried? Will Government please give this information:

(i) for passengers up to 50 miles;

(ii) for passengers from 50 to 300 miles; and

(iii) for passengers travelling over 300 miles?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I lay on the table the information asked for by the Honourable Member.

Statement showing the number of and earnings from passengers carried on the North Western Railway, excluding military passengers and passengers holding season tickets.

Miles.	1932-33.		1933-34.	
	Number of passengers.	Earnings.	Number of passengers.	Earnings.
		Rs.		Rs.
1—50 . . .	44,137,361	1,48,33,487	45,821,139	1,46,13,045
51—300 . . .	12,003,556	2,39,72,202	12,083,492	2,34,85,776
Over 300 . . .	992,205	74,44,333	899,640	69,46,426

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Does that contain the passengers, first class, second class and third class, or only third class?

Mr. P. R. Rau: All passengers.

QUALIFYING EXAMINATION FOR READERS' POSTS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

821. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that a qualifying examination for Readers' posts was held on the 10th and 12th November, 1934, in the Government of India Press, New Delhi, and out of 36 candidates, 14 were declared as successful and qualified?

(b) Are Government aware that the examination was held for testing the qualifications of all the candidates for the posts of Readers? If so, why was the same set of examination papers not given to all the candidates?

(c) Is it a fact that one group of candidates, for special reasons, was examined separately and if so, why?

(d) Is it a fact that the candidates other than the group referred to in part (c) above, were examined after two days? If so, why?

(e) Do Government propose to make enquiries into the matter and declare the examination of both the groups null and void, because all the candidates were not examined at the same time?

(f) Is it also a fact that the successful candidates from the first group have already been appointed as Readers and Revisers, and successful candidates of the second group have been deprived of promotions? If so, what was the intention of the Manager in making two groups?

(g) Is it a fact that on the publication of a letter in the *Hindustan Times* in November, 1934, from the Secretary of the Clerks Union, the Controller, Printing and Stationery, has declared the examination of the second group null and void?

(h) Is it also a fact that the said letter was found to be a forgery and contradicted by the Secretary of the Clerks' Union in the same paper? If so, why did the Controller, Printing and Stationery, take action on false reports?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes.

(b) The answer to the first part is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, the proof reading paper was the same. The others were different. It is obviously undesirable that candidates examined on different dates should have the same paper.

(c) and (d). The two groups were examined on different days, because the Manager considered that there was insufficient accommodation to permit of their being examined simultaneously.

(e) The Controller is enquiring into the matter with a view to considering whether any further action is necessary.

(f) Certain candidates from the first group have received promotion: no candidate from the second group has been appointed. I have already given the answer to the second part.

(g) The letter received the attention of the Controller, but, as I have said, the question of the action, if any, which may be necessary is under his consideration.

(h) The authenticity of the letter was denied, but some of the facts in it were correct.

Bhai Parma Nand: May I know whether the examination paper that was set for the second group was almost the same as that which was set for the first group?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have no information on that point, but, as I have already informed my Honourable friend, the Controller is inquiring into the whole matter.

DUTIES OF NUMBER-TAKERS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

822. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the duties of Number-takers employed on the North Western Railway?

(b) Are their duties similar to those performed by Assistant Train Examiners on the East Indian Railway?

(c) Is it a fact that most of the Number-takers on the North Western Railway are literate, and some of them are Matriculates?

(d) Is it a fact that on the East Indian Railway promotion to the grade of Train Examiners is made from Assistant Train Examiners, but on the North Western Railway the Number-takers are not considered eligible for promotion as Train Examiners? If so, what is the reason for this differentiation?

Mr. P. R. Rau: With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to questions Nos. 822, 823, 824 and 825 together. I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

TRAIN EXAMINERS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

†823. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Are the existing Train Examiners on the North Western Railway performing their duties to the satisfaction of the Railway Administration?

(b) Is it a fact that most of the existing Train Examiners were promoted from Number-takers?

(c) Is it also a fact that most of the existing Train Examiners are either semi-literate or non-matriculates?

(d) If the answer to the preceding three parts be in the affirmative, will Government please state why the existing Number-takers, who are Matriculates are not given promotion to the grade of Train Examiners?

NUMBER-TAKERS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

†824. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Is it a fact that the Number-takers on the North Western Railway are required to supervise the work of the mechanical illiterate staff?

†For answer to this question, *see* answer to question No. 822.

(b) Are they held responsible if there is any failure on the part of the illiterate mechanical staff, and are they awarded punishment for such failures?

(c) Are Number-takers required to attend to mechanical duties such as:

(i) repacking and oiling; and

(ii) repairs to damaged stock at sick lines?

(d) Are Number-takers sent on the line to attend to hot axles, taking and making over of military cars and damages and to Canal trains? Is it a fact that these are the duties of Train Examiners?

(e) Are Government aware that Number-takers on the North Western Railway are required by the Head Train Examiners to perform the duties of Train Examiners when the latter are absent from the stations for duties on the line, or when they proceed on leave for short periods?

(f) Are these duties entrusted to Number-takers with the knowledge of their gazetted officers? If not, do Government propose to ask the gazetted officers concerned to investigate the truth of the matter by references in daily diaries and order books maintained at Train Examining Stations?

(g) Do the number-takers perform the duties of Train Examiners satisfactorily when they are called upon to do so as stated in part (e) above?

(h) Do Government propose to consider the desirability of making promotions to the rank of Train Examiners from the Number-takers?

Electricians on the North Western Railway.

†825. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** Is it a fact that on the North Western Railway 50 per cent. of the electricians are promoted from the staff who can pass a writing test? If so, do Government propose to give similar consideration to Number-takers, who are matriculates, for promotion as Train Examiners?

Protective Duty and Excise Duty on Sugar.

826. ***Dr. P. N. Banerjea:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) the amount collected on account of the protective duty on sugar during the first ten months of the financial year 1934-35;

(b) the amount estimated to be obtained on account of the protective duty on sugar during the whole financial year 1934-35;

(c) the amount collected on account of the excise duty on sugar during the first ten months of the financial year 1934-35; and

(d) the amount estimated to be obtained on account of the excise duty on sugar during the whole financial year 1934-35?

†For answer to this question, *see* answer to question No. 822.

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: (a) Rs. 3,37,71,000.

(b) and (d). I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to pages 14 and 15 of the Explanatory Memorandum by the Financial Secretary on the budget which gives the necessary information.

(c) Rs. 55,04,000.

IMPORT DUTY ON COTTON FABRICS.

827. ***Dr. P. N. Banerjea:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) the amount collected on account of the import duty on cotton fabrics of British manufacture for the first ten months of the financial year 1934-35;

(b) the amount estimated to be obtained on account of the import duty on cotton fabrics of British manufacture for the whole financial year 1934-35;

(c) the amount of import duty collected on non-British cotton fabrics during the first ten months of the financial year 1934-35; and

(d) the amount estimated to be collected on account of the import duty on non-British cotton fabrics for the whole financial year 1934-35?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: (a) Rs 2,33,27,000.

(b) and (d). I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to pages 14 and 15 of the Explanatory Memorandum by the Financial Secretary on the budget which gives the necessary information.

(c) Rs. 2,11,40,000.

RE-EMPLOYMENT OF THE GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY STRIKERS.

828. ***Mr. N. V. Gadgil:** (a) Are Government aware that at a meeting between the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Administration and the representatives of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Workers' Union held on the 8th and 9th March, 1932, the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Agent promised that "if the Union submitted representations in regard to individual Satyagrahis, he would give them his personal consideration"?

(b) Are Government aware that the Union submitted an exhaustive list giving names and addresses of more than 60 employees who were convicted for offering Satyagraha during the strike of 1930?

(c) Is it a fact that the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Agent instituted inquiries into individual cases with a view to taking them back in the employment, but did not proceed further in the matter?

(d) If the reply to part (c) be in the negative, why did the Agent not proceed further with the matter?

(e) Do Government approve of the action of the Agent in refusing to re-engage Satyagrahi strikers?

(f) If the reply to part (e) be in the affirmative, is it a fact that the Agent has employed persons in the Railway who have been convicted of serious offences, such as murder, theft, safe breaking, etc., and are Government aware that the names are published by the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Workers' Union in its official organ? If so, why have such persons been employed?

(g) If the reply to part (e) be in the negative, do the Government propose to instruct the Agent to take all the Satyagrahis back into employment?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) and (d). Government are informed that the Agent, Great Indian Peninsula Railway, completed his enquiries. Nearly half of the men whose names were forwarded were admitted for re-employment.

(e), (f) and (g). Government are making enquiries and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE MILITARY IN MIDNAPORE.

829 *__Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:__ (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether one Murary Mohon Sasmal of village Jukhia in Contai made a complaint to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal against some soldiers who had committed rape on his sister-in-law during a military route-march in 1934? If so, will Government be pleased to state whether any enquiry was made by the local authorities executive or judicial, and if so, what is the result?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Murary Mohon Sasmal was charged under section 182, Indian Penal Code first?

(c) Was that charge withdrawn and a fresh charge under section 193, Indian Penal Code, was made? If so, why?

(d) Was Murary Babu subsequently discharged? If so, was he compensated for his pecuniary loss?

(e) Will Government be pleased to state whether any order for withdrawal of soldiers, stoppage of route-marches and holding of *darbars* are under contemplation?

(f) Did the Divisional Commissioner at a public meeting charge Murary Babu with bringing a false case against the military when the case was *sub judice*? If so what steps had been taken against the Commissioner?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) and (b). I would refer the Honourable Member to items (4) and (8) of the statement laid on the table on the 18th July, 1934, in connection with the allegations against the conduct of troops in Midnapore.

(e) No. I should add that the question of the holding of Darbars is a matter for the Local Government.

(c), (d) and (f). I am making enquiries as to the facts from the Local Government and will lay a statement on the table in due course.

INCOME FROM LETTERS WEIGHING MORE THAN HALF A TOLA INSUFFICIENTLY STAMPED.

830. *Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: (a) Will Government be pleased to state the income from the letters charged by the Post Office on account of their being posted with one anna stamp, being taken as weighing half *tola*, while they were more than half *tola*?

(b) Do Government propose to save the villagers from the confusion that leads to the aforesaid under-payment of postage by revising the rates so that letters up to one *tola* might be posted with one anna stamp?

(c) Are Government aware that generally people cannot make the fine distinction between half and one *tola*?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) No separate account of letters exceeding half tola in weight, which are posted with one anna stamp on them and are consequently taxed, is kept in post offices. The income derived from the taxing of such letters cannot, therefore, be stated.

(b) and (c). The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the reply given by me on the 18th February, 1935, to parts (a) and (b) of starred question No. 300 asked by Sir Muhammad Yakub.

PAY OF THE TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

831. *Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to state if the scale of pay of the Travelling Ticket Examiners of the Moody-Ward system on the East Indian Railway is very low, as compared with the scale of pay of Travelling Ticket Examiners of other Company and State-managed Railways in India?

Mr. P. R. Rau: With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply questions Nos. 831, 832, 833 and 834 together. Government do not consider that the pay of Travelling Ticket Examiners under the Moody-Ward scheme is inadequate nor do they see any necessity for absolute uniformity of pay on all railways in India. The rates of pay prescribed for Ticket Checking Staff on the Eastern Bengal, East Indian, and North Western Railways are contained in the statement I lay on the table.

Statement.

Eastern Bengal.			East Indian.			North Western.		
	Old Scales.	New Scales.		Old Scales.	New Scales.		Old Scales.	New Scales.
Ticket Collector (Relg.)	32-4-60	30-3-45-5-60	Ticket Collectors, Gr. III	37-3-52	Ticket Inspector (Relg.), Gr. II.	30-3-45	Ticket Collectors and Special Ticket Examiners	33-3-60	30-5-50-5/2-60
,, ,,	32-4-60		,, ,, Gr. II	55-3-64	Ticket Inspector, Gr. II	30-3-45		66-4-90	65-5/2-85
,, ,,	65-5-90	65-5/2-85	,, ,, Gr. I	70-5-95	Ticket Inspectors, Gr. I	30-3-45-5-60		105-5-140	100-10/2-120
,, ,,	95-5-120		Tr. Ticket Examiners, Gr. II.	55-3-64	Tr. Ticket Examiners, Gr. II.	30-3-45-5-60		150-10-190	140
Tr. Ticket Examiners, Jr.	36-4-60	30-3-45-5-60	,, ,, ,, Gr. I	70-5-95	Tr. Ticket Examiners, Gr. I.	65-5/2-85		200-10-250	160
Tr. Ticket Examiners, Sr.	70-5-120	65-5/2-85	Asstt. Head T. Collectors	110-5-140					180
Crewmen	36-4-60	30-3-45-5-60	Head Ticket Collectors, Gr. II.	150-10-190	Head Ticket Inspectors, Gr. II.	65-5/2-85			
Crew in Charge	70-5-120	65-5/2-85	Head Ticket Collectors, Gr. I.	200-10-220	Head Ticket Inspectors Gr. I.	100-10/2-120			
Head Ticket Collector	130-10-160	100-10/2-120	Inspectors, Gr. II	150-10-190	Ticket Inspectors, Gr. III	140			
Inspector (Crew)	150-10-190	140	,, Gr. I	200-10-220	,, ,, Gr. II	160			
Inspector (Crews)	210-10-220	180 200	Chief Inspector	240-20-460	,, ,, Gr. I	180			

PAY OF THE TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

†832. *Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the grades of pay of the Travelling Ticket Examiners of both A and B grades of the North Western Railway?

SCALES OF PAY OF THE TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE EAST INDIAN AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAYS.

†833. *Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to state whether the scales of pay of the Travelling Ticket Examiners of the North Western Railway, both of A and B grades, are higher than the scales of pay of A and B grades of Travelling Ticket Examiners on the East Indian Railway?

PAY OF TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE EASTERN BENGAL AND EAST INDIAN RAILWAYS.

†834. *Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the pay of Ticket Examiners of A and B grades on the Eastern Bengal Railway is Rs. 120 per month and that of Travelling Ticket Examiners of the East Indian Railway under the Moody-Ward system Rs. 70 to 95 and Rs. 55 to Rs. 65 of A and B grades, respectively?

(b) If so, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for this unusual difference in their scales of pay?

PAY OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

835. *Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: (a) Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to state if most of the members of the staff of Travelling Ticket Examiners on the East Indian Railway generally reach the maximum of their pay in A and B grades of the Moody-Ward system in the course of three, four or five years and are obliged to serve during the rest of their service on that pay?

(b) Are Government prepared to see that the Travelling Ticket Examiners of the East Indian Railway of A and B grades under the Moody-Ward system should be placed on the same scales of pay with other State and Company-managed Railways?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) The scales of pay are:

Grade II—Rs. 55—3—64.

Grade I—Rs. 70—5—95.

There is nothing to stop the staff concerned from qualifying themselves for promotion to higher posts.

† For answer to this question, *see* answer to question No. 831.

(b) Government do not consider that uniformity of scales of pay on State and Company-managed Railways is practicable or necessary.

REFUSAL OF MILEAGE ALLOWANCE TO THE TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

836. *Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to state why the Travelling Ticket Examiners of East Indian Railway under Moody-Ward system are deprived of the mileage allowance?

Mr. P. R. Rau: As I have explained often in this House Travelling Ticket Examiners are not allowed mileage allowance which is restricted to staff directly connected with the charge of moving trains

CONSOLIDATED ALLOWANCE OF THE TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

837. *Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to state if the present consolidated allowance of the Travelling Ticket Examiners of the East Indian Railway under Moody-Ward system is Rs. 20 and 15 per month?

Mr P. R. Rau: The reply is in the affirmative.

MONTHLY ALLOWANCES PAID TO THE TRAVELLING TICKET INSPECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

838. *Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to state if a pointsman, clock-winder, relieving Ticket Collector, or relieving Assistant Station Master drawing a monthly salary of Rs. 20, 24, 30, or 50 per month, respectively, is paid monthly allowance at a rate higher than what is paid to the Travelling Inspectors of A and B grades under Moody-Ward system on the East Indian Railway? If so, will the Honourable Member be pleased to state the reason for this difference?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government do not consider that any useful purpose will be served by comparing the allowance of different classes of staff.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION AND ANSWER.

RELEASE OF PANDIT JAWAHARLAL NEHRU.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. There are short notice questions by Pandit Nilakantha Das, by 12 NOON. Mr. Avinashilingam Chettiar, and by Professor Ranga, all relating to the same subject. Pandit Nilakantha Das.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: (a) Will Government please state, or ascertain and state, whether it is a fact that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has been given the option by Government of leaving India with his wife as an alternative to his present jail life?

(b) If so, for how long is he required to remain out of India?

(c) Who is to pay for his passage out of and to India and his expenses abroad?

(d) Ordinarily, how long has Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru got to stay in jail to serve out his present sentence of imprisonment?

(e) Was the Pandit informed of the Government's present intentions? If so, with what result?

(f) Is it the idea to extern the Pandit under some law or regulations?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) No proposal for the release of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru or of giving him the option suggested is under the consideration of the Government of India or the Government of the United Provinces.

(b), (c), (e) and (f) Do not arise.

(d) The Pandit was sentenced to two years' simple imprisonment in February, 1934.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: May I ask if Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's wife is suffering from tuberculosis?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I understand that she is slowly improving in health at the sanitarium at Bhowali in the United Provinces.

Seth Govind Das: Have Government seen the recent telegram which has appeared in this morning's paper saying that she is not improving?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The last report I have received is a report dated December the 8th, 1934.

Seth Govind Das: Has not the Honourable Member seen the statement which has appeared in this morning's paper? I think the Honourable the Home Member must have read it,—the statement about Mrs. Jawaharlal's health?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, I have not seen that.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Have not Government seen the communiqué issued by the Superintendent of the Bhowali Sanitarium only recently?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I may say, Sir, that the last information I have is that of December the 8th.

Munshi Iswar Saran: Will the Honourable the Home Member kindly inquire and find out the state of health of Mrs. Nehru, and if he thinks

that her condition is not satisfactory, will Government consider the advisability of allowing Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to go abroad for the treatment of his wife?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That is a hypothetical question.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has received notice of a motion for adjournment, but it is understood from the Honourable Member who gave notice that he does not desire to move that motion.

THE GENERAL BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—*contd.*

SECOND STAGE—*contd.*

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House will now resume discussion of the Demands for Grants. The Chair understands that Demand No 28 has already been moved. There is a cut motion in the name of Mr. Joshi—No. 295.

DEMAND No. 28—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL—*contd.*

Grievances of Working Classes.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I move:

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. President, my object in making this motion is to lodge a protest against the failure of the Government of India . . . .

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): On a point of order, Sir. May I ask whether one and the same man may move more than one cut?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What is the point of order?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: My point of order is that we had certain arrangements about cuts, and I understood that one Honourable Member cannot move more than one cut. Is that permissible?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair is not aware of any such arrangement. The arrangement was about the time to be allotted for motions of particular Groups and of unattached Members. So far as the Chair is aware, it does not think it was arranged that one Honourable Member cannot move more than one motion. Mr. Joshi.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Mr. President, I fully realise that some Members should feel aggrieved at my good luck. (Laughter.) At the same time,

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

let me make it quite clear that I was quite prepared to come to an agreement in a reasonable manner both with the organised Parties in this House and with the unattached group. Mr. President, I am not a speculator, and I would have preferred the certainty of a two hours' discussion to my good luck, but, Sir, the organised Parties would not give me any reasonable time nor would the unattached Members.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I must protest against this, and I think my friend, Mr. Bhulabhai, will bear me out. The organised Parties did nothing of the sort. They gave Mr. Joshi every latitude and every assistance. I think Mr. Bhulabhai will bear me out.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair cannot allow this sort of discussion to go on. Mr. Joshi will move his motion and say what he has got to say about it.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Mr President, if some people will not listen to what I have to say on that subject, I am not very anxious to waste my time on it. My object, Sir, in making this motion is to protest against the failure of the Government for not removing some of the grievances from which the working classes of this country have been suffering. Sir, these grievances are many, and I shall not be able to deal with all of them I propose, therefore, to restrict myself to two or three of those grievances, and I am sure that the Honourable Members that follow me will deal with some of the others.

I would like first to deal with the failure of the Government to pay sufficient attention to the maintenance of good health of the industrial worker in this country. Good health is, Sir, necessary not only for the happiness of human beings, but I feel that it is a matter of great economic advantage to a country that its working classes should enjoy good health. The question of the health conditions of the working classes was examined very closely by the Royal Commission on Indian Labour, and that Commission found that there was a great need for improving the conditions in order that the working classes of this country should enjoy better health. Mr. President, there are a number of people who generally accuse the working classes of this country of being not as efficient as the working classes of other countries. I do not myself believe that the working classes of this country are congenitally less productive than the working classes of other countries. (Laughter.) I feel their productive capacity is as good as the productive capacity of the working classes of other countries. But, Sir, I am prepared to admit that the work, which they do in factories today, on account of difference in conditions, may not be as good as the work done by others. But this difference in the work done by the working classes in other countries and the working classes in this country is entirely due to the differences in conditions.

The working classes in Great Britain, for instance, live in very good houses and their wages are high and during periods of sickness they are very well cared for. In India the working classes receive low wages

and their hours of work are long. Their housing is extremely bad. But I do not propose to deal with these aspects today at all. I propose to deal with the aspect of the health conditions of the working classes. The Royal Commission found there was a great deal that could be done in order to improve the health conditions of the working classes and they have made certain suggestions. They made a suggestion that in order that the food eaten by the working classes should be improved, they should establish a nutrition institute in this country to make certain kind of researches and also propaganda. But, the important recommendation made by the Commission was as regards the consideration of a scheme for the provision of not only medical assistance to the working classes, but for the provision of some maintenance to the working classes during days of sickness. They first recommended to the Government of India that the Government of India should collect statistics from the employers and from their own factories and also independently to find out the incidence of sickness among the working classes with which the Royal Commission was dealing and, in order that a proper scheme for the collation of statistics should be made, the Royal Commission recommended that the Government of India should consult in some manner a Committee of this Legislature consisting of representatives of labour and representatives of employers and some others. The Commission also recommended that after the statistics were collected the statistics should be examined by an Actuary and others and finally the Commission recommended that a formal committee should be appointed in order to examine all this material, and, if possible, to recommend a scheme for the provision of medical relief as well as maintenance during sickness of the working classes. I have not yet heard from the Government of India either in this Legislature or through the reports which they have published regarding the action taken on the recommendations of the Royal Commission as to what has been done. As to the main recommendations they say it is under consideration. I do not know yet whether the Government of India have appointed a committee of the Legislature as recommended by the Royal Commission for consultation, a committee on which the representatives of labour as well as the representatives of employers were to be appointed. It is more than four years since the Royal Commission made its recommendation and if the Government of India were to appoint a Committee for consultation in this matter it was time that they should have done so. I am sorry that on this point the Government of India have given no information. The question is one of great importance to the working classes of this country and I would like the Government of India to take action without any loss of time.

Then, there is another grievance which I want to place before this House, namely, that the Government of India have not yet implemented the recommendation of the Royal Commission for the establishment of an Industrial Council in this country. When the Royal Commission made investigations as to the method by which the Government of India generally formulates its views on labour questions, and the procedure which the Government of India has to go through in order to pass legislation on labour subjects, the Commission came to the conclusion that on the whole the procedure is a very dilatory one. They, therefore, recommended that another method should be found out by which the procedure

[Mr. N M. Joshi.]

could be simplified, and, if possible, the delay avoided. I do not wish to take up the time of the House by describing how the Government of India proceeds in the matter, how they first formulate their own views, and if they have no views how they appoint a committee and sit tight over the committee and when they are pressed to take action how they issue letters to all Provincial Governments and how the Provincial Governments circulate the letters to the different bodies—all that, Sir, takes time. Therefore the Royal Commission thought that some method must be devised by which the delays could be avoided. The Royal Commission also found that in India both the Provincial and the Central Legislatures have power to pass legislation on labour questions. It is true that the Provincial Legislatures have not made sufficient use of the powers which they possess to pass legislation on labour matters. Still, the Commission thought it is necessary that there should be some body to co-ordinate the efforts of the Provincial as well as the Central Legislatures in order that legislation that shall be passed in the different provinces and in the whole country shall be more or less harmonious and will not conflict with each other. They also thought that if a machinery is established to consider the legislative proposals of the Government of India that machinery will also be useful to co-ordinate the efforts of the Provincial and Central Governments and of the Provincial and Central Legislatures. Then, the other day, when my Honourable friend, Mr. Mody, spoke on the question of labour legislation, in the States, and he pointed out the difficulty caused by want of proper legislation in the Indian States. The Royal Commission considered that difficulty also and considered all these points and they came to the conclusion that it will be a great advantage if the Government of India by statute establishes an Industrial Council. As I pointed out that Industrial Council could be useful for various purposes. They suggested that Industrial Council could be useful for various purposes. They suggested that whenever the Government of India had any legislative proposals on which they want public opinion to be consulted that legislation will be considered by an Industrial Council consisting of representatives of the Government, the representatives of the employers and the representatives of the employees so that the delay could be avoided. They also thought that if an Industrial Council of the nature which I described just now is established, that Council will be able to co-ordinate the various efforts made by the Provincial and Central Governments and the Provincial and Central Legislatures. They also thought that although the Indian States may not agree to make labour legislation a federal subject still the Indian States may not object to take part in the deliberations of a body like the Industrial Council. For all these reasons the Royal Commission recommended that an Industrial Council of this nature should be established. I find that the Government of India have not yet given serious consideration to this matter.

The other day this question was discussed in the Council of State, and I find from the newspapers that the reply given by the Government of India was not very satisfactory. It seems the Government of India consider that an Industrial Council as recommended by the Royal Commission

on Labour can only be established when the new constitution comes into existence. I feel that although the Industrial Council would be useful not only under the present constitution but even under the future constitution still the Royal Commission did not recommend that the Industrial Council should be established if only a new constitution is introduced in India. They thought that an industrial council will be useful under this constitution also. If the Indian States do not choose to join such a council, British India need not wait for that reason.

I, therefore, hope, that the Government of India will give serious consideration to this problem, and I recommend this proposal to the Government of India not only for the sake of avoiding delay in passing labour legislation but also on another ground which the Royal Commission had in mind in recommending this industrial council, namely, that under the present circumstances the working classes, employers and Government do not generally meet together except perhaps in this Legislature through their representatives. And, on account of that reason, a good opportunity for bringing about a proper understanding between the various interests is lost. They recommended the establishment of an Industrial Council, in order that it may be a means for the establishment of industrial peace in this country, so that Governments, the representatives of the workers and the representatives of the employers should meet together and discuss matters and there may be harmony and peace in the industry. I hope, Sir, the Government of India will take early action on this subject.

Then, Sir, before I sit down, I would like just to mention a word or two about a point on which some of us wanted to raise a discussion only yesterday, that is, the attitude of the Government of India towards certain unions in this country. Sir, recently the Government of India have started a policy of putting down what they call communist organisations and the communist movement. Sir, I am not a communist; I believe that it is necessary to substitute a better basis for our industry and for our society than the present capitalistic basis

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has only two minutes more.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I assure you I shall not deal with this matter in detail at all. I believe it is necessary to base our society and the industries and the whole economic structure on a socialistic basis, but I do not agree with the communists on two points. I am a democrat; I do not believe in dictatorship either of the proletariat or of other classes of people. Secondly, I do not believe in violence. It is true that the communists do believe in the dictatorship of the proletariat; they also believe in mass violence. But, Sir, if the Government of India want to deal with any acts of violence I feel they can sufficiently deal with them by the ordinary method by bringing the perpetrators of the acts of violence before the Courts. I feel, Sir, that it is wrong to try to penalise mere propaganda because if the Government of India have a right to make their own propaganda the communists have a right to make their propaganda.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik (Home Member): In favour of violence?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: If the Government of India want to create a feeling against violence the first thing which they will have to do is to abjure violence themselves. If the Government of India retain the right to use methods of violence to suppress organisations, on the whole the Government of India will not create public opinion in favour of constitutional methods and against methods of violence. I, therefore, feel that if the Government of India want to meet the propaganda of the communists they should meet it first by doing things by which the ground under the propaganda of the communists will be cut away. The communist succeeds because the people of this country are in poverty. They are groaning under various grievances. If Government take measures to remove the grievances of the people the ground under the propaganda of the communists will be cut away to a great extent. Secondly, Sir, I believe that propaganda should be met by propaganda and not by methods of violence. I hope, Sir, the Government of India will give up this policy because I can tell the Government of India, from my experience, that whenever they have made an effort to put down communism in this country by either putting the communists in jail or by suppressing their organisations, the communist ideas have not been suppressed.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's time is up now.

Mr N. M. Joshi: I shall not take more than one minute now, Sir. If communism is strong in this country anywhere, it is in Bombay, and I know that it is because Government make martyrs of these communists that they get recruits among the educated classes in this country. They get recruits not from among the working classes in this country, but among the educated classes, and that is because Government pursue the methods of suppressing communist activities. Moreover, it is not yet proved that all the unions which Government suppressed are communist unions. When Government start putting down organsations, both communists and non-communists are put down. I hope, Sir, the Government of India will give up this policy, and if they want the working classes in this country to follow constitutional and parliamentary methods, they should do everything in their power to promote constitutional methods and parliamentary methods. Sir, I hope the House will approve of my motion.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. V. V. Giri (Ganjam *cum* Vizagapatam: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, in this year of grace 1935, the Government of India, through the Honourable Member in charge of Finance, have budgeted a sum of 1,00 lakhs for rural uplift, and, directly or indirectly, to tackle the problem of unemployment in this country which represents 40 millions absolutely starving people and 60 millions under-employed. Sir, we expected that the Honourable the Finance Member would place before the House a cut and dry plan of economy to tackle these problems. If the intention of the Government of India was to thwart the efforts of Mahatma Gandhi who has established or will establish the Village Industries Association for a like purpose, or if they desire to place a non-official C. I. D. in all the

villages where this work is done, then this grant of 1,00 lakhs is a curse instead of a blessing. If the intentions of Government were *bona fide*, we all expected that the Honourable the Finance Member would place before this House his suggestions for a planned economy. Therefore, it is our duty on this side of the House to put forward some concrete proposals for discussion in this House.

I feel, Sir, that if the sum of 1,00 lakhs of rupees had to be utilised in a proper manner, it cannot be by the Government of India simply sending the amounts to the Provincial Governments, the Provincial Governments sending those amounts to the Collectors to distribute throughout the various villages in the form of doles. A crore of rupees is a very very small amount considering the objects that are before the Government to tackle the re-organisation of the villages and the unemployment problem in this country. I would, therefore, like to place some concrete suggestions in my own humble way The immediate task before the Government of India is to establish a central economic council representative of the varied interests of this House, charged with the duty of looking after this part of the work, and similar provincial economic councils should be established in the provinces to tackle this work under the guidance and advice of the central economic council. Considering the smallness of the sum, it cannot be utilised in every part of every district of every province. The direction should, therefore, be that two or three selected areas in each province should be taken up for this experiment and the experiment should be in the direction of the State acquiring two or three areas in each province where they should start subsidiary industries; and the whole work should be under the control and direction of the central economic council and the provincial economic councils. The Government should direct the various departments concerned in the provinces, whether it is the engineering department or the co-operative department or any other department, to help these committees in their work. It is only in that way that the matter can be tackled, and I do hope that the Government will give us the opportunity of hearing their proposals as to the way they propose to spend this money, so that this House can give its representative views in the matter. I submit that many things can be done by these councils—they can help in the collection of statistics, they can speed up production and improve agriculture, they can improve sanitation and education in the village parts, and so on. I would like again to submit that if this experiment succeeds in the manner I suggest, it would, in the long run, be a paying proposition to the Government and the Government would not mind, when the results are known, to pay more and more money because it is the duty of every civilised Government to improve every village in the country, improve the hopeless condition of the masses of the population who are starving for food. I hope the Government will give careful consideration to this aspect of the question.

Here I would like to refer to the statement made by the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce in opening the Dayalbagh Industrial Products Exhibition the other day. I noticed he was very frank and less noisy in the statement he made: he referred to the wonderful work done by the Dayalbagh workers, who having spent Rs. 5,000 in the beginning, twenty years ago, have built up a beautiful colony today, where nearly 2,000 workers are employed and three thousand acres are under cultivation and various subsidiary industries have been started: and the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce referred in very appreciative terms to the way in which the little colony was

[Mr. V. V. Giri.]

administered in its various departments, and I would only like to refer to a certain passage which I very much appreciated in the speech of the Honourable Member:

"I have given you these facts and figures; but no facts and figures can give a true description of Dayalbagh. To use another biblical expression—and biblical expressions seem naturally to come to one's lips when one is talking of Dayalbagh—'it is the spirit which giveth life'. It is the spirit behind these figures to which I would like to refer. It is impossible for me to do justice to that spirit and it is impossible I think for any one who has not visited the colony with its beautiful lay out and its happy and peaceful atmosphere to realise the driving force behind its multifarious activities and its combination of the ideal with the severely practical."

This statement is enough to prove the importance which the Honourable Member attaches to the organisation of similar colonies. The other day Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, the Deputy Leader of our Party, made a suggestion that a loan of Rs. 100 crores might be taken to develop the country: and the Finance Member thought either it was done in a spirit of light-heartedness or was merely an imaginative effort. But I think if the Government of India seriously tackle these problems, we, on this side of the House, can give them very constructive proposals. But the whole trouble is this: it is the spirit, as was referred to by the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce, that is necessary: that spirit, unfortunately is lacking, because, unfortunately, the Government that sit on the Treasury Benches do not represent our country, but represent more or less the interests of England. If really nationalist-minded men, representing the people, were to sit on those Benches, I am sure, they will be able to think in terms of India and not in terms of England. However, I can assure the Treasury Benches that while we are not sure of cent. per cent. results under the present Government, and unless the present system is changed we shall not have cent. per cent. results, we are always, so far as we are concerned, prepared and willing where economic interests are concerned, to place our constructive proposals for. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would remind the Honourable Member that the afternoon is allotted entirely to the European Group: therefore, this motion must be concluded before lunch.

Mr. V. V. Giri: Now, I would like to refer to the policy of the Government of India with respect to the workers in this country. The Trade Disputes Act has been in operation for the last more than eight years and I am bound to say that the spirit of the Act has not been put into practice. My submission is this: various disputes in India could have been prevented and great hardships to the poor workers could have been avoided if the Act had been put into effect properly. Many of the strikes that happened between 1927 and 1934 would not have happened if the Government of India had appointed the machinery intended to investigate these disputes that have occurred during this period. The Bengal Nagpur Railway strike of 1927, the Bengal Nagpur Railway lock-out of 1928, the South Indian Railway strike of 1928, the Great Indian Peninsula Railway strike of 1930 and the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway strike of 1932 would not have occurred if the Government of India had appointed a board of conciliation or a Court of Inquiry; and I charge the Government of India that

they are responsible for the sufferings of the workers through all these years, and I charge them that they are responsible for these strikes. I speak, Sir, with some experience of these things, because I had to take part in all these strikes, and we always put forward our suggestions long before and even soon after the strikes had taken place to appoint a conciliation machinery to investigate into the disputes, but the Government of India never did so. If only the Government of India listened to our suggestions, I am sure those strikes would not have occurred; the general strike on Railways did not occur because the Government, at the instance of the Railwaymen's Federation, appointed a Court of Enquiry. A strike did not occur on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway at Dohad, because the Government of India appointed a conciliation board. Therefore, I say, that the Government of India have not implemented at all the spirit of the existing law

Another point I should like to mention is that the Royal Commission on Labour came to India in 1929, and it made its recommendations. Those recommendations were placed before the Provincial Governments and trade unions; there were discussions and discussions and discussions, but up to now those recommendations have not been given effect to. If the workers asked for bettering their conditions, the Government of India would trot out the proposition that the financial stringency would not permit of their doing anything to ameliorate their condition. On the other hand, we put forward proposals which did not involve financial commitments, but the Government of India were very tardy and dilatory and numerous strikes have occurred solely due to the inaction of the Government of India. I submit, therefore, that it is the spirit referred to by the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce that is necessary to put these things into practice. It is because, Sir, that the Members of the Executive Council, sitting opposite, do not realise the difficulties and hardships of these people that they are indifferent to the woes of these poor people. If only all can realise, specially the Honourable Members on the other side, including some of our capitalist friends, that when they depart from this world, they would not take with them their millions to the other world or that the poor workers or beggars would not carry their rags with them to the other world, if they realise the fact that we have all come into this world naked and will get out of it naked, the world would be a better place, for, I am sure, if only Members sitting opposite realise this fact, better things will be done. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has only one minute more.

Mr. V. V. Giri: I thank you, Sir, for giving me an opportunity to explain my views, and I hope the Government of India will take the matters referred to by me into their serious consideration.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Sir, I will detain the House for only a few minutes, because I feel I must say a word in regard to the somewhat astonishing observations that fell from the Honourable Member behind me on the subject of Communism. The Honourable Member showed not only what I am afraid I must consider the most gross ignorance of his subject, but he made propositions which, I must say, completely astonished me. I cannot believe that he would have advanced those propositions if he had

[Sir Henry Craik.]

studied carefully the very full statement of the objects of the Communist party in India which I laid on the table of this House in the course of the Autumn Session, in which I called attention to the fact that we had a finding, a judicial finding by a High Court, as to the objects of the Communist party. These are, in brief, a mass insurrection in order to destroy not only the present form of Government, but what the Communist party seem to think more important, the existing fabric of society altogether, and especially what they regard as the bourgeoisie, of which class they would probably consider the Honourable Member behind me as one representative. Their object is not an ultimate or remote object, but an immediate object which they hope to carry out in the near future, and in case any Honourable Members sitting opposite feel that that is an object,—I do not suggest that they do,—but in case they feel that any of those objects are objects for which they can have any sympathy, I may state that the Communist party in India hates the Congress and all its works even more bitterly than it hates the Government and its works. Now, Sir, in spite of that information and in spite of another published statement which appears to have escaped the notice of the Honourable Member,—the statement published by the Bombay Government when it proclaimed certain organizations as unlawful,—in spite of that information, the Honourable Member suggests that the Government is wrong in doing anything to stop the activities of the Communist party. The statement of the Bombay Government to which I refer was published about the beginning of November, about the time when they proclaimed as unlawful certain Communist bodies including one or two which call themselves Trade Unions, and they concluded their statement by saying that a full examination of the record of these associations has established the fact that none of them was a genuine labour organization, that they were wholly controlled by Communists and that they had been actively furthering the objects of the Communist party of India, that is, as I have said, a mass insurrection to take place at an early date. A short notice question has been placed on the paper regarding similar action taken by the Government of Bengal against certain associations in Calcutta, and I hope to be able to answer that within a few days, and on that occasion to lay on the table another full statement of the attitude of the Government towards Communist associations generally, but I cannot allow the present occasion to pass without expressing my astonishment at the doctrine which the Honourable Member behind me has put forward.

He argued that the Government ought not to use what he calls methods of violence, that is to say it ought not to put the forces of law in motion, against these organizations, although, as I have shown, they are preaching by every means in their power not only armed revolution against the Government, but armed revolution against the whole fabric of ordered society. He alleges that the reason why the Communists attain any success in India is because of the poverty of the country. That is not so. I daresay, that is a contributing reason, but the main reason is because they are inspired by insidious propaganda from abroad and by the supply of money from abroad to carry out their nefarious objects. To suggest, as the Honourable Member suggested, that Government should stand by and watch these organizations daily growing in strength, daily permeating more and more into the masses of the people, until, I suppose, eventually an armed revolution breaks out, is, to my mind, the feeblest and most completely defeatist suggestion ever made, and I do not think any Government,—whether the

Government in its present form or a Government composed of Congress Ministers,—would listen to it for a moment. He actually suggested that we are to stand by and watch the people working for what I can only call a red and bloody revolution within the next few years and to do nothing whatever to stop it. I hope, Sir, the House will repel with all the strength it can the suggestion that Government should accept such fantastic and utterly impracticable suggestions.

Mr. H. P. Mody (Bombay Millowners' Association: Indian Commerce): I desire to say a few words on this cut motion. My Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, is a very privileged person. (Laughter.) He seems to be against every single activity, action and policy of the Government of India, and the harder he kicks against their policy and actions, the better the Government seem to like him. This seems to have given my Honourable friend a great deal of confidence, and he now wants to censure Government in respect even of matters in which, if anything, he has reason to be extremely grateful. Those of us who have had any acquaintance with the record of my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, as Member for Industries and Labour, are bound to recognise the great work that he has done in the way of the amelioration of the lot of labour. We have also seen that the devoted Secretary of his Department, Mr. Clow, has not spared himself in his efforts to implement such of the International Conferences Resolutions and recommndations of the Whitley Commission that are capable of being put into practical effect in the present stage of India's development. Yet, my Honourable friend gets up here and wants to censure Government for its failure to do anything for the labouring classes.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I did not say anything.

Mr. H. P. Mody: My Honourable friend does not know when he is well off. (Laughter.) The Government of India could very well take advantage of the fact that trade unionism in this country is not only in its infancy, but that so far as particular industries are concerned, is non-existent. There are, of course, well organised and well conducted unions like the Railwaymen's Union, of which my Honourable friend, Mr Giri, is the leader. These are functioning as trade unions, and whatever they have to urge must be listened to by every section of the House. But there are industries in which no trade unions exist and the Government of India could legitimately say that there was no pressure from any labouring interests with regard to labour legislation and they could very well sit still. Instead, the Government, under the inspiration of my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, have come forward repeatedly in this House, in the last few years, and proposed one measure after another. My Honourable friend does not seem to appreciate that at all.

Labour legislation must, in my opinion, at any rate, be strictly conditioned by the circumstances of particular industries. I am not suggesting for a moment that any industry has a right to exist which does not pay a fair living wage to its workers, and, so far as employers of labour are concerned, if there be any who have an idea of exploiting labour or of not giving it a square deal, I say they have no right to exist, and they will receive scant consideration not only at the hands of my Honourable friends who represent labour interests, but I hope of enlightened employers of labour as well. But capital is entitled to a reasonable remuneration for what it has put in, and if there is no capital there can be no labour. I say, therefore,

[Mr. H. P. Mody.]

that all those schemes of welfare work, which have been adopted by more advanced countries which can afford those things, cannot bodily be transplanted into India and made operative. And yet a great deal has been done in recent years, and I hope that a great deal more will be done, and I foresee a time when employers of labour will themselves inspire and foster schemes of labour amelioration. Even today, with all the limitations that have been imposed upon them, there are many employers of labour who run their factories on lines which can challenge comparison with what is being done in other parts of the world. But you cannot force the pace, and what the Government of India have done so far is to hold the scales strictly even, and my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, deserves credit, and not censure, for all that he has done. (Hear, hear.)

An Honourable Member: In fact, he has done more than we desired.

Mr. H. P. Mody: I do not wish to say anything about my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi's reference to Communists. I have said and written a great deal on the subject. So far as it is a dispute between Mr. Joshi and the Honourable the Home Member, they can fight it out amongst themselves. But from the point of view of the City in which Communism has played a very disastrous part, I can only say that, if it were not for the fact that those people who represent labour in this House cannot stand up against the forces of extremism and Communism in the very City in which they live and work,—it is because of that circumstance that Communism has raised its head. It is a tragedy that some of the so-called leaders of labour are unable to control or lead labour, with the result that poor, unorganised, ill-educated labour falls into the hands of unscrupulous agitators. I hope this House will not encourage my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, in the policy that he is pursuing. If his policy were to succeed and if every single recommendation that was made by the Labour Commission or by International Conferences were sought to be put into operation immediately in the present very poor stage of India's development, capital and industry would cease to exist, and those for whom my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, purports to speak would also be starved out of existence. (Cheers.)

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce (Member for Industries and Labour): As is usual on occasions when my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, raises his annual voice of protest against me and my Department, the discussion wanders over a very wide field. It is very difficult, therefore, for me to deal adequately with the various points that have been raised in the short time at my disposal, for I fully realise that the House is anxious to get on to the discussion of the next motion. My Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, reminds me of a character in a well known novel, in that he is never satisfied and is always asking for more. But unlike Oliver Twist, he does occasionally get more—(Laughter),—more perhaps than meets with the approval of some sections of this House. Again, he is always actuated by a keen desire to have everything done at once. I can only regard that as an implied compliment to the present Government as due to the feeling that the future Government is not likely to go as far as he would wish.

In the Mother of Parliaments, a short time ago, Mr. Joshi was unfairly and unkindly referred to by a Member, himself, I think I am right in saying, a Labour Member, as a man "picked out by the Government to sit

at Delhi to pretend to represent labour". Now, as I have said, I regard that remark as both unfair and unkind, but as is often the case with unfair and unkind remarks, there is a solid substratum of truth in it, and that substratum is that when Mr. Joshi speaks for labour, he very frequently voices not the desires of labour, but his own desires. He is constantly asking Government to take action on lines for which there is no apparent demand on the part of labour. I would give as a typical instance of that the first point that he raised, with regard to health insurance. There are no indications whatever that a system of health insurance would be welcomed by the workers. It would involve a constant series of deductions from their wage for a purpose in which quite a number of them have no belief at all and from which consequently many would derive little or no benefit. I would draw the attention of this House to what was said on this point in the last Assembly in regard to an experiment that Government tried to make themselves in the direction of health insurance, namely, in the Khewra salt mines. In that case, Government tried to work out a scheme by which they, in addition to paying the whole cost of the medical attention, were to provide half the cost of the financial benefits, that is, the actual proportion of wages—which was, I think, two-thirds wages in this case—to be given when the workman was ill. We asked the miners to contribute the other half, which was to be their only contribution, and we estimated that it would come to half an anna in the rupee of wages. They quite emphatically, and practically unanimously, declared they would have nothing to do with it; and Government felt that they really ought not, under the circumstances, to make the deductions compulsory, particularly as they had certain legislation for preventing other employers from making certain compulsory deductions under consideration, the legislation which is at present before this House. We have no reason to believe that workers employed by private employers would look at this matter in a different light from that adopted by Government employees. Mr. Joshi accuses us of having done nothing in this matter. I wish that, instead of bringing this annual censure motion against us, Mr. Joshi would occasionally come to talk to me about these matters and then I could explain to him what we are doing. In spite of our experience in the Khewra case, we have been exploring the possibilities of health insurance exactly in the manner suggested by the Whitley Commission. That Commission recommended inquiries by a small informal committee of the Central Legislature with medical, actuarial and statistical assistance. That, Sir, is exactly the procedure that we have adopted. The informal committee of this Legislature consists of our own Standing Advisory Committee elected by this and the other House. Medical assistance has been provided by the Public Health Commissioner, Colonel Russell, who has taken a very great deal of trouble in this matter. We have obtained the actuarial and statistical advice from London through him. He went very carefully into this question when he was in England and brought us back a large amount of most valuable information. The question has been placed before our Standing Advisory Committee on two occasions. It bristles with difficulties. The more one examines it, the more difficult it seems to establish a system of health insurance in this country, for the same reason as it is difficult to establish a system of unemployment insurance, namely, the complete absence of all data on the subject. We are, however, again going into this question with our Standing Advisory Committee before the end of this Session and we propose to consult them on the lines on which we should address Local Governments in regard to it. But, Sir, I would submit that

1 P.M.

[Sir Frank Noyce]

in any case the question is not one on which, in present circumstances at least, all-India legislation is desirable. Health is a provincial subject and in starting with entirely new ideas of this kind, the only sound method is to begin experimentally. Even a province is too large an area for experimental work. On the eve of provincial autonomy, it would be entirely wrong to attempt to saddle the provinces with a system which would necessarily be prepared without any adequate experimental basis and which, if carried out on any appreciable scale, would be extremely costly to administer and maintain. Mr. Joshi comes here and tells the Government that it is doing nothing. He wants to know what Government is doing.

An Honourable Member: Give him more.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Sir, I may be a worm, but I can occasionally turn and and I would turn on my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, and ask him what he and other labour leaders are doing. (Hear, hear) What are they doing? He comes here and voices his protest in this House but what is he doing to induce his constituents, the labour of which he claims to be the leader, to get used to ideas of this kind?

I now turn to the next important subject that he referred to in the course of his speech, that of the Industrial Council. He referred to the debates in another place on that subject but I do not know how far the Members of this House are acquainted with what was said there. If I repeat the arguments which were used by Mr. Mitchell in replying to the Resolution moved in the Council of State I trust I may be forgiven. I would, in the first instance, draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Whitley Commission did not regard this as an immediate matter. It is true they did not rule out the possibility of an Industrial Council being started before the Reforms, but it was the position under the Reforms that they had mainly in view and their principal object was to secure under a decentralised system of Government that measure of uniformity and co-operation which they regarded as essential I maintain that the attempt to institute an Industrial Council now would be premature. Labour, as the House is aware, is at present a reserved subject and Provincial Governments are only partially responsible for it There is no guarantee whatever, that responsible Provincial Governments would hold the same view as to the composition or the manner of operation of the Council as the Whitley Commission did. I would draw the attention of the House to an interesting analogy which is furnished by the recommendation of the Industrial Commission which contemplated a system of organisation, including two new all-India services, which was designed in the pre-reform period. That recommendation proved unacceptable to the Ministers when they came into office and effect was never given to it. There is every possibility, at least there is a very strong possibility, that an Industrial Council, constituted under the present regime, would not prove acceptable to the new Provincial Governments. As Mr. Joshi himself admitted, though he very lightly passed over the difficulty, no system instituted now could embrace the States and it is obvious that it would have to be revised as soon as Federation comes into being. There is provision in section 133 of the Government of India Bill to enable a Council to be set up when it is wanted. Lastly, on this point, I cannot see that an Industrial Council at this particular juncture would serve any useful purpose. We are still engaged in carrying out the Whitley Commission's programme. There is

a good deal that remains to be done. That programme was prepared after full consultation with labour, with capital and with Governments throughout India. It is, therefore, unnecessary to have it revised by an Industrial Council and if the Council were to take up new schemes coming outside it, they would have to wait until the present programme has been exhausted and that will take a considerable time. The Whitley Commission I may remind the House, recommended that the Industrial Council should be a statutory body. Statutory legislation in regard to such a Council would be extremely difficult in the circumstances I have endeavoured to explain and I maintain, Sir, that we have every justification for putting the constitution of this Council at a late stage in our programme and, in the meantime, devoting our attention to measures which bear more directly upon the amelioration of labour conditions.

There is another small point that Mr Joshi raised in regard to nutrition. He said very little about it, possibly because he knows that the establishment of a nutrition institute on the scale recommended by the Royal Commissions on Labour and on Agriculture has been held up for lack of funds. But, Sir, the fact that the establishment of a nutrition institute on a large scale has been held up for lack of funds does not mean that no attention is being paid to the subject. Colonel McCarrison in his laboratory at Coonoor has continued to do excellent work in regard to it. He is either on the point of retiring or has already retired and his place is being taken by Dr. Ackroyd of the League of Nations Health Service, who has, I understand, acquired a varied experience and an international reputation on work of this kind. I think that is sufficient to show that this recommendation of the Royal Commission has not been overlooked. Time is pressing and I am afraid I cannot deal at length with the points raised by my Honourable friend, Mr. Giri, but I should like to ask him where he got his figures of 40 million unemployed in this country from. I think he said 40 million wholly unemployed and 20 partially employed.

Mr. V. V. Giri: Sir M. Visweswaraiya quoted it in his book. That is my authority.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Sir, I am studying Sir M. Visweswaraiya's book with the closest attention, but I find it very difficult always to follow him as so much of his argument is based on figures for which he gives no authority. This is one of them. I am quite certain that his estimate is not based on census figures. It is just his general estimate: and I maintain that every Member of this House is in as capable a position to decide how many unemployed there are in India as Sir M. Visweswaraiya. I, for one, do not agree with his estimate of 40 million unemployed.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): That is incorrect. There are more.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: My Honourable friend, Mr. Giri, raised a point about the working of the Trade Disputes Act. I think he maintained that in several cases, at any rate, strikes would have been averted if the Government of India had appointed a Court of Enquiry. Well, Sir, I have not all the facts of the case at my disposal and I cannot carry them all in my head, and even if I had, I doubt if I should be justified in wearying the House with them. But I think I am right in saying that in the Bengal Nagpur Railway case (certainly in one of them) further

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

concessions were made by the employers, and so far as I can remember, no strike occurred. In the case of the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway, there was an actual committee of conciliation sitting, and, therefore, there was no need for any Tribunal. Apart from Railways, the question of appointing Tribunals is one for Local Governments. The last application I can remember related to the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway, and in that, the Union declined to withdraw the accusation that the Agent had acted in bad faith. Now, Sir, I would ask: "What is the use of asking a third party to try and conciliate between two other parties, if one party declines to accept the *bona fides* of the other"? It is as if Mr. Giri said: "Please make me friends with Mr. X. I must continue to tell him that he is a scoundrel, but I must ask you to make me friends with Mr. X again." (Laughter.) That is the position with regard to the last Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway strike. As regards Mr. Giri's suggestions in respect of the one crore grant for village uplift and in regard to economic planning generally, I must leave those to be dealt with by my Honourable friend, the Finance Member. He will doubtless have an opportunity of doing so at some further stages of the discussions. My Honourable Colleague, the Home Member, has already dealt with the question of Communism. That, Sir, concludes all I need say, except that I am very grateful to my Honourable friend, Mr. Giri, for the reference he made to my speech at the opening of the Dayalbagh Industrial Exhibition. Mr. Joshi comes here—as I have already said more than once, and as I shall probably have to say many more times during my term of office—Mr. Joshi comes here year after year and complains that Government are doing nothing. Now, "Dayalbagh" shows what the people of India can do for themselves with a modicum of Government assistance. As Mr. Giri quoted from my speech, Biblical quotations come very naturally to one's mind in dealing with "Dayalbagh". I gave those present two such quotations last Sunday, and I will now give one more and that a final one: "Go thou and do likewise". (Hear, hear.) (Applause.)

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): Mr. President, I shall not detain the House for more than a few minutes. The fact that I am a Nominated Member in this Legislature, nominated by Government, has come in during the last two or three days for some criticism. I am very grateful to my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, for saying a few kind words about me in reply to what Colonel Wedgewood has said about me in the House of Commons, and I am also very grateful to my Honourable friend, Mr Mody, for referring to me as being a privileged person.

Mr. H. P. Mody: Aren't you?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Mr. President, I feel it is a privilege to have the opportunity to represent the working classes of this country in the Legislature of our country, and I am very grateful to the Governor General and to the Government of India for nominating me.

An Honourable Member: You do not stand alone,—there is also Mr. Giri there.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: But, at the same time, Mr. President, let me assure my friend, Mr. Mody, and all those who have criticised me, that I do my

duty according to my lights. I may be displeasing some people, but I hope I shall have the strength to continue in the course which I have placed before myself. (Hear, hear.) I do not wish to say even a word more about this aspect. The Honourable Member in charge of Industries and Labour, so far as my suggestion for the establishment of some scheme for sickness insurance goes, said that he would like the Provincial Governments to take the initiative in these matters. I think, Sir, it will be wrong to expect Provincial Governments to take the initiative in these matters. It is not easy for a Provincial Government to take an initiative, on account of industries being competitive. Health insurance will require some contribution from employers, some contribution from Government and some contribution from the employees themselves. So far as Provincial Governments are concerned, I take it that the Provincial Governments may be persuaded somehow to make a contribution, and in spite of the fact that the Honourable Member thinks that the working classes will not be willing to contribute, I feel they would be willing to contribute. It is a matter of experiment; somebody has to make the experiment, let us make it.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Government have already tried the experiment. It has failed.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Government might have tried the experiment. I do not think, however, that that experiment has been fully tried out. I have absolutely no doubt in my mind that if a health insurance scheme is established by Government, the working classes would not complain about the contribution which they will have to make; but at the same time I feel that the employers in one province will not generally agree to have contributions levied against them unless the employers in other provinces are also asked to pay contributions. Industry is competitive. It is, therefore, necessary that a scheme of this kind should be undertaken by the Government of India and should not be left to the Provincial Governments. The Honourable Member referred to the fact that the working classes generally should take the initiative. He asked me what I had done in this matter. Well, Sir, what I have done is to bring forward this cut motion in this Legislature. (Laughter.)

I generally employ all my time in making suggestions, and I think, Sir, it is not a very easy work to do, but still I undertake it. As regards the Industrial Council, the Honourable Member maintained that it will not be very practicable to undertake the establishment of the Industrial Council on account of the future Constitution. The Honourable Member said that I had greater faith in this Government than in the future Government. Well, Sir, that is a fact. It is because that is so, that I voted against the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report. I feel that the future Government with the two Chambers in the Centre and the two Chambers in the Provinces is bound to give us a worse Government than the present Government. (Hear, hear.) It is, therefore, quite natural that I should like the Government of India to take action in this matter immediately.

Then, Sir, one word about what the Honourable the Home Member said. He said that I was ignorant of the subject. But what else can happen? I want to read books on Communism, but the Honourable Member will not allow me to read books on Communism.

An Honourable Member: Get it from his private library.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I remember a gentleman, who is very closely associated with me, returned from Russia with a number of books. He is a Nominated Member of the Bombay Council today. The books he brought were not allowed to be taken possession of by him. I really want to have a very clear notion about Communism, but, unfortunately, the Honourable the Home Member will not allow me to do that. One thing I would like to say to the Honourable the Home Member and that is that Communism is allowed to exist in Great Britain.

An Honourable Member: No, no.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Yes; it is allowed. The Trade Unions are not suppressed because the Communists are their leaders, and, after all, no disaster has overtaken Great Britain on account of their allowing Communism to exist in Great Britain. I think no disaster will fall on India if communism is allowed to exist in this country. Sir, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Twenty-Five Minutes to Three of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Twenty-Five Minutes to Three of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

Necessity of adapting the Administration to meet Modern Economic Needs:

(*a*) *Establishment of Cabinet Secretariat,*

(*b*) *Redistribution of Portfolios,*

(*c*) *Economic Advisory Staff,*

(*d*) *Overseas Department,*

(*e*) *Tariff Board, and*

(*f*) *Revision of Customs Tariff.*

Mr. F. E. James (Madras: European): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The general purpose of this motion is contained in the words which follow in brackets after the motion. I should like to make it quite clear that this is not a censure motion in the ordinary sense of the word. It is really a motion which is moved by us to draw attention of the House

and of Government particularly to certain proposals which we made last year at this time and some of which I shall repeat in a modified form now. If we find that the attitude of Government towards those proposals is satisfactory, we shall ask leave of the House to withdraw the motion.

In the first place, I should like to refer to the debate last year. We had a whole day devoted to the question of the need for certain administrative changes in the machinery of Government which aroused a great deal of interest throughout the country. I myself was astonished at the interest that was aroused and was the recipient of a great many letters, including a number from various Provincial Ministers, referring in terms of appreciation to the general debate which followed the motion which I then moved. And the general proposals, which I then made on behalf of my Group, have since been discussed by various Chambers of Commerce and other trading and industrial organisations throughout the country, so that the debate served a very useful purpose then in rousing public opinion on a matter which we still believe is of very great importance.

Now, Sir, as far as the specific proposals which I made last year are concerned, I would acknowledge the fact that some of them have already been accepted and others are in process of being carried into effect. For example, the consolidation of the tariff schedule which we pressed last year was effected by legislation at the end of the Session in April. And speaking for our own commercial interests, and, I think, for commercial interests generally, we very much appreciated that action on the part of Government. Then, Sir, we understand from speeches delivered in this House by the Honourable the Commerce Member and in another place by the Chief Commissioner for Railways that the question of the revision of railway tariffs is proceeding and will be expedited as far as possible, and that trading and commercial interests will be consulted during the course of that inquiry before any final conclusions are reached. We attach very great importance to the consultation with trading and commercial interests in the course of that inquiry. I may say here in passing that recent discussions on this question of railway rates raises in my mind and in the minds of many of my own friends the absolute necessity of the establishment of a Railway Rates Tribunal in connection with the establishment of a Railway Statutory Authority. There must be some independent authority to which the public can go, both as regards passenger and as regards goods rates, in connection with the railway tariff.

Then, as far as the revision of the customs tariff generally is concerned, in regard to non-protected articles which we pressed last year, I am afraid we have to record now that so far nothing definite has been promised to us. It is true that the Finance Member, in his reply to the general discussion on the budget, stated that no serious revision of a general nature was possible in the direction which we suggested unless he had some money to play with. We admit that as a perfectly obvious fact, but what we should like him to agree to now is to initiate a careful investigation into the existing rates with the object of securing greater uniformity and a larger free list in regard to those articles which are absolutely necessary for India's internal economy, particularly in connection with the development of agriculture.

Then, Sir, last year we referred also to the Tariff Board and we pleaded with Government for some modification both in the composition and in the function of that body. We referred last year to the temporary nature of the Board and its temporary character was revealed in answer to a

[Mr. F. E. James.]

question put by one of my Honourable friends on the other side of the House by the Commerce Member only the other day. It appears to us that from the probable trend of economic development in this country in the near future it is more than likely that this body, the Tariff Board, will have its hands very full. We, therefore, suggest that its procedure should be less leisurely than it is today and that the preliminary step of establishing to the satisfaction of the Commerce Department a *prima facie* case for inquiry be abolished. I submit, Sir, that the Tariff Board, after all, is only an advisory body, and that the responsibility for Government policy in regard to tariffs remains and must continue to remain in the hands of the Government of the day. Therefore, that being so, we see no danger in suggesting a modification of the present procedure whereby the course of the inquiry may be expedited and whereby Government's conclusions on the consideration of the results of that inquiry may similarly be accelerated. And I very much hope that we shall have some indication today from Government as to whether they are prepared to consider the modification of the machinery in that direction.

Now, Sir, before I go on to the proposals which we wish to continue to press today, I want to say straightaway that we disclaim any attempt to propound schemes of "planned economy", which is a phrase much misunderstood and much abused. We also repudiate definitely that in our suggestions we either infer or imply any attack on any individual or any body which now exists. We believe that in some respects the present system in regard to those matters which I shall shortly describe is, generally speaking, ill-adapted to present-day needs. On the other hand, we do believe that considering all the circumstances, even the present system has stood remarkably well the strain of the world crisis. I should like to say here and definitely that we recognise that much of that is due to the courage and the hard work of those who have been in charge of the various departments during the past few years. On some of them, as we know from experience who have been in close touch with them during these years, on some of them successive emergencies have imposed an almost intolerable strain; and when I heard some of my Honourable friends the other day speak about the peaceful life of some of the Members of the Executive Council, I thought that they could not have been aware of that life certainly during the past few years, and it is only proper that, whatever we may think of the policy of those who administer the Government of this country, this House should recognise the courageous way in which the heads of the departments and the Members of the Executive Council have tackled an unparallelled situation in world economics and have achieved a great deal in this country during most difficult years indeed.

Now, the object of this present motion is limited to the adaptation of certain elements of the administrative machine to meet modern requirements. The present departmental system is a survival to a very large extent of the days of Lord Curzon, and we do not think that in many ways it is really suited to that joint responsibility and co-ordinated action which are so necessary today when practically every country in the world is committed to some form of economic nationalism and is going in for some form of planned effort. Last year, we pressed for a redistribution of the portfolios of the Government of India; and we still believe that this is an urgent and important matter. We consider principally that such redistribution should involve, first of all, the formation of a Ministry of Communications, bringing under one Member or Minister Railways, Roads,

Civil Aviation and Posts and Telegraphs; and, secondly, the portfolio of Commerce and Industries or Trade, involving the reorganization of the present Commerce Department so as to form separately under one Member or Minister a section of Overseas Trade, a section of Shipping and a section of Trade and Industries. The duty of the overseas section would be to foster Indian commerce and to deal with commercial relations and treaties. No one can say that that is not a very urgent matter at the present time. We hear almost every day of abrogated treaties, of action being taken by foreign countries which are calculated to injure India's export trade. Therefore we consider that it is very essential that the department should be strengthened by the formation of a separate overseas section along the lines of the overseas department of the Board of Trade. The section of trade and industries should deal with matters affecting Indian industries and internal trade. I turned over a book during the week-end and found that in the Order in Council issued by His Majesty the King in 1660, establishing the Council of Trade in the United Kingdom the following words appear:

"To take into consideration the native commodities, their growth and production in our kingdom and how they may be ordered, nourished and manufactured to the employment of the people and to the best advantage of the public."

That is exactly the function of the Department of Industries and Trade or the section of industries and trade to which I am now referring. Problems of commerce and industries are inter-related. Those of us who have had to deal with various industrial and commercial problems in recent years have come to realise the essential inter-relation of these two Departments and how there is sometimes now a tendency for one Department to work on one line and another Department to work on another line. Indeed it is sometimes left to the outsider to reconcile those two conflicting points of view in regard to specific proposals. When, therefore, these Departments under one Minister change the present bottle-neck system whereby everything passes through one office in the Commerce Department into the establishment of three sections, it would, in our view, conduce to greater efficiency. There may, of course, be other forms of redistribution which are possible and desirable as far as the Executive Council is concerned. I am not going to suggest others. I refer to these particular ones because they are in regard to subjects in which we are more particularly interested.

The redistribution of portfolios would, to our mind, inevitably involve the establishment of some definite machinery relating to the Cabinet or the Executive Council as a whole, by which records may be kept and decisions may be communciated to various Departments. We are not suggesting any precise method: we believe that a redistribution of the portfolios along these lines will automatically render some method or machinery of that nature absolutely essential. Perhaps we may suggest to the Government that they might invoke the services of Sir Maurice Hankey who, since, I think, 1919, has been the Secretary of the British Cabinet and who has had unrivalled experience in the organisation of machinery in regard to cabinet co-ordination and responsibility. I understand, and I am glad to note it, that the Government of India have accepted in principle the formation of a Ministry of Communications. We consider that a very great step. The precise time at which the change

[Mr. F. E. James.]

should take place is, of course, a matter for the Governor General himself; but, on further consideration of the matter, we came to the conclusion that the distribution between the two portfolios now mentioned is not really enough. We suggest that the whole question of the distribution of portfolios and the Executive Council needs revision. We are quite aware that we may be told that these matters can await the establishment of the new Federal Government. We do not agree with that view. If for any reason Federation does not materialise simultaneously with or shortly after provincial autonomy, the establishment of responsible Ministries in the provinces and the redistribution of subjects will in any event necessitate changes in the Centre and in the administration of the Government of India. We, therefore, suggest that the proper time for the changes which we envisage would be the establishment of provincial autonomy in the provinces, and that in the meantime, in order to be prepared for that occasion, inquiries should be undertaken with that end in view.

The second main proposal which we made last year and on which we have not so far heard of very much progress, is in regard to the appointment of a small staff of economic experts and the creation of an economic advisory council. As I have said, we have discussed these proposals during the year with responsible bodies and we now continue to press for a small economic staff of say three persons attached to the Government of India as a whole. One of them should be, we suggest, a person of outstanding ability who should be termed the Chief Economic Officer of the Government of India. Owing to pressure of administrative business on the departments, the present Secretaries of the departments are working under constant pressure to keep abreast of current problems; they, therefore, as a natural course, have less and less time to give to a comprehensive consideration of economic developments and tendencies. The proposed economic staff, in our view, should stand outside the general stream of departmental business though maintaining contacts with all departments. It should advise Government with regard to the economic consequences of their own policy, undertake inquiries of an economic nature and supply statistics and other relevant information to the Executive Council and generally advise in an expert capacity all or any of the departments. It should be free from administrative routine in order to devote itself to "thinking out" the many problems that confront the Government every day. We suggest that the nucleus of the staff is already present in the Director General of Commercial Intelligence. We do emphasise, however, that this staff must be relieved of ordinary departmental routine, so that the whole of its time may be made available to the real task of consultation, co-ordination, inquiry and advice on economic matters.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): A super Council?

Mr. F. E. James: We do not propose a super Council. The staff should be permanent, and not liable to the ordinary three-year tenure—a system of doubtful advantage anyway. This staff would be only advisory. There is no suggestion of a "Brain Trust", that is what the Honourable the Finance Member suggested,—there is no suggestion of a "Brain Trust" dictating policy, or of an additional department with administrative functions. The duties which we envisage are described in an article

which appeared in the *Statesman* of Sunday last, under the heading "The Craze for Planning", which says:

"The type of adjustment most needed in the machinery of Government is the creation of a compact "policy cabinet" freed from departmental responsibilities of a central planning body with the necessary resources and powers to obtain information, to make surveys, and to work out schemes over a wide field, without expensive functions and with responsibility to the Cabinet alone "

So far as the Economic Advisory Council itself is concerned, we recognise the difficulties that were mentioned last year by Sir George Schuster and which we have realised even more fully since, and we suggest that that might be left for the time being. We do urge, however, the importance of periodic economic conferences with the Provinces on which the advice of the Economic Staff might be of very great value.

Sir, I would, in this connection, refer to the Bowley-Robertson Report which was published last April. I would refer specially to two paragraphs, and I would seek your permission to read them. First of all, at page 2, they say this.

"We recommend the abolition of the title of Director General of Commercial intelligence and Statistics and the establishment of a Permanent Economic Staff, directly attached to the Economic Committee of the Governor General's Executive Council. The staff should consist of four Members. The Senior Member should act as Secretary to the Economic Committee of the Council, to whom he would be responsible for the organization of the whole work of economic intelligence."

Then, the second paragraph is taken from the same page and the same Report:

"The whole staff would maintain the closest possible contact with certain other officers of Government, including both some whose duties are primarily administrative and some whose duties are primarily technical and advisory. It would be within its competence to recommend to the Economic Committee of the Council the *ad hoc* engagement of external technical experts for the purpose of reporting on the economic potentialities of particular areas or of particular branches of processes of production."

We do stress the importance of some of the recommendations contained in this Report, particularly those that I have already referred to and others which refer to the collection of statistics, the initiation and continuation of series of index numbers, of prices, wages, production, etc., etc. I should like the Honourable the Finance Member to tell us whether the Government of India have completed their consideration of this Report, and if so, what, if any, action has been decided upon.

3 P.M.

Sir, these are the two of our main proposals. They are very modest. We do not claim infallibility for them, nor do we claim completeness for them. We put forward the suggestions in the same spirit in which we made our suggestions last year. We believe that the development of India's internal economy and external trade is a vital and a necessary and urgent matter. The basis of India's prosperity is the purchasing power of the agriculturist. An outlet for his products is essential, while redistribution and extension of home manufactures are equally essential. There must, therefore, be a balanced economy in our policy. These are wider questions on which I do not propose to touch. But we are anxious if we can, to secure some adaptation of the present machinery which will equip the Government with the scientific knowledge required and encourage greater co-ordination of effort and policy. We believe that the present

[Mr. F. E. James.]

Government owes it to the new Government of the future to hand over a machine which is modernised and rationalised and more suited to the new conditions under which responsible Government will operate. Sir, I move.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, the House is always interested when my Honourable friend, Mr. James, sets a few problems to it to solve. The problems which he has so eloquently put this year read along the problems he set last year are very difficult and comprehensive, and that is why it is really very difficult to suddenly express opinions on every one of them, but I do hope, when my friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, rises after me, he will solve some of the difficult puzzles which I am not able to handle.

Sir, with one portion of Mr. James' observations I agree, and that is, the administration of the Government of India requires planning. Those of us who have watched the Government of India's administration and the working of the Secretariat after the inauguration of the Mostford Reforms will find that there had been changes in the policy of the organization of the Secretariat on three or four occasions at three or four different periods. There was a time when the Government of India policy was to Indianise the Secretariat Offices, I mean the higher posts—*viz.*, the Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries and Joint Secretaries were attempted to be Indianised. But, Sir, the Simon Commission Inquiry came, and, thereafter, with the idea of establishing reserved subjects, the predecessor of the present Finance Member tried to drive away every Indian from the highest Secretariat staff of the Finance Department. At present, in the Finance Department, there is not a single Indian barring the Budget Officer who occupies, I think, the position of Under Secretary in the Department. The other Departments, barring the Department of Education, Health and Lands, contain only one Indian not higher than a Deputy Secretary as if one Indian against so many European officers would be able to satisfy planned administration for India. Therefore, I support the spirit underlying the observations of my friend, Mr. James, that the Government of India have not moved with modern conditions, nor have they tried to translate the promises that previous Members of the Executive Council gave on the floor of this House. They have gone behind those promises. They might now be working in the spirit of coming events that the administration will be day by day more rigorous and they do not want to part with any responsibility, but I do hope that if there is any idea of modernising the administration of India, there should be a sufficient number of Indians occupying positions of trust and responsibility such as Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries and Joint Secretaries, in the Government of India. I also don't believe that there should be such large numbers of Secretaries, Under Secretaries and Joint Secretaries in the Government of India; their numbers should be reduced.

Sir George Schuster gave the assurance:

"As soon as a convenient opportunity occurs, it is definitely the intention of the Government of India that the question of the change should be taken up."

That opportunity is coming very shortly, and I hope the Government of India will hand over to one Member all the Departments which my Honourable friend, Mr. James, described as Communications. Last year, my Honourable friend also suggested that the Department of Inland Steam Navigation and Shipping should be under the Member for Communications, but this year he has not mentioned anything about inland navigation. But I hope he still adheres to the views expressed by him last year.

As regards the reshuffling of the portfolios of the present Cabinet Members, I know that some of the Departments have very little work. They have increased the amount of work by increasing the number of files although they have really very little work to do. If I may express an opinion, the staff of the Secretariat can be reduced by half, and the supervising staff, I mean, Secretaries, Additional Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries, can also be reduced by half. It is no use increasing the number of files and sitting over them and expressing opinions months and months after. I do recognise there has been some additional work due to the contemplated reforms, but the Reforms Department has grown under the patronage of the Home Department and it is now a much bigger Department than perhaps the Home Department itself. I do hope, now that the reforms chapter is closed, that Department also would be abolished.

I am not surprised that my Honourable friend, Mr. James, spoke hesitatingly on that most interesting subject, economic planning or planned economy. It is true there were two gentlemen, Messrs. Bowley and Robertson, who were investigating something in that line in some anteroom of the Secretariat. But as soon as my Honourable friend, the new Finance Member, landed in India, he bowled out those two Professors and their report as well, and nobody has heard of them or their report until they have been resuscitated today by my Honourable friend, Mr. James. We have forgotten not only those two Professors, but also the existence of those Indian Professors who assisted them. What Roosevelt dreamt or dreams in America, what the Soviet Dictator, Stalin, practises in Soviet Russia, the Government of India, being alien and bureaucratic as they are, cannot conceive. They can befool us once; they can befool us twice; but they cannot befool us all the time. Nobody thinks of India's planned economy, and I am glad we heard the last of it when Sir George Schuster left the shores of India. In a way—I have expressed the view elsewhere—I welcome even the little attempt on the part of the present Finance Member to allot a crore of rupees for economic recovery. I welcome the phrase "economic recovery"; it sounds much better than economic planning, because the phrase "economic recovery" means one crore of rupees this year, and, in the subsequent years, so many crores. But planned economy does not mean anything to me; it begins and ends with the Finance Member who schemes out that plan on paper, and such paper plans end without any tangible shape. The idea of planned economy will not worry our minds as long as the Government think of doing something actually for the economic recovery of the people.

Let me next deal with the problem of revision of the customs tariff. The taxation policy of the Government is, no doubt, intimately connected with the customs tariff revision. With the balance of export trade so little in favour of India, with imports falling off year to year, the Government of India have no alternative but to think of the high customs tariff.

[Mr. B. Das.]

It may be that the Finance Member may receive pressure, either from the Indian commercial side, or from the British commercial side, to reduce the customs tariff, but it is very difficult to reduce customs tariff, and last year, when Mr. Hardy spoke on the subject, he dealt with it in some detail, how the customs tariff has varied from year to year. The Government needs have gone up very high and they have to put up heavier tariffs. But we cannot reduce the customs tariff, whether it is on exports or on imports, unless we point out to Government that there are other methods of taxation. With the present high level of income-tax, we know that there is a diminishing return, and though the Government may go on increasing the rate of income-tax, they will not get more; it will be stationary somewhere between Rs. 16 and 17 crores. Of course, the excise duty has come to stay. My Honourable friend, Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon, may growl, but there it is and it will be a general feature of our taxation. There is at present excise duty on salt, sugar, matches, steel ingots, wines and spirits, also kerosene and petrol. A scientific method of devising excise duties is what this House has always demanded. This House has asked for equalising the excise duty on kerosene with the import duty on kerosene, but there is the political hitch. My Honourable friends, the Members of the European Group, will not agree that excise duty on kerosene and petrol should be equalised with the import duty on those articles. Then, there is the political pressure which is being applied on the Finance Member. There is the problem of Burma separation—he may not talk of it today, but there is that question, and Burma must be given a subsidy or a bounty—I cannot say a subvention,—of Rs. 1½ crores or so at India's cost, and, therefore, the excise duty cannot be equalised with the import duty. The tariff on exports, I submit should be so planned as to help the Indian industries. Last year, Government abolished the export duty on hides. This year they are abolishing the export duty on skins, and yet the Honourable the Commerce Member has been receiving representations, and also it has been expressed on the floor of the House, about granting protection to the tanning industry in India. It is no use levying or abolishing an export duty, if the scheme of export tariff is not a scientific one and is not designed to develop the industries of India. I am opposed to the abolition of the tariff on skins. It is very difficult for anybody in fifteen minutes or even in an hour to detail the exact nature of a scientific system of taxation. Although the predecessor of the present Finance Member foreshadowed that the time had come when the taxation policy of the Government of India should be revised or rather planned out, I want to warn my Honourable friend not to do it, simply because he receives pressure from this side or that side of the House. That means that he will be only tinkering with it. So long as the Government of India continue their present heavy military burden and have to provide Rs. 45 crores for the military expenditure . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has already exceeded his time.

Mr. B. Das: Sir, one minute more, and I have done. As long as they connect the rupee to sterling, as a result of which the economic conditions of the Indian masses have become impoverished due to low prices of Indian produces, and as long as there is this flight of gold to England to the tune of more than Rs. 200 crores worth,—unless Government face all

the problems—delinking the rupee with the sterling and reducing the heavy military expenditure, no financier, unless he is an imaginative Finance Member and expects to go to jail after he retires from this House or while he is in this House, can think of a scientific planning of the taxation policy of India.

Mr. J. A. Milligan (Bengal: European): Sir, I rise to support the motion. Like the Honourable the Mover I do so not in a spirit of censure or with a desire that the Honourable the Finance Member should spend sleepless nights wondering how to make good a further depredation; but in order to mention a particular line of action which I believe to be worthy of the consideration of the Government of India and of this House.

The great economists of the 19th century enunciated and expounded the laws of supply and demand in a world where free trade was a practical possibility. Even at the end of the century, we find men like Professor Marshall demonstrating, in a convincing if somewhat tedious manner, the inevitable ultimate equation of demand and supply by normal natural processes.

They did not forsee the paradox which the regime of *laissez-faire*, to which *they* gave their blessing, was destined to evolve for *us*—a world impoverished by its colossal wealth.

The elimination of man-power from production; the industrialisation of the whole world—accompanied by the subordination of economic precepts to the spirit of nationalism and to the lure of industrial self-sufficiency—these were things undreamt of in the philosophy of Adam Smith. But they are facts that face us today. The profound depression of the past few years has given mankind the leisure and the incentive to think seriously; and concerted action has definitely begun.

Four lines of thought have chiefly engaged attention and have determined the character of the measures taken in different countries to solve the problems they define, namely;

(1) Technological unemployment, or the displacement of men by machines without the provision of alternative employment.

When Adam was driven from the Garden of Eden and harnessed to the task of keeping a wife and family, the handicap was imposed on him, and on all his descendants, "in the sweat of the face shalt thou eat bread"—or in modern economic phraseology "A man's contribution to 'supply' is the measure of his legitimate 'demand'." The most vital urgent duty of the world today is the restoration of earning-power to the growing hordes of the unemployed.

(2) "Over-production" and its counterpart "under-consumption".

(3) The dangers of uncontrolled individualism in the handling of capital.

(4) Predatory competition inspired by the ethics of war.

The problems which I have described are being tackled in different ways by different countries. Russia, Japan, the United States of America, Italy, Great Britain are conspicuous examples of concerted and constructive action. Though the methods adopted in these countries differ widely both in kind and in degree, there is one principle common to them all and

[Mr. J. A. Milligan.]

that is the recognition that the regime of *laissez-faire* and uncontrolled individualism has got to be modified if the world is to achieve true economic recovery. We see three principal devices being tried—national economic conscription, compulsory regulation on lines prescribed by the State, and State-aided self-regulation. It is this third method that I desire to advocate as the one best suited to the psychology of India and the Empire as a whole.

The development of world communications of all kinds and the steady, though still far from adequate, improvement of the machinery of distribution, have brought into prominence the factor of "world-prices" for all general commodities. The existence of "world-prices" enhances the difficulty of achieving national self-sufficiency, and contributes to the permanence of the complicated system of tariffs and quotas so abhorrent to the orthodox economist.

If economic order is ever to be restored out of the present chaos, it will be by a policy of regulation intelligently and rationally pursued.

The world is beginning to envisage the possibility of an industrial system no longer based on competitive and ruthless individualism, but composed of regulated units prevented by Governmental control on the one hand from ever assuming the character of monopolistic corporations, and protected by legislation on the other hand from the disruptive action of recalcitrant and selfish minorities. In such a system the vast problems which have baffled the world under the regime of *laissez-faire* will be capable of satisfactory solution. Such a system cannot come into being with the dramatic suddenness of a Russian 5 years plan. It must be steadily built up, industry by industry, until its potentialities for good are sufficiently manifested to establish it on a footing outside the category of experiment.

Countries like Russia, the U. S. A., and Japan regard it as the business of Government to undertake wholesale economic planning for the benefit of the people. The alternative which I advocate is for Government to give its aid and its co-operation to the people in their economic planning for themselves, until such time, if such a time ever comes, when a compulsory extension of the process is clearly justified. It is right that the Government of every country should watch and study carefully what other countries are doing, but no country can afford to dig itself in and wait for a victory to be won on some other front. If India is not ready to deliver a smashing frontal attack like the N. R. A. of America, it can at least adopt the tactics of Marshall Joffre in 1915 and keep nibbling at the problem that is entrenched so powerfully against us. The attack will be strengthened and advance facilitated by the adoption of the practical suggestions made by the Mover; in particular by such rearrangement as will permit of proposals being submitted to Government through one department and not, as sometimes happens, in a piecemeal manner through two or three.

To every industry that comes forward with a practical scheme of self-regulation asking the Government and the Legislature to give it legal sanction, and to define the rules of the game for the protection of individual interests, I contend that such assistance should be given with sympathetic alacrity. In this way, steady progress will be made in the true rationalization of industry, and India will play a valuable part in the

search for a solution of the world's great problems. India cannot sit still and hope to be presented from outside with a ready-made remedy to which it has made little or no contribution.

Sir, I support the motion.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Before I come to the subject proper, I just like to be permitted to say one thing. At every stage of my life, I learnt new formulæ. While I was at school, I was told that I should repeat these districts of the Madras Presidency at one breath, which I did, and, on one occasion, I scored 99 per cent. marks for repeating Ganjam, Vizagapatam, Krishna, Godavari, Kurnool, Belari, Cudapah, Nellore, South Arcot, Tanjore, Madura, Tinnevelly, Salempur, Coimbatore, South Coast Annantapur, Nigiri, Malabar, Chingleput, City of Madras, North Arcot, Trichinopoly. When I came to college, I learnt new formulæ in the college such as:

$$Sn\,(u+v)=\frac{sn\,u\,cn\,v\,dn\,v+sn\,v\,cn\,u\,dn\,u}{1-k^2\,sn^2\,u\,sn^2\,v}\text{, etc.}$$

When I came to the Assembly, I learnt another formula, and I have heard it so often that I have learnt it by heart. I ask my friend, Mr. Satyamurti, to verify it. He must have learnt it also by heart, and that is "Wait and see". Wait we must, but see we never, and I hope that this particular motion will not be governed by the spirit of the formula to which we are accustomed and which is a new formula I have learnt since I came to the Assembly.

Now, Sir, I just feel that we are now on the eve of a very difficult problem as regards taxation. We have to pay in the neighbourhood of 70 crores every year to the United Kingdom on account of our commitments and remittances; we are a debtor country, and it is not possible for us to dictate to the whole world the policy of taxation. Now, if we adopt the present policy, I am afraid we will come to the conclusion that every country would like us to balance our trade separately, so that we will have no favourable balance of trade with any country, and we cannot possibly pay to the United Kingdom the seventy crores of rupees. Unless we revise the whole policy and bring it on the line with the rest of the world, and have a balance of trade at least to the extent of seventy crores, we will be in a very difficult financial position; and the result will only be the export of gold by means of which alone we can keep up our balance of trade. It is evident that it cannot possibly continue for a long time. You may keep it up for a few years, but not permanently; unless we have a good balance of trade and we revise our entire policy, it is not possible.

Before I come to the specific points raised by the previous speakers, I would just mention one or two points more,—that is, our tariff is now becoming so minute that it really baffles any person who thinks about it. Now, I have got this voluminous book in my hand (Tariff Act), but I can never find out what I want unless I read the whole of it. Sir, this Tariff Act is a very complicated document. Slight variation in silk and cotton gives an additional item in the Tariff Act, a new design of any commodity has an additional place in the Tariff Act. Discovery of new variation leads to the addition of new form of Tariff. Tariff has become so complicated that I am reminded of the story of Prince Alfonso, who, when explained the movement of the solar system, said that he could have devised a simpler system had his opinion been obtained. Whenever there was any difficulty in finding out the correct position of any particular planet, one more circle was added in the name of epicycles and then the circles became

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad]

that he said: "Well, the solar system would have been designed in a simpler manner". So I think this Tariff Act, which is now in my hand, would have been very much simplified. It should not go into so many details, and I hope the Finance Member, when he gets time, will look into the matter and will give us some simple tariff for this country—a tariff in which numbers are expressed in terrestrial figures and not in astronomical figures—I am using the phrase of my Honourable friend Sir Frank Noyce.

The next thing I would like to point out is that we made a kind of unscientific mistake in 1931 in raising all duties by 25 per cent. This was a great mistake and very unscientific. We never cared to see what particular commodities could or could not stand those duties, but we raised the whole thing by 25 per cent. and I think the time has now come when we should go thoroughly into the whole question and come to some definite conclusion. I never advocate that we should reduce these duties by 25 per cent all at once. At the same time, we ought to study the effect carefully and come to some definite conclusion.

Now, the most objectionable feature, to my mind, is what is called our policy of protection, which we have been pursuing during the last two or three years and which is chiefly responsible for the troubles that we now have to face. Now, this policy is ruinous to the agriculturists of this country and it is ruinous in two ways. By this policy of protection you have tried to raise the price level of manufactured articles. Now, we know that the price level of all articles is constant. Therefore, the price-level of all agricultural products must necessarily diminish if the value of one part has arisen: and the fall in the price of agricultural products is ruinous, as it would diminish the purchasing power of agriculturists. The second reason why it is ruinous is that we are now building up a special tariff wall against all these countries. They are retaliating. There is some movement in Germany, in Italy and in other countries. Each country is endeavouring to equalise import and export with us. This means that the export of our agricultural products to those countries may possibly diminish and that is the great danger. Therefore, this is the problem of all our problems—namely, how we should raise the purchasing power of our agriculturists, and unless that is done, I say, Sir, that the economic problem cannot be solved.

Sir, coming now to some of the points that have been touched by the previous speakers, I would just mention that there is an absolute necessity of having a tariff tribunal in the sense in which the word was defined by Mr. James. Our present Rates Advisory Committee is practically no committee at all. It dealt only with four cases last year, according to the Administration Report, at enormous expenditure. What we do require is a kind of Rates Tribunal which should function in the same way as the Rates Tribunal created by the British Railway Act of 1921. The second thing is about the change of portfolio. There is one thing which I feel is a little difficult. In theory, it is all right that we should have a portfolio of Communications. I myself was for it. But so far as this country is concerned, we see that the roads are a transferred subject and the Government of India have nothing to do with roads. As regards railways, more than half are administered by private companies and less than half are administered by the State, and, therefore, a combined portfolio of Communications, to my mind, has not the same force in India unless we modify our Constitution. I quite see that there is not sufficient co-ordination among portfolios under

different Members of the Executive Council, but the creation of a Minister of Communications in the existing circumstances and immediately is quite unnecessary and uncalled for. We should wait till Ministers are appointed at the Centre or at least till Provincial Autonomy is introduced. One Honourable Member raised some objection about the work of the Law Member, and I think the same will be the case with the Minister of Communications when the roads are transferred to the provinces, when the administration of railways is transferred to the Statutory Authority and a half of the railways are administered by the private companies. Therefore, this thing would require very great consideration, and, I think, we had better continue under the existing arrangements till the time we consider the entire problem. I am opposed to piecemeal reshuffling.

My friend, Mr. B. Das, talked about the question of the export duty on skins. Sir, if there is one sensible proposal in the Finance Bill, it is the abolition of the export duty on skins, but I will take up this question when I come to the Finance Bill.

There is one point to which I think we ought to pay some more attention than we have done up to the present and which will arise out of the economic survey which my Honourable friend, Mr. James, emphasised today and that is that we ought to find out some ratio of the actual selling prices at which consumers have to purchase goods to the prices at which the articles in question are actually imported or produced in this country. Taking the case of wheat, we should know at what price the cultivators sell their wheat, at what price it is purchased in Delhi or any other big town, and then we will calculate the amount of profit which the middlemen are getting and find out some solution for avoiding the middleman's profit or reducing it to a minimum. I have got no concrete facts to stand upon, but from the scanty inquiry I made, I think the middleman's profit comes to about two hundred per cent. or more. (Hear, hear.) Some inquiry is called for, not only about the articles which we produce in this country, but also as regards the articles which we import from outside. If this thing is done, it will be a great step forward in economic planning.

Now, there is one point more which I take this opportunity to press and that is that the Commerce Department should have some kind of advisory committee of merchants. Members after Members emphasised the fact, in connection with the Indo-British Trade Agreement, and supported also by telegrams coming from all over the country, that the merchants of India were not consulted. Whether that is true or not, I have no means to verify, but what I wish to emphasise is that such complaints would not have been made, had some kind of advisory committee of merchants existed which the Commerce Department could consult. It is not a new proposal. Such advisory committees exist in every country. The Commerce Department is not an all-wise department. It must have some kind of expert advisers whose advice they may or may not accept.

Before I sit down, I would like to emphasise once more that the time has come when we ought to revise our policy of taxation and make it more scientific and more economic in conformity with what existed before the War. Before the War, we were in a very happy position. We were practically free traders. We had a very nominal revenue duty of five to ten per cent. At that time, we had 80 crores of a favourable balance of trade. We paid all our dues, and, at the same time, we had sufficient money.

Prof. N. G. Ranga (Guntur *cum* Nellore: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I thank you very much for having given me this opportunity of saying a few words just before the discussion on the budget is over. Sir, I rise to support this cut motion for this purpose, that if there were to be an Economic Advisory Council in this country and there must be one and if there were to be a Minister or a Member of the Council for Communications, as there must be, then I would like that every one of the Members of that Advisory Council as well as the Member for Communications should be Indians. If, on the other hand, English people, any foreign expert, any foreigner is expected to be brought over to this country in order to dole out advice to us, then I am not at all in favour of this cut motion, and, I am sure, Honourable Members on this side of the House will not be in favour of this cut motion.

For a very long time, there has been a talk of planned economy in this country. The predecessor of our present Finance Member was very often talking of planned economy and on more than one occasion he assured this House that he was going to take necessary steps to see that a regular staff was appointed in this Government of India for carrying on statistical enquiries. As long ago as 1930, he assured the House that he was going to set apart 2½ lakhs in order to bring some expert from Europe to give us the kind of advice which he thought that we were in need of. As far as economic enquiries go in this country, we have had a number of experts. There was Dr. Slater, there was Dr. Mann, there was myself in Southern India and many other competent men, and all these people have been carrying on economic investigations in villages and in towns of the economic conditions of agricultural labourers, cottage workers as well as those in slum areas. Yet the Government of India did not care to take notice of any of these enquirers or inquiries made by them, but they preferred to bring two great experts, one from the City of London and the other from the City of Cambridge. They were expected to be assisted and helped by some economists of this country. Instead of wasting lakhs of rupees on those great economists of foreign countries, the Government would have done well if they had only consulted our own Professors in this country who had great experience in this country and who would have been very glad to serve this Government, not on any pay, but freely and without any remuneration. This morning, the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce was questioning the authority of Sir M. Visveswaraiya. I may point out to the Honourable Member for Industries and Labour that he is neither a labourer nor an economist, and, therefore, I can really understand his hesitation in accepting the suggestion as well as the estimates of unemployment in this country by such a distinguished and eminent an economist as Sir M. Visveswaraiya. I may remind the Honourable Member for Industries and Labour that Sir M. Visveswaraiya was appointed by the Government of India as President of the Economic Enquiry Committee which toured the whole country and submitted a report to the Government of India.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I was not disputing Sir Visveswaraiya's authority except in regard to one particular point, the number of unemployed people in this country, and I stated that, in regard to that particular point, he gave no authority whatever for his figures, and that, therefore, I and the Members of this House generally were as competent judges in this matter as he was.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In view of the fact that Sir M. Visveswaraiya has been accepted by most of the people who know anything at all about economics in this country as a sound and reliable authority on that subject, I expect the Honourable Member for Industries and Labour to accept the statement of the estimate of unemployed made by him, generally, as long as he is not able to prove to the contrary. He has made that estimate. He is not an irresponsible person, he is not an ignorant person. Everybody knows what his previous history has been, how distinguished a position he has held in planned economy as well as in the industrial development of this country, and when such a gentleman comes forward and makes an estimate, that should be accepted without question. I know why the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce has hesitation to accept that suggestion. If the same estimate has been made by a second rate or a third rate or even a tenth rate British economist, I am sure, he would have no hesitation in accepting the same.

I come now to the question of unemployment. When we were discussing the question of unemployment insurance in this country, we thought we had no statistics of the unemployed in this country. My Honourable friend, Mr. Giri, has pointed out that there are nearly 40 millions of people who are unemployed completely or partially. Yet the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce was not prepared to accept that estimate. I submit that if we go on disputing one another's estimate in this House in the way we are doing, we cannot do anything really good for the country. That only proves that there is very great need for really a very competent Economic Advisory Council to be established in this country. That Economic Advisory Council should be constituted with independent Professors who have had practical experience of village, industrial and slum life and experiences of workers and peasants, and we do not want for the Economic Advisory Council Professors straight from Universities who are kept there merely as a memento or a curio in the Hamburg museum and who are being paid fat salaries merely to play to the tune of all that is being doled out here by the Commerce Member or the Finance Member or the Member for Industries and Labour or all the other Members who form the Executive Council.

Next I come to the question of agricultural indebtedness. The Honourable Member for Industries and Labour would perhaps be the first person to wonder whether really such a great problem as the agricultural indebtedness exists for the whole of India. I hope he will not dispute the fact that there is chronic agricultural indebtedness in this country under which the peasants have been groaning for several years past. This growing burden of indebtedness has become intolerable for the peasants. Ever since 1859, when there were riots in the Deccan of the Mahratta country, Commission after Commission have reported on the imperative necessity of tackling this problem of agricultural indebtedness. For years and years, again and again suggestions were made by responsible Government officials on the floor of the House that Central Legislation should be undertaken in order to solve this problem. Sir Basil Blackett came forward with the suggestion that there should be a Banking Enquiry Committee. It was appointed with a number of provincial branch committees with the idea of gathering information in order to enable the Government of India to find a proper method of solving this particular problem of agricultural indebtedness. But everybody now is pretending his ignorance even today about the agricultural indebtedness and about unemployment and about slum life, and the problem is growing worse and worse every day. The Government are continuing in this blissful ignorance, and if anybody attempts to solve the problem, there

[Prof. N. G. Ranga.]

is no response from the Government. The Government are inimical to any attempts made to solve the problem. The Banking Inquiry Committee came forward with its own suggestions and suggested that an all-India legislation should be undertaken and they said that, wherever possible, Conciliation Boards should be established, and, wherever possible, Economic Enquiry Committees should be established and Economic Boards should be established and that these Boards should gather the necessary information about the actual burden of agricultural indebtedness and the cause for the growth of agricultural indebtedness and also the manner in which that trouble of indebtedness could be solved. But no central attempt has so far been made to solve this problem. But what is it that has been done? The Government of the Punjab propose to spend only one lakh of rupees on rural reconstruction out of which a large proportion is to be swallowed up by highly paid officers; and the Government of the Central Provinces is very glad that it has been able to get only Rs. 17,000 per annum for the next three years from the Central Government in order to help the handloom weaving industry. Then, again, the Government of Madras have appointed an Economic Inquiry Committee with many of its own officers on it as members and that Committee has suggested that the export duty on skins should be increased. And yet the Finance Member comes forward with this very wonderful and novel suggestion and a very original suggestion that the export duty on skins should be abolished altogether. Sir, as somebody said, and it is a well-known phrase, we asked for bread in the shape of the lowering of the revenue duties, and lowering of the burden on the agriculturists by decreasing the amount of revenue that Government are deriving from customs and salt. And what is it he gives? He gives this stone in the form of abolition of the export duty on skins. I do not know if he is conscious about it, but anyhow I can warn him that the only effect of this will be the improvement of the tanning industry in other countries to the detriment of our own industry here.

Next, I come to the question of the national income. Sir George Schuster has suggested,—now that happily he has laid down the reins of office here and is free to suggest anything,—that the standard of living of the masses should be increased. How is it to be increased? How can it be done? It can be done only if the Government of India come to have an idea of the present national *per capita* income, the present standard of living of our people, the manner in which our people are spending their money and also how the people are suffering from poverty, and so on. But they have not got that information. And that is why, when my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, suggested that this Government should undertake a national reconstruction programme of 100 crores, the Finance Member simply turned it down. He seems to have had the impression that my Honourable friend, Pandit Pant, seems to be roving in a sort of dream. But I may assure the Honourable the Finance Member that he need not be afraid of going to jail. If going to jail is necessary at all, I can offer to go to jail on his behalf in order to save this country. Now, Sir, a hundred crores is not a very big sum; it will not be more than £10 million, and the Government in England has been spending more than that on the relief of unemployment.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: A hundred crores is 75 million pounds.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I can anyhow assure my Honourable friend,—and I am sure he cannot contradict me in that,—that the Government in England

has been spending more than 75 million pounds per annum since 1911 on their social services. On the other hand, what is this Central Government doing? The Central Government, whose finances my Honourable friend is so proud of administering and presenting his budget upon, and who is so thoroughly satisfied that his budget has received welcome from every side of the House,—what does he propose to do? He proposes a reduction of 99 lakhs in the expenditure . . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is digressing, and besides, his time is up.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: He suggests a reduction of 99 lakhs in this year when compared to the expenditure that was incurred about ten years ago on nation-building services, that is, the Department of Education, Health and several other Departments.

Another thing to which I wish to draw the attention of my Honourable friends is this. The other day, my Honourable friend, Mr. Mody, was asking the Finance Member to be rather hesitant in thinking of lowering the revenue duties, because the revenue duties have given some sort of protection to some of the industries, and unless those industries are given a fair warning and unless they are enabled to stand on their own legs independently, he should not lower the revenue duties. In trying to accept that particular suggestion, I would request the Finance Member to keep in mind also the needs and the interests of the agriculturists and the workers, that is, the consumers. Revenue duties were raised for revenue alone.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is absolutely wide of the mark. He is not addressing himself to the motion before the House.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, there should be a planned economy and there should be a Member for Communications. This particular suggestion was made as long ago as 1921 or 1922 when the Ackworth Committee made their recommendations that there should be a special Minister as a separate Minister for Communications. And yet till today that suggestion has not been accepted at all by the Government of India. Now, we have only an Honourable Member for Railways and not for Communications. You may wonder why I want a special Member for Communications. I want to end this ruinous and suicidal competition between the railways and the roads; and, in order at present to better the interests of the railways, the Government of India as well as the Provincial Governments seem to me to be busy in trying to thwart the development and the progress of the roads in India. Even such a die-hard and anti-national paper as the *Madras Mail* of Madras was suggesting the other day that the Government of India would do well to have a separate Department for Communications and to construct bridges over the Godavari and over the Krisna in order to have a through road from Madras to Calcutta. Yet I do not know what the Government of India are going to do. Again, there is another suggestion . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has really exceeded his time limit.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: At question time, the Honourable the Commerce Member said to me that he found no difference at all between the report

[Prof. N. G. Ranga.]

that is submitted to the Government of India by their Trade Commissioner in London and the report which the Trade Commissioner of Great Britain stationed in this country sends to his Government. And yet if he will only take the trouble again to consult those reports, he will find that the report submitted to the Government in England is very much better, far superior, to the report that we are having from our own Trade Commissioner. It is in those lines that improvement lies and we want more and more statistics and we want more and more enlightenment. But the Government Members declare their ignorance about every real problem, and they prefer to be ignorant, because to have a knowledge of real state of things may not be convenient to this Government or the Britishers. To possess knowledge is, I fear, considered by Government to be dangerous. And for this we have a very good example in Russia. Russia had her revolution, but, three years after the conclusion of the civil war they had their new economic policy. One year or two years after that, they had their five years budget policy. Similarly, I wish to suggest for the consideration of the Finance Member that at least next year when he is going to present another budget,—luckily for him and luckily for the Government of India he is going to be here for another four years,—let him take that tip from Russia of a five-year plan for his budget proposals. He also wants to give only one crore of rupees for the villages. Because Mahatma Gandhi has collected five lakhs for the uplift of the harijans and he is raising more funds for the uplift of the villages, therefore, they want to fight Mahatma Gandhi and his Village Industries Association. Instead of doing that, instead of simply throwing away this crore of rupees on Aman Sabhas, loyalists and highly paid officers, and so on, I beg to suggest that he should accept the suggestion of my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, and he should raise a loan of 100 crores in this country, and it is not a novel suggestion. Because, in America, President Roosevelt is busy today in raising a huge loan of three billion dollars in order to finance a social and national economic reconstruction policy

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would ask the Honourable Member now to conclude. It is not fair to other Honourable Members that he should occupy so much more than the allotted time.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Therefore, Sir, to conclude, I request the Finance Member to accept the suggestion of my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, to raise a crore of rupees on rupee loan in order to carry on and develop a rural national reconstruction policy in this country, in order to help the villagers of this country in a real manner, and not for the benefit of the British officers and British capitalists, not for the benefit of a few highly paid officers, but for the benefit of the masses of this country.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, most of the discussion this afternoon, or at any rate a good part of it, has had nothing to do with the motion moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. James. In spite of risking the wrath of Mr. Ram Naravan Singh, I do not intend to make any general answers to these digressions except in so far as it may be required to touch upon them for the purpose of Mr. James' motion. But perhaps there are two points I ought to mention at the outset. The first is in order to make the position of the Government abundantly clear, if it is not

already clear. Mr. B. Das, as I understood him, said that his plan for curing the economic evils of the country was to abandon the present ratio, to devalue the rupee. I entirely disagree with him, and, as far as I am concerned, the policy of the Government of India is to make no change in the ratio and will continue to be so. I should like to make that absolutely clear.

Professor Ranga had two cures for poverty, one of which he borrowed from Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant and the other was his own. His own cure was more and better statistics, and he said in fact that you cannot cure poverty until you know the income of every one of the 280 millions of people in British India. I do not think much of that cure. His other cure which is really Pandit Pant's was that we should borrow, not Rs. 100 crores, but Rs. 100 crores a year, and that I hope to be in a position to deal with when I move that the Finance Bill be taken into consideration on Wednesday. It requires more than a casual reference in a debate on a cut motion.

Mr. James has raised a discussion which for the most part is of a character which does not often find a place in our debates: that is the question of the actual administrative machinery of the Central Government. It is quite true that his remarks were directed primarily to the economic activities of Government, but a large part of them at any rate had some application in spheres other than the purely economic, and I think were intended to have application in spheres other than the purely economic. Of course, the question of administration is at all times a very important one and now when we are on the eve of big Constitutional changes, administration assumes a special importance, for, as was clearly pointed out by Mr. James, in fairness to its successors in title, the present Government of India must leave in existence a machine which is not only the best which can be devised, but which is also capable of being adapted readily and smoothly to the new regime which is about to be born.

With these preliminary remarks, I should come at once to the substance of Mr. James' speech; but in view of some references in later speeches and one or two of his own casual references, perhaps I might digress and say a few words about the widely prevalent idea that in these times it is necessary for Governments to resort to economic planning—and this phrase has become almost as blessed as Mesopotamia. I personally was very glad that Mr. James disclaimed his belief in this gospel. On the other hand, another Member of his Party seemed to me to be the most complete economic planner I have ever heard of since Stalin; and let me say at once that I am not a devotee; I am a sceptic: I find it hard to believe in this new fashionable gospel; and when I look round the world at the results of economic planning, I am not in the least tempted to become a disciple. The old-fashioned economics to which Mr. Milligan referred in terms of unutterable contempt proceeded on the assumption that the purpose of production was to supply the wants of the consumer at a price which he can afford to pay, and not a bad idea either. The new economics presupposes that some all-wise authority decides what the producers are to produce and in what quantities and that the consumer must take what he can get and pay for it whatever an all-wise government or other authority decides as a fair price, if he can: if he cannot, so much the worse for the plan. This seems to me nothing more or less than national socialism, and I fancy that if some of those who talk so glibly about economic planning realise the inevitable end of it, they would be very quick to find some new shiboleth.

4 P.M.

[Sir James Grigg.]

Incidentally I am very interested to know that Mr. Das' mind has clearly recognised this ultimate truth, that planning and socialism are the same thing. Mr. Milligan evidently also has faced this problem and he does not mind: he wants socialism, but not in our time: in our time, let the Government guaranteee the private producer his profit: if the Government will only guarantee the profit to the private producer and assist him in every way to squeeze the consumer, all will be well: after that, socialism.

And when you have got your socialistic plan or plan for national socialism, surely it is subject to all the reactions and injuries from the national socialisms of other countries: you are not a free agent and in the end you simply get absolute chaos, and that I believe is the inevitable result of economic planning. My friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, gave a particularly fatuous instance of economic planning which has also become highly fashionable in the world, that irrespective of their balances on capital account, each pair of countries must have an exactly balanced interchange of trade. That is world economic planning. But though I have digressed in this way to say a few words about economic planning, I should, I think, clearly say that though I am not a believer in it, that is not to say, to come back in a somewhat roundabout fashion to Mr. James' motion, that I do not believe that an efficient administrative machine is not a vital necessity or that a country should not have adequate means of studying and considering its economic needs, and it is from that point of view that I shall approach the motion of the European Group.

First, let me clear out of the way the only question raised by Mr. James which is a matter of policy rather than one of administration, namely, the revision of the tariff. Incidentally I was very interested to notice, unless I misunderstood him, that Prof. Ranga is also in favour of a revision downwards of the revenue tariff: I wish he would tell that to the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce . . . .

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I am prepared to, if they invite me.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I am very glad to hear that. On this general question of the revision of the tariff, I made some few remarks in my winding-up speech in the general budget debate, and I am afraid that I am not at present in a position to add very much to that. As I said, it is very difficult to introdue a scientific revision of the revenue tariff until there is money to spare: for even though in the present tariff there may be cases where diminishing returns have set in and where a reduction in those particular cases would yield an increase of revenue, I think it does remain true over the whole field that a greater measure of uniformity can only be achieved after a general downward movement or at any rate a downward movement on balance; and that is why I say that the question cannot assume any very practical importance until there is money to spare. However, I may assure the House that in the meantime we shall press on with the departmental examination and collection of material, which is, of course, a necessary preliminary to the reconstruction of any revenue tariff. Mr. James wants me in the meantime to promise a definite inquiry. But I should prefer to keep an open mind on the subject till the preliminary work has been performed and until the question assumes a slightly more immediate practical importance. In the meantime, I should like, if I may, without offence, to give a word of warning. An inquiry consisting of repre-

sentatives of all the interests concerned would obviously be quite unwieldy, and it would moreover be quite certain to result in a very limited measure of agreement, if any. Clearly we cannot, therefore, have any inquiry which is not impartial, and I am not sure that the agency most likely to produce or undertake an impartial inquiry in a matter of this sort is not the Government itself to whom alone in any case it would fall to take into account the revenue considerations involved.

Next we come to the question of the Tariff Board. Here Mr. James wants more freedom from Government control and more flexibility. His idea was, I think, that the Tariff Board should be made permanent, and that it, and not the Government, should be charged with the responsibility of deciding whether there is or is not a *prima facie* case for protection. I am bound to say I do not very much like this idea, because it seems to me to be approaching the point where you are setting up two Kings in our constitutional Brentford. The ultimate responsibility, as Mr. James definitely said, rests with the Government, and there can be no escape from that responsibility, but in my view just as the ultimate responsibility rests with the Government, so should the initiative in matters of taxation rest with the Government, and, therefore, I personally think that the present arrangements are better than those which Mr. James suggests. A clear demarcation of the respective spheres of the Tariff Board and the Government, I think, is a matter of great constitutional importance, and do not let us forget that whenever permanent Tariff Boards have been set up, either one of two things almost invariably happens. The first alternative is that the Government becomes a mere gramaphone record voicing the Tariff Board's decisions or else the Government finds itself in the position of continually having to resist encroachments on its own domain. Apart from this constitutional question, which is the one which most appeals to me, I am assured by my Honourable colleague, the Commerce Member, that Mr. James's plan of cutting out the *prima facie* stage of the case would not result in any diminution along the inquiry, but, on the other hand, it would lead to overloading the Tariff Board with unnecessary work and in prolonging the general work of the Board.

The next point Mr. James raised was the question of portfolios, and the crux of this was the amalgamation of all communications under one portfolio. He did suggest certain complementary changes, but they clearly hang on to that one main change. This suggestion was virtually accepted by my predecessor a year ago. On that occasion, my friend, Dr. Ziauddin, strongly supported it, but something has happened to make him change his mind in the meantime . . . .

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: The Government of India Bill.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Mr. Das reminded us of Sir George Schuster's acceptance, and I think indicated his approval of it. Since then the principle has been quite definitely and publicly accepted by the Government of India, and of course, I confirm that acceptance today. Sir George Schuster indicated that the most convenient or the most natural occasion for carrying a change like this into effect would be the occasion of a change in the occupancy of the post of Commerce Member. That occasion, Sir, will shortly arise with the departure of Sir Joseph Bhore, and Mr. Das expressed the hope that the change would be made on that

[Sir James Grigg.]

occasion. Naturally, Sir, the Government have considered whether it can be made on this particular occasion, but unfortunately it has been found to raise certain questions which it has been impossible to arrange before the middle of next month which is the term of the present incumbent's office and the consideration of these has meant some little delay, but the principle is there, and Government have accepted it, and we hope, moreover, that it may be possible to put the new arrangements into operation before the end of the current calendar year.

Then, Sir, Mr. James raised some point about an Overseas Department, but, as far as I could make out, what he proposed would boil down to some re-arrangement inside the Commerce Department, and, I am afraid, that, as I am imperfectly acquainted with the arrangements inside the Commerce Department, I am not qualified to express an opinion on that suggestion, but what does seem to me in that matter is, if the work is done with the present organisation and is being satisfactorily done,—and I have not yet heard any suggestion that it is not,—it does not seem to me to matter much by what particular name you call the rose.

Then, Mr. James went on to press for the setting up of some machinery to co-ordinate the various activities of the Government and to secure that the various Departments operate consistently with a definite policy and not as disparate, competing and sometimes contradictory units. I personally would like to say that I am strongly in favour of some such machinery, and I can assure the House that the question of setting it up is under the active consideration of the Government of India Indeed, I think it can safely be said that our examination has reached an advanced stage, and I hope that our consideration will issue in positive action within a very short time. Beyond that, Sir, I cannot go at present, except to point out, as my predecessor did a year ago, that the Economic Sub-Committee of Council is at least a beginning with the machinery of co-ordination in the economic sphere.

Next, Sir, we come to the question of an Economic Advisory Staff, and I think this was the peg on which Prof. Ranga hung a considerable oration on the condition of India from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin. There have been in the past two different proposals having the object of affording to the Government of India expert economic assitance. Firstly, there was the recommendation of Sir Arthur Salter for Central and Provincial Economic Councils representative of various interests—a large number of interests,—and intended to study various economic problems by means of *ad hoc* Committees. Like my predecessor I am not at all enamoured of this grandiose and very expensive scheme. In any case, I gather that Mr. James does not wish to press for anything of that kind. Apart from the doubt as to whether the violently conflicting interests which would be represented on such Councils would ever produce a coherent body of recommendations on any subject under the sun, it seems to me that the initiative in matters of policy must remain throughout with Government, and that it is for the Government and not for any Economic Soviet or public meeting to decide what particular subjects they wish to be investigated. If that is so, these Economic Councils merely become a more clumsy and more expensive means of consulting outside interests.

Then, we get the proposal contained in the Bowley-Robertson Report, and, in spite of Mr. James' disavowal of any desire for a "Brain Trust",

I read the Bowley-Robertson Report as a recommendation to the Government of India to set up a "Brain Trust" on a small scale. I do not like this either, because to have a collection of free lance economists would tend to blur the edges of the responsibility of the executive, and partly,—and I think it is even more important,—because I do not see anywhere any considerable body of doctrine on which economists are sufficiently united to provide a safe guide for any Government. The House will remember the saying that wheresoever five economists gather together, there will be six opinions. (Laughter.)

An Honourable Member: Who is the sixth?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: And, if I may say so, without risk of offence, I think in India economic opinion is so inextricably mixed up with politics that the confusion and variety of opinion would be more than ordinarily bewildering and the six opinions might easily become sixty. But, though I am unwilling to accept either the Salter report or the Bowley-Robertson report in this matter, there is an alternative which, I think, is well worth consideration. I am not sure that the alternative which I have in mind is not also the one which Mr. James has in mind; it is, in fact, based on the plan adopted in the United Kingdom—of appointing an Economic Adviser to the Government of India. In the United Kingdom, the holder of this post is Sir Frederick Lieth Ross, a man, I was going to say, of worldwide reputation, but in any case, certainly of European and American reputation, and deservedly so. His functions are to perform such executive tasks as are actually entrusted to him by His Majesty's Government, for example, to conduct a particular set of negotiations in accordance with a prescribed general policy, to represent His Majesty's Government at International Conferences, and further to prepare briefs and to collect material for special purposes, such as trade or financial negotiations, or for the use and guidance of Cabinet Committees or of individual Ministers. Apart from a small personal staff, he has no department of his own but works entirely through the existing machinery, and naturally, he works in accordance with the general directions of Government, though, like all civil servants, he has the inalienable right to express his own opinion on all occasions. This plan, I think, is working very well in the United Kingdom, and I think it can quite easily be adopted to suit Indian conditions, and that is why I said that it might be seriously examined.

I have now dealt with all the points raised by my Honourable friend, Mr. James . . . . .

Mr. H. P. Mody: Very sympathetically! (Laughter.)

An Honourable Member: He is satisfied!

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: . . . . and I hope that he and his Group will, at any rate, find in my remarks a clear recognition of the importance of the topics he has raised (Laughter), and a proof that the objects he seeks are being kept prominently in mind, though it is quite possible, as I have made clear, I think, that in some instances Government may ultimately hope to arrive at the same end by a different path. In

[Sir James Grigg.]

these circumstances, I hope that he and his Group will not find it necessary to press this motion to a division. (Cheers.)

Mr. F. E. James: Sir, I only have one or two comments to make. The debate has ranged over a large number of subjects. I am glad that the Honourable the Finance Member has called attention to the fact that Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad has changed his mind. But, after all, in a mind of such astronomical proportions such a little thing as consistency is not noticeable. (Laughter.) As far as my Honourable friend, Mr. Ranga, is concerned, his economics, I fear, consist really of expressions of wishes whose inconsonance with facts is imperfectly realised. The more he will think of that when he goes home the more he will perhaps realise what exactly I mean. I would also observe that economics based upon racial considerations are really of no value at all. I now come to the Finance Member. I should like to thank him very much indeed for the very clear statement of his position. I must admit that the present Finance Member is a great contrast in his speeches to his predecessor, and perhaps it will take us a little time to get accustomed to the new style of utterance. The precise economic view of his predecessor always remained, after some of his most mellifluous speeches, in doubt. The same cannot be said of the present Member. If he wore an old school cap, it would bear the motto, *floriat Snowdona*. He is an unrepentant freetrader, and it is crystal clear that he is a disciple of Lord Snowden. Only one or two points occur to me. In the first place, I think, he was a little harsh on my friend, Mr. Milligan. No one at first sight would take my Honourable friend, Mr Milligan, for a socialist. But I can assure the Finance Member, and indeed the House, if they wish it, that Mr. Milligan is not a socialist, although he may look like one. (Laughter.) What, Sir, he was arguing was that as an alternative to the extreme forms of socialism which are being advocated in various quarters, which evidence themselves in the nationalisation of all forms of production and so forth,—as an alternative to that, he was putting forward proposals for a regulation of industries in the interests of the producer and the consumer, a regulation which would have the support of statutory authority subject to statutory control. That is a very different thing from socialism, although perhaps it may be nearer the socialism of Herbert Morrison than the socialism of James Maxton. I would like to assure the Finance Member that we never suggested, certainly we never intended to suggest, that the enquiry in regard to the revision of the customs rates on non-protected articles should be undertaken by a body of outsiders.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I am sorry I misunderstood my Honourable friend.

Mr. F. E. James: We recognise that it must be undertaken by the Government, and we are glad that the preliminary enquiries are about to be started. With regard to the Tariff Board, there, again, we did not for one moment suggest that the Tariff Board should be, so to speak, a Government by itself. I went out of my way to emphasise the fact that the Government must remain responsible for the tariff policy and that the Tariff Board must always be an advisory body whose conclusions the Government of the day should be free either to accept or modify or reject.

Then, with regard to the economic staff, as I think the Honourable Member has suggested, our views and his very largely coincide. Perhaps my quotations from the Bowley-Robertson report misled him, but certainly we and our constituents would be the very first to object to any suggestion for the creation of a body which should be either a super-council or any form of a brain trust. I think we want something which is very much more modest, something which can effectively co-ordinate the economic activities of the various depratments. The Finance Member has, under the circumstances, invited me in a very charming way to be satisfied with what he has said and ask the leave of the House to withdraw my motion. I am happy, after very careful consideration, to be in a position on behalf of my colleagues to ask the leave of the House to withdraw my motion.

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 12th March, 1935.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 12th March, 1935.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

MONTHLY ALLOWANCE SANCTIONED FOR THE TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON STATE RAILWAYS.

839. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to state if the Governor General in Council sanctioned a monthly allowance only a year before last to the Travelling Ticket Examiners of all State Railways at the following rate:

(i) Rs. 35 per mensem for a salary below Rs. 100 per mensem;

(ii) Rs. 50 per mensem for a salary below Rs. 200 per mensem; and

(iii) Rs. 65 per mensem for a salary above Rs. 200 per mensem?

(b) If so, is it a fact that this grant was only applied exclusively to the old staff of Travelling Ticket Examiners and denied to the Travelling Ticket Examiners in A and B grades under the Moody-Ward system on the East Indian Railway?

(c) If so, will the Honourable Member please state the reasons and the justification for such arrangement?

(d) Is the Honourable Member in charge of Railways prepared to take immediate steps to bring the new staff on an equal footing with the old staff of Travelling Ticket Examiners of the East Indian Railway?

(e) Is it not a fact that the new staff of Travelling Ticket Examiners do the same duties as the old staff of Travelling Ticket Examiners? If so, will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to state why the new and old staff of the Travelling Ticket Examiners of the East Indian Railway are not paid the same scale of pay?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) and (b). Yes.

(c), (d) and (e). As I have explained in answer to previous questions in this House, a consolidated allowance of Rs. 35, 50 and 65 was granted to certain travelling ticket examiners, who were formerly in receipt of mileage allowance, as a purely *ex-gratia* measure, in view of the fact that the new consolidated scales entailed a considerable loss in their emoluments. Government are not prepared to extend this concession to staff under the Moody-Ward scheme who were engaged on the lower scale of allowances.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Did these Ticket Examiners agree to accept this scale?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The staff who were engaged under the Moody-Ward scheme knew at the time they were taken that these were the allowances they were going to get.

HOUSE RENT ALLOWANCE OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

840. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Is it a fact that the house rent allowance of the Travelling Ticket Examiners in A and B grades under the Moody-Ward system on the East Indian Railway, has been withheld on account of economic stringency?

(b) Is that stringency over? If so, will Government be pleased to state when the house rent allowance will be restored and, if restored whether it will be given retrospective effect?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government are making enquiries and a reply will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

UNIFORMITY AND STANDARDISATION OF WAGES AND GRADES ON ALL STATE RAILWAYS.

841. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Is it a fact that there has been of late a tendency on the part of Railway administrations in India towards a uniformity and standardisation of wages and grades on all State-managed and owned Railways?

(b) If so, will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to state whether they have considered that the Travelling Ticket Examiners of the East Indian Railway under Moody-Ward system should be given the same pay and allowance and other privileges as enjoyed by Travelling Ticket Examiners of other State Railways? If so, when?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

NON-TREATMENT OF THE TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS AS BELONGING TO THE RUNNING STAFF.

842. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Is it a fact that the Travelling Ticket Examiners are not counted as belonging to the running staff? If so, why? Is it a fact that an engine-*khalasi* is privileged to get mileage allowance?

(b) Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to refer to the definition of the running staff given in this House in reply to the starred question No. 1369, dated the 11th December, 1933, and to state why the Travelling Ticket Examiners are not counted as belonging to the running staff and given mileage allowance in addition to other privileges?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) and (b). Travelling Ticket Examiners are not considered as part of the running staff because they do not perform duties directly connected with the charge of a moving train. Nor are engine *khalasies* so considered, if the Honourable Member means by that term cleaners who look after engines in sheds.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH HIS RELATIVES OF STATE PRISONER MR. MONORANJAN GUPTA.

843. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if any order has been passed against the State Prisoner, Sj. Monoranjan Gupta by either (*i*) the Superintendent of Jail, or (*ii*) by the Government of the province where he is confined, or (*iii*) by the Government of India, regarding his correspondence with his relatives?

(b) If so, will Government be pleased to state why such order has been passed and how long has it been in force, and when will it be withdrawn?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I propose to answer questions Nos. 843 and 844 together.

I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given by me on the 21st February to Mr. Basanta Kumar Das's starred question No. 385. I may add that I have since been informed that two of the four State Prisoners have resumed correspondence with their relatives.

STOPPAGE OF CORRESPONDENCE BY CERTAIN STATE PRISONERS.

†844. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Are Government aware of the fact that the State Prisoners, Sj. Monoranjan Gupta, Sj. Bhupendra Kumar Dutta, Sj. Satya Bhusan Gupta and Sj. Arun Kumar Gupta have stopped all correspondence for over four or five months?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state if the relatives of the aforesaid State Prisoners had corresponded with the Political Department of the Government of Bengal, regarding the cause of their silence for over five months? If so, what reply was given by the authorities corresponded with?

(c) Do Government propose to hold an enquiry as to the cause of the silence of the aforesaid State Prisoners and inform this House of the result?

(d) Are Government prepared to advise the Government of Bombay to inform the relatives about the causes of their protracted silence?

(e) Will Government be pleased to state if the aforesaid State Prisoners are in correspondence now with their relatives? If not, do Government propose to withdraw the prohibitory order, if there be any, without delay and thereby relieve their relatives from anxiety?

(f) Will Government be pleased to state why the prohibitory orders against the State Prisoners were issued?

†For answer to this question, *see* answer to question No. 843.

EXPIRY OF CONTRACT OF THE BENGAL AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

845. *Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha: (a) Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways, please state when the contract of the Bengal and North Western Railway comes to an end?

(b) Will Government be pleased to lay a copy of the contract on the table?

(c) Do Government propose in the interests of the comforts and the conveniences of the travelling public to acquire the line as soon as the present contract terminates?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Government has the option to terminate the contract on the 31st December, 1937, or failing that, on this 31st December, 1942, on giving 12 months notice.

(b) A copy of the contract is in the Library.

(c) The question whether the option of purchase in 1937 should be exercised will be taken up for consideration in the near future.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the factors which Government usually take into consideration, in deciding whether to terminate the contract or not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: One of the main considerations is the rate at which we can get the money required for the purchase.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are questions concerning the conveniences of the travelling public also taken into consideration?

Mr. P R. Rau: Of course.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What is the money that will be required for the purchase of this railway?

Mr P. R. Rau: I think for the purchase of the Bengal and North Western and the Rohilkund Kumaon Railways together, it is about 12 million pounds or 16 crores of rupees.

ABSORPTION OF THE PERMANENT STAFF IN THE MOODY-WARD SYSTEM ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

846. *Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha: (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether all the permanent staff, especially whose names appeared in the report of the Court of Enquiry demoted due to the abolition of the Crew System on the East Indian Railway have since been absorbed in the present Moody-Ward system? If not, when are they likely to be absorbed?

(b) Have all the above mentioned demoted staff now been restored to their old pay and grades, and allowed all the concessions already sanctioned?

(c) Have *ex-gratia* allowance sanctioned in lieu of mileage allowance now been paid to all the staff, especially the Travelling Ticket Inspectors

of Accounts Department, working as Head Ticket Collectors, etc., and on Station duty under the present Moody-Ward system? If not, when are they likely to be paid?

(d) Have all the retrenched staff, especially Travelling Ticket Inspectors of Accounts Department, due to the abolition of the Crew System now been absorbed? If not, when are they likely to be absorbed?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

PRINTING THE NAMES OF TOWNS ABROAD ON THEIR PACKAGES BY FOREIGN FIRMS MANUFACTURING WITHIN THE TARIFF WALLS OF INDIA.

847. ***Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** Are Government aware that many foreign firms now manufacturing within the tariff walls in India, are still printing the names of towns abroad on their packages, and if so, what steps do Government propose to take to force the firms to print "made in India" on such articles?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply given by me to starred question No. 726 by Mr. S. Satyamurti on the 5th March, 1935.

TRUST COMPANIES MANUFACTURING GOODS IN INDIA UNDER INDIAN NAMES.

848. ***Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** (a) Are Government aware that huge trust companies are manufacturing their goods in India under Indian names, and do Government propose to see that the names of the actual parent companies and the town and country of their incorporation are printed on each package, so that the public could plainly see whose goods they were purchasing?

(b) Will Government be pleased to lay a list of such firms and companies, and a classified list of the goods they manufacture, on the table?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) Government have no information as to whether any Trust Companies manufacture their goods in India under Indian names but certain firms, although registered in India for the manufacture of various articles, are believed to be controlled and financed mainly by non-Indian capital. As regards the second portion of this part of the question, Government do not consider that the action suggested by the Honourable Member is necessary.

(b) No list is available but the attention of the Honourable Member is invited to table No. 8 of the publication "Joint Stock Companies in British India" which contain names of companies incorporated elsewhere than in India but which carry on business in the country and also shows the class or nature of trade handled by them. No detailed list of articles manufactured by such companies is available. Copies of this publication are in the Library of the Legislature.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: I was under the impression that under the Merchandise Marks Act, manufacturers have to show the places where the various things are manufactured Why cannot Government enforce that?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: To the best of my recollection, that is not so. What the Merchandise Marks Act does insist upon is a correct description or designation; and if a correct description or designation is not given, those who are responsible can be prosecuted under the Act itself.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: That is just my point For instance, take Gold Flake or cigarettes which are being manufactured in Bangalore or elsewhere. They put the place of origin as England or some other place, whereas they are being manufactured in India. That is surely not a correct description of those goods?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I do not venture to express an opinion, because that is a legal question, but if that is so, then presumably they are open to prosecution under the Merchandise Marks Act.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Is the Honourable Member aware that dealers mark goods as Indian when they are of foreign manufacture? What is the Honourable Member going to do about that?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I do not know that, but, if that is the case, then obviously they lay themselves open to prosecution under the Merchandise Marks Act

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: As this disease is getting acute, may I suggest to the Honourable Member that they should insist that they should not only say that, it is made in India, but they should give a description to show that it is made in India?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: No, Sir, that is going rather too far, I think, but if my Honourable friend will bring to notice any specific cases in which according to him manufacturers or dealers are laying themselves open to a prosecution under this Act, I will see what action can be taken.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: In view of the fact that high tariffs are levied to protect Indian industries, will Government find out some means by which they can really protect Indian industries and stop these foreigners from coming to India under the protection of the tariff wall?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: My Honourable friend can make a suggestion about that.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: If I make a suggestion, will the Honourable Member carry it out?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I will consider his suggestion.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: All right, wait and see.. (Laughter.)

ASSOCIATION OF ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY WITH THE INDIAN DEFENCE AND THE ARMY.

849. *Mr. M. Asaf Ali: (a) Is it a fact that Government have so far adopted no means whatsoever to secure any association by way of an advisory or consultative committee of elected members of the Legislative Assembly with:

(i) Indian Defence, and

(ii) Army?

(b) Are Government prepared to make a beginning in these directions?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: It is the practice of the Government to obtain the advice and assistance of Members of the Legislature on important questions of Army organisation and administration which are not of a wholly technical nature. I need only refer to the Auxiliary and Territorial Force Committee of 1924, the Indian Sandhurst Committee of 1925, the Indian Military College Committee of 1931 and the Army Retrenchment Committee of the same year, all of which contained a number of Members of the Legislature. There is also the Military Accounts Committee which considers the accounts of the Defence Services every year and contains as members two Members of the Public Accounts Committee of this House.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Is it not a fact that there are at least two branches of Army Headquarters, the Quartermaster General's Branch and the Master General of Ordnance Branch which are wholly non-technical? Are we in any way associated with them in any consultative or advisory position?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I cannot admit that they are wholly non-technical. The M. G. O. Branch deals with very technical subjects indeed, such as the manufacture of all kinds of lethal weapons.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: What about the supply of clothes and things of that sort and contracts for supplies of provisions, etc.? Is not that within the province of the M. G. O.? And what about the Q. M. G.'s Branch where the only subject is provisions?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: There are certainly in both branches matters which can be described as non-technical: but there are also very technical matters in the Q. M. G.'s Branch which deals with mechanical transport and matters of that kind.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Excluding the technical side, what about the non-technical side? In what way are we associated with the non-technical side of the army or defence?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I can only repeat what I have already said, that there is a Military Accounts Committee which goes into all questions of military expenditure, and, to that extent, the Legislature is connected with the army at the present moment.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: May I ask whether the attention of Government has been drawn to paragraph 176 of the Joint Parliamentary Committee's

Report where an advisory committee, of the nature that I have just now suggested, was really contemplated? They say:

"An advisory body similar to the Committee of Imperial Defence constituted at the Governor General's discretion would not be open to that criticism and would, we think, have many advantages."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does the Honourable Member want to raise a debate on the question?

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Not at all, Sir. I am simply asking a question and I want to know in what way we are associated with the defence and with the army of our country: are we only here just to discuss things in an airy way?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is not a matter for argument: the object now is to get information on facts.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: I am asking for information on facts: has the attention of Government been drawn to this paragraph that I have just now quoted?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Yes: I may say that that paragraph is partly the result of recommendations made by the Government of India.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: In that case, may I know what steps have Government taken to implement that advice in so far as the present Legislature is concerned?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I have already explained that, but the recommendations were made with reference to the new Constitution and not to the present Constitution.

Mr M. Asaf Ali: That is to say, under the present Constitution, we must be excluded entirely and absolutely even from the non-technical side?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would disallow that question.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Not at all.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Apart from these *ad hoc* Committees, are Government considering any proposal to appoint Committees as have been appointed, with regard to other Departments of the Government of India?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: They are not considering it at the present moment.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know the reasons why they are not so considering associating some Members of this Legislature with the Department for which my Honourable friend is responsible in this House?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: They are not considering it at the present moment, because, for certain special reasons, the Army Department, as I think Honourable Members will admit, is in a different position from

other Departments. I do not know of any Government in the world which has a Committee of the Legislature to advise it on military and defence policy. There is no such Committee in England so far as I am aware.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Can my Honourable friend give me any country in which the military budget swallows half the revenues of the country, and where the military budget is a sealed book to the Legislature?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: The defence budget does not absorb half the revenues of the country.

ASSOCIATION OF ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY WITH EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (FOREIGN AND POLITICAL DEPARTMENT).

850. *Mr. M. Asaf Ali: (a) Is it a fact that Government have so far adopted no means whatsoever to secure any association by way of an advisory committee or consultative committee of elected members of the Legislative Assembly with external affairs (Foreign and Political Department)?

(b) Are Government prepared to make a beginning in this direction?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: (a) The fact is as stated by the Honourable Member.

(b) The answer is in the negative.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Why, Sir?

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Has the attention of Government been drawn to a similar recommendation with regard to the Foreign Department?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: There is no such recommendation, I think, regarding the Foreign Department.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Is it suggested that the foreign policy is in any way divorced from the defence of the country?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: I do not understand exactly what the Honourable Member wants from me as regards the question of fact.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: The question of fact is very simple: is the foreign policy of the Government in any way linked with the defence of the country or not? And if it is so, and we should form some sort of advisory committee for being associated with the defence of the country, are we or are we not also to be associated with foreign policy as well?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: I submit that that is not a question of fact, but a question of opinion.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With regard to the answer to part (b), may I know what are the reasons why Government are not prepared to make a beginning in this direction?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: Probably because it is not understood what useful function such a committee could perform.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has the Government considered the question at all, or are they merely making an *ex-cathedra* statement, that this Legislature does not contain any Members who may usefully advise them on such matters?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: I may say that this is an entirely new suggestion. At the time when the whole question was debated as regards setting up committees to assist the various departments, the Foreign, and, I think, also the Army Department were expressly excluded. That was accepted by the House and if the Honourable Member wishes to raise an entirely new question of policy I submit that a question and supplementaries are not the right way to do it.

BURDEN SHOULDERED BY INDIA OF DEFENDING THE EMPIRE.

851. ***Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** (a) Is it a fact that Canada, South Africa and Australia have their own armies, and no British troops are maintained by them?

(b) Are these countries responsible for the defence of the Empire?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state why India has to shoulder the burden of defending the Empire in addition to the responsibility of defending her own frontiers?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) Yes.

(b) To the extent that these portions of the Empire are responsible for their own defence against external aggression and for the maintenance of internal order they may be said to share in the defence of the Empire as a whole.

(c) India's position in this respect is the same as that of the three Dominions referred to.

The scale on which the military forces in India are maintained is no greater than is required for the defence of her frontiers against local aggression and the maintenance of internal security.

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh: With regard to the answer that British troops were stationed in South Africa, Australia and other places, did the British Government pay for them or did the colonies pay for them?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I must ask for notice of that question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is the opinion to which my Honourable friend referred on the adequacy of the troops maintained? Is it the opinion of the Committee on Imperial Defence?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I referred to no opinion at all.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: My Honourable friend said that the scale on which the army is maintained here is adequate for the purposes of defending India's land frontiers: I am asking whose opinion this is.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: That is the opinion of those who are responsible for the defence of the country.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is it the opinion of the Committee of Imperial Defence?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Yes.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the purposes for which the British troops are maintained in this country?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: For the defence of the frontiers of India against external aggression and the maintenance of internal security.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is it a fact that Indian troops cannot so defend India's frontiers?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is arguing. Next question.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: May I put one question?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): These are big questions of policy which cannot be debated on supplementary questions. The Chair cannot allow any further questions.

PROMOTIONS TO THE POSTS IN HEADQUARTERS OFFICES OF THE TRANSPORTATION AND COMMERCIAL DEPARTMENTS.

852. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** With reference to the information laid on the table of this House on the 21st January, 1935, in reply to starred question No. 363 asked on the 6th August, 1934, will Government please state:

(a) whether any promotions to the posts in Headquarters offices of the Transportation and Commercial Departments were made during the period 1st June, 1934 and 31st January, 1935;

(b) whether any promotions to selection posts of Transportation and Commercial Inspectors were made during the said period in Divisional offices;

(c) when and where the Selection Boards assembled;

(d) what was the composition of the Selection Boards;

(e) who were the candidates who appeared before the Selection Boards; and

(f) who were the candidates eligible for the selection?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

TICKET COLLECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

853. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** Will Government please state:

(a) whether there were Ticket Collectors posted at stations on the East Indian Railway prior to 1st June, 1931; and

(b) what was their scale of pay, hours of employment, normal channel of promotion and the condition of accommodation provided for residence?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government regret that they are not prepared to conduct the exhaustive research into the history of the ticket checking system on the East Indian Railway which this question seems to call for.

NEW SYSTEM OF TICKET CHECKING.

854. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** Will Government please state whether under the new system of ticket checking every train is worked by two men as referred to in paragraph 48 on page 33 of the Report by the Railway Board on Indian Railways for 1931-32, Volume 7? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: So far as the Railway Board are aware, there has been no radical change in the system of ticket checking on the East Indian Railway. Circumstances may, however, arise necessitating the Divisional Superintendent concerned authorising a departure from the arrangement of having two men on each train.

MOVEMENTS OF A TOURIST CARRIAGE AND CERTAIN INSPECTION CARRIAGES ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

855. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** Will Government please state:

(a) the movements of tourist carriage No. 5822 and inspection carriages Nos. 1994, 4884, and 2999 on the East Indian Railway between 7th and 12th February, 1935;

(b) the purpose for which these carriages were hauled to a defunct station;

(c) the number of persons who travelled therein;

(d) the number of tickets or pass held by the travelling persons;

(e) whether the pass was issued for the purposes of duty or privilege;

(f) the days of halt at each station during the move;

(g) the amount expended by the Railway Administration on the move of these carriages;

(h) the amount recovered from the travelling public as the cost of the ticket; and the date of such revenues credited to accounts;

(i) the amount of deficit between the amounts mentioned in parts (g) and (h); and

(j) whether Government propose to withdraw the Inspection Carriages from the officers of the Operating and Commercial Departments and to see how far the deficit in revenues is made up; if not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) to (h). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to his unstarred question No. 115 on the 27th February, 1935. Apparently the allegation in this question is that private persons

were travelling in inspection carriages without tickets. I am asking the Agent to make enquiries into this allegation as well.

(i) Government have no reason at present to believe that these carriages were not used for inspection purposes, and there is no question of any deficit.

(j) No. Government consider that inspection carriages are necessary for efficient supervision.

METHOD FOR THE REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES OF THE RAILWAY STAFF.

856. *Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali: (a) Has the attention of the Governor General in Council been invited towards minute No. E. M. W/Sctt/34, dated the 16th October, 1934, of the Divisional Superintendent, East Indian Railway, Allahabad, reading:

"Your No. O. P. E.-370 of 5-10-34.

With reference to your above, this man was re-instated because he was acquitted by the High Court. He was discharged under my powers in terms of his agreement The question of his subsequent discharge is a matter that is under the discretionary powers of my office. No appeal from this man lies to you as he was discharged by my Superintendent staff.

(Sd.) R. E. RUTHERFORD."

(b) What is the method for the aggrieved staff to have their grievence redressed by the Agent?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I think the Honourable Member can reply to part (b) of this question without sending for the information.

Mr. P. R. Rau: No, Sir, I want to know the circumstances of each case.

DRAFT INSTRUMENTS OF INSTRUCTIONS TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL AND THE GOVERNORS.

857. *Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: Were the Government of India consulted about the draft Instruments of Instructions to the Governor General and Governors? If so, will Government be pleased to state if it was approved by them?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: The reply to the first part is in the affirmative. As regards the second part of the question it cannot be answered by 'yes' or 'no' and to give an answer which will not be misleading, it will involve disclosing contents of Government of India's confidential correspondence which in public interest, I regret, I am unable to do.

CENTRAL PUBLICITY BUREAU OF THE INDIAN STATE RAILWAYS.

858. *Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: (a) Will Government be pleased to state when the Central Publicity Bureau of the Indian State Railways was established?

(b) What is the nature of the activities undertaken by this Bureau?

(c) What is the expenditure on the same, year by year?

(d) Is any benefit from its activities derived by Railways other than the Indian State Railways? If so, is any contribution made by such Railways towards its expenses?

(e) What has been the additional traffic since its establishment?

(f) Are Government in a position to give separate figures in regard to tourists' traffic after the establishment of the Bureau, and if so, how do they compare with this kind of traffic previous to the establishment of the Bureau?

(g) What steps have been taken by the Bureau in the direction of collaboration with similar Tourists' Agencies and Bureaus in other countries?

(h) What are the results of such efforts?

(i) Do any other public bodies, like the Municipalities, Local Boards, Provincial Governments or the commerce and trade of the country derive any benefit out of its activities?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) 1st March, 1927.

(b) A full statement of the activities of the Bureau is contained in a statement placed before the Standing Finance Committee for Railways in May, 1928, which will be found at page 36 of their proceedings, Vol. V, No 1. Briefly, these cover the production and distribution of publicity pamphlets and posters, publication of the *Indian State Railways' Magazine*, press and other publicity advertising in all parts of the world and co-ordination of action as between Railways for the running of excursion trains, demonstration trains and bazaar special trains.

(c) I am placing on the table a statement showing the gross expenditure from 1927-28 to 1933-34.

(d) The reply to the first part is in the affirmative, but the exact proportion is difficult to assess with any accuracy. As regards the second part, the only Railway contributing is the Mysore Railways.

(e), (f) and (h). It has not been found practicable to ascertain, with any approach to reasonable approximation, what additional traffic has accrued to Railways as a result of the activities of the Bureau. A full explanation of the difficulties of making an estimate will be found in the foreword to the Annual Report of the Bureau for 1933-34, a copy of which is in the Library of the House. The estimate made by the Central Publicity Officer is that on the average each tourist spends over Rs. 2,000 on railway fares, hotel charges, sight seeing and purchases. The railway fares included are estimated at under Rs. 500.

(g) The Bureau has been collaborating with other travel agencies and bureaux by arranging for the distribution of publicity material, such as pamphlets and posters.

(i) To the extent that foreign tourist traffic is encouraged and stimulated by the activities of this Bureau, it is obvious that other public bodies do benefit thereby.

Statement.

(In thousands of rupees.)

1927-28	4,28
1928-29	7,19
1929-30	10,46
1930-31	10,31
1931-32	6,37
1932-33	5,02
1933-34	5,17
1934-35 (Revised)	5,03
1935-36 (Budget)	5,54

(The above figures represent gross expenditure and do not take into account receipts.)

Mr. B. Das: Will the Honourable Member kindly say what is the special necessity of giving so many allowances to the Central Publicity Officer of Railways?

Mr. P. R. Rau: May I know what allowanees my friend refers to?

Mr. B. Das: The allowance for editing papers and the special allowance of Rs. 500?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does that arise out of this question?

Mr. B. Das: Yes, Sir.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): From which part of the question?

Mr. B. Das: Expenditure.

Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: Are Government satisfied that the outlay on this Bureau is justified by the results?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I think, from the fact that they are proposing to continue the Bureau on the present scale of expenditure, my friend can take it that Government are satisfied that this expenditure is justified.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is this Bureau expected to give any suggestions to third class passengers as to how to use the carriages, to whom to complain in case of overcrowding and things like that?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am afraid that is not part of its functions.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government consider that suggestion?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask if the Government of India cannot make an estimate of the traffic which they attract by means of this Central Bureau, specially by the Bureaux kept abroad, how can they say that they are satisfied with the results,—I should like to know.

Mr. P. R. Rau: An estimate has been made and the results will be found in the Annual Report of the Bureau, a copy of which is in the Library of the House.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that this Bureau is expected to serve the convenience of both the railways as well as the passengers?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The functions of the Bureau are contained in the answer given already.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government consider the desirability . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question, please.

EXPORT OF INDIAN PIECEGOODS TO PERSIA.

859. ***Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the reports in the press regarding restrictions on the importation of piecegoods into Persia?

(b) Have Government obtained, officially, particulars of the reported arrangements in regard to such imports? If so, will Government be pleased to lay them on the table?

(c) What action have Government taken, or propose to take, to safeguard the Indian exporters of piecegoods into that country?

(d) Have Government considered the question of a trade arrangement with that country?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Honourable Member is referred to page 166 of the *Indian Trade Journal*, dated the 11th October, 1934, which contains the required information. Copies of the Journal are received in the Library of the Legislature.

(c) and (d) The matter is under the consideration of Government.

Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: Will Government be pleased to consult the business community?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Yes, Sir; if I mistake not, I think such reference has already been made.

PROTECTION TO THE GLASS INDUSTRY.

860. ***Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) what action they propose to take in regard to the question of protection to the glass industry; and

(b) when the report of the Tariff Board on the industry may be expected to be published?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) and (b). I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the answers given to Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant's question No. 351 and the connected supplementary questions on the 20th February.

Mr. B. Das: Did not the Honourable Member say that Government would take action shortly?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Yes, Sir. I hope that Government's decision will be taken shortly.

Mr. B. Das: Will the Report of the Tariff Board also be published at the same time?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I would refer my friend to the replies I gave to the connected supplementary questions.

REPORT OF THE TARIFF BOARD ON THE HEALDS AND REEDS INDUSTRY.

861. ***Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji:** (a) Has the report of the Tariff Board on the healds and reeds industry been submitted to Government?

(b) Is so, what date, and as to when Government propose to publish the same?

(c) Do Government propose to announce their plans in regard to protection to this industry?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) to (c). The Report of the Tariff Board regarding the Healds and Reeds Industry was submitted in June, 1934, and is under consideration at present.

IMPORT DUTY ON WHEAT.

862. ***Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji:** (a) Have Government received representations for the continuance of the import duty on wheat, which will expire with the current financial year?

(b) If so, will Government be pleased to state what they propose to do in the matter?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) and (b). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given to Sardar Sant Singh's starred question No. 467 on the 23rd February, 1935.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: There was no reply to that question. The reply was, I think, "wait and see".

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: My friend will get a very satisfactory reply in the course of the next day or two.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Thank you.

ITALIAN DELEGATION IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROPOSED TRADE NEGOTIATIONS.

863. *Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: (a) When is the Italian delegation in connection with the proposed trade negotiations expected in India?

(b) Will representatives of Indian commercial opinion be associated in these discussions?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) No date has yet been fixed for the commencement of the negotiations.

(b) Representative Indian commercial opinion will in due course be consulted on any matter in which it is concerned.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Are Government aware that in Italy many Indian Insurance Companies cannot carry on their business?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I should like to have notice of that question.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will agricultural interests also be given an opportunity to make their representations to the Government of India when the Italian Delegation visits this country?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Does my friend mean himself?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: No, Sir. I want to know whether agricultural interests will be given an opportunity to make their representations to the Government of India.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Yes, I shall not be here myself, but so far as I am concerned, I certainly think that agricultural interests should be consulted.

GOVERNMENT ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CONGRESS ORGANISATIONS.

864. *Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: (a) Will Government be pleased to state their present attitude towards the Congress organisation throughout the country?

(b) Are Local Governments expected to follow the Government of India in the matter mentioned in part (a) above?

(c) Have Government issued any instructions to the various Local Governments on the subject?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) to (c). The views of Government in regard to the Congress, since the suspension of civil disobedience, were stated in the Communiqué issued by the Government of India on the 6th June 1934. The Government of India are satisfied that Local Governments have given and are giving effect to the policy there stated, and further instructions to them are not needed in this matter.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: We know as a fact that in certain parts of the country the Government people are obstructing the Congress organisations. In the district of Singhbhum, Government officials cannot bear the sight of a Gandhi cap.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What is the question of the Honourable Member?

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: I put the question now. (Laughter.) Who is responsible for this? Is it the Government of India, or the Government of Bihar, or the official concerned?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I understand that the Honourable Member's allegation is that certain Government officials cannot bear the sight of Congress workers . . . .

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: No, no. I said, Gandhi caps. In the district of Singhbhum, Government officials cannot bear the sight of Gandhi caps. Who is responsible for this attitude?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Perhaps, the people who wear the Gandhi caps. (Laughter.)

NON-RESERVATION OF INTERMEDIATE CLASS COMPARTMENTS IN MAIL TRAINS FOR THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

865. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** Is it a fact that the Railway authorities to the inconvenience of the travelling public do reserve intermediate class compartments in mail trains for Railway Mail Service in addition to the scheduled accommodation? If so, will Government please state:

(a) whether any such accommodation was reserved on the 13th February, 1935 by Frontier Mail *ex*-Delhi to Peshawar;

(b) the number of compartments converted on that date; and

(c) the total number of intermediate class compartments on that train?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Additional accommodation for the carriage of mails is occasionally requisitioned by the Railway Mail Service. Intermediate class compartments are provided in compliance with such requisitions only on those trains on which there is no third class accommodation. Government are informed that this is done without causing inconvenience to the travelling public.

(a) Yes, but only from Delhi to Lahore.

(b) One compartment of eight seats and another of nine seats.

(c) Fifteen compartments with seats for 117 passengers.

MILEAGE ALLOWANCE PAID TO THE OLD TRAVELLING TICKET INSPECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

866. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors of the Accounts Department on the East Indian Railway were paid mileage allowance which unlike all other forms of travelling allowances, was treated as *pay* for all practical purposes?

(b) Is it a fact that emoluments on which income-tax is assessed are considered as pay under Fundamental Rule 9 (21) (iii)?

(c) Is it a fact that under Fundamental Rule 15 the pay of an employee cannot be reduced save in cases of inefficiency or misbehaviour?

(d) Is it a fact that it was on the consideration of Fundamental Rules 9 (21) (iii) and 15 that Sirdar Bishen Singh on transfer from the cadre of Travelling Ticket Examiner to that of Special Ticket Examiner on the North Western Railway was given the benefit of 75 per cent. increase on pay and his pay was fixed as Rs. 140 against Rs. 80 which he was drawing as a Travelling Ticket Examiner in addition to mileage allowance?

(e) Is it a fact that on reversion as a Travelling Ticket Examiner he was again brought down to Rs. 80, *plus* mileage allowance?

(f) Is it a fact that once again he was transferred as Special Ticket Examiner and his pay was again raised from Rs. 80 to Rs. 140?

(g) If the reply to parts (a) to (e) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether other such employees have been given the benefit of 75 per cent. addition? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Yes, up to the end of May, 1931. These allowances up to a limit of 75 per cent of pay proper were treated as pay for the purpose of leave salary, provident fund and gratuity.

(b) Fundamental Rule 9 (21) a(iii) lays down that pay includes any other emoluments which may be specially classified as pay by the Governor General in Council. This has no bearing on assessment to income-tax which is based under the Income-tax Act, 1922 (XI of 1922).

(c) Yes.

(d), (e) (f) and (g). Government have no information, but are making enquiries.

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali: Is it likely that we shall receive a reply during the present Session?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am sorry I am unable to say.

MILEAGE ALLOWANCE GIVEN TO THE OLD TRAVELLING TICKET INSPECTORS OF THE EAST INDIAN AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAYS.

867. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that mileage allowance was given to the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors of the East Indian and North Western Railways for the hard life that they had to lead and for discharging the duties of responsibility dealing with money matters as acknowledged by the Chief

Operating Superintendent, East Indian Railway, in his Report on the Experimental Working of the Crew system, dated the 5th January, 1928, page 47?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state in what respects they do not justify the above conditions now to warrant the abolition of the mileage allowance?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Government have not been able readily to trace the origin of this practice. In the passage, which has been imperfectly quoted by the Honourable Member, Mr. Harris gave only his conjectures.

(b) The reasons for the withdrawal of the allowance have already been explained by me on various occasions in this House.

CONSOLIDATED TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

868. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that consolidated travelling allowance can be drawn all the year round, irrespective of a subordinate leaving his headquarter, as laid down under Government Supplementary Rule No. 22?

(b) If the reply to part (a) above be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state why the Agent, East Indian Railway, has denied this *ex-gratia* allowance to the employees who are posted on permanent station duty, as stated in this House in reply to starred question No. 438, dated the 7th August, 1934?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Yes, but the essential condition for the grant of a permanent monthly travelling allowance is that the duties of the Government servant to whom it is granted require him to travel extensively.

(b) A monthly travelling allowance can be withdrawn by a competent authority if there is a change in the duties and the Government servant is not required to travel extensively.

CONSOLIDATED ALLOWANCE SANCTIONED FOR THE TRAVELLING TICKET INSPECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

869. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** (a) With reference to the reply to starred question No. 438, dated the 7th August, 1934, laid on the table of this House on the 29th January, 1935, will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the *ex-gratia* consolidated allowance sanctioned for the Travelling Ticket Inspectors on the East Indian Railway, under the authority of His Excellency the Governor General in Council was intended for those employees who drew mileage allowance?

(b) Is it a fact that it was granted in consideration of the heavy loss sustained by the employees due to the abolition of mileage allowance?

(c) If the reply to part (b) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state in what respects this *ex-gratia* sanction has compensated those employees who had suffered a heavy loss in their emoluments due

to the abolition of mileage allowance and are denied this allowance when posted on permanent station duty?

(d) If it has compensated only one class, how do Government propose to accord consideration in respect of the others who have suffered equally a heavy loss, due to the abolition of mileage allowance, *viz.*, those posted on permanent station duty?

(e) Will Government be pleased to state if the orders of the Railway Board conveying the decision of His Excellency the Governor General in Council contained any such restriction in respect of the staff posted on permanent station duty? If so, will Government be pleased to lay a copy of the orders on the table of this House?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) to (c) and (e). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given to question No. 476 asked by Sardar Sant Singh on the 7th September, 1933, and to question No. 839, by Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya, to which I replied this morning.

(d) The allowance is a consolidated travelling allowance and the Government do not see any reason to grant travelling allowance to staff permanently transferred to stationary posts.

INAUGURATION OF A SIMLA TIME LIKE THE DELHI TIME.

870. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** (a) Will Government please state whether on their move to Simla they propose to consider the inauguration of a Simla Time like the Delhi Time?

(b) Will Government kindly state what benefits they have derived from having summer time during the winter months and standard-time during the summer in Delhi?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) The answer is in the negative.

(b) Delhi time was not introduced to benefit Government. Its object was to enable people to make greater use of the hours of daylight when the days were at their shortest.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask whether it is the intention of Government to introduce in various towns various local times in order to cause confusion as regards time tables, and so on?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That question seems to me to contain arguments and inferences.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Are Government aware that the inauguration of the Delhi time has caused a lot of inconvenience to Members here?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Not that I am aware of. On the other hand, I believe that it has generally been approved.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Is it not a fact that the Delhi time was introduced in order to enable Honourable Members to play tennis in the evenings . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order It contains a personal reflection.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask whether the time of the Legislative Assembly was changed according to the wishes of the President?

An Honourable Member: There was no President at that time.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I know whether the Government of India had consulted the President before they changed the time?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: There was no President when the change was made.

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST SOME RAILWAY OFFICIALS AT TUNDLA.

871. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the "Allahabad notes" on page 4 of the *Mazdoor* of Patna in its issue of the 28th May, 1934, regarding the so-called "Unholy alliance" of Mr. Marcon with a Deputy Controller? If so, have the authorities made any enquiries regarding the conduct of that Deputy Controller and Mr. Marcon? If so, with what result? If not, why not?

(b) Is it a fact that Mr. Marcon invariably consulted the said Deputy Controller regarding all questions of transfers and punishments to the Tundla subordinate staff? If so, in what capacity?

(c) Is it a fact that the said Deputy Controller carried on extensive motor business and often ran lotteries and raffles in Tundla? Had Mr. Marcon any share or interest in these concerns?

(d) Is it a fact that several articles belonging to Mr. Marcon, like the oil fan, cameras, etc., were raffled at Tundla by that Deputy Controller? If so, under what rules and under whose authority?

(e) Under whose names are the lorries Nos. 1337 and 1338 registered in Agra?

(f) Are Railway servants permitted to run extensive business in the name of their wives? If not, what action, if any, do Government propose to take against people who are doing business in the aforesaid manner?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Government have not seen the article referred to.

(b) Government are informed that this is not a fact.

(c) and (e). Government have no information but they are making enquiries.

(d) Government are informed that it is not a fact that several articles belonging to Mr. Marcon were raffled at Tundla by a Deputy Controller. A camera was raffled by Mr. Marcon in June, 1933. Government have received no complaints that railway subordinates were forced to take tickets.

(f) The reply to the first part of the question is in the negative. As regards the second part, any case, in which it is alleged that existing orders have been contravened, will be decided with due regard to the circumstances of the case.

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE DIVISIONAL SUPERINTENDENT, ALLAHABAD.

872. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Are Government aware that the present Divisional Superintendent, Allahabad, and some of his senior assistants are very fond of shooting and spend weeks together in this pastime at roadside stations?

(b) Is it further a fact that for the sake of this pleasure, all responsible work regarding the cases of subordinate staff is left to junior officials, particularly to Mr. Marcon?

(c) Are Government aware of the great discontent on this score in the Allahabad Division of the East Indian Railway? If not, do Government propose to enquire into the matter?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Government are informed that the present Divisional Superintendent and some of his senior Assistants are fond of shooting. But it is not a fact that they spend weeks together in this pastime at road side stations.

(b) Government are informed that this is not a fact

(c) The reply to the first part is in the negative, and the second part does not arise.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know, if it is not weeks, how many days they employ in this shooting?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: In view of the fact that I myself invited the present Divisional Superintendent and others to Etawah to have a shooting I can verify from personal experience that they spend a good part of their time in disposing of the office files and attend to cases and may I ask if that is not the case with officers in other Departments? Executive officers, while touring, combine shooting with work.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is not a question.

Mr. M. S. Aney: May I know what is the question of the Honourable Member?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: My question is, is not what I have said a fact? (Laughter.)

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE DIVISIONAL SUPERINTENDENT, ALLAHABAD.

873. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Are Government prepared to enquire if allowances are charged by the present Divisional Superintendent of Allahabad even for days spent in shooting only?

(b) Is any record kept of the work done by these officers when out on the line? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government are making enquiries and a reply will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

RUNNING OF MOTOR LORRY BUSINESS BY RAILWAY OFFICIALS.

874. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Is it a fact that even the timings of local trains are arranged on the advice of Deputy Controllers?

(b) Are Government prepared to enquire whether some Deputy Controllers run their own lorries and are interested, in suggesting timings suited to their own trade?

(c) Are Government aware that the Railways have been losing heavily on account of motor lorry competition? If so, why are Railway servants permitted to run this trade privately?

(d) Is it a fact that a lorry No. 1465 is registered at Agra in the name of Deo Dutt Sharma, who is a relieving Assistant Station Master in Allahabad Division?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) No.

(b) The timings of trains are arranged by the Chief Operating Superintendent, East Indian Railway, and these are discussed with the Local Advisory Committees. Government are not aware of any railway servant running a lorry service.

(c) Government are aware that the earnings of Railways have been affected by motor competition. The second part of the question does not arise.

(d) Government have no information. I am, however, sending a copy of the Honourable Member's question to the Agent of the East Indian Railway, for such action as he may consider necessary.

RAILWAY MAGISTRATES AT TUNDLA.

875. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) How many Railway Magistrates are there at Tundla?

(b) Are they allowed first class passes with two servants each on the whole division? If so, why?

(c) What are their duties?

(d) What is the number of Railway cases at Tundla?

(e) Is it a fact that some of these Magistrates are zamindars?

(f) What are the educational qualifications of the zamindar of Dhirpura and the zamindar of Mohamdabad?

(g) What are the qualifications for which they have been appointed Railway Magistrates?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) So far as Government have been able to ascertain there are no magistrates dealing purely with railway cases; but a bench of four honorary magistrates has been constituted by the District Magistrate to deal with railway as well as other cases.

(b) Government are informed that they have been allowed first class passes, which ordinarily include two servants, over the Allahabad Division in connection with their duties pertaining to the railway.

(c) I presume the duties are those ordinarily entrusted to Magistrates.

(d) Approximately thirty-five per mensem.

(e) I understand one of these Magistrates is a Zamindar.

(f) and (g). Government have no information, I would remind the Honourable Member that these appointments are made under the authority of the Local Government and not by the railway.

RUNNING OF A SHOP IN RAILWAY QUARTERS AT TUNDLA BY A RAILWAY MAGISTRATE.

876. *Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal: (a) Is it a fact that one of the Railway Magistrates at Tundla, who is a wine merchant, has also been permitted to establish a shop in railway quarters? If so, under what rules?

(b) Are Government prepared to make an enquiry into the whole affair?

(c) Does this man compete with the local Co-operative Stores?

(d) Have any representations been made by the Co-operative Stores regarding the competition forced on the stores by the fact that the railway Magistrate can import his wares free of railway fare?

(e) What action, if any, has been taken to stop this loss to the stores and other merchants of the place?

(f) Is it a fact, that his shop has been fitted with electricity at the cost of Railway? If so, why?

(g) Does this gentleman cater for the railway officers, when they go on shooting trips?

Mr. P. R Rau: (a) One of the Honorary Magistrates is a general merchant and occupies a railway building rented to him under the rules of the Administration.

(b) If my Honourable friend will indicate on what point he suggests an enquiry, I shall consider it.

(c) Possibly, as his line of business is the same as that of the Co-operative Stores.

(d) Government are informed that the Co-operative Stores did submit a representation but it has not suggested that the competition is unfair or that stores are imported free of railway freight charges.

(e) None

(f) All railway buildings in Tundla are electrically fitted

(g) I understand the reply to this is in the negative.

PROVISION OF AN ASSISTANT SURGEON IN THE RAILWAY HOSPITAL AT TUNDLA.

877. *Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal: (a) Is it a fact that Tundla is purely a Railway colony, having only one hospital which is a Railway hospital?

(b) Is it also a fact that the entire work in this hospital is in the hands of Sub-Assistant Surgeons, and there is not a single Assistant Surgeon either in the town or in the hospital, and the District Medical Officer of Tundla has to look after a whole district which has a number of smaller dispensaries, and has therefore to be out several days in the month?

(c) Do Government propose to order the provision of at least one competent and qualified Assistant Surgeon at Tundla?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

VENDORS AT THE TUNDLA RAILWAY STATION

878. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Is it a fact that formerly retired railway servants were allotted vendorships at railway stations as a sort of help to them after retirement?

(b) Has this practice now been stopped? If so, why?

(c) On what principles are vendorships offered to outsiders now?

(d) How many retired railway-men and how many outsiders are vendors, at present, at Tundla?

(e) Why have outsiders been appointed in such large numbers?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I presume the Honourable Member's question refers to the East Indian Railway. If so, the replies are as follows:

(a) Yes.

(b) Retired railway servants are not debarred from being given a vending contract if they are considered fit, but the main question is whether they have the necessary qualification to do the work satisfactorily.

(c) Financial standing, reliability and experience.

(d) There are at present 13 vendors, three of whom are retired railway servants.

(e) It is believed that those who have been selected are in a position to give a better service.

PAYMENT MADE BY VENDORS AT THE TUNDLA RAILWAY STATION TO THE DOCTORS AND OFFICERS.

879. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Is it a fact that all the vendors at Tundla station have to pay a certain sum of money every month to the railway doctors and the railway officers? If so, how much?

(b) On what principles and under what orders are the amounts fixed?

(c) Under what head is the amount shown?

(d) Is there any limit to the monthly payment, or is it arbitrary?

(e) Are contracts given to the highest bidders?

(f) How much do the East Indian Railway realise every year in this manner?

(g) How is this income shown in the railway budget?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Government are informed that this allegation is unfounded.

(b), (c) and (d). Do not arise.

(e) No.

(f) The Agent, East Indian Railway, states that the amount received at Tundla during 1934-35, in accordance with the schedule of hawking fees payable, was Rs. 2,200.

(g) It is credited to miscellaneous earnings.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: In view of the general complaints that if any misunderstanding arises between a railway officer and a doctor, then there is no remedy, why should not railway authorities accept the certificates of doctors belonging to the civil hospitals?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I could not follow the Honourable Member's question Remedy for whom?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: My question was, why should not the railway authorities accept certificates from doctors belonging to the civil hospitals?

Mr. P. R. Rau: That question does not arise at all.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: Did the Honourable Member make an inquiry into the allegations?

Mr. P. R. Rau: An inquiry into the matter was made by the Agent, who has reported that the allegations are quite unfounded.

RATES OF PAY AND OTHER PRIVILEGES OF CERTAIN APPRENTICES OF STATE RAILWAYS.

880. ***Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** (a) Will Government please state whether paid apprentices who were in the service of State Railways before the 15th July, 1931, are entitled to the privileges accruing under Railway Board notification No. 807-E. G./111, dated the 21st December, 1933?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, are Government aware that certain apprentices who joined the East Indian Railway before the 15th July, 1931, as paid apprentices, have been engaged on the revised rates of pay?

(c) Are Government aware that an appeal from the men affected has been submitted through the proper channel?

(d) Do Government propose to inquire into this matter and see that the notifications issued by the Railway Board and the interpretations placed by them on these notifications are not ignored but are given full effect to by the respective Railway Administrations?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Enquiries are being made and a reply will be laid on the table in due course.

APPOINTMENT OF PASSED APPRENTICES OF THE JAMALPUR WORKSHOPS AS FITTERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

881. ***Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** (a) Will Government please state whether it is a fact that the Railway Board has introduced a rule to the effect that only those apprentices who have passed through Jamalpur Workshops should be engaged as Fitters on the East Indian Railway?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government please state the date of this order?

(c) Are Government aware that there are employed to-day apprentices who were trained in other shops and Running Sheds of the East Indian Railway before the introduction of this rule?

(d) Are Government aware that the introduction of this rule seriously prejudices the chances for promotion and advancement of the apprentices trained in the other shops of the East Indian Railway who are still in the service of the Railway?

(e) Do Government propose to exempt these apprentices from the operation of the rule regarding the employment of Jamalpur apprentices?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) No.

(b), (d) and (e). Do not arise.

(c) So far as Government are aware, there are employees on the East Indian Railway who have been trained in other shops.

EXEMPTION OF THE EMPLOYEES OF THE OLD EAST INDIAN RAILWAY COMPANY FROM THE OPERATION OF THE REVISED RULES ABOUT QUARTERS AND HOUSE ALLOWANCE.

882. ***Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** (a) Will Government please state whether or not they are bound by the agreement the servants of the old East Indian Railway Company entered into with the Secretary of State for India when the State took over the management of the East Indian Railway?

(b) Is it a fact that this agreement states that "the pay and allowances will be regulated in all respects by the rules and conditions of the East Indian Railway as they stood on the 31st December, 1924"?

(c) Is it a fact that according to the old East Indian Railway Company rules, servants who held supervising grade appointments were entitled to free quarters or house rent allowance in lieu?

(d) Is it a fact that according to Railway Board letter No. 5001-F., dated the 12th May, 1934, addressed to the Agent, East Indian Railway, free quarters or house allowance in lieu thereof are to be given only to those who have held a "post which carried the privilege of rent free quarters or house allowance" in a substantive capacity prior to the date of the introduction of the revised rule, *viz.* 1st October, 1932?

(e) Are Government aware of the fact that there is a growing apprehension in the minds of the old East Indian Railway Company servants

that the agreement entered into by them with the Secretary of State for India at the time of the transfer of management of the East Indian Railway in 1924 is being ignored by the Administration?

(f) Are Government aware that several appeals on this matter have been submitted through the proper channel?

(g) Do Government propose, acting in accordance with the assurances of the Government, to exempt the servants of the old East Indian Railway Company from the operation of the revised rule regarding quarters and House allowance? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) It is unnecessary for me to say that all agreements entered into by Government, whether with the old East Indian Railway Company employees or with any body else, are binding on Government.

(b) In the Memorandum of terms and conditions offered in 1924 to the employees of the old East Indian Railway Company it was stated that the pay and allowances of the employees would be regulated by the existing rules and conditions of the East Indian Railway Company. It was also stated that the rules in force on State Railways as regards house rent would be applied.

(c) Certain classes of employees are allowed rent-free quarters; and if no quarter is available house rent allowance is granted.

(d) Yes. I should add that, on a further representation, the concession was extended to non-gazetted employees who were appointed in a temporary capacity, on or before the date of introduction of the revised rent rules, solely on account of the embargo on permanent appointments and who would, but for that embargo, have been appointed permanently.

(e) No. If there is any such apprehension, it is unfounded.

(f) No appeals from the staff have been received by the Railway Board though certain communications purporting to come from some of the railway staff were received.

(g) No. As I have already stated it was one of the conditions on which they were taken over that they would come under the State Railway Rent Rules.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: In regard to the Honourable Member's reply, I think, to part (c) of the question, will he kindly inform the House when these rules were issued granting free quarters to certain employees?

Mr. P. R. Rau: That is the reply to (d). I am afraid I do not know the exact date.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: With regard to the Honourable Member's reply to (f), will he state whether or not it is a fact that he cannot receive appeals from railway servants as it is against Railway Board appeal rules, and, therefore, it will be impossible for him to receive such appeals? Has the Honourable Member received any appeals through the various Agents in this matter?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I do not remember any.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Will the Honourable Member be good enough to ascertain from Agents whether this is a burning question among the staff, as he knows it is, for I have brought it to his notice myself?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I shall make the necessary inquiries, Sir

VIOLATION BY A RAILWAY ADMINISTRATION OF THE PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING THE NOTIFICATIONS OF THE RAILWAY BOARD.

883. ***Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Taking into consideration the limitations of the present appeal rules, will Government please state the procedure to be adopted in cases where there is a distinct violation by a Railway Administration of the principles underlying the notifications issued by the Railway Board?

Mr. P. R. Rau: This is a hypothetical question. Government have not laid down any rules as to the procedure to be adopted in such a contingency which in their opinion is most unlikely. They have impressed on Railway administrations the necessity of adhering strictly to the substantial principles underlying the discharge and dismissal rules.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Are Government aware of the fact that in many cases appeals from subordinates are not forwarded to the proper authorities in accordance with the Railway Board appeal rules?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government are not aware of this.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Will Government be good enough to make inquiries, particularly from the Agent of the East Indian Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: If the Honourable Member brings specific instances to my notice, then I shall take the necessary steps.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Will the Honourable Member state categorically on the floor of this House that representations have not come to him from any Agent, regarding the unrest and the apprehension in the minds of the people on the question of the appeal rules?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am afraid I do not understand the question.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Let me explain to the Honourable Member. Will the Honourable Member be good enough to state whether or not it is a fact that many appeals have been made by the staff to Railway Agents which have not been sent to the Railway Board?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am not aware of any appeals which should have been sent to the Railway Board that have been withheld by the Agent.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Is it not a fact that the Honourable Member in charge of the Department of Commerce and Railways stated on the floor of this House that appeals will not be regarded as mere scraps of paper, or words to that effect?

Mr. P. R. Rau: If appeals lie to Government under the appeal rules, they will certainly be looked into.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: May I ask. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

PROCEDURE IN RESPECT OF DISCHARGE, DISMISSAL, ETC., OF THE SUBORDINATE EMPLOYEES OF THE OLD EAST INDIAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

884. ***Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** (a) Will Government please state whether Rule XIV of the Civil Services in India, framed by the Secretary of State in Council under sub-section (2) of section 96-B of the Government of India Act, 1919, and issued in Notification No. F.-472-II-23, dated the 21st June, 1924, was applicable, on and from the 1st January, 1925, to those subordinate employees of the East Indian Railway Company who were given service by the Railway Board when Government took over the management from the East Indian Railway Company?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government please state up to what period this rule was applicable to such employees?

(c) If the answer to part (a) be in the negative, will Government please state what rules regulated the procedure in cases of dismissal, removal or reduction of those subordinate employees in 1925, 1926, 1927, 1928 and 1929 when orders were issued by the Railway Board in their letter No. 4080-E., dated the 15th November, 1929?

(d) Is it a fact that the Railway Board's order, No. 4080-E., dated the 15th November, 1929, governed the procedure in respect of discharge and dismissal only, and if so, will Government please state what rules governed the removal or reduction of an employee from a post?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) No. As stated in the preamble to the notification referred to the orders apply to Governors' Provinces.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) and (d). Government of India, Public Works Department, Circular No. VI-Railway, dated the 1st June, 1888, which was incorporated in paragraph 298 of the State Railway Open Line Code, Volume II, regulated the discharge and dismissal of the staff in question In respect of punishments other than discharge and dismissal the staff in question were governed by paragraph 287 of the State Railway Open Line Code, Volume II. I have placed a copy of these paragraphs in the Library of the House.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Will the Honourable Member inform this House whether or not Government will consider the advisability of having a Complaints Departments in the Railway Board or in every State Railway?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I am not prepared to give an answer on a matter like this in reply to a supplementary question.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Then, may I ask how the subject should be raised?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: My Honourable friend could raise it by way of a Resolution if he thinks fit.

SENIORITY OF SUBORDINATES OFFICIATING IN THE TRANSPORTATION INSPECTORS' GRADE ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

885. ***Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Arising out of Government's reply to starred question No. 629 of the 4th April, 1934 regarding the seniority of subordinates officiating in the Transportation Inspectors' grade or the East Indian Railway, will Government please state whether this rule was in force when the Divisional system of operation was introduced? If not, when was this rule introduced?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

SUGAR FACTORIES LIABLE TO EXCISE DUTY IN THE ROHILKUND DIVISION.

886. ***Sir Muhammad Yakub**: (a) Will Government please enlighten this House as to how many *khandsari* sugar works are declared up to this time under the Sugar (Excise Duty) Act, 1934 as factories liable to excise duty in each district of the Rohilkund Division?

(b) What are the grounds on which they are declared so? How many are declared after inspection and how many on mere assumption of the district officers in charge in each district of the Rohilkund Division?

(c) What is the number of those *khandsari* works which were previously not declared as factories under the Factory Act and in which also the condition of 20 workmen was applicable and which were checked by Factory Inspectors in working time, and which are now declared, and why, in each district of the Rohilkund Division?

(d) How many factories in each district of the Rohilkund Division are declared liable to the excise duty under the Sugar (Excise Duty) Act, 1934 only due to their being restarted at new sites and only on the basis of their old premises, while no record of employed workmen in the previous year is available?

(e) How many of the factories declared under the Sugar (Excise Duty) Act, 1934, liable to duty are now working this season and how many are closed?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: The information has been called for and a reply will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Are the Government of India aware that there is a general dissatisfaction in the Rohilkund Division that the agency appointed for assessing the factories is working very harshly upon the *khandsaries*, and that many small factories have already closed on account of this treatment on the part of the assessing officers? And also taking into consideration the fact that the season of making sugar is just on, will Government try to make an inquiry as soon as possible and make satisfactory arrangements? wi

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: I can undertake, Sir, that the inquiry will be made as soon as possible.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: May I ask a supplementary question? Are Government aware that the complaint made by Sir Muhammad Yakub is practically universal, and that it exists in my constituency also? And may I ask the Honourable Member how long it will take him to lay the facts before us? Will it be done before the close of this Session?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: I am afraid I can give no undertaking as to when we shall receive the replies to our inquiries.

Seth Govind Das: Will the inquiry be made before these *khandsaries* are closed?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: I am afraid, again, I cannot say when we shall receive the replies to the inquiries which we have made.

Seth Govind Das: Will it be this Session or the next Session?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: The answer is the same, Sir.

RAILWAY RATES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

887. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** (a) Is it a fact that during the year, 1933, and 1934, only four cases were referred to the Railway Rates Advisory Committee (page 7 of the Administration Report)?

(b) What is the total expenditure per annum on Railway Rates Advisory Committee?

(c) Have Government considered whether it will not be more economical to appoint an *ad hoc* committee for each case instead of having a permanent Rates Advisory Committee?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) During 1933-34 four cases were referred to the Committee. They had also three other cases which had been sent to the Committee for investigation during 1932-33.

(b) The expenditure during 1933-34 was Rs. 71,000. The revised budget estimate for 1934-35 is Rs. 75,000.

(c) The question of appointing *ad hoc* Committees was examined, but it was considered desirable that there should be continuity in the post of the President of the Railway Rates Advisory Committee to permit of rules and precedents for the Committee being built up as it proceeded with its work. Similarly, in the case of the Railway Member of the Committee, continuity in the post was considered desirable, but, as a measure of economy, it was arranged that the Railway Member should combine his work with that of the Secretary.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Who pays for this Advisory Committee—the taxpayers of India or the gentlemen who make an appeal to this Advisory Committee?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No, Sir, the expenditure is borne by Government.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask whether the Rates Advisory Committee is permitted to hear complaints about the railway passengers' fares?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am afraid I must ask for notice of that question.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that if there were to be no permanent Railway Advisory Committee, and if Government were to appoint a Committee on each occasion whenever such questions arise, then much delay would result, because Government would have to decide about the necessity for a Committee like that and also about its personnel?

Mr. P. R. Rau: That is a matter of opinion.

Pandit Nilakantha Das Will they think of abolishing this Rates Advisory Committee?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No, Sir.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Is there under contemplation the setting up of a Rates Tribunal?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No, Sir.

REPORT ON "COMMUNICATION" IN SIND WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE BARRAGE.

888. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** (a) Did the Government of India appoint an officer to examine a report on 'Communication' in Sind with special reference to the Barrage? If so, when?

(b) When will this report be published?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes, in November, 1933.

(b) The report is under consideration by the Government of India and the Local Government. As it is mainly of a technical nature a large number of spare copies were not struck off in anticipation of wide public sale, but a few copies are available from the Central Publication Branch at a price of Rs. 10 each. This was announced in a Press Communiqué issued on the 8th November, 1934. Copies of the report have been placed in the Library.

SUPPLY OF ALTERNATE ELECTRIC CURRENT FOR DOMESTIC PURPOSES INSTEAD OF DIRECT CURRENT.

889. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Are Government aware that electric companies supply alternate current for domestic purposes instead of direct current as used to be the case before?

(b) Is it a fact that alternate current is far more dangerous than direct current?

(c) Are Government aware that many deaths have taken place due to electric shocks?

(d) Are Government prepared to take steps to make the supply of alternate current illegal?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Government are aware that certain electric supply companies supply electrical energy for domestic purposes on the alternating current system.

(b) Potentially, alternating current is more dangerous than direct current, but alternating current systems can be so constructed as to be equally free from danger.

(c) The general administration of the Indian Electricity Act and the rules framed thereunder is undertaken by Local Governments, and reports of accidents which occur on electricity supply systems are not ordinarily made to the Government of India, but they are aware that accidents sometimes resulting in death occur on electricity supply systems.

(d) As was stated in reply to part (b) of starred question No. 4 by Mr. Amar Nath Dutt in the Legislative Assembly on January 26th, 1932, Government do not propose to prevent supply companies from dealing with alternating current. I may, however, add that Government have under consideration the revision of the Electricity Rules, and it is believed that the revised rules, when introduced, will further minimise the risks of danger on electric supply systems.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: What is the advantage of alternating currents in preference to direct currents?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I am afraid I must have notice of that question. I am not an expert in these matters.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Have Government any plan for converting all direct-current supply into alternating ones all over the country?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No, Sir. I have stated that the alternating current system can be so constructed as to be free from danger, as is the direct current system. Therefore, there is no necessity to make the general alteration suggested by the Honourable Member.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Is it not a fact that there is a general complaint that electrical companies have adopted the alternating system of current in preference to direct current?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have not received any such complaint.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is it not a fact that the production of an alternating current is cheaper than the direct curent?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: There, again, I must have notice. As I have said, I am not an electrical expert.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: What current is supplied in New Delhi?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I am afraid, I must ask for notice.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: I can give the answer: it is direct.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Then, Sir, may I ask why the Honourable Member asked for the information?

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Because I want that current to be supplied everywhere. In the smaller places, they supply the alternating current. In the big cities, they supply the direct current, in order, presumably, that the Members of Government and their friends may be safe Is it not a fact that in all European countries they supply the direct current? (*Voices*: "No, no.")

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: All I can say in reply to the Honourable Member's speech is that there is no question of any special Government interest in this matter. Direct current is not supplied in Delhi, because it is a Government City: I imagine the current supplied varies according to the circumstances which prevailed at the time the original installation was made.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Have not Government received a representation from Professor Bhim Chandra Chatterjea of the Benares University on this subject?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I am afraid again I must ask for notice of that question.

Abolition of Military Cantonments at Benares.

890. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Is it a fact that the Military Cantonments at Benares have been abolished?

(b) If so, what do Government propose to do with the extensive lands and buildings so long occupied by them?

(c) Will the removal entail expenditure in the acquiring of lands and raising of buildings any where else?

(d) What was the number of British and Indian troops stationed at Benares so long?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) No, but it has been decided to transfer the Indian Infantry battalion from Benares to Agra next year.

(b) Certain properties in Benares will become surplus to requirements and the question of their disposal is under consideration.

(c) No additional expenditure will be entailed on the acquisition of land, but additional accommodation will be required in Agra costing about Rs. 1,75,000.

(d) One Indian Infantry battalion of 660 men and a detachment of British Infantry 180 strong.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Do Government think that the expenditure of Rs. 1½ lakhs is a very small sum?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: No, Sir. We do not consider that a very small sum, but I would like to explain that the reason why we are doing this is partly because the buildings in Benares are falling down, and it would involve an expenditure of considerably over a lakh of rupees to put them in proper order; and also by removing this battalion from Benares to Agra (the battalion is a training battalion and not an active battalion), which is nearer the centre of the recruiting area for that particular regiment, we shall save a considerable sum of money annually in travelling allowances.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE PUNJAB GOVERNMENT ON ACCOUNT OF AHRAR PRISONERS

12 NOON.

Mr. M. S. Aney: (a) Will Government please state whether the Punjab Government demanded any assistance from the Government of India on account of Ahrar prisoners in the year 1934-35?

(b) What is the total amount, if any, contributed by the Government of India to the Punjab Government for this purpose, and what were the special reasons justifying the same?

(c) Will Government please state whether they have made similar grants to any other Provincial Governments in the same year? If so, to which Governments, how much and for what specific purpose?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) The Punjab Government applied to the Government of India for the reimbursement of the cost of providing jail accommodation for the Ahrar prisoners who were received on transfer from jails in the Kashmir State for confinement in the Punjab jails.

(b) The total amount paid to the Punjab Government was Rs. 1,61,260. The payment was made in view of the fact that the Punjab Government had to incur additional expenditure for the accommodation of these Ahrar prisoners.

(c) No similar case has arisen in any other province so far as I am aware and no similar payment has been made to any other Government. The circumstances under which the Punjab Government undertook to accommodate these prisoners at the time of the agitation in the Kashmir State were exceptional.

Mr. B. Das: Did the Government of India secure that money from the Kashmir State or they spent it themselves?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Government of India paid the money.

Mr. B. Das: Why should the Government of India pay the money? Why not ask the State to refund the money?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It is a big question. It is argued that prisoners who invaded the Kashmir State were British subjects and that was possibly why the Government of India agreed to make the payment.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Under what head of the budget was this expenditure incurred?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I do not know. (Laughter.)

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Was the consent of the Finance Department taken about it?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Yes, Sir

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the Honourable the Finance Member inform the House under what head this sum is shown?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: My recollection is a little vague. I think it must be under one of the political heads

WITHDRAWAL BY GOVERNMENT SERVANTS FROM THEIR GENERAL PROVIDENT FUND ACCOUNTS FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE RESERVE BANK SHARES.

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi: (a) Is it a fact that Government allow the Government servants to withdraw money from their General Provident Fund accumulations for paying the premia of insurance policies, provided they assigned such policies to the Secretary of State?

(b) If the reply to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether they are prepared to extend the concession of withdrawal from the General Provident Fund up to a maximum of Rs 500 for the purchase of the Reserve Bank shares when they are put on the market, provided such shares are assigned to the Secretary of State till the repayment of such advances?

(c) If the reply to part (b) be in the negative, are Government aware that the refusal of this small concession will debar a very large section of the educated Indians of all castes and creeds from being voters in the Reserve Bank?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) Yes

(b) No Advances for investment purposes are not allowed under the rules—*vide* rule 15 of the General Provident Fund (Central Services) Rules read with Appendix B of these rules.

(c) I cannot help feeling that the Honourable Member exaggerates not only the proportion of the population who are Government servants but also the proportion of Government servants who will be prevented from applying for the shares of the Reserve Bank solely by the refusal of this concession the grant of which would, in any case, be entirely inconsistent with the purposes for which the Fund was instituted.

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi: Did Government receive any representations from the Government servants in the subordinate service?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I believe there have been representations, but the request made has been refused.

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi: Will the Honourable Member consider their case sympathetically?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: No, Sir.

THE GENERAL BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—*concld.*

SECOND STAGE—concld.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Today, the Chair understands, the Independent Party will discuss certain motions that stand in the name of their Members. The Chair wants to know which is the motion which the Independent Party want to move.

Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury (Assam: Muhammadan): It is No. 499 in the list

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable the Finance Member will move the demand first.

DEMAND No. 39—ARMY DEPARTMENT.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): Sir, I beg to move:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 4,31,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of the 'Army Department'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 4,31,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of the 'Army Department'."

Indianisation and over-expenditure.

Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Army Department' be reduced to one rupee."

Sir, I move this motion for the refusal of supplies to the Army Department mainly by way of protest against the Government policy of Indianisation and over-expenditure in the military budget. It is perfectly obvious Sir, that this Indianisation of the army is most vital to the question of India attaining the status of a self-governing nation. So long as we shall remain dependent on the British officers and the British troops for the defence of our country, our demand for self-government will be a meaningless abstraction. Indians ought to be prepared to undertake the defence of their own country. It is not only that our self-respect demands it, but

our self-interest also demands that we shall gradually take over the defence of our own country. Our grievance has always been that we have not been given adequate opportunities for training in military science and military leadership, and the policy of the Government has been directed always to perpetual dependence of Indians on the British army and the British troops and the British officers for protecting the country against foreign agression and for maintaining the internal security of the country. In recent years, the army is being Indianised to a certain extent. But that process of Indianisation is proceeding at a snail's pace, and, out of about 7,000 officers in the Indian army, there are only about 195 Indians. It is against this halting, hesitant policy of the Government of Indianising the army that we mainly intend to record our protest today.

I may tell the House at once what our demand is. Our demand is that the recruitment of the British officers for the army should cease immediately and all the new recruits to the army officers rank should be recruited in India, because we maintain that 360 million people of India can very well supply and continue to supply the adequate number of army officers, young men with suitable qualifications to take their training as army officers. As regards facilities for training, the Dehra Dun College may be extended to provide for the training of this increased number of officers We ourselves see no difficulty in the way. There is no difficulty with regard to the supply of recruits, there is no difficulty with regard to the finances or facilities for training. The only difficulty in the way of Indians is the reluctance of the Government of India to increase the rate and pace of Indianisation. That, Sir, is in spite of the fact that high military officers have held this view that complete Indianisation of the army is both a practical and a feasible proposition. When I say complete Indianisation of the army, I do not mean that Indians are prepared just at once to take over the complete control of the army. For it has been calculated that even if we stop recruitment of British officers from today, it will take about 35 years before the British element is entirely replaced by the Indian element. The history of this agitation for Indianising the army is a very long one and a chequered one. I think it was during the War that Indians were granted King's Commission in the army. Later on, an arrangement was made with the army authorities in England according to which 20 recruits were admitted to Sandhurst and six to Woolwich and six to Cranwell. That was a long time ago,—in 1928. I shall begin the reference to the history of this agitation from the year 1921.

It was in the year 1921 that this Assembly passed a Resolution that not less than 25 per cent. of the recruits for army officers' ranks, those who are granted the King's Commission, should be from amongst the Indian subjects of His Majesty. After that came the Military Requirements Committee. That Committee was presided over by Lord Rawlinson and the report of that Committee is confidential. It has not been published. But it is generally well known that this Committee considered this Resolution of the Assembly and accepted it. And they went a step further. They said that this percentage fixed by the Assembly should be increased by 2½ per cent. every year till, within ten years, the proportion of entry of British and Indian recruits may be equalised. Then came another Committee, the Shea Committee; and I should like to draw the special attention of the House to the recommendation of this Committee. This Shea

[Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury.]

Committee was appointed during the Viceroyalty of Lord Reading and this Committee consisted entirely of military officials. And they held the view that complete Indianisation of the Indian officers' ranks is a practical proposition and that it can be done within 30 years. As a matter of fact, they prepared a scheme of completely Indianising the army within 30 years from that day. They divided that period of 30 years into three parts, 14 years, 9 years and 7 years. And they recommended that a military college should be established which would produce 81 cadets annually for the first 14 years, then, for the second period, they suggested that 182 cadets should be produced annually from that college; and, for the third period, I believe they suggested about 88. Now, Sir, the importance of this Committee's report lies in this that here was a body of military officials, no politicians amongst them,— who found that it was a perfectly practical proposition to Indianise the entire army within 30 years. But that report also was kept confidential, and it was only during the discussions at the Round Table Conference that the late Sir Muhammad Shafi drew the attention of the Committee to the existence of such a report. In the year 1923, when the Government of India introduced their scheme of Indianising eight units of the army, they had in their possession the report of that Shea Committee; but, instead of giving effect to the recommendations of the Shea Committee, they produced an eight-unit scheme. That scheme was condemned by everybody, by the Indian public, the Indian press and by the Indian officers themselves. It was condemned, because, by this eight-unit scheme, Government segregated the Indian officers from the European officers and put them in different regiments. In support of that, Government said that they were segregated, because Indians will be given an opportunity of taking full responsibility without the help of the British officers. But the Indians contended that the main reason behind this segregation was that, when the Indian officers attained the senior rank, junior British officers may not be required to take orders from them. This eight-unit scheme was condemned also by the Skeen Committee which was appointed in the year 1925. Now, this Skeen Committee recommended that Government should establish a military college in India, and they also produced a scheme of Indianisation according to which half the cadre of the Indian army was to be Indianised in 25 years. Mr. Jinnah, who was a Member of that Committee, suggested 15. But though the report was published, probably in the year 1926, Government adopted delaying tactics in giving effect to the recommendations of that Committee; and matters remained in that stage till we came to the Round Table Conference. In the Round Table Conference, many high-sounding principles were enunciated which have now receded into the background. One of the Resolutions that was passed by the Defence Committee of the Round Table Conference was this. They said that the defence of India ought to be to an increasing extent the concern of the people of this country and not of the British Government alone, and that the rate of Indianisation should be substantially increased and that a military college should be established in India. It sounds very well in the form of a Resolution, but when it came to the question of giving effect to that, Government again restricted the scope of those Resolutions. They did appoint an expert Committee to work out the details of a scheme of a military academy at Dehra Dun. The Com-

mander-in-Chief was the President, and you, Sir, were one of the members of that Committee; also Captain Sher Muhammad Khan and a few others. Government instructed that Committee to draw up a scheme of a college with an output of 60 cadets a year. The report was published, the college was opened, and I think the first batch came out of the college last year. I maintain that this fixing of the figure at 60 by the Government of India struck at the very root of a rapid process of Indianisation of the army They fixed the number of cadets at Dehra Dun at 60

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan) How many passed out?

Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury: That I do not know; perhaps my Honourable friend, Mr Tottenham, will be able to tell us that You, Sir, in your minute of dissent, protested against this fixing of the number at 60, but you were precluded from making any recommendations with regard to that. In any scheme of Indianisation, the most important question is what should be the rate and pace of Indianisation, that is, how many officers can be absorbed every year by the army. On that will depend how many recruits are to be taken. As to the actual number,—what is the total number of vacancies in the army every year on the average,—Government have never given any definite answer. To the Skeen Committee, they gave the figure of 160; to the Defence Committee of the Round Table Conference, they gave the figure of 120 Now, Sir, even if we accept the figure of 120 in the Dehra Dun Academy, Government ought to have provided for the training of these 120 officers and stopped the recruitment of British officers at once. Instead of doing that, they have arranged for the training of 60 officers at Dehra Dun and are still continuing to recruit officers from England, and, in this way, they are postponing the date of completely Indianising the Indian army

There is another aspect of this question. If the position were that these 60 officers, who come out of the Dehra Dun College, would take the place that would have been otherwise taken by the British officers, that would have meant some increase in the ranks of the Indian officers in the army. It would have meant some progress in Indianisation, but that is not the case. Some of the cadets, who come out of the Dehra Dun College, do take the place that would have been taken by British officers of the King's Commissioned ranks; but others are employed in replacing the Viceroy's Commissioned officers in the Indianised unit Replacing the Indian jemadars and subedars by Indian lieutenants is no Indianisation, and the result of this process is that the number of officers that would have sufficed to Indianise at least two divisions in the army will be entirely absorbed in one single division, and that would seriously hamper and retard the progress of Indanisation in the army. Just at present, the policy of the Government is to Indianise one complete division of the army in all its branches including the artillery. Here also they will send officers who have been trained at Dehra Dun, which means that they are still continuing or rather extending the same principle of segregation, which was condemned by the Skeen Committee and the Indian public in connection with the eight units scheme. I think it is only fair for the Indian officers to demand that they should be given

[Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury.]

the same free choice of choosing their own regiment as is given to other British officers, and our demand is that Indian officers of all divisions should be Indianised simultaneously, and there ought to be no segregation of Indian officers from European officers. These Viceroy's Commissioned officers in the Indianised units should be retained, as they are retained in other units which are not Indianised, and you should stop the recruitment of British officers and have all local recruits in future, and extend the arrangement in the Dehra Dun College to accommodate sufficient cadets to fill up the annual wastage in the army . . . . .

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham (Army Secretary): May I ask the Honourable Member why he wishes to retain the Viceroy's Commissioned officers if British recruitment is to be completely stopped?

Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury: I want them to be retained, because their place is proposed to be taken by the Indian officers trained at Dehra Dun, and I want these latter officers to be free to Indianise other units: I do not want them to be absorbed in displacing the Viceroy's Commissioned officers. Take the case of a unit in which you require 16 King's Commissioned officers and 16 Viceroy's Commissioned officers. If 32 people coming out of the Dehra Dun college are absorbed in that one unit, then there will be 16 King's Commissioned officers left in another battalion to be replaced. Have I made myself understood?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: No: I do not quite understand. I understand that Honourable Member's contention is that British recruitment should be stopped. I want to know on what grounds of principle he wishes to keep two classes of Commissions in the army in future if there are going to be no more British officers.

Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury: It is because this system of Viceroy's Commissioned officers has been prevailing for a long time past and it has stood the test of war and it has stood the test of peace time and the old system has worked so well that I see no reason why it should be abandoned when Indian officers are recruited to that unit. . . .

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: The system of having British officers has also worked well.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better go on.

Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury: In the second Round Table Conference, the Defence Committee made another recommendation, that the Government should undertake an expert inquiry whether the number of British troops in India cannot be reduced. That inquiry has been undertaken as we have been told that no reduction is at present contemplated. If Indians are to undertake the defence of their own country at some date, near or distant, in the future, Government should have adopted a policy of gradual replacement of the British troops by Indian troops; otherwise, if that step is not taken, there will always remain British troops in

the Indian army and complete Indianisation will never take place: I do not want to refer to that incident of the other day, but that is what I think was behind the back of the minds of army officers, that they do not intend to Indianise the Indian army completely.

This question of Indianising the Indian army is closely bound up with the question of reducing the military expenditure. In that pamphlet, which was circulated to us along with the budget, and in another pamphlet, which Mr. Tottenham was kind enough to send along at my request, I find that the cost of the British soldier comes to about Rs. 850 a year while that of an Indian soldier comes to only Rs. 285: it has been estimated that the replacement of the British element by the Indian element will save an amount of about Rs. 8 crores, and it has been said that it will take many years before this replacement can take place; but unless the Government adopt a definite programme of replacement, I think total Indianisation will never take place. Our army expenditure is showing signs of increasing from this year: for the last few years, it showed a decline, but from the note, that has been submitted by the Financial Secretary, it appears that this tendency to increase is likely to continue. One of the most effective ways of reducing army expenditure is to replace the costly British element by the Indian element. In fact, the question of Indianisation and reduction of the army expenditure are more or less inter-dependent and allied questions. On both these questions, Government decline to accede to the public demand . . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has exceeded his time limit.

Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury: I have just got a slip from some of my friends in the House that I should refer to the recruitment of Sayyids in the army. I am told that in the Punjab, though Punjab is taken to be a martial province . . . . . .

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I might possibly save the time of the House by saying that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief has got to deal with that question in another place tomorrow. It is a minor question after all, and we are discussing bigger matters today and I think it might save the time of the House if I let the Honourable Member have that information.

Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury: Sir, I move my motion.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Army Department' be reduced to one rupee."

Mr. M. Asaf Ali (Delhi: General): Sir, I rise to support the motion so ably moved by my Honourable friend Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury. One of the excuses for my rising today in the House is that I have to represent, among others, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and all the British officers in the army who are among my constituents. (Laughter.)

An Honourable Member: Did they vote for you?

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Whether they voted for me or they did not is another matter, but one of the excuses, as I said, for my rising today is that I also want to devote some time to the subject which seems to interest my constituents most, but a better reason than that is to present my own view of the question of India's defence. To my mind, this is the one subject which, to the exclusion of all others, is of the most vital importance to my country ("Hear, hear" from Opposition Benches), and, while I am saying so, I should just like to say another word. The grounds on which my friend, Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury, has moved his motion, to my mind, appear to be only one aspect of the question,—Indianisation and excessive expenditure are only two of the many grounds on which today I would like to refuse supplies to the Army Department. It is a most drastic step, Sir, constitutionally, and I assure the House that if it were a responsible Government, if the Government were responsible to us, and if this were a responsible Legislature, I would think a thousand times, nay a million times before ever dreaming of refusing supplies for the defence of my country. Why do I take this step today? To begin with, it is only a fraction, just a fraction of the expenditure which is incurred in respect of the army that is submitted to our vote, namely, Rs. 4,31,000,—out of how many? Out of, according to my calculation, Sir, 56 crores, although the visible budget which is placed before us is only 44 crores and a little more which comes to about 45 crores, but I say that the actual expenditure on the defence of the country rises up to about 56 crores, even according to their budget, because, they have left out the strategic railways, they have left out the Watch and Ward, they have left out the Ecclesiastical Department, they have left out many other services, which we would not dream of except in respect of our defence. And, that is not all, Sir. I would go further than that, and say that behind the defence of a country is always the foreign policy of a country. If you divorce your foreign policy from your defence, you cut yourself adrift from your proper moorings. Therefore, to my mind the defence of the country also includes a great deal of the expenditure on the Foreign Department, and, therefore, I maintain that, out of a total expenditure of about 56 crores,—it may be a little less or a little more,—they are submitting to the vote of the House only Rs 4,31 000, and, therefore I make bold to say that I would take the most drastic step, because I know that by taking this step I shall not be leaving the defence of the country crippled. All that money is quietly stored away, and it will be utilised exactly as they would like to do. Even if they do not restore it, when we succeed in voting down this Rs 4,31,000 and that amount is not restored, they will be able to find their way by making a reduction in the expenditure of their Chaprasis, communications, or stationery or things of that sort, so that the defence of the country is not touched. I, therefore, have no hesitation whatsoever in taking this drastic constitutional step, because I want to express my profound disapproval, the profoundest disapproval I should say, of the policy of the Government with respect to the defence of my country. And what is that policy, Sir? That policy, to sum it up in two words, is wholly, profoundly anti-national. The defence of the country has been organised along lines which run counter to my nationalism, which run counter to my pride, which run counter to my economic conditions, which run counter to the actual demands of the defence of the country. They have followed a policy not of defending India but of defending the British Empire, which, unfortunately, is swelling from day to day, which, unfor-

tunately, is exposing India to greater and greater danger from day to day, because, the more they expand, the greater are the chances of their being exposed to the enemies abroad. Today there is not a spot on the globe where they have not some interest, where they have not some coaling station, where they have not some colonies, where they have not some highways, and so on,—all those are there,—and who suffers from them? We, by being within the Empire, because there is no spot in the world where they may be embroiled in a dispute into which we are not bound to be drawn That is a policy which we do not wish to follow. I admit that the poor Government of India always turn round and tell us that they are helpless, and they deserve my deepest sympathy. I know in many directions they are as helpless as we on this side of the House are, and I believe the defence of the country and the question of the army of the country is one of those questions in which they are quite as helpless as anybody else Only they do not say so Th's morning, the Honourable the Army Secretary got up and said something which, unfortunately, was not altogether consistent with what His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief said the other day in another place The Honourable the Army Secretary said this morning, Sir, that the policy with respect to the Army and Defence was laid down by the Imperial Council of Defence, and His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief said in the other place: "No, we consult them, but it is with our approval that these policies . . . . ."

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I did not say that. The policy had been laid down by the Committee of Imperial Defence. Mr Satyamurti asked me a question whose opinion it was. I said it was the opinion of those who are responsible for the defence of the country Then he asked me, if it was also the opinion of the Committee of Imperial Defence, and I said Yes. That is all I said. I did not say that the policy had been laid down by the Committee of Imperial Defence.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: I am very glad, Sir, for this elucidation That only lends strength to my argument and you are not so helpless as I imagined you were,—and so all the more you deserve the condemnation which this refusal of supplies implies. ("Hear, hear" from the Opposition Benches.) If you were entirely helpless, perhaps you would have had my sympathy in a greater measure than I would have extended to you otherwise, but if you say you are not helpless, if you say that you have a margin of discretion, then the condemnation becomes all the stronger, all the more emphatic.

However, Sir, let us turn to some other questions. I was just saying that, in so far as expenditure on the army was concerned, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief some time ago promised to make a search for economies, and, amazingly enough, His Excellency's search for economy has resulted—I would not say about those Rs. 60 lakhs, I would not say about the Rs. 2 lakhs or something of the sort—but His Excellency's search for economy has resulted in an actual rise of expenditure on fighting services—I am comparing the figures of 1933-34 and your estimates now—by about Rs. 22 lakhs, and on the administrative services by about Rs. 5½ lakhs, on the manufacturing establishment departments by another Rs. 9 lakhs and on the Army Headquarters by Rs. 10 lakhs! And where does His Excellency register economies? In the Royal Indian Navy. And what does that indicate? It surely indicates nothing else but one thing, and

[Mr. M. Asaf Ali.]

that is, that the defences of the country are not being organised for the country itself but that the defences of the country are being organised for some other purposes, because the defence of the country, as far as I understand it, ought to have been organised along three different and definite lines, consistently with the foreign policy of the country. To begin with, the foreign policy that has been pursued by this Government, in so far as India is concerned, is wholly anti-national because you have created interests not merely in the Middle East, but you are creating interests in Central Asia, you are creating interests elsewhere too, and what is the result? The result is that you have to maintain larger armies here in India in order to be within striking distance of all these places. The Honourable the Army Secretary shakes his head as much as to say that this is not correct. I wish it were not correct, but what am I to do with the evidence that you have supplied me? I am only examining the evidence which is before me. You are keeping the British army in India for no other purpose but for the sole and simple purpose of being within striking distance of all these places around India; no other purpose can possibly be revealed. Why, what about your Imperial Airways? Have you not created interests in Arabia, have you not created amazing interests near about Persia, are you not looking towards Sin Kiang, are you not already looking beyond the frontiers of India in the North? All these are factors to be taken into consideration. And what was your Singapore base? You really wanted to have a base in India, and you really wanted to maintain that base in India, and that is why the British army is kept in India. Otherwise, where is the necessity for a British army with, according to your own calculations, 12 crores of human beings who are fit for military service in India, martial races- can you not get recruits enough to replace the British army in India? Can you not get men enough to replace the British army in India, particularly when it is remembered that the British army today is costing us four times as much as the same number of our own army. It is a scandalous state of affairs that we have to pay for the same numbers of the British army four times as much, and what does it imply?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I would just point out to the Honourable Member that three times 285 is about 850, and not four times.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Mr. President, I am not prepared to accept that correction, because the calculation which I am giving you is perfectly correct, and I am prepared to prove it to the hilt indeed. If the Army Secretary will sit across the table with me, I will prove to him that they are costing four times as much as the Indian soldiers. Then, again, only the other day, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, speaking in the Council of State, quoted totally wrong figures, misleading figures. His Excellency said that in India the incidence of our expenditure on defence came to Rs. 1-8-0 per head.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair may remind the Honourable Member that it is not the etiquette to discuss speeches delivered in another place.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: I am not discussing that speech. I am only just using that quotation. I am only just using the figures which were delivered by His Excellency in another place. I do not mean to discuss His Excellency's speech in this House. I am only just using the figures which His Excellency has quoted. In fact, those were not figures quoted by His Excellency out of his own head: they were really supplied in one of these booklets.

Munshi Iswar Saran (Benares and Gorakhpur Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): On a point of order, Sir. You will kindly bear in mind that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief is the highest military authority in this country and the pronouncements that he makes in the other place really give an indication of the policy which he proposes to pursue in this country. If it is not open to Members of this House to discuss those pronouncements, I venture to submit to you, with great respect, that we shall be placed at a great disadvantage.

An Honourable Member: He never comes here.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): When the Chair said that the speeches delivered in another place should not be discussed in this House, as is the established convention, it did not mean to preclude references to a speech or statement made by such a high authority as the Commander-in-Chief. All that the Chair meant was that any such reference should not be turned into discussion of particular arguments in minute details.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: I was just saying, certain figures were quoted, and I repeat them now. I am actually reading out of the proceedings of the debate:

"The incidence of the defence expenditure in India is Rs. 1-8-0 per head of the population. In England it is Rs. 30."

I challenge both these figures. Even if I leave out all the additional figures that I have relied upon today,—even then, according to their estimates, the expenditure on our defence comes to about Rs. 50 to 51 crores, including the strategic railways and Watch and Ward. I am talking of the defence; I am not talking of the army: there is a world of difference between the two. When you talk of defence, you take into consideration all the factors, all the heads under which expenditure on your defence falls. Therefore, Rs. 51 crores, or even if it is Rs. 50 crores, it would come per head to about Rs. 1-14-0, and not Rs. 1-8-0, and in terms of the incidence of average income in England, this Rs. 1-14-0 would rise to Rs. 32 in England. That is to say, in England the expenditure on the army, according to this scale, should have been Rs. 32 per head. And only on the army, and not on the entire defence, because after all, England is a vast world power. It is a European power, and as such, England is bound to maintain a huge navy and a huge air force, whereas we in poor India have got only to think of nothing else but just an army, and only about eight squadrons,—is it not,—of the air Arm, and the tiniest little navy in the world on which we are not spending more than Rs. 98 lakhs or so.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): There is no navy at all.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: How can you compare the incidence of expenditure on England's defence and our defence? You are defending the whole Empire. We have got to defend our tiny little country. (Laughter.) Will you leave us to defend our own tiny little country in our own way, and not unnecessarily force down our throats your army and your Imperial Expenditure which you are doing today? This is as far as the expenditure is concerned.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has already exceeded his time limit.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Sir, I seldom participate in the debates . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There may be other Honourable Members wanting to speak. The debate has got to be concluded today.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: In that case all that I can do is to state my conclusions instead of going into any arguments, and these are the points I should like to urge on the attention of the Army authorities, if they would only care to take note of these things, which represent the conclusions I have drawn from my own study of the subject and I wish to place in the forefront the foreign policy of the Government, because, to my mind, the foreign policy of the Government is so inextricably bound up with the defence of the country that you cannot for a single second overlook the one while you are considering the other, and, therefore, I place in the forefront the foreign policy of India. Unfortunately, today, India has no foreign policy The Indian foreign policy is really the Imperial foreign policy, because, if we were left to ourselves, I can assure you there would be no enemies anywhere. Today we are a part of your Empire and we are liable to be attacked not only on our own frontiers but we are liable to be attacked all along your imperial frontiers. Therefore, I would first of all say, that you should shape the foreign policy so as to reduce the necessity of maintaining too expensive an army because your present foreign policy appears to me to be increasing the dangers of India. For instance, you take into consideration the concentration that has taken place on the Trans-Oxus frontier. Why is that concentration taking place? I would draw the attention of the Army Secretary particularly to this point. It is simply because you have got your Imperial Airways and you have got at least eight squadrons, I believe, in Mesopotamia, and you have got eight squadrons somewhere in Egypt. Naturally, therefore, Russia has got about 400 aeroplanes right on the other side of the Oxus. Whose danger, I ask you, is being increased? Not yours. It is our danger, and what is the result? The result is that here you have got only eight squadrons. I would, therefore, urge upon the Government, so far as that point is concerned, to reduce the British forces gradually. You are now sending three battalions home. You can make it five battalions every year and clear out the 45 battalions in nine years' time and every year by clearing out five battalions you will be saving up about two crores of rupees and two crores of rupees will be sufficient for both the capital and recurring expenditure on another eight squadrons, because, if you take your Audax machine, which is costing you only 53,000.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has already taken 25 minutes.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: I would beg you to allow me another five minutes.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is not fair to the other Honourable Members who want to speak. The Chair regrets to interefere, but the Honourable Member will get one minute more.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Then, I will say this. I was just now talking about shaping the foreign policy so as to reduce the foreign expenditure and to that end I would ask you to encourage friendly buffer states all round the land frontier and conclude counterbalancing engagements with other Asiatic powers, to maintain equipoise beyond the borders of the buffer states. Replace your forward policy on the North-West Frontier by Sandemanisation within friendly trans-border territories. I am perfectly aware of the difficulties of that side but I am purposely putting that suggestion before you. So far as external invasion is concerned, increase the air arm to meet any contingencies on the North-West Frontier, bearing in mind the large Russian concentration on the other side Mechanise the Indian army to the same extent as the British army and particularly, in so far as light artillery corps, tanks corps and air force are concerned and don't neglect gas, because after all you have got to take that into consideration. India is the weakest in Asia as regards air arm and gas. Regarding internal security, I only want to make one small point and that is that you should increase the territorials, if necessary by conscription I would be a willing party to conscription on a large scale any time and your police should be militarised. They have certainly proved themselves, beyond a shadow of doubt, during the last 15 years You have been telling us all the time that the police in quelling disturbances have proved most loyal and useful and are you going to turn round now and say that you do not trust the police?

Sir, I shall wind up my remarks with one word. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, speaking elsewhere some time ago, said that without the British forces our Indian army would be without a backbone. I wonder if His Excellency ever realised the implications of what he was saying? If I were an Indian officer or an Indian soldier, I would take it as a grave insult to me, to my manhood and my soldierly profession, because, it simply means that without the Britisher the Indian army would be worse than useless. It would be invertebrate, and what Indian would be prepared to hear such a condemnation of an army on which the Britisher has spent millions and millions of the taxpayer's money for 75 years, ever since 1859?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I have listened with great attention to the speech delivered by my
1 P. M. Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury. I congratulate him very sincerely on the deep thought and attention he has given to such a complex matter as the army in this country. I have listened with greater attention to the extraordinary speech of my friend, Mr. Asaf Ali. Sir, I stand here today to support the principle, but not the method, underlying the speech of my friend, Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury. I believe, Sir, that the time has come when the army book, which has hitherto been more or less a sealed book, should be opened and that we should have a glimpse into the contents of that book and so understand more about the administration of the army. I also believe that the Army Member and the Army Department are making a serious effort to acquaint us, laymen, with the

[Sir Henry Gidney.]

complex problems that are involved in the administration of the army. I repeat, Sir, that I agree with the principle and the sentiments underlying this motion. But, I regret, I cannot agree *in toto* with the remedy suggested. Sir, I shall not delve into the past history of the Indian army, because I am not in a position to do so. I am closely familiar with many of the Committees concerned; I was a member of the Committee that sat about 1921-22 to report on the Esher Committee Report; I gave evidence before the Military Requirements Committee, before the Skeen Committee, I was a member of the Indian Territorial and Auxiliary Force Committee and which considered the formation of the Indian Military Academy, and I was a member of the Defence Sub-Committee, first R. T. C., and so I am somewhat familiar with the development of Indianisation in the army. Sir, the Army Member, the other day, said that it was impossible to realise complete Indianisation of the Indian army, and anyone who really has knowledge of the subject will agree with him.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: To whom does the Honourable Member refer?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: The Army Secretary

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Excuse me, Sir, I never said that. (Laughter.)

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: If I have misquoted the Honourable Member, might I be given an opportunity of explaining what I meant. I am sorry if I have misquoted the Honourable Member, but I think it was in reply to a certain question he said that to say that there could be complete Indianisation of the army in India would be impossible.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I have never said that. What I said was that, at the present rate, the Indian army would never be Indianised.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I accept the qualification, but the implication is there

Sir, before one can demand Indianisation of the army, he has to look at the formation of an Indian regiment. Those who are familiar with the composition of an Indian regiment must admit that it does not consist, except in special regiments as Gurkhas, of a single class or community: they are of a mixed caste. The reasons for this composition are not far to seek. But the vital point to remember is that the present efficiency of the Indian army is entirely due to the intimate and beneficial contact between the British Officer and the Indian Officer and sepoy that one cannot conceive of any separation that must result if the recruitment of British Officers is stopped.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Oh, oh, oh! (Interruptions).

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Sir, I am going to answer only one interruption and I shall refuse to answer any more. The interruption just made was "no".

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I said "oh"—I did not say "no".

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thinks the Honourable Member had better not take notice of these interruptions.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Sir, can one readily conceive of the Indian army minus the British Officer of today? (*Voices*: "Why not? Why not?") Is it a question of the politician's point of view, or is it a question of the Indian soldier's point of view? Ask the Indian soldier. Does he want the British Officer removed from the Indian army? He is the man who is interested most of all. He is the man who is under training to defend this country, he is the man who realizes and appreciates that he is getting the best training possible from his British Officer. Sir, if it were not for the politician's point of view, as voiced by the Opposition back benchers, let me put before the House the following. The Honourable Mr Asaf Ali stated in his speech that he objected to the army being ruled or commanded for all practical purposes by the foreign policy of the Government; and he said, as also did the Mover of the motion, that we should stop the recruitment of British Officers at once and that we should recruit all officers in this country. I am in agreement with him when he asks that we should recruit more Indian Officers. I am also in agreement, as I said in the Committee of which I was a member, the Indian Military Academy Committee, that 30 recruits per year from the country by open competition was hardly enough. The other 30 I know are recruited as Y cadets from the Indian army total 60. I consider that it should have been sixty by open competition and I, as a member of the said Committee, held that view So far as I am in agreement with him—I mean that there should be an increase; but let me ask this one question. If the cost of the British army in this country were debited to Imperial revenues, would any one in this country object to the British army remaining here?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Yes, Sir, I know the politician objects to it, firstly because it wounds his national feeling and it is expensive. I sympathise with the national feeling, but let us face facts.

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): Why not endorse that feeling?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I cannot. I repeat the British army is here, and I again ask if the cost of it were debited to Imperial revenues, would anyone object to having that British army in this country? (*Voices*: "Yes, yes, yes.") Sir, I hope it will be a very long day before the British army leaves this country. It is no use playing with facts and it does not need much imagination to realise what will happen in India if the British army were to leave. India today is not safe from invasion. The North-West Frontier Province is a very vulnerable part.

An Honourable Member: From which side?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: We have got Afghanistan ready.

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur (South Madras: Muhammadan): No. no—certainly not.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Sir, if for no other reason, at least for our own internal peace, the British army is necessary. It is no use glossing

[Sir Henry Gidney.]

over facts and playing with sentiment. Sir, I make bold to say that, however much I sympathise with the principle—and I have said I am in agreement on the point that we should more rapidly Indianise the army—it is not true to say that this is a public demand. (*Voices*: "It is the national demand, it is the demand of the nation.") Sir, let my interrupters go to the villages and ask the villager whether he would do without the British army in this country.

Sardar Sant Singh: It depends on who asks the villager?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Honourable Members have stressed the disadvantages of segregation. I quite agree that to completely segregate a class of officers and not to have them mixed with British Officers is undesirable, and I think that has been the cause of the failure of the eight-unit scheme. I also think that to segregate Indian Officers in a division would be equally objectionable. But if we are anxious for Indianisation and to test our Indian personnel, there is no other test available than segregation to stand on their own feet. But I am sure that as we are given further opportunities of learning the art of defence, and the martial spirit of India is re-awakened and fed by further opportunities than are being offered today, we will in time supply men who will be the equal of anybody as officers. We have the men in this country. It is no use saying that the youth of India do not possess the martial spirit and courage. It is ridiculous for anybody to say that. The past history of this country has proved it. But the proposition that the external defence of India, its internal security and the peace and tranquillity of this country would be safe without the British army, I am not prepared to accept. I am aware that the cost of the British soldier is much more than that of the Indian soldier. It has to be. Unfortunately it has to be; and the Honourable Member was quite right in his estimate that there would be a saving of eight crores. But to my mind this is the main reason for which the politician objects to the British army. He complains that the cost of this army is too prohibitive and prevents the development of the nation-building services. I quite agree in his calculation, but the risk would be too great. I do agree however that it is time Indianisation was, in a larger measure, speedened, but not certainly to the extent that the recruitment of British Officers should be stopped at once. This would be a suicidal policy.

Sir, much market has been made of the recommendations of certain Committees which were confidential in nature and which showed that the army could be Indianised within about 30 years. It is true that this point was raised, because I was a member of the Defence Sub-Committee of the First Round Table Conference, and I remember the controversy that arose, but that is beside the point. Now, what I want the Government to consider with regard to this cut motion is this. They should seriously consider whether or not the pace of Indianisation is too slow, and if it is too slow, how to provide ways and means by which more recruits could be enlisted in India into the Royal Military Academy at Dehra Dun. I would suggest to the Honourable the Army Secretary that he should double the number of Indian Officers annually recruited, and so, in a measure, meet this national aspiration, this national desire of India to learn to defend her country in time. It is no use saying we intend giving India complete control of her defence, and it is useless to say you intend ultimately giving

India Dominion Status, because, without complete control of her defence, Dominion Status is an absolute myth. I do think we should increase this Indianisation, but only in compatibility with the safety and tranquillity of the country. That does not mean we should stop recruitment of British Officers in India, but that we should increase the number of officers recruited in this country, and as this number increases and they show their fitness for such duties, the recruitment of officers from England should *pari passu* be gradually lessened. I also submit that this segregation of Indian Officers into a division will not be a fair test of India's fitness for military control, though I admit it is the only test—I would also submit that in this Indianisation of the army and in the training of the defence of this country, Indians should be given an opportunity of training in every branch of the services. I know a beginning has been made—a small beginning, but I think that when they show their fitness, the Government should speeden up further experiments on these lines. I, therefore, regret very much that, except in the principle involved, I cannot support this cut motion, although my wholehearted sympathy goes out to the Mover in his reasonable and sincere desire to speeden up Indianisation of the Officer ranks of the Indian army.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Twenty-Five Minutes Past Two of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Twenty-Five Minutes Past Two of the Clock, Mr President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

U Thein Maung (Burma: Non-European): Sir, we support the motion for the cut as to us Indianisation of the army means Burmanisation of the forces in Burma, and we are not at all satisfied with the present state of affairs in the military department in Burma. It is a disgrace to the Government of India and an insult to the manhood of the people of Burma that there is not a single Burmese unit in the army. Government have not even declared that it is their accepted policy to Burmanise any existing unit or to raise new Burmese units. On the other hand, they have gone to the length of disbanding such Burmese units as were raised during the great war in spite of their excellent work and splendid services during the war, and, since then, they have not trained the Burmese for the army, the navy or the air forces in spite of very strong popular demands therefor. Government's answers to our questions in this House have been absolutely unsatisfactory. They have simply told us that the whole question of the future defence of Burma is still under consideration. We do not know how long this question will remain under consideration and who are considering it at all. But we do know that the Burmese public opinion has not been consulted and that even the Legislatures have not been taken into confidence, and we are very much dissatisfied. We submit, Sir, that Government can safely take steps to train some Burmans at least for the army, the navy and the air forces even before they have come to a definite decision as regards the whole question of the future defence of Burma—Burmanisation of the forces in Burma being an accepted policy and differences of opinion being only as regards the pace thereof. Even the most

[U Thein Maung.]

conservative opinion as to the pace of Burmanisation must admit in fairness to the people of Burma that a beginning should be made now and that further loss of opportunities should be prevented.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I must begin by congratulating my Honourable friend from Assam who had the courage to move this motion though I understand he has never ridden a horse or even a bike, and his province so far has not contributed a single recruit to the army. I expect that my Honourable friend, Mr. Fuzlul Huq, from Bengal, will move for the Bengalisation of the army. Sir, my right to take part in the debate today arises, not so much from the fact of my being an old Member of this House who has had his say on many similar occasions, but from the proud privilege which no other Honourable Member of this House can lay claim to of being a soldier and representing the soldiers This privilege, Sir, enables me to take not an academic view of things, but view them from the standpoint of a practical soldier who knows the realities of a soldier's life, the requirements of a soldier, and, above all, the qualifications of a soldier. Soldiers like poets are not born, but made. A soldier, like Rome, is not built in a day. Soldiery is an institution in itself which grows through long experience and training. There is nothing that well-equipped, well-trained and efficient soldiers cannot attain, whether in the battle-field, in the playing field or the field of peace

An Honourable Member: Or in the Assembly.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: Or in the Assembly

Sir, it is a well-known fact that no nation holds a square yard of territory by any right derived from heaven. Frontiers are made and altered only by human agencies alone It must be thoroughly understood that the lost lands will never be won by solemn appeals to the good God or pious hope in the League of Nations, but only by force By this I mean to say that no nation can dispense with the defence services despite the efforts of the League of Nations and disarmament conferences or by preaching the gospel of *shimsa* of Mahatma Gandhi. Granting that defence is very necessary, the size and organisation of the defence forces should be left to the experts considering the condition of the country.

Now, Sir, before I come to the question of Indianisation, I will say just a few words to my friends In my opinion, Indianisation is, of course, connected with the policy of defence, but my Honourable friends have spent most of their time on the policy of defence. I think if they had given more attention to the Indianisation of the Indian army, they would have thrown more light on the question. I have read the debates in the other House and have listened to Honourable Members' speeches in this House, I think there is a serious misconception in the minds of Honourable Members. When we talk of Indianisation, we mean the Indianisation of all Indian regiments and every branch of the Indian army should be officered purely by Indians Indianisation does in no way mean the withdrawal of British troops.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Why not?

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: Not at all. When Egypt Egyptianised the army, she did not ask for the withdrawal of British troops simply for the sake of Egyptianising the army. That is an absolutely different question. Sir, let us set aside all the prejudices and imaginary thoughts and see, as practical politicians, how far we are right in demanding 30 years to Indianise the army or to fix any period for complete Indianisation. Sir, I have been a strong champion of Indianisation, in this very House. When a similar motion was moved at Simla, I said:

"We are loyal, don't keep us under control and observation for ages. Our bravery and leadership we have proved in many wars, and we have excellent material. Give us opportunities."

Some of the Honourable Members have said in the other House that while our forefathers and grandfathers were Field-Marshals and Generals, why should we not be Field-Marshals and Generals? And they have tried to prove the gallantry of Indian soldiers. Nobody has ever questioned the gallantry of Indian soldiers. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief said the other day in the other House that the Indian soldiers' gallantry is without question, and I say more emphatically that no nation in the world can compete with the gallantry of Indian soldiers. But the question is not of soldiers, it is a question of leadership. The leadership is the chief thing, the bravest body of soldiers is of no use unless they have an efficient leader. To lead the troops in battle-field is not a joke; it can only be achieved after strenuous training and long experience. I must confess that before the Great War the Indian officers were not given an opportunity to lead troops: they were trained to be led. It was probably due to the mistrust of sepoys after the Mutiny or some other grounds which are well known to the Government. But, Sir, events make the man. It was in 1918, after the Great War, that the Indians were given the King's Commission: the first batch of Indian gentlemen cadets were gazetted in 1920 as second lieutenants. I had the honour to be one of them. Out of these officers, I think fifteen are left on active list, and I hope that none of them will be axed.

Mr. B. Das: Why did you not become a Major? (Laughter.)

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: They will now: the officers who got their Commissions in 1920 will reach their majority in 1938, and promotion to the rank of Colonel, that is, to command a battalion, comes after 24 years . .

An Honourable Member: Good Lord!

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: That is the time scale: you cannot change it: and so, in 1944, probably, you will be able to see the first Indian Colonel in the Indian Army. Now, you can realise how you can Indianise the army within 30 years. Promotion to the rank of a Brigadier takes at least 30 years: not every Colonel can become a Brigadier, since promotion to the rank of General is absolutely by selection and not by seniority or service. Thus, in 1950, we will probably be able to see the first Indian General, from the first batch which was given Commission in 1920. It is impossible to promote all Colonels to the rank of General.

Let us now take the question of Indianising one Command. My Honourable friend proposed that probably in 30 years we could Indianise the

[Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan.]

whole of the Indian army; We take the question of Northern Command. The Northern Command is composed roughly of 22 Brigades, and each Brigade Staff is composed of one Brigade Commander, one Brigade Major and a Staff Captain and two or three additional officers. All staff officers must pass through the Staff College: unless an officer passes through the Staff College, he is not a *pukka* Staff Officer and he cannot take a permanent job as a Staff Officer. The first Indian, fortunately, Captain Kariappa, who has just qualified, has been given a staff job, I think, at Quetta—I am not sure where he has been appointed, but he has been given a staff job and he is the first Indian Staff Captain in the Indian Army . . . . .

Maulana Shaukat Ali (Cities of the United Provinces: Muhammadan Urban): How old is he?

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: He is very young. he was 18 in 1920.

Maulana Shaukat Ali: And would you tell me the age of a Field-Commander of a Brigade or Division?

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: Brigade Commanders are generally about 48 or 50 You can, therefore, imagine how it is possible to have complete Indianisation in 1952 unless we manufacture Generals or Colonels in some factory . . . .

An Honourable Member: During the War, we did it.

Another Honourable Member: How long did it take Japan?

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: There has been a lot of talk about this, and Honourable gentlemen have said that in 1952 we could easily Indianise the whole army I would merely say that both the Committee and the gentlemen are imaginative politicians, and that reminds me of a story which, with your permission, Sir, I shall relate, for the edification of those gentlemen and the Committee which recommend that Indianisation should be complete in 1952. In 1870, after the battle between the Germans and the French, when the Germans had conquered the two provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, the German Kaiser ordered the German officers to enlist French people in the German army and to teach them German language as soon as possible. To assure himself that his order was obeyed, he used to inspect them once a week and he used generally to ask three questions of the French recruits in order to know what they had done, and his first question was, "How old are you?" The second question was, "How long have you been in the service?" The third was, "Are you getting your pay and equipment regularly?" The German instructor noticed that when the Kaiser came he put these three questions regularly and so he said to the recruits, "Look here, when the Kaiser puts you the first question, you will reply "18 years, Sir"; when he asks you the second question, say "six months". and when he asks you the third question, say "both regularly, Sir". So, next week, when the Kaiser came round to inspect them, instead of asking the first question first, he put the second question first to the recruit and asked "How long have you been in the army?" The recruit replied, "18 years". The

Kaiser then asked "How old are you?" to which the recruit replied "six months, Sir" (Laughter), and finally the Kaiser said, "Either you or I am a fool". The recruit replied "Both regularly, Sir". (Laughter.)

But, Sir, having considered all these facts, I still persist that the Government should devise some ways and means to give larger opportunities for Indianisation of the Commissioned ranks of the army. There are about six or seven thousand officers in the Indian Army, and, at the present rate of Indianisation, it would take a very long time to replace all the British officers.

A few words about the Viceroy's Commissioned officers. My Honourable friend, the Mover, has just mentioned that he would not like the idea of eliminating Viceroy's Commissioned officers from the army. I was a great champion of keeping them, and, in the Indian Military College Committee, I fought their case and I was against the elimination of the Viceroy's Commission in Indianised units, but, after discussion, I was convinced that it is better the Indian officers, holding the Viceroy's Commission, should be altogether abolished. The reason is this: that in the past, when a recruit joined the Indian army, his highest ambition was only the rank of Subedar-Major or Risaldar-Major, but now, if you abolish these Viceroy's Commissions, if a recruit is well educated, his highest ambition will be to be the Commander-in-Chief or Field Marshal If he has qualified himself and gets to Dehra Dun, after passing Dehra Dun he can go up to the rank of Field Marshal; but if he is a Viceroy's Commissioned officer, he can only go up to the rank of Subedar-Major or Risaldar-Major; and I most emphatically pressed upon the Government that the sooner the Viceroy's Commission is abolished in the Indian army the better for the Indian troops.

An Honourable Member: Question

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: Probably he is right in some way: perhaps he wants to support some middle class people who cannot get education for their sons. But to them I would say, let them educate their sons and join the army and try to get an army cadetship and go to Dehra Dun to be trained as efficient officers to command troops. . . .

An Honourable Member: But they can never be Commander-in-Chief!

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has only a few minutes more.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: I come now to the question of the withdrawal of the British troops. This question was discussed at the First Round Table Conference, by the Defence Sub-Committee, presided over by Mr. Thomas. There was a large body of opinion against the idea of dispensing with British troops altogether. The Indian princes were strong supporters of the British army, because they stood on their treaty rights. Mahatma Gandhi, placing the Congress views before the Federal Structure Committee on November 17th, 1931, said that the Congress wanted command over the army in India with the goodwill of the British troops, and he wanted the British people to tell the British troops that they shall remain here, not to protect the British interests, but to protect Indian life against foreign aggression, and so on, and he still agrees with

[Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan.]

the statement he made some time ago. At the same time, Sir, there are communal differences in the country, and, therefore, unless and until the various communities inhabiting this vast country come to a proper understanding, unless and until they have mutual confidence in one another, it cannot be said that India will be in a position to manage her own defence.

Maulana Shaukat Ali: Sir, I am very much interested in this question, and I have given a good deal of thought over it. I come with an absolutely unbiased mind, not with any intention to criticise the Army Member, but to hear his views as a responsible officer who represents the army in this House, and I assure him that when he rises to speak, I shall listen to him most patiently, so that I may thoroughly understand the point of view of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief. Sir, I never served on any Committee, and I know nothing about the subject, except that I have read a good deal as a layman. I am not going to quote figures to prove my case, but I have studied the question as an Indian, as one whose family has worked during the last 600 years as soldier-administrators. Sir, the martial spirit is in my blood, and I understand many of these things. I have been a rebel and an outlaw, but when my time came to show my mettle I was bowled out for reasons which may not be mentioned now.

Now, Sir, what is the idea of keeping the British army in India? You have 60,000 British troops here. Is this army meant for the defence of India, is it meant to give the British people, whose fate is linked closely with that of the Indian people, sufficient confidence that they have 60,000 British troops to back them up? If it is for the defence of India, then, for such a vast country like this, 60,000 troops are not at all sufficient. You have already got Indian troops, and, I believe, you have got several million troops elsewhere, in case India is attacked. Now, if you maintain all these British troops to give the handful of British people who live in this country sufficient confidence, then I think you are following a wrong policy, because without the goodwill of the people of the country, and without winning the Indian people's confidence, you can do nothing. As I said on the very first day, I have been an outlaw and a rebel, but I am perfectly willing,—nay, I am anxious to co-operate with the Britishers, I shall move every fibre in this big body of mine to bring about an honourable understanding, so that Providence may keep up the British connection with this country for the interest of both. Sir, we have many friends and well-wishers of India, amongst the English.

An Honourable Member: No.

Maulana Shaukat Ali: You may say "No", you may be perfectly justified in holding that view. You have been under-dogs. I have been an under-dog also, but I never allowed bitterness to grow in my heart. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must address the Chair. He need not take any notice of such interruptions.

Maulana Shaukat Ali: I say, as the Persian Poet says:

"Urfi agar ba girya mooasar Shuday wisal sad sal meen tawan ba tamanna greestan."

"If by crying for years you could get a sweetheart, you may cry for 100 years, but the sweetheart does not come this way."

Sir, I know of one man at least intimately on that side, and that is my friend, Sir Joseph Bhore. When my brother was dying, he asked me to cultivate him. When I met him sometime later, there were tears in his eyes, and I think any man who shed tears when my brother was dying and whom Maulana Mohamad Ali loved and respected, he would be as good an Indian patriot as any in the country. Sir, I don't agree with many of my brethren here on this side (Congress) on this point. There are many competent Indians,—out of the so many, there are three Members sitting over there, who are occupying their places with such great distinction in the Executive Council, who have all proved their worth, and they are quite capable of looking after their respective departments. Then, there are my friends, Messrs. Rau, Bewoor, Kripalani, Mian Abdul Aziz and many others who have proved their capacity for work. There is no lack of men. They are as good as any in the world. Therefore, I say, that the time has come when we should get the best Indians possible without making any discrimination against men from England. I have no objection to pay them as high a salary as is necessary. Indianisation does not mean that you should at once get a few of the best Indians. What will be the use for new English recruits for the railway traffic department or for the locomotive shops or other purposes? Get the best youngmen from our own colleges in India As for experts, bring them down here, get good coaches, pay them well, promise them, besides high salaries, bonuses, if necessary, but with this condition, that within ten years they should train large numbers of good and capable young Indians. To such people I shall give even ten lakhs each, if necessary, as bonus, but they should get the best material and coach young and educated Indians. This is the basis on which India should be built, and I don't think mere destructive criticism will do any good. Sir, in spite of the provocation offered to me on this side or on that side, I am not going to lose my balance, and I am not going to allow any bitterness to get into my heart. Sir, I entered on my 63rd year only two days ago. I have not wasted my time all these years. I have been working in my own way for the advancement of my country. I think I have suffered, and if people were to judge me by the record of sacrifices I have made, I think I shall be inferior to none in this House. I, therefore, say, give the British another trial.

An Honourable Member: Trial?

Maulana Shaukat Ali: I say trial,—T, R, I, A, L. Give the British another trial for 10 years.

An Honourable Member: Will that do?

Maulana Shaukat Ali: Yes As we stand today even, if all Hindus and Muslims unite, if the Indian princes show their affection to us, if we all combine together, we can certainly turn out the British from this country, but we must be prepared for rivers of blood which we must avoid. It is not a joke. It is not easy to expect Sir Henry Craik to pack up and go away. But, I say, the time has not come for all that, and so I don't think we should work up war, but exert for an understanding and peace.

There is another friend here for whom I have very great respect, I mean my friend, Sir Henry Gidney,—but, I regret, he said "Oh, when

[Maulana Shaukat Ali.]

the British army leaves the shores of India, you will send an S.O.S. and tell the British people: 'Please come back, mamma, we are afraid; come and take care of us' Sir, today when we are not united, this is the present condition. Now, Sir, we have learnt many things from the British people, and we have yet to learn many more things. I honestly believe that we want Britishers to remain in this country on honourable terms, because we are demoralised. That is why we are in the present position. If there is no hope from them, and they will not share the Government of this country with us, I am perfectly willing to make up my mind with you all to start a mass rebellion, or revolution, and I shall not be lacking in my support to you. But I must understand what it all means, you must realise what it means, but today I see that we must seek every avenue for peace, and I do say that today I see there is a chance of coming to an understanding. I will give ten years, for this effort, if not much longer time. We should show our capacity for work instead of only criticising. If an outsider came and heard some of the language in this House, he would be tempted to call it a Monkey House. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. The Chair cannot allow this kind of language to be used regarding the House.

Maulana Shaukat Ali: I have heard this language used here, Sir, and that is why I used the expression to avoid that. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order The Honourable Member cannot use such language about the House.

Maulana Shaukat Ali: Sir, I have no desire to wound the feelings of anybody, nor do I wish to attack anybody.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim). The Chair hopes the Honourable Member will withdraw the expressions he has used.

Maulana Shaukat Ali: I withdraw it, Sir. These expressions I heard. I withdraw them as desired by you, Sir

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can now go on with his speech.

Maulana Shaukat Ali: If you want to fight against 350 millions of people, 60,000 British troops are nothing. If the people of this country make up their minds to break this British connection, your 60,000 troops mean nothing. If these 60,000 are meant for the defence of India, they are not sufficient. Therefore, I would suggest that you can easily take off half the number of British troops now, and, within a few years, you will find, when you have acceded to the wishes of the people, that the people will co-operate with you and offer you when the time for help comes even a 100 million recruits from India. I assure you I can give you ten lakhs of fine young men within three months—men who would be as tall as myself and as big as my Honourable friend, Captain Sher Muhammad Khan. We need money for nation-building activities, then why should we waste our money by having a larger number of highly

paid British soldiers? How long are we going to depend upon you for India's defence? Supposing there is another world war like the last war. His Excellency the Viceroy, Lord Hardinge, had said that India had only 15,000 troops left and that it had bled white for Britain. If we are not trained to defend our country, some other country would come and conquer India, and we would be helpless if the British were defeated and withdrew from India. Therefore, instead of being a mill-stone round your neck, instead of dreaming and conspiring and training people to throw bombs and thrust their knives into British officials,—instead of all that, try to make friends with us. I was a rebel and an outlaw, and yet I have become a friend, and I have no doubt that many people will become friends, if you change your angle of vision. Indian people have been your best friends in the last war, and I think our reward should have been quite different. I am not ashamed of the lessons I have learnt from the British, but these lessons do not mean that I should always remain in perpetuity their slave. Personally, I think, if one fine morning I find every English man, or woman disappear suddenly from India, I would be very sorry, and people would be wondering what had happened to them, but I may tell all that, after four or five days' wonder, the Indian people, realizing what had happened, would carry on and the administration will be as good, if not better than it is today. ("Hear, hear" from the Opposition Benches.) That is my conviction. It does not mean that I do not want the Englishman. We want everybody who lives in India and makes India his home, Hindus, Muslims, Parsis, Sikhs, Christians, and Anglo-Indians, and in this connection, I have one grievance against my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, that he and his people are more proud of the father than of the mother. (Laughter.) I also include all the British merchant princes who have made the commerce of India, every British civilian who is serving India—his children must be allowed to compete with my children, but those who have nothing to do with India, but only send out their youngsters fresh from British colleges to occupy high appointments in this country, should be told "this place is not for them". The Nawab of Pataudi told me that he knew no cricket when he went to England and he said that he owed all his cricket to his coach, Frank Woolley. He said that when, for the first time, he went to play for England against Australia, no one was more happy or more proud than Woolley at his performance. We have been your pupils, and now we want to administer this country, and we want you to help us in that object. Why should it mean that we want to kick you out, or beat you or hurt you, or deprive you of the wealth that you have made in this country? It is peace and honourable co-operation that I want, and I think it is up to you to grant it. I say, the time has come when India must be trained to stand on her own legs. You have got no British troops in Canada; you have got no British troops in Australia, or in New Zealand, or even in South Africa, who fought you only a few years ago. Then, why in India alone? We have been your friends. We are tired of waiting and waiting and hearing all kinds of excuses and arguments. I do not want to say anything unpleasant, though I can say many things unpleasant quoting history. My desire is not to talk of war, my desire is to have peace and friendship. I want to hear the Army Secretary, and I want to see what they are going to do to Indianise the army, in order to give the people of India evidence of their honesty and good intentions, and also in order to show that, when we get power in our hands, we shall not touch even a single Englishman or woman or child, but it will be

[Maulana Shaukat Ali.]

the honour and good name of India that we should look after them. (Cheers.)

Sardar Mangal Singh (East Punjab: Sikh): I have great pleasure in associating myself with the views expressed by the Honourable the Mover of the motion. This amendment raises a very important question which is very intimately connected with our future political development. I wish to speak on this question with a great amount of caution and restraint. We should not do anything or say a word which will impair the discipline of the army or which will in any way lower the efficiency of the army. (Hear, hear.) I recognise that we do require a good and efficient army to defend our country from external aggression and from internal disorders. When we say that you should Indianise the army, we do not in the least mean that its efficiency should be lowered. If that is the insinuation, if that is the implication, it is a great insult to the profession of the arms, a great insult to the Indian soldier. The other day His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, whilst speaking in the other House, said that there was not a large supply of young men with long traditions of military leadership behind them. I do not know what to say to my Commander-in-Chief. During the last century and a half, the military authorities in this country have done everything to suppress the military leadership in us. They have done everything to deprive us of all those opportunities which cultivate and create the aptitude for military leadership in our men. And after doing all that, after a century and a half, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief comes to us and says, "You have not got that aptitude of military leadership now". I take it as a great insult to the profession of arms in India. I do not agree with my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, when he said that Indian officers and Indian men in the army do not desire Indianisation. I speak from personal knowledge, I hope it will not be taken as presumptuous on my part, but I do say, that I have been in the army myself and I have the honour to represent a community which contributes the highest share to the defence of the country proportionately. I daily come in contact with retired Indian military officers and those men who come on leave. I know their minds. They are more anxious than the Congressmen there for the speedy Indianisation of the army. It is they who are always suffering in the army from the inferiority complex, from the inferior status which they have got. I know their feelings. They are always smarting under this disgrace of always having to carry out the orders of British officers. I speak from personal knowledge and personal experience. I have listened to the speech of my gallant friend, Captain Sher Muhammad Khan, but I am sorry I do not agree with him when he says that the Viceroy's Commissioned officers should be abolished straightaway. I was rather surprised to hear it from him. He is the representative of those very officers and he comes here and says that his constituency should be abolished.

3 P. M.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: It is a matter of opinion.

Sardar Sant Singh: A matter of inspiration!

Sardar Mangal Singh: The Honourable the Army Secretary interrupted the Mover of the amendment and said, "Why do you require Indian

officers?" Sir, I submit there are two reasons why we do not want to abolish the Viceroy's Commissioned officers. The first reason is that it delays Indianisation.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: May I say on this point that it will not delay Indianisation by one minute? If I may explain this point now, I will try to do so. An officer in the army takes 25 years or 26 years to reach command of a battalion. It will make no difference whether they begin as platoon commanders, which is what the Viceroy's Commissioned officers are, or whether they begin as company officers. It is perfectly true that the replacement of Viceroy's Commissioned officers by Indian officers will delay the commencement of Indianisation for a few years whilst these Indian officers are taking the places of the platoon commanders. That will take three or four years, or possibly a little more; but it will not delay by one minute the completion of that process because in either case it will take them 25 years to reach command of a battalion.

Sardar Mangal Singh: Had the Honourable the Army Secretary waited for a few minutes more, I was going to deal with that question. I say, Sir, in spite of the explanation of the Honourable the Army Secretary that the abolition of the Viceroy's Commissioned officers will delay the Indianisation of the army. We have at the present moment selected 15 regiments to Indianise, a complete war division and in that division there are about 300 Indian officers and about less than 200 British officers. For that if we are to abolish the Viceroy's Commissioned officers, we require in all 500 Indian commissioned officers, but if we keep those Indian officers there, we require only less than 200 Indian commissioned officers to Indianise the whole division. If you replace the Viceroy's Commissioned officer by Indian commissioned officer, you are not Indianising it. You are only replacing Indian by Indian. Is this Indianisation? You are simply changing the Viceroy's Commission into an Indian commission, which is only a change in name. What is the change? In this connection I am reminded of an incident. Once, Sir, there was a great agitation, about the unhealthy condition of Mianmir cantonment, in England. There were British troops there who were dying of malaria and there was a great agitation in the British Parliament that the Mianmir cantonment should be abolished. What did they do? They changed the name of Mianmir into Lahore cantonment and announced in the Parliament that they had changed the cantonment. This is typical of the Indianisation which you are carrying out now. They are replacing a Jemadar or a Subedar or Risaldar or Risaldar Major by an Indian commissioned officer from Dehra Dun. I ask the Army Secretary—is this Indianisation? This is merely change of name and we are not going to be deluded by it.

My second point as to why the Viceroy's Commissioned officer should be retained is this. If you abolish this order now, it will seriously affect the efficiency of the Indianised units. I tell you why. Now every villager who goes into the army has the aspiration to rise one day to the post of Jamadar Subedar or Risaldar or Risaldar Major. If you deprive that chance to that ordinary man, those efficient men and good soldiers would go to other units and not to your Indianised division which you are going to create. You are creating such conditions that after 14 or 18 years your Commander-in-Chief will come here and say: "Look here, these Indianised regiments are inefficient, and, therefore, Indians are not fit for the army".

[Sardar Mangal Singh.]

On account of these two reasons, I say that the Viceroy's Commissioned officer should be retained, and if you are going to abolish it, we shall consider it after the whole army is Indianised. At present the question is to replace the British officers by Indian officers.

I now come to the question of the Indian army. I am sorry to say that the whole structure and the whole composition of the Indian army is based on mistrust, doubt, suspicion and racial discrimination. I am sorry to say it but it is a fact. The policy which was chalked out, after the Mutiny, is still there in the army. The two counterpoises which were proposed at that time are still there in the army. Before the Mutiny there was one European soldier to five Indian soldiers and even sometimes one to six or seven but, after the Mutiny, they fixed the proportion as 1 to 2 and that proportion they are still carrying on. Another counterpoise which they proposed is that all the regiments should be mixed regiments. There should be a platoon of Sikhs, Punjabi Mussulmans, Gurkhas, Mahrattas, Rajputs and Dogras. The mixed regiments are in order to counterpoise amongst themselves, the proportion of the British and the Indian is the other, two counterpoises still exist. I ask, in all seriousness, in all humility, if the loyalty of the Indian soldier is still questioned.

An Honourable Member On the Official Benches: No.

Sardar Mangal Singh: Why are you, then, keeping this counterpoise? Why don't you withdraw the British army? This British army is a counterpoise to the Indian army. They probably feel that if there is a revolution in this country, the British army will stand by the British. In this sense, the British army is not an Indian army but it is an army of occupation to perpetuate the British raj and to carry on the exploitation of the country. It is to protect their interests and in this sense it is not a national army but an army of occupation.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has two minutes more.

Sardar Mangal Singh: About the military leadership. I said that they have not given us opportunities, and, even after 100 years, they would not give us small opportunities willingly, but, in the war, when the British officer died, our Indian officers got the opportunity to command the platoons and what happened at that time? They had no previous training. They were not the graduates at Sandhurst or Cranwell or any of the military colleges of England. They were simply Jamadars or Subedars or Risaldars and how did they behave. Here is book called: 'Deeds of Valour performed by Indian officers and soldiers'. I will give you only two or three instances as to how those officers and soldiers met that crisis, when the British officers were killed and the enemy was coming on. That will show that if you give us opportunities we will not be wanting in deeds of bravery. The first case is that of Jamadar Mir Dast who was granted the Victoria Cross. I will read an extract from the London Gazette:

"For most conspicuous bravery and great ability at Ypres on the 26th April, 1915, when he led his platoon with great gallantry during the attack and afterwards collected various parts of the regiment when no British officer was left and kept them under his command until the retirement was ordered."

Then, there is another instance—of Subadar Bhagwan Singh:

"For conspicuous gallantry and devotion to duty. When his Company Commander was wounded early in an engagement, he took command and led the company with great courage and skill, setting a most inspiring example to the men. Later, when the adjutant and the Subadar-Major became casualties, he carried out their duties in addition to commanding his company, and rendered invaluable assistance during the ensuing night."

Then, there is another Subadar Mit Singh:

"When his company commander was wounded during an engagement, he at once took command and led the company with great coolness and skill. By his excellent dispositions he repelled a counter-attack, and maintained the ground won. He set a magnificent example to his men."

Sir, this book is full of similar extracts, showing that when the Indian officers got the opportunity, they behaved well and they met the crisis. Sir, only yesterday, I came across in this book the deeds of bravery of our own Marshal. (Loud Applause.) This is what the London Gazette says of his conspicuous gallantry while serving with the Indian Expeditionary Force in France:

"During an advance on the 30th November, 1917, his squadron was caught in barbed wire. Under heavy shell-fire, Nur Ahmad Khan showed great presence of mind and initiative in extricating the squadron. By his personal bravery and good example, he succeeded in rallying his men and galloped through a barrage of heavy shell and machine gun fire."

(Loud and Prolonged Applause.)

—But mark these lines carefully—

"But by the time that 'D' (Pathan) squadron began to pass through the defile, they met with a very different reception. The leading troop was almost blown to pieces by the concentrated fire on the narrow opening but the remainder of the squadron never wavered, nor did they change their pace"

(Loud and Prolonged Applause.)

"Advancing with the utmost steadiness through the gap, the troops spread out in diamond formation forty yards apart, and breaking into gallop crossed the intervening open ground under heavy shell and machine gun fire and joined the leading squadron in the hollow ground. This gallant episode, which was watched with admiration by onlookers, was one of which any army in the world might be proud For mounted troops to advance in the face of modern fire-arms is in any circumstances an undertaking requiring the greatest pluck and daring. To make such an advance in orderly formation, first through a narrow defile and then across open ground, exposed throughout to hostile artillery and infantry fire, betokens not only dash and gallantry, but also coolness and nerve on the part of the leaders and steady discipline and morale of a very high order in all ranks."

(Hear, hear.)

Nor was this merely a vain display of reckless bravery. The opportune arrival of Hodson's Horse at a point where the defence was very seriously weakened, and at a moment when the single squadron of the 8th Hussars was in danger of being overwhelmed, was successful in definitely checking the German advance and materially assisted in keeping the line unbroken.

Major Nawab Ahmad Nawaz Khan (Nominated Non-Official): All these things were taught by the British to us, Indians.

Sardar Mangal Singh: Sir, these certificates were earned at a moment of crisis by those men who were deliberately deprived of those opportunities of getting an aptitude for leadership. I submit, Sir, that we should never accept a position whereby you are merely going to have this Indianisation as an experimental measure. If you do it, we refuse to have it, we do not want it on that basis. (Hear, hear.)

The other day, in the Council of State, the Commander-in-Chief said that they will pronounce their judgment after fourteen or eighteen years.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: No

Sardar Mangal Singh: Sir, if the Indians are fit to teach them in peace and lead them in war, then and then alone they will extend Indianisation. I do not accept that proposition. Sir, wherever you have given opportunities to Indians, they have shown that they are eminently fitted. See in the I.C.S. how they have acquitted themselves, and see in this very House how our Indian Leader of the House and other Indian Members are leading the Government men. (Laughter.) Wherever you have given us opportunities, we have shown that Indians are not less capable than any European or anybody else. (Hear, hear.) I say that on that ground I do not accept that proposition. How long shall we be under examination? They gave us reforms. They now say: "Look here, boys, have these reforms for ten years and you are under examination, and we will pass our judgment after that". Similarly, here Government come forward and say. "All right, we will give you some commissions, we will make some Lieutenants, some Captains and, after some time, we will pass our judgment, and if you get 45 per cent. of the marks, we will promote you to another class". Sir, we refuse to accept that position. (Hear, hear.)

Another important point which I want to allude to is the Commissions you are giving us in the army now. I maintain, Sir, that the Commissions, which are now being given, the Indian Commissions, are inferior to the King's Commissions, which, for instance, you gave to my friend, Captain Sher Muhammad Khan and to our Marshal. I know the Army Secretary will contradict me and he will probably come up with the argument that this is equal to dominion commissions I do not want to hear that argument, because, in the dominions, these conditions do not exist. If there are any British people in the army, they are in the general army. Here they are not. Here they have got a separate army: and, if our Indian Commissioned officers and the King's Commissioned officers and even private men, if they go into mixed formations, then the Indian Commissioned officers will not be entitled to that rank—that is to command mixed formations I know the Honourable the Military Secretary is shaking his head, but, in spite of that, I maintain that you are not giving those Commissioned officers that right. Even if the King's Commissioned officer is a junior to our Commissioned officer, he will not accept his command. That is the whole position. And this is not only in the case of officers. I ask the Army Secretary—supposing there is an Indian Commissioned officer going on the road and a British soldier meets him; if he does not salute the Indian Commissioned officer, I ask the Army Secretary if he is entitled to his salute, and if the British private soldier refuses to salute the Indian Commissioned officer, is he really entitled to put him under arrest and take him to the quarter-guard and punish him? Certainly not, under the present army conditions, and that is the whole point. I

again put the other question: will the Indian Commissioned officer be entitled to sit on a courtmartial of junior British officers, or even of private British soldiers? You will probably say that this condition will not arise for another 20 or 25 years. I say, these conditions are met with in every-day life. There are mixed formations, there are occasions when the Indian officers and the British officers come together, and if the Indian Commissioned officers are to be treated like that, I say, no respectable nation will accept that position, and India will not accept that position of inferiority complex and inferior status.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has exhausted his time.

Sardar Mangal Singh: I am finishing, Sir. With these words, I submit that the pace of Indianisation should be greatly increased, and the recruitment of British officers should be altogether stopped. (Hear, hear.) If we today stop the British recruitment, even then it will take nearly 40 years to complete the Indianisation of the army, and if we do not stop that recruitment,—well, the other day, the Honourable the Army Secretary frankly admitted that, at the present rate, Indianisation could never be accomplished and the Indian army could never be Indianised; and, if that is the position, we do submit that the least that the Government should do is that they should stop the recruitment of British officers from England. With these words, I heartily support the motion moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Sir, if I intervene in the debate at this stage, I think it is in accordance with the wishes of Honourable Members, and I hope that they will give me a patient hearing on this controversial subject. With most of what has fallen from Honourable Members today, I shall deal in the general body of my speech, but I must admit straightaway that Mr. Asaf Ali took me by surprise and I do not quite know even now what he was really aiming at. He took one deep breath and inflated the army budget by ten crores, that is from 45 crores to 55 crores I am still not quite sure how he did that. He then took another breath and said that this enormous sum must be greatly reduced, but for every reduction that we make in the way of abolishing British regiments we must make a corresponding increase in the air force and in the navy. Those increases were advocated, definitely to meet certain imperial liabilities which at present the army in India does not accept. He apparently wished us to accept these liabilities in addition to those that are now laid upon us Last of all, he took an even deeper breath and suggested that we should introduce conscription in India which would mean, according to his own figures, conscripting 120 millions . . . . .

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Not necessarily.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I thought conscription meant universal service. However, it is not necessary to go on further with that. I should like to acknowledge very gratefully the very temperate way in which the Honourable the Mover placed his case before this House, and I hope I shall be able to do the same. It is obvious from what we have heard on the motion that it raises the whole policy of defence. I must, however, confine myself to certain aspects of it, if I am to keep within my time limit.

[Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham.]

Fortunately that is fairly easy, because the most important aspect of the whole problem is the question of Indianisation. I shall, therefore, confine most of my remarks to that subject.

There are, however, just four facts that I should like first of all to place before the House with regard to the general level of defence expenditure. Now, the first is this. At the present day, the defence budget stands at 45 crores, whereas in 1930, it stood at 55 crores. That shows a reduction of ten crores is six years and nobody can call that negligible. At the same time, the more we reduce, the greater seems to be the demand for reduction. When our budget showed 55 crores, the general cry was for a reduction to 50 crores, and now, when we have reduced the expenditure to 45 crores, the demand for reduction is even greater. At the same time one cannot help noticing a somewhat inconsistent tendency, and that is a tendency to increase the defence budget by putting on to it various items which at present find a place under various other heads of account. I can only conclude that the reason for this is that, the smaller our budget gets, the more difficult it becomes to criticise it and so our critics want a larger target to aim at. They want to be able to produce telling statistics based on the size and the cost of the army. Now, one might point out that from the taxpayer's point of view, (and that is after all what we are mainly considering today) the mere transfer of items from one head of account to another does not make the slightest difference. I am thinking particularly of the case of strategic railways. But there is a point of substance behind that. The military authorities themselves have never clearly understood why the category of so-called strategic railways should be limited to a few lines on the other side of the Indus which do not work at a profit. There is another point of view, and I put it before the House, that the main lines from Karachi and Bombay to the north-west of India are of infinitely greater strategic importance than the comparatively few trans-Indus lines on which the loss is incurred. It seems to me to be equally sound, or unsound, to suggest that, if the army is to pay the loss on these trans-Indus lines, they might also claim a share of the profits on the other lines.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Were they constructed for military purposes?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Originally, no doubt they were constructed partly for that purpose.

The second point is that this year undoubtedly the army budget has increased by about half a crore. Nobody can maintain, however, that that increase indicates any change of policy. Nobody can maintain that full warning was not given of that possibility; and nobody can maintain that in this respect the army are behaving in any way differently from all the civil departments of the Government. In fact it has been repeatedly said, during the last few years, that the reductions that we have secured have been secured partially by temporary cuts in pay, partially by the fall in commodity prices, partially by the fact that we have been living on our surplus stores instead of keeping up our reserves to the full extent and partially by the fact that we have postponed expenditure on building. It is, therefore, inevitable that, when the pay cut is restored, when prices begin to rise, when we have consumed our surplus stores, and when it becomes no longer economical to postpone expenditure on buildings, there must be

an increase in the army budget. That is the second important fact that I wanted to mention.

The third fact is this. Honourable Members are very fond of saying that more than half the revenues of this country are absorbed in defence. Well, Sir, that is not correct. Actually the figure at the present moment is about 26 per cent. of the total revenues of India. But even that is not the really important point. The important point is that in 1914, that is before the war, the proportion of the revenues of India that was spent on defence was 34 per cent. In other words, before the war it was a little over one-third; while today it is a little over a quarter. We now spend eight per cent. less of our income on defence and eight per cent. more on the civil departments. If I may go back a further still, it may interest Honourable Members to hear extracts from a lecture, which a learned Professor of the Madras University gave the other day, about army organisation in ancient India. He says:

"We see that the military expenditure was a little over 50 per cent. of the total expenditure of the State."

That is talking of thousands of years ago. He goes on:

"It appears, the pay of the officers and the soldiers were dependent on the economic condition of the times and in the face of constant attacks and in the absence of necessary funds in the treasury, the King could encroach upon the private property of his wealthy subjects by levying more taxes upon them."

That merely shows how history repeats itself.

The fourth important fact is this. Last year, I made certain calculations from published figures and I found that the total cost of the defence of the British Empire by land, by sea and by air at that time came to roughly £150 millions a year, that is about 200 crores. Out of that enormous sum, the British taxpayer pays about eleven annas in the rupee and the Indian taxpayer pays rather more than three annas in the rupee, while the Dominion taxpayer pays under two annas in the rupee. It is perfectly true that the Dominion share compared with Indian share is small, but there are differences between the conditions in the Dominions and the conditions in India to which I need not refer at present. The point I wish to make now is that the Indian share compared with the share of the British taxpayer is also very small. It is indeed often apt to be overlooked or forgotten that, although India may pay a great deal for her army, she pays practically nothing for her naval defence and very little for her air defence. Those, I submit, are the sort of facts, or some of the facts, that ought to form the back-ground of any general consideration of the level of the defence expenditure.

But, Sir, I am perfectly well aware that what Honourable Members are mainly interested in is that, whatever the present figure of defence expenditure may be and by whatever amount we may have reduced it during the last five or six years, still, in their opinion, considerable further reductions could and should be secured by more rapid Indianisation. I, therefore, turn to the question of Indianisation and I will attempt first of all to explain the policy of the Government of India with regard to the Indianisation of the Indian army; that is to say, the replacement of British by Indian officers in the Indian army.

Sir, it is quite impossible to argue this case unless one fundamental proposition can be accepted, and that is that the replacement of British officers by Indian officers is an experiment. Now, by making an experiment

[Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham.]

I understand doing something that has never been done before and applying certain tests to it to see whether it will work. That is what I mean by an experiment.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Does it imply that you can go back on the experiment?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: We must see whether the experiment works. By the test that we apply to this experiment naturally I understand the test of efficiency. And in this connection I think I need only quote the report of the Defence Sub-Committee of the first Round Table Conference, to which my Honourable friend, the Leader of the Independent Party,—who I am sorry to find is not present today, signed his name. What they then said was:

"It was unanimously agreed that in a matter of such importance as defence, the utmost care was necessary in expressing opinions and the Sub-Committee as a whole was very anxious not to create the impression that any one in any way to any degree wanted to say anything that could even remotely tend to imperil the safety of the country or to weaken the strength of the army. It was in view of this general feeling that all sections of the Sub-Committee emphasised the importance of maintaining the same standard of efficiency in training as prevails now in England."

Now, Sir, with those who hold that we already possess sufficient proof of the ability of Indians to train troops, as officers, in peace and to lead troops, as officers, in war, I am afraid it is impossible for me to argue. I can only say that at the moment we have no proof and only a certain amount of evidence. And in saying that I do not wish to be misunderstood. The valour and gallantry of Indian troops is fully, freely, gladly and unreservedly admitted and acknowledged. But, Sir, the qualities required of a soldier are very different from the qualities required of an officer whose business it is to train troops in peace and to lead them in war.

Sardar Sant Singh: May I ask the Honourable Member one question? Did not those gentlemen whose names were read out by Sardar Mangal Singh lead their men in war and act as officers?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: They certainly did and all credit is due to them for doing so. But it was not their life's work and they did it in the heat of the moment during the war. That does not prove necessarily, as I am now going on to argue, that they would have made good commanders of battalions or brigades or good Generals or good Commanders-in-Chief.

I have said it before, and I will say it again, that the mere fact that a number of young Indians are able to pass an examination into the Indian Military Academy and pass out of it with success, the mere fact that they are able to command with success small bodies of troops in peace time, does not necessarily prove that they will make good commanders of battalions or brigades or divisions or army corps. I have no doubt that many of my Honourable friends opposite would have had no difficulty themselves in passing these examinations and in learning the necessary drill. I have no doubt that even I myself could have done it, but, speaking entirely for myself, I have no doubt whatever that I should have made an extremely bad General. And, therefore, it does not necessarily mean that because young Indians can pass examinations in the Academy they are, therefore, fit straightaway to command large bodies of troops. Now, Sir, to those

who are prepared to admit,—and I think there are some,—that the Indianisation of the Indian army is an experiment, in the sense in which I have used the term, I will say as follows. In practically every speech and in practically every article that is written on this subject we are told that at the present rate it will take hundreds of years to Indianise the army. That is not true. It will not take hundreds of years or thousands of years or even millions of years. At the present rate, as I have said before, even if one British officer is recruited every year, the Indian army will never be completely Indianised. And if there are any Honourable Members who do not understand that even now,—I will refrain from using those terrible words that I used the other day,—I will merely hand them over to my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin, and ask the learned professor to give them a few lessons in elementary mathematics.

Munshi Iswar Saran: When do you think the army will be completely Indianised according to your calculation?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I am coming to that now.

Now, Sir, I think the Leader of the Independent Party, Mr. Jinnah, and those who sit behind him, understand the position perfectly well. In fact, it was clear from what Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury said that they do understand the position. The position that Mr. Jinnah took up at the Round Table Conference was this. The quickest possible method of Indianising the Indian army is to stop British recruitment tomorrow. If you do that it will take 35 years; and, in his opinion, that was possible and should be done. He failed, however, to carry with him the rest of the Committee. Therefore he said: "If you are going to do anything short of that, you must lay down a definite indication of the pace at which you intend to proceed." Therefore to him Indianisation in 5, 10, 15 or 25 years clearly means that after those 5, 10, 15 or 25 years we must bind ourselves not to recruit any further British officers. I am glad we have got that clear. Let us apply that to our policy. Our policy is not, never was, and never could have been, intended to Indianise the whole of the Indian army, either completely or partially; and I do submit that it is unfair that it should be criticised as if that was its intention. The object of our policy is to Indianise a very definite portion of the Indian army in a very definite time. The portion of the army that we are Indianising is, as I have explained before, a division of all arms, and a cavalry brigade with a proportion of all the necessary staff and ancillary services, such as the Indian Army Service Corps, the Indian Army Ordnance Corps, Remounts and so on. We have made the most careful calculations and we find that an intake of 60 cadets a year into the Indian Military Academy, making due allowance for casualties and wastage, should be sufficient, or more than sufficient, to provide all the officers required to officer those units by 1952, that is to say, in 17 years from now.

Now, Sir, some Honourable Members may say, "how is it possible to Indianise those units in a period of 17 years when the period it takes to command a battalion is 26 years?" Sir, that is perfectly true. The army is one of the few professions in which infant prodigies are not allowed. There is a time-scale of promotion, 9 years to Captain, 18 years to Major and 26 years to Lieutenant-Colonel. The explanation of course is that, when we started this scheme for the Indianisation of a division and a cavalry brigade, we started with something in hand. We started

[Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham.]

with the officers who had already been recruited for the purposes of the old eight-unit scheme which began in 1924 and the first of whom, therefore, should be fit to command their battalions in 26 years from 1924, that is, in 1950. In this way, we calculate that, if all goes well, there should be sufficient officers of sufficient standing from about 1950 onwards to command, not only the original eight units, but also the additional units included in the division and cavalry brigade. And, by that time, these various units will probably have had their baptism of fire in some frontier engagement or other: they will have passed through the supreme test; by that time there can be no possible talk of experiment. . . . .

An Honourable Member: And if there is a great war, sooner!

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Honourable Members may ask: "Have we got to wait till 1952 or 1950 before any further advance can be made?" My answer to them is "Certainly not". An impression seems to have gained ground that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief said the other day in another place that no more Indianisation can take place for fourteen years. Sir, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief never said anything of the kind. His Excellency has always been strictly consistent in what he has said on this subject: and what he has said is that it is only when you get a sufficient number of Indian officers with fourteen years' service that you will be able to express an opinion about the success or otherwise of the experiment. I would like, if I may, to read the actual words of His Excellency's address to the Indian Military College Committee on this point—it was in 1931. His Excellency said:

"At the present moment, the young Indian officers in the eight units have seven years' service. That obviously is not long enough for us to tell whether they are going to be fit to administer and train a unit in peace and lead it in war. In seven more years (that will be in 1938) however, they will have had fourteen years' service and by that time I feel pretty certain that we shall be able to give a definite opinion whether they are going to be a complete success or not; and we need not wait until a further seven years, which would bring young officers now in the Army up to 21 years' service and approaching the time when they would command units, before we decide to carry the experiment further."

I should like to ask the House to compare this policy of ours with other policies that have been put forward for the Indianisation of the Indian army, and, in particular, the scheme of the Skeen Committee. Under the scheme of the Skeen Committee, half the officers in the Indian Army in 1952 would have been Indian and half of them would have been British. Now, let us suppose that there is somewhere—I do not say in this country or in England, but somewhere—an entirely imaginary body of very influential people who are bitterly opposed to Indianisation as such and who will take every possible opportunity to obstruct it. Let us suppose also that these semi-Indianised units, with half their officers Indian and half British, had acquitted themselves well and that the demand was put forward for the total stoppage of British recruitment. What would our imaginary obstructionists say? Surely it would be open to them to say: "Yes, it is all very well to say that these units have done well: but the reason why they have done well is largely because they have got so many British officers—half British and half Indian. We will increase the ratio of Indianisation; we will take in two Indians to one British or even three Indians to one British but we cannot go further at present." I quite

agree, at that rate, that it would take hundreds of years to Indianise the Indian Army. Now come back to our own scheme. We have, in 1950 or 1952 a number of units which are completely Indianised from top to bottom and commanded by Indian officers. Let us assume that those units, as we hope, will have also acquitted themselves well. If that is so and, if, then a demand for the stoppage of British recruitment were put forward, what possible answer could our imaginary obstructionists have? I for one can see no practical answer; and I would ask the House seriously to think out the implications of what I have said. It may mean, as far as I can see, the possibility of Indianisation within a much shorter time than either the British Indian delegation mentioned or than Honourable Members opposite seem to think.

Now, I shall turn to one other aspect of this matter It is said that our policy is based on distrust of Indians. I deny that absolutely. To my mind, the making of an experiment, so far from involving distrust, must connote a very decided measure of trust combined with an ordinary measure of prudence. I will take an analogy from trade. Supposing a young man walked into a motor firm's office one morning and said that he had discovered a wonderful new invention which would make motor cars very much cheaper and would not affect or reduce their efficiency. He produces his plans and designs and specifications and the firm is impressed. But does that firm immediately incorporate this design in their next year's model and sell it to the public? No firm would think of doing such a thing. What they do is to build a few cars including the invention and subject those cars to the most rigorous tests on the beach and on the road; and then if they succeed in passing those tests they put the car into commercial production and sell it to the public. I need only say that the army is a much more complicated machine than a motor car; and incidentally if Honourable Members say that it is absurd to imagine that a country of the size and character of India is unable to produce officers to lead their army, surely it is equally true that it is incredible that a country of the size of India should not be able to produce motor cars. Still the fact remains that in both cases India has not yet done so. . . . .

An Honourable Member: Thanks to you!

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Now, my point is that we *are* trusting these young officers; we are launching them upon this experiment and we are giving them every possible guidance and assistance. Nobody can deny that. We are going out of our way to post to the Indianising units some of our best and most sympathetic officers to train these young men, as they gradually get senior, to take their places; and if we are doing that, I do not think anybody has any right to say that our policy is based on distrust. On the other hand I do say that the public generally and Honourable Members opposite could help enormously towards the success of this experiment, if they too were ready to trust us and also to trust these young men. At present what do we hear? Nothing but talk about invidious distinctions or differences in powers of command and segregation. Now, what does segregation mean? Merely putting these young men by themselves to do a particular job with proper guidance and proper supervision. No Honourable Member opposite, I am quite sure, would admit that these young men are not capable of running the show by themselves: why then do they object to this word segregation? I believe it is entirely

[Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham.]

due to the supposition that our scheme of Indianising completely a portion of the army is based on our desire that British officers should never submit to the command of Indian officers.

An Honourable Member: That is just the point.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I need only refer to the debates that took place in Simla last year on this subject. What did it all amount to? What our opponents then said was: "We want complete reciprocity of powers of command between British and Indian officers in the Indian army." We said: "We agree. That is the principle that we ourselves advocate and we are going to do it." Our opponents then said: "We do not trust you to do it: we want you to put a definite section in a definite Act and tie your hands in order to do it." We said: "That is not the right way to do it: powers of command are not regulated by the Indian Army Act or the Army Act at Home: they are regulated by the King's Regulations which are issued by His Majesty who grants the Commission." Now, only a few days ago an amendment to the King's Regulations was issued and I will read it to the House:

"The power of command to be exercised by Indian Commissioned officers in relation to personnel belonging to His Majesty's Indian forces will be the power of command vested in officers of corresponding rank and status holding commissions in the land forces."

That is exactly what the Honourable Members wanted. It gives complete reciprocity of powers of command in the Indian army without any reservation of any kind. I do hope, Sir, that that will be enough to convince Honourable Members. . . .

An Honourable Member: Will you put it in the Act?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: . . . . . that we are just as much in earnest about this as they are. It is quite true, Sir, that we cannot possibly promise now, at this moment, to stop British recruitment in any fixed number of years, but what I have said will, I hope, show Honourable Members that our policy does at least contain the possibility of a rapid approach to that position, and possibly a far more rapid approach than Honourable Members seem to think.

Now, Sir, I have dwelt possibly too long on the Indianization of the Indian army. I should like to say a few words about the reduction of British troops. The first thing I must say is that I deny absolutely that any portion of the army in India, either British or Indian, is maintained here as, what Honourable Members are pleased to call, an Imperial Reserve. That, Sir, is not true. The army in India, both British and Indian is maintained on a scale which is sufficient to protect India against local aggression on her frontiers and to maintain internal security; and, so far from the army in India being constituted as an Imperial Reserve, it is a plain fact that if India, which God forbid, were ever to be faced by the major danger of attack by a great Power, the army in India, British and Indian, as it is constituted at present, would not be sufficient to repel that attack, and we should have to apply for assistance and re-inforcements from England. So much, Sir, for the actual strength of the army in India. I do not believe that if that army were entirely Indian, there would be one single Member in this House who would advocate its reduction by one single man. There does, however, remain the question of the possibility of replacing British troops by Indian troops. Now, Sir, as regards that, I can only refer to what the Leader of the Independent Party

said about it at the First Round Table Conference. What he there advocated was,—I will quote his own words, "As you go on with Indianization, British troops must be *gradually* reduced". Sir, I may be perhaps excused for placing more emphasis on the word 'gradually' than possibly Mr. Jinnah himself did, but I cannot believe that by the word 'gradually' he meant either rapidly or suddenly; and our policy, as I explained the other day, does involve the gradual replacement of British by Indian troops. Our programme of Indianisation includes automatically the gradual replacement of certain portions of the British army by Indian units. The whole of this policy has been very carefully considered, within the last few years, both by this Government and by His Majesty's Government, and it was considered in the full knowledge of the strength of Indian opinion on this subject. Surely, Sir, we should be guilty, to say the least of it, of extreme inconsistency if, at this moment, we were to change our minds and advocate a sudden or rapid acceleration of the process.

Sir, that is all I have to say. I do hope that, whether Honourable Members agree with me or disagree with me, at least they will give me credit for having put my views before them honestly and frankly. (Hear, hear.) I do myself believe that the Government policy in this matter is the right policy. (*Several Honourable Members from the Opposition Benches*: "No, no.") We have no reason whatever to fear criticism regarding it, and I say it is the right policy, because, I believe, in the long run, it will prove itself to be in the best interests of the safety, honour and welfare of this country. (*Several Honourable Members from the Opposition Benches*: "No, no.")

(At this stage, several Honourable Members asked for a closure.)

Mr. G. Morgan (Bengal. European). Mr. President, after the very full explanation given by the Honourable the Army Secretary, there is really very little left for me to say.

4 P. M.

An Honourable Member: On whose behalf?

Mr G. Morgan: On my own behalf. In fact, the few notes that I had made related to points with which the Army Secretary has already very ably dealt.

Now, Sir, it is evident from the speeches delivered today that this House considers an army in India is necessary. One has only to look at the map of India to realise the necessity for a force to safeguard the country. The North-West Frontier is an eternal question. The North-East Frontier may at any moment become another serious problem, and the long line of seaboard renders India vulnerable Now, Sir, taking it for granted that an army is a necessity, the next question is what should be the strength and composition of that army? For many years past innumerable Committees have discussed this question and I will only refer to the Garron Committee, which is sometimes called the Capitation Tribunal. The findings of that Committee were accepted by His Majesty's Government and by the Government of India, and India receives a contribution of two crores, which will relieve, in practice, the Indian taxpayer of payments equivalent to the cost of eleven battalions of British infantry, that is to say, about one-fourth of the British infantry in India.

As this House is aware, the total fighting strength of the army in India was 238,000 in 1914, whereas in 1934 it was reduced to 179,000. The reduc-

[Mr. G. Morgan.]

tion has been, therefore, 59,000, of which 20,000 were British troops. At present, the strength of the field army is about 69,000 and that is considered, by those responsible, to be the minimum sufficient for what is called the minor danger, not for a big war, although this fighting force would have to "hold the fort", so to speak, in the case of a big war, until reinforcements came from overseas. That position has been explained by the Army Secretary only a few minutes ago. Sir, accepting this position, we now come to the question of the replacing of British troops by Indian troops. Honourable Members must be aware that this cannot be done by a stroke of the pen. It must take time.

An Honourable Member: Why?

Mr. G. Morgan: Because it cannot be done. You have to face facts. It must take time. I ask Honourable Members to face facts, and they know perfectly well that it must take time. The Sub-Committee of the first Round Table Conference acknowledged, and this has been repeated in this House today, that it would take 35 years to complete from the time British recruitment was stopped. It is not possible to stop British recruitment at once, as the Army Secretary has explained, until the result of the training of the cadets from the Military College has definitely shown that a sufficient number of officers of the right type are available and that they prove themselves capable, after reaching the rank of Captain. That is where the real test comes in.

Now, Sir, as regards the replacement of British troops by Indian troops, I understand that under treaties, with some of the Indian States, some British troops have to be retained in India. I do not know how many British troops have to be maintained, but I understand that some British troops have to be maintained.

In discussing the strength of armed forces, one has to remember that there are, (1) internal security troops, (2) covering troops, and (3) the field army, each of which has special duties assigned to it The total comes to, as I have said, 179,000 Out of this total, the British number 58,000. The present policy, which I repeat has been fully explained a few moments ago by the Army Secretary,—the present policy with regard to Indianisation of the Indian army—involves the replacement of certain units in the British army by new units of the Indian army, and this has a direct bearing on the reduction of British troops serving in India. That is a point not to be missed Some of my Honourable friends have objected to the expression, "experiment", but taking the definition which the Army Secretary has given of the word "experimental", in the same sense, Indianisation is in its experimental stage and must be tested before the larger question is accepted.

Sir, coming to the expense of the army; the cost of the fighting portion of the army, from the figures which have been supplied to us, comes to something under Rs. 22 crores, less than one-half of the total defence budget. It is said that more is being spent than before the War. That is perfectly correct in the number of rupees, but here, again, the percentages have been given you. India today spends a smaller proportion of her revenue on defence than she did in 1914. Honourable Members may say

that still it is too much. Very well. How can we reduce this expenditure? Let us take first the replacement of British troops by Indian troops. That, as this House will realise, or at least I hope will realise, must be a gradual process.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. G. Morgan: They say "No", but I think if they go into the question they will find it is so, and it must be so. That there will be a saving ultimately is not denied; there must be a saving when that is completed. Mr. Jinnah, to quote another utterance of the Leader of the Independent Party, at the Round Table Conference, when the question of reducing British troops was under consideration, said, "As you go on reducing British troops it may be necessary for the safety of India, external and internal, that our standing army of Indian troops should be increased". So, there would be no large saving there when it ultimately came to pass. Now, Sir, let us see whether savings in other directions could be made. The first that comes to my mind is some system of road-making on the frontier I think if you study the Waziristan position and the result, you will come to the conclusion that it would provide a very good investment and save a a great deal of money.

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. G. Morgan: You can say what you like. I am sure that a proper programme of road-making would certainly reduce our army expenditure on the frontier by a very large amount. Another possibility, Sir, is the manufacture of motors, tanks and aeroplanes which we have to purchase in large quantities abroad. As regards lethal weapons we manufacture 98 per cent. of what we use in the army, in India. I am sure, if Honourable Members will read carefully this little pamphlet they will endorse the conclusions come to by the Department and which I am prepared to accept. There is one thing when the question of a return to pre-war cost is brought forward, I should like to mention the question of equipment. We quite realise that the equipment, etc., of the army should be thoroughly up to date. The Legislative Assembly in 1921 accepted a Resolution to this effect. I would ask Honourable Members to read paragraph 3 of Chapter VII of this pamphlet in this connection If they do, they will find that the cost is bound to be higher than it was in 1914. Sir, I oppose the motion.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta).]

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Mr. Deputy President, I am glad that the Honourable Member who represents the Army Department here has accepted two propositions as axiomatic and they will be sufficient for my purpose. One is that the gallantry of the Indian soldier is undoubted and the second is that the aim is Indianisation. There may be difference so far as the interpretation of the word *Indianisation* is concerned, but I take it that in a general way *Indianisation* is acceptable. Coming down to some of the things that he told the House, I am glad to say that a good deal of the information that he gave us is already supplied to us by this very valuable blue book, but one or two points are not mentioned in it and I find it my duty to bring

[Dr. G. V. Deshmukh.]

them to the notice of the House. My Honourable friend talked a great deal about the efficacy of the officers in leading masses of men. What I should like to know is this. Are you going to have officers for your army by the attempt that you are doing now? What is the attempt that you are doing at the present time? You have opened the so-called Indian Sandhurst or the Dehra Dun Military Academy in which you take about 70 students per year, that is 15 students every six-monthly, and altogether the College cannot accommodate more than 70 students. Taking all the six years course, there are not more than 70 students. Am I correct?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: The course at the College is 2½ years and the total number of students there is over 200.

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh: If that be so, the information that I saw in the League of Nations report is wrong. Taking the figures given by my Honourable friend as correct, compare them with the attempt that is being made in England to provide officers for their army. You have Officers Training Course, both junior and senior. In the junior course you prepare the children and boys so that in future they may become competent to be your officers. So far as the senior training course is concerned, you have a regular staff of 795 or 800 officers as permanent staff and nearly 30,000 men to whom training is given to be future officers. This is not the only thing, you will find that they do it from the Public School course itself. At the Public School you aim at producing men, so that they may be officers afterwards. Look at the training that your Public School boys get. If that is the attempt that is being made in England, what is the attempt you are making in this country, and then you come forward each time and say that you have not got sufficient officers, that men are not accustomed to lead in this country!

In a country like India, where aristocracy and nobility of birth are held so much in dignity and at a premium, are we going to be told that there will be a dearth of officers to lead our men? You know very well that without experience, without having had previous training either at Sandhurst or at Woolwich, in the time of the great crisis during the War, you actually had men who led the armies in Flanders and in France. The proof of it lies in the fact that the Victoria Cross, which had not been given to Indians before, was given to Indians after the War. They showed rare courage and came up to more than your usual standard at the time of that crisis. And are you going to tell me that during peace time they will not be able to lead your armies? The whole thing appears to me to be some kind of an excuse to keep the intelligent Indian boy from his legitimate birthright, and that is, of leading his own men in the field.

You will not be able to achieve this Indianisation by your saying that we have made a beginning. What is the proportion of Indian officers in your tank corps? You have started the eight-unit system. How many officers are there in your air force? Out of the total number of 7,000 odd officers, I was grieved to see, I would not say ashamed, the number of Indians who are carrying the King's Commission is 219 and this is what we are supposed to gloat over and say that there is going to be Indianisation. It stands to reason, and you were perfectly right that day when you spoke about the rate at which Indianisation is going to be carried on. I will interpret Indianisation for the present in the way you take it, that is

to say, replacing British officials in the Indian army by the Indian. I say even taking it in that way I am inclined to agree with you that if you go on at this rate, that is at the rate of ten per year, it may take about 700 years to reach this Indianisation. The Round Table Conference is repeatedly mentioned before this House. What is the use of telling us half truths. It was insisted there that you should see the wastage, the vacancies per year which take place. The wastage or the vacancies which were taking place in the officer's cadre were from 120 to 150 and, taking it at its lowest, the minimum was 90 and it was suggested at that Conference that an attempt should be made to Indianise the army by putting a stop immediately to the British recruitment and this is not merely the Indian idea Look at your Rawlinson and McMunn Committee. They suggested that within 25 years half the officers should be Indian, but before the Rawlinson Committee there was a committee which was appointed by the Government of India in 1922 and what was the conclusion which was arrived at? The report was not submitted to the Skeen Committee nor to anybody else but it was circulated round to the Defence Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference. It was definitely mentioned there—and General Rawlinson was responsible for it—that perfect Indianisation could take place within 30 years. It is not Indians who are talking about complete Indianisation. It is your own Generals, your own efficient men, your own Committees. Then you hide some of the reports. You distort some of the other reports of the Committee and you come before us and say, "Oh, there is a lack of men capable of leading the armies in this country"

The world war, if it has taught anything, it has taught one thing. If you look into the lessons of history, you will find that all this talk about tradition and heredity has nothing in it I have been brought up in a scientific atmosphere all through my life, and I tell you that it is the environment which will produce warriors and leaders. If you want to know, I can give you historical instances. There was a warrior class in Egypt, but how did they stand before the artisans and plebians of Rome? Take Japan. Before the army was democratised, what was the condition. Except the Samurai, nobody else could be a soldier. What is the result today? You will find that every ordinary man going in the street is a hero and as good as a Samurai. Coming down to your own country and your own nation, you thought that only the scions of great houses should become captains and commanders for leading the army but what did you see in the Great War. I know that a tooting cockney became a trench hero and I am sure that no Englishman will deny that. If there is a will, there is a way You can achieve everything, provided you have the will and you give the proper training. That is so far as the officers are concerned.

Now, so far as the British section of the army is concerned, we are constantly told; "Oh, don't touch that". It frays the nerves of a certain section of the House when we touch this part of the programme. The army is said to be for the defence of the country. For whose defence? I know that the Englishmen are well defended in their own homes. If defence has any meaning, it can have that meaning only for me, the Indian, and if in that defence I am not going to have my voice heard as to how I am going to be defended and as to how I am going to spend the money for that defence, then, so far as I am concerned, that defence is a farce and there is no good your telling me that the defence is for the good of my country. How do we stand so far as the officers are concerned?

[Dr. G. V. Deshmukh.]

Do you mean to say that we will not be able to replace the British section of the Indian army? The Honourable Member himself admitted that so far as the gallantry of the Indian soldier is concerned, it is unquestionable. If that is so, what is there to prevent the replacement of the British soldier by the Indian soldier. Are you suspecting his loyalty? I hope you will not do that injustice? There might have been a time in 1857 perhaps. During the last 80 years, the Indian soldier has been loyal according to your ideas and, if at the end of 80 years, that is after the passing of three generations, if you are even now inclined to suspect the loyalty of the Indian soldier, then it does not redound very much to your credit. If you don't suspect his loyalty, then why should you not replace the British soldier? Now, your army is divided into internal security 70,000 troops, covering troops 42,000 and the field army 69,000. If you read this book, you will find that the duty of the covering troops is supposed to be frontier warfare. I take it that the frontier warfare is the most onerous part of the army. So far as these covering troops are concerned, it will be instructive to see what is the proportion of the British troops to the Indian troops in the campaigns on the frontier. If you look into the statistics of the 20 campaigns you have had in your frontier, you will find that the average number of British troops to the Indian troops in these frontier campaings was something like two per cent. and, when you have only two per cent. of the troops engaged in this frontier warfare, you must have 69,000 British troops to 120,000 Indians. So far as internal security troops are concerned, you allow 70,000 troops.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: May I ask the Honourable Member where he got the figure of 2 per cent. from?

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh: I will get you the figures afterwards. I do not speak without my book. That means that for the internal security you have one thousand more than the field army which is 69,000 and pray, what is the function of these internal security troops? Internal security troops at the present time, or at any time, can do only police work and if that is not convincing, you have only to refer to the history of Ireland. Even in the Black and Tan period, it was the police which secured the internal security of Ireland. Now, do you want 70,000 troops for this internal security? And what is the proportion of Britishers to Indians in these internal security troops? You will find that the number of Britishers is much larger than Indians. Now coming to the field army. You have a field army of 69,000. If you are aiming all the time at defence against the frontier tribes, you do not want more than two per cent. of the British troops. What is your 69,000 standing army going to do if an army is marching from the Oxus or Ohio? You can quite well understand how modern warfare is going to be waged. What is 69,000? Don't you remember that when your 150,000 troops landed from England on the Continent what the Kaiser said? He said: "walk over that contemptible army"—and that army, Sir, was not contemptible, it ended in the retreat in the Mons, that is perfectly true, but, supposing this country had to face really a first-class nation on the frontiers of India, what are you going to do, and what is this 69,000 army going to do? All I say is this, that in fighting a first-class nation, it is absolutely insufficient and it will be inefficient. So far as fighting with any second-class army or frontier tribes is concerned, it is not more than absolutely necessary, but if you have any vision before you, you are bound to see that wars in future are

not going to be fought on a minor scale, but on a very much larger than that in 1914, and how are you going to arrange for our defence? By means of mercenary army of 69,000 Britishers and 120,000 Indians? No. We ourselves would very strongly resent and object to being defended by a mercenary army. Sir, we Indians would like to stand up ourselves, on our own legs, and defend our hearths and homes (Loud Applause.) Supposing we have to fight against any first-class army in future, you must have the vision for that. See to that. We are all aware how you are making provision for your reserves and for your supplementary reserves and for your ancillaries and for your junior and senior training corps and even by starting rifle clubs and by your starting military education in your Public Schools.

Now, so far as our education is concerned, you will have to do something on the same basis so far as India is concerned If you ask me, I am all for efficiency, I am for mechanization, but I am also for this, that in that mechanization the scientific and technical branches should exist not only for Europeans, I am for the due share of Indians therein. I say, that every Indian who is taken into the army must have a free access to all the technical and scientific and mechanized branches, but, as you are aware, that no Indian has. We know he is excluded from the Royal Air Force, any tank corps is taboo to him. I ask for admission to all these not because I want to invade England, not because I want to come and invade even my frontier province or my frontier neighbour, but simply because, in the wars of the future, I will not be left alone. Sir, I am not such a passivist. I believe in the military efficiency of a State I do not think that human nature is going to be changed to such an extent that in future there is going to be a millennium and war is going to vanish. On the other hand, I take the realities of the situation as they are, and I can tell you that in future, India being the most coveted prize, what would England be without India? Sir, we know Lord Rothermere says for every pound that the Britisher earns fourteen shillings out of that comes from India and, therefore, India is looked upon as a covetous prize by every nation, whether it is Russia or Japan or the Chinese hordes. They all have their covetous glance at India. Are we going to wait till your eight squadrons of aeroplanes come round to the frontier or till your reinforcements come over from England and, in the meanwhile, am I going to be exploded? Sir, my standpoint is—and I take it that that is the right standpoint for every self-respecting Indian, whether he be the warlike Punjabi or somebody belonging to my Maratha country or even the Madrasi. (Loud Laughter.) I say that that would be the standpoint of every true Indian, and, therefore, what I say is this, that you will not be able to achieve your object of defending this country by this narrow view. You must not only replace the 69,000 British troops, but I say, even more than that, you must have reserves. The Mesopotamian Commission said that in this country there is no dearth of warlike material. All this artificial distinction between martial and non-martial races does not appeal to me. I am proud of my Punjabi countrymen, but this invidious distinction is not scientific, it is not fair to others and it is absolutely selfish so far the martial and non-martial races are concerned. But even if you take that view, your Mesopotamian Commission told you that out of 33 crores there are five crores of war-like races in this country. Why don't you train them up, instead of depending upon reserves and supplementary reserves? Instead of that, you are satisfied as at present with 120,000.

[Dr. G. V. Deshmukh.]

Sir, this kind of thing will not satisfy us. You must look at it entirely from the defence point of view, and, therefore, I say, Sir, that I must have the right, and I owe it to my country that I must have the right so far as our own officers and men are concerned.

Now, Sir, I do not want to take very much time, but I cannot really sit down without alluding to this budget. Sir, this book is very valuable Some of my friends, belonging to the Finance Department, might say that this is a military budget, and this item takes away 45 crores out of 120 crores, and what is the good of appealing to us, of the Finance Department? Sir, in this book, as on page 25, the military gentlemen make it a point that, so far as their expenditure is concerned, it has only gone up by 53 per cent. from 1914 up till now, but so far as the civil expenditure is concerned, it has gone up by 125 per cent. You cannot say to the military side—well, you cut down your expenditure. The necessary retort will be—yours has gone up very much. Why don't you reduce it? But that is not the only way how expenditure has gone up. You have combatant officers, and you have non-combatant officers so far as the ancillary forces are concerned. If this is your view that we want fighting units for the defence of the country, I can even agree and say "very well, temporarily, if you think so, by all means have your combatant units in India, but what about the auxiliary and the ancillary units? And do you know that in the ancillary units, the ratio of officers is very much more than in the fighting units? So far as the fighting units are concerned, whereas there is one officer to 59 fighting units, in the ancillary units you have one officer to 26 units". Where does all this money go to? It is absolutely unnecessary. If you are honest about Indianization, then, at least in the non-combatant units, you can make a good and decent beginning, and you can have a fairly large number. So far as the ancillary services are concerned, they cannot differ very much from the civil side. Well, Sir, that is the one point that I want to make that, naturally, the military side cannot be asked by the civil side to reduce their expenditure. Our cry from this side, representing the taxpayers, is that the expenditure of this country has grown up very high, and, therefore, we claim that there must be a reduction of taxation. You want to put it on a narrow issue. You say that the military people will say that there is the civil expenditure which has gone up, and the civil people will say, there is the military expenditure, which has gone up Sir, all this reminds us of Molier's play showing the singing master and the fencing master quarrelling with each other. Then, I do not really see why the motor industry cannot be started in India. You will be able to economise a very great deal, and this remark or suggestion coming from the military side is very good indeed, because in that way you will be able to start the motor industry at the present time and at a future date perhaps you may be able even to make your own aeroplanes. Therefore, my idea of educating this country in the art of providing from its own resources, both men and materials, must be carried out for the sake of our own defence, at the right time.

I hope in speaking thus I have not frayed the nerves of any section of the House more than I could help. I have taken my stand on the general principles, on the principle of self-respect and on the ground of honour. I know that grounds of honour are more respected on the military side than on any other side. You know very well, Sir, that without grounds of honour, there will be no army. When his honour is concerned, the soldier has to

lay down his life on the battlefield and die for his country, otherwise it will only be a gang of murderers. That being so I thought it better to appeal to the House on the ground of sportsmanship and on the ground of honour. It may be, Sir, that on account of incomplete information that the things I have said may not be correct, it may be that I am congenitally unable to understand, but if there is a congenital idiocy—acquired idiocy is the worst, stamped with the brand of hypocrisy on its brow. (Applause.)

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) resumed the Chair.]

Several Honourable Members: The question may now be put

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is that the question be now put.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury: I have no reply to make.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Army Department' be reduced to one rupee."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—79

Aaron, Mr. Samaei
Abdoola Haroon, Seth Haji
Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr
Abdullah, Mr H. M
Aney, Mr M. S
Asaf Ali, Mr M
Ayyangar Mr M. Ananthasayanam
Azhar Ali, Mr Muhammad
Ba Si, U.
Badi-uz Zaman, Maulvi.
Bajoria, Babu Baijnath
Banerjea, Dr. P N.
Baqui, Mr M A.
Bardaloi, Srijut N C.
Bhagavan Das, Dr
Chhattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra Nath
Chettiar, Mr T. S. Avinashilingam.
Chetty, Mr. Sami Vencatachelam.
Das, Mr. B
Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra
Desai, Mr Bhulabhai J
Deshmukh, Dr G. V.
Essak Sait, Mr H. A. Sathar H.
Fakir Chand, Mr.
Fazl-i-Haq Piracha, Khan Sahib Shaikh.
Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.
Giri, Mr. V V
Govind Das, Seth.
Gupta, Mr. Ghanshiam Singh.
Hidayatullah, Sir Ghulam Hussain
Hosmani, Mr. S. K.
Iswar Saran, Munshi.
Jedhe Mr. K. M.
Jehangir, Sir Cowasjee.
Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Khan Sahib, Dr.
Khare, Dr N B.
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D K.
Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
Mangal Singh, Sardar.
Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.
Muhammad Nauman, Mr.
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Syed
Nageswara Rao, Mr K
Paliwal Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta.
Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.
Parma Nand, Bhai.
Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri
Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur Makhdum Syed.
Rajan Dr T. S S.
Raju, Mr P S. Kumaraswami.
Ranga Prof N. G.
Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
Sant Singh, Sardar.
Satyamurti, Mr S.
Shafi Daudi, Maulvi Muhammad.
Sham Lal, Mr.
Shaukat Ali, Maulana.
Sheodass Daga, Seth.
Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib Nawab.
Singh, Mr. Deep Narayan.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
Sinha Mr. Shri Krishna.
Som, Mr. Surya Kumar
Sri Prakasa, Mr
Thein Maung, Dr.
Umar Aly Shah, Mr.
Varma, Mr. B. B.
Vissanji, Mr. Mathuradas.
Yakub, Sir Muhammad.
Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr.

NOES—48.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.	Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab	Lloyd, Mr. A H.
Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan Bahadur Nawab Malik.	Metcalfe, Mr. H A F.
Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A A. Venkatarama	Milligan, Mr. J. A.
Bajpai, Mr. G. S	Monteath, Mr. J.
Bewoor, Mr. G. V.	Morgan, Mr. G.
Bhore, The Honourable Sir Joseph	Mukharji, Mr. N. R.
Buss, Mr L. C.	Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya Charan
Chatarji, Mr. J. M	Nayar, Mr. C Govindan.
Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry	Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
Dalal Dr. R. D.	Owen, Mr. L.
DeSouza Dr F X	Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Drake, Mr. D. H C	Rau, Mr P R.
Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya Ananda	Richards, Mr W J. C.
Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry	Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
Graham, Sir Lancelot.	Sarma, Mr. R. S.
Grigg, The Honourable Sir James	Scott, Mr. J Ramsay.
Hockenhull, Mr F W	Scott, Mr W L
Hudson, Sir Leslie	Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain Sardar.
James, Mr. F. E	Singh, Mr. Pradyumna Prashad.
Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir	Sinha, Raja Bahadur Harihar Prosad Narayan.
Kripalani, Mr. Hiranand Khushiram	Sircar, The Honourable Sir Nripendra
Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri	Sloan, Mr. T.
	Swithinbank, Mr B. W.
	Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO 79.—BALUCHISTAN

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 27,63,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Baluchistan' "

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 27,63,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Baluchistan'."

Repressive Policy in Baluchistan.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon (Sind: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I move:

"That the demand under the head 'Baluchistan' be reduced by Rs 100."

By this cut motion, I want to protest against the repressive policy that is being pursued by Government in that province. I have very little time left, and I do not think I can explain this repressive policy in detail, but I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that for the last two years Government have started a repressive policy in Baluchistan, because these people want advancement for their province. They are not allowed to make any speeches in the province itself; they have also no right to publish a newspaper. Lately, a gentleman, called Abdus Samad Khan, came to Karachi and made a speech in a meeting where fortunately I was present, and I think I myself have made stronger speeches than this speech he made in Karachi. On account of this, he was, on his return to Quetta, placed before the *Jirgah* under section 124-A and a sentence of three years' imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 3,000 was imposed on him. He was sent to jail and he was not allowed any kind of pleader or barrister to defend him. Besides that, Abdul Aziz Kurd, who lives in Baluchistan, sent some article to a Punjab newspaper, and, on account of that, he was arrested on his return to Baluchistan and placed before the *Jirgah*. The *Jirgah* acquitted him.

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe (Foreign Secretary): Sir, on a point of order, I should like to point out that Abdul Aziz Kurd is a subject of Kalat State and that any action taken against him was taken by the Kalat State, and is, therefore, a matter of the internal administration of that State.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then the Honourable Member should not refer to that case.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: I do not know if it was the Kalat State, but he was first of all placed before the *Jirgah* and was acquitted. The next day, he was again arrested and convicted to pay a fine of Rs. 500. On the third day, he was again arrested and sentenced to five years' imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 5,000. Besides these, there are many things I had to say, but the time is short, and, without saying more, I will appeal to the House to vote in favour of my motion.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Cut motion moved.

"That the demand under the head 'Baluchistan' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe (Foreign Secretary): Sir, may I in the first place object strongly to this method of producing a case at the very last moment and stating it against a local administration without giving me any proper time to reply? Regarding Abdul Samad, I can say quite definitely that I, quite contrary to the Honourable Member, have seen the whole record . . .

Sir Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): We expect a general answer from the Government. We do not want to deal with particular persons and individuals.

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: It is quite impossible for me in the space of three minutes to give a general answer to a complaint of repression against

[Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe.]

an administration. The Honourable Member has mentioned certain specific cases which I will do my best to deal with as rapidly as possible. . .

Sir Muhammad Yakub: That was by way of example only

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: It may have been by way of example; but it was to my mind a gross libel upon the administration. As I was saying, I myself sent for the record of that case in order that I might be in a position, if necessary, to defend the case before this House. Abdul Samad received a fair trial according to the ordinary system of law in force in Baluchistan. He made no appeal against the conviction which he was able to do: he applied for no revision and he accepted the punishment, presumably as being just. I may add that I think it is rather unfair to bring a case before this House before the person convicted has taken any steps to obtain the ordinary legal remedies which are open to him

The other case of Abdul Aziz Kurd, as I have already pointed out, was entirely a matter for the Kalat State, and it is, I believe, contrary to the rules of this House for matters concerning the internal administration of an Indian State to be discussed. As far as I know, the proceedings were perfectly regular and the conviction was entirely in order.

The next case which the Honourable Member mentioned was that of newspapers and meetings I have discussed this matter frequently with the Agent to the Governor General in Baluchistan. He informs me that far from there being any restrictions upon meetings, anybody can have a meeting if he wishes and provided they confine the proceedings of the meeting within the law, there is no possible objection As regards newspapers, I am prepared to admit that the attitude of the local administration, though reasonable, was not in accord entirely with modern tendencies. They took the view, whether rightly or wrongly, that newspaper agitation, among a primitive population of the kind which lives in Baluchistan, was impossible without exciting feelings and possibly disturbances which would have been a very grave responsibility upon themselves. They, therefore, desired to retain certain powers which they possessed which appeared to the Government of India to be rather archaic They have now agreed and I am sure the House and particularly my Honourable friend who represents Baluchistan unofficially but nonetheless loyally in this House would like to hear it—the Government of India asked and they have agreed no longer to apply these special powers but to rely entirely on the ordinary Press Act which is in force. I recently inquired from the local administration as to what applications there were at present for publication of newspapers and I have been told that there were only three—I am speaking from memory owing to the way that this motion has suddenly been shot upon me—there were only three, of which certainly one had been granted and the other was under consideration. . . .

(It being Five of the Clock)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order: the question is:

"That the demand under the head "Baluchistan" be reduced by Rs. 100."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—75.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.
Abdoola Haroon, Seth Haji.
Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.
Abdullah, Mr. H. M.
Anwar-ul-Azim, Mr. Muhammad.
Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.
Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad
Ba Si, U.
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi
Banerjea, Dr. P. N.
Baqui, Mr. M. A
Bardaloi, Srijut N. C.
Bhagavan Das, Dr
Chattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra Nath.
Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.
Chetty, Mr Sami Vencatachelam
Das, Mr B.
Das, Mr Basanta Kumar.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J
Deshmukh, Dr G V
Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.
Fakir Chand, Mr
Fazl-i-Haq Piracha, Khan Sahib Shaikh.
Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.
Giri, Mr V. V.
Govind Das, Seth.
Gupta, Mr. Ghanshiam Singh.
Hidayatallah, Sir Ghulam Hussain.
Hosmani, Mr S. K.
Iswar Saran, Munshi.
Jedhe, Mr. K. M.
Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
Khan Sahib, Dr.
Khare, Dr. N. B.
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
Mangal Singh, Sardar.
Mehr Shah Nawab Sahibzada Sir Sayad Muhammad.
Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.
Muhammad Nauman, Mr.
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Syed.
Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.
Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta.
Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.
Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.
Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur Makhdum Syed.
Rajan, Dr T S. S
Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.
Ranga, Prof. N. G.
Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
Satyamurti, Mr. S.
Shafi Daudi, Maulvi Muhammad.
Sham Lal, Mr
Shaukat Ali, Maulana.
Sheodass Daga, Seth.
Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib Nawab.
Singh, Mr. Deep Narayan.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Shri Krishna.
Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.
Sri Prakasa, Mr
Thein Maung, Dr.
Thein Maung, U.
Umar Aly Shah, Mr.
Varma, Mr B. B.
Vissanji, Mr Mathuradas.
Yakub, Sir Muhammad.
Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr.

NOES—47

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.
Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan Bahadur Nawab Malik.
Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A. A. Venkatarama
Bajpai, Mr. G. S.
Bewoor, Mr. G. V.
Bhore, The Honourable Sir Joseph.
Buss, Mr. L. C.
Chatarji, Mr. J. M
Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry
Dalal, Dr. R. D.
DeSouza, Dr. F X.
Drake, Mr. D. H. C.
Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya Ananda.
Graham, Sir Lancelot.
Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.
Hockenhull, Mr. F. W.
Hudson, Sir Leslie.
James, Mr. F. E
Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir
Kirpalani, Mr Hiranand Khushiram
Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri.
Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
Lloyd, Mr A H
Metcalfe, Mr. H. A. F.
Milligan, Mr. J. A.
Monteath, Mr. J.
Morgan, Mr. G.
Mukerje, Mr. N. R.
Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya Charan.
Nayar, Mr. C Govindan.
Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
Owen, Mr. L.
Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Rau, Mr. P. R
Richards, Mr. W. J. C.
Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
Sarma, Mr. R. S.
Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
Scott, Mr. W. L.
Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain Sardar.
Singh, Mr. Pradyumna Prashad.
Sinha, Raja Bahadur Harihar Prosad Narayan.
Sircar, The Honourable Sir Nripendra.
Sloan, Mr. T.
Swithinbank, Mr. B. W.
Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F

The motion was adopted

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Before the demand, under which this motion has been made, is put, it may be mentioned that in putting this motion to the House the Chair has followed one or two previous rulings, but the Chair is itself not quite satisfied whether there was really a proper discussion of the subject. Therefore, the Chair wishes that this should not be taken as a precedent for the future.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a reduced sum not exceeding Rs. 27,62,900 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Baluchistan'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 16—CUSTOMS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 78,81,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Customs'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND NO. 17—TAXES ON INCOME.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 87,92,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Taxes on Income'"

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 18—SALT.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a reduced sum not exceeding Rs 72,81,900 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Salt'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND NO. 19—OPIUM.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 34,23,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936 in respect of 'Opium'"

The motion was adopted

DEMAND NO. 19A—EXCISE.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 4,68,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1936, in respect of 'Excise'"

The motion was adopted

DEMAND NO. 20—STAMPS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,42,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Stamps'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO 21—FOREST

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,13,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Forest'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 22—IRRIGATION (INCLUDING WORKING EXPENSES), NAVIGATION, EMBANKMENT AND DRAINAGE WORKS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,95,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 23—INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT (INCLUDING WORKING EXPENSES)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 10,55,95,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND No. 25—INTEREST ON DEBT AND REDUCTION OR AVOIDANCE OF DEBT.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 21,33,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Interest on Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND No. 26—INTEREST ON MISCELLANEOUS OBLIGATIONS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 66,28,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND No 27—STAFF, HOUSEHOLD AND ALLOWANCES OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 4,60,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor General'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO 28—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 73,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Executive Council'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 29—COUNCIL OF STATE.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,34,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Council of State'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO 30—LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,03,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO 31—FOREIGN AND POLITICAL DEPARTMENT

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,11,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Foreign and Political Department'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND NO. 32—HOME DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is

"That a reduced sum not exceeding Rs. 6,79,900 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Home Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO 33—PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,55,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Public Service Commission'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 34—LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim). The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,10,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Legislative Department'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND NO 35—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, HEALTH AND LANDS

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 6,05,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Department of Education, Health and Lands'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND NO 36—FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 9,71,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Finance Department'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND NO 38—COMMERCE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,83,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Commerce Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 39—ARMY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a reduced sum not exceeding one rupee be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Army Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 40—DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIES AND LABOUR

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,84,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Department of Industries and Labour'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND No 41—CENTRAL BOARD OF REVENUE.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,97,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Central Board of Revenue'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND No. 42—PAYMENT TO PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF ADMINISTRATION OF AGENCY SUBJECTS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,56,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Payments to Provincial Governments on account of Administration of Agency Subjects'"

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 43—AUDIT.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 96,91,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Audit'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 44—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 55,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Administration of Justice'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND NO 45—POLICE.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,19,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Police' "

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO 46—PORTS AND PILOTAGE

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim). The question is

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,02,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND NO 47—LIGHTHOUSES AND LIGHTSHIPS

Mr President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,40,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Lighthouses and Lightships'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND NO 48—SURVEY OF INDIA

Mr President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 21,11,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Survey of India'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND No. 49—METEOROLOGY.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,31,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Meteorology'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 50—GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,02,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Geological Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 51—BOTANICAL SURVEY.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,22,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Botanical Survey'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND No. 52—ZOOLOGICAL SURVEY

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 83,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Zoological Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 53—ARCHÆOLOGY.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,48,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Archæology'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 54—MINES.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,20,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Mines'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 55—OTHER SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

'That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,55,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Other Scientific Departments'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 56—EDUCATION.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,11,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Education'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 57—MEDICAL SERVICES.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,22,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Medical Services'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 58—PUBLIC HEALTH.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,91,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Public Health'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 59—AGRICULTURE.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,31,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Agriculture'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 60—IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,45,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 60A—SCHEME FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING IN INDIA.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,73,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Scheme for the Improvement of Agricultural Marketing in India'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 61—CIVIL VETERINARY SERVICES.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,90,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Civil Veterinary Services'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 62—INDUSTRIES.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,44,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Industries'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 63—AVIATION

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 15,06,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Aviation'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND NO 64—COMMERCIAL INTELLIGENCE AND STATISTICS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 5,18,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Commercial Intelligence and Statistics'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND NO. 65—CENSUS

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Census'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO 66—EMIGRATION—INTERNAL.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 16,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Emigration—Internal'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND NO. 67—EMIGRATION—EXTERNAL.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,91,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Emigration—External'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 68—JOINT-STOCK COMPANIES.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,29,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Joint-Stock Companies'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND NO 69—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim). The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,12,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO 70—INDIAN STORES DEPARTMENT

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 19,67,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Indian Stores Department'."

The motion was adopted

DEMAND NO. 71—CURRENCY.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,64,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Currency'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 72—MINT.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,83,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Mint'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 73—CIVIL WORKS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,10,25,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Civil Works'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 74—SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES AND PENSIONS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,13,55,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Superannuation Allowances and Pensions'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No 75—STATIONERY AND PRINTING.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 33,33,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Stationery and Printing'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 76—MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,61,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Miscellaneous'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 76A—EXPENDITURE ON RETRENCHED PERSONNEL CHARGED TO REVENUE.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 56,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Expenditure on Retrenched personnel charged to revenue.

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 76B—MISCELLANEOUS ADJUSTMENTS BETWEEN THE CENTRAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,03,57,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 77—REFUNDS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,15,32,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Refunds'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 80—DELHI.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 43,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Delhi'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 81—AJMER-MERWARA.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 14,08,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Ajmer-Merwara'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 82—ANDAMANS AND NICOBAR ISLANDS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 25,70,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Andamans and Nicobar Islands'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 83—RAJPUTANA.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,99,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Rajputana'"

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO 84—CENTRAL INDIA.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,27,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st March, 1936, in respect of 'Central India'"

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 85—HYDERABAD.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 42,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Hyderabad'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 85A—ADEN.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 5,50,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Aden'.".

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 86—EXPENDITURE IN ENGLAND—SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 22,63,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Expenditure in England—Secretary of State for India'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 87—EXPENDITURE IN ENGLAND—HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR INDIA.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 26,39,000. be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Expenditure in England—High Commissioner for India'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 88—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON SECURITY PRINTING.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Security Printing'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 89—FOREST CAPITAL OUTLAY.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Forest Capital Outlay'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 90—IRRIGATION

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Irrigation'"

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 91—INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 55,06,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 93—CURRENCY CAPITAL OUTLAY.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Currency Capital Outlay'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 94—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON VIZAGAPATAM HARBOUR.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,50,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 95—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON LIGHTHOUSES AND LIGHTSHIPS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Lighthouses and Lightships'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 95A.—CAPITAL OUTLAY CONNECTED WITH THE INSTITUTION OF THE PROVINCES OF ORISSA AND SIND.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Capital Outlay connected with the Institution of the Provinces of Orissa and Sind'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 96—COMMUTED VALUE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,63,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Commuted Value of Pensions'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 96A—EXPENDITURE ON RETRENCHED PERSONNEL CHARGED TO CAPITAL.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel charged to Capital'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 97—DELHI CAPITAL OUTLAY.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 52,45,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Delhi Capital Outlay'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 98—INTEREST-FREE ADVANCES.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 70,18,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Interest-free Advances'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 99—LOANS AND ADVANCES BEARING INTEREST.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): **The question is:**

"That a sum not exceeding Rs 11,00,72,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Loans and Advances bearing Interest'."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim). As regards the business for tomorrow and the day after, the Chair wishes to consult the House as regards questions. If the House so desires, the Chair is prepared to dispense with questions tomorrow and the day after and also to sit till 6 P.M., on both these days, so that as many Honourable Members, as possible, who desire to speak may have a chance of doing so. If that suits the wishes of the House, the Chair wishes to follow that course.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): May I ask, Sir, if it is on the understanding that we do finish the debate on the motion that the Finance Bill be taken into consideration on Thursday night at six o'clock? Is that your suggestion, Sir?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is certainly the Chair's idea. What the Chair has agreed to or rather the House has agreed to is to give this extra four hours to Honourable Members. The Chair believes, if the Leaders of Parties impose a certain amount of self-denial on themselves and their Groups, in that case the Chair would hope that the consideration of the Finance Bill might be finished day after tomorrow. At any rate, the Chair should like to have a chance of consulting Leaders of Parties tomorrow morning at 10-30 A.M. in order to decide what is the best course to adopt.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Has anything been decided about Friday and Monday definitely?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair understands from the Leader of the House that the Government are agreeable to the desire, apparently of Non-Official Members, that Friday should, as an exceptional case, be a non-working day and so also Monday. That will give six uninterrupted non-working days to Honourable Members, and, if we could finish the consideration of the Finance Bill on Thursday, then the House will be able to take up the Finance Bill clause by clause after the reopening.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): We have no objection to the House not sitting on Friday or Monday, but we would proceed on the footing that the matter will be finished on Thursday afternoon at six o'clock. If that is not finished on Thursday afternoon, then we do not commit ourselves not to sit on Monday.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Leader of the Opposition): That is rather too late to suggest. Whether Friday should be allowed or not is a thing in which I am entirely in the hands of the House.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: If it is not finished by Thursday, then we shall not probably agree to both the days being let off. It is much better if we discuss it and come to some arrangement in the President's room tomorrow morning at 10-30 A.M.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): What is the objection to our continuing the debate on the 21st?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: There is no objection, except prolongation of this matter.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: And with regard to the Finance Bill, some of the taxes expire on the 31st March and the Bill has to be disposed of before that date.

Seth Govind Das (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions. Non-Muhammadan): But it sometimes used to be discussed after the 31st March also. As an old Member of the Central Legislature, my memory reminds me that once the Finance Bill was discussed probably in the first week of April.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: But that is not a very desirable precedent.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): At any rate if the Leaders of the different Groups will be good enough to see me tomorrow in my room at 10-30, we may be able to arrive at some decision

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: But, at the same time, we should be told what are the reasons why the debate cannot be continued on the 21st March.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: If the Honourable Member proceeds in that way, there is no good reason why the House should not sit on Friday.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 13th March, 1935.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 13th March, 1935.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): As regards questions, the Chair announced yesterday that, if the House wanted, the Chair would dispense with questions today and tomorrow. Is that the desire of the House?

Honourable Members: Yes.

STATEMENT LAID ON THE TABLE.

CASES IN WHICH THE LOWEST TENDERS HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR INDIA IN PURCHASING STORES FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce (Member for Industries and Labour): Sir, I lay on the table a statement, furnished by the High Commissioner for India, showing all cases in which the lowest tenders have not been accepted by him in purchasing stores for the Government of India, during the half year ending the 31st December, 1934.

HIGH COMMISSION-

INDIA STORE

ABSTRACT OF CASES in which tenders for Stores demanded by the Central of the goods demanded, were accepted on the grounds of superior inspection, quicker

HALF YEAR ENDING

Stores ordered.	Contract Number.	Name of Contractor.	Amount of Contract.
PART A.—*Cases in which lower foreign tenders, including British tenders for ten*			
			£ s. d.
Zinc ingot 1 ton .	R. 1658/3062/12-11-34	The British Metal Corporation Ltd.	16 10 0 (From London stock, Rhodesian origin).
PART B.—*Cases in which the discrimination*			
Hamamelis folia 90 lbs. and Lobelia, B. P. 300 lbs.	R. 1554/2935/26-10-34.	Stafford Allen & Sons, Ltd.	21 0 0 (British).

PART C.—*Cases in which the discrimination*

Nil.

PART D.—*Cases in which lower British tenders*

Nil.

EB FOR INDIA.

DEPARTMENT

Government, other than the lowest complying with the technical description quality, superior trustworthiness of the firm tendering, greater facility of delivery etc.

31ST DECEMBER 1934.

Lowest tender not accepted.	Reason for acceptance.

foreign made goods, have been set aside wholly or partially in favour of British ders.

13 0 0 (Belgian).	The tender accepted was the most favourable bearing in mind the superior quality of the zinc offered and the higher cost of inspection abroad.

is between British firms only.

18 2 6 (British).	The superior quality offered by the accepted tenderer represented more than the difference in the price.

is between foreign firms only.

Nil.

have been set aside in favour of foreign tenders.

Nil.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE CENTRAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR RAILWAYS.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore (Member for Comerce and Railways): Sir I move:

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect in such manner, as may be approved by the Honourable the President, six non-official Members from the Assembly who shall be required to serve on the Central Advisory Council for Railways."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect in such manner, as may be approved by the Honourable the President, six non-official Members from the Assembly who shall be required to serve on the Central Advisory Council for Railways."

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I do not stand to make any criticism today; but I would just like to make a few suggestions about the working of the Railway Advisory Council. This Committee did not publish any proceedings till the year 1929: from this year it began to publish its report. In the year 1932, the Council had no meeting, and, in 1933, it had only one meeting when they discussed the catering arrangements: last year, it held three meetings. This Council is the most important of the committees in connection with railways, and I would very much like that the Honourable Member in charge of the Railways may consider three suggestions which I make today. The first is that this Council is not authorised to pass any resolution. Members can sit down and express their opinions, but they cannot pass any resolution for the guidance of the railway authorities. I would like, therefore, to suggest that this Council should be allowed to pass resolutions. Of course, the value of those resolutions will only be advisory, they will not be operative, but it is desirable that the railway authorities should know the views of the Advisory Committee: they should not only be satisfied with the views of individual members, but of the Committee as a whole. My first suggestion, therefore, is that this Council, which is not now authorised to pass resolutions, should in future at least be authorised to pass resolutions which will, of course, be of an advisory character.

My second suggestion is that the meetings of this Council should be held oftener: one or two meetings in a year are not sufficient if the Council is to be of any help to the railway authorities.

My next suggestion is this: during the course of our discussions on the occasion of the budget and in questions and answers and resolutions, we make a number of suggestions about the improvements in railways. It should be the duty of this Advisory Council to take stock of all our suggestions and to frame certain recommendations which should be in the form of resolutions; and from the report of this Committee we will know that something definite is being done. This is my third suggestion for the consideration of the Honourable Member for Railways.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): Mr. President, may I say a few words? I am glad that my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, has made some suggestions for improving the work of the Central Advisory Council. The railway budget is as large as our general budget, and that fact alone should convince the Members of this Legislature that we should give sufficient importance to the work of controlling our railways on behalf

of the people of this country. The machinery for legislative control of the Indian railways consists, in the first place, of the general discussions and the passing of the railway budget in the Legislature. Secondly, there is the Standing Finance Committee and the Public Accounts Committee which give some attention to the railway finance; but the Legislative Assembly has not got sufficient time to go into the details of the railway administration. The Public Accounts Committee and the Standing Finance Committee naturally pay attention to the financial aspect of the railway administration; but, besides the financial aspect, there are several other questions of policy which must be closely watched on behalf of the Legislature. I feel that that work can be done only by the Central Advisory Council.

Looking at the report of the Central Advisory Council, it is satisfactory to know that on the whole the work of the Council is showing some improvement, and I hope that if the Government of India and the members of the Advisory Council will give sufficient attention, that work can be improved still further. My impression is that the Central Advisory Council, instead of reviewing the whole administration and the policy underlying that administration, and making suggestions for improvement all round, merely takes up stray questions for consideration: and, while some of these questions may be important, on the whole the committee does not take the whole aspect of the administration into consideration. I would like the Central Advisory Council to take a review of the whole of the railway administration in its different aspects. I would like the Advisory Council every year to consider projects of new construction. The Finance Committee and the Public Accounts Committee examine the financial aspect of new construction; but, besides the financial aspect, there are other questions of policy, and I would like the Council to consider that question too. Then there is the question of rates and fares; and there is the question of the staff. It is true that the representation of minorities in the railway services was considered by the Central Advisory Council; but I do not know why the Central Advisory Council should not discuss the question of the conditions of service for the employees. Then, there is the question of stores purchase, the question of the manufacture of locomotives and such other questions in which the Legislature is interested. I would, therefore, like the Central Advisory Council to take into review the whole of the Railway Administration, and I support the suggestion of my friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, that the Central Advisory Council should pass resolutions. I do not know why my friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, should have said that the Central Advisory Council is not allowed to pass resolutions . . . .

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: That is a fact.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I don't know why this Council is not allowed to pass resolutions. I don't know who can prevent the Central Advisory Council from passing a resolution if it insists on doing so. The Honourable the Commerce Member may not approve of it, but still, if a Council meets, I do not know who can prevent it from passing any resolutions. I would, therefore, like the Members of the Legislature, who are on the Central Advisory Council, to exercise their right. If, after all, the Honourable Member in charge does not agree to the passing of resolutions, well, he may not call a meeting; but we can ourselves call a meeting and pass a resolution . . . .

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: May I point out that I did want to exercise this right, but I was told that this was outside the scope of that Advisory Council.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I cannot understand how anybody can prevent the Central Advisory Council meeting and passing a resolution. I, therefore, hope that the members of the Central Advisory Council will insist on their right of passing resolutions. Not only that, but I would suggest to the Government of India not to put obstacles in their doing by saying that it is not right to pass a resolution. Take, for instance, the question of . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thought the Honourable Member wanted to make only a few suggestions.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: My suggestion is that the work of the Central Advisory Council should be regularised. I would go further than what my friend, Dr Ziauddin Ahmad, suggested. He said that the Council should pass resolutions, but I would suggest that, in addition to passing resolutions, the Central Advisory Council should prepare a report, approve of the report and sign it, as the Public Accounts Committee does, and I don't know why this should not be done. It is in that way, Sir, that Members of the Central Legislature, some of whom will be members of the Central Advisory Council, will be responsible to the Legislature. How are the Members of the Legislature to know what their representatives did on the Central Advisory Council unless there is a report signed by them. I hope, Sir, my suggestions will be taken into consideration by Government.

Prof. N. G. Ranga (Guntur *cum* Nellore Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I wish to make a few suggestions for the consideration of Government in connection with this matter I have gone through all the Reports of the Local Advisory Committees as well as the Report of the Central Advisory Council, and I find that the Central Advisory Council has not been given an opportunity to review the reports of the Local Advisory Committees with a view to taking advantage of the recommendations made by the Local Advisory Committees. As a matter of fact, there was one very useful suggestion made by one of the Local Advisory Committees that a particular kind of carriage was found to be extremely useful and convenient for third class passengers, and yet no notice of it was taken by the Central Advisory Council, and when I drew the attention of the Government by means of a question, I put the other day in regard to this suggestion, the answer I was given was that the defference between the cost of manufacture of the present third class carriage and that of the new type of third class carriage was negligible, and that the only reason why the Government of India wished to keep the present type of carriage was that it accommodated three more persons in each carriage, and so on. If only all the facts had been placed before the Central Advisory Council, it would have seen it fit to recommend to the Government of India that this new type of carriage should be adopted all over India on all the railways.

Secondly, Sir, there is the question of freights and rates. One of the members of the Central Advisory Council at its last meeting did raise the question of freights on agricultural products, but no special mention was made by any particular member about the various grievances of agriculturists, nor did the Chairman take the trouble to afford the members the necessary information.

Thirdly, Sir, there is the question of third class passengers. Most members of the Central Advisory Council seem to be more interested in the amenities that ought to be provided by the Government of India and the railways for second class, intermediate class and first class passengers than for third class passengers. But some of us did raise the question of the grievances of third class passengers, but no serious attention was paid either by the Chairman or by the Council as a whole.

Then, Sir, there is the question of the Railway Passengers' Association. The other day, in answer to my question, my friend, Mr. Rau, suggested, that these railway passengers' associations need not . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is the Honourable Member trying to give instructions to the Council that has not yet been formed?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I am making suggestions, Sir. It was suggested that these railway passengers' associations need not be given any particular opportunity to directly approach the railway officers, but they should be told to try and approach the local advisory committees, and so on. Therefore, I suggest—I do not know whether I shall be in order to make any suggestions to local advisory committees . .

Some Honourable Members: No.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In that case, I suggest that the railway passengers' associations should be told to make their representations to the Central Advisory Council, so that this body may go into those grievances and make the necessary suggestion to the Government of India I also endorse the suggestion made by my friend, Mr Joshi, that the Central Advisory Council should be authorised to pass resolutions from time to time upon all questions that come up before them.

Then, Sir, it was stated that the Central Advisory Council met only once. There was a grievance made by Mr. Joshi that the Council did not meet at all during last year's budget, and, as a result of it, it met only last year and was also only once . . .

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: That is an incorrect statement. The Council met twice.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I am sorry, Sir. We have received so far only an account of one meeting of the Central Advisory Council, and naturally I made that mistake that it met only once. But I would suggest for the consideration of the Government that it should meet at least once in every quarter, so that the grievances of third class passengers and agriculturists and all others could be ventilated and considered better

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Sir, I do not propose to waste the time of the House in replying at any great length I must repudiate the suggestion that the Central Advisory Council has not met sufficiently often and it has not been sufficiently interested in its work. My recollection of the last occasion is, we had a whole day meeting beginning at 11 and concluding at 5 in the evening. I offered to continue

[Sir Joseph Bhore.]

the discussions the next day, and it was only at the request of Honourable Members themselves that we did not continue for another whole day.

I can give my friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, the assurance that I will look into the suggestions which he has made.

As regards the other two gentlemen, they have embarked upon a volume of suggestions to the Advisory Council as to how it should conduct its work, and I have no doubt that the members of the Council, when they are elected, will consider the gratuitous suggestions made by these two gentlemen as to how they should conduct themselves on the Central Advisory Council.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect in such manner, as may be approved by the Honourable the President, six non-official Members from the Assembly who shall be required to serve on the Central Advisory Council for Railways."

The motion was adopted.

ELECTION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the non-official Members of the Assembly do proceed to elect, in the manner required under rule 51 of the Indian Legislative Rules, eight members to be members of the Committee on Public Accounts."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the non-official Members of the Assembly do proceed to elect, in the manner required under rule 51 of the Indian Legislative Rules, eight members to be members of the Committee on Public Accounts"

The motion was adopted.

ELECTION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ROADS.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce (Member for Industries and Labour): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this Assembly do proceed to the election, in such method as may be approved by the Honourable the President, of six members to serve on the Standing Committee for Roads which will be constituted to advise the Governor General in Council in the administration of the Road Account during the financial year 1935-36."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That this Assembly do proceed to the election, in such method as may be approved by the Honourable the President, of six members to serve on the Standing Committee for Roads which will be constituted to advise the Governor General in Council in the administration of the Road Account during the financial year 1935-36"

The motion was adopted.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO SIT ON THE IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND ITS GOVERNING BODY.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Honourable the President may direct, two members to sit on the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research and its Governing Body."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Honourable the President may direct, two members to sit on the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research and its Governing Body."

The motion was adopted

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has to inform Honourable Members that for the purpose of election of Members to the Central Advisory Council for Railways, the Committee on Public Accounts, the Standing Committee for Roads, 1935-36, and the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research and its Governing Body, the Notice Office will be open to receive nominations for all the Committees upto 12 NOON on Friday, the 15th March, 1935, and that the elections, if necessary, will be held on the following dates, namely

1.	Central Advisory Council for Railways . .	21-3-35
2.	Committee on Public Accounts	23-3-35
3.	Standing Committee for Roads, 1935-36 . . .	21-3-35
4.	Imperial Council of Agricultural Research and its Governing Body	22-3-35

The elections to the Committees which will be conducted in accordance with the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote will, as usual, be held in the Secretary's Room from 10-30 A.M. to 1 P.M. on each day appointed for the purpose.

THE INDIAN TARIFF (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore (Member for Commerce and Railways): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, for certain purposes.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, for certain purposes."

The motion was adopted

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member) Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to fix the duty on salt manufactured in, or imported by land into, certain parts of British India, to vary certain duties leviable under the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, to fix maximum rates of postage under the Indian Post Office Act, 1898, to fix rates of income-tax and super-tax, and to vary the excise duty on silver leviable under the Silver (Excise duty) Act, 1930, be taken into consideration."

Sir, in making this motion, I propose to deal with two very important points raised in recent speeches made by Leaders of the Opposition. The first occurred in the speech on what I may compendiously call repression, made by my Honourable friend, Mr Bhulabhai Desai. With all his immitable skill in throwing dust into the eyes of jurymen, a device in which he is not only a past but a present master (Laughter), he gave a somewhat malicious analysis of the Central Budget in terms which I may perhaps paraphrase somewhat freely as follows, 15 crores for an alien army of occupation, X crores for police and other agents of repression, Y crores for the bloated salaries of parasitic civil servants, Z crores for pensions of retired parasites of this class, and one crore for the welfare of the country My Honourable friend will forgive me if I say that he reminds me of a remark which was once made of a very famous, but slightly unorthodox Chancellor of the Exchequer, to the effect that he used figures as if they were adjectives, but I would like, in this case, to substitute for the word "adjectives" the word "epithets" (Laughter.) The Leader of the Opposition, or perhaps I might call him the Counsel for the Prosecution, knows perfectly well that under the present constitution there is a clear demarcation of functions between the Centre and the provinces, and that under this demarcation, broadly speaking, the Centre is responsible for defence and finance, while the provinces are responsible for, what I may call, the beneficent or welfare activities of the Government No analysis of expenditure is legitimate which does not take into account the budgets of the provinces and the Centre together Now Sir, I have had a rough analysis of the expenditure of the Centre and the provinces together made for the year 1933-34, and as far as I can make out, the amount of beneficent expenditure is approximately equal to the amount of of the defence budget, namely, between 40 and 50 crores of rupees a year. So, it is a little grotesque to suggest that the care of the Government for the direct improvement of the lot of Indians is only measured by the one crore which has in this year's Central budget been allocated for rural development You may argue, if you like, that a comparatively high proportion of national expenditure goes on defence against external aggression and preservation of internal order but, I think, he would be a rash man who would deny that self-preservation is not Man's first law and I personally do not believe that in the present circumstances of this country and of the world that the amounts spent in India on this object are capable of very large reduction In any case, in countries where there is great inequality of wealth and where large numbers of people are very poor, and where, in consequence, there are comparatively low limits to the taxable capacity of the country—in countries like that I think it is axiomatic that the cost of self-preservation is bound

to appear high in proportion to the rest of the budget. The real remedy for this, I submit, is not to neglect to provide against dangers of external invasion or internal disorder, in other words, to provide for what I call self-preservation,—the remedy is not, I say, to neglect to provide for self-preservation, but that the wealth of the country should be increased, which besides being a good thing in itself, has also a snowball effect in that it would increase the yield of existing taxes without increasing the burden and so would increase the capacity of the Government to set aside more and more expenditure of the kind which adds to the welfare and wealth of the country. The question is, how is this to be done? And here I come to my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant's speech. His proposal, or rather his apocalyptic dream—dream is his own word . . . . . .

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): You accept it as a dream. You said: "I am not going into the dream land . . . . "

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: . . . is that Government should borrow 100 crores every year and spend them on promoting the welfare of the poor and the reconstruction of India.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I meant to say that Government should begin immediately with a loan of one hundred crores. It may be necessary to carry on every year for some time, but not necessarily

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I have looked up the actual text of his speech.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I have no objection. You may begin like that.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I might refer to it

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I stand corrected and accept that position. You proceed on

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The Honourable Member said, "that it will be necessary to float a loan of 100 crores a year in order to rebuild the economic life of this country". In other words, he hankers after, or perhaps I should say, dreams of applying to India President Roosevelt's New Deal. Now, why do I say that the Pandit's plan is to all intents and purposes the same as President Roosevelt's New Deal. I take it that there are three definite features of the New Deal and that these are first devaluation of the currency, secondly an enormous creation of credit and thirdly a limitless programme of public expenditure out of borrowed money. Now, whether my Honourable friend likes it or not, there is no doubt that in India a vast programme of borrowing is impossible without a vast manufacture of credit and that a large inflation of credit inevitably involves the devaluation or at any rate the depreciation of the rupee. Of course one of the main objects of the New Deal is to secure a rise in prices, and I suppose that one of the theories underlying it is that you first make everybody happy by raising prices all round—though that easy assumption that everybody will be better off if only you can raise prices sufficiently high seems to me to be a little open to doubt at the threshold—you first try to make

[Sir James Grigg.]

people happy by raising prices all round, and then the very raising of prices will of itself lower the burden of the enormous debt that you have incurred in raising prices. That I take to be one of the underlying theories of the New Deal. Of course if the Deal is to work properly it should ensure that the inflation produces a rise in prices which at least corresponds to the amount of the devaluation, but is this the case? The United States has had slightly more than 40 per cent. devaluation. The new parity is 59·06 per cent. of the old parity but the rise in the general price index has been much less than this in spite of the fact that more and more special measures to accelerate the rise in prices have had to be undertaken. The United Kingdom has had a devaluation which is also in the neighbourhood of 40 per cent slightly more than 40 per cent. and there, as far as I can remember, the rise in prices has been in the neighbourhood of ten per cent. India, of course, has had the same devaluation as sterling, that is slightly more than 40 per cent and in India, as far as I read the figures, the general price level has not risen at all but the price level of agricultural products on the other hand has had a disastrous fall. That means that the two constituents of the Indian price index, manufactured goods and agricultural prices, show, in the case of manufactured goods, a rise, and, in the case of agricultural products, a fall, the net result being on balance no general rise in the price index Now, Sir, I think it will be generally agreed that a process of inflation cannot by itself create new wealth As Mr. Bernard Shaw said in the book which Mr Desai quoted the other day, "The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism", you cannot make a country rich by calling a penny two pence

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): No You can by giving a second penny

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Inflation can at the best effect a purely internal transfer of wealth—I say at the best. At the worst, it can be worse than this. It can involve a net loss of wealth, and this, I think, is the case with the debtor country where the rise in internal prices is less than the fall in the external value of the currency and I gave examples just now to prove that practically invariably the internal rise in prices is less than the amount of depreciation required to produce that rise. Now, India must show a loss, being certainly a debtor country, when that takes place India is quite clearly a debtor country and I ask Honourable Members to note that this is only one of the respects in which the circumstances of India are widely different from those of the United States, so that even if the prospects of success in the United States were much clearer than they are in fact success could by no means be assured in India.

Prof. N. G. Ranga (Guntur *cum* Nellore: Non-Muhammadan Rural): What about Famine Protection Works?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I will come on to that. In fact I have already anticipated that interjection. It can in any case be said with confidence that the inflation *plus* devaluation part of the New Deal would result in nothing but loss for a country like India and the question now is whether the enormous expansion of public expenditure which is another essential feature of the New Deal can counteract or even reverse

this loss. Clearly the public expenditure can only result in a gain if it is devoted to projects which will increase the productivity of the country and show a definite prospect of an adequate return in the more or less immediate future. If it does not, obviously, every increase of borrowing will increase the rate of interest demanded by the lenders and plainly too the budget deficit will go on increasing. Clearly then more and more borrowing will be necessary and finally and inexorably we move on to the stage when lenders are unwilling to lend at any price. At this stage we resort to the printing press and so become inextricably involved in the process which took place in Germany and Austria in 1923, the impoverishing effects of which it will be quite idle to deny and which are clear for everybody to behold. So I come back to the assertion I made just now that if the New Deal is to succeed the money borrowed must be spent on projects which are going to show a more or less immediate return. Now, does anybody seriously suppose that there are in India at the present moment projects to the value of 100 crores a year, which could be confidently expected to be immediately remunerative? Let us first look at agriculture. Here, we have in a large part of the world a real over-production combined with an increasing unwillingness on the part of countries to accept agricultural projects and a desire to make themselves agriculturally self-supporting the instruments of this being higher tariffs, quotas and restrictions of all kinds. Clearly, therefore, no scheme for a large scale increase in agricultural production is likely to be remunerative in the near future and so we cannot expect any large part of our 100 crores is going to be utilised in ambitious agricultural schemes. I do not of course say that nothing should be done for the villager. The setting aside of a crore of rupees for grants to the Provinces is sufficient proof that I do not hold this view but what I do say is that whatever is done for the rural population at present must be done without any expectation of an immediate money return, and, therefore, must be done within the limits of the budgetary resources of the Centre and the Provinces taken together. And so I am afraid that we must, in the main, concern ourselves with small schemes in individual villages, and not with expensive and wasteful eye-wash. (Laughter.)

Now, what about industries? Here, again, we have got to deal with the general desire of the world for national self-sufficiency, and I am afraid that this means that any schemes we have got to consider in the industrial part of the field must almost entirely be schemes which relate solely to production for the domestic market. Now in this sphere, I should have thought that, in the circumstances of India today, it was fairly safe to start with the assumption that schemes which are pretty certain to pay can get all the capital they want, even now, without any intervention on the part of Government, and, at the risk of being accused of being a disciple of the dodo, I say that, if private enterprise can do a thing, it is wrong for Government to do it, because, when producers are not risking their own money, their efficiency, their enterprise and their energy is bound to suffer. If, then, undertakings which are likely to pay without any intervention of the Government can get all the capital they want already, then the sphere of Government in utilising these one hundred crores a year of borrowed money is confined to industries which cannot stand on their own feet within any foreseeable time; and, that being so, the whole justification for the New Deal disappears. There is no gain from the expenditure to counteract the net loss from the deflation, and let me add here, by way of digression, that in India, I feel absolutely sure, it is the cultivator who will suffer a disproportionate part of the loss. I feel sure, in India, inflation will raise the

[Sir James Grigg.]

prices of imported manufactured articles to a greater extent than it will raise those of agricultural produce; and I feel equally sure that the benefit of such rise of prices as does occur in the case of agricultural produce will be largely absorbed by the middleman.

An Honourable Member: What about rural indebtedness?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: And so the unfortunate cultivator will pay much more for what he buys and get little if any more for what he sells, and his last state will be much more desperate than his first. So we reach the conclusion that the Pandit's dream is not likely to increase the wealth of India, but is much more likely to land this country into still further distress and poverty.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: It will not be to the advantage of England.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I am talking about the interests of India. (Interruptions.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim). Order, order.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: My friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, is entitled to ask me, in return: "what is your plan?"

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Will you accept my plan?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: No, I have rejected your plan. I said: "you are entitled to ask me, what my plan is". That is a perfectly fair question, and I confess freely that it is not possible to give a very spectacular answer to it. My answer is, first—and here I have no doubt that I shall excite the derision of all economic planners—my answer is, first, that we should pray for a disposition in the world to return to the doctrine of cheapness and free exchange and the abandonment of what Lord Hugh Cecil once called "the accursed doctrine of scarcity". But this is a case where unilateral action is not of much use. I would in this connection ask the Honourable Pandit to reflect on the words of Mr Wallace, the Secretary for Agriculture in the United States. He said, in a very remarkable pamphlet that, unless the United States are prepared to accept 500 million dollars more of imports from foreign countries, it will be inevitably necessary to plough up, to abandon the cultivation of 25 million acres of good, cultivable land. And I would like to say one word more to those who say that *laissez faire* is as dead as the dodo, I commend to them a study of what has happened in Australia. Such recovery as Australia has had has been almost entirely due to the single commodity, wool, and that is the one commodity with which there has been absolutely no attempt to interfere in any way. My second answer is that we must do what we can in innumerable small ways to improve the conditions and increase the efficiency of producers, particularly our primary producers. The first part of my answer is not likely to be very immediately effective. With the second, a start can be made at once, or, rather, the Government of India can make a start—the provinces have been doing a great deal in this line ever since the Montague-Chelmsford reforms came into being—and that is why the Government of India have this year set aside a crore from the surplus for

the purpose of economic work in the villages. This is a beginning, and I hope it is only a beginning, but it is an earnest of what I believe is the only way at present to deal with India's problem, and that is not to try large, grandiose schemes which, if they fail, will land India in incurable bankruptcy and make the people's condition much worse than before, and which are far more likely to fail than not, in my view certain to fail.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In the same way, we are starting from individual villages and working out our programme.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I have thought it well to deal with the two important points which have been raised in earlier speeches by way of introduction to this motion. I have no doubt that a great many other points will be raised during the course of the debate, but to these I shall have an opportunity of replying, in winding up. For the moment, Sir, I have nothing more to say and I beg to move. (Loud and Prolonged Cheers.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That the Bill to fix the duty on salt manufactured in, or imported by land into, certain parts of British India, to vary certain duties leviable under the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, to fix maximum rates of postage under the Indian Post Office Act, 1898, to fix rates of income-tax and super-tax, and to vary the excise duty on silver leviable under the Silver (Excise Duty) Act, 1930, be taken into consideration."

The Chair finds that notice has been given of an amendment to the effect that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. The first motion is in the name of Pandit Nilakantha Das, and there is a motion to a similar effect in the names of a number of other gentlemen. The Chair wishes to know whether Pandit Nilakantha Das wishes to move his amendment.

Pandit Nilakantha Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): No, Sir I am not moving it.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does any other gentleman wish to move that motion? (*Voices*: "No, no.") The House will now go on with the motion for consideration of the Finance Bill.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Sir, I listened to the speech of the Honourable the Finance Member today as I did during the last five or six days with close attention. I hope I will have time to deal with the various points he has raised in his speeches. Sir, I was struck by the ease and the grace of the pose of the Honourable the Finance Member He ever looks as fresh as the rose in his button hole. It was a mystery to me as to how a man involved in figures having to face all this criticism and carry on with him the load of millions of rupees on the one hand, and of millions of impoverished starving people on the other, could be so perennially gay. I was really perplexed But his speech the other day gave me the answer and I would have almost shouted *eureka*. I found that he is not oppressed by any economic theories, doctrines or canons. He asserted with some emphasis that, as a rule, five economists hold six opinions and in this country as many as sixty. In fact, I could not easily understand how five could be converted into six; but I was reminded of the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee, and I

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

found the Honourable Sir James Grigg arrayed with other economists such as Sir Satya Charan Mukherjee, Seth Bhag Chand Soni, Captain Lal Chand and Major Nawab Ahmad Nawaz Khan have often made the six there against us of the elected five and thus I came to understand how five could be equal to six. He was in fine company. Even that was not enough. I think, Sir, that even Sir James Grigg could after all have two opinions, one in England and the other in India. (Hear, hear.) In England, the export of gold is prohibited. Planning is almost the order of the day

An Honourable Member: No, no.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I will show it. Please have a little patience Here he shrinks from both as one would from the serpent or the scorpion and he would like to encourage the export of gold and put his foot on any idea of planning. Or, I think Sir James Grigg could have two opinions, one as a private non-official gentleman and the other as Member imported from England, ...

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Free of duty.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: . . for administering the affairs of this country, in a different economic field for the benefit of the country to which he owes allegiance above and in priority to everything else. So, if the Honourable the Finance Member held two opinions, added to the other four, the total would be six. None need dispute its arithmetic. But, Sir, I was further perplexed when he told us that in this country, in particular five economists had as many as sixty opinions. That was a still more difficult conundrum and a baffling puzzle to solve. I did not luckily find it very difficult when I got the light. The Honourable Sir James Grigg now looks with disdain, if not with contempt on the breed and tribe of economists. They are people deserving of no consideration, of no weight, and I am not surprised at it. He would not accept Sir George Schuster. He would not accept what Robertson or Bowley said. He would not accept what even Sir Arthur Salter has said. He has, in fact, as I read in a paper this morning, thrown all their reports into the drain. That is the import of his speech. I had read in my school days that certain class of people after climbing the steps turned their backs on them, but I notice there are others—more enterprising and thorough and daring adventurers—who not only turned their back on the ladder, but also gave it a kick with a view to breaking it to pieces. The Honourable Sir James Grigg had his day of economics, he had his field day, and now he is prepared to trample upon it. He will have nothing more of it. He will have no use of it. Why waste time? Economics might have had its day when he was sitting by the desk for so many years in England But when he has come to this land, this land of the brown and perhaps of the black, why should he be guided by this economic sophistry? I can well understand that. But the reality is just otherwise. There is greater unanimity in essentials and fundamentals of economic thought and opinion today than ever before.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: No, Sir.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: It is easy to say, no, but it is not easy to demonstrate and to establish that "no". I am prepared to establish my "yes." Sir, what is the position today? I am prepared to accept that some of the sophistries, as they might be called today, some of the old doctrines of economics stand exploded today. Some of the canons have been exploded recently, but humanity is ever advancing forward in its dynamic course of progress, and it is but right and proper that man should benefit through experience, and he should live to learn and that he should outgrow his old habiliments and expand just as the bark of the tree expands with growing stem. So, I am not surprised at the growth, at the expansion of human thought even in the economic sphere. But, Sir, while everything else has changed, the Honourable the Finance Member is still rowing petty cruise to the Robinson Crusoe island in the stagnant backwaters of the surging economic sea. He refuses to take note of what has happened since the days of Adam Smith as he would not perhaps of what has happened since the days of Adam and Eve. He can only think of *laissez faire*. He is still lost in *laisses faire*.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Yes, what of that?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant Do you observe *laissez faire* in your country? Please answer then: Subsidies in England, how many millions? Protective duties in England, how many millions? Subsidies by Runciman to shipping industry, how many millions? Subsidies to live-stock industry, how many millions? Bounties to wheat-growers, how many millions? Bounties to beet-growers, how many millions? Preferential tariffs against whom? Quotas and agreements for what purpose? Economic Council, its objectice? Development Board, its purpose? The Board of Trade, its constitution? Well, Sir, I will wait for a reply and I will expect the Honourable the Finance Member to enlighten me on these points and tell me how far these are consistent and compatible with the underlying principles of *laisses faire*. Not only that, labour regulation, wages control, regulation of social amenities and social utilities and everything that matters in life? Let him talk of *laissez faire*! *Laissez faire*! That broken thing, that reed which nobody can handle today except in pricks and bringing blood out of his own hand. Yet he is still hugging and clinging to that. That sounds disaster to this country. I feel when I face him that I am certainly almost a revolutionary I want a change, and a genuine march forward, and when a man is lost in the slough and backwaters, I discern no hope, no expectation, no possibility of any advance from or through him. I am really disappointed and distressed.

Now, Sir, what are the rock-bottom facts of economics today? I would ask the Honourable the Finance Member what is the
12 NOON. opinion of Mr. Keynes about planning. He knows, of course, what Roosevelt thinks; he knows, of course, what Lloyd George's New Deal means; he knows, of course, what Sir George Schuster has been repeatedly saying since the day,—and there lies the irony,—he handed over the reins of office here to his successor. He knows also of the scheme that has been outlined by Sir Arthur Salter, and I believe he has read his book "Recovery". I believe he has also got Sir M. Visweswaraiya's book on "Ten Years' Planning". I do not know if the title of that book including the anathema P—L—A—N—N—I—N—G was not too much for him. Let me hope, Sir, that scientific training of youth has

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

enabled him to reconcile himself to the reading of that book although it deals with planning. Then, has he ever read a book written by an initiate and not by a heterodox, Mr. Darling of the celestial Indian Civil Service? He may not take note of what we think and what we say. After all, we are men here . . . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I have discussed the question with Mr. Darling.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Then, I am sorry there is no hope for him and he is incorrigible. I had thought that there was still some room for new light and that his windows were open. But I find that no amount of fresh air can warm his blood or enable it to course in his veins as that of a live growing organism. Then, Sir, does he know what Laski thinks? Does he know what Lord Allen thinks? I have his book with me . . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: So have I.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I think he knows what Lord Passfield desires, and I think he knows what so many others like him think today, I should like him to give the name of one single man who is against planning and against . . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Yes, Professor Lionel Robbins.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I doubt if he can be arrayed against so many names. Of course, he may have some weight when coupled with the Honourable the Finance Member, but by himself he is a solitary figure and cannot carry much weight. But, Sir, I recollect that I have digressed from his conundrum about five being equal to six and even sixty. The Finance Member seems to have in a way clearly gauged the situation. At the present time, the whole economic world holds opinions almost adverse to him. So, in order to make up the hallowed sixty, his own opinion should be given the weight of 59 as that of the rest of the world because of its unanimity it can count only as one; and where 59 are arrayed against one, safety lies only in inverting the figures, so none need blame the Finance Member for the importance and value he attaches to his unique opinion. The solution may look queer and the method of calculation original. But as the standard of valuation differs according to one's pre-conceived notions, I was not surprised at the appraisement of the Honourable the Finance Member.

Sir, there was another remark which the Honourable the Finance Member made, and that was still more interesting. He said that in this country economics is mixed up with politics. I do not know if it is such a horrible heresy. In my younger days, when I was a student, we used to call the science of Economics as Political Economy, and it seemed to me that politics had something to do with economics. But the Honourable the Finance Member thinks there is nothing in common between the two. It also appeared to me then, as it appears to me now, that the supreme object of a State is to secure and promote the economic well-being of the people, the material happiness of the subject, as they say,—

I do not use the term in the political sense. But he thinks politics should not be mixed up with economics. So far as my country is concerned, I agree with him; and I will congratulate him if he can extricate the economics of this country from the mess of politics. That will be of great advantage to us. After all, Sir, how has this mixture, as you call it, or this amalgam if you choose, of politics and economics worked in this country? Can he conceive of the pegging of the rupee to paper sterling on pure economic grounds? Can any country at a time like this, when prices are falling tremendously, when old values have gone down and the old order is topsy-turvy, think of fettering its own currency by tying it to the tail of the currency of any other country? Can he think of it as economically conceivable? Is there any more reason in economics why the rupee should be pegged on to paper sterling in preference to the mark, the franc or the dollar? And does not that enable the Honourable the Finance Member and his country to dump their goods into this country with a preferential advantage today of about 40 per cent? And the more the sterling goes down in value, the greater the advantage to him.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Not at all if the rupee is pegged to it.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Of course, as sterling goes down, the rupees goes down, and, at least to that extent, in other countries the value of the rupee falls, while the value of the currency of other countries is appreciated. I imagine there are some gentlemen here who have their relatives and wards in France or Germany. Do they not know that since the rupee was pegged to paper sterling, they have to remit at least 50 per cent. more than they used to previously in order to maintain their wards in those countries? Does that not satisfy him? This is no place for going deeper into economic niceties, but I will expect the Honourable the Finance Member to accept the obvious. He may neglect that which is not equally patent, but, where a thing is obvious enough, he should have the magnanimity to make a concession in my favour. Sir, there then we stand; that is one of the results of the economics in this country being broad-based on politics. Then, Sir, is there any economic justification for raising a sterling loan at a higher rate in England while we can raise the money in rupees at a lower rate in this country? Is that, again, a pure economic proposition? Has he any economic explanation for Government stores being purchased at higher prices in England when we can get them cheaper in other countries? Sir, has he ever heard of the gold reserves of one country being maintained in another country, hundreds and thousands of miles away, while the former had been starving and had to borrow money at high rates of interests? Has he ever heard of gold being prohibited in every other country except our own and the export of gold being promoted here alone? Is that too a purely economic proposition? And, Sir, he will pardon me for saying something which is more direct and somewhat pointed, and I trust he will not regard it as more poignant.

If this had been a free country, would he have been imported from a place four thousand miles away to administer the economic affairs of 350 millions if it were a pure question of economics divorced from politics? Sir M. Visweswaraiya is an old experienced man: there are many others—

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

Coyajee, Shah and others: and I think some other names might occur even to the Honourable the Finance Member. Would they not have been placed there in preference to him? Has he ever heard of foreigners being given higher wages and higher rates of pay than the sons of the soil for doing the same kind of work? And are not the benches opposite themselves—for whom I have great regard—getting more than an economic pay? Are we not paying them too much compared to what we would have to pay to our own indigenous men? Has he ever heard of money being remitted from one country to another in the shape of interest on securities and loans contracted by the Government of that country and yet being exempted from income-tax in the country of issue? Has he ever heard of pensions of Government servants being remitted from one country to another and yet being free from income-tax in the country which pays them? Has he ever heard of the salaries of men on leave being remitted from one country to another and yet being free from income-tax in the former? Let him not glibly talk of economics and politics in the same breath in this country. One living in a glass case can never be too cautious and would be well-advised in guarding against offering needless provocation to others. For my part, how I wish that in our country economics were pure, unadulterated, and crystal-like. For, how then could we have such a bloated military budget? How could we then have such a top-heavy system? How could we then have the restoration of the salary cut in these circumstances? Economics in this country is no more and no better than a football which only those who hold this country under domination are privileged to kick and play, whether out of bounds or high up in the air, but invariably for their own fun and recreation.

Yesterday, Sir, there was a discussion over the army budget, and there was a reply to the debate by the Honourable the Army Secretary. I was feeling all the time whether anybody ever looked at the question from the point of view of the capacity of the men who had after all to pay the bill. My Honourable friend today says: "Self-preservation is the supreme law. Self preservation is the domineering purpose of life". What for? For slavery? For being subordinate to other people? For ever to continue as the drawers of water, for ever to continue as the dregs in the empire? What for? What is the purpose of this self-preservation? And what for does this stage exist? Has that ever occurred to the gentlemen sitting opposite? I say self-preservation is no use unless there is a moral purpose behind and the State must be supposed to have gone down in the scale of civilisation if it thinks and believes that its object is fulfilled when man is allowed to exist, but only to die in driblets. That is what is happening here. For my part, I felt and feel today, to me it is inconceivable, that I should ever be a party to the allotment of any funds or to the appropriation of any revenues of this country for the purpose of the domination of a foreign people or for the purpose of perpetuation of foreign rule. Have you ever heard on economic grounds of the employment of foreign soldiers at four times the wages paid to the indigenous brand? I am, perhaps, required to use this terminology as motor cars and Indian soldiers and officers, according to the Army Secretary, belong to the same type or genus—they are all "things" in the vocabulary of those gentlemen there: but have you ever heard of such a thing elsewhere? I say, do not talk of economics on the floor of this House: otherwise, it will be very hard for you.

This is but a preliminary survey of what the Honourable the Finance Member said the other day. I will just refer to a few remarks that he made today. He referred to what the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition observed the other day. He aptly described him as the counsel for the prosecution and himself as the culprit in the dock. He has virtually accepted the facts on which the prosecution based their charge. I ask him now what is his verdict? He also constitutes the jury unfortunately here; and will the jury take an impartial, a judicial and a detached view of the case? If they do, then the case for the prosecution has been accepted by the culprit in the dock. He accepts that the facts are right, and so far as the Central revenues are concerned, they are mainly appropriated for the purpose of the so-called defence. After all, why do you want an army? I had with me and I have today certain quotations from celebrated Generals as to the purpose of this huge army and also of retaining the British Soldiers and officers in Commissioned ranks in this country; but I do not deal with them now: I want to confine myself to points of economics only in spite of the aversion that the Honourable the Finance Member may have for that: for, after all, that happens to be his dirty job here.

I will come to the other question, and that is of greater importance as to how we can get out of the present mess, how we can relieve the misery and alleviate the sufferings of millions of starving people in this country. That is the issue, and I hope, on humanitarian grounds, in so far as the handicap of political considerations and his faithful allegiance to his country do not interfere, he shares that desire with me. There are certain salient and principal features of the present situation which must be taken into account before we reach any conclusion. India, I accept, is pre-eminently an agricultural country: I accept that 80 per cent. of our population is directly or indirectly sustained and maintained by agriculture. I concede that scientific technique and mechanisation can extract out of the soil a considerable amount much in excess of what human labour can get out of it unaided by such tools and instruments. I also concede that at the present time there is a move in various countries towards self-sufficiency. Every country wants to be self-contained, every country wants to be self-sufficient. I concede all these. I also concede, Sir, that along with it, as Adam Smith said long ago, the capacity of a man's stomach is limited, and even if you adopt the gluttonous methods of the old Roman Emperors, you cannot enlarge it materially. While it is open to a person to put on ten dresses, ten new coats or twenty in one day, instead of putting one dress for 20 years, it is not possible for a person to eat more than he can in 24 hours even if he takes his food 20 times instead of once or twice in the day. So I admit that there is a rigid limit to the amount of consumption of agricultural produce, while there is an unlimited scope for the expansion of commodities and articles produced by mechanical means. How does that help my friend? He tells us that agriculture has little scope; he tells us that every country has almost enough to maintain itself; he tells us that he will help the villagers. How is he going to help them, may I know? Will he enable the villager to produce more? To produce more with what, with the Meston Plough or with another Plough which may hereafter be called the Grigg Plough? Will that enable the villager to get more out of the soil as compared with what one can get out with the aid of mechanised technical skill and improved methods that are enforced in a large scale in other countries? That is desirable. Will he

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

do it? Will that alone suffice? The output of the soil may go up. The land may be made to yield more than what it has been producing so far, but we know also that prices have fallen considerably,—and my friend knows that if we look at the index figures, we find that prices have gone down by about 46 per cent. We also find that today the world in fact produces more than it can consume in staples. We find also that modern methods of transport depending on petrol have ousted draught cattle and other animals which had to be maintained formerly out of the produce of the soil. There are millions in our country still ill-fed and starving for lack of means and resources. But there is very little room for export of agricultural produce, and there is still lesser room for export of agricultural produce at a profitable rate. I think it is a fundamental fact which the Honourable the Finance Member has to admit. I would like to ask him whether he disputes my analysis in any way, and, if so, how?

Then, Sir, the other factor is this. Today modern methods of production and mechanisation for mass production are employed to such an extent that it is difficult to consume all the products. In fact, since the War, the output of commodities and articles in the world has gone up by nearly one hundred per cent. By the year 1925, it had gone up by about 40 per cent, and between the years 1925 and 1929 the output increased still more rapidly and that was at the root of the slump, trouble and impoverishment in the midst of plenty in most countries.

Then, Sir, we are faced with another difficulty. You start a small industry. I don't mean to dispute the utility of small industries. They have a place, but if you have them to the exclusion of everything else, if you concentrate on them alone, and if you do not employ any other improved methods of mechanisation specially for heavy key industries, how are you going to compete with the world? How will you compete with the man who goes about with his cheap stuff produced on a vast scale by modern machinery? It is obvious that you cannot. Then, what is the way to face the present position? Of course, the fundamental fact is there. Unless you produce more, you cannot enable the average individual in this country to purchase more; unless you purchase more, you cannot consume more; unless you consume more, you cannot produce more. So, you are in a vicious circle. How do you get out of it? It is not quite an easy thing to get out of it. But if you are not equal to the task before you, then get out of it and make room for others. You must be equal to the task. You are there as a trustee of the nation. You are there drawing a pretty good salary, a handsome bonus and a pretty good overseas pay . . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: No, I am not getting any overseas pay.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Well, I will vote for it if you make it votable. It is no good your saying that you are not equal to the task. One must be equal to the task, and if he is not, he should admit his helplessness and give way. Sir, I am surprised at the attitude of the Honourable the Finance Member. That he should try to nibble at these things in this crisis is simply unthinkable.

Now, Sir, having mentioned these two things, I shall mention the third thing, which is an important feature of the present economic system. We have been carrying on the policy of protection for the purpose of encourag-

ing industries in our country. You may call it a policy of discriminating protection. I may set certain gentlemen here at ease by saying that I am not opposed to such a policy of protection, provided it is supplemented by other things, for by itself, the policy of protection is not free from defects. It imposes a tax of a regressive type; that is, it enables money to flow from the poorer to the richer classes upwards, which is unnatural. The second thing that it does is that it places a premium on inefficiency. The third thing that it does is this, it enables the State to waste away the funds of the nation by giving them the opium of protection; under the guise of protection, Government secure large sums for waste and extravagance. The fourth thing that ensues from protection and the premium on inefficiency inside the country, and consequent inability to face competition with other countries is this, that whenever the artificial props are removed, the whole order crumbles down again. Thus, the policy of protection has its inevitable disadvantages. Besides, this policy leads to a certain amount of corruption inside the State. As there are so many industries ever trying to catch the ear of the Honourable the Finance Member . . . . .

An Honourable Member: You mean the Commerce Member.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Yes, of the Honourable the Commerce Member, though not in a rude way,—I find the Commerce Member is not here, but I hope. when he hears of catching his ears, he will not be irritated. Well, Sir, while recognising all these adverse factors, there is no doubt that, in the present stage of infancy in industrial development, we cannot make any headway unless we have some sort of protection and safeguards in our country. We cannot produce indigenous goods and we cannot compete with the world otherwise. The nascent industries have to be protected. At the same time, our people are inconceivably poor, and protection imposes an additional burden on them, as for everything they purchase they have to pay more. These are the factors that I have to take into account. Sir, if you drop protection, you do not improve the position. More goods will be dumped, drain will increase, whatever metal is left will go abroad, and the inherent capacity of the country to purchase goods and to sustain itself will become worse still. There is another feature of the present stage of industry and that too must be borne in mind. Ordinarily, mechanisation leads to unemployment unless there is co-ordination. It may look strange, but it is true that the immediate effect of the extension of mechanical means is an addition to the numbers of the unemployed. Take the case of sugar industry itself. Modernised sugar industry has perhaps absorbed a few thousands of labourers, but it has thrown out of employment millions of villagers who used the indigenous press formerly. That is the case with railways also. The railways can transport goods in much larger quantities and with much greater ease, but they react on the general economic position of the country and they have thrown millions of transport workers out of employment. So, the growth of big industries, unless co-ordinated, leads to extension of unemployment, a sardose though it may seem. Let us recount the circumstances. Agriculture by itself is not enough to sustain our people, in the present state of affairs in the country, agriculture cannot be made profitable. That is No. 1. Small industries cannot compete with bigger industries, and goods produced by hand or by crude methods cannot stand any competition, that is No. 2. Protection by itself leads to certain consequences

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

which are harmful. That is No. 3. The fourth point is that the poverty of the country is such that immediately we have to apply ourselves to the raising of the standard of living of the people. These are the four cardinal principles which you have to take into consideration. And where is the remedy to be found? I have no doubt in my mind, and I am as clear as anybody can be, that the remedy is to be found—the only possible remedy, the only effective remedy, the only efficient remedy that you can find lies in State planning—you may call it New Deal, you may call it by any other name you like. I have no quarrel.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Russia!

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Russia in this respect is the best, if you agree with me,—Russia *minus* violence and some other things, about which I have my own fads, such as, rejection of God, in whom, in spite of the advance in modern world, I still continue to believe. Take these two things away, and add a little strictness in the matter of marriage. With these reservations, I have no quarrel with Russia and I agree with you. I am not afraid of the word, national socialism. I use if in its literal sense. It seems to play on the nerves of the Honourable the Finance Member. Why should we be afraid of it? If that is the remedy, why not make use of it? I am neither a socialist, nor a Communist, nor a capitalist; I am reminded of the answer which a telephone operator once gave to the Finance Member in my province. The Finance Member rang up the exchange, and the operator wanted to connect him with the desired number, but there was some little delay. It put out the Finance Member who asked him: "Are you a non-co-operator? Why this delay?" The man replied: "I am neither a non-co-operator, nor a co-operator, but a plain operator." (Laughter.) So far as I am concerned, I am neither an idealist, nor a materialist; I am a realist. I take stock of the situation. I take account of the factors that are before me, and I try to judge, to weigh, to appraise them, and to arrive at some constructive remedy and scheme for getting over the difficulty. I do not run away from them. Now, then, what is the remedy? The remedy is plain. Money is cheap today. The Government of India know as well as I do that they can have the money they want just for the asking. In fact, even this year they have made a provision for the redemption of loan to the tune of Rs. 50 crores. I know they have in their savings banks deposits about Rs. 55 crores. In their cash certificates they have another Rs. 15 crores, so that, if they had the will, there was the way. How have the railways been developed in this country? If the policy of *laissez faire* had been applied, would you have a mile of railroad in this country? Does not my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, know the methods that were adopted? Guarantees, bounties, and every sort of subsidy and help were given. Are not in England similar methods being pursued even now? What does he think of the Electric Board? Does it not consist of the representatives of the Government and of the people? What does he think of the Broadcasting Committee? Is not that, after all, a State financed industry? Are not there many other things? Then, why run away from the problem? State regulation and State control are the only methods by which, in the modern age of competition between corporate States concentrating on industrialism, backward countries can maintain their existence in the conflict all the world over. (Cheers from the Congress Party Benches.) There can be no doubt

about it. On the one hand, there is money available on easy terms; on the other, there are industries which we can develop. Our resources are unlimited. In our country, we have got iron, we have got coal, we have got mines, we have got copper; what have we not got, and what can we not do? But I tell you, we want a Swaraj Government. The Honourable the Finance Member did me a little injustice. I never expected him to borrow Rs. 100 crores today. I said that, if we had a Swaraj Government today, I would have most humbly suggested to that Government to launch on a large scheme of national reconstruction for the regeneration of my country and to borrow for that purpose Rs. 100 crores,—he says per year, I accept, per year, so long as my plan is not fulfilled, and when it is fulfilled, then to stop borrowing. What does the Finance Member say? One crore he has given for rural reconstruction. Does he know the number of villages in India? He is quite new yet and may not be knowing. But perhaps he does, I give him credit for that. If he had pleaded that there are many other things that a man must learn before he took a plunge into a large constructive scheme for raising the general standard of living in this country that would furnish some ground for a period of probation. He has already rejected the Salter report! Sir Arthur Salter was, as he certainly knows, the Economic Adviser to the League of Nations for as many as fourteen years. A man with that vast experience was brought to this country and he prepared a scheme, but the Finance Member, though quite new, discarded it within a short period of his arrival at Bombay. Then we had experts like Messrs. Bowley and Robertson, over whom, again, Government spent considerable sums of money. But my Honourable friend, fresh from England, and unfamiliar with the affairs of this country, —I would not say ignorant,—threw their report too into the drain as the *Statesman* put it this morning This idea and scheme of planning is not a novel one. It has almost universal support and all shades of opinion, including the *Statesman*, the *Hindustan Times*, the *Hindu*, etc., are of one mind and one tune. These days I find the Government paying great respect to public press in this country, specially the Honourable Member sitting to the right of the Finance Member.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): He does not read. He says he never reads. (Laughter.)

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Really! All the same, public opinion in this country on this matter is unanimous. The resources are sufficient. A beginning can be made. There is no other effective remedy out of the difficulty. Then, why don't you move, I know it will hit the industries in England. If we mechanise industry in our own country, foreign imports are bound to suffer. Look at the stupidity and the idiocy of the present world—the Honourable the Finance Member deplored the other day and he really looked pathetic that people in the world should desire to purchase and actually get goods cheap? After all, is it really a misfortune that goods should be available cheap? In fact, the present situation is intriguing. Is it not strange that we should make a grievance of it that Japan manages to supply goods cheap to us? Is it not stupid and atrocious that while the world is producing more than it can consume, people should be starving and stocks should be thrown into the sea or fire. That is monstrous and unpardonable. Let us beware. The laws of economics are inexorable and must be respected.

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

I will now say a word or two about the Finance Bill. The Finance Bill proposes taxes in three forms, the salt tax, the income-tax and the postal receipts. I may at once say that, so far as I am concerned, I do not want this Bill, if I can thereby hasten the day of Swaraj. As I said, I do not want to provide a shell for the upkeep of a Government which is here to perpetuate our slavery and to foster foreign domination, but, still, if they are responsive to the wishes of this House, I will wait and see and then decide what to do. There are, as I said, three proposals. I must declare unequivocally that my very grain recoils at the idea of granting supplies to foreign people for the maintenance of their supremacy in this country. It seems to me to be immoral, and old fashioned as I am, I still attach some value to the eternal principle of morality. But, Sir, in spite of all the agony and in spite of the qualms of conscience, I would restrain myself as a practical man if Government shaped their policy with the set purpose of affording relief to the poor. That is the only criterion I apply. So far as the Finance Bill is concerned, there are, as I indicated, two or three main propositions. The first relates to salt. My Honourable friend knows as well as I do that the incidence of indirect taxation in this country is very high and it is necessary that this incidence should be lowered. Salt is an indispensable article which the poorest of the poor need. The Honourable the Finance Member wants to preserve and to give free ply to the law of self preservation. There is no better preserver than salt and let me remind him, that the builders of human destiny and the preservers of humanity are regarded as the salt of the earth, and if the Finance Member is true to the salt of the country, he must alleviate the miseries and sufferings of the poor. So I ask him to reduce the salt duty, if he cannot abolish it altogether. I ask him to raise the minimum level of income-tax, as, apart from other grounds, it is an uneconomic tax, for from about 275,000 assessees between 1,000 and 2,000 you expect only about 50 lakhs, while the remainder, almost equal in number, are expected to contribute about 17 crores. He knows, I think, that it costs him about ten lakhs a year to collect this tax. He contemplates an increase of about nine lakhs in the amount provided for the collection of income-tax in this year's budget mainly with a view to collecting the small meagre sums from this class who really cannot afford to pay. I ask him to accept Rs. 2,000 as the minimum limit for the purpose of exemption from income-tax. He knows that in this country there is no allowance for married people, children, etc. So, the least that he ought to do is to raise the taxable limit to Rs. 2,000. The third thing that I want him to do is to reduce the price of the envelope and the postcard. The poor man wants these means for intercourse, culture and education. I cannot understand the policy of the Government. They are introducing costly schemes of broadcasting for the ostensible benefit of the masses, but would maintain prohibitive rates for the postcard and envelope! The easiest means of communication between the villages and the cities and between the villages in this country is the postcard. Where is the sense, equity or justice in investing lakhs in broadcasting, while the postal rates are prohibitive. If you look at the chart attached to the report of the Postal Department that I have before me, you will notice that consumption of cards and envelopes is steadily going down as people are finding it hard and expensive to pay for them. In fact, in several places, motor buses are becoming popular means of communication. You have to compete with others too. If you reduce the rates and have some consideration for the poor man,

I am certain that these changes will not affect the revenue seriously. Firstly, I expect, as I have said, a larger surplus than the Honourable the Finance Member has provided for. Secondly, he has omitted some receipts which are potential on which we can count and we are entitled to count. We expect a contribution of about six crores from railways every year. It is only being postponed, and there is no reason why we should not take it into account when we calculate the revenue The third thing which we should not forget is that we have not yet drawn upon the railway reserve of 27 crores of rupees. There are other ways by which the income of the State can be increased. I would suggest, for example, the raising of the limit to the deposits in the savings banks. I believe that if people are allowed to deposit money in savings banks without any restrictions, the deposits will go up by several crores, and you can get a good saving thereby. You can pay off the debts that have been incurred at high rates of interest by money raised at low rates and make a saving thereby. And, so far as I am concerned, I would not be sorry if you were to revise the income-tax schedule and levy higher rates for unearned incomes such as those out of interest; and also if you imposed a larger scale of duties on the profits of companies above a certain minimum, *e.g.*, if companies which earned more than six per cent. paid a higher rate of duty, that too would be helpful. I think there are many ways by which the finances can be improved without adding to the burdens of taxation. I need not say more about the contents of the Finance Bill at this stage.

Sir, I will just read out, if I may, two quotations from two books and close my speech. One is from Mr. Darling's book, "Wisdom and Waste in the Punjab Village", about the utility of raising money by loan for the purposes of reconstruction. Mr. Darling says:

"The proposal to raise a reconstruction loan is likely to be condemned because it is novel and without precedent. But the situation in India is also without precedent: a population of 360 millions, of which less than 10 per cent. are literate, is about to embark on the hazardous course of democracy and self-government, and meanwhile the depression has doubled the burden of debt and reduced the standard of living to the pre-war level. In a sense, precedent may almost be said to exist. In the perilous days of the war India contributed £ 100 millions to its cost without considering too carefully how and when the loan would be repaid. These days too are not without their peril, for the world is full of explosive forces and in the hearts of the people are yearnings such as have never been there before. A reconstruction loan would have several advantages over the war loan. First and foremost, it would be productive. Secondly, it would be an internal loan and be mainly spent in the country. Thirdly, it could probably be raised at less than four per cent, and, finally, it would give employment to many idle matriculates and graduates. (*Laughter.*) And one more point may be urged. The moment is particularly auspicious for a big constructive effort. The changes contemplated in the political sphere demand for their success a corresponding change in the social and economic spheres, and, if leadership is good, they might well provide the necessary momentum."

Of course, Mr. Darling's politics are quite different from mine, but his views should weigh all the more with the Finance Member on that score.

There is, Sir, one more quotation I wish to give from Salter, which is the epilogue of his book, "Recovery", and I would beg of the Honourable the Finance Member to give some thought to it:

"Before the vast magnitude of the tasks ahead, man's spirit has for the moment faltered and his vision contracted. The public mood is apprehensive where it should be bold, and defensive where a broad and generous policy is most required. Everywhere men fly to new tariffs and restrictions, to nationalist policies, domestic currencies, parochial purchasing and personal hoarding—like frightened rabbits each

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

scurrying to his own burrow. Surely it is for the moment only. Which country of us has not, but a few years since, shown the resources we now require of courage, of personal devotion, of industrial and financial leadership, of public direction, in a need no greater and in a cause less worthy? We are, if we could but grapple with our fate, the most fortunate of the generations of men. In a single lifetime Science has given us more power over Nature, and extended further the range of vision of the exploring mind, than in all recorded history. Now, and now only our material resources, technical knowledge and industrial skill, are enough to afford to every man of the world's teeming population physical comfort, adequate leisure, and access to everything in our rich heritage of civilisation that he has the personal quality to enjoy We need but the regulative wisdom to control our specialised activities and the thrusting energy of our sectional and selfish interests. To face the troubles that beset us, this apprehensive and defensive world needs now above all the qualities it seems for the moment to have abandoned—courage and magnanimity."

(Loud and Prolonged Applause.)

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions Muhammadan Rural): Sir, we have been accustomed for the last five years to have every year new proposals for fresh taxations. Those proposals came not only in the shape of the Finance Bill, but they came in the shape of protection and sometimes in the name of equalisation of prices. Sir, I congratulate the Honourable the Finance Member that he did not follow the course of his predecessors and that he did not impose new taxation. On the contrary, he has given some relief, and our criticism from this side of the House is that the relief that he has promised is not sufficient and it falls short of our expectations and it falls short of the recovery of trade.

Sir, I would first like to mention one or two points referred to by my distinguished predecessor, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant—I endorse his theory of protection. I say also that I am not opposed to protection, but I am opposed to the manner in which the protection theory has been carried out during the year 1934 by our Government. I wish he had been in this House and supported me when throughout the year 1934 I fought and fought against the manner in which the theory of protection was being given effect to by the Government of our country.

Sir, the next thing is about the question of spending large sums of money on new undertakings. I think the Honourable the Finance Member has missed the real meaning and significance of the proposals of my friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant. He really meant that at a time when people are starving, at a time when there is so little employment in the country, Government should not adopt the policy of retrenchment and make the people more miserable. They should, on the contrary, start some kind of scheme by which they may increase employment. People are suffering, no doubt, and they are feeling miserable, and I also say that we should not accentuate their sufferings and make the people more miserable. The Honourable the Finance Member asked—what are the undertakings which the Government of India should take up when they have something to spare in this direction. I suggest one scheme, and that is the scheme of metalling the *kutcha* roads. A responsible engineer calculated that if five carts pass a *kutcha* road per day, then the economic saving will pay the cost of construction and repairs to *pucca* roads. I also agree that many hundreds of crores may be usefully spent in this direction, and I think there are a number of other suggestions which can be taken up.

1 P.M.

Now, I come to the Finance Bill. First, I take up the question of the export of gold. Sir, in discussing that problem, the Honourable the Finance Member falls into the error which is not uncommon in the art and science of reasoning, that it is the dual significance of one and the same word. My Honourable friend may have heard of the ingenious lectures given by Sir Bertrand Russell on one occasion about the foundation of geometry. He came afterwards to a very peculiar position on account of one and the same term being used in two different senses. He came to the conclusion that A was at the same time B, and not B. The conundrum was, whether the class of all classes is an individual or a class. Now, if you go on generalising and generalising, ultimately you come to the class of all classes, and I ask whether the class of all classes is a class or it is an individual. It is certainly both a class and an individual. The case of gold is similar. I ask, whether gold is a commodity or whether gold is a means by which we can regulate the finances of a country, we can regulate the exchange and we can establish the financial position of a country. These are the two ways in which gold could be used. The Honourable the Finance Member has been telling us that gold is a commodity just as much as wheat is a commodity and it can be sold freely like any other commodity. But, unfortunately, other countries are not treating gold as a commodity, and they are utilising their gold to stabilise their currency and to stabilise their financial position. It is on account of this difference in meaning, this dual significance which is given to treasure that all this confusion arises in India. In India, we consider gold as a mere commodity like other articles, but other countries consider gold as a means of stabilising their financial position, and they are conserving gold as much as they possibly can. I wish we in India may use our gold for this purpose, and we should not lead ourselves to the same kind of illogical conclusion as Bertrand Russell did in the significance of the expression "class of all classes". Every country has withdrawn gold altogether from circulation. They are not using it as a commodity, but they are only using gold at present as a means of stabilising currency of the country. I pray that our Government should use gold in the same sense and not use it in its dual significance which I have just described.

Now, Sir, the same is the case with silver. On the one side, the Government use it as a commodity. They imposed an import duty on silver which was six annas originally, and, thereafter, there was a surcharge of 25 per cent., and thus it was raised to 7½ annas. Fortunately, afterwards, it was reduced to five annas, and now the proposal is to reduce it to two annas. I am sure that the Reserve Bank will press upon the Government that there cannot be any import duty upon any particular article. It is not a commodity only, it is an article by means of which the Bank will stabilise the financial position of the country. The Government themselves have set apart large sums of money for silver redemption fund, and this in itself is a proof that they are not considering it purely as an article just as much as wheat or any other thing.

The next thing in connection with the export of gold to which I should like to draw the attention of the Honourable the Finance Member is the speech delivered by his predecessor, Sir George Schuster, on the occasion of the budget debate in 1938. He says (at the time he delivered his speech) the export of gold amounted to 107·08 crores or its equivalent of $80½ millions. To this he added 15 million sterling as the favourable

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

balance of trade. Thus the total amount was 95⅓ million sterling. In this speech he gave the manner the Government utilised 95⅓ millions He said:

"In the first place, Government has used about £34 millions in meeting its ordinary recurrent commitments. Secondly, it has used £15 millions in discharging the 5½ per cent, sterling loan which matured on January 1, 1932, thereby liquidating an obligation which cost it £825,000, equivalent to Rs. 110 lakhs per annum, and greatly strengthening its credit in London. Thirdly Government has added about £11 millions to its currency reserves and .... Government therefore made good use of the abnormally high amount of sterling which it was able during these fifteen months to purchase as a result of the gold exports."

Then, he continued:

"Out of £69⅔ millions sterling we used about £34 millions for meeting our current requirements and £35¼ millions sterling for strengthening our position."

Further on, he says:

"It appears to be a fairly accurate estimate to say that in the fifteen months with which I am dealing about Rs. 15 crores or £11¼ millions was required for the repayment of money invested in Indian treasury bills by foreign banks."

We expected that the Finance Member in his budget speech will give us a clear account of the manner in which he spent or he utilised these 220 crores which represents the amount of sterling gold exported from this country. I mean a scheme of this kind was really very desirable, so that we may visualise how far this export of gold was utilised to stabilise the financial position of our own country. The first thing that I should like is that at least this export of gold ought to have been utilised in transferring our sterling obligations into rupee obligations, but I find that, in spite of our export of gold to the extent of 220 crores, our sterling obligations are continually increasing. In 1933, our sterling loans amounted to 505·36 crores, and it rose to 512 crores in 1934 and 513·36 now. In spite of the export of gold, I regret that we have not been able to diminish our sterling loans and transfer it to the rupee loan, and this is a thing which really the Government ought to have done.

The next thing I should like to discuss is the theory of our taxations. Sir, I pointed out last year that:

"During the five years preceding, our income from customs remained almost stationery in spite of increase in taxation. In 1930-31, our income under customs was 46·81, we have added a customs duty of about 30 crores during five years and still last year our income was 46·87 crores This year we estimated 48·48 crores, but I am quite sure that our actual income will fall short of our expectations. This shows that 46½ crores is practically the utmost capacity that this country can pay."

I really gave in the same speech which was on the 20th March, 1934, the details of the customs duties added year after year. From this it appears that the maximum capacity of our taxation was reached and the addition of any duty whatsoever in whatever form it may be imposed will not increase our net income, because the law of diminishing returns begins to operate. You cannot go on beyond the utmost capacity of the

people and the utmost capacity of the people, as I calculated, was only 46½ crores. In calculating any theory of taxation, there are two points which ought to be borne in mind and which are very often ignored by the Members on the Treasury Benches who are responsible to invent all kinds of hooks to pick out money from all the pockets that we have, concealed or open. I should like to point out to the Honourable the Finance Member that the income of the people of India since 1929-30 has diminished by 800 crores per annum, that is, the income of the people in India is today less than it was in 1929-30 by 800 crores. If the House desires, I can give you the method of calculation. It is less by 800 crores compared with what it was in 1929-30. Since the income of the people has decreased, it is evident that their capacity to pay taxes must equally diminish. That is point number one. The second point is that in this country we have got a special tax which I call an *invisible tax* which does not exist in any other country. What is this invisible tax? It is that every person who earns his money has to support his friends and his relatives who are not employed or who have little or no income. I went into the case, and I enquired a large number of persons as to what is the proportion of their income which they have to spend in support of persons who are unemployed, and I came to the conclusion that it is four annas per rupee. So out of every rupee which an earning member gets in this country, four annas goes to support his relatives and friends who are unemployed. This four annas in the rupee I call an invisible tax which does not exist in the calculation of the Finance Member, which in practice every person who lives in this country has to pay.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): The Europeans do not pay it.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I am just now talking only of Indians. Fortunately in other countries persons who are unemployed are paid by the State. They are supported by the State out of the visible taxes which the people pay to the Government. Here, in this country, the visible taxes that we pay to the Government do not go to support the unemployed people, but the unemployed are really supported by the little income of the persons who get something and the minimum figure under this account is four annas in the rupee. Therefore, these are the two factors which ought to be borne in mind when you begin to calculate any theory of taxation. Sir, my friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, has really gone into details about taxation, and though I believe our Fiscal Commission's report is a very valuable document and one of the best reports ever written under the direction of the Government of India, it has now become obsolete. Circumstances have enormously changed, the high tariff walls which have now been built up nearly by every country did not exist in those days, and it is now high time that we should revise our policy of taxation. No doubt we should protect our industries, but, at the same time, we should protect our smaller industries from the bigger industries. It is not only our duty to support and protect our bigger industries, but the protection of our smaller industries from our bigger industries is also an important point; and I doubt very much whether by imposing very heavy tariffs we can really protect any industry or find employment. It is a method by which the poorer people pay money into the pockets of the rich. So I would like to take this opportunity to suggest that the time has come when we should seriously consider the

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

whole question of the policy of taxation. My friend, the Finance Member, in his speech said:

"Certainly that tariff is too high; certainly it is far too complicated; and on both accounts it is a restraint on trade and recovery."

I entirely agree with him, and I hope he will be able to find out ways and means by which he can materialise his statement, because, a mere statement of facts is not sufficient. We want really to carry it out into practice. That is a much more important thing for us. Of course, I am not in a position to give any definite suggestions about taxation, but I think the question of the quota system may be determined and explored a little more closely to see whether it will be able to find out some kind of solution for this difficulty.

Sir, I will now say a few words about the ratio.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Half Past Two of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Sir, you may remember that I told you that I shall have to obtain from my friends their view as to whether there should be a sitting on Friday: after that, I took personally some trouble to find out also from my Muslim friends here as to what their views on this question were and whether they felt very strongly that they should not sit on Friday. We are quite ready to help them; but the position is this: if this matter is not finished tomorrow—and we are quite willing to sit longer today and tomorrow and do without questions and to agree to anything which this House and you, Sir, may ask us to do—it really means a gap of six days during the discussions, which, I am sure, my Honourable friends will agree is not very convenient. We are quite willing not to sit on Friday: I do not expect to get an undertaking from anybody that they will close tomorrow in the afternoon—that I do not expect, and I am not asking for any such undertaking; but, if my friends will give me some help if we put the closure tomorrow after sitting late as long as is necessary, I expect that help in return for our not creating any difficulty, whatsoever, in agreeing not to sit on Friday. I have explained my position very clearly to the House, and I leave it to the House and to you, Sir, to judge what should be done.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Sir, I have got no personal interest, because I am finishing my speech within half an hour: but I think it is really the privilege of the House, especially on the Finance Bill, that they should have their say in full: it is very seldom—I do not remember at all—that closure was applied. In fact this is the only occasion in which we can discuss all those matters which we could not unfortunately discuss on Resolutions for want of time and this is the only occasion when we can lay our grievances. It has, therefore, been the practice all the time that in matters of finance

and taxation, the representatives of the people are given the fullest opportunity to express the views of the taxpayers. I think there should be no time limit: we can easily afford to continue the discussion: we will finish the Finance Bill in time, the rules will not be violated and if there is any further business, we can sit for two days in April.

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi (Tirhut Division: Muhammadan): Sir, beyond the fact that the second reading of the Finance Bill may be finished by tomorrow. Friday next is a very exceptional Friday as you know very well; and, therefore, the Mussalmans would like to be free on that day, and I hope Government will see their way to accept the wishes of Mussalmans.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I doubt, Sir, if it will be possible to finish the discussion on the motion before the House in the afternoon tomorrow. There is no desire to prolong the discussion, but, from the very nature of the case, it seems difficult; specially I am in a very awkward position having taken so much of the time of the House myself, and I cannot possibly agree to any arrangement that will curtail the liberties of my colleagues here.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): Sir, we do not want to be accused of showing any disrespect to the strong feeling of the Muslim community, and we are quite willing to agree that the House will not sit on Friday. All I expected was—I do not want anybody to curtail his speech if he has something to say—that, as a matter of arrangement, my friends could help us to some extent. I made it perfectly clear to the House, even before my friend spoke, that I was not expecting anybody to give any undertaking that something will be done by tomorrow.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is certainly the desire of the Chair not to curtail the privilege of Honourable Members as regards discussion of the Bill before the House,—the Finance Bill. But, so far as the arrangements are concerned, the Chair is afraid, there seems to be no unanimity on the point. So far as the Chair has been able to follow the Honourable the Leader of the House, his section is not willing to give up Friday sitting unless the discussion of the Finance Bill . . . .

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: May I say, Sir, that that is not our intention? I did not say that unless they agreed to finish on Thursday, we insist on sitting on Friday. I wanted their help to bring matters to a finish as soon as possible, but I did not offer any objection to keeping Friday free: I did not make any conditions.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then the position as the Chair understands it now is that the matter remains uncertain. If the Chair has been able to follow the Honourable the Leader of the House, if, by tomorrow, it becomes clear some time or other that the discussion will be finished tomorrow, then the Government will not insist on a sitting on Friday . . . .

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: It is my fault, Sir, that I have not made myself clearer. I am offering no opposition to not sitting on Friday: I was only asking my friends to help and finish the matter as soon as possible.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then, the Chair takes it that the Government section offer no opposition to Friday being a non-working day of the Assembly; but the Leader of the House expressed a hope that it may be possible for Honourable Members to so regulate their speeches as to conclude the discussion tomorrow; but, as the Chair understands it, he does not insist in any way on that as a condition precedent to not sitting on Friday. Therefore, the Chair will, as it has already announced, waive questions tomorrow and agree to sit till 6 o'clock; and, if it is not finished, then there will be no sitting on Friday, but the discussion will be continued on Thursday, the 21st March.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Sir, before I take up the question of the ratio, I take this opportunity to thank the Finance Member for allotting a crore of rupees for rural uplift. I know my friends on my right could not thank him for this: they consider that this amount is hopelessly insufficient; but, looking at the past history of the case, I think we have secured something, because since the year 1933, I have been trying my utmost to impress on his predecessor that we should take into consideration the requirements of the villagers: I pressed hard on the occasion of the discussion on the Reserve Bank Bill that a portion of the profit should be set apart for the rural co-operative banks and for land mortgage banks. But the Finance Member at that time did not agree, and I proposed then that a great service would be done to the country if somebody took the Finance Member to some of the villages and showed him the actual conditions of the poorer people residing in those villages, and today I propose the same thing and say that whenever opportunities arise, the present Finance Member may kindly visit the villages and see for himself the actual conditions under which the poorer people live. We on this side of the House know full well all about these poor people, because we had to visit the villages in connection with our elections.

Now, Sir, coming to the ratio question, I do not want to make today any definite statement about ratio. We heard the emphatic statement of the Honourable the Finance Member that in his opinion the ratio of 1*s.* 6*d.* is definite and final, and no change can be effected in it. Let him not think of making any change, I won't join issue with him, but I should like to submit certain facts before him, and I want him to offer me a solution of those difficulties. It is a fact that we have to pay 70 crores of rupees every year on account of our obligations or commitments and also private remittances, and this fact cannot be denied Sir George Schuster also admitted this fact on the floor of the House May I ask the Finance Member how he is going to find out these 70 crores every year? Up to the year 1929 or even 1930, we have been paying this amount from the balance of our trade, but since 1930-31, the balance of trade is not sufficient to pay the entire amount which we have to pay every year. For example, in the year 1929-30, our import was 249, our export was 318, and so the balance of trade was 69, and it was just sufficient to pay our obligations. Next year, that is 1930-31, our import was 173 and our export was 226, and the balance of trade was only 53 crores. Here, again, it fell short by 27 crores. Then, in the year 1931-32, the balance of trade dwindled to 31 crores. In 1934-35, the balance of trade was nil, so that the Finance Member had really to find out the entire amount from other sources. In 1933-34, import was 117 and export was 150, and the balance of trade was 33. I do not ask him to consider the question of ratio, but I do request him to suggest a

method by which we can have a favourable balance of trade equivalent to 70 crores, so that we may pay our annual obligations. If this balance of trade practically disappears, how are we going to pay the amount, and the only way by which we can pay is by the export of gold. Now, Sir, this export of gold is not a thing which can go on indefinitely. We have gone on with the export of gold for about four years now, and we may possibly be able to continue the gold export for another couple of years, but we cannot possibly continue the export of gold, because we have not got an indefinite supply of gold with which to meet our obligations. Therefore, Sir, some method must be found to secure this balance of trade. Now, this balance of trade has been ruined, it has been upset, for two reasons. One reason is the high tariff wall which has been built up by which we have really annoyed other countries so that each country is now trying to have a balanced budget with India leaving no balance in our favour. The second reason is the high value of the Rupee. We on this side of the House believe that if the Rupee is devalued and it is reduced to 1*s*. 4*d*. or even to a shilling, then our exports would improve. Here we have got the example of Denmark and New Zealand which the Honourable the Finance Member quoted. If this method is not sufficient, then the burden of the proof lies on the Finance Member himself to suggest ways and means by which our balance of trade may be improved so as to meet our annual commitments to the extent of 70 crores. It is evident that England will never accept 70 crores in terms of wheat, oil seeds or other commodities. She will require money in sterling. How are we going to meet the difficulty unless some countries buy these articles from us and give us sterling in exchange? That is one difficulty which the Finance Member has to solve. Let him fix the ratio at whatever rate he likes, I shall have no quarrel with him, but he should suggest to us ways and means to secure the balance of trade in our favour so that we may pay our obligations.

Then, the second thing which I should like to mention is the high value of our agricultural products. The Finance Member in his speech has admitted that the prices of agricultural products are going up, and the proposal that has been laid before us this morning by the Honourable the Commerce Member about the reduction of the duty on wheat from Rs. 2 to Rs. 1-8-0 will further lower the prices of agricultural products. That will be a great blow to my friends in the Punjab, and, as has been proposed by the Commerce Member, if the reduction of duty on wheat is effected, it is a matter which would require the serious consideration of every one in this House. We on this side of the House think that to raise the price level of agricultural products, the devaluation of the Rupee is a necessary, though not, a sufficient condition. I think my friend, the Finance Member, knows the mathematical significance of "necessary" and "sufficient", and when we consider on this side of the House that the de-valuation of the Rupee is a necessary condition for raising the price levels, I say this is not a sufficient condition. There are other factors which ought to be taken into consideration to achieve our object. Sir, I may be entirely wrong, but I feel that these are really two problems for which a solution must be found by the Government. Sir, I don't believe in all the economic theories that are propounded in the world, but the problems are there, and a solution must be found out either by mathematical calculations or by politicians or by economists or by politicians—I don't care what theory is applied, but I want a satisfactory solution of these two problems. I must have a clear balance of trade of 70 crores to pay our commitments, and I must raise the price levels of our agricultural products, so that our people may be

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

able to pay freely and the prosperity of our country may increase. I do not question the theories of economists,—I am not an economist myself, nor do I believe in the theories of economists. I said two years ago that economists have done more harm to the world with the exception of wars under the name of religion than any other body of people. They first advanced the theory that the prosperity of a country depended upon the favourable balance of trade, then the experience of Central Europe did away with that theory altogether. Then the economists advanced the theory that prosperity depended on the stability of exchange, and I said two years ago that that theory had been exploded, in fact there was only one man who understood all the details of these exchanges and that man was in the Lunatic Asylum. This was the quotation from Professor Gregory. Then, they started the new theory, and that is the stabilisation of prices, and so on and so forth. So the theories constantly change, and the countries have paid out enormous sums in order to meet the requirements of these theories. Therefore, I do not believe in any of these theories, but I want two things. I must have a clear balance of trade in order to meet my obligations to the United Kingdom, and I also want that the price levels of our commodities should be raised,—whether that is done by mathematical theories or by any economic theories, I do not mind, but I must have a solution of these two problems.

The next question is the question of education and the establishment of the new Board which the Government of India have sanctioned. In 1928, Sir Philip Hartog's Committee recommended the establishment of a Central Advisory Board. I moved a motion on the 16th February, 1932, demanding the immediate creation of this Board, and my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, on behalf of the Government, gave an assurance that the Local Governments had agreed, that the Government of India had agreed—at least I understood, though he did not say so exactly to that effect, that it would be established very soon. 1932 passed, 1933 passed, 1934 passed, and we are now in 1935. I am glad that the Honourable the Finance Member has acknowledged the necessity of establishing this new Board. But the amount that has been sanctioned is a very trifling amount, and I read on page 162 of the Demands that the amount is only Rs. 25,000. For such an important undertaking a sum of Rs. 25,000 is hopelessly insufficient I agree that education is a transferred subject. So also is agriculture a transferred subject. But just as agriculture has got an Imperial Council of Agricultural Research to advise the provinces and carry on experimental work which the provinces themselves cannot undertake, and it co-ordinates the work of the provinces, similarly we should have a Central Advisory Body to advise the provinces in matters which they cannot undertake themselves and to co-ordinate the work. I gave notice of a Resolution on this topic, to which my Honourable friend, Dr. Bhagavan Das, gave an amendment which I accepted—we must rely in future upon this new Board to find out solutions of our existing problems which are still awaiting solution. One very important problem is that no Committee or Commission since 1882 has ever examined the educational problems as a whole. The Calcutta University Commission considered the problems of University education. The Punjab Enquiry Committee considered the problem of university education, but the problem of education as a whole has never been considered by any committee. I do not recommend any more Committees or Commissions, because we have got very sad experience

of them, but I think this particular body, if it is properly established, may be able to do committees of enquiries may have done. These partial enquiries are exceedingly harmful and they are very dangerous, at least, in my province, because my province of the United Provinces is like the sick, credulous old woman who will take any medicine prescribed by any physician or any person whatsoever. The Calcutta University Commission prescribed some solutions for the Calcutta University. The Calcutta University did not adopt them, but the U. P adopted them *in toto*.

Mr. B. Das: Because you were a member of that Commission. That is why they accepted.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: In spite of it. Now, the Punjab Government appointed a Committee, but the recommendations of that Committee have not been accepted by the Punjab Government so far, but our Government like the sick, old woman, came out with a Resolution. The Government of India have already issued a circular on this point, and it must have been written by the President of the Punjab Enquiry Committee, and, as in the case of appeals to the Railway Board all the opinions will be examined by the same authority who was the originator of the original scheme. I think a strong advisory Board would remove this apprehension and it is absolutely necessary for this particular kind of work.

Another thing which is awaiting solution and on which we feel strongly is the question of examinations. In the case of examinations, everybody is dissatisfied, and one gentleman from Trivandrum, Mr. Kuppusami, has gone so far—and he has given proofs and statistics in support of his proposition—he has gone so far as to say, "No injustice would be done to candidates if the marks allotted to them were simply drawn out of a ballot box". Instead of reading the answer books of a candidate, put the roll number in one box and all the marks in another and draw a lot, and no injustice will be done to the candidates, that is the value of marking in our schools and colleges. I shall not discuss the details. I have given my reasons in the book which I have already published.

The question of technical education is dealt with also in the circular of the Government of India. There are two distinct views about technical education. One is that it should be separated from the general education, and the other is that we should have a system by means of which general education and technical education may be combined together. These are very important but debatable points, on which we must come to some kind of solution, and I think this Advisory Board, if it is properly established and if it functions properly, should be able to tackle this problem. I individually believe that we should have a system following the polytechnics in England and not follow the German system where there is one university for general education and another for technical education, under the name of Hoch Schule.

Coming to primary education, we know that provinces are making experiments in primary education, but one province does not know the results of experiments obtained in another province, and the Board ought to be able to co-ordinate the work and make known the results of the experiments carried on in different provinces. The question of secondary education has always been left in the background, and that is really the weakest point in our whole system of education. Nobody has ever been able to tackle or solve the problem at all, and I think that even this

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

circular places us in a very difficult situation. Everybody admits that we have got before us the very important problem of unemployment, and people think that the problem can be solved simply by rearranging the courses of subjects in various grades of schools by putting one year more or one year less in the high schools and the universities. This reminds me of the story which my Honourable friend, Sir James Grigg, related this morning, namely, by calling a penny a tuppence, you cannot become doubly rich. Similarly, by re-arranging your courses of study from one class of school to another class of school, you cannot solve the problem of unemployment, which is a very difficult problem and which educationists alone cannot solve. It requires the co-operation of the businessmen, the capitalist, the educationist, and, above all, the Government. Government should make up their mind that this problem should be solved, and then alone can a solution be found.

Let me deal with one or two other points. I take first the League of Nations. I urged half a dozen times last year the discussion of this question, but I could not ballot a Resolution in time. I repeatedly requested the Honourable the Law Member to give us time to discuss the question of the League of Nations, but he could not give us time to do it. I do not advocate that we should withdraw from the League of Nations, but I may point out that when we spend such a large sum of money on contribution and the Delegations to the League, and when the Delegations make some recommendations, those recommendations must be respected. I have here got the recommendations of the Delegation of 1929. I shall just read out three recommendations they have made. One is: "In the first place, we consider that some means should be found for increasing the interest of the Indian Legislature in the work of the League." That is their first recommendation, and the action that Government have taken on that is that no opportunity has been given to the Legislature to interest itself in the work of the League. Their second recommendation is: "The administration itself should be provided with a suitable machinery for a more intensive and adequate treatment of the League of Nations." No machinery is provided by the Government. They receive publications and books from the League and they do not even inform the Members of this House that such publications have been received and any Member can have them with pleasure. Perhaps they send the publications to some Departments or destroy them periodically when there is no particular place to keep. Their third suggestion is—and this is a very important suggestion—they recommended a permanent representative at Geneva representing India. Of course, he will be a representative of the Government, but as yet no action has yet been taken, and I have not seen any proposal discussed anywhere, either in this House or outside, it may have been confidentially discussed, I do not know. There is one more suggestion that they have made, and that is: "An active policy should be pursued with regard to the possibility of India being elected to the membership of the Council of the League." In spite of the fact that we are the fifth largest contributor to the League, India has never stood, has never competed, and has never expressed a desire to become a member of the Council of the League. This is really deplorable. Again, though our contribution is fifth from the point of view of money, the number of Indians employed in the League of Nations is very nominal. Any one who is interested in the subject may perhaps consult page 1280 and onwards of this book, that is, the League of Nations'

Official Journal. There the names of all the persons are given who are employed by the Secretariat of the League of Nations, and you will find that there are only seven or eight Indians there, out of whom two are in the permanent list and the rest are temporary. This is the treatment we received at the hands of the Secretariat. May I ask my colleagues on this side of the House whether the time has not come when we should consider whether our contributions to the League of Nations should or should not continue. We must have a fair return for our money, and, if people are not prepared to give us an adequate share of our money, then we have no alternative, however unfortunate it may be, but to separate and withdraw our connections from the League.

I will now turn to one or two other matters and finish in two minutes. The first is the excise duty on sugar. Last year, we were dis-
3 P.M cussing the question about the distribution of various duties among Madras and Bengal, but I, representing the United Provinces, watched the debate. If there is to be any distribution of the income from a particular commodity to a particular province, then am I not right in urging upon the attention of the House that part of the excise duty which you collect on sugar ought to be given to the United Provinces and Bihar? The reason is that on account of the sugar factories the roads have very much deteriorated. You get the money in two ways, in the shape of enhanced income-tax and in the shape of excise duty and it is only fair that a portion of it should be given to the repair of the roads, if not to the general revenues of the province.

I now come to the budget proper. First, there is the question of the post office. I wish to plead for the villagers and people residing in small towns. I think it is desirable to consider whether we should not give some relief to these poor people. I have not got the figures with me. The Honourable Member in charge of the Post Office wanted to discuss these figures, but I am not prepared to make a definite contribution to it at this stage. When the time comes, I shall do it, but we should seriously consider whether we cannot lower the rate on postcards and increase the permissible weight of the one anna envelope from half a tola to one tola. There is one thing which I should like to discuss in greater detail, and that is the income-tax level. I have got with me the correspondence from the various taxpayers in which they describe how unfairly they have been treated by the Government. I think we will discuss that question when the question of raising the minimum limit from Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 2,000 comes up. It is not really the small income that we have got to consider. We have to consider the infinite amount of troubles in which the poor people are involved by this lowering of the limit. Money is extorted from *ekka* drivers and betel nut sellers, who keep no account and who are illiterate, in the same way as land revenue is extracted by the Tahsildar.

I will now say a word about skins. This question of skins should not be considered from the point of view of one province. It should be considered from the point of view of all India. On account of the export duty, the trade was actually going down, and, by the removal of the duty, there is every likelihood that the trade will go up. The trade in both hides and skins had been going down. By the removal of the duty on hides last year, the trade is going up and the trade in skins is going down. This is clearly a proof that, by the removal of the duty on skins, trade will improve. As there are other members to speak, I don't like to take more time.

Mr. F. W. Hockenhull (Assam: European): There is a tendency on this occasion for provincial representatives to urge their local claims on account of every conceivable grievance as also to provide the Finance Member with every variety of suggestion which involves new or increased expenditure, in their own territory. Reluctantly, Sir, I am constrained to follow this example, but I hope with some justification. As my claim could not appropriately be urged on any other occasion, and, further, last year, Sir James Grigg's predecessor really made the invitation in his budget speech wherein he stated:

"I may say, however, that we in the Government of India are prepared to recognise that there may be some special claim for assistance in the case of Assam."

On that occasion, I urged that the statement left some doubt in the minds of those of us who were concerned, regarding how far recognition went, and while recognition was one thing, action was another. There has, hitherto, always been the conclusion that there is the will for something to be done, but it is left to others to provide the remedy. Nothing happened last year, and, while leaving communications out of the picture for the moment, nothing has happened now with regard to the deficit position.

Certain Members, when this matter was before the House the other day, in good humoured interruption, suggested that all Local Governments had overdrafts, that in any case, a little more local taxation was the obvious remedy, failing which resort could be made to fresh borrowing. The attention of the Government of India has been regularly and repeatedly directed to the position, and, I hope, from their reticence, that they, too, do not view with equanimity the growing indebtedness of this province.

Now, Sir, Assam's financial embarrassments are a real problem, and not merely a temporary inability to balance its own budget. The first part of the problem may be said to lie in the fact that on existing lines, taxation within Assam's own boundaries is never likely to furnish sufficient funds to enable it to pay its own way. The province is dependent almost entirely on agriculture which fortuitously was flourishing in every department during the post War boom period when Assam, as a Governor's province, was incorporated. I need hardly remind this House of the changed conditions since those days; a change that has resulted in greatly depleted revenue.

The second part of the problem is the necessity, the urgent necessity, of the development of its own rich natural resources which in good time will render it self-supporting.

First, let me speak of taxation. And here, I would address myself to those who have not read the findings of the various impartial investigations of the problem. Those who have read them can hardly remain unconvinced. The Federal Finance Committee, the White Paper, the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report, have all pointed out the necessity for relief. Indeed the latter is so pointed in its recommendation that with your permission, Sir, I will quote it. Para. 260:

"It is certain that Assam urgently needs an assured increase in its revenue, but the question in what form this need is to be met, whether by fixed subvention or by assignment of revenue, is a matter of fiscal administration on which we do not feel called upon to express an opinion."

And, again, para. 270:

"The claim of Assam to an increase in its revenues has for some time been recognised as one which the Central Government must meet in some form."

Here, at long last, we have not only the recognition of a claim, but also the agency which will be expected to implement it. May I make one more quotation, from the report of the Government of India's representative—the Comptroller in Assam. He states:

"At the rate at which the revenue position of Assam is deteriorating, it seems very probable that it will soon fall behind Burma and Bengal which were the last in the race in 1932-33. There is no hope of such a change in the economic position of the country in the near future as is likely to render the financial position of the province satisfactory."

The impression may have been left on the minds of Honourable Members that because the results are so poor, Assam is not pulling its weight, or perhaps its full weight in the matter of taxation, Provincial and Central. Let me endeavour to correct this view. What is the province doing in the matter of taxation? I have here an interesting compilation of the comparative figures in the provincial and Central spheres of the whole of the provinces of India.

First, then, provincial: Assam comes fifth in the list. Bombay, Punjab and Madras only are much ahead of it in the *per capita* expenditure charged against revenue. In the realm of Central taxes raised in the provinces, Bombay and Bengal stand first and second, respectively. This is due solely to their large income-tax payments, which, again, is sure evidence of their wealth. It is wholly reasonable that the two most wealthy provinces should pay the largest contribution. Assam, however, which comes third in the list, and not very far behind either of them, is one of the poorest provinces in India, as her income-tax payments clearly show. The reason of her large contribution to Central revenues is the heavy excise duty on oil, which, in the last available return, amounts to Rs. 1-4-7 per head of population.

In spite, therefore, of Assam's position as third in the list of Central, and third also in the list of combined Central and Provincial collections, there is an overdraft of 2 crores 11 lakhs, an amount which exceeds the purely provincial heads of revenue in any one year by fifteen lakhs. Yet we are expected, and indeed are trying hard, to wipe out this deficit by annual repayments, which can only be done by incurring fresh loans, a state of affairs which, in a commercial undertaking, would not be tolerated for a moment. I ask the Government of India how long such a state of affairs is to be allowed to continue? But not only have we to contemplate the day to day expenditure, we have to develop and expand our resources, improve existing and create new communications, in circumstances so costly as to be incredible to those who are unaware of the conditions: and, further, endeavour to maintain and expand our social services.

I would acknowledge with appreciation the Finance Member's beginning in the matter of proposed improvement in communications, but while doing so, it must be borne in mind that these grants are for approved schemes, and while likely to be of inestimable value in the future, do not in any way relieve the strain and anxiety of the present straitened position regarding revenue. I acknowledge his reference to Assam in the budget speech the more readily, not so much for the amount of the assistance as for his real understanding of the problem.

[Mr F. W. Hockenhull.]

But there is another aspect of the picture—the effect of the continuous borrowing and state of bankruptcy upon the morale of the people of the province.

When we speak of the province, let us not forget that, besides the territory, the rice-lands and jungle, the forests and the tea gardens, there are the inhabitants to consider, and that prosperity or depression is not a question only of balance sheets but a reflection of the condition of these people. (Hear, hear.), We are apt to think of Government in the abstract as if it were a machine and not composed of men of like feelings with ourselves. Government have their own problem. It is their responsible duty to carry on. Without borrowing they cannot carry on. As honest borrowers, how are they to repay the loan? In circumstances so demoralising, the best tribute that can be paid to the Government and the Legislative Council is the admission of the Audit Department of the Government of India. They have steadfastly pursued a policy of stemming the tide of disaster, have effected economies almost to the point of deterioration, have honestly tried to establish equilibrium in the face of insuperable difficulties and are even now investigating the possibility of fresh taxation. Are they never to have the satisfaction of positive achievement?

And what of the people themselves? Their record in the working of the reforms is second to none. Given a fair chance, I am confident that they will maintain that record. What enthusiasm, what interest, can be expected for the next instalment, which, in present circumstances, can mean only further privation? I ask, Sir, that the Honourable Member will give this his urgent consideration and some hope of an early response to our appeal. (Applause.)

Khan Sahib Shaikh Fazl-i-Haq Piracha (North-West Punjab: Muhammadan): Sir, I have been looking forward to an opportunity to voice the grievances of the people of my constituency, but hitherto I could not find any. I am thankful to you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to have a say and to represent the views of my constituents on two important matters. Sir, one concerns a most important section of the Muslims of India, that is, the Sayyids, and the other, to which I would like to allude, is the class of poor, helpless, petty zamindars of the Lower Jhelum colony who hold Government grants of land on horse-breeding conditions under the Army Remount Department.

Mr. President, you know with what respect and reverence the Sayyids are looked upon by the Muslim community, and you can, therefore, well imagine the feelings of the general Muslim public, on any untoward treatment the Sayyids are accorded by the Government. Sir, the Sayyids are a class of most courageous and brave people, fit in every respect to be enlisted in the army, but, so far as I know, the door of the Military Department is closed upon them and very many restrictions are laid upon their enlistment to the army. Sir, the Sayyids are a very important class of zamindars in the Punjab, with a strong build and stout physique, like that of our Honourable colleague Nawab Sir Sayad Muhammad Mehr Shah. There are among them landlords holding large areas in the districts of Shahpur, Jhang and Multan. They form the backbone of the Punjab Province wielding considerable influence with the general Muslim population. I don't know what reasons are there to justify the Government's action for restricting the enlistment of the Sayyids to the army. There is

a great feeling of resentment amongst this section of the Muslim community, and it might, after some time, develop into a serious agitation. The Sayyids are regularly organising themselves to fight their cause and I think the Government must have received representations on that account. I would advise the Army Department to take this matter in a very serious way, and to place the views of the Sayyid community, which I am voicing now, for action before the Government before any agitation is started by the Sayyid community.

Sir, the next point on which I wanted to make my observations is about the horse breeders who form the bulk of the voting population of my constituency who are in a bad plight and suffering under hard restrictions. Sir, it was in the year 1902, on the opening of the Lower Jhelum canal in the Punjab that the Government decided to distribute about 400,000 acres of Government waste lands to zamindar peasants on the horse breeding conditions in plots of fifty acres each, to produce remounts for the army, which spends a huge item on importing remounts from foreign countries. This colony of the horse breeders, besides rendering service to the Army Department, brings annually an income of several lakhs of rupees in the shape of the land revenue and water rates Mr. President, when the declaration by the Government was made for the grant of lands on horse breeding conditions, the people, fascinated by the prospects, flocked from every quarter of the Punjab and agreed to leave their homes to do service to the Government and thereby earn their living by tilling the lands and breeding horses. Sir, the conditions for the horse breeding grants are very rigid and hard for the grantees and they need reconsideration and revision. Sir, a grantee holding land under the horse breeding conditions, has to permanently keep a mare of a very good type, approved by the Officers of the Remount Department, for regularly breeding remounts for the army, utilising only the services of a stallion selected by the Department. The grantee has further to fulfil many other conditions and observe several restrictions in order to keep on the grant and to save it from confiscation. Sir, these conditions may be divided into three heads, firstly conditions regarding the land in grant itself, secondly the conditions regarding the mare and its progenies and thirdly the conditions regarding the grantee himself. The land in grant is to remain the property of the Government and the grantee is to be only a tenant of the Government without any proprietary rights. The grantee, therefore, cannot, without the previous sanction of the Financial Commissioner, transfer or attempt to transfer any right, title or interest in or possession of the property. The grantee cannot even sublet the produce of the land for more than two harvests. Nor, can he sell any trees in the land, even though they may have been planted by himself. In matters of succession, the rule of primogeniture is to be observed and the other heirs of the grantees have got no right or interest in the grant, no matter how much hard labour or capital they might have put in, for the improvement of the grant land or the purchase of a mare.

Mr. President, as regards the mare and its progenies, the mare, in the first place, must necessarily be approved by an officer of the Remount Department. The grantee cannot sell or transfer the mare without the permission of the Army Remount Superintendent. The progenies of the mare, until they have attained the age of eighteen months, cannot be sold, but to the Government and at a price fixed by the Army Remount Department, however low that may be. Besides this, the grantee has to maintain and manage the mare and its progeny in such a manner and at such places

[Khan Sahib Shaikh Fazl-i-Haq Piracha.]

as the Remount Officer may think fit and has to present them as many times and at any place the Officer may choose to appoint. As regards the grantee himself, he has permanently to reside in his land, no matter if he may have his sons or servants to look after the mare or the crops. It is also incumbent upon him to render every sort of assistance to the administration in the prevention or detection of crime like a headman or a watchman of a village. Another condition was afterwards added which I will read out from page 79 of the Punjab Colony Manual:

"The tenant shall be bound to be and to remain at all times of loyal behaviour and to render active support to the Government and its officers in any time of trouble and disorder. The decision of the Local Government, whether this condition has been violated by the tenant, shall be final and, if the Local Government is of opinion that the tenant has committed a breach of this condition, it may resume the tenancy or any portion thereof, either temporarily or permanently, and such resumption shall not affect any other penalty to which the tenant may be liable under these conditions or otherwise.

If the tenant is ordered under section 118 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to execute a bond to be of good behaviour, or is sentenced to a term of imprisonment of one year or longer and the order or sentence is not set aside or the sentence not reduced to a term of less than one year on appeal or revision he shall be deemed to have committed a breach of the conditions of his tenancy and the Collector may order the resumption of the tenancy as provided in section 24 of the Act aforesaid."

Sir, when failure to abide by the aforesaid conditions makes the grant liable to confiscation, the House can well judge the difficulties of a poor grantee. In getting the tenancy of only about 50 acres of land the poor grantees have pawned themselves, their children, their cattle and the mare with the Government to serve them day and night like prisoners in jail without any apparent handcuffs or fetters. For a slight infringement of the conditions the grantees are either heavily punished with fine or with confiscation of the grant. The horse breeding grantees have altogether lost their personal as well as moral liberty. They have to keep in good humour the officers of every department and above all the employees of the Army Remount. Any person of the Remount service, from a stallion stable groom to the highest officer, can bring havoc upon the poor grantee, nay the police too is not the less strong in this matter. For the displeasure of any of them they can at any time bring the grantee confiscation rules into operation and the grantee can be turned out of his grant empty handed at any time. Some years back an agitation against these rules and the treatment of the employees of the Army Remount Department was started by the horse breeder grantees in the Shahpur district, but it was subsided with the wise handling of the affairs by the local district officers and the higher authorities. But the feelings are still there and it is just possible that a current of the same agitation may run again. The people are extremely anxious in getting the rules and the conditions changed and to secure the proprietary rights of the holdings they have on any reasonable conditions the Government may impose. A Colony Committee was appointed in 1908 to consider the question of giving proprietary rights in the grant colonies and for the information of the House I will read out a passage from the Punjab Colony Manual by Mr. Wace explaining the views of the committee on this question:

"In considering the conditions on which a colony should be established it is essential that from the first, it should be kept in view that the colonisation stage is a temporary one, that the object to be aimed at is the final establishment of a prosperous and well-settled community to whom no right or liberty will be wanting

which is with advantage to the common weal enjoyed by the members of older communities. It is obvious that in order to secure the effective settlement of a colony to avoid the chaotic condition in which colonists would unregulated, establish themselves and to effect such improvements in the standard of comfort and well-being as can be obtainted by temporary guidance and education it is desirable that conditions be laid down to which would-be colonists must for a time submit themselves. But it cannot be contemplated that restrictions or conditions which detract from the liberty allowed by the common law to all good citizens should continue after the colonization stage is passed. To maintain such restrictions would be to render a district which had once been a colony a less free, and therefore in some respects a less desirable, place of residence than the districts from which the settlers were drawn. The hope may be indulged that, in some respects, the period of restriction and guidance may have abiding results in the habits and customs of the descendants of the first colonists, but it would be in every way unreasonable and inexpedient that restraints considered inappropriate for citizens elsewhere should apply to those citizens whose ancestors have brought new lands under colonization It appears therefore to be axiomatic that special conditions imposed on colonists should be so contrived as to prepare them for the stage at which the colony would come under the common law of the province to which it belongs."

Then, they give their reasons why, after a certain stage, the restrictions over proprietary rights should be removed. They say:

"*First.*—According to ancient custom the reclamation of waste and unappropriated land is recognised throughout Northern India as giving a little to proprietary rights, and in giving lower rights, Government will be open to the charge of conceding less than is due by ancient custom.

Second.—The wish of the colonists to acquire the proprietary status is a very strong one; it is based partly on sentimental, and partly on practical, grounds which are not unreasonable, and a concession by Government on this point is likely to evoke feelings of real gratitude.

Third.—The withholding of such rights has given rise to an idea, in the colonies and elsewhere, that Government regard with disapprobation the status of proprietors.

Fourth.—The grant at an appropriate time of such rights would be an immense stimulus in the progress of the development of the colonies.

Fifth.—Such a grant is necessary to allow the colonies when fully developed to come under the ordinary law of the Punjab

Sixth.—The power of alienation implied in proprietary rights appears essential to the future economic evolution of the colony, restricted alienation would ultimately result in extreme sub-division of property and a consequent general depreciation of the average standard of prosperity. It permits of no rewards for energy on the part of those who remain on their lands and gives no stimulus to enterprise on the part of those, who might leave the colony were they not tied to it by their small holdings

Seventh —The concession need cost nothing to Government."

Sir, these are the views of the Committee which was appointed in 1908 and to which the Punjab Government and the Government of India agreed, but they ordered that excepting the Jhelum Colony, alone, where the question is reserved for further consideration in connection with the treatment of service grants, the colonists in other colonies, not holding on service condition, should be allowed to acquire proprietary rights. It is almost 27 years now that conditions stand unaltered and the question requires the consideration of Government. Sir the present system of popular election to the local bodies, the Legislative Council, Assembly and the Council of State, may be an advancement for other people but for these grantees it is a curse and a nuisance, for they are very often discouraged from exercising their own will in the matter of voting. (*Mr. S. Satyamurti*: "By whom?") By the interested remount officials. They cannot afford to incur the displeasure of any employee of the Remount Department in their district, whatever position he may hold, for the displeasure of any such person may harm them much.

Mr. B. Das: Sir, on a point of order. Last year, there was a ruling from the Chair that when we are discussing the Finance Bill generally every Department is criticised and representatives of those Departments should be present. Now, my Honourable friend is discussing an army question, but we do not find any representative of the Army Department present here. Now, can the Honourable the Leader of the House take notes on every subject and give a reply categorically? I do hope your ruling will be the same.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There is no question of a ruling, but the Chair does think it is only right that the Honourable Members representing the different Departments of Government should be present when the Finance Bill is being discussed.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Sir, last year this question was raised, and I gave definite instances that if any gentleman on this side gives wrong facts, they ought to be corrected immediately by the Members of Government. Otherwise we build up a theory on wrong facts.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has pointed out the desirability of Honourable Members of Government being present.

Khan Sahib Shaikh Fazl-i-Huq Piracha: Sir, I was speaking about interference in election affairs. The employees of the Remount Department are second Gods of the horse breeders grantees, and even though they may have no indication from an officer of the Remount, the knowledge of the connections of a candidate with any officer of the District Remount Department is a sufficient warning to the horse breeder voters against their ignoring these connections. Unfortunately the Remount Department probably has no fixed period of term for an officer whether of a lower or of a higher grade to remain at one station, like that of the civil departments. I would very strongly suggest that such officers as have to deal with the horse breeders directly or indirectly should not be allowed to stay for more than two or three years at one station. No officer of the department should ever be posted at such circle or in such an area where he has got vested interests of himself or his relations. I need not dilate on this point and I hope the department will take note of this matter.

Sir, I have a little more to say about the industry of horse breeding itself and I have got a note with me written by Major Vanorenen, a well known horse breeder of the Punjab in the Montgomery district, who is known to be an authority on the subject. In his opinion, the horse breeding scheme in the Punjab is not progressing owing to certain obstacles, removal whereof necessitates immediate consideration of the Department concerned. His reasons are:

"Firstly, a rigid system is instituted which prevents the more enterprising breeders from profiting by keeping better mares, in that they are compelled to sell their produce to the Army Remount Department at prices which do not vary proportionately to the quality of the produce. More or less the same prices are paid whether the produce are good or indifferent.

Secondly, there is no remunerative market for the young stock which are not accepted by the Remount Department. The number of stock not accepted because they are slightly below or above the rigid Army standard of measurement at too young an age to judge horses, is much greater than the number accepted. Breeders, having

to make room for later born produce, are compelled to sell the unaccepted stock at sacrificial and absolutely minimum prices to Bojpuri breeders who ruin them. Not only is this a severe discouragement to the breeders, but the wastage of stock is immense. If there were more encouragement to the breeders to keep their unaccepted stock, or to other zamindars to buy them, and rear them for a year or two longer, the large majority would develop into very good horses."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would point out to the Honourable Member that he is entering into details which are not relevant at this stage.

Khan Sahib Shaikh Fazl-i-Huq Piracha: I must mention all the difficulties that result from the restrictions and hardships under which the horse-breeding community is working in my constituency. I would strongly urge upon the Government the necessity of appointing a committee of the Members representing the Colonists in the Central Legislature to advise them in these matters and to reconsider the conditions which are laid upon these petty zamindars who have only small holdings to live upon.

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, this Finance Bill deals with the duties on salt, silver, skins, postage rates and income-tax. Of these, the salt rate is continued, silver rates reduced, the duties on skins abolished, postage rates continued and income-tax and super-tax reduced. This Bill can be said to be the off-shoot of the Finance Bill of 1931, or rather the two Finance Bills of 1931. Now, Sir, it is a very striking coincidence that, in this period from 1931 to 1934-35, we are passing through a period of emergency legislation and emergency measures both in the sphere of politics and in the sphere of economics and finance. It will appear that in the sphere of politics in this period, we have got so many pieces of emergency legislation, sometimes beginning as an Ordinance and then being put permanently on the Statute-book. For instance, in 1931, we had the Indian Press Emergency Powers Act. In 1932, we had the Bengal Criminal Law Amendment Act, No. IV; in the same year, again, another Act, No. XI: then, in 1932, a third Act, the Bengal Suppression of Terrorist Outrages Act came: still another in the same year, namely, Act XXII, the Bengal Public Security Act; and still another, the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1932, XXIII of 1932. Then, in 1934, we had the Indian States Protection Act . . . . .

An Honourable Member: Louder, please.

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: I was submitting that from 1931 to 1934 or 1935, we have been passing through a period of emergency legislation both in the sphere of politics as well as in the sphere of economics and finance. In the sphere of politics, we have got so many emergency legislations, first coming as an Ordinance and then put permanently on the Statute-book. Similarly, in the sphere of economics and finance, we find there was that emergency legislation in September, 1931; although it was intended to be in operation for eighteen months only and was to expire in March, 1933: but we all know how it has been extended from year to year. There was first the extension in March, 1933, there was a second extension in March, 1934, and here we are going to have a third extension in March, 1935. In that fateful year, 1931, the rate of duty—I am speaking generally without going into details—was raised in the first instance from 15 to 20 per cent. Later on in the year, there came a crisis and there was another Finance Bill in September, 1931; and under that Act the duty was raised from 20

[Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta.]

to 25 per cent: the result was a total increase, if I have been able to calculate properly, by about 66 or 67 per cent. on the previous rate. Of course this increase was made purely for revenue purposes and not for purposes of protection or any other purpose; and all these increases were made in violation of the fundamental canons of taxation. This was done admittedly because there was a crisis to tide over and, therefore, at that critical juncture the Government did not pause to consider whether these emergency measures, etc., were proper or improper. If it is treated as a temporary measure for 18 months, of course it can be tolerated; but if it is made permanent, if it is renewed from year to year as it has been done, during these three years, it is high time to consider the ulterior and far reaching effect of this drastic taxation. There was the indiscriminate increase of 25 per cent in all cases without any regard to the fact as to whether the person taxed had the capacity to pay or whether the commodity taxed could bear the burden. In some cases, the surcharge was even on protective duties, and, therefore, the principle of protection was violated so far as the amount of protection is concerned. The tariff duties were already too high. These high surcharges on the already high revenue duties were in contravention of the law of diminishing returns. In some cases it had the effect of protecting some items which were not eligible for protection. These are all the fundamental objections to this general emergency programme of 1931; and, as I was going to submit, if it was for a temporary period, it could possibly be tolerated, but it is going to be made permanent. All this of course was for revenue purposes; but revenue is not all. Whether your object is revenue or any other, all the same it must inevitably have other reactions and therefore last year, when Sir George Schuster was dealing with this matter he said:

"As the need for revenue continues as urgent as ever, we propose to leave the other surcharges unaltered. This, however, only covers the revenue side of the matter, and there are, as I have already indicated, other possible reactions from the continued existence of these high duties which we cannot ignore."

I draw your attention, Sir, and the attention of the House to this promise made by Sir George Schuster:

"We propose during the coming year to examine this situation carefully from all points of view."

Unfortunately this year there has been again an extension, a fresh lease given to the life of these emergency measures, but it has not pleased Sir James Grigg to examine the situation. The promised examination, proposed and promised by Sir George Schuster, has not been made by his successor, yet all the taxes have been renewed. Of course, I am speaking very generally. All the drastic surcharges and new taxes and duties have been renewed except with regard to raw skin and silver and partly also with regard to income-tax. I say, Sir, that it was a very serious matter which Sir George Schuster raised. He promised an examination of the whole situation very carefully and from all points of view, as he said. Nothing of that sort has been done. On the other hand, we find that all the taxes are being renewed. I feel, Sir, that my Honourable friend, Sir James Grigg, quite forgot the fact, that he was not writing on a clean slate. There was a previous history behind it, and I feel, Sir, that he owed it to his predecessor as well as to this Honourable House to examine the whole situation in that light, and then and not till then, was he justified in renewing all these taxes and duties.

Now, Sir, this year it has been said that there has been a surplus. It is a fictitious surplus, because when all these taxes are not abolished, it cannot properly and reasonably be called a surplus at all. What has been done this year? We are grateful to Sir James Grigg for the partial relief he has given in regard to income-tax. We people are grateful for small mercies. He has done two things,—he has restored the salary cuts, and he has also given relief partially in respect of income-tax. My grievance is that before restoring the salary cuts, all the surcharges or quasi-surcharges in respect of income-tax should have been abolished. What is really the implication, the necessary result of these two things, namely the restoration of pay cuts and not raising the exemption limit from Rs. 1,000 to Rs 2,000? It only comes to this. You are taxing a monthly income of say Rs. 83. If the annual income of a man is Rs. 1,000, then his monthly income comes to about Rs. 83, and so you are going to tax a monthly income of Rs. 83—for giving relief to an officer earning Rs. 100, Rs. 500, Rs. 1,000, Rs. 2,000 a month. That is what it comes to. In this connection it is worth considering how the financial position of other people has been affected as a result of the depression. Take the case of the landlords, the moneylenders, lawyers, medical men and other professions, everybody's income has been affected, everybody's income has been reduced not by five per cent. but in some cases by 50 per cent. or even 75 or 80 per cent If that is so, are you justified, I ask, in taxing incomes between Rs. 1,000 and Rs. 2,000 to give relief to people who are earning more than 20 or 50 times that amount? Is it justice, is it equity? Therefore, I feel I am entitled to say that you are taxing the poor people to help those who are comparatively far more rich.

Let us consider another aspect of the question. I say that even in spite of the five per cent. cut, the position of Government servants has not in any way been affected very materially by this depression, because the prices of articles have fallen and the cost of living has been reduced. Therefore, the poor people, other than Government servants, feel that it is a selfish arrangement that has been effected, they feel that charity has begun at home, and that the Government and the Government servants do not exist for the people, but the poor people exist for the Government and Government servants. The question is how to balance the budget. What is the remedy? The remedy lies in the curtailment of the expenditure and the reduction in the cost of the top-heavy administration. I shall not dilate on this point, because it is a matter which has been hammered on for the last 50 years, and it is no use repeating the old arguments over and over again. It appears to me, Sir, as if a Court of Wards has been appointed to look after the interests and welfare of disqualified Indians, because it is said that Indians are incapable of managing their own affairs, but how does the Court of Wards—I mean the Government of India—deal with their wards? It is the duty of the Court of Wards to pay due attention to its wards, to give proper education to their wards, to make proper arrangement for their food, to look after their health and sanitation and generally to look after their welfare, but here we find that the entire income of the State is eaten up by those who are administering the affairs of disqualified India, and, after meeting their own expenditure, there is hardly anything left for the use of the disqualified proprietors. I should say that this amounts almost to a breach of trust. It is said that the British Government are our trustees. I do not know, Sir, who executed that deed of trust. Supposing they are our trustees,—they may or may not be our trustees,—but supposing they are our trustees, then I say they have committed a breach of trust because, before they take their fat and handsome salaries, they ought to

[Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta.]

have provided for the necessities of the people whose affairs they have taken upon themselves to manage. Then, Sir, the scale of salaries paid in this country is simply extravagant, it is unreasonably high . . . .

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Much less than the fees of lawyers.

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: On that matter I think the Honourable the Law Member is more guilty than anybody else among lawyers. Nobody has charged larger or heavier fees than my friend over there. Now, as the question has been raised, shall I say a word about the lawyer's fees? I really feel, Sir, that it is not proper for lawyers to charge exorbitant fees . . . .

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I won't charge them again.

Mr. Akil Chandra Datta: If you go back to the Bar, you will again charge the same exorbitant fees. I think if we take into account the salaries of Executive Councillors and other high officers of Government, I don't think it can be said on a fair comparison that the lawyers charge very exorbitant fees.

Now, with regard to the question of income-tax, may I take the liberty of making a suggestion, Sir. For broadcasting we have allotted Rs. 20 lakhs, and for the North-West Frontier Province Road we have allotted Rs. 25 lakhs. My own submission is, so far as this allotment for the North-West Frontier Roads is concerned, it will be perfectly clear from the statement of the Honourable the Finance Member, that this is really a misplaced grant, this is really an item of military expenditure.

Then, there is this amount of Rs. 93 lakhs for Civil Aviation. Civil Aviation is a very good thing in itself, but it should not be done by taxing the poor people. The salary cuts come to Rs. 55 lakhs and 53 lakhs in the Civil and Military Departments respectively. If all these amounts are not devoted for the purposes for which they have been proposed, but if they are devoted for the purpose of giving relief in the income-tax, that will be more proper and more reasonable. The amounts set apart for broadcasting, the North-West Frontier, Civil Aviation and the restoration of the salary cuts, will be sufficient to abolish the entire surcharge on the income-tax; they will be sufficient to raise the exemption limit to Rs. 2,000, and you can also abolish the surcharge on super-tax. There is one item, for instance, in the case of every company and registered firm, whatever its total income, the tax is two annas and two pies in the rupee. In other words, more than one-eighth of the profits, however small the total profits may be, is to go to the Government. When you add to that the surcharge, that makes it really oppressive. It really becomes a restraint on trade, as has been so truly observed in his budget speech by the Honourable the Finance Member. The most important problem for India at the present moment is the question of prices of agricultural commodities. That is a question on which so much has been said and so much has been written that I have nothing new to say. May I say only this, that recovery will not come of itself like a windfall. As in other countries you have increased taxation, but this cannot continue for any length of time, for either this year or next year the taxes have got to be reduced. It is admitted, therefore,—it is not a controversial matter—it is admitted that there must be some plan for recovery, call it constructive economic planning, or call it planned economy. You may flout it; it may be as

4 P.M.

blessed as Mesopotamia. You may not accept devaluation of the rupee as a partial solution. You may not accept the method that has been adopted in America. You may not accept President Roosevelt's plan. You may not take a lesson from Japan. All the same, there must be some way found out for recovery. What is your plan? That is the question of all questions. Increased taxation cannot be the panacea of all economic evils. It will not only not ease the situation, but will aggravate it. It will be from the frying pan into the fire. It may cure the disease, but will kill the patient. I am not an economist, I am not an expert in this matter, I have no pretensions to give advice or to make suggestions. But as a layman and as an Indian, all that I understand is that there must be some way found out for recovery. It is precisely the business of the Honourable the Finance Member. This has not been done, although this matter was elaborately discussed in the budget speech last year. Sir George Schuster said:

"True, we must have a plan, but before we have a plan, we must know our position. We do not know what is the statistical position. We must have time to study the problems and to be sure of our own position."

This is what I find was said last year in the budget speech:

"Now, in working on all the three main lines (*about the improvement of the condition of the agricultural masses*) which I have mentioned it is essential that Government should be able to give scientific study to the problems and have accurate statistical knowledge as to its own position. We have made several changes lately in our organisation in order to facilitate this. We have for some time had an economic subcommittee of Council, and we have recently set up a central bureau for Economic Intelligence and Statistics at Government headquarters. . . . Further developments on these lines will depend on the recommendations to be made by the two economic experts from England—Professor Bowley and Mr. Robertson—who are now examining the position in consultation with three Indian economists."

That was what we were told in March, 1934. In March, 1935, we are told: "Oh, that is nothing. Professor Bowley and Mr. Robertson are no good at all." Last year we were asked to wait for the report of these two gentlemen, and this year we are told that their report is worthless. I do not understand why it was said: "We must study this question. We must know what our position is. We must study statistics and so on. Our statistics are at present incorrect and unreliable." May I ask what the Director General of Commercial Intelligence and Statistics is for? We have got a department for that purpose. We were told: "All these statistics are wrong and unreliable and we must make a fresh study." These two gentlemen were brought out from England at the cost of the rate payers and now we are told that their report won't help you. Their report does not make you wiser. When and from what quarter do you expect light? Who will advise you? When are you going to make up your mind? This is the fifth or sixth year of depression. You have been talking about this problem of low prices, and every year in this House this subject has been discussed, and this being the sixth year, may we know when are you going to know your own position and when are you going to have a policy formulated? The question was categorically raised by Sir George Schuster himself last year,—how long the present state of affairs were to continue? His answer was this:

"But the fact that we have survived without disaster so far does not mean that serious problems are not being set up. It is a question of how long the present state of affairs can continue. Undoubtedly in the early stages of the depression savings in cash and other forms were drawn upon, and this cannot last for ever. Moreover, the accumulation of arrears of rent and interest may lead to a serious situation. We have

[Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta.]

throughout watched this situation carefully in close consultation with Provincial Governments, and we have now with the cordial approval of these Governments arranged to have a conference in April at which we can together review the whole situation and consider this problem of indebtedness together with all possible lines of concerted action to improve the general economic situation."

That Conference was held in April last. I have got a copy of the report of its proceedings. Sir George Schuster also investigated the question as to how far the purchasing power of the people can be stimulated by public works. Sir George Schuster was constrained to say:

"It is quite possible that the proper time has come when we may utilise this method with beneficial results."

He then said:

"For all these reasons, we have been diligently exploring possibilities."

He says further:

"In any case this is a line of policy in which the main initiative must be taken by the Provincial Governments and it is one which we propose to explore fully with them at the forthcoming conference, to which I have just referred."

Yet, we have not been told this year what is the result of all that discussion and what were the recommendations, whether any policy has been formulated, and if so, whether any action has been taken to give effect to that policy. So that, Sir, it appears to us from the promises made last year and from the attitude taken this year—I do not think anybody can quarrel with us when we say—that the Government are not at all keen about it, that they are absolutely indifferent and are treating these matters light heartedly. Although there was a promise made last year, our present Finance Member has not thought it fit even to refer to these things in his budget speech or anywhere else. Now, Sir, I am not going to make a speech on the subject of the gold standard. I shall confine myself to asking some questions. Some of these, if not all, have been put, but I have put them together and I shall be grateful if categorical answers could be given on these points by the Honourable the Finance Member. My questions on this subject are these:

Why do the other countries not part with gold? Can he explain why all countries are scrupulously safeguarding their resources of gold? Is it true that the export of gold helps the Government to carry out their remittance programme? Does he believe that the export of gold can and will continue for good, to enable India to meet her foreign commitments? If not, is it not the duty of the Government to explore all possible avenues to increase her trade balance? What is his policy to achieve this purpose? What step has been taken to give effect to this policy? Does he seriously believe that gold is as good a commodity for export as other commodities like jute, cotton, rice, etc., and that there is no fundamental difference between gold and other commodity? Has India a huge and unlimited surplus stock of gold? Does India produce gold? Does not gold represent the most dependable purchasing power, which is not possessed by any other metal or commodity? Does not this distinguish gold fundamentally from other commodities? Is he aware that even the *Economist* admitted a few weeks ago that the continuous exodus of gold is a sure index of the distress prevailing in India? Is it a fact that during the last thirty years India imported nearly 700 crores worth of gold and that during the last four years 222 crores have been exported? Is it fundamentally sound to fall back on her reserve capital instead of developing the normal trade balance in merchandise? Is it a fact that India's trade balance in merchandise is steadily diminishing?

There is just one other matter on which I want to say a few words, and that is the question of the allocation of the jute duty. Bengal claims the entire proceeds of the jute duty as a matter of right. This question has been dealt with by my Honourable friend, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra, in the course of the general discussion of the budget I shall not repeat those arguments. I shall only add one or two arguments which were not touched upon by him. At the very outset I am anxious to point out, that so far as this Legislature is concerned, it is not of very great importance. After all, it is a question of one or two years, because, under clause 137 of the Government of India Bill, this question of the allocation of the jute duty will be decided by His Majesty in Council and it is laid down there that either half or more than half . . . .

An Honourable Member: Not less than half.

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: The provision in section 137, clause (2), is this:

"Notwithstanding anything in the preceding sub-section, one half, or such greater proportion as His Majesty in Council may determine, of the net proceeds in each year of any export duty on jute or jute products shall not form part of the revenues of the Federation but shall be assigned to the provinces or Federated States in which jute is grown in proportion to the respective amounts of jute grown therein."

So, any provision that is made here will be for this year or the next year. Now, the point to which I draw the attention of the House is this. It appears that under the Meston Settlement, the percentage of total provincial revenue retained in the provinces is this: Bengal retains only 30 per cent. whereas Madras retains 69 per cent. the United Provinces 78 per cent. Punjab and Assam 85 per cent. Central Provinces 90 per cent. and Bihar and Orissa 92 per cent.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): What about Bombay?

Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta: I don't think I have got that here.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: It is worse off than you are.

Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta: I thought I would be asking for permission from Sir Cowasji to discuss this question. With your permission, I am discussing it and also with the permission of Mr. Joshi who is not here. Two arguments are advanced against our demand for the jute duty, namely, that there is permanent settlement in Bengal which is responsible for the deficit of that province and that there is the additional cost on account of the terrorist movement. So far as the permanent settlement is concerned, instead of giving my own argument, may I invite the attention of the House to the argument that was advanced by Sir Nripendra Sircar in England. I cannot put it better than he has done, and, therefore, I shall quote from his speech:

"The fact that most solemn pledges had been given by the then Central Government, and that reliance on those pledges has resulted in an extraordinarily long and complicated chain of sub-infeudation—all such considerations cannot be ignored. Treating, however, those solemn pledges as mere scraps of paper the matter may be considered from the strictly business point of view."

[Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta.]

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. S. Satyamurti (one of the Panel of Chairmen).]

What follows is important:

"The introduction of the Permanent Settlement, and the various Tenancy Acts which followed it, have enabled the Bengal tenant to pay rent at a low level. One has only to compare the low rent paid by him with those paid in other provinces. If the tenant is rack-rented, he cannot possibly bear the burden of the Jute Export duty which really means an addition to the land revenue."

Had there been no permanent settlement and no special taxation on jute, the rent of the tenant would have been greatly enhanced and Bengal would have enjoyed a corresponding increase in land revenue. Therefore, the benefit from jute, the peculiar crop of Bengal, has been taken, not by Bengal, through enhancement of the Land Revenue, but by the Central Government, through an Export Duty.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi (Dacca *cum* Mymensingh: Muhammadan Rural): What is that book, Sir?

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: A compilation of the speeches and writings of Sir Nripendra Sircar in England. Then, as regards the cost of the terrorist movement, I shall simply lay the figures before the House, and they will speak for themselves. The cost of the terrorist movement in Bengal was this. In 1931-32, only 21½ lakhs; in 1932-33, 47 lakhs; in 1933-34, 53¾ lakhs; in 1934-35, 62½ lakhs,—and we know that the deficit has been for these years two crores, and the total jute duty is over three crores. Therefore, the cost of the terrorist movement should not stand in the way and cannot account for the deterioration in the financial position.

One word about the postal rates. Now, this is a matter which has been discussed thread-bare on many occasions. I shall say only one word about this, and that is this. Looking at the matter from the point of view of the Government, I think it is quite desirable that the postal rates should be reduced, because I cannot imagine any other case in which a reduction will please so many people of this country all round. Such a reduction of postal rates will be a relief to as many people as there are in India. Everybody, the poorest man, will be benefited, and that is an aspect of the matter which I submit should be considered in this connection. There are other matters upon which I should have liked to speak, but I shall not take up any more time of the House. (Applause.)

Pandit Nilakantha Das: (Applause.) Sir, it is rather sometimes painful to be dragged into academic discussions on financial measures or other measures like this in this House, but we have got to do it. We are not responsible, Sir, in any way for the Finance Bill, and we never hope to be,—rather we are precluded by all means from taking any active part in framing the financial policy of our own nation. It is not the custom to send the Finance Bill to a Select Committee, but still I gave an amendment to that effect, hoping that we should at least be allowed to sit and discuss across the table the provisions of that Bill, and, if possible, that we shall thus be able to re-shape the Bill according to the needs of our nation,—at all events, we hoped, if possible, that we might contribute

something towards the re-shaping of the Bill; but it was found that no useful purpose would be served by moving that amendment here. The Bill is there, and it must be taken as such. We are here to amend it—for what purpose? We do not know.

Coming to the policy of the Administration of this country including its financial policy, it may be defined in one sentence. The whole and sole object of this has been, and still is, to find a market for British industrial products. . . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Absolutely untrue.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I shall prove it.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: You will not, you cannot.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: . . . . . and the suitable investment for British money. I am not depending upon mere inferences, and let not anybody understand that, because I am a nationalist and a Congressman, I say this. I shall not delve into the ways adopted during the eighteenth century. They may be very very unpalatable, and I hope my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, will agree with me that, in those dark days, that was the object of the then policy of the Government of India. Even in the latter half of the last century, whether we required our railways for our development or not, nobody knew, we did not know, money came forth on guaranteed interest and that rate of interest we are still paying on some of them, and then, when a great number of lines were built, doubled, and sometimes quadrupled, and materials were purchased and wasted, and when, even in spite of all this, we were still economically at least vegetating, some cotton mills were set up in Bombay, and an import revenue duty was levied on cotton goods, at once the cry from England was there—"no import duty; if you have it, you must have a countervailing excise duty". Sir, that cotton excise duty was a scandal so long. This cannot be denied. Then, even in spite of that, I may say that the policy of Imperial preference for purchases began just in the beginning of this century. Now, what does all that show? Lord Curzon turned it down in 1903. He was afraid of reprisals of Indian articles in other countries as measures of retaliation. But, at that time, the unemployment in England was not a keen question. Then, just after the War, when other countries in the world were growing in industrialism and in industrial outlook, and there were competitors and England was in danger of being dislodged from her unique industrial position, what happened? Just before the Montford reforms, in the Imperial Council that preference showed its head again. It is not really protection for "Indian industries". I shall come to that later on—it is not for the protection of our industries that the policy of protection is there. What was there at the basis of that policy? Preference to British industries. There was a Resolution specially for British preference, and that came in 1922, under the new reforms. The result of it was the Taxation Enquiry Committee. What were the terms of reference? This is what was included definitely therein: preference to Imperial or British products. But now the world has changed and the eighteenth century methods of rule by the rod are not perhaps considered advisable. So, we are deluded with forms of Commissions and Committees. Some of my Honourable friends just now complained that there was this Committee and there was that Committee and

[Pandit Nilakantha Das.]

their conclusions were not listened to. But it is not that the Government is for the Committees, but they are for the Government. If it is to their interest, the Government will follow their recommendations. Otherwise not. So the policy of preference was simply veneered over by these committees and commissions; and so are measures sometimes also glossed over even with the word constitution and even with the League of Nations. What are all these to us? Simply some forms with which the whole thing is veneered over so as to make it appear that it is something in accordance with the constitution or this or that. In 1924-25, the thin end of the wedge, as my late Leader, Pandit Motilal Nehru, said, was introduced in the shape of protection to steel industry, and preference came later on in 1927. In that preference what was the condition? When we gave preference to steel, we were producing on some of the items not even two per cent., but yet we gave a tariff preference. If the Honourable Member wants it, I shall show the figures. Indian production of galvanised sheet was not even two per cent. of our total consumption, it was a little over one per cent. and we put in 1927 the protective tariff. It was partly protective tariff and bounty in 1924, and, so far as protection was by bounty, it was good. But the bounty was meant only to lure the nation to give a tariff protection to an industry producing only less than two per cent. of our requirements, and our industrialists and our big men backed the measure even with a British preference. Even now we produce galvanised sheets about 30 per cent. but this percentage is not so much due to the promotion of our own industry as it is due to a reduction of consumption. It may also be partly due to world depression, but the high indirect taxes and the protective tariff in themselves are responsible for the decreasing purchasing power of the Indian taxpayer. Now, what is the consumption of the steel that we were protecting by tariff? Today it is less than half. When we began protection in 1926-27, it was 14 lakhs of tons and now it is five.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Whose fault is it? Whom are you blaming for that?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I am blaming the protection by tariff which has led to the loss of purchasing power and specially when that tariff is levied with a view to preferring British goods and ostensibly to protect our industries producing a very small fraction of our requirements. You are not promoting our industry, and everything nowadays is laid at the door of the world depression. But do the world depression and the Indian depression mean one and the same thing? We have got a very extensive home market, we have got natural resources and we have hoarded gold in this country, and there are various other means by which we could have thwarted this world depression, at least sixty per cent. of it. But where are we today? We are more depressed; our purchasing power is much less than it is in any other country, it is much less than that of any other taxpayer in any other part of the world. But India is a rich country, we have got an extensive home market and vast resources. During all these years, you have purchased so many things. What have you produced here? You have given protection to so many industries. Even with regard to this steel industry for which you have cleverly changed a bounty to tariff protection, you have slyly, without the knowledge of the public, diverted even the contracted purchases of certain articles from Indian companies to firms in England. Even in the year 1931-32, when

the purchases for India were the slenderest, the Government purchased the least in India. India perhaps got only whatever was left after satisfying Britain. Did the Honourable Member ever notice this fact?

The Industrial Commission recommended, in order to give impetus at least to our industry, to establish a Stores Purchase Department under the Government of India. The Department is no doubt there in name. I have myself pressed the point very often as to why all the purchases cannot be centralised in the Indian Stores Department. That was never done. There must be a Marshal General here and an Agent of Railway there, a Controller of Purchases here and another there. There must even be some patentees here who will supply articles at monopoly price. Some Honourable Members may be surprised, that even servants of the Government who are interested in purchase can hold patents and monopolies. We have got our Department of Standardisation. I was surprised to find that a question was put in the Council of State in 1933 by the Honourable Mr. J. C. Banerjee. The question was:

"(a) Is it a fact that Mr. John Dallas Wrench, Mechanical Engineer, Railway Board and Mr. J C Mahindra obtained a patent for non-slipping fastenings for securing railroad sleepers to rails? If so, is it the same Mr. Wrench who is now a Member of the Railway Board?

(b) Are Government servants allowed to take patents for articles supplied to the Department in which the officer is employed?"

The answer, which the Honourable Sir Guthrie Russell gave, was:

"(a) Yes.

(b) Government servants are permitted to patent any of their inventions."

I know, as a matter of fact, even in the case of bridge making, our Railway Engineer and an Englishman planned some parts which could not be purchased in this country. Some firms in England held the patents for these parts. These standardised patents may be English or may be Indian. But a patent is a patent. It is a monopoly which leads to corruption. As a matter of fact, the other day, I put a question about Diesel oil engines, and the reply was that some of the parts are patents still. The reply was perhaps that the whole engine was a patent sometime ago, but that the patent has expired; but still some parts are patents. As to the rails, for instance, we have got a contract with the Tatas to supply all the rails. The Tatas are dying for want of rail orders. Still, under the name of 'sorbetic' rails, a good lot is being purchased, year after year, from England. Sleepers and their fashionings also are similarly brought from England under various pretexts. I asked a question here as to the reason why these sleepers are purchased in England. When I was here last time I wanted to see that no purchase of any article which can be produced in India should go to any other country. And it was so in 1929-30 when no sleepers or rails were purchased from outside.

Mr. P. R. Rau (Financial Commissioner, Railways): Sir, on a point of order. My Honourable friend has got on the order paper questions in regard to all these facts. Is it not better that he should wait and hear those answers rather than make statements without giving this side an opportunity for a reply?

Mr. Chairman (Mr. S. Satyamurti): There is no point of order, but the Honourable Member will be well advised to wait till answers are given to those questions, and not refer to them now.

Mr. P. R. Rau: The questions are coming on in a few days.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I say what I know.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Why do you ask then?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: So that my friends may know. If I am mistaken, I may be corrected here. Why should I be precluded from saying what I know? It is not your property or any other man's property that I am using. What I mean to say is that they are purchasing from England inspite of the fact that the articles can be purchased in India, and that is a fact. If my Honourable friend, Mr. Rau, does not like it, I will not say any more, for, this being a discussion on the Finance Bill, this much will be enough. Let Honourable Members know that this is the basis of the entire policy of the administration.

Then, what are the methods of administration? To make money any how and to spend it for certain purposes which would better be left unsaid in so many words. It is for perpetually keeping Indian culture and Indian intellect under bondage. I do not say economically, that is a plain question. Of course, I did not enter into the question of foreign loans, to which let me refer here in passing. The other day, I put a question on the subject if there is any distinction or any account between Indian and foreign loans and if there is any plan for converting foreign loans into Indian loans. I did not ask anything about the interest. I shall surely be told that that is entirely a business proposition. But my view is that Indian interest is lower than English interest, and so, it was two years ago, when at a higher interest, money was borrowed in England. That I know, but still I believe that even at a little higher interest money should be secured in India and foreign loans should always be repaid, for, in our loans, we do not get money and pay interest alone. We get English products for loan, as we are often simply lured into it. When my Honourable friend, the Deputy Leader of my Party, was asking for a planning and a loan of 100 crores for development, the Honourable the Finance Member was perhaps laughing to mean that it was not a possible proposition. He has, I think, interrupted somewhat to that effect. Evidently he did not relish it.

I will tell you how it was possible when English articles could not find a market in the world. In the Imperial Economic Conference of 1923, Sir Charles Innes, the then Commerce Member, was representing India, and there were talks about mutual advantages to India and England, and that by means of loans by purchase of articles, etc., and there he says:

"'India is buying much, but the question now is, cannot she buy more?' I have no difficulty in answering that question ....Every thinking person in India is agreed that what India wants is a bold constructive programme of development." (*Report, page 54.*)

This is just on the eve of borrowing 30 crores for five years, and this bold programme for borrowing and development was passed in this House. Then:

"In order that full use may be made of her great resources large sums have been set aside for rehabilitation of her railways", etc.

"Government estimated that something like 70 million sterling would be spent on imported stores during the next five years for railways and other development schemes. As in the past, so in the future, I have no doubt that the skill and enterprise of the British manufacturer will see to it that the vast bulk of their monies (*i.e., Indians' monies*) will be spent in this country." (*Report, page 55*).

This did not satisfy the Chairman, who said:

"Take India. Mr. Innes gave us a picture of a big programme. There was, if I remember aright, 70 million worth of orders which would be placed for five years. What I would put to you is, supposing assistance were given in the matter of interest, would it be possible for India to increase the programme above the figure at present in their minds and/or alternately—I put it for preference 'and'—while increasing the aggregate of the programme to take some of the orders of the later years and put them in earlier years? For instance, you have this programme spread over five years, that is to say 15 million pounds a year. Now can you take all or any part of the last two years' programme and put it in hand in the first two years if some assistance were given in the matter of interest? Those are the kind of things which I wish to see if we can accelerate to our mutual advantage." (*Report, page 158*)

Mark these words, "to our mutual advantage". Then our representative makes this reply after expressing satisfaction that such a proposal was made:

"At the end of this year we shall have spent—on railway material alone—35 million pounds in the course of three years, and about 90 per cent, has been spent in this country. With the full assent of the Legislative Assembly, only last year, we decided that we must make a real effort to rehabilitate our railways, and for that rehabilitation programme we have set aside the sum of 100 million sterling. We anticipate that in the next five years 57 millions will be spent on material usually imported into India, and of that 57 millions I am sure that the British manufacturer will see to it that the greater part is spent in England.

That is by no means the whole story. I have referred so far only to the rehab litation of the railways We hope to be able to embark upon some new construction, although I recognise that new construction does not interest His Majesty's Government as much as rehabilitation at the present time." (*Report, page 167.*)

The last sentence is significant, for new construction means purchase of earthwork, gravel, concrete, wood sleepers, and many other things, which are necessarily purchased in India.

Then, he referred to the scheme for the development of the Bombay City which would cost many million pounds. He also refers to the Sukkur Barrage and many other provincial schemes and says that orders for many millions of pounds will go to England. This is how development is good: and what is good for the gander is not good for the goose. Both borrowing and development are there when some development of English industry or to find markets for the products thereof were necessary; but when my Honourable friend said, "Borrow 100 crores", he was not in the Treasury Benches, he was not in the confidence of the Finance Department—it may be 100 crores or it may be 10 crores or more or less, it does not matter—the principle is the national development and national uplift. I say, these two things ought not to have been so very unpalatable had it not been for the fact that our Government is run with an object which is not primarily the promotion of Indian interests.

Take, again, the policy of taxation. I have already said we are being enslaved even in culture, in theorising and in everything. We have to take it for granted that whatever is good for England is good for us. The argument is always trotted out "Army? Look at England. Navy? Look at England. Industries? Look at England. Take the Ottawa Agreement: we make all arrangements with the dominions: why should you not be there?" I was once reading, that even in the matter of the Tata Iron and Steel Company, when they first wanted money for floating the company, Mr. Jamshedji Tata went to England twice or thrice for raising it, and he also brought out English experts to find out areas of coal and iron, neither

[Pandit Nilakantha Das.]

the money was available, nor could the experts find any iron ore. In disgust, he gave it up: fortunately for him, the swadeshi movement came and somebody put it into his head—I think it was Mr. P. N. Bose who pointed out the iron and the coal near the iron. Money was raised in India, and, in three weeks' time, more than enough money was subscribed, and so it is now an Indian company. Whenever we think of anything, we are asked to go to England and see whether it is or is not done in England. We have got our Ottawa Agreement that way and also our high tariff wall all round.

In this tariff, if you analyse the income from taxes you find Rs. 16 crores from income-tax and 61 crores from customs excise, including salt. The entire tax income is 78 crores: practically customs and income-tax are the only two heads that give the taxes. By customs we are paying 61 crores. that means each man in India pays, taking 28 crores as the population in British India . . . .

An Honourable Member: You must include the States also.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Very well; it is about Rs. 2 per head; and if you analyse some of these taxes like salt, matches, kerosene, and perhaps sugar—our people do not get sugar, but never mind—about six annas or more of this is poll-tax which every man must pay.

We know the paying capacity of our people today. The price of the produce—the price of food grains in our country today is well-known—over and above that, you have got rice export duty, which is under consideration —I know it would be long before the decisions are published, as my friend, Mr. Satyamurti,—you, Sir,—asked the other day and got a reply. How does it all affect the taxpayer? Today, in my part of the country, I know that one acre of land, according to the settlement officer's calculation, costs Rs. 20 to Rs. 21 to cultivate it and it produces 15 to 16 maunds of paddy on the average: the price of paddy is between 1-4 and 1-8 per maund: where is the margin? Rice is not demanded in foreign countries; hence it is not a thing to be explained to anybody that today the export duty falls upon the ryot, the producer and not upon the consumer: it cannot be transferred to the purchaser and falls upon the producer as an additional land tax. As I was saying, 15 maunds of paddy means 10 maunds of rice: and on each maund of rice there is a duty of 2a. 3p. Then on each acre of land the peasant pays an additional tax of Re. 1-6 all over India; whether Government gets the money or not does not matter; the peasant pays it indirectly to somebody: he does not get it; and so, when this is the condition, where is the margin for him? In the name of industry or whatever you may call it, you are going on putting indiscriminately indirect taxes. I see the expenditure is there and I cannot change it; but to live for the time being I propose this: you reduce indirect tax wherever possible—and not the direct tax. But when the opportunity came, you trotted out the plea that you were pledged to reduce the surcharge on income-tax; and that will be reduced by one-third in the same way as the tax on incomes from Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 2,000: that is only Rs. 75 lakhs. Of course this may not be palatable even to many of my own friends, but I feel it very sorely that when the man is paying at least Rs. 2 to the Government Treasury and about that sum, if not more, to the pockets of our industrialists in protection, and over and above this loses in export duty, he is being taxed

to the tune of Rs. 4 or more on the average. With what heart do you not think of reducing some tax either from salt or from kerosene which is an article of his daily use? He is not living today. As I said, he is simply vegetating. How this poor man is able to keep his body and soul together is really a mystery to me. How long can this state of affairs continue? How long can the Government make money like this? Of course, those people who are paying surcharges are certainly in affluent circumstances, and it is not so difficult for them as it is for the poor people to pay for the State.

5 P.M. Look at the civilized countries of the world. England is always cited as an example, and so we shall take England first There the customs revenue in 1933-34 was 209 million pounds, excise 117 million pounds, thus indirect tax total is 326 million pounds. Then, again, income-tax 336 million pounds, other direct tax, such as estate duty etc., 112 million pounds, and all told the revenue yield from direct tax is 448 million pounds Now, let us take the United States of America, and there the yield from income-tax was 10.57 million dollars, customs 328 million dollars.

An Honourable Member: For what year?

Pandit Nilakantha Das. It is perhaps for the year 1932-33 the latest year available, whatever it be.

Now, let us take Japan which is protecting all her industries.....

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) resumed the Chair.]

Japan's development of industries under the fostering hand of the State is really unrivalled. Japan's revenue from income-tax was 138 million yens, and that from customs was 113 million yens. Even in England, it will be observed that whenever they thought it necessary to impose an indirect tax, they always took care to see that it was not put on articles of necessity or on the means of production, because if they did so, it would retard the industrial progress. Now, if you analyse the position in India, what do you find? Tax on articles of necessity, including salt, which is really the greatest necessity of life, both for men and animals, and on means of production is 78 to 80 per cent. of our entire indirect tax revenue of 61 crores. In England, it is 20 per cent. of the entire indirect tax revenue.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Indirect taxation in England is about 40 per cent.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I could not calculate exactly some of the items but certainly it is just half of what it is in India.

Mr. M. S. Aney: What is the percentage out of that 40 per cent. regarding the incidence of tax on articles of daily necessity?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: 40 per cent. is the taxation realised from customs and other indirect taxes, and 20 per cent. of this 40 per cent. is the amount of tax on necessities of life like tea, coffee, etc., and means

[Pandit Nilakantha Das.]

of production like oil, etc., whereas, in India, the tax realised from means of production and necessities of life is 78 to 80 per cent. of the amount of indirect tax.

Sir, I was very glad to hear the other day when my friend, the Finance Member, said that he did not like the indirect tax. I thought some provision was going to be made in the Finance Bill to give relief to the poor man in respect of the indirect tax, but, instead, I find that direct tax surcharges are reduced and the surpluses, which ought to be real surpluses, are considered to be windfalls, and something is given to the village industries in which I am not very much interested. Of course, I would much appreciate if the rural uplift movement worked well, but we have to wait and see the progress of this movement We do not know how much of the money allotted for the village uplift movement will be swallowed up by experts. I have known what many of these experts do. Perhaps an expert drawing Rs. 2,000 a month or more, with oversea allowance, would, sitting on a telescope with half a dozen butter flies or a dozen larva under it in a palatial house erected for the purpose . . . .

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: You mean a microscope?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Yes, I mean a microscope, and these experts will perhaps say that they are carrying on researches into the causes of some pest in paddy. Then there are also the Publicity and Propaganda officers, the travelling allowances, in addition to all the high salaries to be taken into account, and so, considering all these items of expenditure, it remains to be seen how much of the money allotted will go towards giving relief to the poor people. Sir, I am really very apprehensive of Government trying to dole out a crore of rupees in this fashion, for I apprehend that, on account of this, they may become even more unpopular in the long run than they are today. Therefore, my friend must take care to see that a proper distribution is made to the people and the major portion of the allotment is not swallowed up by the Government officers who will either be engaged in the work or be sent round the villages by their travelling allowances and high salaries. Now, I know there are many research schemes under consideration. We have become slaves of experts I have put a question asking how many Indians are there in these Research Departments, but I have not yet got a reply to my question. There is the Agricultural Research scheme, Marketing Board and so many other schemes all over the country, and almost at the head of every scheme, there is an Englishman, and not an Indian. I was speaking here of scandalisation . . . .

Mr. M. S. Aney: Scandalisation? Perhaps you mean standardisation?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: It is the same thing. Our friends are talking of Indianisation, and the Indianisation, that is being carried out, does not secure sufficient jobs for Indians. Sir, I submit the services ought to be modelled on the conditions prevailing in the country, and in fixing the scale of salaries to officers whom you appoint, the circumstances of the country have to be taken into consideration. We must have Indians in all our services. What is the good of giving so much money to outside experts? I have perhaps taken a very long time.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Now, I shall directly come to some of the features of the budget. Much has been said on the export of gold and our ratio and rupee being linked with sterling and with gold. I leave that.

Here I point out some interesting item. I observe in the budget that we are going to have no more revenue from provision opium perhaps from this year. My Honourable friend, Sir Leslie Hudson, is not here today, but he was expressing sorrow the other day that China eats opium but she does not eat opium from us. Let the Chinese eat opium, but we shall not be a party to selling them opium. It is their look out to put their house in order.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: They are having opium from other places.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: If you can sell to China or in the North Pole, that is a separate issue, that is not under discussion now,—perhaps I may agree with my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, when I consider that question. But, what is the position now? In India what are you doing? I speak of excise opium. This excise opium is sold at the cost price to provinces, that is, the price is practically fixed, or if it varies at all from year to year on account of depression, it should be less, it cannot be more. The revised estimate for this year for excise opium is 44,86,000. I do not discuss here whether provinces are selling it to their own clientele at a bigger or a smaller price, or what money they are making. That is not my concern now. But, I find that the estimate for the next year is 50,80,000. How is this increase accounted for? Probably, when you are not selling any provision opium you want to make money somehow, and it may be a plan, though my Honourable friend is opposed to planning, the increase in the sale of excise opium may be either to make a profit over the cost price, or to push more and more opium in provinces with some end in view. Which is it?

As regards roads, some money was available from the so-called windfall.

An Honourable Member: No.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Oh, no. It is from the motor oil. That goes to the North-West Frontier. If so, why should it not come from the military budget? As a matter of fact, this inter-provincial road policy, as I understand it—I have made some enquiries—is more for the military purpose than for the civil purpose. Motors are running on the poor district board roads, but the boards are not getting any money from this Road Fund. It is for inter-provincial roads, for which a standard is fixed—perhaps some cast iron plates are in contemplation for metalling or so,—that is what I read somewhere,—in order that armoured cars or motors weighing so many tons at such and such speed can go on the road. Such roads are made from the inter?provincial Road Fund. What does it show? Is it for the good of our people, for the cartman who plies his cart? As a matter of fact. I have seen on these inter-provincial roads

[Pandit Nilakantha Das]

our cartmen are asked to ply their carts just under the road in the mud, and those pucca roads are kept for motor cars. This is how the road money is being spent.

I shall not take more time of the House My last point is this scramble for jute duty, oil duty and so on. I come from a poor province. My constituency is being formed into a new province and when all the money is being divided, I must ask for something. My Honourable friend, the Finance Member, perhaps will say, you take this much of subvention, and be satisfied. But why should I ask for subvention? As regards the jute duty, I can understand. That duty is not transferred to the consumer, now that there is no big demand abroad. Most part of it is borne by the producer; so there is some reason for its being demanded. But my Honourable friend over there was asking for Assam, and he was speaking of income-tax as a contribution from the provinces, if I heard him aright. At a distance I could not hear him. But who is really paying more to the central revenue? The direct or the indirect tax-payer? 61 crores are paid by indirect tax. I ask, out of these 61 crores, how much does my poor constituency pay, which is not jute, which is not oil. Why should I get subvention? I demand a share in the money which each man in my constituency pays to the Central Government.

An Honourable Member: In the form of?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: In the form of indirect tax, and specially for protection. Why should Government pay itself 11 crores in the name of protection? The consumer pays today to Assam in the shape of excise duty on oil. Besides, without the countervailing import duty on oil, Assam oil would get no revenue.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Who are you?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I come from the constituency which I represent—Orissa.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Are you not an Indian?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Yes, I am an Indian.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: That is all right.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: If every one is taking his share, I should demand mine, and my share stands more on reason. If all the money that we pay to the general exchequer, rightly or wrongly, is divided like this, in jute export and oil excise, and so on, then my claim is, I want my proper share. Let them raise the import duty if they like, or the income-tax, or even let them levy a poll-tax from me, let them even protect industry by tariff where necessary, I am ready to pay, but let not the Government make money out of protection for budgetary purposes. That protection money should be divided amongst those people that are paying for the protection.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Is the steel industry within the jurisdiction of Orissa or of Bihar?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: If the Tata Steel Works were in Orissa, I should have some consolation, but that is not so. And the Vizagapatam Harbour, which will drain the entire western Orissa of its agricultural and forest products, is not in Orissa. Tatas live upon our iron, our manganese, and I may tell you that it has only recently been discovered that besides the store of iron ore in Mayurbhanj, which is being worked, there is an inexhaustible store of iron ore in Keonjhar which contains 67 per cent. of iron,—perhaps nowhere else in the world so big a percentage of iron is found in the ore. And all this is in Orissa, but not in Jamshedpur. All this will be exploited from my land, but I will not get the advantage or benefit of it. Orissa has been neglected and uncared for under this Government for 150 years and Orissa has been made poor now. It was an empire. On three sides it had powerful empires like Bahmani and its off-shoots, the Vijayanagar and Bengal. All these people had always an eagle's eye, a vulture's eye on Orissa. But Orissa held out as an empire for 450 years before it fell, as the last independent empire, during the days of Akbar. Orissa is poor today. You laugh at it when you speak of some subvention to it of 25 or 30 lakhs. But, I want money which I claim as a matter of right, I pay for protection all along, poor as I am, and I have no industry, in my Province. You give me some industry. I shall be satisfied. Still, I would urge that this protection money should not be swallowed by Government for budgetary purposes. If not to Orissa, let it be given to Bombay, to the Central Provinces or any other province. It is money given for industry, and must be set apart for the promotion of industry. Let it be given to the village industry, or any new industry. People that are paying it are not paying it for revenue. If you make money out of protection, then you will naturally delude us more and more into protection of industries, when protection is either useless or unnecessary. You will exploit our national sentiments for the growth of our national industry and a vested interest will be created behind you to support you with or without reason. Don't put us to that trouble. You give it in bounty to other industries. I quite agree to that, but never make revenue out of it.

Khan Sahib Nawab Siddique Ali Khan (Central Provinces: Muhammadan): Sir, I may be allowed to express my gratitude to you for giving me an opportunity to make my second speech. As a matter of fact, I was very keen on taking part in the general discussion of the budget, in order that I may place the grievances of my province before this Honourable House. With this idea in view, I stood up for about 14 times, but unluckily I did not catch your eye. I beseech you not to think for a moment that I want to blame you for it. May, I respectfully submit that, to a greater extent, the old Members of this House are responsible for it, who want to participate every time in the debate and who do not realise the difficulties of back benchers like me. (Laughter.)

Sir, before I begin, I want to make it clear to the House that I, as a representative of the Muslims of the Central Provinces, am in duty bound to express their grievances on the floor of this House. I hope my Honourable colleagues from the Central Provinces will bear me out that

[Khan Sahib Nawab Siddique Ali Khan.]

I would not have failed in my duty as a Member of this Honourable House to express the grievances of other communities also but I find that the other communities do not need my assistance and they have no grievances to my knowledge and hence I confine my remarks at present to the needs of my community only.

Sir, since the inauguration of the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms, to our sad disappointment, not a single Muslim was appointed as an Executive Councillor of His Excellency the Governor. Nobody can say that there was dearth of an able and an efficient Muslim to occupy that high office. But, I am at a loss to understand as to why the claims of Muslims were ignored in this direction.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That has nothing to do with the Central Government or the Finance Bill.

Khan Sahib Nawab Siddique Ali Khan: May I respectfully say that during the last time when Murtuza Sahib wanted to express the grievances of the Muslims of Madras . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is a provincial subject. The Honourable Member can go on.

Khan Sahib Nawab Siddique Ali Khan: The same is the case in the Judicial Commissioner's Court. After several representations, the late Khan Bahadur Ghulam Mohiuddin, Bar-at-Law, was appointed as Additional Judicial Commissioner, but, to our great sorrow, probably 2½ years after his appointment, he breathed his last. After his death, no Muhammadan was appointed as Additional Judical Commissioner. Sir, I urge on the Government to consider the claims of the Muslims of my province in this respect and to appoint at least two High Court judges in the near future when the High Court comes into existence. Sir, again, the representation of Muslims in Audit and Accounts Services and the Income-tax Department is very meagre. In the Accountant General's office, the percentage of Muslims is only 6·7 and in the office of the Deputy Accountant General, Posts and Telegraphs, the percentage is 11·5. Sir, I am subject to correction, but my information is that there are hardly three per cent. Muslims in the Income-tax Department. Sir, I hope that all Honourable Members of this House will support me when I make a demand that the long standing grievances of the Muslims of the Central Provinces should be redressed and that they should get an adequate share in the services.

Mr. A. H. Lloyd (Government of India: Nominated Official): May I correct a point on which the Honourable Member has been misinformed? The percentage of Muslims in the Income-tax Department in the Central Provinces is at least ten per cent.

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): What is the proportion to population?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: I believe the proportion is about 4 per cent.

Khan Sahib Nawab Siddique Ali Khan: Sir, the Muslim representation in the services has by now become a chronic disease. The Government of India have issued a Resolution fixing 25 per cent. places for the Muslims, but they have not provided any machinery to see that their orders are really carried out. There are certain problems which are still left unsolved in this connection. In the case of post offices, the Government of India have laid no scheme before us for the distribution of 25 per cent. among the various provinces. It is evident that the proportion will not be the same in all provinces, but the percentage should be so distributed that the total may work up to 25 per cent. No such scheme has ever been laid before the Assembly. The distribution of 25 per cent. by railways was very much objected to by the Muslim Members. The Government carried on this distribution in spite of the protests of the Mussalmans and in spite of their departmental recommendations to the contrary.

Sir, I take this opportunity to press two points on this occasion. A large number of Mussalmans do not take interest from the Post Office Savings Banks and the Imperial Bank, and they will not take interest from the Reserve Bank also. I suggest that this sum should be credited to a special account. The fund may be administered by the Government, assisted by a small committee of the Legislature.

Sir, I very much appreciate that the Finance Member, the other day admitted the need of the agricultural classes and set aside a sum of Rs. one crore for rural development and 40 lakhs for road development but the amount is not sufficient. It will not be out of place to bring to the notice of this Honourable House one very important thing which deserves serious and sympathetic consideration of the Honourable Members. It is the sorry plight of the cultivators of my province. Year after year they are faced with famine and poverty, due to scarcity of rain, frost, and, in some places, abundance of rain. I shall, therefore, request the Honourable the Finance Member to give a liberal share to my province and thereby relieve the peasants of their growing distress. The Provincial Governments are unable to undertake the work of ameliorating the condition of peasants without the assistance of the Government of India. I, therefore, suggest that the amount provided in the budget should be given in the shape of grants and on the condition that the Provincial Governments should spend about the same amount from their own resources.

Sir, the most delightful part of the budget, which was presented the other day in this House, is the reduction of the surcharge on income-tax by one-third, and I take this opportunity to impress upon the Honourable the Finance Member the extreme desirability of removing the tax altogether in case of incomes between Rs. 1,000 and Rs 2,000. By this tax, the sufferings of the people are great and the income of the Government is very nominal. According to the Finance Member, the income from this source is 75 lakhs. He has himself promised to reduce it by one-third and consequently the income will only be 50 lakhs. The figures for the collection of this amount are not given, but it may safely be put down at 20 lakhs, and, consequently, the net income in the coming year from this source will only be 30 lakhs. This amount is very trifling compared with the miseries it involves. The poor shopkeepers, who are

[Khan Sahib Nawab Siddique Ali Khan.]

not accustomed to keep accounts, are assessed to imaginary figures, and the amount is collected by inflicting great pains upon them and by sending them to jail.

Sir, the other day, my Honourable friend, Mr. James, initiated the discussion about the re-shuffling of the portfolios of the Executive Council. I got up but I could not have the opportunity to speak on that occasion. I should like to emphasise here, and I believe I share the views of many others on this question. The re-shuffling of portfolios should not be taken up in parts but should be considered at a time when the Provincial Autonomy is established or reforms are introduced at the Centre. But to go on changing the portfolios year after year will create a great confusion in the administration.

Sir, I should also like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that the Mussalmans of Berar at present have got no voice in the election of their representative in the Assembly. This is a standing complaint which has several times been brought to the notice of the Government. It was expected that a Mussalman would be nominated this year from Berar as a Member of the Legislative Assembly but, alas, the Government did not take any notice of the wishes of the Mussalmans of Berar.

Sir, I have repeatedly heard the complaint that the question of Berar should not be decided without inviting the opinion of the people of Berar. May I remind my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, the representative of Berar, whether he was consulted when Berar was separated from the Nizam's territory and why on that occasion he did not raise any voice? If Berar is to be separated from the Nizam's Dominions and attached to the Central Provinces, then, not only the people of Berar, but the people of Hyderabad should also be consulted, and I should like to know whom the British Government consulted when drafting the Government of India Bill? I wonder why the main issue was left out, and only concentration is made on the consultation of the people of Berar.

Sir, provision has been made in the Budget for the scheme of broadcasting and I would, therefore, suggest, that a broadcasting station should be established at Nagpur. It is the centre of India and the broadcasting station can cover a large number of Indian States including Hyderabad.

Sir, before I conclude, I want to say a word about the aviation in my province. A Flying Club was started at Nagpur under the distinguished patronage of His Excellency Sir Montagu Butler, the *ex*-Governor of the Central Provinces and Berar. Wing-Commander Cooper also visited Nagpur twice and selected a site for the landing ground. But no subsidy was given to us by the Government of India. The Flying Club, therefore, exists in name only and we fly in imagination. (Hear, hear.) I hope the Honourable the Finance Member will consider our claims sympathetically and favourably.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi (Meerut Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir (Applause), I must really thank you for this opportunity I have got of expressing my views on the budget. It is no use repeating complaints, Sir. My predecessor did it when he got the second opportunity, that the back benchers are really suffering from a disadvantage by their position. Personally, Sir, I was anxious to speak, only because I

happened to be nearest to this City of Delhi, belonging as I do to the Meerut Division, and because the people of my constituency were just clamouring that it is a strange thing that just as the Urdu proverb says·

"Charagh tale andhera."

"The persons who belong to the nearest place are not taking any part in the discussions of the Assembly"—because myself, who is the Mussalman representative and my Hindu colleague from the same constituency have not had the opportunity of speaking at all.

Now, Sir, taking the Finance Bill which is under discussion today, I do not want to take much time, because I do not want to be an example to others to prolong my speech at the expense of the time which can fairly be claimed by other Members also. Sir, the present Finance Bill proposes certain taxation to be realised. There is no doubt that in the world no Government can exist which does not realise taxes from the people. The only question is—what is that Government which has got this right of taxation and the right of governing the people? It is a well-known principle that that Government is a "Government by the people of the people and for the people". We know definitely at this stage that the present Government is not a "Government of the people", it is not a "Government by the people", but if it has got one single ingredient, that is, it is a "Government for the people", well, then, I think, it might be justifiable for them to raise taxation for the government for the people. Now, Sir, we have to consider whether the present Government is "for the people". If that ingredient is missing I say, the right of raising any taxes from the people of India is not established. Let us see, then, what this Government have been doing. It is well-known that India has been suffering, along with the rest of the world, from the depression for the last five years. There have been conferences all over the world, and different nations have been trying to solve the question of this depression. We have to see how far our present Government have solved or are trying to solve or have taken any steps to solve the present problem of agricultural depression. There may be a reply that they have passed certain debt legislation which, fortunately or unfortunately for the United Provinces, has been passed by the United Provinces Council, though such legislative measures have not received the sanction of the Governor General, but, Sir, the question is, what is the principle of the Debt Acts? Can they ever solve the problem of the depression, or can they ever relieve the difficulties of the agriculturist? The main principle of the Debt Acts is that there must be a reduction in interest, that there must be instalments, and that the value of the property in cases of sale in execution decrees must be increased

Mr. Fakir Chand (Jullundur Division· Non-Muhammadan): They wipe off the debts.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: Well, I think there is a little difference between myself and yourself on that point. So these are the few things which have been the objectives, as far as our United Provinces Acts are concerned, and I think that all our Debt Acts are based on the same principle. The question is that the thing they assume is that there is something with the debtor to pay. The presumption is that the debtor has

[Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi.]

got to pay something out of his pocket. The paying of that thing is determined by these Acts, but I submit that in cases where the tenant has not got sufficient to meet the rent or land revenue, and to meet his own necessities and the necessities of his family, then what happens to the question of payment? The utmost that can be said for these Acts is that they in some way or other postpone the evil day for the tenant and do not postpone it for a very long time because, when the instalment falls due, he has to pay it and when he fails to pay it the whole money becomes due, and the property is sold. It does not matter at what price it is sold, high price or low price. It is immaterial to him, because sometimes it happens that even if the whole property is sold away, part of the debt might still remain, or, if he is fortunate, the whole might be cleared away from the sale of the property. All this is immaterial for the purpose of the tenant. My submission is that this legislation of debts is absolutely an eye-wash, and, as my Honourable friend just now remarked, it has only agitated the minds of the bankers on the one hand and of the poor agriculturists on the other The bankers think that something has been taken away from them, that their debts have been wiped off; but they do not consider for a moment that what else can they get except the property of the man for the debts he owes. Supposing the property is sold in execution of the decree in spite of the fact that the agriculturist was carrying on the cultivation of the land with his own hands. Now that property has gone to the banker. Does he think that when the agriculturist could not succeed in realising anything from the property while he was cultivating it with his own hands and realised nothing out of it, does the banker think that as soon as that property comes into his hands through sale, he could get anything by renting it to other people? As a matter of fact no value is got out of the land, no income is got from the property whether it remains with the tenant or with the *sahukar*. A land can be valuable only when something could be got out of it What is the use of having the whole range of lands on the Himalayas unless you get something out of those lands. Therefore, unless you get some valuable produce out of the lands, there is no use of having those lands at all. My submission is that the first essential function of the Government is to raise the price of products of the land and then there would have been no necessity for all these laws and for all these eye-washes and for all the heart-burning between the capitalists and the agriculturists and labourers. India is not all alone in this matter of depression that is going on in the world. Is there no other nation in the world which is undergoing similar difficulties? I say, you need not even study deeply, but only read the papers and you will find that America was suffering from the same malady and disease and the whole world was suffering from the same disease England forced herself away from the gold standard, because she found that gold was being drained away from her country. America also resorted to the same method, and why? Not because it was wanting in gold, not because there were any creditors on the market who were demanding gold, but because America was suffering from a plethora of gold. Gold was in plenty in the treasury, and they thought that while other countries were abandoning their gold standard, the products of their country also were becoming lower and lower in price. So America thought, in the interests of the agriculturists, in the interests of the industrialists, that she should abandon the gold standard. Mr. Roosevelt, with a courage which is seldom to be seen in the world, collected

the whole gold of America in the Federal Bank and gradually made currency notes incovertible, or, in other words, left the gold standard. Gradually, the value of the dollar was reduced by 40 per cent. That is 100 dollar note carried in the market only about 60 dollars of gold and what was the result? The result was that prices advanced. The wheat growers, the agriculturists of America, who were suffering from the greatest depression, people who had sold their farms, who had mortgaged their lands and who had withdrawn their children from schools and colleges, all began once again doing everything with their own hands, because it was felt that they had something to stand back upon. It was felt that they had something with which they could pay up their dues and still retain something to support their future lives. This is what happened in America. It has happened not like India in the course of five years, but in the course of two years. America did not stop there, but she began to stabilise her currency at that sixty per cent. So my submission is that it is absolutely callous for Government not to take care of the agricul turists, not to take care of the persons on whom they rely, not to take care of the persons who contribute most of the revenues to the Government. If such a callous policy is followed, can it be said for a minute that they are entirely blameless? Only the other day, the Honourable the Finance Member, whom we have often heard with pleasure, and I say, Sir, to his credit, that he is mostly moderate in his expressions and is modest in speech, the other day there was a remarkable change in the Honourable the Finance Member when he started talking about exchange. When the question of ratio was raised, I saw that it brought about a considerable change in the attitude of the Finance Member, and, in a firm way, he said that so far as ratio was concerned the Government had decided that there could be no change. So my idea is that so far as this present problem is concerned, it is a definite decision of the Government not to change the ratio, not to argue with us on that particular point and not to satisfy us on that point. Why? The Government are not out to relieve the sufferings of the masses, to relieve the sufferings of the agriculturists and to relieve the sufferings of the labourers in the industries. The Government are not prepared to satisfy us, they are not prepared to argue with us, but only want to say once and for all that they are not going to change this ratio. This only shows the way in which the question is being dealt with without looking to the interests of the country.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable Member has much more to say, we will resume the discussion tomorrow.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: Yes, Sir.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 14th March, 1935.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 14th March, 1935.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

STATEMENTS LAID ON THE TABLE.

Information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 19 asked by Mr. Sham Lal on the 13th February 1935.

PROSECUTIONS INSTITUTED BY THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER, MEERUT CANTONMENT, AGAINST CERTAIN GHEE SELLERS.

(a) Yes. The sanction of the Cantonment Board was not necessary, as the Executive Officer has been authorised by the Cantonment Authority by general order under section 266 of the Cantonments Act to file complaints.

(b) Yes. Three cases were compounded under the provisions of section 267 (*1*) of the Cantonments Act, 1924. The Executive Officer is authorised by the Cantonment Board to compound cases.

(c) & (d) The reply is in the affirmative, but as will be seen from the answer to part (a), there was no question in this case of the use of section 25.

(e) Does not arise.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 282 asked by Mr. Sham Lal on the 18th February, 1935.

TAX IMPOSED ON MENIALS IN THE DALHOUSIE CANTONMENT.

(a) and (b). Yes.

(c) No. A tax on menial and domestic servants is imposed in the Dalhousie, Dharamsala and Murree Municipalities.

(d) Government are not aware that any unemployment has been caused by the tax in the Dalhousie Cantonment.

(e) No.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 550 asked by Mr. Anugrah Narayan Sinha on the 25th February, 1935.

CONFIDENTIAL ENQUIRY MADE IN BIHAR AND ORISSA, FROM PRIVATE MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ABOUT THEIR WILLINGNESS TO VOLUNTEER FOR WAR SERVICE OR IN ANY NATIONAL EMERGENCY.

The enquiry was made by the Bihar and Orissa Government at the request of the local military authorities. The request was due to a misunderstanding and has been cancelled.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 764 asked by Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar on the 9th March, 1935.

COTTAGE MATCH INDUSTRIES IN INDIA.

(i) Information is not available.

(ii) The amount of excise duty collected on cottage matches factories upto the end of January, 1935, is Rs. 2,78,806-9-5.

(iii) The Honourable Member's attention is invited to my reply to Mr. Chettiar's question No. 761 in this session.

Information promised in reply to unstarred questions Nos. 212 and 213, asked by Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur on the 9th March, 1935.

INCREASED EXPENDITURE OF THE AJMER MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE.

212. (a) (i) Proposals under consideration for the improvement of Municipal administration in Ajmer, include town planning, improved water supply and drainage.

These schemes will require considerable expenditure, the amount of which cannot however at present be estimated.

(ii) No.

(b) No. It is proposed for the present to continue the existing arrangement.

AFFAIRS OF THE AJMER MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE.

213. (a) (i) No.

(ii) No Dr. Shakur resigned but not for the reason implied.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) No.

(d) No.

(e) No.

(f) Does not arise.

THE INDIAN FINANCE BILL—*contd.*

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi (Meerut Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, yesterday I was discussing the attitude of Government towards the masses of this country. I was saying that Mr. Roosevelt relieved the agricultural and industrial depression in America by leaving the gold standard, or, in other words, by making the currency notes inconvertible and thus reducing their value in the markets to the extent of 40 per cent. and thereby raising the prices of the agricultural products. This was only so far as the markets were concerned, but, for the payment of debts and taxes of the Government, the currency notes, being legal tender, retained their old value. Thus the agriculturist, by this devaluation of the dollar, got the same price for his products as he was getting in pre-depression days, and the effect of depression was taken away.

If the Government of India seriously wanted to help the agriculturists and industrialists of India, they could have easily followed the steps taken by America. But, to this proposition, the answer of the Government of India, in addition to what was said by the Honourable the Finance Member regarding the bad effects of inflation, would be that in India the habit of using currency notes is not well-established, and, to make them inconvertible, would mean a sharp blow to the whole currency system. For the sake of argument, I concede that there is some truth in that statement, but if Government were to exercise a little of their imagination in the interests of India, they could have easily discovered that there already exists a circumstance in India which would have facilitated their following the example of America. It is that the silver rupee is an overvalued coin. It contains silver worth only about 9½ annas. If Government simply open the mint for the coinage of silver rupee to the public, the value of the rupee in the market will fall down by about 40 per cent. and the price of the products will go up, if not to the same extent, at least to a considerable extent. For example, if wheat is now selling in the market for 16 seers in the rupee, it will come down to nine or ten seers a rupee, and the whole agricultural and industrial world would feel the benefit at once. The agriculturist would be able to pay his debts, the poor zemindar would be able to save something, and the problem of unemployment would be solved. We must remember again that Government and the creditors would also not be losing anything. When the land revenue was fixed by Government and the loan was advanced by the banker, the value of the rupee in terms of commodities was the same as it would be after that change, and thus they are to be deprived of an illegitimate gain, but they lose nothing. Have the courage to follow Mr. Roosevelt and you will feel appreciable improvement in a couple of months. But, are the Government of India prepared to do that? No. I am afraid not. There would be a hundred and one excuses for that. At first, the excuse was that it was only an experiment in America, and we should wait and see. We have waited and seen. And what have Government now to say about it? Yesterday, the Honourable Member said:

"I feel sure, in India inflation will raise prices of imported manufactured articles to a greater extent than those of agricultural products. I feel equally sure that the first benefit of such a rise in prices as occurs in agriculture will be largely absorbed by the middlemen, and so the unfortunate cultivator will pay much more for what he buys and get very little, if anything more, for what he sells. His last state would be much more desperate than his first."

He admits that there would be an improvement in prices, but, he says, the benefit would not reach the peasant and the rise of price of imports would adversely affect the tenant. Probably the Honourable Member thinks that the Indian cultivators uses motor-cars and lives in English style supplying his necessities from England and other European countries, and will thus have to pay more. I am afraid he has not probably seen him. He is a man who has not got sufficient cloth to cover his body and sufficient food to feed his family. He is destitute and does not live on imported articles or even mill-made cloth. Do not deny him the little gain which can save his life and profession on such excuses.

The other excuse of the Government is, as was repeated yesterday, that India is a debtor country and has to pay up her liabilities in sterling. The fall of the price of the rupee in terms of sterling would make the

[Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi.]

commitments very large and the taxation would have to be made very heavy. But that would not have occurred if that policy had been adopted at an earlier stage, as then our exports would not have gone down to such a large extent; and, secondly, if Government had stopped the export of gold and purchased it themselves, they would have accumulated sufficient gold for the purchase of sterling for paying up the liabilities of India. If Government have the interest of Indians at heart, there can be a hundred and one ways out of the difficulty. Where there is a will, there is a way. Is it not a fact that when England went off the gold standard in 1931, it was also a debtor nation? Its foreign credits were mostly frozen credits and its debits were living debts. Did England hesitate to leave the gold standard for the reason of its indebtedness? No; on the other hand, its indebtedness was the chief reason for leaving the gold standard. When the Government of England left the gold standard, the Government of India did not hesitate to link the rupee to the sterling, but they say that no further devaluation is proper. Japan, by the extreme devaluation of the yen, overwhelmed the markets of India; and yet to the Government of India, all the others, in spite of their successful results, are on the wrong way, and they, in spite of their failure, are on the right path. All countries of the world are saving their agriculture and industry by devaluing their currencies, and what the Indians demand is not to devalue the rupee, but only to do away with its overvaluation They want that the price of the rupee for some time at least be made the same as the amount of silver contained in it. That can be easily done by opening the mints to the public for coinage of the silver rupee. The mints in every country are open to the public and were always open to the public in India till 1893, when they were closed in the interest of England. Let them once more be opened, if not for all time to come, at least only to remove the present depression; and then we will admit that the Government of India have the interest of Indians at heart and is a "Government for the people". But, are the Government prepared to do that? No, not in the least. On the other hand, they are bent on making that position more and more difficult of attainment. In the present budget proposals, they have further reduced the price of the silver, so that the excuse of not opening the mints might assume greater force. Look at the difference of the treatment of Indians by the Government of India and the treatment meted out by the Americans to the British Government. The Americans accepted the payment of an instalment of debt by the English in silver instead of in gold and, not only that, but they accepted the silver at a far higher rate than the market rate. They accepted it at 50 cents. an ounce at a time when the market rate was 36 cents. an ounce. The Americans wanted to increase the price of the silver. But the Indian Government is bent on reducing the price of silver, that is, the price of the silver ornaments of the poor and afflicted peasants of India at this time of depression. Of course, strange are the ways of the Government. They have got so much the interests of Indians at heart that, in matters of finance, they must do the reverse of what other nations of the world are doing. If other nations of the world stop the export of gold in the interests of their countries, the Government of India must encourage the export of gold in the so-called interests of India. If other countries make an attempt to increase the price of silver, then it is in the fitness of things that the Government of India must decrease it. If you request them that they may follow the ways of their masters in England, then they are prepared to say that in

this matter their masters are wrong. But I appeal to them to have pity on the condition of the masses in this country, to take courage in both their hands and follow the example of America. Then they will find the afflicted agriculturist, the ruined zamindar and the workless educated getting a vestige of prosperity and singing the praises of the Government. If they govern in the interest of India, then they need not fear the agitator, the Communist or the terrorist. With the prosperity of the country, they will all settle down to peaceful occupations.

Leaving that question, I only want to say a few words about the way in which the Finance Bill and the budget are put before the House. The proposals that are now before the House are being made after the budget is over: that is, all the items of expenditure have already been decided upon and, whether approved of by this House or not, are to remain there by the force of certification. Now, we are called upon to express our views about the revenues that are to be realised to meet that expenditure. Now, what is our position? If we cut off any of these items of revenue, it will be said that we do not feel our responsibility as we do not consider as to wherefrom the expenditure of the Government is to be met. As was remarked the other day—and rightly so—instead of cutting the coat according to the cloth, as every reasonable and sensible person is expected to do, we must provide the cloth for the coat, the dimensions of which have already been decided upon. But our difficulty does not end there. If we were given the full power of providing the cloth, as we wanted, we might even then have helped the Government. We would have provided for certain sources of income which would have covered any diminution of revenue brought about by our recommendations, but we have not got the power of doing that even. The position to which we are thus reduced is this, that we can be considered to be people who feel their responsibility only in case we accept the Bill as introduced by the Government. In every other case, we would be called to be irresponsible. Time and again the complaint is made that we act in the spirit of opposition for the sake of opposition: but is it not a fact that that position is being forced upon us by the Government? . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member should bear in mind that there are other Honourable Members who want to speak.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: I am finishing, Sir. Whatever might be the tradition, the method of passing the expenditure first and taxation afterwards is very illogical. This method in itself contemplates forcible realisation. As you have reminded me, Sir, I am not going to take up much time, but only want shortly to submit that it is not only the taxations which are proposed in the budget that the tax-payer has got to pay, but there are many other taxes that we have got to pay; unfortunately some of the programmes, that have been set out by the Government for the uplift of the masses and for the spread of broadcasting, will, instead of helping the masses, render them liable to further taxation. So far as the advent of broadcasting is concerned, it will, I know, be a direct taxation on the middle classes, because the development of broadcasting would mean the necessity of providing the people with radio sets and receivers, and the whole development of broadcasting will simply mean selling radio sets directly or indirectly through official agency. I am speaking this from my own experience: instead of helping the middle classes, it will be a burden on them.

[Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi.]

The secret circular of the Government that was recently issued, I know, has, to a certain extent, led the Provincial Governments to increase the tours of the officers in the interior of the country; from my experience, I can assure this House that everybody in the country is shivering at the idea. They think that now the villages even in the interior will not be safe from the depredations of officials. In this way, there is the danger that the poor agriculturist will be liable to further taxation in the form of forced gifts and supply of articles that are to be made to these unwelcome guests. So, it is not only the taxations that are under contemplation by this House, but there will be other taxes as well to be borne by the taxpayer of India.

As regards taxes on incomes below Rs. 2,000, I submit, they are taxes on persons who have got no accounts and who cannot prove what their income is; and this is to the knowledge of the legislators; the result is, that in all such cases, the taxes often fall upon people who are only guilty of being a "*safaid posh*" or who carry on small trades. It is a matter within the knowledge of everybody in India. With these remarks, I close my speech.

Maharaj Kumar Vijaya Ananda Gajapatiraj (United Provinces: Landholders): Sir, it is said that on the occasion of the consideration of the Finance Bill, all things under the sun may be discussed . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair hopes not.

Maharaj Kumar Vijaya Ananda Gajapatiraj: I like to utilise this opportunity. The Honourable the Finance Member has shown us the way how to be direct in the method of approaching the topic, businesslike in disposing of it, and to save time. I shall try to follow him.

From my brief experience of this House—and I have not been negligent in having that experience—I have been struck with the varieties of interests which have found voice here, and diversities in the angle of vision which are apparently disclosed by them. Enquiries on hundreds of topics and discussions on matters ranging from one end of this vast continent to the other, present a show of motley crowd, rich in colour, enlivening in their manifold presentations, and thought-provoking in their significances. Today, I shall refer to some of these topics. On a rapid glance over the proceedings of a fortnight, I find no less than 44 specific topics upon which calls on the public purse have been discussed. We have discussed on aircrafts, aeroplanes, and aerodromes; broadcasting, wireless and trunk telephones; sugar industry, match industry, lac industry, glass industry and oil mines; Tungabhadra project, University contributions, traffic survey in Sind, all of which, I admit, legitimately claim their share from the public fund. Of the existing charges on the Treasury, Provincial contributions, army benefit fund, war pensions, political pensions, protection to industries have had our anxious attention. We have demanded locomotive factories, rent-free quarters for certain class, new extension of railway lines, welfare officers, and Indianising of Trade Commissioners. Incidentally, we have not neglected to attend to our little comforts and furniture in the new quarters here, fans for railway passengers, benches on lawns and such other matters.

Sir, let me not be misunderstood. I am not speaking against any of these topics. But this is the occasion to take stock of all our demands and husband our resources in terms of the demands. This is how I take this Finance Bill discussion to be. If it is claimed that he who pays the piper, may call for the tune, the piper may well say that here are the tunes which have been already called for—please take that into account. By formulating our demands on different items of more or less importance and trying to extract promises from the heads of departments concerned in these matters, we have on this occasion to hear from the heads of departments—Well, here are the things we have to provide for—there must be special provision in each department for adequate financial supervision. They can well say—We shall be responsible first for all payments made by the Department and secondly for representing in terms of cost all the proposals which proceed from our department In my humble opinion, this is the position we are in, when we discuss all and sundry from the man in the moon to the supply of ribbon and nibs in offices in discussing the Finance Bill. Of course, it is my own angle of vision.

I have ventured to raise these points, because I feel that everything in a modern State depends on money supply. And I am afraid many a reform, many a legitimate claim are ship-wrecked on this rock of finance. Nevertheless, we as representatives of particular interests have our grievances. We shall place them before the question of supply is solved.

Sir, the Government of India may be aware that the landlords and Talukdars of the United Provinces have made representations to Sir Malcolm Hailey about the hardships they are suffering from. I shall be failing in my duty if I do not refer to at least two of them. The rules for the realisation of revenue need revision so that the position of the landlords may not be jeopardised, and I must strongly and respectfully urge that the landlords should be consulted when remissions of rent and revenue are decided upon.

In this connection, I should also give vent to the apprehensions of the Talukdars of Oudh regarding the observations of the Joint Parliamentary Committee in paragraph 371 of their report. The Committee cannot give an assurance that "every promise or undertaking made by the British Government in the past" will be maintained "unaltered and unalterable for all time". These may change as the "natural consequences of the change to responsible Government". I must say that the apprehensions are reasonable.

Sir, coming to the actual burden of the people, I beg to place before this House my own points of view regarding two questions, which I have gone into a little. I feel the present postage rates on letters and postcards are strongly resented by the general public, and the income-tax burden on people having limited income between a 1,000 and 2,000 is also too much for them. I looked into the discussions on these two matters of the last few years. As to the postage, Sir Frank Noyce expressed his view on the 22nd March, 1933: "Any reduction in postal rates would involve us in an immediate and heavy loss", although he admitted that "volumes of traffic may result from reduction in postal and telegraph rates". Therefore, the question resolves itself into the problem whether the public utility service of the Postal Department should be subordinated to the commercial considerations of profit and loss.

[Maharaj Kumar Vijaya Ananda Gajapatiraj.]

There is the other question of income-tax burden on people with low income. Last year, on the 27th March, 1934, Sir George Schuster raised the bogey of loss of Rs. 75 lakhs and said that he had discussed this question fully in the previous year, and perhaps he laid main stress on the low level of prices which meant, according to him, a good deal more than the level of prices prevailing five or six years ago. On looking into the debate of 1933, it will be found that on the 25th March, Sir George Schuster gave various reasons for retaining this income-tax burden. One of his reasons was that with the average income of Indians at Rs. 80 per head per annum, the man who gets between a Rs. 1,000 and Rs. 2,000 is in a comfortable position. I need not go into this question in detail. But one thing, I may mention, is that in spite of all the changes in our Indian life, deliberate or by force of circumstances, the unit of economic life is still the family and not the individual. All other arguments of his were based mainly on fall in prices. I urge on the Honourable the Finance Member to bear in mind that now the level of prices is again rising, this burden on persons who maintain hand-to-mouth existence should be done away with.

By confining my attention to these two topics, I do not minimise in any way the value of the financial commitments which may be necessary otherwise. I have based my observations on the most modern tendency in dealing with the economic problems. I am still a student and would like to take my lessons from the well-known thinkers and writers. Dr. Herman Finer in his recent well-known work on Modern State has traced the psychology of the modern clamour for economy and has found that it derives its volume "perhaps more from the impulse 'to do what one likes with one's own' than from the desire to see money well spent by the public authorities".

Lastly, I submit that a hope has been raised that we are all working for responsible Government—a new dawn and the Spring is near. The Honourable Sir James Grigg is striving to give a new orientation. It is upto him to leave some margin in the hands of everybody in India In that hope, I shall conclude with another quotation from the said learned author: "Engraved upon the heart of modern society, to a depth reaching to its inmost core, is the motto of a Birmingham Bank, 'He who has, is' " . . . for though it is not everything to modern man, it is much. "He who has, is", that is not all. "He who has, governs".

With these words, I resume my seat.

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah (Sind Jagirdars and Zamindars: Landholders): Sir, I am very thankful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak on this occasion. I can assure you that I shall be very brief, and confine my remarks to the speech of the Honourable the Finance Member and to the Finance Bill.

At the outset, I feel I must enter an emphatic protest against the reduction of import duty on wheat. This reduction will tend to decrease the price of wheat much further. It will also add to the difficulties and embarrassments of the agriculturists. Sir, it is the agriculturist who pays the excise duties to the extent of crores of rupees to this Government and also direct taxes to the Provincial Governments. Sir, mine is an agricultural province, and the cultivation of wheat is increasing in that province because of the Sukkur Barrage. The result will be that most of the people will give

up cultivating wheat, and the Government of Bombay will suffer because, the people won't come forward to purchase Sukkur Barrage lands or lease them. Therefore, I will request the Honourable Member in charge, if he wants to reduce the import duty on wheat, not to take that step at this critical moment.

I now come to the Honourable the Finance Member's suggestions. He says: "My answer is that first we should pray for a disposition in the world to return to the doctrine of cheapness and free exchange". Even if we pray in that direction, I am afraid it will be a cry in the wilderness.

An Honourable Member: Not a prayer in the wilderness!

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah: What is every country thinking of? Self-sufficiency. What is every country doing? Everybody wants to depend on his own resources. In order to protect their products, they are raising tariff walls, and they are entering into agreements with other countries. If we follow the policy of the Honourable the Finance Member, I am afraid that we will stand alone, and I do not think we will benefit by it. I come to his second suggestion. He says: "My second answer is that we must do what we can in innumerable small ways to improve the condition and increase the efficiency of our producers, particularly our primary producers". He has not mentioned the ways, but in his speech of yesterday he told us that there was over-production of agricultural products in the world; therefore, he seems to be against any increase in agricultural production. The prices of agricultural produce have fallen considerably. It is the agriculturist who pays all sorts of taxes, and the Honourable the Finance Member has not made any suggestion to improve his condition. Then, my Honourable friend has not made any constructive suggestion how to balance the budget hereafter. He knows that crores and crores of rupees of emergency taxes have been piled on the people of this country, and, according to his own budget, he has shown that the expenditure is increasing. He has admitted that the revenue from opium and the revenue from the import duty on sugar will ultimately disappear. How is he going to provide for those contingencies, may I ask? Supposing the depression does not disappear, nobody can forecast or foretell the future, is he going to resort to further taxation? I am afraid this House will not lend its support to additional taxes. I was sorry when I heard him justifying the heavy military expenditure, which we say this country cannot afford. Well, I will quote for his information the opinion, not of the Members of this House, but of a very independent and impartial expert,—I refer to the opinion of Sir Walter Layton. He said:

"It is to be remembered that the extent to which taxation is felt as a burden depends very largely on the objects on which a Government spends its revenue. Thus, it has been frequently pointed out that taxation for the purpose of paying interest on an internal debt is, economically speaking, a transfer of wealth within a country, which may—it is true—hamper enterprise, if the method of raising the revenue is unwise, but which need not do so or affect the total saving power of the community. Again, wise expenditure on social services, and particularly on health and education, should be remunerative in the sense of increasing the wealth-producing power, and, therefore, the taxable capacity of a country. Security is, of course, essential, if production is to develop but it cannot be claimed for expenditure on defence either that it is a mere redistribution of income, or that it promotes productive efficiency. Indeed, economically speaking, it is the most burdensome form of expenditure, and this is particularly the case where, *as in the case of India*, the army contains a large element drawn from elsewhere. If, therefore, the high 'defence

[Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah.]

ratio' in Indian Government expenditure is partly due to the low level of other expenditure, it remains a peculiarly burdensome one, and it would be reasonable to assume that, even if the total expenditure of India were increased, the burden would be more tolerable and more readily borne, provided this particular charge were diminished."

I am glad that yesterday the Honourable the Finance Member has given a complete reply to the Army Secretary's argument that as regards the ratio of defence expenditure we must take the total revenue of India, that is, of the Central Government and of the Provincial Government. The Honourable the Finance Member explained to us yesterday that under the Government of India Act there is a distribution of functions as well as of revenues, and that the Central Government have to deal with the more important functions such as Defence, and, therefore, they are given the more important and expanding sources of revenue. I am sorry, the Army Secretary is not here. Another argument that was brought forward by the Army Secretary in defence of the high military expenditure was that the civil expenditure in proportion has increased more than the military expenditure. I think that is a very fallacious argument. One evil does not justify another evil, two wrongs do not make one right. When we talk of the heavy military expenditure, no heed is paid to our cry. Most of the Honourable Members in this House suggested a reduction in the heavy military expenditure, which this country cannot afford, by Indianising the army. Indianisation was supported even by my gallant friend, Captain Sher Muhammad Khan, a nominee of the Government. He told us, in clear terms, that Indians are as gallant and as brave as any other soldiers, and that they had given very good proof of their gallantry during the War. Even as regards leadership, he showed that Indians had proved worthy of leadership. And who were those people? They had no training at Sandhurst or at Woolwich. Now, when the Government have started the Dehra Dun College to give a regular training like the training at Woolwich or Sandhurst, I think, if they consider our cadets from Dehra Dun unfit for leadership, the sooner they close the Dehra Dun College, the better for all. ("Hear, hear" from the Opposition Benches.) So, there is great room for retrenchment. I will request the Honourable the Finance Member to carry out drastic retrenchment in military expenditure as well as civil expenditure, and I will further request him to support the expansion of industries in this country, because we know that agriculture is not sufficient for the teeming millions of India to keep them in comfort. With these words, I have done.

Mr. Suryya Kumar Som (Dacca Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I am not an economist nor a politician. I am a simple layman living in the mufussil, in touch with the masses and classes in the villages I do not claim to know much of economic and political theories, but I do claim that I know what touches the masses of the people and the cause of their sufferings. That I claim to know better than those who live in big cities and far away from the country side.

Sir, I have been noticing that, from various economic points of view, this question of taxation has been argued, and my Honourable friend, Mr. Pant, yesterday made out a very strong case for change of the taxation policy of the Government. He based his reasoning on facts with some reference to economic theories. I am not going to refer to any economic theory. But I say that one thing must be accepted by the House, that unless this extravagance in administration, both civil and military, is

stopped or curtailed, you cannot escape from the effects of drastic taxation. If you are to spend money, you must have the money. I would, therefore, ask Honourable Members of this House to concentrate their attention on how to curtail the expenditure or rather how to compel the Great Mughal in London to cut his coat according to his cloth. For this expenditure you must have money. I do not know what influence the Finance Member exercises over the Cabinet of the country. I am not conversant with the powers he has got. To me it seems that he is something like a Treasurer or a distributor of the money demanded by his masters. His position, I do not think, is enviable at all. They say to him: "We want money for this purpose and that purpose. You must find the money". That seems to be his position and the poor gentleman goes on exploring all avenues by which he can get the money, and, consequently, for the time being, he ceases to be a man with any feeling looking only to the sources from which he can get money. That is his position, as I understand it. Now, Sir, the very high taxation obtaining in this country is not really the grievance of India. The real grievance is that no portion of this taxation goes to improve the condition of the country, to develop its industries and to make its people economically richer than they are. That is the gravamen of our charge Of course, we know that taxation is a necessary incidence of every Government, whether civilised or uncivilised. That we know; but, in all other countries, taxes are utilised to improve the condition of the people, to improve the economic situation of the country. Why is all this magnificent administration in this country—if it is not going to govern the country in a way that will make the people economically happier than they are? Sir, taxation should *pari pasu* improve the economic condition of the people and the economic position of the country. If that is not done, the people will become poorer and poorer, more incapable to pay taxes and will groan under it, hastening revolution in one shape or other as the inevitable result. If the money is used to improve the economic position of the people to an effective extent, they will certainly welcome the taxation, but that is not to be found under the present administration. I will go back to the 18th century to give a little idea of the principle upon which the administration used to be run in those days and which continues today. Sir, in the beginning, these foreigners—these Englishmen—came here as merchants, and, according to the ordinary ethics of a merchant, they began to shake the pagoda tree to any extent to get the money they required. Not only that. They did something else; to improve the industry of England, they began to destroy the industry of India. They exploited us for their own gain for the Company's gain, to enrich their own country. They could not do it effectively unless the thriving industry of India, which could hold its own against any competition, was checked if not destroyed. For that purpose, what did they begin to do?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim). The House would prefer to hear something about the Finance Bill.

Mr. Suryya Kumar Som: Sir, I will give only one or two instances. We all know how the cotton industry of Bengal was ruined. They found that cotton fabrics were exported in large quantities to England and other foreign countries. We all know how the finest fabrics were made in Dacca known all the world over as the Dacca Muslins. They put duty after duty on it, and when that also failed, they went to the length of

[Mr. Suryya Kumar Som.]

cutting the fingers of the expert weavers in order that this sort of fabric may not at all be produced in Bengal.

About the silk industry, the story is the same. Large quantities of silk were exported from India to England and to most European countries. England began to tax it by and by. When the taxes failed, they took to enacting the most iniquitous law imposing fines and imprisonment on those who used Indian silk.

These are facts which are recorded in history and which are known to almost all the Members of the House. Take the case of ship-building. Large numbers of well-constructed ships used to ply between England and India, with Indian merchandise, that drew the attention of the English people and by various means they destroyed that industry, and now they say that India has not got enough of ships, whenever the claim is made by our countrymen that India should embark on ship-building. So this is the way the Britisher began the administration of this country in the dark days of the beginning of the British rule in the eighteenth century. Sir, having destroyed all these industries, they forgot that they in fact killed the very hen that lay golden eggs for them. (Laughter.) Sir, it is thus that the country lost all its industries, and the economic condition of the country became, from day to day, worse and worse On the other hand, Sir, the taxes are increasing day by day—and a peculiar situation has been created: the people are groaning under heavy taxation, and the Government are in difficulties in running the extravagant administration—an administration which I make bold to say is the most expensive administration in the world That is the situation with which we and the Treasury Benches find ourselves faced now. What I ask the Treasury Benches today, Sir, is to retrench their expenditure in the administration, both judicial and executive, and of course in the military also. They must cut their coat according to their cloth or else it will be impossible to realise the taxes that will be necessary to run this most costly administration. Sir, we do not find that there is any earnest endeavour on the part of the Government to help the country and to improve its economic power, and unless they can do it, the only other course left for them is to retrench

Now, do you find any serious attempt at retrenchment? When there is a talk of retrenchment in the services, the only thing we see is that poorly-paid clerks and other subordinates are readily retrenched, whereas the civil services and other similarly highly-paid services remain absolutely untouched. Surely, that is not retrenchment, and that sort of retrenchment will not do for finding out the money which they want. If I am now to cite certain instances to show the disparity of the pay of the higher and lower services in India, as compared with the pay of the higher and lower services in England, that will at once expose the extent of extravagance. We often times talk about the high pay of the Government officials, but few of us have the time or the opportunity to look into the real facts. The House will excuse me if I cite one or two instances to show the enormous difference that exists between the pay of officials in England and the officials here. First of all, let us consider the per capita income of an Indian. Sir, it is only £3 a year, whereas the per capita income of a Britisher is £50, a year. Thus, the average income of the Britisher is over sixteen times the average income of the Indian. That being the economic situation of the country, that being the comparative position of the people,

look at the respective scales of pay of the two countries. I will give two or three instances only. Sir, you will find that the Prime Minister of England is drawing only £5,000 a year, whereas our Governor General, who runs a subordinate administration, is paid as much as £20,000 a year. The pay of the Secretary of State for War in England is £5,000 a year, whereas our Commander-in-Chief is drawing as much as Rs. 8,333 a month. The Members of the Executive Council of this Government are drawing about Rs. 6,666 per month each—far more than the Prime Minister of England.

Now, if you come to the provinces, you will find the Governors drawing Rs. 10,000 a month, their Ministers drawing Rs. 64,000 a year, and their Executive Councillors are drawing equally large sums besides the overseas allowances, the Lee concessions and all other things. It is evident that the comparative economic position of an average Indian is one-sixteenth of the economic position of an average Englishman. But you will find that the pay of officials in India, on the contrary, is almost double of that in England in every case. Sir, considering the responsibility of the work and the trouble of the Prime Minister of England, who practically rules over the whole world (*Voices*: "Oh, oh, oh,") he is satisfied with £5,000 a year, whereas our Ministers, our Executive Councillors—and there are lots and lots of them now-a-days, compared with some years ago—are drawing more than Rs. 6,000 a month. Sir, unless this extravagance in the administration is reduced, I fear there is no hope of reducing the taxation, and, I think the House will agree with me, that the administrative costs may safely be reduced by one-half without any difficulty, and without in the least endangering the efficiency either of the civil administration or of the military administration. I appeal to the Honourable Members of this House to combine and see whether we can have a real retrenchment in the Army and in the civil administration; and unless you do it, I say, Sir, it is no use pointing out economic theories and such other things. The actualities are there. I may tell you, Mr. President, that this high salary is not only ruinous to us in point of the money which is taken away, but there is another aspect which is more dangerous to the people in its effects and is more mischievous in its results. It seems to me, Sir, that there is a policy that underlies the maintenance of these highly-paid services. We know there are many Indians also who are paid at these very high rates of pay and also enjoy other extraordinary concessions. Even in the Provinces, the pay of the members of the lower services—the Deputy Magistrates and Munsifs and all others—has been increased to such an extent that they are drawing more income than a first-class man, in an ordinary profession and in the trade can now possibly earn.

I think, Sir, there is a policy that underlies all these things,—namely, to denationalise and un-Indianise our people in the Government services. By having more money than they really need, they get into luxurious and extravagant habits of the West—forget their own culture, and leave off the villages; they do not mix with the ordinary middle-class people, who, I must point out, are really the backbone of the country; they do not mix with the cultivators and the masses; as a matter of fact, Sir, they look down upon the cultivators and like to think middle class people from which the majority of them are recruited as people not belonging to their class altogether. By that, Sir, they are taking them out of their moorings; they are un-Indianised and they

12 NOON.

[Mr. Suryya Kumar Som.]

take to the habits of Europeans—cut off from Indian society, cut off from the villages and practically cut off from the national culture. That is the idea underlying this high pay. I am strengthened in this opinion by the fact that whenever there is a proposal for increment of pay, we find the Government take it up at once. I remember, Sir, that when the proposal to increase the pay of services was raised, the Lee Commission was appointed and, within three months after the enquiry began, the report was published and it was given effect to without any delay. Well, Sir, no Commission or enquiry was held in India whose findings were carried out in greater hurry and in such a short time as the recommendations of the Lee Commission. Was it of such an importance? Was the Empire dying for giving increased pay to the Indian Civil Service in the shape of overseas allowance, etc.? I say, there is a sinister principle underlying these high emoluments. This is how I look upon it. What do we see in the whole administration? What do we find in New Delhi? You have all these magnificent buildings, the huge Viceregal Lodge, big roads, luxury all round,—very expensive, if not more expensive in grandeur and splendour than the Mughal Emperor. Sir, it looks as if the British Government are vying with the Mughal Emperors of old and want to outstrip them in the eastern splendour. In a poor country like India, if the Government want to spend vast sums of money on these splendours and things like that how can they get the money without taxing? Surely they are not expected to bring the money from England. The alternative is to tax the poor people who are already groaning under poverty. They have been borrowing till now, but now the borrowing of the Government has come to an enormous limit and they have now had recourse to further taxation. Sir I can only say that all these iniquities that brought about the ruin of India were dug out of the archives of the old records of the East India Company and its Despatches. That great man, Sakharam Ganes Deushkar, in his book *Desher katha* wrote all these things. He did not make any comment. But that book our benign Government has already proscribed and it is no longer in existence.

Now, Sir, this brings me to a passing reference to the question that was agitating the people's mind for a long time. We find the civilised world, particularly the Englishmen, stigmatising the Vandals who destroyed the libraries and such other things in the days of past. But I say Sir, those Vandals did not do more mischief than what the Government here are at present doing by proscribing such books. Those Vandals destroyed only one or two libraries, but they never destroyed all the books in the way that our present Government are doing by the proscription law. So, even now we find ancient books which recorded the history of the ancient people, their culture and civilisation despite the vandalism of the Vandals. But at present so far as vandalism which goes by the name of the law of proscription is concerned, it effaces out of the earth even the very traces of such literature which recorded the misdeeds and the misdoings of the British bureaucracy.

Sir, I now come to the question that vitally concerns us. It is admitted that the price level of the produces is at the lowest now. It is well-known that India has not yet recovered from the world depression which it began to experience ever since the Budget was introduced a few years ago imposing new taxes. These Budgets have not done any justice to the people of this country. Has the Honourable the Finance Member

followed any canons of public finance? Sir, there is some surplus this year. What does the Honourable Member do with that surplus? He does not care for the millions of people who are groaning under the pressure of heavy taxation. He does not give any relief to them. He, finding some surplus in the Budget, at once goes to the relief of the already pampered Government servants by restoring their cut salaries. The Government servants in India are the most highly paid people in India. There is again the fact that the purchasing power of money has gone up in these days of depression. Are the Government servants dying under the pressure of this paltry five per cent. cut in their salaries? Was it more necessary to relieve the Government servants of their five per cent. cut than to relieve the poor masses who are groaning under heavy taxation? This shows clearly the shamelessness, the callousness and the want of feeling and the want of sympathy in the Government for the poor masses. This is not certainly the only instance of want of sympathy on the part of Government for the poor people in India. I cite this only as one instance. It speaks volumes about the mentality of the Treasury Benches. If the Honourable the Finance Member had not restored the salary cut, he could have utilised about a crore of rupees to bring great relief to a great portion of the income-tax payer, I mean, those with an income of Rs. 2,000 and less. But the Finance Member did not consider it worth his while. He at once runs to give relief to the Government servants and he asks the people to contribute more and more every year in the shape of new taxes. Is this justice? If one thinks of all these things, one will come to the conclusion that it is useless arguing with this bureaucracy. We have read the speeches made by abler men, the best men of India here inside and outside the Chamber. In these speeches made by these men, the same principle, the same economics of relieving the mass from the burden of excessive taxation was being discussed. But nobody seems to feel for the injuries and the sufferings of the nation. It is admitted that the nation is groaning under poverty. The average annual income per head is only three pounds and this is the sort of people who are being taxed mercilessly. I would ask the House to rise against this extravagant administration which is not only making us poor by taking away all our money, but it is also indirectly ruining our culture, making us un-Indians. That is the great danger. I would ask the House to stand against this sort of heavy extravagance and I say until you can check that, it is no use arguing with the bureaucracy about economic principles. My Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, gave some constructive ideas to the Government yesterday in his speech. I doubt whether those constructive ideas ever entered the ears of the Honourable the Finance Member. Far from acting upon them, I doubt whether he ever remembered them after leaving the Chamber. However, if need be we have to produce a practical scheme or a constructive scheme and demonstrate how the administration of the land can be carried out with half the cost, and if not with more but with equal efficiency. I hope some of the Honourable Members here would produce such a scheme when occasion arises. It is not difficult to produce one. Sir, this reminds me of another thing. Sir, you know there is simultaneous examinations for the Indian Civil Service in England as well as here in India. Some boys are selected here in India as a result of the examination held in India and then they are sent to England for training. You are aware, Sir, that these boys have to administer this country as Collectors or Magistrates or Judges. They have to administer justice to the Indians in the

[Mr. Suryya Kumar Som.]

villages and in the districts. For that purpose, I do not understand why they should get training in England for two years. Mark this, Sir, and look at the policy underlying this system. The boys are at once sent to England, part of the expenses are met by the Government and part by the poor fathers. The boys live in England for two years. For what purpose? Are they going there to govern England, or Ireland or Scotland or Wales—so that they ought to know the habits and culture of that land? Are they going there to know how to rule them? They are to know the people whom they have to serve. If they are to be sent anywhere, they should be sent to the villages around the districts during the training period to learn the economic position, the difficulties, the feelings, the nature and the culture of the people to whom they will have to administer justice. But that is not done. They are sent to England; and, I say, only to give them lessons in English culture, to teach them to hate their own culture and to teach them not to mix with their own people. That is the purpose for which they are kept there for two years and then they become safe men.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has already taken up nearly half an hour of the time of the House, and he has not said one word about the Finance Bill.

Mr. Suryya Kumar Som: Sir, two minutes more, and I finish. Thus the money is spent, I say, with a great purpose—the purpose of un-Indianising the services. This is the spirit in which the money is spent and that is why you find difficulty in meeting the expenditure. If you go on spending money in this way there will be no end of expenditure. Sir, I ask the Treasury Bench to stop this spirit of denationalising the services and the consequent extravagance and also direct their attention as to how to bring the taxes on a par with the economic condition of the people. I do not say that you can change the whole thing all at once by a stroke of the pen but let us see in the present Finance Member a beginning of this ideal in the administration.

Sir, about this Finance Bill, I will mention a few things. First, with regard to the price of postcards and then with regard to the charge of four pice for letters of the weight of half a tola. This charge of four pice for half a tola is a fraud and a sham. We cannot write on a letter paper which is below half a tola in weight. I understand the number of deficit stamped letters has increased, and that is to the detriment of the interests of the people, but it no doubt enriches the exchequer. I, therefore, suggest one tola for one anna. As regards the postcard, I would ask you to consider that the postcard has become like tobacco a vital necessity of even the poor villagers in this twentieth century, and my suggestion is that it should be brought down to half an anna, if not less. As regards income-tax on incomes below Rs. 2,000, my Honourable friends have spoken about it. It tells upon the middle classes who are undoubtedly very hard-hit by this depression. They generally follow professions which have gone down very low and the petty traders also have suffered from low income. If you show some relief, it will be appreciated by the people, and a reduction in the price of the postcard will be a great benefit to the masses and classes alike.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, before I begin to discuss the Finance Bill in a most haphazard manner, I think it my duty to thank you for affording me this opportunity of speaking in this House; and, Sir, I have to thank you specially because we the back-benchers of any Party are at a great disadvantage. We may stand up scores of times, but we are not fortunate enough to catch your eye, and we being back-benchers, our front-bencher bosses, of course, overshadow us. Whatever it may be, although I admit it is our misfortune, even then there is a remedy for that misfortune. I do not blame anybody; I simply describe the pitiable condition in which we back-benchers find ourselves.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable Member will observe, he will find that more back benchers have taken part in the debate than front-benchers.

Dr. N. B. Khare: We feel like forlorn children . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better address himself to the Finance Bill now

Dr. N. B. Khare: Sir, this occasion of the Finance Bill and the budget is a very important occasion in the history of any country and also that of India although it is a subject nation. Sir, when this occasion approaches, many people amongst us who are rather credulous and overhopeful think in their heart of hearts that now is the time when the sweet and smiling celestial cherub will open the flood-gates of heaven and cause the celestial Ganges, the milky way, to descend from heaven upon the plains of Hindustan. Sir, I am not one of those who entertain such fond hopes. The fact of the matter is that there is no doubt that the celestial Ganges, the milky way, descends upon the plains of Hindustan, but the unfortunate part of the whole matter is that after descending upon the plains of Hindustan it does not flow through them. It flows directly into the English Channel in a straight and precipitous course and empties itself there with innumerable mouths. Of course I need not describe what those mouths are, they are known to all of us, They are the so many services,—the Indian Civil Service, the Indian Medical Service, the Indian Ecclesiastical Service, the Indian Agricultural Service, the Indian Forest Service, the Indian Army, the Indian Police Service, and God knows what not; and then there are the interest charges, capitation charges, trade and commerce and so on. They are all permanent leeches; of course they are medicinal leeches; they do not kill us because if they kill us they cannot afford to live. Sir, the Finance Bill which is placed before us for finding ways and means for providing money for the budget we passed the other day is a very funny thing. I compare the Government of India to a great trading concern which it was before and which it even now is.

Sir, I am not a financier and I am not a juggler with figures and I do not want to deal with the innumerable figures. I feel like chewing dry bones if I do it. Sir, I find, that half or nearly half,—may be a little less—of the revenue which we earn annually is spent upon the *chaukidars* guarding our premises. Sir, any trading concern which does that every year will not be called a trading concern at all. Not only can one question its wisdom, but if the managing director or the manager of

[Dr. N. B. Khare.]

that trading concern insists upon doing it every year, you might also call him a congenital idiot. But, in this particular instance, it is not so If that managing director, under the garb of spending half the revenue, even though it may be for *chaukidars*, uses that money for the benefit of his own kith and kin and people who are friendly to him and interested in him, then I would not call him a congenital idiot. That is the situation which obtains in this country so far as the military expenditure is concerned . . . . .

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): What would you call him?

Dr. N. B. Khare: Cunning. The whole policy of this administration can be summed up in two words, or rather one word—domination: whether it is political or financial or both or any permutation and combination of both it does not matter. So what happens is this: the budget happens to be more or less not a people's budget at all, nor is the Finance Bill which is meant to balance that budget: but it is a budget of the services and Government servants. No wonder then that so many people, both paid and unpaid, honorary and amateurish, come forward in this House to extol the policy of this administration to the skies because it benefits them. When I look at this thing, I am reminded of a story, perhaps in the *Pancha Tantra* or somewhere, which I read in my childhood. Once upon a time, there was a marriage celebrated in the family of camels; and to recite the marriage hymns or *mantras*, asses were invited; and in that function they began to praise each other: one said to the other: "Oh, what a beautiful countenance!" The other said to the first: "Oh, what a musical voice!" I can only recite this story and stop there and will not go further. It may be like a marriage season for our friends who sit in the opposite Benches; but for us it is not a marriage it is the occasion of a funeral: in India at least every funeral is followed by a *Shradh* the next year: *Shradh* means the anniversary ceremony of the dead. On that day, what happens is that in memory of our departed ancestors and to pay respect to them, and to remember our duty towards them, we invite a couple of Brahmins and feed them for a day. Here also, what I find is this: that this annual budget and Finance Bill is an occasion of *Shradh*: and what *Shradh*? It is the *Shradh* or anniversary ceremony of the departed glory of Mother India: it only helps to remind us of our duty to our motherland. That is the only use of this budget to me, and it has no other earthly use for me. But there is one great difference. In our household *Shradh*, what happens is that we feed one or two Brahmins only for a day; but here to perform this costly *Shradh*, we have to feed not one or two Brahmins, but hundreds and thousands of white, brown and black Brahmins, and that not for one day but for 365 days in the year: and that is the Finance Bill.

Mr. M. S. Aney: It is a perpetual *Shradh*!

Dr. N. B. Khare: The reason for this is not far to seek. The British power was established in India in the following sequence—all beginning with B, just like British: wherever the British race have gone, three things have gone there in sequence: first of all, the Bible, then Balance and last the Bayonet. Bible stands for religion—Christianity as they

understand it, not as we understand it. Balance means trade and commerce. And Bayonet of course we are all familiar with it; and all these things are entirely made in Britain; they are British to the backbone, like their Bovril; and we are asked here to find money to perpetuate this policy and to support these three departments, the Bible, the Balance and the Bayonet. We cannot do it in all conscience: we know we will be forced to do it, but we will not be a willing party to it. That is my only argument. Taking the Bible, I know that there is an item in the Government of India expenses, called the Ecclesiastical Department. If I am right, about 45 or 46 lakhs per year is spent on that department. That money, which belongs to the Indian taxpayer, is spent on these white *padris*. There is no necessity to do so: it is wrong and immoral to do so; but they are doing it. I will just ask them one question. That item is non-votable: still I will ask them one question: where is the necessity of doing it? What do you spend upon the religious instruction of people who do not follow the Christian faith? What about Muhammadans? What about Hindus, and Buddhists and others? You do not spend a single pie upon them. Why then do you spend so much money upon *padris* of the Christian religion and yet parade your religious neutrality? I cannot swallow that pill: it is too much to swallow.

I once met a very venerable European missionary with whom I travelled in the same compartment when I came to Delhi to attend this Session. We had a good chat, and he himself admitted to me in the course of our conversation that all the European nations who profess Christianity now are no longer Christians at all, and he himself further said that they have given up the ways of Christianity, which every one knows, are noble, and these people have fallen into bad ways. And, Sir, what do we find today? God of these people is not Jehova, but Moloch, Mammon and Belial, and half of this money will be spent to feed the military Moloch. That is my grievance.

Now, Sir, I will not traverse the hackneyed ground. I will not talk of gold except to say that the gold policy is an operation of transfusion of blood from India to England. I will not talk of salt. I will not talk of sugar except to say that there was a countervailing duty on foreign sugar, and then the Indian sugar was protected by that countervailing duty. We were given protection, and people naturally thought that it was a good opportunity to concentrate their attention on the sugar industry, and they spent crores and crores of rupees on the establishment of sugar factories, and for these sugar factories, crores of rupees worth of machinery was imported from England, and when all the money went into the pockets of England, what do we find? We find a surprising thing, I mean the excise duty. That is all I want to say about it. Sir, I am not much fond of sugar or salt. I am rather fond of red chillies, and, therefore, I will proceed to the Army Department.

Sir, the day before yesterday we were told by the Army Secretary that the British do not distrust the loyalty of the Indian troops and the Government are following the policy of Indianisation in a proper way, that there is no racial animosity, and that there is no differential treatment in the army,—that is what I understood him to say, but, Sir, in spite of the view held by the Army Department, I would maintain that the policy of this Government, especially in the Army Department, has been the same consistent policy of distrust and discrimination and divide and

[Dr. N. B. Khare.]

rule, and I shall attempt to prove it to the House if I can, and this policy has been followed for the last 100 years, and even today it is followed in spite of the vehement protests made in this House and outside it. Sir, I shall, with your permission, quote a few passages,—it is an old quotation,—nevertheless it applies with equal force to conditions existing today!

"This question involves issues of the greatest moment demanding the most careful consideration. It appears to me to be of vital importance to the safety of the Empire that we should maintain and encourage the distinction of race feelings and habits which have, heretofore, kept the various great sections of the people of this country from coalescing and becoming a homogenous race to whom national feeling and national cohesion would be natural and possible.

The more diversity that can be introduced into the constitution of different corps the better, so that in any case of any future attempt at combination the heterogeneous character of the various regiments may present an effective bar to it, and be a source of information to commanding officers."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What is the Honourable Member quoting from?

Dr. N. B. Khare: It is a book written on Indian Defence Problem by Captain G. V. Modak of the Gwalior Army.

This is what His Excellency Naville Chamberlain, Commander-in-Chief, considers:

"Each army corps . should be distinct in race, religion and language."

Then, Lord Elphinstone (G. G.) says:

"I have long considered this subject, and I am convinced that the exact converse of this policy of assimilation is our only safe military policy in India. *'Divide et impera'* was the old Roman motto, and it should be ours."

Here is a quotation, Sir, from Brigadier Coke who would have each corps of one tribe or caste and his reasons are:

'That, in a rising of the Mussalmans, you would always have Sikhs, Dogras, Gurkhas and Hindu corps to defend or *vice versa*. By mixing the castes in one corps they become amalgamated and make common cause, which they never do if they are kept in separate corps. The result of mixing them in one corps has been to make them all join against Government and not only the soldiers but through them the Hindu and Mussulman Zamindars were incited to make common cause which they never would have done, had the races been kept in distant corps. Our endeavours should be to uphold in full force the (for us fortunately) separation which exists between the different religions and races, not to endeavour to amalgamate them. *Divide et impera* should be the principle of the Indian Government."

Here is another quotation from Lieut.-Colonel H. M. Durand, C.B., on special duty with the Governor General,—not the present Governor General, of course. This is what he says:

"As we cannot do without a large native army in India, our main object is to make that army safe, and next to the grand counterpoise of a sufficient European force, comes the counterpoise of natives against natives.

To preserve that distinctiveness which is so valuable and which, while it lasts, makes the Muhammadans of one country (province) despise, fear or dislike the Muhammadans of another. Having thus created distinctive regiments let us keep them so against the hour of need."

By the system (of distinctive regiments) thus indicated, two great evils are avoided, firstly, that community of feeling throughout the native army and that mischievous political activity and intrigue which results from association with other races and travel in other Indian Provinces and secondly, that through discontent and alienation from the service."

Sir, this is the policy. Not only that, the Princes might flatter themselves for the trust which they enjoy under British rule, but here is a quotation which proves the real truth:

"It is claimed by enthusiastic Rajamaniacs that we should provide an outlet for the military aspirations of the Princes, and in addition to rank and honours should give them commands in peace and war, in fact should train them to succeed us in India, when we give the country Home-rule.

The Native State, as at present constituted and ruled, relieve us of the administration of one-third of British India and strengthen the Empire.

To add to their troops, and to encourage their martial ardour, would make them an anxiety and possibly a danger. Notwithstanding the perplexing march of time and events, we cannot disregard historical precedents, or the question of colour."

And, Sir, when we ask them, they tell us that they are our trustees, they are the trustees of the voiceless millions, they know our interests better, that they will dictate the policy which is beneficial to us, but we all know that this trusteeship is mere humbug and camouflage. God never awoke one fine morning and appointed the Britishers as our trustees, but I shall presently tell the House what even some of the Britishers themselves tell us about this. This is a quotation from General Maurice:

"We are less than honest in our talk about our trusteeship for the 'voiceless millions' of India. India, certainly no longer 'voiceless' and far from its being a question of 'trusteeship', our hold on India is chiefly in our interest and frankly imperialistic.

We conquered India as an outlet for the goods of Britain. I am not such a hypocrite as to say we hold India for the Indians, we hold it as the finest outlet for British goods in general and for Lancashire goods in particular."

Sir, I will not detain the House very long, but I will make one fact clear, and that is, that the only solution which appears possible to get over the morass of financial difficulties is to cut short the army expenditure quickly and immediately. If the British tommy is replaced by the Indian soldier, who, as the Army Secretary has admitted, is his equal, if not superior, in valour and everything else, there will be no difficulty. For the British portion of the army there is short service recruitment and they stay here for six years and then go back to England. In that way the British people get a good supply of trained and capable soldiers at the cost of India. But the Indian soldier is not recruited on the short service system because then you will have so many people thrown in the Indian population who have had a military training. You cannot deny that, otherwise what difficulty is there in adopting the short service system for Indians? I will go further and say that not only is the Indian soldier—though ill-clad, ill-fed and ill-trained—more competent than the British soldier, but that the British soldier has many a time proved himself inefficient, because he comes from a different country and lives in a different climate—I do not blame him for that,—and although he gets more pay, three and a half or four times, and so many different allowances which are denied to his Indian confrere, yet in actual warfare, on many occasions, in Mohamand warfare and in frontier defence, he has proved himself unequal to his Indian companion. Because he is confronted with a different

[Dr. N. B. Khare.]

country and with mountainous surroundings. It is only 10 or 15 years ago, that in Sandhurst, they have started a course of frontier warfare. Again, in spite of all the meticulous care which the Medical Department takes about the British soldier,—he is nurtured here in an incubator or a hot-house and a lot of money is spent on that purpose. Yet in spite of all that, he is not found equal to the task, as can be proved from the writings of Britishers themselves. So, what is the good of forcing this unwanted article upon us when we can have our own article in a better and cheaper way? If this is done, about 20 or 30 crores of rupees would be saved straight-away, and that money could be spent on beneficent activities. Will the Government do it? I am afraid they will not, because it is not in their interest.

Sir, this catalogue of grievances is a very long one, it is so long, or rather it is as long as the proverbial tail of the Hanuman of Ramayana fame. The tail of the Indian Hanuman, in the shape of these grievances, is so long, and so powerful a prehensile organ that he should have burnt Lanka, ere long, but he cannot do that, because his own kith and kin are ranged on the enemies' side. We have been many times asked as to why we came here, what is our attitude, whether we have abandoned the civil disobedience campaign, and all sorts of questions are asked of us. I am not ashamed to admit that for immediate effects the civil disobedience campaign has failed. I am not ashamed to admit that, and that is why we are here. But that does not mean that our mentality has changed, or that we have lost sight of our ideal. What shame is there in being defeated or in losing one's battle? There is no shame in losing a battle; there is shame in not fighting at all. Even Shakespeare says: "Not failure, but low aim is crime". So, we need not be twitted like that. After that, we are told: "What is this? You have come here. Accept this". But why should we accept? What is this Finance Bill? It is placed before us ready made and we have to say, Yes! Though we have lost our battle for the time being, yet it does not mean that we should be slaves mentally; it does not mean that. If a man becomes a slave mentally, then he is gone for ever. This reminds me of a story in the Mahabharata, which happened at this very place, several thousands of years ago. When the Pandavas were deceived by the Kauravas with loaded dice,—as we were by ordinances and fiats,—and they were made powerless, Draupadi was brought into the durbar of the Kauravas and she was told: "Now, what will you do? Your Pandavas are powerless, there is nobody to take up your cause. You are helpless. Now, what will you do? Consent to become the queen of Duryodhan". Was there anybody in that durbar to advise her to accept that shameless proposal? There was nobody. There were some people. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair may remind the Honourable Member that there are other Members who also sit on the back benches, who want to address the House on the Finance Bill.

Dr. N. B. Khare: I shall finish, Sir.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Don't leave Draupadi unprotected like that!

Dr. N. B. Khare: That would be very ungallant. So, what happened was this. Draupadi did not sit on the lap of Duryodhan. The reply that she gave was: "God is my protector". And God helped her, and Bhima's mace sat on the lap of Duryodhan At that time, too, in the durbar of the Kauravas, there were Bhishma and Drona and others. Draupadi appealed to them for protection, but they said:

"*Arthasya purushô dasah.*"

"Man is the slave of money."

"Your cause is just, but what can we do? We are powerless." When such great men said like that, what to say of the defenders of our rights who sit in the opposite Benches—I call them defenders of our rights although they are not so in reality.

We really feel for the Government of India in this matter. We feel for their subordinate position. We want the Government Members to be real *sirkars* and not merely *sirkars* in name. That is our grievance and when we are trying to pull them out of their unhappy position, they should not hinder but help us. I will explain why all this happens. All this happens, because it is the British Parliament which governs us and not this Government. I deny the right of the British Parliament to govern us. I do not concede that right. They may tell us there is a legal right. I say "No". We never consented. There is no right of consent, and there is no right of conquest. I have got no time. My Party Whips are after me. So, I must close, but, if I had the time, I would have proved from historical happenings that the British never really conquered us. The British Parliament governs us not by right of consent or conquest. They are simply governing us by right of usurpation and long usage. Usage, howsoever long it may be, if it is a wrong usage, an immoral usage, an unjust usage, it cannot be justified by mere length of time. I would say that it does not matter if it is a despotic power. If there is one despot, he will be tired of it, but this system is neither despotism nor democracy. God knows what this system is, under which a few millions of aliens are governing many more millions of people, not in the interest of the people, but in their own interest. This system is certainly grotesque, absurd, unjust, immoral, and we protest against this system, and if the Finance Bill is brought for the support of this form of administration, I will say that I will have nothing to do with it. That is all I have to say.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin (Punjab: Landholders): Sir, in this debate, I will confine myself to one and one issue only, which is really very dear to my heart, and that is the Indianisation of the army. Sir, the other day, I heard the Honourable the Secretary for the Army Department speaking. It shook me out of my slumber, because, before his speech, I was under the impression that the Indianisation of the army was an accepted principle, but the things did not turn up as I had imagined them to be. Sir, the Army Secretary himself said that his speech was frank. I congratulate him on his frankness, but I must say that we had not heard such frankness from the Treasury Benches for a very long time. As a matter of fact, such frankness had not been heard since Lord Birkenhead laid down the reins of his office. Of course, we hear such frankness nowadays from people like Mr. Churchill and Lord Lloyd, but these gentlemen are out of office. So their frankness can be ignored, but when it comes from a gentleman

[Mr. M. Ghiasuddin.]

who is the mouth-piece of the Government of India, I think notice should be taken of it. There is one passage in his speech to which I take very strong exception. My Honourable friend, Mr. Tottenham, said that the Government of India were not sure whether Indians would make good officers or not, as he said they have not yet proved themselves to be good officers. There was doubt in his mind whether Indians are fit to be Generals. He made his point clear by saying that there are no motor cars manufactured in India and he did not know whether Indians are able to manufacture motor cars. Similarly, he said that no Indian has ever held the position of, I think, a General, and that was open to question whether they will ever be able to adjust themselves to that position. Now, Sir, this is a gross insult to a nation.

I am very sorry, I do not see the Honourable the Leader of the House or the Honourable the Commerce Member in their seats, because, although they are Members of the Government of India, they are Indians, and I would have liked to ask them whether they also share this opinion of the Government of India about their race. Sir, there are other countries bordering India. Persia and Afghanistan have their Generals. Even in the small State of Nepal, they have got their Generals, and, may I ask, why this stigma of inferiority is placed on India alone, by a public servant of India? I congratulate the Government and I congratulate my Congress friends that they have started understanding each other very well. We, the middlemen, are being squeezed out, because there is real agreement between the Government and the Congress. The Congress say that Government have sapped our manhood. I heard one of the Congress speakers say so. Government do not admit that they have sapped our manhood, but they agree that our manhood has been sapped. So, to a certain extent, both parties agree with one another. Sir, we are sometimes ironically called the habitual supporters of the Government and we expected the Government to come forward and say "No. There is still manhood in you". But that is not so. I congratulate the two sides on their closer understanding.

Day before yesterday, when I came to this House, I had three complaints against the Indianisation policy of the Government, but, after hearing the Honourable the Army Secretary, I had four complaints. My fourth complaint was his speech. My first complaint is that the speed of Indianisation is too slow. My second complaint is that the method of Indianisation is defective, and my third and most serious complaint is that the status of Indian officers under the new scheme is inferior. Now, I will come to my first point, and that is the speed of Indianisation is too slow. The Honourable the Army Secretary said that one division is marked for Indianisation. Now, Sir, in the Indian army, I think there are at least 13 or 14 divisions. I do not know the number exactly.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham (Army Secretary): Six or seven divisions.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: Only one division is marked. I think it is a very small number, and we are not satisfied with this. I think, Sir, there should have been more, because in that case we could satisfy the demand of our young men who are in need of employment. Sir, when I plead the cause of these young men in this House, I must point out that I am not pleading the cause of any criminal, I am not pleading the cause of

1 P.M.

people who have done anything wrong. The point should be taken note of that I am pleading the cause of those people whose families have served the Government for a good long time, who have got many of their relatives lying today under the foreign soil of France and Flanders. (Hear, hear.) I am pleading the cause of those young men who are honourable in every way, clean in body and clean in mind, and who have one ambition and one ambition only, that is to serve their country and their Emperor in an honourable manner. (Applause.) Sir, I am pleading the cause of such men, and I am sorry that the Government are not lending a sympathetic ear to these demands. My second complaint is that the method of Indianisation is most defective. When I say this, I am referring to those reserved units set apart for the Indian officers, instead of sending them to an amalgamated army. Sir, I do not know why there is this separation and segregation. On the one hand, the Government ask us to co-operate with them, and, on the other hand, we are denied co-operation.

Sir, I admit that, after all, we Indians are beginners—I do not say that we have not got good material, nothing of the sort, but I must admit that so far as modern methods of warfare are concerned, we are novices. We have forgotten the art of war, because we were not trained in it for a long period; but, for that very reason, they should not separate and segregate our young officers. On the contrary, it would be very beneficial for our young men to work side by side with their British brother officers, who are more experienced, and I cannot understand why this separation of units has taken place. And I can say it, Sir, that the young Indian officers are quite dissatisfied with this arrangement. They do want to work with their British colleagues—to join the same mess, to play games with them and yet they are denied all these things, and I really can say that most of our young men are quite hurt by this process.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Does the Honourable Member wish to continue British officers for the Indian army?

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: For the time being, yes.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: That is not what his Party recommended.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: I do not know; but, surely, for the time being, we want that British officers should remain; and, if I am not mistaken, the Honourable the Army Secretary himself quoted day before yesterday the Leader of our Party and he said that our Leader wanted their retention; so I really do not know why this point has been raised by the Army Secretary. Sir, we do want that more Indians should be taken and our modest demand is—and I am not speaking on behalf of my Party here—I think at least fifty per cent. of the officers of the Indian army should be Indians. That, for the present, is our least and most modest demand. This demand has been conceded in other departments of the civil services, and, in all these departments, we are getting fifty per cent.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan (Nominated Non-Official): We *are* getting fifty per cent.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: We are not, and you say "we are getting fifty per cent"?

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: Yes.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: You mean to say that fifty per cent of the officers will be sent to one-eighth of the army and the remaining fifty per cent. will be sent to seven-eighths of the army? If this is your mathematics, I fail to understand it—I am not very good at mathematics myself, but this even beats me.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan: You are mixing those two things.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better go on.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: There is a strong suspicion in certain quarters that this process of segregation is just for the reason that no Indian should ever be able to command a unit where there are British officers. I do not know if this is the tendency, but if it is true, I think it is very regrettable. On the civil side, there are a good many Indian officers who have the privilege of having European subordinates under them and the relations in those services are very friendly; and, if that experiment has been a success in the civil service, I do not know why it should not be extended to the Army. Now, Sir, coming to my third complaint, it is that the status of the new Indian officers who are to be recruited under the new scheme is an inferior one. Sir, I was glad that the Honourable the Army Secretary read out an amendment to the King's Regulations and he said that they will be able to command the Indian units, but, Sir, the very fact that they are to be sent to these segregated units bound to put the stigma of inferiority on them and I can quote from history of the army before the Mutiny, as my Honourable friend, the Army Secretary, must be well aware, there was the Queen's army and there was the Company's army and the feeling of superiority on the part of the officers of the Queen's army did exist as regard to the other class of officers, and, mind you, both were Englishmen; no officer who belonged to the Queen's army would willingly serve under an officer of the Company's army. This feeling of snobbery was present there, and yet they say that there won't be any such feeling if certain units are absolutely segregated. There has been a feeling of disappointment. These new cadets will not be able to command British troops. I think this will diminish their prestige to a very great extent, because in every-day life they have to deal with British troops. For instance, in the Supply and Transport Corps there are British non-commissioned officers and an officer of the Indian Army in his daily routine has to deal with these non-commissioned officers. What respect will they show him, knowing that he is quite an inferior sort of officer and has not the power to command them? Surely, then, the life of these young officers will become unbearable, and it is in fact unbearable today, and they keenly feel this sense of inferiority. Of course the sense of discipline in the Army is so strong that they cannot make any complaints against it, but they feel it all the same. Sir, the Government can bring forward one excuse and that is in the last Legislative Assembly this very Honourable House passed a measure which created these officers and these distinctions.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): We protested very strongly, then.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: Now, Sir, my submission is that no House of Legislature can bind its succeeding Legislatures. If the last Assembly passed this measure, we at any rate, are dissatisfied with it, and want to do away with it.

Sir, all I can say is that at all events those elected Members in the last Assembly who voted in favour of that measure did not earn the gratitude of their country (Loud Applause),—and you see, there are very few of them here today. (Hear, hear.) But, while on that subject, I cannot help saying a few words for those Members who resisted that law, and, while on that point, I cannot pass over the gallant stand taken by that fine gentleman, the ex-Leader of the Independent Party, who raised his voice loudest against this discrimination. I am referring to Sir Abdur Rahim, who, as the Leader of the Independent Party, in the last Assembly, really voiced the opinions of the country. I know that Sir Abdur Rahim and his followers were defeated, but let me assure them that their defeat was without disgrace. I want to tell the military authorities that we are thoroughly dissatisfied with the present state of things. Day before yesterday, there was a vote on the Army Department demand. I think that vote should have opened their eyes.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Their eyes are never open.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: Taking the representatives of my province, the Punjab, which is sometimes ironically called the Ulster of India, out of eleven elected Members, ten of whom were present in the House nine voted against that demand. They censured the Government, one remained neutral. I think this vote of the Punjab Members should open the eyes of the military authorities. We are dissatisfied, and, if I am right, I think only one Indian elected Member voted with the Government on that demand. I want to tell the Government of India that we are dissatisfied with this present arrangement, and I want to tell His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief that we are dissatisfied, and, if my voice reaches England, I want to tell His Majesty's Government that we are thoroughly dissatisfied, and the same applies to both the House of Parliament. With these words, I conclude my speech.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Twenty-Five Minutes Past Two of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Twenty-Five Minutes Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji (Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau: Indian Commerce): Sir, during the course of this debate, I understood the the Finance Member remarking that there were no constructive suggestions coming up from this side of the House. Honourable Members on this side may as well ask, have Government adopted any constructive line

[Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji.]

of policy on whatever suggestions have been made hitherto? My Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, has practically dealt with all the points mentioned by the Honourable the Finance Member, and I do not want to tread over the ground which has been trodden over so far. But I will simply make some constructive suggestions, to see whether there is any response coming from the Government Benches at all.

I will first take the incidence of the Income-tax. First of all, the losses in business in one year are not allowed to be carried forward to the next.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): The Honourable Member is under a misapprehension. I was talking about constructive suggestions for curing poverty, and not for making the rich richer.

Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: I will give other suggestions too if they would only be carried out. As regards the actual Finance Bill, I will give them presently. If the business losses are allowed to be carried forward, or the tax charged on a three-years average, it will not make any material difference to the present Finance Bill, but it will certainly be a boon to the commercial community.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That is one crore a year.

Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: If I remember rightly, his predecessor sympathised with this demand, and practically promised, on the floor of this House, that he would look to it and remove this disability.

There is another point also worth mentioning. The incomes derived from pensions, earnings from interest on the sterling debt and similar other incomes earned in India but paid out of India are not being taxed at the source of income. If these are taxed, on an average of ten per cent, it will probably give not less than three crores a year. The attention of his predecessor was actually drawn to this subject, and he also at the time promised to consider it sympathetically. Is the Honourable the Finance Member prepared to do it and bring about the necessary amendments?

Another point is this. A good many Honourable Members have spoken about the iniquity of the restoration of salary cuts. I may here mention that the salaries and allowances were enhanced by the Lee Commission at a time when high prices were ruling. Those high prices have disappeared long since. I remember the Honourable Member mentioning that the increase of salaries was naturally due to the high price level in the country, and these ought to fall or be reduced when the prices have fallen. Perhaps part of the depression which has since resulted is due to the linking of the rupee to sterling, at an unduly high rate. The prices in the country have, at any rate, gone down. If that is so, I do not see how the restoration of the cut could have been justified at all.

The people were crying for the redress of their grievances, and I think it is due to them that their needs should have been met first and taxes reduced before any such restoration was effected. At least that would have saved a very good amount.

Now, coming to salt; let me draw the attention of the House to this that probably every Member of the House has formed his own opinion

from the representation on the subject by the different mercantile bodies, as well as the private agencies concerned, and they know what is the feeling prevalent about it. When the Finance Member said that he is going to leave this point to the free vote of the House, either to abolish the salt import duty or to continue it for one year at least, I think he is absolutely unjustified in view of the promise that was given at the time of levying that protective duty. That duty was put on for a period of five years, and we are still in the middle of it, and really speaking there is no necessity to remove it so soon. Furthermore, it has got to be borne in mind that recently the prices of salt have gone down tremendously and the ill-effects of the duty have been mitigated to a certain extent. If the duty, as proposed by the Honourable Member, is removed, the competition will be too much, not only from Aden, but also from other Red Sea ports and continental countries. So long as Aden is not separated from India, it requires consideration on our part. A great deal of Indian capital has been invested in the Aden salt works, and I do not see why we should not protect the interests of Indians in Aden who have invested a large amount of capital in this industry there. If there is any demand in any one part of the country that they are suffering owing to this duty, it could easily be met by advising them to develop their own industry in that part of the country, and Government should help them in developing the local industry to the required standard. If such a policy is adopted with the assistance of Government the corresponding industry in that part of the country will grow and prosper and meet the demand there. Naturally there will be no necessity, after a few years of that sort of protection and the help of the Government, to keep any sort of import duty.

Regarding the removal of the duty on hides and skins, I think it is absolutely unjust on the part of the Government to remove it at the present stage. The industry at present is just developing; and while it is in its infancy, I do not know what reason Government have to stifle it at this stage. I want our country to be self-sufficient in the matter as in others; and unless the Government of the country adopt proper policy, I do not think we can at any time be successful, and work up the necessary industries in our country. I would request Government not to abolish the export duty on hides at this stage.

Furthermore, as regards the expenditure side of the budget, my Honourable friends have made various suggestions, in various directions: but I will take up the suggestion of financial adjustments on the separation of Burma I have already put in some questions about that subject, and I will not tread upon that ground at present. I will wait till the opportunity comes on a future occasion. But at this stage I may say that there is considerable room for saving in that direction.

My Honourable friend, Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatullah, came out with the suggestion that the reduction of the import duty on wheat ought not to have been brought in, but the old rate ought to have been maintained. I am one with him as far as that is concerned: if the duty is maintained at the existing rate, it will at least save to some extent the agriculturist of his province, namely, Sind . . . .

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah: And the Punjab too.

Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: At least Sind, I said: I include the Punjab also. Regarding flour also, a reduction has been proposed, and I might have to bring out that subject when the consideration of the amendment on that is brought up for discussion on a future date.

These are some few suggestions that I have to make with absolutely one mind and that is this: the Honourable the Secretary in the Army Department said that we have got to apply certain tests to every suggestion that is made, and see whether it stands the test. Accordingly, I have made these suggestions, and I will see what the Government Benches and my European friends have to say, and whether the British and the Indian Governments have got in their heart the welfare of the masses and the welfare of the country at large. I have made these suggestions to see and test the *bonâ fides* of the statements they make on the floor of this House and also outside at times. With these few words, I resume my seat.

Babu Baijnath Bajoria (Marwari Association: Indian Commerce): Sir, the principle underlying the Finance Bill is the supply of money for the administration of the country. When we are asked to give the supplies, I think we are entitled to ask for the redress of our grievances.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Not from that place.

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: As I represent a commercial constituency, it is in the fitness of things that I should ventilate the grievances which concerns vitally the commercial interests, and, therefore, they are not based on race or creed or colour. Sir, the Finance Member in his budget speech said that he himself was not satisfied with the budget presented by him. Therefore, he cannot expect others to be satisfied with it. True, the budget has not only been balanced, but shows a big surplus during the current year and also anticipates a surplus for the next year. But let us examine how this surplus has been secured. Sir, as far back as in September, 1931, when the financial position of India was in a very bad plight and the credit of the country was at stake, some emergency measures were adopted for tiding over the difficult situation created by circumstances not our own but due to world-wide trade depression.

In that year, the Government took steps to curtail their expenditure on the one side by means of retrenchment and on the other hand they took steps to levy emergency taxation like the surcharges. In the field of retrenchment of expenditure they enforced the cut in salary of all Government servants by ten per cent. of their pay and in the field of taxation they levied surcharges, and, by one stroke of the pen, increased the income-tax, super-tax, import duties, excise duties, etc., by 25 per cent at a time when all sections of the people of this country, whether the agriculturists, merchants, professional men, landholders and others, were already groaning under a heavy burden of taxation at a time of unprecedented economic depression, and this sudden increase of various forms of taxation came as the last straw on the back of an already overladen camel. These measures were taken in order to meet budget deficits, and it was definitely declared that these emergency measures had been adopted temporarily to tide over exceptional difficulties and the Finance (Supplementary) Act of 1931-32 was passed for a period of about 18 months on this definite declaration. It was then confidently expected, by all sections of the people, that these additional taxations will lapse at the end of March, 1933. But it was not so to be. This reminds me of the writing of a

leading journalist that whenever Government want to impose additional taxation, it is always said that it is only a temporary measure, but a taxation once imposed never goes, and becomes a permanent thing. It has happened so in this case also. During the last two years, the financial position of the Government has much improved, but what have the Government done to reduce the burden of taxation? Government took the earliest possible opportunity of restoring the cut in salary of Government servants on the ground of alleged pledges as if the ten per cent. or even five per cent reduction in their fat salaries was unbearable to them. But it is a solid truth that the income of all classes of people, namely, agriculturists, traders, money-lenders, landholders, persons in private employment, etc., has all gone down by 25 per cent. or even more during recent years. The cost of living in recent years has also gone down considerably. Therefore, in my opinion, this restoration of cut in salary was not in the least justified. Sir, this restoration of five per cent. cut has cost the Central general revenues 92 lakhs and the Railway revenues 70 lakhs annually. The provinces, many unwillingly, had to follow suit which has cost them about 150 lakhs. Thus, if this five per cent. cut were not restored, there would have been available about 162 lakhs to the Central Government and 150 lakhs to the different provinces for utilisation in various projects of public utility. Sir, when the Government restored half of the cut in salary to their servants in 1934-35 budget, the people in general and the commercial interests of the country in particular confidently expected that theirs would be the next turn to get relief, by way of abolition or substantial reduction of the surcharges on income-tax. This surcharge is having a very great distressing effect on business, and capital is becoming very shy. It is the business of every Government in every country to see that the commerce and industry in the country may develop for which the main sinews is capital. In a country like India, where ordinarily capital is shy, we should take all steps to encourage capital to flow into the field of industry and commerce so that the country's raw resources may be better utilised to the advancement of this country. I for one can never agree to the action of the Government in the full restoration of the cut in salary before giving substantial relief to the trade and industry of the country by a substantial reduction in all the surcharges levied in September, 1931, and especially on income-tax. I may inform the Government, that the full restoration of the cut in salaries of Government servants, drawing fat salaries, have evoked a serious discontent amongst all sections of the people throughout the length and breadth of this country and I am perfectly certain that most of the elected Members of this House, both Europeans and Indians alike, irrespective of the differences of opinion amongst them in the field of politics, strongly disapprove of this restoration of cut in salaries

Sir, the next point I wish to deal is the way in which the surplus of 389 lakhs has been distributed. I for one do not agree to the expenditure of 93 lakhs on Civil Aviation and about 20 lakhs on broadcasting and 25 lakhs for roads in North-West Frontier Province. As regards the Civil Aviation let us examine as to the classes of persons who would avail themselves of this development. It will be only utilised by a few commercial magnates or by the richer classes. The vast expenditure proposed to be expended on the development of Civil Aviation, at this juncture when the masses are groaning under the burdens of multifarious indirect taxations, is wholly unjustified and cannot be supported by any section of the Indian people. Sir, to my mind, this Civil Aviation is nothing but a branch of the Royal Air Force and is being developed and maintained for the sole purpose of helping the Army in India.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce (*Member for Industries and Labour*): I must protest against that statement as being wholly inaccurate. This expenditure has nothing whatever to do with the Army in India. It is entirely civil expenditure.

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: However, the fact remains.

That being the case, I have no objection, if such a development of this branch of aviation is also carried out from the Army estimates of this country, which is already beyond proportion to the total revenues of the country. Sir, the expenditure of 25 lakhs provided for road construction in the North-West Frontier Province is also for military exigencies and so this should have also been included in the army budget. These sums of 93 lakhs and 25 lakhs should have been utilised for the development of cottage industries and for relieving unemployment in the whole country and especially in Bengal.

I next come to the question of the grant of Rs. 20 lakhs for broadcasting. We are told that it has a great educative value. But, in practice, we find that this broadcasting is being utilised only by the rich and is nothing but a luxury. I admit that broadcasting has a potentiality of being utilised for mass education but that may only be achieved if Government is prepared to instal free radio machines in every village primary schools, where the village folks may get the news of the world free of cost. I think the present programme of broadcasting, as we find, consists mostly of songs and theatrical performances, which are only meant to cater to the perverse mentalities of the people living in luxury and comfort. Broadcasting is not being utilized for the purposes of education of the masses while large sums are being spent on this project.

An Honourable Member: Don't you keep a radio in your house?

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: I have not got any.

Then, Sir, I come to the question of the excise duties on matches and sugar. Sir, I am fully aware of the extent of protection given to these industries. I am grateful to the Government for taking the bold action of levying substantial protective duties on sugar even though it created a big hole in their revenues but the Government will be amply rewarded for this generous policy, as under the shelter of this protection, numerous sugar mills have been erected in the different Provinces and the cultivation of sugar-cane has also increased considerably. I eagerly look forward for the day when India will be self-supporting as regards sugar, and shall not have to look to other countries for this necessity of life. But, Sir, both the matches and sugar industries have not yet developed fully and it is premature to levy excise duties on them for raising Government revenues. I think the excise duties should have been deferred for a few years, and, during that period, the restoration of cut in salary, should have been enforced by way of retrenchment. Sir, the sugar excise duty during the ten months ending January, 1935, has yielded a revenue of about 3 crores and 37 lakhs and it is only just and fair for me to demand that a large sum of money must be spent for intensive and comprehensive sugar-cane research for the improvement of the quality of sugar-cane so that the percentage of yield of sugar may be much higher than it is at present and also for the prevention of diseases in cane as is being urged by the Indian Sugar Mills Association. The development of this industry depends on

the quality of sugar-cane available to the Indian mills, and, it is, therefore, necessary that nurseries should be established and better quality seeds distributed to the cultivators. These measures are required not only for the advantage of the millowners but also for the raising of the price level of sugar-cane for the advantage and welfare of the cultivators as well.

Then I come to the question on which a great deal of revenue is being wasted. Sir, I mean the London Stores Department under the charge of the High Commissioner. The expenditure incurred, to my mind, is a large waste and we can never subscribe to it From the available records we find that in 1932-33 the total value of stores purchased was about nine lakhs and 55 thousand pounds, out of which stores worth about four lakhs pounds were purchased through Departments of His Majesty's Government like the War Office and the Admiralty in respect of which the London Stores Department only acted as a post office. But the cost of the London Stores Department in that year was £170,000 *i.e.*, about Rs. 23 lakhs. It, therefore, shows that it is costing us 23 lakhs of rupees for the purchase of stores worth about four lakhs and 98 thousand pounds, or, in other words, about Rs 66 lakhs. It means that during the year 1932-33, the expenditure of the Department was about 35 per cent. on the total value of stores actually purchased by it. Let us also examine the figures for 1933-34. In that year the total value of stores purchased by the Department, excluding those purchased through the Departments of His Majesty's Government, was four lakhs and 18 thousand pounds and the cost of the Department was £161,400 or about 22 lakhs of rupees. Sir, I would like to read out the classification of charges incurred in the London Stores Department to show how preposterous these charges are.

I will read to you only a few of the items:

Share of India House Staff expenses, interest on capital, *etc.*, £16,500;

Consulting Engineers, Naval Architects and other experts outside the Department, £29,100;

Labour (other than clerical and technical staff) and miscellaneous items, £19,300;

Directing and clerical staff, £36,700;

Directing, technical and clerical staff, £53,100.

I fail to understand the cost of £29,000 in consulting Engineers and Architects when there are already 21 higher technical officers in the Department.

Though there is a slight decrease in the proportionate cost, yet the cost, as it stands, is beyond comprehension of any business firm worth the name. I, as a businessman, have never heard of expenses of about 35 per cent. on the total value of stores. On the other hand, let us compare the working of the Indian Stores Department during the years 1932-33 and 1933-34. The following figures will speak for themselves:

	1932-1933.	1933-34.
Value of goods purchased . . .	330 lakhs	360 lakhs.
Direct and indirect expenditure of the Department	21¼ lakhs	22¼ lakhs.
Earnings of the Department . . .	10 lakhs	12 lakhs.
Net cost of the Department . . .	11¼ lakhs	10¼ lakhs.

[Babu Baijnath Bajoria.]

Sir, in replying to the debate on the Public Accounts Committee report on the 30th August, 1934, the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce said that the question of amalgamating the London Stores Department with the Indian Stores Department was under consideration and amalgamation was bound to come in course of time but nothing has yet been done. I would, therefore, suggest that the London Stores Department be forthwith abolished and the purchases, other than through Departments of His Majesty's Government, be controlled by the Chief Controller of Stores, Indian Stores Department, in India, either by arranging with some reputed British firms who, I think, would only be too willing to act as purchase agents on a maximum commission basis of five per cent. or by the establishment of a small Stores Department Branch in London.

Mr. B. Das. Five per cent is too high.

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: But we are paying 35 per cent. now. Sir, I welcome the introduction of rupee tender system as this expresses definite preference for goods produced or manufactured in India and also enables stockists and merchants in India to get a much larger share of the orders placed by the Department. I would ask the Government to make it a point that when it is necessary to purchase goods of foreign manufacture, they should place the orders, as far as possible, through importers and stockists in India rather than pass over the order to the London Stores Department, as the former method, while assisting Indian traders, will also be economical to the Government

I have got another serious grievance against the London Stores Department Sir, out of a large establishment of technical officers to the tune of about 21 members, there are only two Indian officers employed there. One as assistant Inspector and the other as assistant chemist. Certainly the High Commissioner can find best qualified Indians in London, trained in all branches of engineering and I would request the Government to insist on the appointment of more Indians in the London Stores Department. Sir, I have carefully gone through the reports of the Indian Stores Department for the years 1932-33 and 1933-34 and am very pleased to state that under the able guidance of Sir James Pitkeathly, this Department is doing very useful work in helping Indian trade and industries. Sir, I would prefer that all the stores required to be purchased for the different departments of the Government and railways should be purchased through a central stores department instead of each department and each railway having a separate purchasing department which is a costly affair. It is always more economical to buy big quantities at a central organisation and to distribute and supply the requirements of the various departments than to buy piecemeal separately through different departments.

3 P. M.

The next point I wish to refer is the question of the restoration of jute duty to the Province of Bengal. Sir, I congratulate the Government of India for the small mercy they have shown to my province of Bengal by restoration of half the jute duty, and, in this connection, I think His Excellency the Governor of Bengal deserves the congratulation from every representative from Bengal, irrespective of caste, creed and colour, as it is well-known that but for his persevering efforts in this direction, we would not have been able to secure this small mercy. Sir, I call this

a small mercy, because no Bengali worth his salt can be ever satisfied unless and until we are given back the whole of this duty on which the Central Government has no claim. This product of jute is a gift of nature to Bengal, and, as such, Bengal has got every claim over the whole of this duty either from the standpoint of equity or from the point of view of justice.

Sir, when this question of restoration of jute duty to Bengal comes before this House, I find that several representatives of other provinces think that this is doing a special favour to Bengal. But, Sir, we claim this duty and the whole of it, not as a favour, not as a mercy but as a matter of right?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What about "India"?

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: We all know that it is illogical to put an export duty on agricultural produce, and an export duty cannot be compared and does not stand on the same footing as import and excise duties, both for revenue and protective purposes. Sir, it has been possible to levy this export duty on jute only because it is the monopoly product of Bengal and is not grown in other countries. The burden of this duty falls to a great extent on the producers and it is the inherent right of the producing provinces to get the export duty on their agricultural produces. Sir, Bengal is the greatest earning province for the Central Government (*An Honourable Member*: "Question") as it pays the greatest amount of income and super-tax, customs duties, salt tax and the consumers in Bengal have also to suffer greatly for protection given to industries in other provinces of India, *e.g.*, iron and steel, sugar, cotton, etc. Indeed, Sir, it is an irony of fate that Bengal, while feeding generously the Central Government and the other provinces, herself remains a beggar. This is an intolerable state of affairs. (Hear, hear.)

I hope and trust that every Member from Bengal, irrespective of caste, creed or colour will voice their protest in not being given the full benefit of the jute duty, as otherwise Bengal's progress, both material and moral, is being jeopardised for want of sufficient finance.

Sir, I would now like to draw the attention of the Honourable the Finance Member and of the House to an anomaly that exists in the rates of jute duty which is adversely affecting the jute industry in Bengal. Sir, the rate of duty on the export of raw jute is Rs. 4-8-0 per bale of 400 lbs. which amounts to about Rs. 25 per ton, whereas the rate of duty on manufactured jute, *viz.*, Hessians, is Rs. 32 per ton. Again, the rate of duty on jute cuttings is Rs. 1-4-0 per bale or Rs. 7 per ton only, whereas the duty on manufactured jute, *viz.*, sacking, in the manufacture of which a good proportion of jute cuttings is used, is Rs. 20 per ton. Hence, we see that the export duty on raw jute is much less than on manufactured jute which means that the jute mills in Scotland, Germany and other foreign countries are getting a substantial advantage over the jute mills in Bengal. The result of this has been that jute is exported to a great extent while our own mills are only working 40 hours per week instead of 60 hours and 54 hours which they used to do a few years back and 12½ per cent. of the Hessian looms are lying sealed. This has thrown hundreds of thousands of labourers out of work, and the wages of those employed had also to be curtailed. This state of things cannot be called satisfactory, though I know, by a system of restriction of output and by organised

[Babu Baijnath Bajoria.]

action, the jute mills are making a profit Sir, at a time when the Government of Bengal and all concerned in the jute trade are engaging their serious attention to raise the price level of jute, it is out of the question to increase the export duty on raw jute The only other alternative is to reduce the export duty on manufactured jute, both Hessian and sacking so as to bring it at least on a parity with the export duty on raw jute, so that the local mills may not be at a disadvantage in competing with foreign mills. Sir, in making this suggestion, I may be open to criticism that there will be a loss in revenue, but in my opinion the increased production by the jute mills and increased shipments of manufactured goods will compensate for the loss in revenue due to lower tariffs and further increased production will enable the local jute mills to provide employment to further hundreds of thousands of labourers, and will also be of immense benefit to the cultivators. I commend this suggestion for the serious consideration of the Government.

The next question I wish to bring before the Government is the question of consumption of Indian cotton by the Indian mills within the borders of India. Sir, here, I have a real grievance against the cotton millowners in India as it is shocking to me that they are using cotton imported from Egypt and other foreign countries to the tune of crores of rupees annually and are thus neglecting to make proper use of Indian cotton. Sir, during the discussion of the trade agreement with Japan and England we demanded the stipulation for the consumption of raw Indian cotton by those countries. It is our duty to find out markets for our raw produce, because India is mainly an agricultural country and industrially less developed. In order to have a balance of trade in our favour we will have to export our raw produce more than the imports of finished products from other countries. But, Sir, cotton industry in India is sufficiently advanced and has been given protection as well. Therefore, certainly we have a claim to know from the industry as to what steps they have taken to use Indian cotton and not foreign cotton. It is an everybody knowledge of every Indian that India is exporting at the present moment foreign cotton to the value of crores of rupees annually, and I think time has come when Government should take steps to find out as to how best the import of raw cotton is reduced and the use of Indian cotton in Indian mills is increased. It is a slur on our national industry like the cotton industry that they cannot produce manufactured cotton articles which we call 100 per cent. Indian, *viz.*, Indian capital, Indian labour, and Indian raw materials. I hope my friends from Bombay will not misconstrue this suggestion of mine. I am one of those who are for the abolition of cotton excise and also for the protection of the industry by a protective duty. But that is no ground that I should not press the question of the use of Indian cotton in Indian mills to the exclusion of foreign cotton.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Does the Honourable Member only refer to Bombay mills, when he makes those remarks, or include also the mills in Bengal?

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: Because you own most of the mills.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Bombay does not contain most of the mills.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated: Non-Official): Bombay and Ahmedabad.

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: If, due to the old type of machineries, Indian cotton cannot be used, I will then ask the millowners to replace them with the latest machineries irrespective of the country of origin of such machineries and which will help in the use of cent. per cent. Indian cotton. Sir, I feel it is a matter of shame for an agricultural country like India producing vast quantities of cotton to import foreign cotton for use in our own mills; and I think every Indian worth his salt must be feeling like that.

Last, but not the least, is the question of the transfer of the Agricultural Research Institute from Pusa to Delhi. I must confess that I have not been convinced by the arguments of the Government in favour of such a transfer. The money which is being sunk in the construction of the Institute in Delhi is to my mind a huge avoidable waste The Institute could have been reconstructed with half the cost in Pusa. Sir, I am dead sure, that this sum of Rs 40 lakhs at present provided for this scheme is only the first instalment and further equally big instalments will have to be provided before this scheme is completed.

Next point to which I wish to draw the attention of the Government is the spending of money on this construction from the revenue and not from the capital. Sir, this transfer of the Institute to Delhi is connected with the programme of making the Imperial City more popular, and, therefore, the whole of the expenditure should have been met from the head of Demands called Delhi Capital Outlay. As far as I know the Government of India has frittered away about 23 crores on Delhi, the pet and spoilt child of the Central Government with no return whatsoever from this huge expenditure.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Sir, I should like to ask my Honourable friend where he gets his figure of 23 crores from.

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: Sir, the Leader of the House knows it. (Laughter.)

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Then, may I ask my Honourable friend, the Leader of the House, to authenticate his statement?

An Honourable Member: That is an under-estimate.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Are we to take it, Sir, that the Leader of the House did say that 23 crores was the cost?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Let the Honourable Member go on.

[At this stage, the Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar rose, but Babu Baijnath Bajoria happened to be standing.]

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Has the Honourable Member concluded his speech?

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: One minute more, Sir. In order not to increase the figure of capital outlay on Delhi, Government have adopted this ingenious method of finding money from the revenues for spending on Delhi. This is one of the Government of India's

[Babu Baijnath Bajoria.]

budgetary tricks for evading criticism on the Delhi Capital Outlay Programme which has been condemned by all, Europeans and Indians alike,—a huge waste of capital with no return, but on the contrary, consuming a huge sum on the Central Public Works Department for the repairs and maintenance of the New Capital. Sir, I hope and trust that the Government will give due and sympathetic consideration to the points raised by me.

Mr. W. J. C. Richards (Burma: European): Sir, in view of the probability of the political separation of Burma from India, I will confine my remarks to a narrow range, to matters of pressing concern to Burma which are controlled by the Central Government. Burma is in dire distress and I will not take up time by attempting to draw the picture as it is very similar to that painted of Assam yesterday by my Honourable friend, Mr. Hockenhull. His description of the present condition of Assam reminded me of Burma a few years ago in times which adversity has since made us regard as years of comparative prosperity. The financial condition of Burma for some years has been getting progressively worse in spite of severe retrenchment and the rigid applications of economy in all spheres. The Burma Government has budgeted for the coming year for a deficit of Rs. 93 lakhs which, if correct, will make Burma's debt to the Government of India at the end of March, 1936, Rs. 863 lakhs.

Speakers from other constituencies have asked for direct and immediate relief from Central revenues but I do not follow their lead, as I think, they and I have very little chance of getting it, and I consider it would be imprudent for Government to consider the claim of any one province without simultaneous consideration of the claims of all provinces. (Applause.) I believe the Honourable the Finance Member's plan of improving the condition of individual industries, thus bringing about an improvement in the economic situation, is a sound course and I place in this category the removal of the duty on machinery which presses very heavily on provinces like Assam and Burma which are at present in a destitute condition but have valuable undeveloped resources. The supply of machinery at the cheapest possible cost has long been regarded in India as an essential condition of industrial progress and in that long period of just over twenty years which ended in 1916 industrial machinery was admitted free of duty. That period witnessed the development of some of India's great key industries.

Much of the machinery which is used in some industries becomes worn out in a short time and its cost forms a substantial portion of the cost of production. Therefore, if the duty on machinery is abolished, there should be a considerable set off in higher receipts from income-tax and super-tax. I mention this point, not because I have much faith in the argument myself, but because it has been so frequently used in connection with restoring Government servant's salaries to their former level and making them liable for the surcharge on income-tax.

In discussing the emergency budget, Sir George Schuster said that of all the import duties that on machinery was the one he would select as the first for removal. When the promised departmental enquiry on the revision of revenue tariffs is held I hope Government will place the removal of the duty on machinery in the forefront of the agenda for sympathetic consideration.

It is a matter of disappointment that at least half the export duty on rice is not being allocated to Burma. I will not raise the question of the incidence of the export duty except to say that in Burma we do not accept the view that because there are duties on rice shipped from the other big exporting countries the duty on rice exported from India does not fall on the cultivator or other Indian interests. I realise that if the Honourable the Finance Member's view as to what are non-recurrent surpluses is to be accepted, Central Revenues cannot be weakened by the transfer to Burma of half the rice export duty, although I maintain that there is greater justification for it than transferring to other provinces half the export duty on jute. In the budget discussion we have been reminded frequently by the Honourable the Finance Member of many old economic truths and I share his faith in most of them, but I cannot accept his treatment of the export duty on rice by any principle other than that which he applies to jute. It seems to me that he has one set of economics for Bengal and another for Burma. For reasons which I have stated and which I appreciate, I waive Burma's claim to a prompt settlement of the rice export duty and content myself with postponing the claim until the proposals for the financial settlement between Burma and India are made public when Burma will no doubt be able to establish its title to half the export duty on rice exported from Burma in the present financial year and in that on which we are about to embark. (Applause.)

Mr. K. Nageswara Rao (East Godavari and West Godavari *cum* Kistna: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I thank you for the opportunity given to me to make a few observations on the vast and intricate financial problems involved in the Financial Bill and discussions. The long established practice of surveying Indian financial matters, on this occasion, without any restraint from Mount Kailas to Kanya Kumari is, I think, intended to extend the vision of the House and that of the Honourable the Finance Member beyond the manipulation of facts and figures to the realities of finance. The manipulation of figures and facts is the business of an accountant and no expert knowledge is needed to do that. The inter-relation of Central and Provincial financial matters enhances the responsibility of the Finance Member in deciding the financial policy of the Central Government. Autonomous Provinces and indirect representation may, in course of time, lighten the responsibility of the Finance Member in these matters. But the welfare of the people in one form or other, as an all-India problem, is bound to be determined by the Central Government.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. No Honourable Member is allowed to read newspapers inside the Chamber.

Mr. K. Nageswara Rao: The Honourable the Finance Member, in introducing the budget proposals, stated, "that the needs of the rural areas should have the first claim on the balance to be distributed by me". Though the grant of 100 lakhs is of little consequence for the economic development and improvement of rural areas, the recognition of the claims of the rural areas by the Central Government is a welcome change in the attitude of the Central Government to draw the attention of the Provincial Governments to the needs of the rural areas. India is a land of rural areas and agriculture is the main occupation of the rural population. The Indian cultivator is the mainstay of the Indian economic structure. Out of 352 millions about 314 millions live in villages. The progress of urbanisation,

[Mr. K. Nageswara Rao.]

during the last forty years, has been a little more than one per cent. owing to the commercial policy followed by the Government. In spite of the Industrial progress during the last forty years, the population dependent on agriculture has steadily increased from 59 per cent. in 1891 to 73 per cent. in 1931.

The present slow rate of industrial progress is suicidal to the economic interests of this country. Cottage industries, which used to contribute to the rural prosperity, have gradually disappeared. Agriculture has become a precarious occupation The world depression and the economic, financial, and political policies of the Government of India have crippled the agricultural industry The exchange and currency policy and the policy of Imperial Preference have reduced the incomes of the farmers by several crores of rupees. The abnormal fall in prices, during the last five years, has reduced the income of rural population by crores of rupees, while the taxes have increased considerably The rise in taxation in the case of the rural population, who live on agriculture, is much higher than in the case of those who have regular incomes owing to the fall in the agricultural prices. The problem of unemployment in the rural areas has become more serious and pressing than the problem of unemployment in the urban areas. The recommendations which the Royal Commission on Agriculture made in 1928, "that all the resources at the disposal of the State should be brought to bear on the problem of rural uplift. What is required is an organised and sustained effort by all those departments whose activities touch the lives and surroundings of the rural population" has become much more imperative in 1935 The rural population has been actually living on its capital instead of on its production Thousands of farmers have been ruined and the downward march is still continuing. The farmers have sold their lands and ornaments to meet their liabilities but there is no hope in sight in the present financial outlook of the Government. The distress gold of the rural population has saved the Government and the country from financial catastrophe But the Government remains indifferent as usual to the needs of the rural population. The Finance Bill introduces no relief to the suffering rural tax-payer though he bears a greater portion of the burden. Though the generous grant of 100 lakhs is a welcome change in the economic outlook of the Honourable the Finance Member, it will not effect any material change in the economic condition of the rural population. The financial proposals should have provided some permanent relief to the over-burdened rural taxpayer instead of a grant of 100 lakhs. The previous Finance Member's pledges are equally sacred in the case of the general taxpayer as in the case of salaried officers. But the whole financial policy of the Government is based on the State Services. One million servants of the State determine the fate of 350 millions in an ascending scale, from His Excellency the Viceroy to a Chowkidar in a village represent the interests of the State. The financial and self-preservation responsibilities of the Finance Member are mainly in the interest of the servants of the State and the people who maintain these servants have only secondary consideration.

The main problem for the consideration of the Finance Member is the self preservation of the millions of rural population and his responsibility to the taxpayer. The rural indebtedness amounts to about 800 crores and is increasing day by day. Rural reconstruction and regeneration in some form or other is necessary to give relief to the rural population by creating employment to the millions of unemployed in the rural areas. If the grant

of 100 lakhs of rupees can secure the desired end in 7,00,000 of villages there is nothing to be said against the policy. But even the policy of this grant seems to be only an eye-wash. When the substitution of direct to indirect election to the Central Legislatures is taken into consideration, the recent success of the Nationalist and Congress candidates in the Assembly elections has deprived the rural population of their right to direct election. Repression and concession always go together in the Government policy. The problem is not how many crores are required but what are the requirements and how they are to be met. It is not a matter of money but a matter of outlook and change of heart. If the Government seriously believe in rural uplift, the first requisite is trust in the people. Repression of all forms is to be discontinued and the confidence of the people in the rural areas is to be secured. There are millions of educated and uneducated people who can serve the country if they are trusted. There are well trained men in all the branches of Government services for all constructive purposes and they can profitably co-operate with the people. The only requisite is a change in the angle of vision. In the reconstruction programme sufficient production of food must naturally take the first place. The imports of wheat and rice testify how India is gradually drifting into helplessness even in the matter of food grains. The growing population requires immediate attention of the Government so far as food is concerned. The population of India requires 90 million tons of food grains per annum but the yield of food crops amounts to 65 million tons. After giving allowance for the quantity required for export, seed, cattle feeding, the balance is barely 50 million. This insufficient supply of food-crops to a country predominantly agricultural is sapping away the vitality of the people. The cultivated or cropped area in British India is 261 million acres. In addition to this there is an area of 154 million acres of cultivable waste land which may be brought under cultivation. There are projects like Tungabhadra, which require immediate consideration, in Madras, Bengal, Punjab and other provinces.

Apart from the financial policy, even in the matter of general services the needs of the rural population are generally relegated to the background. In 1933-34, 1,000 rural post offices and post boxes were closed while those of the urban ones were increased. In starting experimental post offices the partial contribution system was discontinued and full contribution system was adopted. While the increase in the expenditure of urban post offices is 11 lakhs in that of rural post offices is only 50,000 in the budget proposals, though the cost of a rural post office is only about Rs. 140 per annum. In the matter of roads and communications, the same negligence is shown to the village communications in the rural areas.

In the field of Government jobs the rural population have very few chances. But a few small concessions, without any financial complications, may be given to the people (1) The observance of the Gandhi-Irwin Salt-Pact in a more liberal spirit. (2) The extension of rural post offices to every group of five or more villages. (3) Village road extension and construction. These items can be easily undertaken for the economic uplift of the rural population.

The main problem to be solved by the Government is the increase of production and income of the rural population. The rapid revival of industries and the extension of agriculture are problems, which the Government are required to solve. The mechanization of large industries may

[Mr. K. Nageswara Rao.]

require time and large capital, but the revival and improvement of cottage and rural industries can be undertaken without delay. There are thousands of educated young men and women who are ready to serve their country. There is stagnation not only in agricultural industry, but in all walks of life. Lack of identity of interest between the rulers and the ruled makes the financial and other policies unreal.

In this connection, a fitting tribute may be paid to the great social services which Mahatma Gandhi has rendered to the uplift of Harijans in the rural areas by reviving and improving the leather industry. In villages, leather industry is a cottage hereditary industry practised from time immemorial by Harijans, Harijans richly deserve a portion of the rural uplift grant to improve their social and economic condition. In this matter politics are not mixed with the Harijan uplift. Above all, financial problems are problems of men, and matters of money ought to occupy a secondary place The Government should give up their prejudice and prestige and see their way to help Mahatma Gandhi in his rural uplift work. India has the good fortune of having a great living man. He has inspired the Indian people with self-respect, self-confidence and self-reliance. He is the embodiment of truth, service, and non-violence and may be safely allowed to carry out his rural industrial revival work. Plain living and high thinking is the key note to Mahatmaji's life. Real and living India is still to be found in Indian villages. The farmers are self-respecting, hard working, honest labourers and Mahatmaji, a great leader of men, may be allowed to carry hope and light to the suffering millions of the rural areas in the revival of rural industries.

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: May I make a personal explanation? I made a mistake when I gave the figures of expenditure for Delhi: I said 23 crores. It should have been 13 crores. I am very sorry for the mistake.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I am very grateful to my Honourable friend for his correction: I may tell him that the actual figure is 15 crores.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): What about the new expenditure of Rs. 2 crores last year?

Mr. Muhammad Nauman (Patna and Chota Nagpur *cum* Orissa Muhammadan): Sir, first of all allow me to congratulate the Finance Member on his having introduced and presented a Bill for the first time, within the memory of the last few years, which does not aim at new taxation and new customs duties. Of course, the relief given is far from being satisfactory for a country like India, but we must appreciate even that little, which we have been given. I wish we could be in a position to make constructive programmes, as we, unfortunately, do not have any control on our own affairs we can only make suggestions and repeat our tales of sorrow and despair. Looking to the whole foreign trade and commerce of India we only feel that we exist in this country to be used by foreigners and become a means of their prosperity. It is not that we allow ourselves to be exploited by our own actions but that we have no remedy as a slave nation in this country. We are saddled with agreements like the "Ottawa Agreement" and the "Indo-British Trade Agreement" even against our definite expressions of dissatisfaction and disappointment.

For a country like India, where 80 per cent. of the people are engaged in agriculture, it is absolutely necessary that the export of those products to other countries should be facilitated in every possible way. Having my connections with commerce for some time in different capacities as Vice-President of the Muslim Chamber of Calcutta and other commercial bodies in Bengal and Bihar and Orissa, I do firmly believe that all the export duties on such commodities, where we do not hold virtual monopoly, should be abolished. In this connection, I may once again congratulate the Finance Member for having abolished the export duty on skins, and this little relief is being very much appreciated by the merchants everywhere. I remember yesterday some of the Honourable Members belonging to the Congress did not appreciate it and made erroneous statements. If I am allowed to say so, I think it is due to their ignorance of this trade or for reasons of prejudice existing amongst our Hindu friends for the trade. I will not take the time of the House in explaining the ins and outs of the skin trade, but I may inform him and the House that the abolition of the skin duty is absolutely necessary. The skin trade has reached a level where it may altogether be ruined like the indigo trade as it is being replaced by artificial fabric use and rubber use all over. The skin trade has a world-wide competition and we could not compete with Africa, Russia, Mombasa, Madagascar and China skins with a handicap of the duty. I think the Honourable Member does not realise that for reasons of selections and assortments, the duty of five per cent. *ad valorem* was so high that we could not ship these skins at all to foreign countries. The value of the rejection skins is Rs. 3 to Rs. 5 per 100 and to export them with a duty of five per cent. *ad valorem* will make the sale impossible in foreign countries. Since over six years, we had practically stopped shipping of inferior skins, and the shipping of the skins of Oudh and Lucknow quality which only value about Rs. 30 per 100 was also on the point of being stopped. In such skins duty came to about 20 per cent. of value and not five per cent. Mombasa and other skin shipping countries were able to defeat us in prices mostly on account of this duty. There may be an idea with some people that we could use our skins in India in our own tanneries, but I may inform the House that uptil now, even Madras, the foremost tanning city, has only been able to build up a trade in "Half tanned hides and skins" and, either, for the lack of skill or machinery, they have not been able to produce such tanned stuffs as would enable them to compete with other tanning countries.

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: (South Madras: Muhammadan): Question.

Mr. Muhammad Nauman: Duty was levied on skin by way of protection to these industries but we have seen that no efforts have been made by those tanners to compete against foreign tanning. Skin is also one of such products in India where we do not hold virtual monopoly and which is one of those raw commodities for which we have either no sufficient use or no sufficient arrangements to prepare them here and export tanned skins or ready-made shoes to other countries. Sir, you will not be surprised to hear that skin prices reached a level, where the butchers would prefer to throw them off rather than send them by land and sea to be sold in skin emporiums and markets for a price which would not even cover the freight and the charges of salting (for preservation), etc. It actually happened that in a State like Nepal nobody could take the lease of hides and skins, and, in this way, many people have suffered huge amounts of losses. I remember to have brought these facts to the notice of the Commerce Member

[Mr. Muhammad Nauman.]

in 1933 in my capacity as head of the Deputation led by the Muslim Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta. From the figures given in the Honourable the Finance Member's speech, you can also realise how India was losing her share in the skin trade.

Now, coming to other commodities, Sir, I would only suggest that once again the tariff rates should be revised for every thing on the present level, and effort should be made either to abolish the export duties or minimise it to the extent it may require.

I would also suggest in this connection that prohibitive import duties should be levied on the imports of such commodities which we ourselves produce in majority such as rice, wheat, shellac, etc., the duty levied on import of rice and wheat is insufficient. Recently, an inferior class of shellacs have been imported from other countries like Siam to be mixed with Indian shellac and re-shipped to foreign countries at an advantageous price. This has distinctly reduced the value of our shellac export. Representing as I do Chota Nagpur, this area is being mostly damaged.

Import Duty on Salt.—As regards salt, I am of opinion that it is absolutely in the interest of Bengal that this is retained till such time when Bengal becomes a self-manufacturing unit, and, if proper support is given, Bengal can develop her manufacture in no time. In this connection, I beg to point out to a resolution of the Chamber reading as follows:

"This meeting of the citizens of Calcutta and the people of Bengal resolve that in the interests of the National Salt industry the present policy of protection be continued for a sufficiently long time to enable the Indigenous Salt Industry to grow and prosper and that it urges upon the Government to give all facilities and assistance pecuniary and otherwise, for the growth and development and success of the Bengal Salt Concerns

This naturally brings in the question of rates into the forefront. Under protection it is admitted on all hands that the consumers had their salt at a price far below what they had for the last fifty years so the protection had not been a burden on the consumers During these three years of protection the prices ranged round about Rs. 56, in 1931, Rs 64 to Rs 66 in 1932 and Rs 45 to Rs. 47 in 1933

Herein lies the importance of Aden Salt but at the same time it would not be out of place to mention here that of four Aden Works, three are purely Indian and one Italian So it is up to the Government to discriminate between Indian Aden Salt Works and Italian Salt Works at Aden by some sort of excise or duty as in case of steel and such other industries under the operation of the Ottawa Pact in sympathy with the demand of all quarters. Such a discrimination would give further facilities for the development of the National Salt Industry."

Silver Duty.—I think the reduction of duty on silver is very much appreciable, but I would suggest that import of silver should be free of duty as that will stabilise our rupees, and, as Dr. Ziauddin suggested, this may be urged by the Reserve Bank as well in no time.

Of course, the review of gold export is something which requires more attention. The Honourable the Finance Member seems to think that it is one of the commodities like our own raw products like wheat. I cannot understand this philosophy of economics, as the exchange jugglery among the European powers has been the real fight for their commercial superiority and without gold resources how they can do I do not understand. Gold is not a commodity which we can grow as much as we like. "Gold" having been taken as the standard for exchange of commodities for all the time leads us to believe that only a limited quantity exists in the world, and, so long it is the standard of exchange and reserve, the credit

of a country will depend on her gold reserve at the back of her currency, and, unless this is so, why should America have refused to accept payment of debts in kind and insisted on gold? England, in her anxiety to keep her reserves, went off the Gold Standard and the U. S. A. placed an embargo on gold. Germany, France, Holland and other countries limited their import credits and Bills of Exchange. Japan at once manipulated her own exchange in the way suited to her for commercial relations with India and other parts of the world. Australia limited the amount of her import values to create sufficient gold reserve in support of her trade balance. This automatically takes us to the question of ratio administratively fixed at 1/6 and which, in the opinion of the Finance Member, is final. Of course, it is final so long it can be fixed without our consultation, and, it is in these matters, that India begins to feel that "Good Government is no substitute for self-Government". I know that all we say may not be of any use, but, we only say so to impress on the Government that this is what is being thrust on us against our will, and if we cannot do anything we can express our regret and sorrow and make a protest in words so long as we have freedom of speech in this House.

Sir, why is this 1/6 fixed and in whose interests? Mostly to the interest of England and in the interest of all other foreign nations who can manipulate their own exchange to keep their "trade balance" intact. England went off the gold with all the other countries of the world, sterling dropped, but India was tied to her in the same ratio, and why, because India had no voice to put a value to her currency and revalue her own coins. The simple effect of this 1/6 is that we are constantly losing a considerable share in our exports to other countries. No country would accept a ratio thrust on her, but we have to go on with it as we have no voice to make ourselves felt. Our interest is watched by that section of the people whose better interest lies somewhere else probably.

Grant of One Crore and Industries.—Allow me to thank the Honourable the Finance Member for having granted a crore of rupees for rural uplift. I do not agree with the remarks of some Congress Members that even that allocation is made with some sinister purpose, but I would only say that this charity should have been accompanied with nation building realistic programmes. It is one thing to distribute a crore of rupees in such a vast country like India, and it is another thing to make material improvements in this country to uplift the industry and to make the nation self-contained and self-employed.

How many people can be benefited by this amount in a vast country like India? The method of distribution will be Imperial and the expenses entailed there will be equally philanthropic. Let us see what other nations do, what Peter did in Russia, what Bismark did in Germany, and what Japan did with her people to bring them to a level of first class nations in a short space of time. They gave financial support by way of subsidies. They gave all support in educating their men as experts in other foreign countries. They encouraged industries and gave protection to their industry inside and gave facilities for the export of same to other countries by revising the shipping freight policy and by opening up banks in other foreign countries to facilitate their trade. What we have in India is a discriminatory treatment everywhere. We have no financial support from Government in developing either industries or commerce. The question of fund to be found has already been discussed by my friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, and I agree with him that the Government of India can always find

[Mr. Muhammad Nauman.]

ready money if they wanted to do so. We know protection was given to sugar and match industries through protective duties, but this was only a moral support, and that even is nipped in the bud by way of levying an excise inland duty. They are taxed to such an extent that they can only exist and keep their heads above water, but never to thrive. How can any capitalist feel safe in the investment when every year's budget may bring some new excise duties? With these constant dangers of protection being reduced, who can plunge into big industrialist programmes? Can India not make motor cars and aeroplanes, radios, and so on? But we have neither the necessary protection from Government nor any subsidiary support as this is probably not the intention of our Government to bring us to a level of first class industrialists. With enormous sources we have in this country, we can do miracles and compete with first class powers within a very small interval of time.

Now, let me tell you that the Indian merchants have to exist against all odds placed in their ways as obstacles. We have no support in any thing, we have to fight against so many other circumstances created in this country to put us off the track. The foreign banks in India exist only to help exploitation by foreign merchants, their own countrymen receive all facilities of overdrafts, secured and unsecured credits, overdrafts against hypothecations of stocks and bills, mortgages of assets and short credits, and above all, a ready support for "good reference". But, an Indian merchant is not only refused assistance, but is even refused that moral courtesy of a "good reference". Normally, they say about Indians as being "good for small engagements", but, with even a man in the street from their own native land, they will place all such remarks which may convince the people of other countries in their commercial integrity. What do these foreign merchants normally do? They make combines and control the market at the lowest possible range against the interest of the Indian stockist and the Indian agriculturist, but no notice is taken of this. Shipping companies, insurance companies are mostly foreign concerns and they do all to help their own merchants living in India, but we people of this country have only to look and lament.

In this connection, I may point out that in some cases it has so happened that Indian firms have not been permitted to open branches in foreign countries. Only recently an insurance company was refused license to have a branch office in Italy, and this news has appeared the other day. It runs as follows:

"I understand that the Italian Government has refused permission to an enterprising Indian insurance company to open a branch in Italy and do business there on the ground that there are enough of insurance companies in Italy to look after the needs of Italian people and there was no need for any foreign concern to establish any branch in Italy. The Italian Government added that they would issue an Indian Company license to trade in Italy if they issued any more license to any foreign insurance companies in Italy.

It will be recalled here that different countries have different laws to govern insurance companies. America wants foreign concerns to deposit five hundred thousand dollars before they could write down a single policy. France also has such restrictions. The Indian Government has not prescribed any such restriction as far as foreign companies are concerned. I am informed that 18 Italian companies have started insurance business in India after the Italian Government's refusal to the Indian concern to open business in Italy Indian companies are facing with a cut throat competition from foreign concerns.

The Bombay Insurance Companies Association discussed today the Italian Government's reply to a sister Indian concern and the question of leading a deputation to the Government of India to urge for protection to Indian concerns. The Bombay Association has addressed to Bombay M. L. A.s to raise discussion during the Finance Bill on this subject. This question will loom large at the forthcoming conference of Indian insurance companies in Bombay.

I understand Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Chairman of the Oriental Insurance Company, will preside over the Conference and Sir Homi Mehta will be Chairman of the Reception Committee."

This is in the *Hindustan Times*. This is the treatment meted out to us when we want to trade in foreign countries, but our Government would allow anybody and everybody to come here and exploit us.

4 P.M. One of the purposes of the European combines in the form of associations is to defeat Indian merchants consistently by placing all sorts of obstacles and by all mischievous propaganda outside this country. Looking to the jute mills, the House probably knows that they restrict their produce by sealing their looms and restricting their hours of work, but they never care what happens to the jute growing people. It actually happened in Bengal that during 1931-32, some of the areas were left without being harvested as the expenses of cutting the crop would not even meet the price. May I, Sir, inform the House why this happened? Not because the jute bags and hessian cloths were not in demand in foreign countries, but because through combines these jute millowners and managing agents wanted to maintain their own ratio of profits about 33 per cent. to 40 per cent. gross. Despite all depression, this trade remained as profitable a programme as was possible under the circumstances, of course not so much as during the War when they earned 300 per cent. gross profits in their turn over. An Indian shipper's contract is always looked with suspicion, and unless some guarantees are placed, or unless those Indian houses are too big to be questioned about, these mills would not accept direct contracts, and all these are the results of many years' continued efforts for a combined and well-planned exploitation. These mills are also Indians, as their shares belong to Indians mostly, but because managing agencies are given to foreign concerns, the jugglery of company law and the managing agency shelters them for everything and they reserve the cream to themselves and let the sharers sleep aside with a marginal profit. The Government of India know these facts probably, but no effort has ever been made to counteract such arrangements.

As an example of combined effort for defeating the cause of Indian merchants, Europeans have got a chamber named the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, and their arbitrations are another farce. I do not know what justice is done between European and European, but the arbitration between a European and an Indian is mostly a farce and a method to quell down the poor Indian merchant. The arbitration is something very curious. From my own experience in a matter of difference between my firm and some Australian buyers, we were refused to elect the names of the arbitrators. We were even refused to be represented through our solicitors and lawyers, and against all sense of justice and equity we were saddled with an award of about £4,000 (four thousand pounds), and this was the treatment given to us, probably because we were Indians. This was one of the best methods to relieve the European firm from competition. The constitution of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce is so made that no Indian merchant is ever given any help or support, and this commercial oligarchy of a

[Mr. Muhammad Nauman.]

few people do all they can in their own interest and in the interest of continuing the exploitation of this poor country. In the Bengal Chamber, no Indian new members are anymore allowed, I would request the Government to take steps, so that they may at least feel that the matter is being taken notice of by the authorities in this country, and if foreigners desire to continue their commercial pursuits, they can only be allowed to do so on the basis of equal partnership with Indians. We are insulted in our own homes, and this is the specimen of the control we have on ourselves. An Indian is treated as a criminal, especially in the business world, and why, because he wants to share the commerce of his land.

Commenting on the company laws, I would only think that the commercial jugglery of managing agencies should be revised in the light of the expert opinions of Indian lawyers and Indian merchants chambers and the Muslim Chamber of Commerce of Calcutta. It is through these managing agencies that exploitation of Indian trade and commerce is mostly carried. It is an example of foreign exploitation with our own money and our own labour. Indians buy shares, they supply stock, they work the machineries but the cream of profit goes out of our country. Now, looking to the monopolies granted by the Government we think this is another example where exploitation is allowed by the Government with their knowledge and power. All big monopolies have been given to foreigners like those granted to the Calcutta Electric Company, Calcutta Tramways, Bengal Telephone, etc. All such big monopolies are given to European firms. Even in the Stores Department, we have seen that contracts are given to people in London through their London offices in preference to Indian traders. Some firms hold a sort of virtual monopoly for supply of grains, etc. As Mr. Bajoria pointed out, 35 per cent. expense is involved in making purchase for only 60 lakhs of rupees. I would only submit that the welfare of a nation depends on her resources utilised in industries and her commerce, and unless this Government is willing to support us in such directions, we cannot feel satisfied. It is absolutely necessary that efforts should be made to help industries by subsidies, grants, etc., and instructions should be given to banks to encourage Indian merchants. The Bengal Chamber of Commerce should be informed that their arbitrations, so arbitrarily carried out, cannot be binding in the Courts of Law. The High Court of Calcutta should take no notice of such frivolous awards secured without legal representation of parties. There should be a thorough revision of the freight policy of the railways, as I have already remarked during the debate on the railways. A Board should also be framed to regulate the freight charged by the shipping companies, which should be adjusted to the interest of this country. To facilitate communication, cheaper postage should be immediately introduced. To spend money on broadcasting may well be appreciated, but it is a surprise that the cheaper means of postal communication has been ignored and an effort has not been made to make this easier and provide it in such a way as to be within the reach of more people for more frequent use in business. Sir, the Government will find a solution of the unemployment by only encouraging and supporting industries and commerce, and it is by means of this that Government may find a solution for ending the terrorist movement, which probably has had a start in this country as a result of there being an unemployed educated section of the people in India. With these words and suggestions, Sir, I resume my seat.

Mr. Fakir Chand (Jullundur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, in dealing with the Finance Bill which was introduced by the Finance Member yesterday, I wish to make a few observations on the general policy of the Government, in order to show that a Government which seeks to impose taxes should satisfy the elementary tests of good government. So far as the present Government is concerned, I wish to lay the following charges at its door. My first charge is, the present Government is not observing the provisions of the great Proclamation of Queen Victoria, which is the Magna Charta of our rights, both in letter and spirit in the matter of recruitment to the army. The Indian army has hitherto been recruited not from all classes, castes and creeds but from certain supposed martial classes only. Now if candidates satisfied the physical test, they should, I say, be taken and tried, if only they show the proper aptitude for training, no matter to what class they belong they should be taken into the army, and if they showed merit and ability, they should be promoted to the officer rank. Who knows that from amongst recruits from these very classes a Hari Singh Nalwa, who was the greatest General of the army of Maharaj Ranjit Singh, may not emerge? Not only this, Sir, but I may say that this Hari Singh Nalwa conquered Afghanistan, which up till today, has only been the dream of many people.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: No; Afghanistan was never conquered by Hari Singh.

Mr. Fakir Chand: Therefore, Sir, let this bar, the confinement of the recruitment only to the martial classes, be removed, and everybody, I urge, should be free to be recruited to the army. If another war takes place in the near future, then it will be necessary to find men by indiscriminate recruitment, as happened during the last war, although, normally, nobody can find recruitment excepting the most privileged members of the martial classes who used to be recruited before, but, Sir, when the Great War came on in 1914. everybody got recruited to the army. And what will be the result? The result will be that, if another war comes on in the near future, it will be necessary to find men by indiscriminate recruitment and without proper training, and it will be difficult to rely upon such an army, composed of men newly-recruited, without any previous experience and proper training at their back. Besides it is necessary that the Indian army should not be merely a mercenary one, but should be transformed into a truly national army, and for this purpose it cannot be made a close preserve for certain classes but should be thrown open to all classes and communities. (Hear, hear.) Secondly, a national army and not a mercenary army could alone defend the huge frontiers of India against a foreign attack from a first-class power, as was so ably demonstrated by my friend, the Honourable Dr. Desmukh day before yesterday in his fine speech on the military budget. My second charge against the Government is that it has totally disarmed and emasculated the entire Indian population consisting of 360 million souls. As matters stand, it is penal for a man to handle arms and he is liable to suffer rigorous imprisonment up to the extent of seven years if he is found in possession of arms and is attempting to conceal them under section 20 of the Arms Act. This law applies to all classes, martial and non-martial, as none can convey arms without a license. The result is that almost daily we read in the newspapers of such and such person's house having

[Mr. Fakir Chand.]

been burgled by dacoits and of his family members having been assaulted, disgraced and deprived of all belongings.

Now, is that a satisfactory state of affairs? Is it not the right of every man to be able to defend himself and his family and his hearth and his home against marauders and dacoits? And how can this be done unless you are allowed to possess arms and to receive training in the use of arms?

Then, my third charge against the Government is that of racial discrimination in the matter of the military services more especially in the matter of the employment of officers. The plea advanced is that the officers require previous training, and as Indians have not been previously trained, Indianisation could not be speeded up more rapidly. Sir, after the report of the Skeen Committee of 1926 we have only had so far one college at Dehra Dun, but the cost of education is most prohibitive so far as a man of ordinary means is concerned, and the education at that college can only be availed of not by young men of the average middle classes but only by those of the richer classes. According to the Skeen Committee's Report, half the cadre of officers of the Indian army should, by 1952, be Indians. Let us wait and see, as I am sure this will never come into being. The racial discrimination is also apparent in the case of the medical services attached to the army. Coming to this racial discrimination in the matter of the medical services, I will just give you a few figures to show how this has worked. Since the Great War began in the year 1914, recruiting to temporary commissions in the Indian Medical Service began from out of a number of private medical practitioners and civil assistant surgeons taken from Local Governments. Up till the year 1934, roughly about 1,500 men were recruited, but only 69 have so far been confirmed. Out of these temporary I. M. S., some have served with the Department for nine years but have not yet been confirmed and 45 such men are still on the temporary list. I may point out that Mr. Tottenham, the other day, was pleased to say that only people who are now acting as temporary officers are of five years' service but I pointed out to him that he was mistaken, as one of my relations with nine years' service is serving there, and I gave him the name, so I hope he will correct his previous answer. Now, these men are forty-five in the list, and some of them have served the Department for nine years. These temporary men are alright as Captains, but, when the time comes for their promotion to the rank of Major, they are either not confirmed or they are discharged. Now the proportion of Europeans to Indians has been fixed under the orders of the Secretary of State at two to one but as a matter of fact the actual proportion in the services is seven to one—Europeans seven and Indians one. There is no earthly reason why the proportion of Europeans to Indians should be two to one as the service, as it is called, is Indian Medical Service and a great many competent Indian doctors who have actually been officiating for a period of nine years or ten years are available. As such, why should then there be an influx of such a high proportion of European doctors in India? Then, take again, the staff of the Director General of Medical Services and the Public Health Commissioner with the Government of India. No Indian has so far been taken as Director General of Medical Services or as Public Health Commissioner. Up to this day, you will find that not a single Indian has been appointed to these offices. Then again take the case of the Royal Army Medical Corps,

which has about 500 officers, but not a single Indian has been recruited to it. Although this Royal Army Medical Corps serves the British Army, inasmuch as European officers are eligible for the Indian units, why should not the Indian officers similarly be eligible for service in British units serving in India? But not a single Indian has been appointed to it. This racial discrimination makes the administration top heavy and at the same time, undermines the efficiency of the services. The racial discrimination predominates everywhere and has permeated all Departments, whether civil or military, with the result that instead of an Indian feeling that he is an Indian first and everything else afterwards, he feels that he should serve his community—as a Muslim, Sikh or Parsi would serve his brother—first and then his motherland.

From the point of view of the services, civil or military, I urge, Sir, that efficiency should be the sole test and not the fact of a man belonging to a certain class or professing a particular religion or faith. This can never conduce to efficiency in the general administration. This policy of racial discrimination has worked great injustice, as will be apparent if one reads the Punjab Alienation of Land Act or Relief of Indebtedness Bill which is shortly to receive the assent of the Governor General. Both these Acts are a disgrace to any civilised nation more particularly to the English nation which prides itself as owning the greatest Empire in the World. Under the Punjab Alienation of Land Act, no person, except certain favoured classes and tribes, can purchase land from an agriculturist without the sanction of the Collector of the District which is rarely given. In execution of decrees, the lands belonging to agriculturists are not saleable, but in the case of loan due to the co-operative banks, the lands, houses and everything belonging to the agriculturists are saleable.

Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri Lal Chand (Nominated Non-Official): No, no.

Mr. Fakir Chand: The land is certainly liable. The Court can take hold of everything in execution of the decree. Under the Act, everything is saleable.

Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri Lal Chand: See section 60, Civil Procedure Code.

Mr. Fakir Chand: That does not apply at all. It is a special Act. In the case of the Relief of Indebtedness Bill with the help of the Conciliation Board, you can wipe off the debts due, be they decreed debts or even secured debts. Now, is it just or fair that debts advanced under the ordinary law should be wiped off by an Act recently passed with retrospective effect. If justice is to be administered it should be administered to all classes freely and impartially whether they are agriculturists or non-agriculturists. All should be made to feel that they are on the same footing in regard to their civil rights and disabilities.

My fifth charge against the Government is with regard to their educational policy which deserves to be wholly changed. Vocational training should be introduced and technological institutions should be started so that the problem of unemployment should be solved and hundreds and thousands of our young men who are driven to despair by reasons of unemployment may find employment and avoid imbibing the cult of terrorism and communism which most of them are liable to do as matters

[Mr. Fakir Chand.]

stand at present. The other day we read of a Bengali young man of Lucknow having thrown himself before an engine and being killed instantly because he was disappointed with life and because he could not get any employment.

As to the merits of the Finance Bill, I support my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, in so far as he asks for a reduction of the salt duties, to whatever extent it may be possible, as this affects all classes and especially the poorer ones.

As regards the post office, the Government should revert to old rates of one pice post card and two pice envelope which are most popular amongst all classes. This can be easily done if the question of broadcasting and of making roads in the Frontier Province are held up for another two years. After all this policy of making roads in the Frontier, I am afraid, may prove disastrous some day. We know that there were differences from the very start as regards this forward policy of the Government. There were two schools of thought from the very beginning. It was Lord Lawrence who initiated this forward policy. The other school of thought was of opinion that the policy should be one of masterly inactivity and that we should stand on our frontiers and guard ourselves against any foreign invasion. We have been crying about the bogey of Russian invasion although that bogey was nipped in the bud by Japan in 1904. So that, my submission is, that instead of finding money for broadcasting, which is not so essential a thing as the remission of taxes, or instead of finding money for laying out new roads on the Frontier which again is not very necessary now, instead of doing all these things, if the Government were to utilise the surplus in its hands for reducing the postal rates as well as to reduce the salt duty and also reduce the minimum level of taxable limit to Rs. 2,000, if all these had been done, it would have been of real help to the masses. Instead of that, the Honourable the Finance Member reverts to these things of finding money of 20 lakhs for broadcasting, 25 lakhs for roads and another 20 lakhs for aviation, and so on.

As to the income-tax, if one studies the provisions of the Act, it has three great defects. Firstly, the assessing agency and the agency which hears appeals from the orders of the assessing officer belong to the same department which is interested in realising, as much as practicable, without regard to the dictates of justice and fair play. Under the English Act the agency which assesses the tax is representative of the people and this agency sits and assesses the tax. Whilst amongst us it is the Income-tax Officer, it is the Income-tax Department which assesses the tax and the hearing of the appeals rests with the Assistant Commissioner who belongs to the same Department. As a matter of fact the agency which hears appeals should be entirely different and should be unconnected with the agency which assesses tax, and, moreover, the assessment of the tax should be on a more popular basis than it is at present and just as in the case of the English Act the representatives of the people should sit and assess tax. But here we have one and the same department, which is interested in collecting taxes, sitting and assessing people to tax.

Now, as to how this Act is worked, I beseech your attention to two provisions of the Act, section 23, sub-section (4) and section 18. Now the

ordinary procedure for the assessment of tax is this. A demand notice is sent to any person on whom a tax is sought to be levied and it is to be returned by him after filling in the necessary particulars. If he does not do so, then in that case, he has no right of appeal against the assessment. There is another provision, section 23, sub-section (4), which says that if the Income-tax Officer requires a certain document to be produced before him and the assessee does not produce it, either for this reason that he does not have it or that he has no knowledge of the same, then, in that case, he is absolutely damned, because the assessing officer then has it in his discretion to assess according to the best of his judgment. You all know what the best of his judgment may be. It means that the Income-tax Officer might assess to any extent and in fact cases have happened in which an assessee who used to pay tax on Rs. 10,000 last year has been assessed on an income of six lakhs this year simply according to the whims of the Income-tax Officer. All this provision is availed of by certain Income-tax Officers simply to avoid any appeal against their orders. There is no appeal if the Income-tax Officer proceeds against an assessee under section 23, sub-section (4). Now it very often happens that if an income-tax Officer takes it into his head to assess a man to the highest rate, he calls upon him to produce a document which probably he knows that the assessee does not possess. In the case of any ordinary person, he may not have any such document at all, but all the same if the Income-tax Officer calls upon him to produce, either he has to produce the document or say he has no such document. If the man produces the ledgers, the Income-tax Officer says, "I do not believe your ledgers, I want your stock register. As you have not produced it, I will assess you to the best of my ability and judgment". He makes an assessment on the assessee. I ask, Sir, is this fair, is this equitable that in the case of a dispute, which involves Rs. 500 or upwards, you have got a right of second appeal to the High Court but in the case of the Income-tax Act, you have no right of appeal at all if once the Income-tax Officer takes it into his head to call for a document which, however, the assessee is not able to produce for some reason or other? I submit, that is grossly unfair and we are denying the right of appeal to a person even if he is assessed to the extent of several lakhs because, in the case of ordinary dispute, where there is a dispute involving Rs. 500 or more, he has a right of second appeal to the High Court, but in the case of income-tax assessment, there is no right of appeal if the Income-tax Officer chooses to proceed under section 23, sub-section (4). Under the English Act, we have three appeals, whereas, here, we have not got even one appeal.

Then, there is section 13 according to which the Income-tax Officer, in certain cases, can use a flat rate and several people are assessed at a flat rate. For instance people who have lent money to zamindars are sometimes assessed at a flat rate by being supposed to have received 25 per cent. interest per year. They are assessed at that flat rate. The Income-tax Officer says to the moneylender, "you do not show your books, and, therefore, I assess you at a flat rate". This is section 13, The third difficulty in the administration of the Income-tax Act is that a reference to the High Court only lies on a question of law under section 66, and that too in very rare cases. As sometimes the income-tax figures go to lakhs, it is only equitable that the right of appeal to the High Court should be given even on questions of fact more especially as there

[Mr. Fakir Chand.]

is a right of appeal in civil cases to the High Courts in case of the subject matter of dispute being more than Rs. 5,000. There is a right of appeal to the High Court. In the case of the income-tax you have no right of appeal to the High Court except the right of having a reference on a pure question of law. And in the case of civil disputes we have the right of first appeal to the High Court even on questions of fact if the value is above Rs. 5,000. The second suggestion which I make is that the agency which hears the appeals should be entirely distinct from the agency which assesses the tax. It is high time the Government should pass an Act which would do full justice to the assessees.

As to the incidence of the tax, for the present I would be satisfied if the minimum for tax is raised to Rs. 2,000 and the right of appeal safeguarded as I have stated before. Trade depression has ruined the traders and the only way in which a fair assessment can take is the way which I have already described. It should be on a popular basis just as under the English Act it is the representatives of the people who make the assessment. Similarly it should not be the Income-tax Officer who should hear appeals but some other agency. Otherwise the discontent will be driven deeper and deeper every day. And I may point out that this Income-Tax Act is used as an engine of oppression by some Income-Tax Officers. There was a time when people used to say that it is the *thanadar* or the *tahsildar* who oppresses people; but nowadays you will find that everybody, from the poor *pan* seller to the rich merchant, offers *salaams* to the Income-Tax Officer, because he is the biggest man from whose judgment there is no appeal if only he proceeds in a malicious way. Therefore my submission is that so far as the administration of this Act is concerned, it should be administered in a proper way and the rights of the assessee safeguarded.

Then, so far as the decrease of the import duties on wheat is concerned, I submit it will work disastrously to agricultural interests inasmuch as the price of wheat will go down. In fact I heard talks on the telephone of the speculators of Delhi who were trying to reduce the prices since they learnt that the import duty is being reduced. The result will be this. Government say that they have given one crore of rupees for agricultural uplift. That is being given with one hand but they will be taking away with the other hand what they have given to the agriculturists, if as a matter of fact they reduce the import duties; because the price of wheat will be reduced and my part of the country consisting of colonial tracts at least would suffer heavy losses which may amount to several crores of rupees. And there is no justification for the reduction of this import duty. We have plenty of wheat in the whole of India just now and it is no use trying to reduce the price of food stuffs with the consequent disadvantage to the agriculturists. With these humble submissions I beg to say that I do not oppose the Finance Bill but I only suggest that these modifications should be incorporated.

Mr. B. B. Varma (Muzaffarpur *cum* Champaran: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I desire to confine my observations to one main subject, namely, the present plight of sugarcane growers in India. The Tariff Board on Sugar Industry has pointed out that, "not far short of 15 million people

are directly concerned in the cultivation of sugarcane". This was the position in 1930. Now considerably many more thousands are directly interested in this industry.

The same report observed:

"The price of most staple crops in India depends on world causes, since the home market is not sufficient to absorb the total production. But in the case of sugarcane, the position is different . ..There is perhaps no other agricultural product of equal importance in regard to which Government has the power to afford substantial relief by ensuring that so far as possible the home market shall be reserved for the Indian agriculturist, so that, however, greatly he may be affected by world causes as regards his other crops, one source may remain from which he may be able to obtain the wherewithal to pay his rent and irrigation dues and produce those necessaries of life for which cash payment is required." (*Vide page 40 of Tariff Board Report.*)

In short,—

"At all times it occupies a prominent position in agricultural economy as being one of the few crops on which the cultivator relies to meet his cash requirements."

It is wonderful that the cultivators of cane, in spite of the low price of cane and various handicaps, are pursuing their work with admirable courage and hope. They cannot be expected to grow canes for all times when they are not able to get a just return on their labour and outlay. They rightly think that they are not receiving a fair and equitable share of the benefit given by the protective tariff. Cane is being grown at the expense of the soil fertility, and, we are, therefore, heading towards disaster. It is not possible for the cultivators to adequately manure their holding as is necessary in the cane cultivation on the basis of the prices they are receiving. The Government of Bihar and Orissa held two Sugar Conferences to which I was also invited, to represent the growers. The result of the conferences has been that the Government of Bihar and Orissa have framed some Rules under the Sugarcane Act to minimise the malpractices and abuses prevalent in most of the mills but no adequate financial resources have been made available to the Bihar and Orissa Government to effect agricultural improvements. Efforts should be made to improve the yield rather than increase the area of cultivation of sugarcane. The Government are doubtless aware that each acre of land yields 50 tons of cane with 12 per cent. of sugar in Java instead of 10 or 11 tons of cane with only nine per cent. of sugar in India. If the cultivator can raise the yield from 11 to even 30 tons, it will yield to him more than double the income from the same land. This will both be in the interests of the cultivators as well as of the mills. If a small area is properly cultivated, according to improved methods, it will give more yield than a large area badly done. Intensive cultivation is better than extensive cultivation. To place the industry on a sound basis, cordial relationship is no doubt essential between the manufacturers and the growers. The manufacturers should try to understand the difficulties of the growers and not merely make hay while the sun shines and to have the pound of flesh from the cultivators at all costs.

As a result of the Tariff Board's recommendations, the Government adopted the policy of protection of sugar industry so successfully that home production has increased and the imports of white sugar, which amounted to nearly a million tons a year in 1930, have diminished to somewhere about 200,000 tons. The question naturally arises as to who has been benefited by this policy of protection.

[Mr. B. B. Varma.]

In all their calculations regarding the quantum of protective duties to be levied or arriving at fair selling price, the prime factor of granting a fair price to the cane producer was borne in mind. The Tariff Board stated:

"Since, as we have seen, the problem before us is mainly agricultural and the interests to be served are primarily those of the cultivating classes, it is not sufficient to ascertain the price at which cane can be obtained. It is necessary to go farther and attempt to determine a fair selling price for cane, that is to say, a price which will give the cultivator a reasonable return for his labour and outlay, etc." (*Vide page 54.*)

On this basis, they concluded "a fair price for cane would be about eight annas per maund delivered at factory" This they estimated as a minimum price .

But, Sir, in practice, this principle has been totally ignored ever since the policy of protection was launched. Notwithstanding the fact that last year this House passed the Sugar Cane Bill, the cane grower has been out of the picture and it is only the sugar manufacturer that has been looming large.

I would like to emphatically state that the average cane grower has never received a reasonable price The average price in my Province of Bihar and Orissa has never been above five annas a maund. I desire to remind this House, that according to calculations of the Sugar Technologists referred to by the Honourable Mr. J. P. Srivastava at the Simla Sugar Conference in July, 1933, the price which the cane grower should obtain is 8 annas and four pies a maund under the present conditions adopting the Tariff Board's line of argument. I ask, whether this has ever been realised in practice? Although the consumer has made great sacrifices in the shape of protective duties amounting to crores of rupees, the cultivating classes, for whose interests the protection policy was primarily recommended, have not received that much attention that they merit.

The whole problem has been obscured by the controversy over the imposition of excise duties. There has been an impression that the interests of the sugar factory owners and cane growers are divergent. The Tariff Board did not proceed on this assumption. It is fundamental that neither the cultivator nor the factory owner should be asked to work below reasonable cost of production.

At the same time, efforts should be made to rationalise the whole industry in every possible direction. In regard to the sugar manufacturer, one of the main grievances is that the by-products of the industry, like the molasses, etc. are not yielding a remunerative return. In this connection, I would like to quote the following extract from a speech delivered by Sir P. C. Ray at Dacca in September, 1933:

"Ways and means must be devised for the proper utilisation of molasses..... ...In my opinion, it can be utilized, with much profit, in the following two ways :

(a) Production of methylated spirit.

(b) Production of power alcohol which might be used as a partial substitute for petrol. You will be surprised to know that on an average over a million gallons of methylated spirit are imported annually from Java alone. Much wealth can be easily

retained in the country if this huge quantity of spirit is produced from our own molasses. But the most profitable way in which it can be utilized is the manufacture of power alcohol from it. The latter, when mixed with petrol in the proportion of 5 to 1, serves as a fine substitute for motor fuel. The bulk of the molasses, produced in the Phillipines and Hawaiian Islands, is disposed of in this manner. It will not be out of place to mention it here that legislations have been enacted in almost all the Continental countries making it compulsory for the Petrol companies to use not less than ten per cent of power alcohol with petrol. I should, therefore, urge upon the Government to consider seriously the desirability of passing such legislation in India irrespective of some revenue losses that might follow due to the fall in the import of petrol "

Coming to the cultivator, there is necessity for improvement in the methods of cultivation. This requires greater State assistance, financial and otherwise, than in the case of the organised factory owner on account of the general ignorance, conservatism and helplessness of the agriculturist. The Government should provide irrigational facilities by sinking tube wells, and making sufficient quantity of water available to the fields. They should supply better seeds through demonstration farms of Government in each big area where cane is grown and spread knowledge about methods of manuring. Increased research should be undertaken with a view to improve the quality of cane suitable to different climatic conditions in various provinces.

In the Explanatory Memorandum by the Financial Secretary, it is stated that the special subvention to provinces out of the sugar excise duty will amount to Rs. 5.48 lakhs for 1934-35 and Rs. 6 43 lakhs for the coming year. This niggardly sum is hardly sufficient to take up the task of educating and assisting the cane grower to adopt latest methods followed in Java.

The Honourable the Finance Member, in his reply in the general discussion, stated that nearly Rs. 24 lakhs have been spent on sugarcane research and another sum of Rs. 14 lakhs is allotted for the same purpose, to be spent in the course of five years. I do not know what proportion of this expenditure represents establishment charges. I am afraid the expenditure on supply of seeds of improved quality has been comparatively low or none at all. This must be correspondingly increased to be of actual benefit to the cultivators. As representing the cane growers in Bihar and Orissa, I am bound to say that the activities of the Agricultural Department in regard to sugarcane, so far as the cultivators are concerned, have not spread far and wide to any tangible extent, have not been properly advertised and have conferred no substantial benefits.

Therefore, I submit that all the income out of the excise duty on sugar amounting to about Rs. 140 lakhs, or, at any rate, at least Rs. 40 lakhs should be set apart for a large scale drive to rationalise the industry.

These sums should be utilised for giving assistance in cases where adequate price has not been secured on the sugar-cane, for experimenting on and introducing improved types of sugar-cane and in similar activities. Local Committees, representative of Associations of interests concerned, should be formed and consulted in the matter. Periodical reports as regards the activities of the Government should be made available to the Members of this House and the public at large for constructive criticism. Otherwise, protection will be a colossal failure and a great catastrophe to the cultivator of sugarcane is imminent in this country if timely action is not taken. With these words, I conclude my remarks.

Maulvi Badi-uz-Zaman (Bhagalpur Division: Muhammadan): Sir, I have no desire to enter into any detailed discussion at this stage. I would like to confine myself to matters that come within the purview of the Finance Bill. I am not prepared to welcome either the budget or the Finance Bill. Both of them are disappointing documents. It goes without saying that the taxation policy of the Government is wholly unjust and unfair. It has caused great discontent and resentment in the country. Taxation, both direct and indirect, has affected adversely the welfare and prosperity of the country. While the prices of commodities produced in India have considerably gone down the burden of taxation has enormously increased. Honourable Members are aware that India has been the worst sufferer during these hard days of financial stringency and general economic depression. It is during this period that emergency taxes were imposed Now, when there is a surplus budget, which is the outcome of the repressive taxation policy of the Government, it is just and fair that all the emergency taxes should forthwith be done away with. But what have the Government done? They have reduced the surcharge by one-third. This reduction does not satisfy the taxpayers. With regard to poor class of taxpayers, the attitude of the Government is highly objectionable. The Government have not shown any sympathetic gesture to this poor class of taxpayers. People whose income is below Rs. 2,000 a year find it very difficult to maintain themselves and their family members, and it is a pity that these people are made to pay taxes. The retention of Rs 1,000 as the minimum taxable income is certainly highly objectionable. All small incomes below Rs. 2,000 should be exempted from the income-tax.

Then, I take the case of the postal rates. The abnormal rise in the price of postcards and envelopes has been a great source of hardship to the public. Last year some nominal reduction was made in the rates for envelopes on condition that the weight should not exceed half a tola. Of course a quarter sheet of foolscap paper with an envelope weighs more than half a tola. I am told that this so-called concession has proved beneficial to the Government and not to the public. It is extremely unfortunate that the Government has not thought it worth while even to reduce the price of a postcard which is intended for the poor people. The least that the Government should do is to reduce the price of the postcard to six pies.

The budget shows that there has been a substantial improvement in the financial position of this department. So there is no reason why there should not be some reduction in postal rates. I represent a constituency where the people are very poor and simple. Luxuries of life are wholly unknown to them. They are quite satisfied with simple food. Lots of people who cannot buy curry are satisfied with rice and salt. Salt is an article of food, both for the rich and the poor, and such an article should be free from all sorts of tax. It is in the interests of the consumer that such an article should sell cheap. The duty, which is nothing short of a tax, ultimately falls on the consumer. Therefore, in the interests of the people, the duty on salt should be altogether abolished, if possible, or at least it should be reduced. With these words I resume my seat.

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi (Assam Valley: Non-Muhammadan): I thank you very much for kindly giving me this opportunity of speaking on this subject of the Finance Bill. I have been hearing since yesterday various

speeches which dealt from protection to horse-breeding. I hope to be able to finish my speech with something that is more relevant to my province and also to the Finance Bill. Any taxation on postage and salt must be unpopular; it touches the pockets of the poor, and, therefore, I do not think anybody would support it. Since yesterday there has been a chorus of voices registering their protest against any imposition of a tax on these two commodities. Besides that, we have been hearing a lot about the export of gold and the sale of silver. I need not say more in this connection than quote a few words from the report which I have received from the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry. They say:

"The Commission (*The Hilton Young Commission*) contemplated a gold standard in India, and took care to emphasise that during this period no favourable opportunity of fortifying the gold holding in the reserve should be allowed to escape because they found, that the amount of Rs. 85 crores, then in the Reserve, was unnecessarily large and they recommended a reduction to Rs. 25 crores through the melting and sale of rupee coins over the period. The Government adopted this suggestion but in a peculiar manner. They used the silver very often to meet their current requirements and in place of silver rupees for which current notes were issued, '*ad hoc*' securities were put in the Paper Currency Reserve to make up the difference in the Reserve between the face value of the rupees melted and the amount realised by the sale of the bullion refined out of them These '*ad hocs*' were cancelled at the earliest opportunity and there was thus a continuous deflation with every sale of Government silver."

Later on:

"The Hilton-Young Commission in 1926, recommended sales as a means to an end, namely, the acquisition of gold reserves to strengthen the international position of the rupee."

Have the Government conserved the gold resources of India? The gold is being exported in any quantity from India, and the Honourable the Finance Member justified the export the other day by saying that the excess gold was being sold at a profit and that with that profit a lot of other industries were being carried on. I say this is really distress gold. But my Honourable friend denies it. I say from my own experience—as Chairman of a Local Board I have an opportunity of travelling far and wide in the villages. And what did I find there? I found that the villagers in Assam, especially rural Assam, were unable to pay the land revenue. And why? Because the land revenue was raised very high in 1926 without a legislation as was required by the Taxation Enquiry Committee and agreed to by the Government. And the land revenue was raised not by 17½ per cent. as recommended by that Committee, but sometimes by 200 per cent., with the result that the people could not pay the land revenue. When the *maujidars* or contractors of revenue go to the men and demand land revenue, the poor people cannot pay their land revenue. What do they do in the first instance? They bring out their cows, cattle, and a little extra paddy they have got. They are sold, and you will be surprised to hear that cows are sometimes sold at eight annas and bullocks at five rupees. Who buy them? In the wake of these officials, Marwaris and other traders follow, and as those people are unable to pay, they sell these cows, bullocks, etc., to the Marwaris and, with that amount, save themselves for the time being. After that what happens? The District Magistrate, and if he cannot come, Deputy Magistrates and others go to realise the balance of the land revenue. On that occasion what takes place? The poor cultivator,—in thousands of cases this has happened—go inside and bring out the gold which their wives or daughters wear in the ear or on the neck or on the hand.

[Srijut N. C. Bardaloi.]

This gold which is called the hoarded gold may be the earnings of a lifetime of those families, and possibly, may be, of two generations, and probably three or four pieces of ornaments were all that they possessed. What do they do? They go inside the house, bring out their gold and sell the same to the Marwari at Rs. 5 a tola or Rs. 10 a tola at the utmost. The Marwari sends it on to Calcutta to be sold there. This is how the so-called hoarded gold of the peasant is sent on to England.

Khan Bahadur Mian Abdul Aziz (Punjab: Nominated Official): Do the Marwaris actually buy at Rs. 5 a tola?

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi: Yes. Things have come to such a pass. They buy at Rs. 5 to Rs. 10 per tola. All this because there is the Government official standing there, and, out of fear, these people bring out their gold and sell it to the Marwari and pay up their balance. This is truth, and I can vouch for it. Not only that. Do you know what else is happening in Assam? Only the other day, when I was coming to attend this Assembly, this happened. What were the Government doing to realise land revenue? These lands are Government lands being *Khas Mahals*—they annulled the settlement of those persons who could not pay their land revenue, and, after that, they gave notice to them to quit their holdings. Then the Government officials took elephants and demolished the houses in which, probably for seven generations, they had been living. This also appeared in the papers and it was raised in the Assam Legislative Council. This is the pass to which the Government have come. And why? The Government itself is a pauper Government now, and in order to carry on the administration somehow, they must realise every pie that they could get from the peasants and cultivators. There are no rich men there. They do not get a lot of money from the rich men, and, in order to run the administration, they must get money, and that they do by terrorising over the ryots.

The other day, when my Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury, was speaking about petrol tax, there was a lot of laughter in this House. We do not like to come here as beggars. What we want is justice and what is our right. He described Assam as a Cinderella—this word was used by Sir Henry Cotton fifty years ago. He said that Assam was a veritable Cinderella waiting for her Prince Charming. And he did come—in the shape of foreign exploitation! The railway was opened after that, tea gardens sprang up like mushrooms, and oil fields were opened, coal fields were opened. And how has Assam gained out of the oil fields about which there is so much trouble? The oil fields are in Assam. The shareholders of that company are in England. The shareholders get profit; the coolies are Makaranis and Nepalis, and they get wages. And the Central Government get the taxes. What does Assam gain? Nothing. My Honourable friend, Pandit Nilakantha Das, said that other provinces also ought to get a share. I do not mind; I wish them joy. Are the jute tax and the petrol tax the same thing? I wish all joy to Bengal. I wish that Bengal should be helped,—Bengal has suffered enough. But what about Assam? Petrol is the national and natural wealth of my province—petrol, coal and all that. The people of my province are not deriving any

benefit out of that, but people from other countries come and exploit our reserves of national wealth. What has Assam got in return? A crore and a quarter comes to the Centre. When I came to Delhi and saw these beautiful stately buildings and these beautiful gardens, on which crores and crores have been spent, I, as an Assamese, could not look upon them with equanimity. I see before my eyes my people being terrorised for the sake of their land revenue money and the money which is got there by terrorizing my people is being spent at the Centre, while that small province, with two crores of revenue, is starving there and, when I see what a lot of money is coming to be spent on aviation and broadcasting, I think to myself, "Well, wipe us out of the face of this earth". You can indulge in the luxury of broadcasting but how long are the peasants in Assam going to suffer? I do not say this myself. I think the greatest critic of this Central Government is the Finance Member of the Assam Council. What does he say. I have got a copy of his speech. He says this:

"A total indebtedness of Rs 2,11,47,000 may not sound particularly terrifying to a Finance Member who is normally called upon to deal with rupees in terms of crores but the position is very different in a province like Assam, where the total annual income from all sources—excluding *pro forma* entries which appear on both sides of the account—is almost exactly equal to this sum and where the income from purely provincial heads of revenue falls short of this sum by some fifteen lakhs of rupees."

Lower down, I find one redeeming feature in the statement of the Finance Member, namely, the grant of money for the Road Development Account. That is described by the Honourable Mr. Laine in this way:

"Nor will it be any reply to our complaint to point out that we have already received, and may receive again, substantial grants from such funds as the Road Development Account. I have already referred parenthetically to the nature of Assam's claims as regards this particular fund and we have discussed this thorny subject in the Council on more than one occasion."

How have we been treated regarding subvention and other things? I may here point out what is happening to the other provinces of India. Bengal will get from the jute duty about 167 lakhs—of course a substantial sum towards meeting the deficits. Bihar and Orissa will be separated and Orissa being a deficit province, it will get a subvention and Bihar will be self-sufficient. Punjab is well-off already. The North-West Frontier Province gets a subvention of a crore of rupees and they are crying for 50 lakhs more. Let them get it and they ought to get it, but why not Assam? Sind, which is going to be separated, will get a sufficient subvention and Bombay will be better off. So far as Assam is concerned, it is said that there will be a committee which will decide what Assam should get later on. But how long are we to live on hope and how has this Government treated us in the past? How the Percy Committee, which discussed the financial position of the different provinces, said that no representative of Assam had been asked to sit on it and, in spite of this, they considered our hard case. This is what Mr. Laine says:

"The published proceedings of the Joint Parliamentary Committee incidentally indicate that for the public declarations of the justice of our case, to which I have just referred, we are in the first instance mainly indebted to Lord Eustace Percy, who took it upon himself to champion Assam's claims in a Committee before which, unfortunately, Assam had been accorded no direct opportunity of representing their case. To the Nobel Lord, therefore, and to all those who may have collaborated with him, we tender our most grateful thanks, and trust that these explicit admissions of our need—admissions that have since been publicly endorsed by the ex-Finance Member of the Government of India, in the course of a broadcasted address in England—will be taken into full account by the Subvention Commission or Committee."

[Srijut N. C. Bardaloi.]

So, Sir, we find that although there was no representative of Assam, Lord Eustace Percy, somehow or other, took the case of Assam into account and we find that in the Joint Parliamentary Report Assam's case has been discussed several times and we hope that something will be done when the time comes but how are we to proceed in the meantime. There is a deficit of 55 lakhs out of a total income of two crores and it will go on increasing. Why? Because Assam depends entirely upon land revenue and land revenue cannot be realised because the tax has gone up to the maximum limit. I could not hear my friend, Mr. Hockenhull, properly. I think he read out a statement showing how each province is taxed and in what manner. I have got a list of that also and I find that Assam comes third and Bombay comes first. Bombay is a rich place. It comes first in the matter of taxation per head. Then comes Bengal and then comes Assam. Assam comes third in the matter of taxation and I do not think that any more taxes will be proper, nor do I think that the people will be able to bear them.

5 P.M.

Now, Sir, my next point regarding Assam and the next grievance which I want to place before this House is in regard to the opium question. There was a lot of discussion yesterday but nothing regarding the future policy in regard to opium. We all know what happened at the Hague Convention regarding the restriction of export of opium. It was decided that opium should not be exported to other countries except in quantities which may be necessary for medicinal purposes. Now, India and Persia were the two countries which doped the others with opium. China and America objected. China went out of the Opium Committee of the League of Nations and America also went out of it, because the British representative and representatives of some other nations did not agree that opium should be stopped altogether except for medicinal purposes. We find that a Resolution was passed in this House, that up to 1935, the export of opium should gradually diminish, when it will be stopped altogether. I find now from the *Explanatory Memorandum* that it is hoped that the India Government will not export any more opium to China or other foreign countries from 1935 It is said there, that the opium which is produced in India will be kept for home consumption. Now, these opium factories are in Marwar, in Benares and in Bihar For whose benefit are these opium factories producing opium? For the benefit of the Assamese people? This subject has been discussed by that great man and philanthropist, Mr. Andrews, in a book which was also presented before the League of Nations. All the facts are here in this book. What do we find there? The Assamese people never knew of any opium till about 1815 or 1816 We have got reports that before the Burmese invasion of Assam, Assam had 19 invasions. It was invaded by the Pathans, the Moghuls and by Raja Ram Singh, son of Raja Mansing at the head of the Moghul army. Assam staved off all those invasions but, suddenly after the Burmese revolution, what happened to Assam? One gentleman the other day jeered at my friend, Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury, because he talked about military affairs. We, who have come under British subjection only about a hundred years ago or still less, had been fighting every nation which came to Assam,—and now we are jeered at as being a non-martial race because my friend over there thought that our people are not in the army! I say they are still in the army. Don't you know the Assam Rifles is manned also by Assamese in numbers who are passing in the name of Gurkhas? Even if it is not so, I do not think that there is

any reason of feeling proud because some people are enrolled in the present army of a foreign Government because they are supposed to belong to the martial classes. What I say now is—that we have become poor and helpless and that is why we want help? In about 1820 some sepoys, who went to Assam under Captain Walsh, took some opium pods with them to Assam and they cultivated it there, and thus they taught some people this vice. Then it spread to the whole of Assam. Of course nowadays the evil is lessening. But what has happened to all those martial people—the Ahoms, for instance, whom the Muhammadan writers described as being one of the most redoubtable, valiant and war-like races? Sir, it is a pitiable state of affairs: Most of the people in the interior are doped with opium—men, women and children! Now, how do you know who are the opium-eaters? Sir, whenever, there, you will meet with children without clothes on their bodies in winter, you know it is an opium-eater's child, when you see a house without a roof, it must be an opium-eaters house. The moral of the whole race is being undermined, their sense of self-respect is taken away. When an opium-eater in the evening does not get his opium, he would stoop to any length of degradation and depravity; he will bring his own children to be kept as pawns with the opium-seller, so that he may get his ration of opium. He has got no principles, he has got no scruples, he has got no honour, so much so that an opium addict would even pawn his wife's honour in order to get his miserable opium, so vicious is the grip of opium on him! Does this Government, which administers this opium, in order to make its revenue . . . . .

An Honourable Member: The Central Government?

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi: Does this Government look on all these miseries with equanimity? When China has come to such a stage that she will not touch it, why should we?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Somebody else is supplying opium to China.

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi: I say, let China take opium from wherever she likes, but why should we supply China with opium? If opium is such a good thing, why should you not supply it to England? (*Cries of* "Shame, shame".) Sir, I have read the proceedings of the League of Nations. The Irish representative said that, "in the whole of Ireland, probably they had got a pound of opium"—so, he was not interested in this matter at all. And the plea of our Government with regard to Assam is this—that if you take away opium from those who are taking opium, they will at once die.

An Honourable Member: Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury does not take opium.

Sir Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): How do you know?

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi: Sir, as Lord Chatham said in connection with the American taxation: "three millions of people so dead to all sense of shame are fit to make slaves of the rest", I say that when you yourself are surrounded by opium-eaters who have gone down to such depths of

[Srijut N. C. Bardaloi.]

degradation and vice as I have related, you yourself are liable almost to become something like that. Sir, I am describing all these dreadful effects of opium on the mass of the population in no spirit of levity, but I am describing them in all sincerity and sadness. Government officials are very fond of saying that opium cannot be stopped all at once, for then the opium-addict will at once die.

Now, I may tell you, Sir, that during 1921 I was sent to jail for two reasons. One was because myself and a band of my followers succeeded in stopping the sale of opium and liquor considerably, and that was why I was sent to jail (Applause),—and what did I find? In my long ramblings over villages, where I made people give up opium by my catching their feet and by other persuasions (Hear, hear), what did I find? I found that people, who gave up opium, readily recovered their health after a year or so, doing good work, feeding their children. Now, what happens among the opium-consuming inmates of a jail? You don't supply opium to them? No—but they do not die there because of that. So why all this kindness to opium-eaters? Sir, we must teach the people to do away with opium altogether. I find in the Opium Committee's Report an account of so many people, who were getting their bread on account of poppy cultivation in Malwa, in Bihar and elsewhere. Now, let Government, instead of making them cultivate the poppy and opium, let them cultivate something better,—food-stuffs, for example. But in order to supply opium for internal consumption, opium is raised, and with that object you are consequently undermining the health and morals of those people and as a matter of fact, you are really killing a nation, a race and industrious people.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: May I ask how much revenue the Local Government derives from this opium?

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi: In those days it used to be 80 lakhs or so—now I suppose it has come down—it is about 35 lakhs or something like that. Sir, I am quite sure, it will take not less than another twenty years more for opium consumption to be decreased appreciably in Assam, not to speak of its total eradication. In the Census report by Mr. Mullens he has said that within 30 years this Assamese race will be extinguished. In Upper Assam, probably the Assamese-speaking people will remain, but in Lower Assam, they shall be extinct. I believe that to be true. A fine race, with a long, long past, with glorious historical associations, a race of fighters, a race of poets and singers, a race which has got a literature as rich as any other literature, that race is going to be extinguished. And why? Sir, the principal cause of that is opium. Sir, about 1853, in his report to Government, Mr. Moffat Mills said that the Assamese people are very good, and he proceeded to say:

"It is contended that the Assamese peasant is apathetic and indolent, that he is satisfied with an easily-attained competency and that without a large increase of population, which is at present checked by the ravages of cholera and epidemic disease, by the inordinate use of opium and the consequent licentious habits of the people."

So far back, then, as 1853, this is what was said, and even now it is continuing. This terrible scourge is going on in Assam, and if this policy of Government is followed, what will follow is that within twenty years

this fine race will be extinct,—and for what purpose? For the purpose of the Government's revenue. That is what I strongly object to. And regarding this opium policy, I beg to submit that the Government should give up their Malwa and other centres where they cultivate opium. As a matter of fact, when I was in Assam, I consulted many of the opium officers, and they say that, so long as Malwa raises opium and Benares raises opium, and Bihar raises opium, it is impossible to stop smuggling. In fact opium worth many lakhs is estimated to be smuggled in this way. Now if there be no opium raised here in India, there will be no smuggling and the opium-eater will be better off without that pernicious thing being cultivated, except for medicinal purposes. Sir, with these words, I resume my seat. (Loud and Prolonged Applause.)

Mr. Umar Aly Shah (North Madras: Muhammadan). Sir, I saw this Government Budget and the Indian Finance Bill. I think nobody will support this kind of Finance Bill which is placed before us. Sir, India is an ancient historical country in the world. There are 35 crores of people and there are 7½ lakhs of villages in this country. There are many religions, many languages and many races. Now the budget says that the Government want to spend one crore of rupees for rural reconstruction, but this amount, I submit, is not sufficient for the development of the villages. It is a drop in the ocean. Now, India is 2,500 miles in length and 2,000 miles in breadth. In it there are 60 crores acres of land out of which 36 crores of acres of land are cultivated. Eight crores of acres of land are barren and nearly 16 crores of acres of land will be cultivated, but Government do not take proper steps even now. Most of the population in India depends upon cultivation, but they do not know the scientific way in which cultivation is being carried as in Japan or Russia. If the peasant wants to cultivate his land, he has to purchase bullocks and ploughs. He would get per acre eight or ten bags of paddy which means about Rs. 20 or Rs. 25 worth. Besides he is bound to pay assessment, water tax, professional tax and several other taxes. How are these taxes collected by the Government? They are collected in the most cruel way just as sugar juice is got out of the machine. Once the descendants of Chengiz Khan destroyed Baghdad and the countryside, and Poet Saadi described how the country was made desolate. I say that even if Homer or Saadi should come and see the condition of the country, they will find it difficult to describe the condition of the cultivators and their grievances. Now, Sir, in these critical and depressing days, our budget shows that the Government have collected nearly 175 crores. They provide for an army of 1,79,000 on which they spend 45 crores. Sir, in the time of the great Moghuls they provided an army of ten lakhs and they spent on them a very little amount. They collected from India 12 to 18 crores of rupees only. Now, Sir, by this sort of expenditure, on such a large scale, neither the Government is satisfied nor are the people satisfied. By such huge expenditure the people are becoming poorer day to day and the Government also are becoming bankrupt. In the beginning, if the condition of India were so bad as it is now, nobody would have cared to invade India as Arabia. In those days, they called India *ratnagarbha*, meaning a store for rubies. In those days, they called India as *Vasundhara*, meaning a country of gold. But, Sir, rubies were knocked away by the Mughals and gold is being knocked away by the British. Now, our condition has become *bhuka fakir*. We want neither the budget nor the Finance Bill. What we want is a piece of bread and peace.

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, with regard to this budget and the Finance Bill, many suggestions have been made. I have also got certain suggestions to make, but before I do that, I have got certain fundamental objections to this Finance Bill. After submitting my fundamental objections to the Finance Bill, I shall submit a few observations which I have to make with respect to my Province.

The fundamental objection to the Finance Bill is this, that this Government has no right to tax the people Well, Sir, it may be too big a proposition from the mouth of a back-bencher like myself, but the position stands. The Congress stands for it and we have come here to repudiate the right of this Government to tax the people of India. I know that this is no more than an academic talk. I also know that many of the suggestions that we have made will fall on deaf ears of our rulers. But, Sir, I crave the indulgence of this House to lay these fundamental objections though it may be mere words and without any effect. The world has advanced in theory from the principle that might is right to the principle that right is right. Well, there were days when might was right, when it could be said that because I have conquered this tract, therefore I shall rule it, either by the free will of the people or against their will. The Great War was fought to establish this principle, and in that Great War India also joined to establish that principle. Well, that principle has been established partially in theory at least We see that there was a plebiscite taken in Saar to find out whether Saar territory should go to Germany or France. That shows, I think that the world has advanced from the principle of might is right to the principle that right is right. If the world has advanced so far, even though I happen to occupy the last Bench in this Chamber, I have got a right to say this, that this Government, by the very same theory for which the world war was fought and to establish which thousands laid down their lives, that same theory tells me, that this Government has no right to tax the people of India and, therefore, this Government has no right to bring forward this Finance Bill. Well, Sir, I say that this Government exists in India not by the free will of the people of India. If there be any doubt about it let there be a plebiscite as there was a plebiscite in the case of Saar. The Congress represents the people of India and, as our claim is that the Congress represents the people of India, the Congress has said that this Government has no right to tax the people of India unless we get or obtain Swaraj. The only other thing is this. It used to be said that the people of India are willing supporters of this Government, because they passed laws with the consent of the Members of this Assembly which is now defunct. I say that claim also has gone. From the various adverse votes that this Government has received any shadow of doubt that existed in the minds of anybody here, that this Government exists with the free will of the people of India, is gone. Therefore, I say that from the resolutions of the Congress, from the votes of this House, this Government does not exist by the free will of the people of India, and, therefore, constitutionally and morally this Government has no right to bring in this Finance Bill. This is my fundamental objection.

Now, Sir, many objections have been raised that the army is costing much. I say that probably if it were my army, it might even cost more, and I would not grudge that. Even a small country like Japan or Germany is probably spending more than what we are spending. The

fight is not there, so far as I am concerned. I would probably consent to vote more for the army if it were *my* army. I would probably consent that the Viceroy should have more autocratic powers if he were *my* Viceroy. Does not Herr Hitler in Germany exercise greater powers than our Viceroy does here? Was not Einstein, one of the greatest scientists of the world, turned out of Germany almost within 24 hours? If the Viceroy were *my* Viceroy, I would probably tolerate his autocracy: if the army were *my* army, I would probably vote for more. By "my Viceroy", I mean that he should be elected by the free will of the people of India, and I will tolerate greater autocracy in him than he possesses.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Who shall be the King of India to have your Viceroy there?

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: That great constitutional question I will ask my Honourable front-bencher friend, Mr Aney, to answer. My point is that we have come here to demand, and we say that the Government of India should be constituted by a Constituent Assembly elected on adult franchise based on the free will of the people of India. For the Viceroy elected by the free will of the Indian people, I would say this that all laws shall be subordinate to his word. He shall not be subordinate to any law at least for ten years to come. My trouble is not this that the head of the Government of India exercises autocratic powers; my trouble is not that the army is very expensive; my trouble also is not this that person and property is not safe; my trouble is only this that it is not my Government. If it were my Government, if he were my Viceroy, I would say, "You *have* autocratic power, you may hang a man without trial, you may send him to jail", for India has to be built. Did not Herr Hitler send away one of the biggest men in the world, Einstein, the greatest scientist that the world has produced after Newton? He was turned out bag and baggage almost within 24 hours. I want *my* Viceroy to have that power, because I want India to be built. But *my* Viceroy will not have his eyes towards England, he will not be thinking in terms of England, but every minute he will be the servant of the people of India. He will have to be elected by me. Was not Herr Hitler, even after the tyranny that he was supposed to have committed, returned by 90 per cent. of the votes? *My* Viceroy or the head of *my* Government will be like that.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik (Home Member): Who are you going to put up for the job?

An Honourable Member: Wait and see. (Laughter.)

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: I will be my own candidate. (Laughter.)

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: We will all vote for you. (Laughter.)

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: Now, having said all this, I now come to certain concrete proposals. The Honourable the Finance Member has very temptingly suggested that he is devoting one crore of rupees for village uplift and the method that he has adopted is that we should start from the villages. Now, I do not know if the Honourable the Finance

[Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta.]

Member has seen any village in India; I know that he has certainly not seen a Chattisgarh village and I will take him there. Sir, India is a poor country and the Chattisgarh tract, from where I come, is the poorest. That Chattisgarh in the good old days, in the early eighties, was one of the most prosperous tracts in the whole of India. There was a report, written by one Colonel Agnew, in the year 1820, I could not find that report in the Library. But I remember that report says that it was a land of plenty, famine was unknown, theft was unknown; and the report was not by an Indian but by an Englishman. That was the condition of Chattisgarh at that time. Then, I have a report in my hand which is of a much later date, that is, 1869, by Mr. Hewet. This is a settlement report, and, in that report also, we find that the condition of the peasantry there was one of plenty. Sir, I will not read long extracts from it because as I am tired, everybody else must be tired and probably the President is the most tired. (Laughter.) The state of the peasants there is given in paragraphs 224, 225 and 226 on pages 86 and 87. The peasantry was a robust peasantry without debts, and I will only read this:

"At present, so far as can be ascertained, about one-third of the raiyats borrow seed grain but most pay from year to year and there are few or none who have old accounts pending."

I now ask this Government, "Can you say the same thing of any tract in India, much less of Chattisgarh"? The peasantry is steeped in indebtedness and are living from hand to mouth. When I was in the Central Provinces Council the question was raised and I got a census of about 50 villages made from house to house and their indebtedness was inquired into by me: and the average indebtedness of a tenant came to about Rs. 100. This is the present state of affairs and that was the state of affairs in 1869. And, within this short period, what do we find? Out of 100 tenants, 95 are indebted. What to say of the *malguzar*? Who is responsible for all this? If this Government is responsible for all this, as it certainly is, nobody can say no and everybody must nod assent—what right has this Government to exist? It has not got the will of the people; it has not got the interest of the people at heart. What is the result? The result is that there is indebtedness. If you go to a Chattisgarh village, out of every ten villages you will not find a single well for drinking water in eight of them; and in nine of them you will not find any drinking water in summer. It is very easy to talk here: it does not make any impression here on us because every one, who hears it, forgets it. But live in Chattisgarh summer for two hours without water and then see. You will have to fetch water from three or four miles away and then dirty water at that. This is the condition today. What are you doing to alleviate the condition of the peasantry whose life-blood is being sucked? Are you going to do anything? Are you going to dig one well? There was a scheme of the Central Provinces Government about digging wells in the villages. The district councils were asked to provide a part of the funds, the local people were asked to provide a part and the Central Provinces Government was to give a third. We welcomed that scheme: we wanted to work for it: we were ready for it; but then the Central Provinces Government, owing to financial stringency, announced that that scheme had been abandoned. I now ask the question: after pure air, drinking water is the first necessity of

life, and if the people of India cannot get drinking water, what right has this Government to exist? I do not know the whole of India: I know only my tract of Chattisgarh—and I give an invitation to the Finance Member to go there in summer and see ten villages: if he finds that out of those ten villages, eight are without wells, then he will be convinced. Only last year there was the cholera havoc: and the Civil Surgeon and others went there in order to permanganate the place of water supply: and what did they find? There was no water in the wells: there was a pond which was all empty except for muddy water and they said: "What are we going to permanganate?" This is the condition in which we live. This is the pathetic condition in which our villagers live. I ask the Finance Member: "Please go to any village: I will take you there and show you their true condition".

There are other things like the condition of the cattle there. Chattisgarh cattle is the worst—hardly bigger than a dog. I do not think anybody who has seen the big cattle either in the Punjab or in Sind can have any idea of the cattle in Chattisgarh . . . . .

An Honourable Member: What about the human beings there?

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: They are like myself—but I am not a typical example: but like me they live. As I was saying nothing is being done in that tract for improving the condition of the cattle. I am talking of villages because the Honourable the Finance Member has said that we must go to the villages: I quite agree there: we should commence from the villages: let us then study the difficulties under which the villagers are suffering, and, I say the first and foremost thing for the villager to be done is to give pure water supply for drinking purposes.

An Honourable Member: That is provincial.

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: But, then, a part of this money, if it is earmarked for wells in Chattisgarh, will not be provincial. Something must be done to help the agriculturist in cattle-breeding: very little is done now: I cannot say that nothing is done.

The next thing is about irrigation. This House will be surprised to hear that, after spending about three crores of rupees—I beg pardon, ten crores of rupees—in the Central Provinces the scheme is neither profitable to the Government nor to the people. Formerly the Mahanadi and the Tandula Canals used to be classed as productive irrigation works, but they found that nothing could be gained and they transferred it from productive schemes to unproductive schemes. The whole mistake is this: They did not study the conditions of Chattisgarh: they brought their ideas from the Punjab and the United Provinces and engrafted those ideas in Chattisgarh: They started big schemes; but they failed to see that we are not suffering from lack of water: we are suffering from lack of proper distribution . . . . .

Mr. M. S. Aney: Lack of brains in the officials!

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: Yes: not in us: When I was a member of the Irrigation Committee, I brought this pointedly to their notice and told them they could not graft their ideas from the Punjab and the United

[Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta.]

Provinces and transplant them in Chattisgarh because, the problem of Chattisgarh is not the problem of the Punjab and the United Provinces: in Chattisgarh we have somewhere between 45 to 50 inches of rainfall: our problem was not a problem of scarcity of water: it was a problem of distribution, and, for that purpose, small tank schemes would have been better and that was the old system. If you, therefore, want to study the village problem and really help the villagers, please try the small tank schemes, if not in those tracts where you have got big irrigation schemes, at least in those tracts of Chattisgarh where you have not got big schemes.

The next thing I would like to bring to the notice of the House is the consolidation of holdings. The consolidation of holdings is of course going on but it is going on very slowly. Therefore I say, please expedite it. I will conclude by saying one word as to why the people of Chattisgarh have been reduced from plenty to starvation. It is the land revenue policy of the British Government which is mainly responsible for it I will read one paragraph from the land revenue policy of the Indian Government. The land revenue policy of the Indian Government is said to be this: "Greater elasticity in revenue collection facilitating its adjustment to the variations of the season and the circumstances of the people". I ask, are you following it?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes

Mr. Ghashiam Singh Gupta: Have you given elasticity in the revenue collection facilitating its adjustment to the variations of the season and to the circumstances of the people? It was said the other day that the prices of paddy have been lowered by 55 per cent I say they have been lowered by cent per cent, and what remission has been made in the land revenue in the rice tract? Variations of the season and the circumstances of the people—the circumstances of the people are such that the value of rice today is not half as much as what it was some years ago, and still there is no remission in the rice tract in the Central Provinces. Not only that, but they are enhancing the rent and revenue on the basis of the old rates. I again ask the Honourable the Home Member, is that following the policy . . . . .

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, I do not believe it.

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: I have got the figures. These are the settlement reports of two districts . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does the Honourable Member suggest that the Central Government is responsible for the land revenue policy at Chattisgarh?

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: The Central Government was responsible before.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): We are discussing the present state of things under the Finance Bill.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: What book is the Honourable Member reading from?

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: Land Revenue Policy of the Indian Government.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Of what date?

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: Lord Curzon's—1902.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: At that time, the Central Government was responsible, but now it is not.

Pandit Nilakantha Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Does not the Central Government adopt its policy under the Finance Bill having regard to all these circumstances?

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: I am reminded here of a small story and after having narrated it I will sit down. There was a *sahukar* who was very stingy. But he did not like to be known as being stingy but wanted to be known as charitable. It was advertised that Mr. A was very philanthropic and that nobody who went to him came back without receiving some charity or some alms, and without having his desires satisfied. What did the *sahukar* do? He had four doors to his *haveli* and posted four *chaukidars* one at each door. Anybody who went near the *chaukidar* at the first door was told, "This is my door, you cannot be permitted to enter it to go to my chief". The *chaukidar* at the second door said, "You cannot go by this door to my chief. I won't allow you to go to my *sahukar* by this door". The same thing happened at the third and fourth doors, with the result that the poor fellow was turned out. And still the central *sahukar* was very charitable! That is exactly what is happening here. Am I to understand that the Provincial Governments are not paying heed to any instruction of the Central Government? It is something like the *sahukar* saying, "What am I to do? I am charitable, but my *chaukidars* do not allow you to come to my place". The Central Government says, "We are charitable, but the provinces, our *chaukidars*, do not allow you to come to us". I only ask this question. Cannot you compel Provincial Governments to adopt your policy with regard to what you have already said? There is one other matter, Sir . . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair hopes the Honourable Member will realise that the whole House is already tired.

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: In that case, I conclude my speech, Sir.

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): With your permission, Sir, I desire to make a statement as to the probable course of Government business in the week beginning Monday, the 18th.

[Sir Nripendra Sircar.]

Honourable Members are aware that in that week the House will sit on Thursday, the 21st, Friday, the 22nd, and Saturday, the 23rd. On Thursday, motions will be made for the election of members to the following:

(1) Standing Finance Committee for the financial year 1935-36,

(2) Court of the Delhi University, and

(3) Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore

Thereafter, certain Supplementary Demands for Grants under the Railway and General Finances will be presented. On the conclusion of this business, the discussion of the Indian Finance Bill will be resumed.

It is proposed to interpose the motion relating to the Parsi Marriage Bill which was on today's agenda in the name of Sir Cowasji Jehangir between the passing of the motion for the consideration of the Finance Bill and the consideration of the Bill—clause by clause.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 21st March, 1935.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 21st March, 1935.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

System of having a Second Guard in the East Indian Railway Passenger Trains.

891. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Is it a fact that the system of having a second guard in East Indian Railway passenger trains has been discontinued?

(b) If so, are Government aware that this has involved great risk to passengers boarding trains at ill-lighted stations at night when, for want of proper information from the centre, the guard at the back signals the train to move off?

(c) Do Government propose to take steps to re-introduce this system?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Government are informed that Second Guards have never been employed on East Indian Railway trains carrying passengers. Conductor Guards have been employed by night on mail trains, and there has been no change recently in this respect.

(b) The Agent, East Indian Railway, states that external train lighting enable the Guard to satisfy himself if passengers are entraining or detraining, before giving the starting signal.

(c) Government agree with the Agent's views on this matter.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is it not a fact that these external lights, instead of helping passengers, interfere with their free movement, because they get into their eyes.

Mr. P. R. Rau: That seems to be a matter of opinion.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: It is a matter of fact. Will Government kindly take some steps to make sure that passengers are entrained before the train moves on? Would they instruct the station master or some member of the staff at the station to give a signal to the guard from the centre of the train that all passengers are on board before the guard at the back signals the train off.

Mr. P. R. Rau: I shall ask the Agent to consider this matter.

CLOSING OF THE PASSAGE LEADING TO THE DHARMASHALA AT THE ETAWAH RAILWAY STATION.

892 *Mr. Sri Prakasa (a) Are Government aware that the East Indian Railway authorities have closed the passage leading to the *dharmashala* at the Etawah Railway Station directly from the station yard, causing much inconvenience to the passengers?

(b) If so, do Government propose to instruct the railway authorities to open up a passage under such reasonable conditions as they may like to impose on the managers of the *dharmashala*?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) No.

(b) I have forwarded a copy of the question to the Agent, East Indian Railway, for considering the suggestion.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: I am sorry I did not catch the reply. Does the Government deny the fact?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government are not aware of the fact. They do not deny it. They have forwarded the question to the Agent for considering the suggestion.

SYSTEM OF GRANTING CONTRACT FOR THE SALE OF FOOD-STUFFS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

893 *Mr. Sri Prakasa: (a) Will Government please state what is the system of granting contract for the sale of food-stuffs on the East Indian Railway stations?

(b) Is it a fact that in the Dinapore Division 270 contractors have been turned out and four contractors appointed for the whole division who appoint sub-contractors under them?

(c) Are Government aware that this has entailed much hardship on those who used to do this business before?

(d) Is it a fact that these contractors sell goods at higher rates than the older ones and are Government aware that the quality of food-stuff supplied, has in no way improved?

(e) Are Government prepared to re-start the old system?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) The system varies on the different Divisions. As regards the Howrah and Dinapore Divisions, I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad's question No. 639 on the 5th March, 1935. As regards the other Divisions, petty contractors are appointed at each station.

(b) Four contractors were appointed for the Dinapore Division, but I have no information as regards the number who were displaced. I am not aware of the arrangements these four contractors have made for carrying on their business, but understand that there has been no sub-letting.

(c) This is quite likely but can hardly be considered a sufficient reason for retaining the old system.

(d) and (e). I would refer the Honourable member to the reply I gave to Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad's question No. 640 on the 5th March.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I request you, Sir, to kindly take up Dr. Rajan's questions tomorrow, as he is attending on Mr. Sherwani who is very ill.

†894*—908*.

ATTITUDE OF STATES TOWARDS THE FEDERAL STRUCTURE PROPOSED IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

909. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government of India will shortly ask individual States clearly to define their attitude towards the Federal Structure proposed in the Government of India Bill;

(b) whether this enquiry will take the form of asking the Princes to let Government know whether they propose to join the Federation or not;

(c) whether a draft of the proposed Instrument of Accession has been informally circulated by Government among the Princes; if so, the names of the Princes to whom they have been so circulated; and

(d) whether a copy of the draft will be placed on the table of this House?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) The Honourable Member's attention is invited to my reply to question No. 446 given on the 23rd February, 1935.

(b) The enquiry, when it is made, will be on the lines indicated by the Honourable Member.

(c) Yes. Government are not prepared to give the names of the individual Princes.

(d) No.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has there been any change in the position since the publication of the White Paper, agreeing to the demands of the Princes and the Secretary of State's memorandum and despatch to the Government of India on the same subject?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That is a matter of opinion as to whether the position has changed or not.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are Government still asking the Indian Princes to join the Indian Federation, or are they leaving them to decide the question, after the Bill is passed by both Houses of Parliament, and assented to by the King?

---

† These questions will be answered later.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: My Honourable friend's question assumes that the Princes were asked by Government to join the Federation. That is not admitted.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has the draft of the proposed Instrument of Accesssion been circulated by the Government among the Princes?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That I have answered. Yes.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With what purpose has it been circulated?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: So that they may read the Instrument of Accession.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is it with a view to enabling them to make up their mind as to whether they will join the Federation or not?

(No reply.)

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has the attention of Government been drawn to the Secretary of State's statement that the Bill will go on, and that the Princes will be asked to consider the question of joining the Federation, only after the Bill becomes law?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I do not know that it arises as a supplementary question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: It is for you to rule.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Under which part of the question does this come in?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Under this head, No. C.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not think it arises. The Honourable Member can put down a question.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Were they asked to say whether they agree or do not agree with the Instrument of Accession?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Does my Honourable friend assume that they have been asked whether they agree or do not agree?

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Yes, I do.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: There is no ground for making that assumption.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Then, what is the purpose of sending it to the Princes.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I have given the answer to that.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Is it the intention to federate the States even without asking them?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I think the question is very sarcastic, but it has no sense.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is the purpose for which this draft has been circulated among the princes? That question has not been answered.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I have answered that; I will answer again. When they get this Instrument of Accession, they will read and see what it is like.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is it for the purpose of enabling them to decide whether they will join the Federation or not, or merely to add to their sum of knowledge?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: It is for giving them information. They need not read it if they do not want to.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Is there any sense in the Government sending this Instrument of Accession?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is not a proper question.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: That is the suggestion made by the Government themselves.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That question has been answered.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have Government heard in reply from any of the Princes, to whom they sent this Instrument of Accession?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: If my friend will put a question on that, I will consider it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether they were asked to reply to it, or was it merely a unilateral transaction?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: If my Honourable friend is trying to get at the contents of this document which is confidential, I am not prepared to disclose it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I know that perfectly well. I am simply asking whether these princes were expected to reply to it, or whether it was merely a unilateral transaction.?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am afraid the question as put would involve my disclosing a part of the contents of that document, and I am not prepared to do that.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: In view of the fact that the successful passage of the Government of India Bill is dependent on whether Federation is established or not, will the Honourable Member inform this House whether the consent of the princes to Federation is a pre-requisite to the functioning of the Bill?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: My Honourable friend assumes that the Bill is dependent on certain matters. That is a matter for Parliament. I cannot express any opinion on that.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Did the Government of India send any recommendation to the Secretary of State to proceed with the Bill, whether the Princes join the Federation or not?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am not aware of it, but even if I were I would not disclose it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Did Government send any communication at all?

(No reply.)

REFORMS OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

910. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) how long the Reforms Department has been working with the Government of India;

(b) the cost of the establishment and the staff per year;

(c) how much longer the Reforms Department is expected to work;

(d) the particulars, kind and class of work on which they are now engaged; and

(e) whether they are arranging for elections to the Provincial Legislatures early next year?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) The Reforms Office has been in existence, as a separate Department of the Government of India, since May 15th, 1930.

(b) I lay a statement on the table.

(c) It is impossible to say at present for how long a separate Reforms Office will be necessary. The whole office is on a temporary basis and will not be continued longer than is necessary.

(d) and (e). The office deals with all questions relating to Constitutional reform. It is at present particularly engaged in dealing with matters relating to the Government of India Bill and in considering the arrangements, including electoral arrangements, which will become necessary soon after the Bill is passed if it is passed.

Statement.

	Rs.	
1930-31	1,50,253	Actuals.
1931-32	1,88,248	..
1932-33	1,48,114	..
1933-34	1,54,927	..
1934-35	2,00,100	Estimated expenditure.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the main items of work on which they are just now engaged, Sir?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Sir, I have answered that point that:

"It is at present particularly engaged in dealing with matters relating to the Government of India Bill and in considering the arrangements, including electoral arrangements, which will become necessary soon after the Bill is passed if it is passed"

In answer to my Honourable friend's supplementary question, I should say that is the main item which I have disclosed in my answer.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Now that the Government of India Bill is before the Houses of Parliament, what are the Government of India doing, Sir?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Among other things, they are answering questions put here.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: That is, if I may say so, a cheap sneer. I am asking this: now that the Government of India Bill is before the Houses of Parliament—and we are told heaps of times that they cannot answer any question on that Bill—I am asking specifically, what this costly Reforms Office is doing to justify its existence.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That is exactly what I have answered. That is what the Department is doing.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: That is no answer. I am asking—what are the main items in connection with this Government of India Bill on which they are engaged today?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I think, Sir, as my Honourable friend did not listen to my answer, I will read it out again:

"The office deals with all questions relating to Constitutional reform It is at present particularly engaged in dealing with matters relating to the Government of India Bill and in considering the arrangements, including electoral arrangements, which will become necessary soon after the Bill is passed if it is passed."

In answer to my Honourable friend's supplementary question, I said:

"The main item was electoral arrangements."

Mr. S. Satyamurti: So, Sir, may I take it that, excepting electoral arrangements, there are no other items in connection with the Government of India Bill, on which this Department is now engaged?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I think, Sir, "main item" means that there may be some subsidiary items also.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are those subsidiary items, Sir?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I have not got a complete list; I shall be able to supply them at fairly short notice.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the electoral arrangements with which they are now concerned? Are they in connection with the Provincial Councils or the Federal Legislature?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Both.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

COST OF BUILDING THE CAPITAL AT NEW DELHI.

911. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) the reasons why the estimate of six crores of rupees for the cost of building the capital at Delhi has been exceeded by 7·34, crores;

(b) the main details of this extra expenditure;

(c) whether there are any proposals or schemes for increased expenditure on New Delhi, and if so, their cost; and

(d) whether there is any proposal to make New Delhi the capital throughout the year, and if not, why not;

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The estimate of £4 millions sterling, or roughly Rs. 6 crores, to which the Honourable Member refers, was not based on detailed calculations. It was not, and was not intended to be, an "estimate" in the departmental sense. That the figure has been exceeded is due partly to the fact that it was an under-estimate, partly to the rise in rates and wages caused by the war, partly to the Constitutional Reforms, and partly to increases in the personnel of the Government of India.

(b) As the original estimate of Rs. 6 crores was not based on detailed calculations I am unable to give details of the extra expenditures.

(c) The Budget Estimate for 1935-36 includes a sum of Rs. 52·45 lakhs for Delhi Capital outlay. The sum is mainly for:

(i) the completion of the Irwin Hospital,

(ii) the extension of residential accommodation; and

(iii) services, such as roads, sanitation, and electric light and power, connected with old and new residential accommodation.

(d) The matter was last considered in 1933 when Government decided to take no action until constitutional changes require it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, in view of the fact that so much money has been spent, will the Government of India reconsider, instead of waiting for the reforms, the question of making New Delhi the permanent capital of India?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have nothing, Sir, to add on that point to the reply given by my Honourable colleague, the Home Member, recently.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know how the constitutional requirements and the increase in the Government's personnel have added to this large expenditure provided for already?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Yes, Sir, I can give my Honourable friend some information on that point. The New Capital Enquiry Committee of 1922 went into the question. They found that the original detailed estimates of Rs. 9 crores had been increased to Rs. 12·92 crores; and that this increase of Rs. 3·9 crores over the first estimate of 1913-14 was due to three main causes. The rise in rates and wages owing to the war accounted for Rs. 2·23 crores, the reforms accounted for Rs. 1·41 crores, and the balance of Rs. 26 lakhs was due to the inclusion of unforeseen items. I may mention also, for the information of my Honourable friend, as a measure of the gradual expansion of the project, that in 1922 it was intended to house 160 gazetted officers and 1,127 clerks. If our programme for 1935-36 is concluded, we shall, apart from the accommodation available in hospitals and chummeries, have house accommodation available for 287 officers and 2,356 clerks.

Mr S. Satyamurti: Has any of the expenditure been incurred with reference to the possibility being kept in view of New Delhi being the Capital of India? Has any of the expenditure on building houses, for example, been incurred with reference to the possibility of making this the permanent Capital of India?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: That question has already been discussed at considerable length on the floor of the House in reply to supplementary questions, and, as I have already said, I have nothing to add to what my Honourable colleague, the Home Member, said recently.

Seth Govind Das: Is it not a fact that when it was decided to remove the capital from Calcutta to Delhi, it was thought that the Capital would remain in Delhi permanently?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think my Honourable friend had better put down a question on the notice paper on that subject

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

POWER OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO SELECT CANDIDATES IRRESPECTIVE OF THE NUMBER OF MARKS OBTAINED IN THEIR EXAMINATION.

912. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether their attention has been drawn to an answer of the Secretary of State in the House of Commons recently to a question that the system by which under clause 97-4 of the Government of India Act "The candidates certified to be entitled under the rules shall be recommended for appointments according to their order of efficiency as shown by their examination" is to be abandoned or modified;

(b) whether Government are aware that this clause does not appear in the Government of India Bill.

(c) whether the Government of India were consulted on the omission of this clause from the Bill; if so, what their recommendation was; and

(d) whether it is proposed to give power to the Secretary of State to select candidates, irrespective of the number of marks obtained in their examination?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) The question was generally discussed with the Government of India.

(d) The intention of clause 233 of the Government of India Bill is to leave the Secretary of State free to recruit for the Indian Civil Service by any method he may consider suitable.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Did the Government of India, in that informal consultation, make any recommendation to the Secretary of State about the non-introduction of this clause 97 (a) in the Government of India Bill?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: My Honourable friend is aware that it is not the custom to disclose, in the public interest, any recommendations made to the Secretary of State by the Government of India.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, I cannot accept that answer I must ask for your ruling . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) The Chair has given its ruling already.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, my Honourable friend says—"it is not the custom", etc. It is not right, Sir, to rely on "custom". He must aver every time that, in his opinion, the public interest would be adversely affected, by giving this answer. If my friend means to say that, for all time, they will never answer any questions on this matter, then that is against the Rules and Standing Orders.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not think that was intended.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I say—"in the public interest".

Mr. S Satyamurti: If the Honourable the Home Member says that he does not want to rely on the custom, and if he says that in this particular case he considers that the public interest may be affected adversely by giving the answer, that is different.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That is what I intended to convey.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Thank you very much. May I know whether Government have any knowledge of any reasons why this clause has not been inserted in the new Government of India Bill?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I do not think it is for me to interpret the reasons that led to the inclusion of the particular clause in the present Act.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are the Government aware that the reason is that too many Indians are getting into the Indian Civil Service in London, and the Secretary of State wants the number of Europeans to be increased, whether they get higher marks or not?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I do not think that is the reason.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Then, what is the reason? How do you say that that is not the reason?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: As far as I am aware, that is not the reason.

"WAYS AND MEANS" ADVANCES EXTENDED TO THE TREASURY BY THE IMPERIAL BANK.

913. *Mr. S Satyamurti: Will the Honourable the Finance Member be pleased to state:

(a) whether his attention has been drawn to the article entitled, "World of Indian Finance", in the issue of the *Indian Finance*, dated the 15th February, 1935;

(b) whether the "ways and means" advances extended to the Treasury by the Imperial Bank now amount, or recently amounted, to six crores;

(c) whether Government have considered the alternative of adding to the currency;

(d) the basis of the interest that is charged by the Bank for these advances;

(e) the reasons why Government let the Imperial Bank have their balances free of interest, and pay interest to the Bank for their advances;

(f) whether Government are aware that this frequent and frantic recourse to ways and means loans is in total defiance of their purpose; and

(g) whether Government propose to take any steps to protect the interest of the tax-payers and if not, why not?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) I always read the *Indian Finance* though I do not invariably agree with it.

(b) Ways and means advances reached a total of six crores on the 7th of February, 1935, but have since been completely repaid.

(d) I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply given on the 13th August, 1934, to question No. 47 asked in the Council of State by the Honourable Mr. Hossain Imam.

(e) Under the terms of its agreement the Imperial Bank of India receives no remuneration for the conduct of the ordinary banking business of Government other than such advantage as may accrue to it from the holding of Government balances free of interest.

(c) (f) and (g). This is one of the occasions on which I am not in agreement with the *Indian Finance* though I am afraid it would not be possible to give detailed reasons within the limits of a Parliamentary answer. I might perhaps say, however, that there seems to be a certain confusion between the two responsibilities of the Government, *viz.*, that for regulating their temporary borrowing operations and that for controlling the currency. As regards the former it is a question of judgment on each occasion whether it is more suitable to increase the takings of three months Treasury Bills or to take a day to day Ways and Means Advance, but it is, in my view, in no circumstances suitable to provide for the temporary exigencies of Government finance by resort to an expansion of currency. This is nothing more than pure inflation and what is more inflation to meet a purely temporary need.

As regards the latter it is the duty of a currency authority to meet fully the legitimate demands of trade and industry subject to there being no doubt about its ability to maintain adequate reserves and Government have consistently aimed at carrying out this duty But here again expansion in advance of the needs of the market is nothing more than 'trying to make yourself fat by buying a bigger belt' as Mr. Keynes describes it.

Finally, I might remind the House that the second function will become the responsibility of the Reserve Bank as from the 1st April, next. The first will remain a responsibility of the Government but it will be of course exercised in the fullest co-operation with the Reserve Bank.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I ask for the answer given in the other place? I assume that it is not the practice here to refer to the answers given in the other place. In fact, there is a ruling to that effect.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The proceedings of the Council of State are circulated to Honourable Members.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I will read the relevant part of the answer:

"I regret that I am unable to disclose the rates of interest paid on these advances. They are settled by confidential agreement with the Imperial Bank and vary from time to time in accordance with market conditions."

Mr. S. Satyamurti: oes the Honourable Member think that it will affect the public interest adversely, if he tells us the rates of interest?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Yes, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In coming to the decision as to what is best in the interests of the Government, did the Honourable the Finance Member consider which rates are more advantageous and more profitable to the Government, and to the tax-payers, the one or the other method?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Of course.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do Government propose to extend the currency circulation?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I certainly should not give a notice in advance if I was going to do that.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that, in view of the economic conditions during the last year, there is a growing need for extended currency supply in this country?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I have answered that question. I said that Government have consistently tried to carry out their duty of keeping the market fully supplied with currency in accordance with its needs. I believe that that object is being properly carried out, and I think it will continue to be carried out.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What is the amount of increase effected in the currency supply during the last year?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Six crores.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are Government aware that they are unnecessarily favouring the Imperial Bank by this contract?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I think that is an outrageous suggestion.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What is the confidential document? Why cannot it be disclosed on the floor of this House?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: You cannot carry on your business in the light of every day publicity in this Assembly. It will make things quite impossible.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Have the exports of gold resulted in any extension of currency in this country?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The exports of gold seem to me to be irrelevant to the question of currency.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Have they had any effect at all upon the total supply of currency in this country?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I think it is quite possible that, because of the receipt of gold from people who have not hitherto been using it, it may have brought more money into active circulation.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that in the last four years there has been, on the whole, a diminution in the total supply of currency in this country?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That is not true.

Opening of a Federation Branch in the Foreign and Political Department.

914. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state?

(a) whether it is a fact that from the 1st of April next, a new branch will be opened in the Foreign and Political Department of the Government of India Secretariat which will deal exclusively with the formation of the Federation;

(b) if so, what will be the nature and extent of the work of this branch,

(c) what is the period for which this branch is being created, and the cost thereof?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: (a) and (b). A separate Branch of the Foreign and Political Department has been created from the 1st March, 1935, to work out the application to each State of the new Constitution Bill and to deal with the work that will arise in connection with the accession of the Indian States to the Federation.

(c) Two years in the first instance; about Rs. 69,000 a year (including the pay of the officer in charge of the Branch).

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is the main nature of the work which this separate Branch has been doing, since the 1st March, 1935?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: I have already explained that what it is there for is to work out the application to each State of the new Constitution Bill. It is quite obvious that if the States do accede to the Federation, the drafting and so forth of the accession agreements will entail a considerable amount of work

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the fact that the question of accession of any State to the Federation has not yet arisen and will not arise for some time, may I know the reason for the creation of this Branch so soon?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: In order that they may be prepared for the possibility of accession.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: May I ask, Sir, from what source is this separate Branch being recruited?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: From the ordinary source presumably from which other branches are recruited, that is, through the Public Service Commission.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is this Branch in communication with individual States, with regard to their proposed accession to the Federation?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: That Sir, I am not in a position to say at present.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is it because the Honourable Member is unaware or is unwilling to say that?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: It is mainly because he is unwilling to say.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know the reason for this unwillingness?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: No, Sir.

Seth Govind Das: Do Government not think that on the mere assumption that the States will join the Federation, the spending of this money is a waste?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: Was that a question or an argument? I did not catch it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I must ask your ruling again, Sir. It comes to this, that the Honourable Member gets up and says: "I am unwilling to answer your question, and I am not prepared to say the reason why". This attitude reduces the privilege of asking the questions to a farce. They must at least give us the reason, as to why they will not answer the question.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Perhaps the Honourable Member will give the reason.

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: One of the main reasons is that if the Honourable Member is going to raise a point of order, I can do the same. As he knows, questions which concern the relations between the Governor General in Council and the Indian States cannot be put on the floor of the House and cannot be answered. Questions of this kind, as to whether we are in communication with the Indian States and what is the nature of that communication, are, obviously, to my mind, out of order.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: A point of order should not be countered by another point of order. I submit that this does not raise any question affecting the relations of the present Government of India with any individual State or States. We are dealing with the proposed Federation, and I am asking what this Branch is doing, with regard to the future accession of States to the Federation, and I am perfectly entitled to an answer.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): As regards any particular communication between the Government of India or the Political Department and the States, if the Department says that the communication is of such a nature that they cannot, in public interest, disclose it, the Chair must accept that position.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Then, let him say so!

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): He has said so.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: He has not, I submit.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Oh! Yes, he has.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION.

915. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) the present personnel of the Public Services Commission and the monthly salaries of each;

(b) what examinations, written or oral, were conducted by the Commission in 1932, 1933 and 1934; and

(c) the amount realised during each of the above years from the candidates in each examination as registration fees, examination fees and any other fees?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I lay two statements on the table containing the information asked for.

(a) *Pay and personnel of the Commission.*

1. Sir David Petrie, Kt., C.I.E., C.V.O., Chairman, Pay Rs. 4,000 a month.
2. Mr. H. S. Crosthwaite, C.I.E., I.C.S., Member. Pay Rs. 3,500 a month.
3. Rai Bahadur B. P. Varma, I.S.E., Member. Pay Rs. 3,500 a month.
4. Dr. L. K. Hyder, Ph.D., C.I.E., Member. Pay Rs. 3,500 a month.

(b) and (c) *Statement showing the fees received during 1932, 1933 and 1934 by the Public Service Commission in respect of the Examinations held by them or the Selection posts recruitment to which was made through them.*

Name of Examination or Selection.	1932.		1933.		1934.		Remarks.
	Application fee.	Examination fee.	Application fee.	Examination fee.	Application fee.	Examination fee.	
	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	
1. Indian Civil Service . .	2,240 0 0	24,700 0 0	3,015 0 0	23,100 0 0	2,632 8 0	22,600 0 0	
2. U. P. Civil (Executive) Service	1,115 0 0	5,850 0 0	875 0 0	3,850 0 0	650 0 0	5,050 0 0	
3. Indian Police and U. P. Police Service . .	3,252 8 0	6,450 0 0	1,892 0 0	6,550 0 0	2,317 8 0	4,399 8 0	There was no examination for the U. P. P. S. in 1934.
4. Selection of Army and Railway Apprentices . .	1,100 0 0	..	..	..	..	..	
5. Selection of Army Apprentices	..	..	..	..	195 0 0	..	
6. Indian Military Academy and Royal Indian Marine and Indian Air Force (held twice every year) . .	5,970 0 0	16,950 0 0	3,217 8 0	16,850 0	3,060 0 0	15,400 0 0	
7. Indian Audit and Accounts Service, etc. . . .	..	..	..	..	6,075 0 0	5,850 0 0	
8. Superior Telegraphs Engineering and Wireless Branches of the Posts and Telegraphs Department .	450 0 0	2,550 0 0	600 0 0	4,125 0 0	—	—	

9. Indian Railway Service of Engineers and Superior Telegraphs Engineering, etc.	..			..			..			..			1,312	8	0	9,375	0	0	
10. Ministerial Service	..			25,590	0	0	..			33,195	0	0	..			6,990	0	0	
11. Special 'Dufferin' Examination	..			..			..			..			..			400	0	0	
12. Selection posts	2,055	0	0	..			4,582	0	0	..			18,284	0	0	..			The number of posts for which recruitment was made during 1932, 1933 and 1934 was 11, 19 and 26 respectively.
Total	16,182	8	0	82,090	0	0	14,181	8	0	87,670	0	0	34,526	8	0	70,064	8	0	
	98,272	8	0				1,01,851	8	0				1,04,591	0	0				

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GENERAL PURPOSES RETRENCHMENT COMMITTEE IN REGARD TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OFFICE.

916. *Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Will Government be pleased to state whether they have carried out fully the recommendations of the General Purposes Retrenchment Committee of 1931 in regard to Public Services Commission office?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I lay on the table a statement containing the information asked for.

Statement showing details of retrenchment in Demand No. 33—P. S. C.

Reductions recommended by the Retrenchment Committee.	Reductions accepted by Government.	Remarks.
1. Reduction of the number of members from five to three.	The number of members has been reduced from five to four.	
2. Reduction of the status of the post of Secretary to that of Assistant Secretary or reduction of the special pay to Rs. 200 for an incumbent recruited from an All-India Service.	In view of the technical and responsible nature of the work it is not possible to employ a Secretary of the status of an Assistant Secretary to the Government of India. The special pay of Secretary, P. S. C., was fixed on the analogy of the special pay attached to the posts of D. S. in the Government of India. It has therefore been decided that the special pay of persons now in service who may be appointed to the post should not be altered so long as the special pay attached to posts of D. S. is not altered. So far as new entrants are concerned, the decision that may be arrived at in the case of D. Ss. in the Government of India will also apply to this post.	
3. Reduction of at least two posts of stenographer.	One post of stenographer has been abolished. The abolition of another post was dependent on the reduction of the number of members from 5 to 3. As the number of members has been reduced only to 4, it was not possible to abolish another post of stenographer.	
Reduction in the cost of other ministerial staff.	Not accepted, as it was not possible to reduce the strength.	

Reductions recommended by the Retrenchment Committee.	Reductions accepted by Government.	Remarks.
5. Reduction in the strength of inferior servants.	The number of inferior servants is fixed in accordance with the general scale applicable to other offices. Consequent on the reduction of one post of Member, one post of 2nd class Jemadar and two posts of peon were abolished.	
Reduction from Rs. 500 to Rs. 200 of the provision for medical treatment.	Accepted.	
7. Curtailment of touring and reduction of the scale of Members' reserved railway accommodation to a coupe compartment of two berths or when a coupe is not available two first class berths. Chairman to continue to get a reserved four-berth compartment.	Accepted with the modification that if no coupe is available Members should get a full four-berth compartment. The provision for travelling allowance has also been reduced.	
Permanent location of the office in Delhi, all but one of the Members being allowed to recess in the hills.	The question is a general one. As the Government of India have decided not to locate any portion of staff in Delhi, it is not possible to locate the office of the P. S. C. there.	
9. Reduction of the provision for contingencies from Rs. 18,500 to Rs. 13,000.	The provision for contingencies has been reduced to Rs. 14,000.	It has been necessary to raise the provision on this account since 1934-35 on account of— (*i*) increase in postal rates; and (*ii*) increase in general expenditure consequent on the holding of examinations for recruitment to services, which was not done previously by the P. S. C.
10. Enhancement of fees charged to candidates from Rs. 5 to Rs. 7-8-0	Accepted.	

FORMATION OF A NEW SECTION IN THE HOME DEPARTMENT TO DEAL WITH THE QUESTION OF COMMUNAL RECRUITMENT.

917. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** (a) Is it a fact that Government have decided or have under contemplation the formation of a new section in the Home Department to deal with the question of communal recruitment in offices of the Government of India and to keep the Public Services Commission as merely an examining body?

(b) If so, what was the necessity of attaching this section to the Home Department and not allowing the Public Services Commission to perform the above functions?

(c) If the Public Services Commission is merely going to be an examining body in future, are Government prepared to consider the advisability of reducing the personnel (both the members and the subordinate staff) to its proper proportions consistent with the reduction in their duty now proposed by the creation of a separate branch in the Home Department?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) A temporary section has been created in the Home Department to deal *inter alia* with the work arising out of (i) the Home Department Resolution of the 4th July, 1934, on communal representation in the services and (ii) the assignment of candidates recruited by the Public Service Commission for ministerial service in the Government of India Secretariat and Attached Offices and questions connected therewith.

(b) and (c). Questions connected with communal representation in the services are not part of the functions of the Public Service Commission, a point which has been recognised in the new Constitution Bill, clause 255 (3) of which is to the following effect:

"Nothing in this section shall require a Public Service Commission to be consulted as respects the manner in which appointments and posts are to be allocated as between the various communities in the Federation or a Province."

Work arising out of (ii) above, *viz.*, that of assignment of candidates recruited by the Public Service Commission was previously undertaken by the Public Service Commission, but it was found that this arrangement was not satisfactory and interfered with the ordinary work of the Commission as an examining and advisory body. Its removal has caused only a slight reduction in their work and one post of clerk in that Office has been left unfilled. I may further point out that the strength of the Commission was reduced by one Member as a measure of retrenchment a short time ago and that since then its work has increased largely in all respects.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: If the Public Service Commission has nothing to do with the choice of the candidates for the different jobs, then, Sir, what is the object in having a Public Service Commission at all and holding examinations under its ægis? Is it merely to hold examinations and for nothing else?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Public Service Commission holds examinations, but it does not assign the successful candidates to particular offices.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if there is any intention to increase the number of Members of the Public Service Commission?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: There is no present intention.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Does the Honourable Member find that the examinations held by the Public Service Commission are more reliable than the results of the examinations held by the Universities?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That is asking me to express an opinion.

UNORTHODOX QUARTERS AND BUNGALOWS ON CERTAIN ROADS IN NEW DELHI.

918 ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the unorthodox type quarters and bungalows on Mahadeo Road, Allenby Road and Talkatora Road were built for occupation all the year round or merely for the winter season?

(b) Are Government aware that in many of these types of houses, the doors open directly on to the lawn with the result that on days when it rains, water gets into the rooms to the annoyance and inconvenience of the tenants?

(c) Are Government also aware that in these houses the front or back rooms, as the case may be, are practically uninhabitable during the summer as the sun beats directly into the rooms?

(d) If the answer to parts (b) and (c) be in the affirmative, are Government prepared to take the necessary steps by providing protecting shades or awnings over the doors opening directly on the lawns in order to minimise the inconvenience to tenants?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The quarters referred to are intended for occupation during the whole year.

(b) The doors of some rooms open directly on to the lawn, but no definite complaints either of annoyance or inconvenience have been received. It is understood, however, that, during wet weather rain does drive into some of the rooms and steps will be taken to remedy this defect when funds are available

(c) No.

(d) I have already said in dealing with part (b) that certain improvements will be carried out when funds are available.

CLERKS' QUARTERS IN TIMARPUR, DELHI.

919. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state for how long the clerks' quarters in Timarpur were built to last? Is it not a fact that they were built to last for a maximum period of ten years and that rents were recovered accordingly from the year 1912?

(b) Is it not a fact that the cost of those quarters has been recovered in full long ago?

(c) If so, do Government propose to consider the desirability of reducing the rents of such quarters?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) No specific period of years was prescribed, but the intention was that the quarters should last until replaced by permanent quarters in New Delhi.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

REMOVAL OF THE IMPERIAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FROM PUSA TO DELHI.

920. ***Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) what section of the Imperial Institute of Agricultural Research will be retained at Pusa and with what staff, after the main institute is removed to the suburbs of Delhi;

(b) what they propose to do with the vast area of land at Pusa;

(c) what they propose to do with the High English School and hospital there; and

(d) by what time the main institute at Pusa is likely to be removed?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) No section of the Institute will be retained at Pusa but a Botanical sub-station will be maintained there.

(b) All the land other than that required for the sub-station will be disposed of in accordance with the rules regulating the transfer of State lands set out in the Finance Department Resolution No. D./3428-A., dated the 10th December, 1925, and letter No. D./3009-A., dated the 28th October, 1929, a copy of which is available in the Library of the House.

(c) The Government of India will discontinue their annual contribution towards the maintenance of the High School. The hospital will be closed.

(d) By 1937

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know how far the construction of this new Imperial Agricultural Institute has progressed in Delhi and how long will it take to set it in working order?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I have already informed the House that it will be ready by 1937, and as regards the first part of my Honourable friend's question, the position is that the ground is being cleared, the foundation stone has been laid and the building operations will start shortly.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do the Government of India propose to have also an experimental farm attached to the Institute when it is transferred to Delhi?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: As a matter of fact, the agricultural work of the Institute will be done partly here and partly at the sub-station which is already in existence at Karnal.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do Government realise that the experiments of all the crops that are now being made at Pusa cannot be made here in Delhi?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: My Honourable friend evidently did not listen to what I said in answer to part (a) of the question, namely, that a Botanical sub-station will be maintained at Pusa in order to carry on the experimental work on those crops which are peculiar to the soil and climatic conditions of the region.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do Government propose to take up experiments on any new crops when the Institute is transferred to Delhi?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I think the number of all staple crops in this country is pretty well known and has been the subject of experiments for a long time. The Government cannot, therefore, invent any new crops for such experiments.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Are there any additional crops on which experiments will be carried on here?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I do not know whether there are any additional crops.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: What are the reasons why the Institute was transferred to Delhi?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: My Honourable friend was not in the House last August when I explained that matter in my speech lasting thirty-five minutes.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: Will the Government of India accept the suggestion that the Institute should be allowed to exist and flourish as a provincial concern?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: If the Government of Bihar and Orissa is prepared to maintain the Institute as a provincial concern, nobody will be happier than the Government of India.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Was the Government of Bihar and Orissa consulted?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: It is not for the Government of India to accept the suggestion; it is for the Government of Bihar and Orissa to decide whether they will accept the financial responsibility.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: If that Institute is transferred to Delhi and the experimental work is to be carried on here in Delhi, and, at the same time, another part of the experimental work is carried on in the sub-station, will it not involve additional expenditure to the Government of India?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: My Honourable friend does not appreciate the fact that crop experiments cannot be centralised in any one place. They have to be carried on in different centres.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: If the Government of Bihar and Orissa likes to maintain the Institute, will the Government of India allow any subsidy?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The Government of India cannot allow any subsidy in regard to a matter of provincial administration.

INQUIRY INTO THE CASE OF MR. BHARTHI, *ex*-GUARD, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

921. ***Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha:** (a) With reference to the starred question No. 795 of Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen, dated the 12th September, 1933 relating to the case of Mr. Bharthi, *ex*-Guard, East Indian Railway, will Government please state if they have completed their inquiry into the case?

(b) Is it a fact that the Railway Board gave advice to the Agent, East Indian Railway, that the sending of advance copies of appeals does not call for disciplinary action?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The answer to both parts of the question is in the affirmative

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Is it a fact that every railway employé is entitled to address, by means of an advance copy, any appeal to the Railway Board?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am not aware of any orders preventing it.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: But is it or is it not a fact that this is accepted by the Railway Board as a legitimate channel of representing a grievance?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The legitimate channel of representation is through the railway administration.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: That is beside the point. I want to know: Is it or is it not a fact that every railway servant is entitled to send an advance copy of an appeal to the Railway Board without courting the displeasure of the Agent?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have already replied to that. There is nothing to prevent a railway servant from sending an advance copy of any memorial to whomsoever he likes.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Therefore, it is a fact that any Railway Agent who shows his displeasure towards any employé who does that is acting contrary to the policy and orders of the Railway Board.

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have already replied, in answer to part (b) of the question, that the Railway Board have advised the Agent that the sending of advance copies of appeals does not call for any disciplinary action.

SCALES OF PAY OF POSTAL CLERKS AND SIGNALLERS AND OF TELEGRAPHISTS.

922. ***Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury:** (a) Are Government aware that in Great Britain the Postal Clerks and Signallers are given a higher scale of pay than Telegraphists, on the ground that the duties of the former involve more complexities and heavier responsibility than those of the latter?

(b) If so, will Government please state the reasons why the Postal Clerks and Signallers in India have been given a lower scale of pay than that sanctioned for Telegraphists?

(c) Do Government propose to equalise the scales? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Government have no precise information.

(b) and (c). Departmental telegraphists are given a better scale of pay in recognition of the fact that they are required to possess a higher degree of operative skill and technical attainment than postal clerks or signallers, and Government do not, therefore, consider that there is any case for equalizing the scales.

TELEGRAPH MASTERS AND THEIR PERCENTAGE IN COMPARISION WITH TELEGRAPHISTS.

923. ***Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury:** Will Government please state the total number of appointments of Telegraph Masters, and their percentage in comparison with the total number of telegraphists, both general service and station service taken together?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The cadre of Telegraph Masters has been fixed for the year 1934-35 at 255 which represents a ratio of 17 per cent. as compared with the total number of telegraphists

REVISED SCALES OF PAY FOR FUTURE ENTRANTS IN THE POST OFFICE, RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE AND TELEGRAPH SERVICE.

924. ***Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury:** Have Government arrived at any decision with regard to the revised scales of pay for future entrants in the Posts Office, Railway Mail Service and Telegraph Service? If so, will Government please lay on the table a statement showing the revised scales? If not, when is the decision likely to be arrived at?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: Government have sanctioned revised rates of pay for non-gazetted Government servants of the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department who enter or have entered service on or after the 16th July, 1931. A copy of the orders has been placed in the Library of the House.

PERCENTAGE OF MUSLIMS IN BIHAR AND ORISSA AND IN THE PURNEA DISTRICT.

925. ***Maulvi Badi-uz-Zaman:** Will Government please state that percentage of the Muslims in Bihar and Orissa and in the District of Purnea, respectively?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I would refer the Honourable Member to pages 132-133 of Part II of Volume VII, Census of India, 1931, a copy of which will be found in the Library of the House.

EXEMPTION FROM CUT IN SALARIES OF SUBORDINATES SUFFERED FROM EARTHQUAKE IN BIHAR AND ORISSA.

926. *Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha: (a) Are Government aware that the Local Government have granted exemption from cut in salaries of their subordinates who have suffered from the last earthquake in the Bihar and Orissa Province?

(b) Are Government aware that grave discontent prevails among the staff under Central Government, serving in the said province, who have similarly suffered from the earthquake, on account of their non-exemption from the cut?

(c) Are Government aware that the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs made a definite promise to his staff serving in Bihar that they will get all reliefs that the Local Government would grant to their employees?

(d) Do Government propose to grant the exemption to their employees in Bihar and remove their grievance?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) Yes.

(d) Yes Orders will issue shortly.

MEMORIAL SUBMITTED BY THE CLERKS OF THEOFFIC E OF THE CHIEF ACCOUNTS OFFICER, NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

927 *Mr. Fakir Chand: (a) Is it a fact that a memorial submitted in November, 1934, by the qualified clerks of the Chief Accounts Officer's office, North Western Railway, Lahore, for a revision in seniority (fixed for the purpose of promotion to Accountant's grade) alleged to have been based on the mis-interpretation of rule, is still lying undisposed of with the Chief Accounts Officer, North Western Railway, Lahore, and has not so far been forwarded to the higher authorities with his remarks? If so, what period do Government consider as reasonable for the disposal of such papers?

(b) Do Government propose to have the matters expedited?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government are informed that certain memorials were received in December, 1934, and are under consideration. The Chief Accounts Officer has been asked to expedite disposal.

STORAGE OF HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS DURING SUMMER IN "D" TYPE QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI.

928 *Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah: (a) Is it a fact that residential quarters in New Delhi were constructed primarily for the use and convenience of the staff of the migratory offices of the Government of India?

(b) Is it also a fact that for some years past the practice has been not to allow the occupants of 'D' class quarters to store their household

effects in the godown of their quarters during the summer season when they move up to Simla?

(c) Are Government aware that the tenants of these quarters, who are refused permission to store their surplus and heavy effects not required at Simla, in their godown, are put to great inconvenience at the time of the move up of the offices?

(d) Is it a fact that the reason why the permission referred to above is not granted is that the "D" class quarters are usually allotted to the local people for some months in the summer season?

(e) Is it also a fact that the temporary tenants referred to in part (d) above usually pay much less rent for the quarters, because they are in receipt of less pay than the winter occupants?

(f) If the replies to the preceding parts be in the affirmative, do Government propose to issue instructions that in future the quarters should be allotted to temporary summer residents subject to the stipulation that the godowns of the quarters will, if required, be retained by the winter occupants? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) No.

(b) Storage is permitted in those quarters which are not likely to be allotted for the summer season.

(c) I am prepared to take it from the Honourable Member that some inconvenience is caused to the tenants in such cases.

(d) Yes.

(e) They pay the rent due under the rules, while migratory tenants pay nothing during the summer.

(f) No. It would be unfair to the summer tenants, and would involve loss of rent.

Installation of Additional Points of Electricity and Provision of Flush Latrines in certain Quarters in New Delhi.

929. ***Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah:** (a) Is it a fact that for some years past the Government of India have had under consideration the question of installing additional points of electricity and providing flush latrines in 'C' and 'D' class quarters in New Delhi?

(b) Is it also a fact that these installations have been provided in the new quarters on Minto Road, rents for which are charged at the same rates as for the old quarters?

(c) When do Government propose to provide these installations in the old quarters?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) It is hoped that the installation of additional electric points in the old quarters will be completed by the end of this month. Modern sanitation will be provided in 1935-36 provided the necessary funds are voted by this House.

DESIRABILITY OF BUILDING COW-BYRES IN THE LAND BEHIND THE IRWIN ROAD AND BAIRD SQUARE QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI.

930. *Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah: (a) Is it a fact that a large plot of land is lying vacant near the *dhobi ghats* behind the Irwin Road (Orthodox) quarters and Baird Square?

(b) Do Government propose to make a park there? If so, when? If not, do Government propose to consider the desirability of building cow-byres there for the use of the tenants of the quarters in that locality?

Mr. G. Bajpai: (a) Yes.

(b) It is not intended at present to turn the plot into a public park. The provision of cow-byres is a matter for the Municipal Committee of New Delhi

TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE DELHI CAMP ALLOWANCE FOR ALLOTMENT OF QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI TO THE STAFF OF THE ATTACHED OFFICES.

931 *Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah: (a) Is it a fact that the Delhi Camp Allowance allowed to the staff of the Attached Offices of the Government of India is taken into account in calculating the rent chargeable for the Government quarters allotted to them but not for the purpose of allotment and classification?

(b) Is it a fact that the allowance is of a more or less permanent and regular nature and that its grant in the winter season can be foreseen just like that of pay?

(c) Do Government propose to change the allotment rules to remove the anomaly referred to in part (*a*), either by taking the allowance into account for both purposes, or by leaving it out for both? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) and (c). I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to my reply to question No. 666 which was asked by Rao Bahadur B. L. Patil on the 10th April, 1934.

(b) In some of the attached offices, the Delhi Camp Allowance is renewed from year to year, while in some the allowance is sanctioned as a permanent measure for so long as the offices continue to move between Simla and Delhi.

COMPENSATORY AND LOCAL ALLOWANCES TO THE STAFF OF THE ATTACHED OFFICES IN NEW DELHI.

932. *Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah: (a) Will Government please lay on the table a statement showing the following information regarding the compensatory and local allowances on salaries of Rs. 101, Rs. 201, and Rs. 301, to the clerical staff of the Attached Offices in New Delhi:

(i) full rate (pre-cut) of Delhi Camp Allowance admissible to old entrants;

(ii) present rate (after cut) of Delhi Camp Allowance allowed to old entrants; and

(iii) rate of consolidated allowance allowed to "new entrants"?

(b) Is it a fact that the "cut" in the Delhi Camp Allowance, was introduced on account of financial stringency?

(c) Is it also a fact that the cut in pay also was introduced on account of financial stringency, but it has been decided to restore it with effect from the pay for April, 1935?

(d) Do Government propose to restore the cut in the Delhi Camp Allowance also in the next financial year? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) (i). I lay on the table a copy of the reply given to part (a) of Pandit Nilakantha Das' unstarred question No. 272 on the 21st March, 1930, which gives the information asked for.

(a) (ii). The Delhi Camp Allowance is given at the same rates subject to a ten per cent. cut.

(a) (iii). The new rates of house-rent allowance are Rs. 15, Rs. 20, and Rs. 25 per mensem on pays of Rs. 101, Rs. 201 and Rs. 301. It is an allowance admissible to those not provided with Government quarters. In addition, a conveyance allowance of Rs. 25 a month is granted to those working in New Delhi but residing in Old Delhi Notified Area.

(b) Not entirely. The main reason for the cut was the fall in the prices of staple commodities, which happened to coincide with the beginning of the financial stringency.

(c) The answer is in the affirmative.

(d) I am afraid I can give no undertaking in the matter. The question will be considered in due course.

Reply to Pandit Nilakantha Das' unstarred question No. 272 on the 31st March, 1930.

Secretariat Attached Offices.		Army Headquarter Offices.	
Pay.	Rate of allowance.	Salary.	Rate of allowance.
	Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
Rs. 50 or less .	16-10-8 per mensem	Rs. 50 or less .	16-10-8 per mensem.
Rs. 50 to 75 . .	20-0-0 Do.	Rs. 50 to 80 .	20-0-0 Do.
Rs. 75 to 100 .	26-10-8 do.	Rs. 80 to 120 .	33-5-4 do.
Rs. 100 to 150 .	40-0-0 do.	Rs. 120 to 180 .	40-0-0 do.
Rs. 150 to 200 .	50-0-0 do.	Rs. 180 to 200 .	50-0-0 do.
Rs. 200 to 250 .	53-5-4 do.	Rs. 200 to 300 .	60-0-0 do.
Above Rs. 250 .	56-10-8 do.	Rs. 300 to 350 .	66-10-8 do.
		Rs. 350 to 500 .	83-5-4 do.
		Above Rs. 500 .	100-0-0 do.

INDIANS APPOINTED AS HOME MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

933. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh:** Will Government be pleased to state whether any Indian has hitherto been appointed to the Home Membership of the Government of India and several Local Governments in this country, and if so, how many and when?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No Indian has so far been appointed as Home Member of the Government of India but Indians have held this post in several Provinces and I lay a statement on the table containing the information desired by the Honourable Member.

Statement showing the number of Indians who have been appointed as Home Members in the Provincial Governments since 1921.

Province.	No. of Indians who held the post.	Year and date.
Madras . .	2	30-3-25 to 16-5-34 and 16-8-34 to date.
United Provinces . .	4	3-1-21 to date with brief intervals on two occasions.
Burma	4 (Burmans).	Since the introduction of reforms in in 1923.
Central Provinces . .	3	17-12-20 to 4-10-30 and 8-10-30 to date.
Assam	4	3-1-21 1-3-24 1-4-29 31-3-34 } Date of appointment.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Why has no Indian been appointed as Home Member in the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The appointment of Home Member in the Government of India is not made by the Government of India.

MARTIAL RACES.

934. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh:** What is a martial race, as understood by the Government of India and which are the martial races of this country recognised as such by them?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Sir, I will repeat the answer that has been given in the past to similar questions in this House.

Government do not recognise any particular class, caste or community as martial or non-martial; but units of the Indian Army have always been organised on a class basis; and as there are limits to the size of that army, only a limited number of classes can ordinarily find a place in it. The classes enlisted at present are shown in the Indian Army List at the heading of each unit, and they are those which, in the opinion of the military authorities, produce the most efficient soldiers.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are we to take it that Government do not think of some classes as martial and some classes as non-martial?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I said that Government do not recognise any particular class, caste or community as martial or non-martial.

Biharis in the Indian Army.

935. ***Mr Ram Narayan Singh:** (a) What is the number of Beharees in the Army of India?

(b) Is the recruitment of soldiers still going on in Bihar, and if not, why not, and since when?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) 180.

(b) The reply to the first part of the question is in the affirmative; the other parts, therefore, do not arise.

Construction of the New Howrah Bridge.

936. ***Mr. B. Das:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if they have given final approval to the project of the new Howrah Bridge at Calcutta, and if the estimates have received their sanction?

(b) When is the construction of this new bridge likely to be taken up?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) The project does not require the approval of the Government of India, nor do the estimates need their sanction.

(b) The matter is primarily the concern of the Local Government, and the Government of India have no official information on the subject.

Special Benefits derived by changing the Standard Time at Delhi during the Winter Months.

937. ***Mr. B. Das:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the reasons that led them to change the standard time at Delhi by an advance of 30 minutes during the preceding two months?

(b) What special benefits, if any, did Government and the public derive thereby?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply which I gave to Mr. Azhar Ali's question No. 870.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN THE MATTER OF RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTION OF GUARDS IN THE HOWRAH DIVISION.

938. *Mr. **Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the Indian Guards of the East Indian Railway under the Divisional Superintendent, Howrah, appealed to the Railway Board, complaining against racial discrimination in the matter of recruitment and promotion? If so, will Government be pleased to state what action has been taken by the Board?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No such appeal has so far been received by the Railway Board

GUNNER GUARDS IN THE HOWRAH DIVISION.

939 *Mr. **Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) What is the total strength of gunner guards under the Divisional Superintendent, Howrah?

(b) What is the percentage of the posts held by Anglo-Indians and Indians?

(c) What is the scale of pay for the gunner guards?

(d) Are the gunner guards not supposed to work trains on main line?

(e) How many Indians are on the maximum of Grade II and how many are there in Grade I ?

(f) What is the total number of guards in Grade I and in Grade II?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I would refer my Honourable friend to the reply given by me to question No 163 asked by Mr. Nabakumar Sing Dudhoria on the 23rd July, 1934.

SECOND CLASS PASSES FOR GUARDS ON THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

940. *Mr. **Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the guards on the Eastern Bengal Railway are entitled to second class passes when their pay and mileage allowances exceed Rs. 125 a month?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether the guards of the East Indian Railway, are entitled to get second class passes when their pay and mileage allowance exceed Rs. 116? If so, why is that privilege not granted to the guards of the Eastern Bengal Railway, which is also a State-managed Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave on the 23rd July, 1934, to Mr. Nabakumar Sing Dudhoria's question No. 164.

PASSES FOR EMPLOYEES ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

941. *Mr. **Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that on the East Indian Railway, employees drawing pay of Rs. 116 and above are entitled to four return or eight single

journey passes, whereas employees drawing pay of Rs. 75 to Rs. 115 are entitled to three return or six single journey intermediate class passes and those drawing pay of Rs. 74 and under are entitled to three return or six single journey third class passes?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for granting a similar number of passes for those receiving less pay?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that no restriction of pay is made for officers who are entitled to first class passes? If so, why is there any restriction of pay on subordinate staff in the matter of grant of passes?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a), (b) and (c). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave on the 23rd July, 1934, to Mr. Nabakumar Sing Dudhoria's question No. 165.

Case of Mr. K. C. Das, an Assistant Station Master at Naihati, Eastern Bengal Railway.

942. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the East Indian Railway authorities issued notification No. 30 in the weekly Gazette, dated the 24th January, 1934, to the effect that those who fail for the second time in the Chandausi Examination, it will be taken as definite proof that the man is unfit for the post he substantively holds and, if no other suitable post is available, he will be discharged?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state why Babu K. C. Das of Naihati, an Assistant Station Master of 16 years' standing, who only failed at the first examination, was degraded to the post of a number-taker, and was not given a second chance, as the rule permits?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state whether similar practice is observed on the other State-managed Railways?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a), (b) and (c). The information is being obtained, and I will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

Uniform Rule for all Railways for testing the Transportation Staff like that in vogue on the Eastern Bengal Railway.

943. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if the Railway Board is prepared to examine the question and issue one uniform rule for all Railways in the matter of testing the staff attached to Transportation like that in vogue on the Eastern Bengal Railway?

(b) Is it not a fact that on the Eastern Bengal Railway officers and inspecting officers, when visiting a station on inspection, hold oral-examination of the staff attached to Transportation working?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) and (b). The question will be examined by the Railway Board.

IMPORT OF FOREIGN SUGAR AFTER THE IMPOSITION OF EXCISE DUTY.

944. *Sardar Sant Singh: How much foreign sugar has been imported into India since the imposition of excise duty on Indian sugar, during each month up to the 31st January, 1935?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: The information asked for by the Honourable Member as far as available is contained in the monthly accounts relating to the Sea-borne Trade of British India and the Kathiawar Trade Statistics, copies of which are in the Library of the Legislature.

SUGAR-CANE FROM RAMPUR STATE SOLD TO CERTAIN FACTORIES IN THE UNITED PROVINCES.

945. *Sardar Sant Singh: (a) Is it a fact that sugar-cane from Rampur State was sold to sugar factories in the western parts of the United Provinces?

(b) Is it a fact that this cane was conveyed by Railway to the factories?

(c) Is it a fact that no minimum price has been fixed under the Sugar-cane Act for sugar-cane from Rampur State?

(d) Is it a fact that the State has imposed an export duty of two annas per maund on sugar-cane exported to British India by Railways? If so, has this duty caused any decrease in the export of cane from that State, and what is its effect on those factories?

(e) Does the State charge any excise duty on sugar produced in the Rampur State?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: (a) and (b). Government have no information.

(c) Rules made by a Local Government under the Sugar-cane Act, 1934, can apply to British territory only.

(d) and (e). Government have no information other than that contained in the Rampur Press Communique in the *Statesman* of the 21st February, 1935.

Sardar Sant Singh: Will Government kindly inquire whether sugar-cane from Rampur State was or was not sold to sugar factories in the United Provinces?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: All the information that is available or is required is contained in this press communiqué of which I have a copy here and of which I shall be glad to lay a copy on the table if the Honourable Member so desires.

Sardar Sant Singh: Then, will the Honourable Member lay the copy on the table?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: Certainly, Sir.

Extract from the S[illegible] dated the 21st February, 1935.

* . . . . . .

SUGARCANE SALE.

PRESS REPORT DENIED BY RAMPUR STATE.

Rampur, February 20. The Chief Minister of Rampur State in a Press Communiqué says :

"The attention of His Highness's Government has been drawn to a statement in the Press that the export of sugarcane from Rampur State to the U. P. will be the subject matter of interpellation in the Assembly. It is stated that there is no minimum price for sugarcane fixed in the Rampur State. This is not true His Highness's Government has passed a Sugarcane Act and framed rules thereunder on the lines of similar legislation in the U. P., and the minimum price fixed from time to time has never been less than that fixed in the U. P.

The export duty has been instituted to discourage speculators buying sugarcane in the State at fancy prices, and applies only to cane grown in a certain defined area, most of which the cultivators contracted to sell to the local sugar factory at the beginning of the present season and for which the factory made advances to the growers. The factory has agreed to buy all the sugarcane grown in this area but the non-contracted cane will be purchased not at the minimum price but at a price fixed from time to time by a special committee, which includes two representatives of the growers. The price fixed by this committee will in no case be less than the minimum price prevailing in the U. P In fact, it has been higher throughout." A. P. I.

REDUCTION OF THE NUMBER OF PASSES BY THE RAILWAY AUTHORITIES.

946. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** Is it a fact that the Railway authorities have reduced the number of privilege passes to three? If so, has the Indian Railway Conference passed a resolution to raise this number? If so, what action do Government propose to take in the matter?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The reply to the first part of the question is in the negative. For more detailed information I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to Bhai Parma Nand's unstarred question No 65 on the 22nd February, 1935. The Indian Railway Conference Association has made certain recommendations in regard to the modification of the rules for the grant of passes, which are now under consideration.

REVOLUTIONARY ACTIVITIES OF THE HINDUSTANI SEVA DAL.

947. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** In view of the statement made by the Honourable the Home Member that the Hindustani Seva Dal is connected with revolutionary activities in some provinces and so Government are not able to remove the ban on that organisation, will Government please state:

(a) in which provinces the Hindustani Seva Dal is connected with revolutionary activities;

(b) in which provinces it is not connected with such activities, and

(c) whether Government are prepared to remove the ban on it in such provinces in which it is free from revolutionary activities? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) The Hindustani Seva Dal has been banned in Bombay, Bengal, the United Provinces and the Punjab. As I have explained already in the answers given by me on the 14th February, 1935, to Mr. S Satyamurti's supplementary question, the organization in these provinces is of a revolutionary character and its activities have included incitement to violence.

(b) I do not know whether it is functioning in any other provinces but, if so, its activities are presumably unobjectionable.

(c) Does not arise.

Seth Govind Das: Have Government seen the recent statement of Dr. Hardikar, the founder of the Hindustani Seva Dal?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, Sir.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are Government aware that the Hindustani Seva Dal being an all-India organisation, when it is banned in one province it is banned in other provinces also?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That is not so The ban is only imposed in four provinces.

Mr. T S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are Government aware why the ban on the Hindustani Seva Dal has been removed in Madras?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: So far as I am aware, it never existed in Madras

Seth Govind Das: In view of the recent statement of Dr. Hardikar, do Government propose any change in their policy?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: On the information of the Honourable Member, when did the Hindustani Seva Dal in these four provinces start revolutionary activities?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I presume they started before they were banned I forget the exact date of the ban, but it was some time in 1932.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is the question of the ban on these associations ever reconsidered?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes: it is reconsidered by the Local Governments concerned.

Mr. T S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: When was it last reconsidered?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That I cannot say: it is the function of the Local Government to reconsider these matters.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is there any time limit—once in six months or a year or anything like that?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thinks these questions have been answered.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Was this ban imposed, after the Civil Disobedience Movement was started, or before?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Before the suspension of the Civil Disobedience Movement.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am asking whether it was before the Congress started the Civil Disobedience Movement or after.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Congress started the Civil Disobedience Movement, as far as I am aware, about 1920.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know, Sir, . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

RECOGNITION BY GOVERNMENT OF CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE.

948. ***Mr T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** What are the conditions for Government's recognising a Chamber of Commerce?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: The usual conditions are that the chambers of commerce concerned should be of good standing and sufficiently representative of important commercial interests

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is the Andhra Chamber of Commerce recognised by the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I must ask for notice.

RESERVATION OF HIGHLANDS IN KENYA FOR EUROPEAN SETTLERS.

949. ***Babu Baijnath Bajoria:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the Carter Commission recommended the reservation of highlands in Kenya for European settlers?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the total amount of Indian capital and the total amount of European capital invested in Kenya?

(c) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether representatives of the Government of India, or the representatives of Indians in Kenya, were included in that Commission, and if so, what were the recommendations of such representatives in the matter of reservation of highlands in Kenya for European settlers in that place?

(d) If no such representatives were included in the Carter Commission why was it not done? Did the Government of India press for the inclusion of such representatives in that Commission? If not, why not?

(e) Were the Government of India consulted in the matter of the appointment of the Carter Commission? If so, what were the views of Government on that subject?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) The reservation for persons of European descent of the area known as the Highlands is not a recommendation of the Kenya Land Commission. It is part of the policy of His Majesty's Government as laid down in the White Paper (Cmd 1922) of 1923

(b) Government have no information.

(c) to (e). In 1931 the Joint Select Committee of Parliament on Closer Union in East Africa recommended that in view of the nervousness among the native population in Kenya as regards the land question, a full and authoritative enquiry should be undertaken immediately into the needs of the native population, present and prospective, with respect to land within or without the reserves, held either on tribal or on individual tenure. The Kenya Land Commission was appointed in April, 1932, in consequence of this recommendation. The personnel of the Commission and its terms of reference will be found in its report, a copy of which is in the Library. The Government of India were not consulted as regards its composition or functions, presumably because the Commission's work related primarily to questions concerning the native population.

WHEAT AND RICE IMPORTED INTO INDIA.

950 ***Babu Baijnath Bajoria:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the quantity of wheat imported annually into India during the five years preceding the date of the passing of the Wheat Import Act, and the quantity of wheat imported into India annually during the succeeding years up to date?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state how the importation of wheat into India during those two periods compares?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state the quantity of rice, husked and unhusked, imported into India from each of the countries like Japan, Siam and Indo-China, during the periods from the 1st April, 1933, to date?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) and (b). The Honourable Member is referred to Volume I of the Annual Statement of the Sea-borne Trade of British India for the years ending 31st March, 1930 and 1934 and the monthly accounts for January, 1935, copies of which are in the Library of the Legislature.

(c) Figures of imports of rice including paddy from April, 1933 to March, 1934, from the countries mentioned in the question are contained in Volume I of the Annual Statement of the Sea-borne Trade of British India for the year ending 31st March, 1934. As regards figures from April, 1934 to January, 1935, a statement is laid on the table.

Imports of Rice including Paddy into British India from Siam, Indo-China, Japan and other countries.

In Tons.

	Siam.	Indo-China.	Japan.	Other Countries.	Total.
1934 35—					
April, 1934 .	30,782	3,856	671	4	35,313
May . .	19,142	854	523	..	20,519
June . .	19,784	10,706	4	10	30,504
July . .	13,217	7,286	705	1	21,209
August . .	25,102	9,515	8	.	34,625
September .	25,095	4,736	8	8	29,847
October .	44,792	18,065	4	4	62,865
November .	29,802	7,114	6	3	36,925
December .	32,708	28,078	5	21	60,812
January, 1935	7,149	217	6	.	7,372
Total (10 months)	247,573	90,427	1,940	51	339,991

Motor Cars imported into India.

951. ***Babu Baijnath Bajoria:** Is it a fact that the number of motor cars imported into India is increasing annually? If so, are Government in a position to give the total amount of money which has gone out of India annually as the price of motor cars imported and the price of parts of motor cars imported into India during the last five years?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) The Honourable Member is referred to the Annual Statement of the Sea-borne Trade of British India, Volume I, for the year ending 31st March, 1934, copies of which are in the Library of the Legislature.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are Government considering any proposal to promote the motor manufacturing industry in this country?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Not that I am aware of.

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: Are Government aware of any Government which grants subsidies for production of motor cars in their country?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: My Honouable friend will have to give me notice of that question.

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: Are Government prepared to consider the question of granting subsidies to any firm in India for the production of motor cars in India?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: No such application has been made.

Seth Govind Das: If it is made, then, will Government favourably consider it?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: That is a hypothetical question.

CONTRACT FOR CARRYING THE COASTAL MAIL.

952. ***Babu Baijnath Bajoria:** (a) Is it a fact that the contract for carrying the coastal mail is given to European firms only?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the names of the companies which have been given the contract for carrying Government mails between Burma and India?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state the year when the contract for carrying such mail was made last and the period for which it has been made?

(d) When will the contract expire?

(e) Do Government propose to give the contract of carrying such mail to the coastal ports of India and Burma to Indian companies? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) No.

(b) The British India Steam Navigation Company and the Bengal-Burma Steam Navigation Company.

(c) The contract with the British India Steam Navigation Company was made in the year 1924 for a period of ten years. The mail service between Chittagong and Rangoon was run by the British India Steam Navigation Company as part of the contract but towards the end of 1933 arrangements were made by that Company with the Bengal-Burma Steam Navigation Company to undertake jointly the services between Chittagong and Rangoon. It was settled by negotiation with both these Companies that the existing contract and arrangements would be continued for a period of two years from the 1st February, 1934. In this connection the Honourable Member's attention is invited to the reply given to Mr. K. C. Neogy's starred question No. 309 in this House on the 2nd March, 1934.

(d) 31st January, 1936.

(e) It will be open to Indian Companies to tender if and when tenders are called for the conveyance of mails between the coastal ports of India and Burma when the present contract expires As stated in reply to part (a) above there is no bar to the giving of such contracts to Indian Companies.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are there any Indian companies now to which such contracts are given?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have already mentioned one in reply to the Honourable Mr. Bajoria's question: I have said that in regard to this particular contract, it is shared by the British India Steam Navigation Company and the Bengal-Burma Steam Navigation Company, which is an Indian Company. In regard to the mails between other coastal ports, I think there are a number of contracts which have been given to Indian Companies The Bombay Steam Navigation Company is one of them; but if my Honourable friend wants details of these contracts, I am afraid I must ask for notice.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Do Government accept the policy of giving preference to Indian companies, in order to encourage Indian coastal shipping in this matter?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I would remind my Honourable friend that the Posts and Telegraphs Department is a commercial department.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that several Indian companies also had put in their tenders last time when the British India Steam Navigation Company was given this contract?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I must ask for notice of that question.

PROMOTION OF SUBORDINATES ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

953. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Will Government please state whether senior and lower subordinates of the East Indian Railway are promoted by selection or seniority of the service?

(b) Is it a fact that these promotions have been given sometimes by the seniority of service? If so, why?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Both.

(b) I cannot see what objection my Honourable friend has to seniority of service being taken into consideration in making promotions.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: In view of the fact that some railways do not maintain classified lists of subordinates, how is it possible, when a selection is being made, to ascertain the seniority of these men?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am not sure that my Honourable friend's assumption in the first part of his question is correct.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: May I inform the Honourable Member that I have received letters from Agents that that is correct?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is not a question.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: It may not be a question. But it is information badly needed by the Honourable Member.

PROMOTION OF SUBORDINATES ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

954. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Will Government please state the names of persons who got their promotion on the East Indian Railway during 1933-34 by (i) selection, and (ii) seniority of their service, division by division, with the names of posts to which they have been promoted and the pay they are entitled to get?

(b) Is it a fact that some persons who were promoted on account of seniority of their service were degraded later on? Will Government please state their names and the reason or reasons for the action taken?

(c) Is it also a fact that the claims of some persons who had had officiating chances in higher grades in different capacities, were overlooked when permanent vacancies occurred, and preference was given to their juniors? If so, why?

(d) Will Government please state the names, posts, and the pay of (i) persons who have thus been preferred to their seniors and (ii) those whose claims have been overlooked?

(e) Were the persons who received preference over their seniors selected? If so, by whom, and on what grounds?

(f) Is there any standard prescribed for such selection? If so, what?

(g) Does this standard govern the whole East Indian Railway?

(h) Is there any selection board? If so, who are its members, and how many of them are officers?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) to (e) Government have no information, and do not consider that the expense and labour involved in getting it will be commensurate with any advantage to be obtained from it.

(f) and (g). Selections are made according to merit, due regard being given to seniority and all other relevant considerations.

(h) A Selection Board is called together only when necessary. It is understood that normally senior scale officers compose the Selection Boards.

PASSING OF WRITTEN EXAMINATIONS BY SUBORDINATES IN RAILWAY SERVICES.

955. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the subordinates in railway services have to pass written examinations?

(b) Is any record kept of these written examinations, including the numbers obtained by the examinees?

(c) Are the results of these examinations communicated to the examinees?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Yes, in some cases

(b) Yes.

(c) Examinees are informed of the results of the examinations. Government are not aware whether the marks obtained by each examinee are communicated to him.

RENT-FREE QUARTERS OR HOUSE RENT FOR TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS AND TICKET COLLECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

956. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** Is it a fact that Travelling Ticket Examiners and Ticket Collectors are entitled to rent-free quarters, or house rent, since the introduction of the Moody-Ward system on the East Indian Railway? If so, are they getting these privileges? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The rules with regard to the provision of quarters and the rent recoverable for quarters, when provided, are contained in Chapter II of State Railway Code (Revised), a copy of which is in the Library of the House. If the Honourable Member can give me definite instances of these rules not being observed in respect of any staff on the East Indian Railway, I shall make the necessary enquiries.

EXAMINATION HELD AT CHANDAUSI FOR THE SELECTION OF CANDIDATES FOR ASSISTANT STATION MASTERS' COURSE.

957 ***Mr. Sri Prakasa** (on behalf of Sirdar Jogendra Singh): (a) Is it a fact that recently an examination was held at Chandausi for the selection of candidates for Assistant Station Masters' course?

(b) Are Government aware that while it was advertised in newspapers that applications would be received up to the 4th January, 1935 on forms to be had from the office of the Divisional Superintendent, Moradabad, on payment of a fee of rupee one, but the forms were only issued up to the 28th December?

(c) If so, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for this arbitrary action contrary to the previous notification and the authority which was responsible for it?

(d) Is it a fact that a large number of applicants who came after the 28th December, 1934, had to go away disappointed and had to suffer unnecessary financial loss and inconvenience for no fault of theirs?

(e) Is it also a fact that it was advertised in the newspapers that only such candidates will be taken as possessed a speed of at least 20 words per minute in telegraphy? If so, will Government be pleased to state if any persons with a lower speed have been selected in preference to those possessing a much higher speed, and the reasons therefor?

(f) Is it a fact that some of the applicants who fulfilled the required condition of speed, were not even called for the test at Chandausi? If so, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for not doing so and also whether the fee of rupee one realised from them was refunded?

(g) Is it a fact that the applicants were asked to appear before the Selection Board at 11 A.M.; but were not put before it until 2 P.M. and the Selection Board remained sitting till 8 P.M., causing unnecessary hardship and suffering to the applicants?

(h) Will Government be pleased to state how many of the candidates, selected, are relations of railway servants?

(i) Is it a fact that a certain number of candidates were also seletced as signallers from amongst the applicants? If so, is it a fact that candidates with lower speed were selected in preference to those possessing a higher speed? If so, why?

(j) Will Government be pleased to state whether they contemplate taking in such candidates as have passed the speed test and were not selected for the next Assistant Station Masters' course?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for information and will place a reply on the table of the House in due course.

SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY AT THE KASHI AND MOGHULSERAI RAILWAY STATIONS.

958. ***Maulana Shaukat Ali:** (a) Is it a fact that the Electric Supply Company, Benares, have offered to supply electric energy to Kashi Railway Station, East Indian Railway and even to the Moghulserai Railway Station at cheaper rates than it is possible to generate at Moghulserai?

(b) Is it a fact that the East Indian Railway are spending more money on running cables to Kashi and Benares Cantonment Stations when the Supply Company's mains are already in the vicinity at Benares?

(c) What will be the capital expenditure on these cables to Kashi and Benares Cantonment Railway Stations?

(d) Are the railway authorities satisfied that their generative cost with all capital expenditure will be lower than the rate offered by the Supply Company, at Benares?

(e) Is it not a fact that the Moghulserai Railway Power Station was made much too large in the first place and that the extension to the Kashi and Cantonment Stations is an attempt to cover up this mistake?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Government understand that offers have been received but the rates are not cheaper.

(b) Yes. The Administration have found this cheaper.

(c) The estimated capital expenditure on cables from Moghulserai to Kashi is Rs. 31,000 and from Kashi to Benares Rs. 16,000.

(d) Yes.

(e) No. It had the usual provision for future extensions.

The second part of the question does not arise.

ADULTERATED GHEE.

959. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Are Government aware that the practice of selling adulterated ghee has gone beyond all bounds, so much so that it has become impossible to get pure and natural ghee in all cities and towns?

(b) Are Government aware that by means of this adulteration of vegetable with natural ghee, a great economic fraud is practised upon the people, both rich and poor?

(c) Are Government aware that the measures adopted by local bodies have proved ineffective to check this evil?

(d) Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of finding out some radical remedy, such as giving harmless colour to the vegetable ghee to make it distinguishable from the ordinary ghee for common people?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) to (c). Government have no precise information.

(d) The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given to parts (a) and (c) of Mr. Sham Lal's starred question No. 149 on the 12th February, 1935.

NON-REPRESENTATION OF NON-MUSLIMS OF THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE IN THE CENTRAL LEGISLATURE.

960. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Is it a fact that ever since the Montford Reforms were introduced in India, a Hindu, Sikh or any one else from amongst any other minority communities in the North-West Frontier Province has never been nominated either for the Council of State or for the Legislative Assembly, and that a Muslim has always been nominated to represent that province?

(b) Are Government aware of the grievances of the Hindus of the Frontier Province for their non-representation on the Central Legislature ever since the introduction of the Montford Reforms?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) The facts are as stated by the Honourable Member.

(b) Government have no information.

REDUCTION OF THE INDIAN NON-OFFICIAL ELEMENT IN THE NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE.

961. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Will Government please state why the Indian unofficial element in New Delhi Municipal Committee was reduced from five to three in 1932, during these days of reform?

(b) Are Government now prepared to increase this number?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given to part (c) of Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh's starred question No. 67 on the 6th September, 1932.

(b) The constitution of the New Delhi Municipal Committee is under consideration.

UNDER-REPRESENTATION OF HINDUS IN THE NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE.

962. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Is it a fact that according to the last census the population in New Delhi is as follows:

	Hindus.	Sikhs.	Muslims.	Non-official Europeans.
about	40,000	2,500	12,000	2,200

(b) Will Government please state why there is an under-representation of Hindus in the New Delhi Municipal Committee, as compared with other communities, as, for about 40,000 Hindus, there is one representative, L. Jagdish Prasad, for about 2,500 Sikhs a representative, Sardar

Bahadur Sardar Sobha Singh, for about 12,000 Muslims a representative, Khan Bahadur Ch. Akbar Ali, and for about 2,200 non-official Europeans a representative, Mr. Bloomfield?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given to his starred question No. 900 on the 23rd March, 1933.

POPULATION OF HINDUS AND MUSLIMS AND THE POLICE FORCE IN NEW DELHI.

963. ***Bhai Parma Nand**. (a) Will Government please lay on the table a statement showing separately the total population of Hindus and Muslims in the Delhi Province?

(b) Will Government please lay on the table a statement showing separately the number of Hindus and Muslims working as:

1. Constables,
2. Head Constables,
3. Sub-Inspectors and Assistant Sub-Inspectors of Police,
4. Inspectors, and
5. Deputy Superintendent of Police.

in the Delhi Province?

(c) If the Police force is not according to the proportion of the population of these two communities, are Government prepared to take steps to remove this defect?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) The total population of Hindus and Muslims in the Delhi Province is:

Hindus.—405,849; Muslims.—206,960.

(b) The numbers of Hindus and Muslims in the various ranks of the Delhi Police are:

1		2		3		4		5	
Constables.		Head Constables.		Sub-Inspectors and Assistant Sub-Inspectors.		Inspectors.		Deputy Superintendents.	
Hindus.	Muslims.	Hindus.	Muslims.	Hindus.	Muslims.	Hindus.	Muslims.	Hindus.	Muslims.
662	903	85	121	27	39	3	3	...	2

(c) Officers of the rank of Assistant Sub-Inspectors and above are obtained on loan from the Government of the Punjab and no question of communal representation arises in their case. As regards Constables and Head Constables, who are recruited locally, Government are unable to accept the position that recruitment should be determined by the population ratio of the communities in the Province.

LABOUR AND SOCIALIST ORGANISATIONS IN CALCUTTA DECLARED UNLAWFUL.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: (a) Are Government aware that 13 labour and social.st organisations in Calcutta have been declared unlawful bodies, including organisations like the All India Trade Union Congress, Port and Dock Workers' Union and the Railway Workers' Union?

(b) What is a Communist organisation according to Government?

(c) Are all labour and peasant organisations Communist organisations? Or, are only some of them? If the latter, which?

(d) Are even trade union organisations Communist organisations? Or, are only some of them? If the latter, which?

(e) What are the reasons for declaring the 13 organisations unlawful?

(f) Will the arrested persons be put on trial in the ordinary public courts?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) Yes. The statements which have appeared in the Press are correct.

(b), (c) and (d). As it is not possible to compress into an oral reply a full statement of the policy adopted by the Government of India and the Local Governments for dealing with communist organisations, the reasons underlying it and the action taken in pursuance of that policy, I lay a statement on the table which answers the points raised in these questions. Local Governments have taken no action against *bona fide* labour organisations or *bona fide* trade unions.

(e) The notification of the Government of Bengal declaring certain associations and unions unlawful has been issued because of their revolutionary activities and because of their advocacy of the programme and methods of the Communist International and the Communist Party of India. They have been organised by Communist agitators and have generally during recent months been advocating the overthrow of the established Government and economic system in India by means of meetings and demonstrations at which Communist slogans have been shouted; Communist emblems displayed and revolutionary speeches delivered; pamphlets have also been distributed of a most inflammatory nature, advocating militant action I may quote an example. On the 21st July, 1934, after Mr. Gandhi had addressed a public meeting at Deshbandhu Park in Calcutta, a procession arrived and a large crowd collected to whom leaflets, issued by the Calcutta Committee of the Communist Party of India, were distributed which said that "The masses of the country were being prepared for armed revolution. The Communist Party sought to bring about the destruction of the British Government and the Capitalists by means of armed revolution". It concluded with the words "Down with Gandhism. Destroy the British Raj. Join the Communist Party. Be prepared for armed revolution". The true character of the banned associations was displayed on the 10th of March, 1935, in demonstrations staged to protest against ban; at this violent speeches of an uncompromising and militant communist character were delivered by leaders. Local Government are in no way attacking genuine labour unions but only such as utilise cloak of labour to spread subversive propaganda of communist type and are led by avowed communists many of whom have

already been convicted in substantive cases. They are willing to consider lifting the ban from associations abandoning such propaganda and eliminating communist personnel Of 13 associations declared unlawful by the Government of Bengal only three are registered trades unions and that there are altogether 52 other registered unions now operating in Bengal.

(f) It is understood that the persons arrested have been released. Whether any prosecutions will be instituted is a matter for the decision of the Local Government.

Statement regarding the policy of the Government of India and local Governments in regard to "Communist" organisations, the reasons for it and the action taken in pursuance of it.

On the 23rd of July, 1934, the Government of India declared the Communist Party of India, its Committees, Sub-Committees and Branches to be unlawful associations under the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1908 on the ground that they had for their object interference with the administration of the law and the maintenance of law and order and constituted a danger to the public peace. The reasons for this action were explained in detail in the reply given by the Honourable the Home Member to a question by Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh on the 14th of August, 1934. Briefly the reasons were that it had been held judicially by the Allahabad High Court in the Meerut case that the Communist Party of India aimed at the violent overthrow of the present order of society and bringing about the independence of India by means of armed revolution and sought to secure this object by means of mass action, strikes, demonstrations, etc., culminating in a general strike and an armed insurrection. In amplification of that statement, it is desirable to quote certain extracts from the Draft Platform of Action which first appeared in December, 1930, in the "International Press Correspondence", the official organ of the Communist International and copies of which were circulated at the Karachi Congress in March 1931. It contained, for example, the following :

> "In its struggle to win leadership of the masses, the Communist Party of India calls upon its supporters to make resolute use of any legal and semi-legal opportunity for public action and mobilisation of the masses around working class slogans. On every occasion they must expose the treacherous part played by the National Congress. As one of the practical means of explaining to the toiling masses the exploiting and treacherous policy of the Congress Leaders, the Communist Party of India recommends to its supporters to make use of their activity in the trade unions, municipal councils and similar institutions. The Communist Party of India calls upon its supporters and organisations to develop mass revolutionary activities and struggle of the working class for their political and economic demands, mass refusal by the peasants to pay taxes, levies, rents, debts, particularly in districts where there are large landed estates, thereby mobilising and preparing the mass of the toilers for revolutionary struggle against imperialism. The Communist Party of India deems it essential to organise mass trade unions based on factory committees, with the leadership elected directly by the workers and consisting of advanced revolutionary workers. The trade unions must become regularly functioning mass organisations, working in the spirit of the class struggle. The Communist Party of India works for the transformation of the All-India Trade Union Congress into a fighting All-India centre of the labour movement on a class basis."

In regard to the peasants, the draft platform stated that :

> "In order to disorganise British rule and maintain revolutionary pressure against it, the Communist Party of India calls upon the peasantry and agricultural proletariat to engage in all kinds of political demonstrations, and collective refusal to pay taxes and dues. The Communist Party of India calls for refusal to pay debts and arrears to government, the landlords and the money-lenders in any form whatsoever."

> "The Communist Party of India calls upon the revolutionary working class youth to build up the Young Communist League. The Communist Party of India calls for the country wide organisation both of mixed and of separate

workers, peasants and students' detachments, both to defend the people's demonstrations, strikes, etc., and in order to make systematic preparations for the armed struggle of the Indian people."

Government had evidence to show that attempts were being made by Communists in various parts of India to carry this programme into effect and that as in other countries such as the United States of America they were endeavouring to secure control over workers organisations to create thereby revolutionary organisations of workers which would control *bona fide* labour organisations. They were also attempting to inculcate revolutionary and communist ideas into the peasants in particular in the Punjab, were starting Youth Workers Leagues, *e.g.*, in Madras and Bombay, and in industrial centres in Bombay and Calcutta were endeavouring to obtain control over trade unions or to start communist unions.

In view of these facts Government recognised the necessity of taking action not only against the Communist Party of India but also against subsidiary organisations which were working in support of its programme and adopting the methods which it had suggested.

The Punjab Government, therefore, on September 10th, 1934, declared unlawful five associations. These included the Anti-Imperialist League and the Punjab Kirti Kisan Party, which had recently become active and were trying to secure control over all communist activity in the province and to spread communist ideas in the villages. Thus the Amritsar Kirti Kisan Sabha which was also declared unlawful had organised two propaganda tours in the villages in that district and was about to organise a third when the notification was issued. As soon as the notification was issued, a search was made of the offices of each body, but it was not found necessary to take any further action or to institute prosecutions, for all five associations subsequently declared themselves to be dissolved and have ceased to function.

In Madras the local Government on the 20th November, 1934, declared unlawful the Young Workers League which had as its published object the overthrow of British Imperialism and its Allies by mass action. This association had been organised by a Communist about whom the following finding was recorded in a criminal case :

> "There can be no doubt from the evidence on record that he has imbibed all the doctrines of the Communist International and that he came to Madras—the evidence leaves little doubt—to spread the doctrine of Communism in its worst form, having discovered here a virgin soil where he believed the seeds would sprout with rapidity and vigour."

There was also reason to believe that this League which was in no sense a *bona fide* trade union of labour organisation was in touch with the Communist International.

In November the Government of Bombay took similar action against five associations and published a communique on November 8th, 1934, from which the following is an extract :

> "The Communist Party of India is known to work through a number of local organisations and the Government of Bombay have considered it desirable that the action taken against the Communist Party of India should be carried into effect against bodies which are locally active in fomenting unrest in pursuance of the ultimate object of the party. A full examination by Government of the record of each of these five associations has established that none of them is a genuine labour organisation, that they are all wholly controlled by communist and that they have been actively furthering the objects of the Communist Party of India."

Finally the Government of Bengal for the reasons given in the oral reply to Pandit Nilakantha Das' question No. 1659 have taken action against 13 associations which are under the control of local Communist agitators.

This account of the action taken by local Governments shows clearly that no action has been taken against *bona fide* trade unions or labour organisation, but only against those which are working in support of the objects of, and adopting the methods recommended by, the Communist International. That the activities of Communists are resented by many *bona fide* labour workers is shown by the following statement issued by a Railway Workers Union which took steps to expel the Communists from their Union :

> "We now come to realise that these organisers are not primarily interested in the immediate work of the genuine Trade Union Movement. Belonging as

they do to the Communist school of thought and openly professing the Communist philosophy involving an undisguised preaching of violence they were primarily interested in exploiting the Union for their specific objective. We find them giving the slogan of a political general strike in season and out of season, when we definitely know that the workers in their present disorganised condition cannot be effectively mobilised to a strike even for their own economic demands."

Their activities in India are similar to those in other countries and an interesting account of their activities in the United States of America and of the resentment felt against them by *bona fide* labour workers will be found in a book entitled "Reports on Communist Propaganda in America as submitted to the United States Government by William Green, President American Federation of Labor". The following pertinent statement may be quoted :

"Wherever communists can gain a foothold in trade unions they seek to capture those unions. Where they cannot get a foothold in existing unions they seek to organise new unions. In practically all of the basic industries strictly communist labour organizations have been created. These organizations do not enter into agreement with their employees, except in rare cases where agreement is meant to serve as subterfuge. The purpose of communist labor organizations is not to safeguard and improve the present order but to undermine it and destroy it.

No authority knows or possibly ever will know in what direction the communist effort will extend next or at what hour the communist high command will consider it expedient to launch into the field of open violence.

We know that we see a constant revolutionary menace."

The action taken by the Government of India and by local Governments with their full approval will, it is hoped, tend to hamper the work of communist agitators, prevent the spread among the uneducated working classes and the uneducated cultivators of revolutionary communist ideas and that by so doing the growth of *bona fide* labour organisations working for the good of the workers

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that the Labour Organisers of a particular Railwaymen's Union have applied to the Government of Bengal to appoint a Conciliation Board to settle the disputes between the R. S. N. Company and the I. G. N. and Railway Companies, and is it not a fact that the Government of Bengal on receipt of this particular application must have realised that this particular organisation cannot be a communist organisation, but that it is a real, genuine labour organisation?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I should require notice of that question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are all these organisations equally guilty of the acts which the Honourable the Home Member mentioned in his long statement?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I think it is not possible for me to say that all of them are equally guilty, but they are guilty.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are the overt acts alleged against every one of these organisations, such as to make the Government believe them to be of a revolutionary character?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Some of them have been deliberately secret acts.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the overt acts which any of these organisations have been found to be responsible for?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have already quoted one where they distributed highly revolutionary and inflammatory leaflets at a public meeting.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Which organisation was r sponsible for that leaflet and its distribution?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Calcutta Committee of the Communist Party of India.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is the Honourable the Home Member aware of the fact that the *Indian Mazdoor*, a weekly paper, is being published by the All-India Trade Union Congress?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, I am not aware of it. I don't see any connection with it.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that the *Indian Mazdoor*, which cannot be considered a Communist organ, is being published by the All-India Trade Union Congress?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have already said that I am not aware of that publication.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are any of these organisations connected with, or affiliated to the Calcutta Communist Organization?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, but I do not know whether they are ostensibly affiliated to it, but they certainly pursue the objects which the Communist Party of India have in view.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are Government punishing the holding of opinions of a Communist nature, or are they taking action only against overt acts advocating revolution?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Broadly speaking, they are taking action against acts or speeches or propaganda in favour of a violent revolution.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it, therefore, that the Government are not punishing people or bodies for holding opinions, even though they may be of a Communist character?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Holding an opinion of a Communist character is not an offence, so far as I am aware.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: May I know, Sir. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Short Notice question, Mr. Richards.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: It is a very important question, and I want to put some more supplementaries.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Mr. Richards. Short Notice question.

REVISION OF BASIC QUOTAS ALLOTTED TO BURMA UNDER THE RUBBER RESTRICTION SCHEME.

Mr. W. J. C. Richards: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if they received from the Burma Rubber Licensing Committee last November a request to ask the International Rubber Regulation Committee to increase Burma's basic quota?

(b) If so, have Government supported the request and made representations in the proper quarter?

(c) Do Government propose publishing the reasons for an increased quota put forward by the Burma Rubber Licensing Committee?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) and (b) Yes, Sir.

(c) No, Sir.

IMPORTS OF FOREIGN RICE, PADDY AND BROKEN RICE INTO INDIA.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: (a) Will Government state whether they are aware:

(i) that the accounts relating to the sea-borne trade of British India supplies only the statistics of 'rice not in the husk'; and

(ii) that separate statistics are not given for paddy and broken rice?

(b) Will Government please state from which accounts they were able to know the quantity of broken rice imports?

(c) What is the exact value and amount of imports of foreign rice, paddy and broken rice, respectively, from the years 1930 up to date?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) (i) and (ii) In the Annual Statement of the Sea-borne Trade of British India, statistics relating to 'rice in the husk' and 'rice not in the husk' are shown separately. Statistics of broken rice are not shown separately.

(b) Special statistics have been maintained from August, 1934, from information available in the Custom Houses.

(c) I lay on the table a statement giving the information as far as available.

Statement showing imports of 'rice in the husk', 'rice not in the husk' and of broken rice in India from 1930 onwards.

Year.	Rice in the husk.		Rice not in the husk		Broken rice.	
	Quantity	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Tons.	Rs.	Tons.	Rs.	Tons.	Rs.
1929-30 .	725	1,06,695	5,635	8,04,950		
1930-31 .	1,571	1,23,744	7,445	7,97,724		
1931-32 . .	9,042	5,71,036	17,931	16,19,897		
1932-33 . .	11	697	35,510	31,10,087	Not available.	
1933-34 .	4,381	2,24,178	84,024	48,99,373		
1934-35 . . (nine months April—December).	106,172	not available.	226,447	not available.		
August 1934 to January 1935	.	.	..	.	122,846	80,27,482

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are Government aware that the statistics that they get is only from the invoices received of the goods imported?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I am not aware of the data from which those figures were compiled, but those are the figures supplied to us by the Customs House officers.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Have the Government of India deputed any special officer to prepare this special statistics for the imports of broken rice?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: No. The information is supplied by the Customs House officers.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: In view of the fact that this will be an important factor in discussing the Bill that is coming on very shortly, will Government call for information as to how they are able to distinguish broken rice from whole rice, and will they circulate that to Members of this House?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Will my Honourable friend repeat the question?

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: In view of the importance of the question in discussing the Bill which is coming off very shortly, will Government call for information as to how the statistics of broken rice is got separately by the Customs House officers?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I shall try to obtain the information.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will my Honourable friend also circulate it to Members?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I am not prepared to undertake to circulate it to Honourable Members, because I do not know when I shall receive the information. But I shall certainly deal with it when I am referring to the matter in the course of my speech.

Restriction of Indian Imports into Italy, etc.

Mr T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: (a) Will Government state whether they are aware that the Italian Government have ordered that during the year 1935, Italian importers will not be allowed to import from India more than 30 per cent. of the goods imported in 1934?

(b) Is the action of the Italian Government due to the fall of our trade with Italy owing to the Ottawa Agreement?

(c) What is the amount of trade that this action of the Italian Government will affect?

(d) Are Government aware that the Italian Government have put a ban upon Indian Insurance Companies from doing business in Italy?

(e) What action have Government taken in these matters?

(f) If no action has yet been taken, what action do Government propose to take?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) The Government of India are informed that the Italian Government have for the period 16th February to 31st March, 1935, restricted the imports into Italy of practically all commodities to about 25 per cent. of the imports for the corresponding period of 1934. It is not known what degree of restriction will be imposed after 31st of March.

(b) No. The object of the restriction, which is not directed against India alone, is, in the words of the official decree, to ensure a fair equilibrium between imports and the means for their payment abroad.

(c) India's export trade to Italy in the year 1933-34 amounted to 5½ crores of rupees.

(d) No. Government have been informed that one Indian insurance company has experienced difficulty in setting up business in Italy, but in the absence of any precise information as to what was the nature of the difficulties experienced, it has not been possible to make any representations on the subject.

(e) and (f). The Government of India have already entered an energetic protest against the recently imposed restrictions and on receipt of a reply from the Italian Government, they will consider what further action should be taken.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are Government aware that there was a recent Anglo-Italian Agreement which was published a few days ago in the papers?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Yes.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is the Honourable Member aware that the Anglo-Italian Agreement stipulates that about 80 per cent. of the British exports will be allowed into Italy?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I believe that is correct.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: If that is the case, is it the proposal to make India a pawn in this matter, so that England may strike a better bargain?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: No. We are in direct communication with the Italian Government on this question.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Have the Government of India power to approach directly the Italian Government for a trade treaty?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Not directly, Sir, but we have made our own representations through the British Government which is the channel through which we have to approach a foreign country.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: When were the negotiations started?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Which negotiations?

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: About this prohibition.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Directly after we received authentic information in regard to the restriction.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are Government aware that there are reports in the papers of insurance companies being banned?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: We have had no authentic information. We have only heard that one insurance company experienced certain difficulties. That insurance company has not thought fit to place before us a full statement of the difficulties which it has experienced.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Am I to understand that, if Indian nationals experience difficulties in the matter of trade and commerce in other countries, they should represent matters to the Indian Government and then only the Indian Government will take action?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: My Honourable friend must surely realise that we cannot take action unless a full statement is made to us, so that we may be in a position to see whether a case does or does not exist for representation to the foreign country concerned.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: The Honourable Member just said that the ban placed by the Italian Government was against imports from all parts of the world, which is correct. But since that ban was placed, an agreement has been entered into, as the Honourable Member has admitted, between Great Britain and Italy. Why is it, then, may I ask, that it takes so long for the Government of India to negotiate with the Government of Italy for better terms when Great Britain has succeeded already in obtaining a concession as compared with the original quota?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: My Honourable friend must address that question to the Italian Government.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: May I ask the Honourable Member why I should address that question to the Italian Government and not to my own Government and why I should not ask for an explanation as to why it takes longer for our Government to negotiate with the Italian Government than it takes the Government of Great Britain?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: For the simple reason that the Government of India do not control the actions of the Italian Government.

Mr. H. P. Mody: Do Government possess the necessary power to take immediately retaliatory action in the event of their representations being met with a flat refusal?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I am not prepared to say what power the Government of India have in that behalf. I shall need to go into the matter much more carefully.

Mr. H. P. Mody: Do not the Government of India consider it necessary to arm themselves with such powers, in view of the fact that so many countries, such as, Persia, Turkey, Italy, are, on account of financial and currency troubles, imposing severe restrictions against imports from this country?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. H. P. Mody: This is not a matter of opinion. My question was this. Many countries are imposing restrictions, may be of a general character, but certainly against India, and do not the Government of India think it necessary, in view of this, to arm themselves with the necessary powers?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: My Honourable friend must realise that if it became necessary for us to secure an even balance with another country, we should probably have the power to effect that, but the position of India being what it is, namely, that she must have a favourable balance of trade, it acts somewhat as a handicap in our negotiations with other Governments.

Mr. H. P. Mody: The position with regard to Persia is identical with what my Honourable friend has just now said; the balance of trade is largely against India, and what action has been taken in this case?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I think I have said in reply to a supplementary question that we were in communication with commercial opinion on that point.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Is it not a fact that the Government of India are not as well placed as the Government of Great Britain in negotiating such terms?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: If my Honourable friend means to say that the machinery which we have to adopt is somewhat cumbrous, that is so. We have to go through London and then through Rome.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: In questions of urgency, will the Honourable Member consider a better method of communication?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: What is the better method?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Of going direct.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Surely, my Honourable friend knows that we have not the power to negotiate direct with a foreign Government.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: But since the matter is urgent and other countries are taking advantage of their powers of communicating direct, will the Honourable Member consider contingencies of the sort arising in the future, so that he or his successor may be in a better position to negotiate than he is today?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: It does not lie in the Honourable Member's power to do so, but no avoidable delay has been allowed to occur so far as we are concerned, because action has been taken by telegram.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Is it not a fact that another country, namely, Great Britain, has been able to get further concessions while the Government of India are still negotiating?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I think my Honourable friend already knows the answer.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: What is the reason for that?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: The reason for that has already been explained.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: The only explanation that the Honourable Member has given is that the Government of Italy are responsible. Is it not a fact that the Government of India are responsible?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: No, Sir, the Government of India are not responsible.

Mr. H. P. Mody: Can the Government of India, by executive action, restrict the imports from Italy?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I believe, we can.

Mr. H. P. Mody: Do the Government of India consider it desirable to do so?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: That is a very different matter. That raises larger questions of policy, and I am not prepared to give an answer to that straightaway.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: When did you have information about it?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: We had information in the first instance by telegram from our Trade Commissioner in Milan, but we had to wait until by Air Mail we received details and the moment we received details a telegraphic protest was launched.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: When did you receive the telegram?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I cannot give you the dates.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that on the first April next these restrictions will be imposed on Indian imports?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is it against the public interest to give the date of the telegram?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: No. If the Honourable Member will put down a question, I will give a reply in due course.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: In view of what has already been stated on the floor of the House, will the Honourable Member obtain his freedom from London and be in a position to deal directly with the Government of Italy?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I do not see how we can free ourselves from the constitutional position as it exists at the present moment

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: What I want to know is this. I do not want to change the constitutional position. Would the Government of India make any effort in order to be able to deal with this question direct, and be free to do so by getting the sanction of the Secretary of State for India?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Personally I do not think that such a course is possible, but I shall certainly consider it.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

FIRING AT KARACHI.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have received notice of a motion for adjournment of the business of the Assembly from Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur. I want to know whether the Honourable Member wishes to move his motion?

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur (South Madras: Muhammadan): Sir, before I express an opinion on it, I want to ascertain from you if you will permit me to move it tomorrow, as there is another adjournment motion today which is of greater importance than this.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is whether the Honourable Member wishes to move his motion today?

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: I do not propose to move it.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There is another motion for adjournment which stands in the name of Mr. Gauba. The notice I have received is that the Honourable Member proposes to ask for leave to move a motion for adjournment of the business of the House today for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance as follows: the firing resorted to by the police at Karachi on the 19th instant. I want to know whether any Honourable Member takes objection.

(No objection was taken.)

As no objection is taken, the motion will be taken up at 4 o'clock.

ELECTION OF THE STANDING FINANCE COMMITTEE.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): Sir, I move:

"That this Assembly do proceed to the election, for the financial year 1935-36, in such method as may be approved by the Honourable the President, of a Standing Finance Committee of the Assembly not exceeding fourteen in number, to which shall be added a Member of the Assembly to be nominated by the Governor General. The member so nominated shall be the Chairman of the Committee."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That this Assembly do proceed to the election, for the financial year 1935-36, in such method as may be approved by the Honourable the President, of a Standing Finance Committee of the Assembly not exceeding fourteen in number, to which shall be added a Member of the Assembly to be nominated by the Governor General. The member so nominated shall be the Chairman of the Committee."

The motion was adopted.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE COURT OF THE DELHI UNIVERSITY.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): Sir, I move:

"That the elected Members of this Assembly do proceed to elect, in such manner as may be approved by the Honourable the President, four persons from among their own numbers to be members of the Court of the University of Delhi in pursuance of sub-clause (5) of statute 2 of the First Statutes of the University set out in the schedule to the Delhi University Act, 1922 (VIII of 1922)."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the elected Members of this Assembly do proceed to elect, in such manner as may be approved by the Honourable the President, four persons from among their own numbers to be members of the Court of the University of Delhi in pursuance of sub-clause (5) of statute 2 of the First Statutes of the University set out in the schedule to the Delhi University Act, 1922 (VIII of 1922)."

The motion was adopted.

ELECTION OF A MEMBER TO THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, BANGALORE.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): Sir, I move:

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect, in such manner as may be approved by the Honourable the President, a member to represent this House on the Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, for the period 1935-37 (both years inclusive) in pursuance of the provisions of clause 9 (secondly) of the scheme for the administration and management of the properties and funds of the Institute, which was published in the Gazette of India with the notification from the Department of Industries and Labour, No. 1-10 (T.), dated the 12th February 1926, *vice* Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, whose term of office has expired."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect, in such manner as may be approved by the Honourable the President, a member to represent this House on the Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, for the period 1935-37 (both years inclusive) in pursuance of the provisions of clause 9 (secondly) of the scheme for the administration and management of the properties and funds of the Institute, which was published in the Gazette of India with the notification from the Department of Industries and Labour, No. 1-10 (T.), dated the 12th February 1926, *vice* Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, whose term of office has expired."

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi (Tirhut Division: Muhammadan): Sir, the appointment of an Honourable Member of this House to represent this House at the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, has not received the attention in the past that it deserves. The Honourable Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad was elected for the last term, but he was not given an opportunity to sit at the meeting of the Council. The last meeting, which was a very important one, was announced to be held on the 23rd July, 1934. Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, our elected representative, at once wrote to the Director that the Assembly was sitting on the 23rd July, and, therefore, the meeting might be held a week earlier No reply was received from the Director as to why they did not listen to his simple request, and hence he tendered his resignation to the Secretary of the Education Department, as I have been told by Dr Ziauddin, and he sent one copy of his resignation to the Director of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore. Now they treated it with scant courtesy. Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad was, I am told, consulted on this question by the Government, but no step was taken after that for ensuring that the future meetings of the Council will be held at a time when the representative of this House will have the opportunity to attend. Over and above that, Sir, I have been informed that the Director is dealing with the properties and funds of the Institute in a manner which requires a strict scrutiny. There have been complaints against the Director, and a representation, I am told, has been made to His Excellency the Governor General—I do not know how far it is correct, but I have been supplied with a copy. Some of the members of the Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, made that representation, in paragraph 2 of which they said:

"That your petitioners beg to approach Your Excellency under Regulation 32, page 13, of the Institute, with the present requisition for inquiring, by means of a special committee appointed for the purpose, into the working of the Institute for the past two years."

I shall not tire the House by reading the whole of it. It is a long one and there are a series of grievances of professors and others on the staff of the Institute which *prima facie* goes to show that there is something wrong with the management of the Institute. Now, unless we are assured that the Director will regard the appointment of a Member of this House with some attention and will facilitate his attendance at the meetings of the Council, there is no use making an election of a Member of this House. It is really a disgrace to the Member who is appointed and who is not listened to by the Director in small matters, as I have just now narrated.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Sir, I do not think I ought to detain the House very long. Two points have been raised. First, as regards the alleged indifference of the Director in the matter of fixing dates for the meetings of the Council. The position as regards that is that under the bye-laws of the Institute, which have been framed with the approval of the Governor General in Council, dates are fixed in the following manner. Ordinary meetings of the Council shall usually be held on the third Monday in the months of July, November and March. Now, Sir, ordinarily, the Assembly does not meet in the month of July or in the month of November, though it is in Session in the month of March. Last year, as you are aware, for very special reasons, there was a meeting of the Assembly in July, and that was the reason why the Regulation being what it is, it was not

possible for the Director to meet the convenience of the Honourable Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad in this respect. His hands are tied by the bye-law to which I have referred. But I can assure my Honourable friend that I shall take up with the Director this question of trying to adjust the meetings of the Council so far as possible to the convenience of Honourable Members of this House, because it is obviously our desire that the representative of the House shall be an effective representative, and not merely a ceremonial or nominal representative. Then, Sir, my Honourable friend said something as regards complaints which had been made against the Director. He read out from a memorial which he said had been addressed to the Governor General in Council. I can assure my Honourable friend that no such memorial has yet reached the Governor General in Council. If a memorial reaches the Governor General in Council, the Governor General in Council will, as he is required by the terms of the regulation—I need not read it out—take it into consideration; but there is one point I should like to lay before the House for consideration. This is the first time in the history of the Institute that an Indian has been appointed to the position of Director. That Indian is a man who is eminent in the world of science—Sir C. V. Raman, who is the holder of a Nobel prize and I think of every conceivable distinction that it is open to any scientist to secure. (Applause.) I submit that it is not right that any Honourable Member of this House should pay any attention to complaints made against a person of that distinction; I think that this matter ought really to be left to the Governor General in Council to be dealt with in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Regulation. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect, in such manner as may be approved by the Honourable the President, a member to represent this House on the Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, for the period 1935-37 (both years inclusive) in pursuance of the provisions of clause 9 (secondly) of the scheme for the administration and management of the properties and funds of the Institute, which was published in the Gazette of India with the notification from the Department of Industries and Labour, No. 1-10 (T.), dated the 12th February 1926, *vice* Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, whose term of office has expired."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have to inform Honourable Members that for the purpose of election of members to the Standing Finance Committee for the financial year 1935-36, the Court of the University of Delhi and the Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, the Notice Office will be open to receive nominations for all the Committees upto 12 Noon on Saturday, the 23rd March, 1935, and that the elections, if necessary, will be held on the following dates, namely:

1. Standing Finance Committee, 1935-36, 25th March 1935
2. Court of the University of Delhi, 25th March, 1935.
3. Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, 26th March, 1935.

The elections to the Committees which will be conducted in accordance with the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote will, as usual, be held in the Secretary's Room from 10-30 A.M. to 1 P.M. on each day appointed for the purpose.

[Mr. President.]

As regards the agenda, the Chair is informed that certain Honourable Members feel that the interposition of the Demands for Supplementary Grants, while the consideration of the Finance Bill is still continuing, is likely to cause inconvenience. The Chair consulted the Leader of the House and the Honourable the Finance Member as well as the Honourable Member representing the Congress Group whether it would not be more convenient if the consideration of the Finance Bill was continued uninterrupted until it was finished. There seems to be an agreement that that would be the most convenient course. In the ordinary course, it is expected that the consideration of the Finance Bill will be concluded by at least tomorrow, because the Supplementary Demands are also of an urgent nature, and they must be disposed of before a particular date of this month, and so also the Finance Bill. That, the Chair understands, is the course to which the Government also agree and it will perhaps suit the Honourable Members.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Law Member): If I may make a statement, that is exactly what happened in Mr. President's Chambers, and there is no reason why the House should not know what was arranged there.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh (Chota Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, we cannot follow what is going on there

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable Member will listen, he will be able to follow.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): When my Honourable Colleague, Sir James Grigg, and myself and my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, representing his Party, met today in the Chambers of the Honourable the President to find out if we can come to an agreement, what was discussed was that so far as the Government are concerned, they have no objection to the discussions being continued, namely, that the motion for the consideration of the Finance Bill be finished before the Demands for Supplementary Grants are taken up. We wanted to know from my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, whether, having regard to the urgency of the matter, we could depend on their support for closure if it be necessary not today but tomorrow at the end of the day. I gathered that my Honourable friend would give me some information but probably as they are in some disturbed condition over the unfortunate illness of Mr. Sherwani, I have not got that information. But if I may assume that I can at least get the support of my Honourable friend and his Party tomorrow in the afternoon as regards putting an end to this motion for consideration of the Finance Bill, then I can say that we have no objection to this change being made and to the discussion being continued where it had been left and the motion for consideration of the Finance Bill be finished and disposed of before the Supplementary Grants are taken up. That is exactly what I understood and still abide by that arrangement.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair takes it that that is an arrangement which commends itself to the entire House.

(No objection was taken.)

Then the discussion on the motion to consider the Finance Bill will be resumed.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Mr. President, it is rather unfortunate that six days should have intervened between the last discussion on the Finance Bill and today, and it is a little difficult to recapture the atmosphere of that discussion. But, I will do my best under the circumstances. I take it that this motion gives this House an opportunity of exercising its constitutional right, to the extent to which it is vested in it, of refusing supplies before grievances are redressed. I propose, in the course of my remarks, to try and satisfy this Honourable House that, both on the merits of the Finance Bill and on the standing grievances in this country which are still unredressed, this Finance Bill does not deserve the support of this Honourable House. The Honourable the Finance Member referred in his speech to the fact and stated that the English practice of dealing with two years was better than our practice of dealing with three years. I agree with him, but there is one respect, I think, in which we are better. Our income and expenditure estimates are prepared and are presented together, so that this House knows exactly how much revenue is sought to be raised, and how that revenue is being proposed to be spent, and on what purposes; and I trust this wholesome practice will continue.

We have, Sir, a Standing Committee on Finance in this House. However, it is not a Statutory Committee and it has not a right of audience as such before this House It is, at best, a committee which advises the Finance Department. I suggest that this Committee should have its powers and duties considerably enlarged, and a permanent officer should be attached to this Committee, so that this Committee may be able to perform its functions very effectively. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, however much we may economically use the time available to this House during the general budget discussion and the Finance Bill, we cannot exercise that meticulous and pervasive control, which it is the right and the privilege of this House to exercise over income and expenditure, and, I think, therefore, that these suggestions deserve the consideration of the Honourable the Finance Member.

Under the Government of India Act, the Governor General is authorised to allot not more than 15 days for the voting of demands, on the Railway and the General Budgets. As it is, we get only 12 days. Why do we not get all the 15 days we are entitled to? That, I think, will add to the privileges of this House. We shall be able to discuss more demands for grants. I may also suggest that the time set apart for general discussion at least on the General Budget may well be scrapped and set apart as time for the voting on demands for grants. As it is, we have a general discussion on the Finance Bill, and a general discussion on the General Budget. If we get, on the whole, eight or nine days for the voting on demands for grants, I submit it will be very much more satisfactory.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): May I just make an interruption? Is it the idea of the Honourable Member that the Standing Finance Committee should undertake a serious and exhaustive investigation of a few of the grants or a selection of the grants and then submit to the House materials and ask it to consider them seriously and in a detailed manner and the rest of the grants may come automatically under the guillotine? Is that his suggestion?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: No, Sir. I was speaking of the time allotted to this House for the voting on demands for grants. I was suggesting that we should get the full 15 days provided in the Government of India Act, and not the 12 days as we now get and, secondly, that the time set apart for the general discussion on the General Budget at least should be set apart for the voting of demands for grants, as we get an opportunity of a general discussion on the Finance Bill as such. I also suggest that we should get time allotted for each demand. In the Madras Legislative Council, we get two hours or four hours for each demand. It, therefore, enables the House to go forward according to the time table.

Coming to the actual financial position of the Government of India as exhibited by the Budget and by the Finance Bill, I want to present to this House a few striking facts. The total net revenue is estimated at 77 crores, 28 lakhs. This is spent as follows:

Interest on debt, 10 crores 39 lakhs.

For the reduction or avoidance of debt, 3 crores.

For defence expenditure, 44·98 or 45 crores.

Thus this total is 58 crores 37 lakhs. For other expenditure charged to revenue, it is 16 crores 82 lakhs. Well, Sir, that figure is deceptive, because in that figure are included the following items, ecclesiastical, 31 lakhs, political, one crore and 41 lakhs, watch and ward, 2 crores and 6 lakhs, making a total of three crores and 78 lakhs. Thus, more than 62 crores out of a revenue of 77 crores 28 lakhs are spent on purposes which, although in the picturesque language of the Honourable the Finance Member may be called self-preservation expenditure, are certainly not nation building expenditure. We then get roughly ten to twelve crores for the other expenditure of the Government of India.

In his speech introducing the Finance Bill, the Honourable the Finance Member controverted our statement and said that, taking the Central and the Provincial Governments expenditure together, they are between them spending roughly as much as the Government of India spends on defence expenditure. Well, Sir, assuming that that fact is correct, I would respectfully ask the Honourable the Finance Member whether he is satisfied with the total expenditure, on about 220 millions of people, for all their elemental needs of education, sanitation, public health, medical relief, agriculture and industrial improvement, of less than 45 crores?

On this matter I have the high authority of Sir Walter Layton, I hope the Honourable the Finance Member will not question it, because I read the other day that there are only three free traders still left in the British Empire, and they are Sir Walter Layton, Lord Snowdon and Sir James Grigg. Lord Snowdon is no longer in power, Sir Walter Layton is not in power, but unfortunately for us Sir James Grigg is in office and in power. But let us see what Sir Walter Layton says on this aspect to which the Honourable the Finance Member referred:

"On the expenditure side, debt absorbs 15 crores, defence, 55 crores,"

—that was in 1930, but now it is of course 44 crores,—

"law and order, and justice 21 crores, general civil administration 27 crores, pensions 7 crores; and, as against that, education throughout India gets about 13 crores, health and medical services 6½ crores, agriculture and industry 3½ crores and the expenditure on civil works amounts to 14 crores."

That is so far as national expenditure throughout the country is concerned.

Comparing this with the expenditure in other countries, may I draw the attention of this House to these striking facts? The total public expenditure on social services in Great Britain, after war pensions are excluded, increased from £22,600,000 in 1891 to £338,500,000 in 1925. In that year, this expenditure made up about one-eleventh of the national income. The public expenditure in Germany on social welfare and housing alone increased from ten per cent. of the total expenditure in 1913-14 to 25 per cent. in 1928-29. In the Netherlands, it was 32·4 per cent. in 1930, in France it rose to 23 per cent. in 1930. I think these figures are fairly striking and the Honourable the Finance Member may well pause a bit and ask himself the question whether he has proved to his own satisfaction that our expenditure on nation building departments is anything up to what is accepted by all civilised countries as a reasonable standard.

Coming to the income side, there are equally striking figures. Our customs revenue is responsible for 51·84 crores; income-tax, which is probably the only direct tax in this country, gets us 16 crores 40 lakhs, and salt, a tax to which the Congress is definitely opposed and which it will take every step in its power to abolish or radically reduce the moment it gets power, gives us eight crores 73 lakhs. These three taxes between them give you practically the whole of the Central Government revenues amounting to 76 crores 97 lakhs. Incidentally I would like to draw the attention of the Honourable the Finance Member, if I may, to the fact that the cost of collection is going up from three crores in 1921 to three crores 66 lakhs in 1935-36. I may add that in 1932-33, the total revenue of 79·91 lakhs, that is roughly 80 crores was collected, with an expenditure of three crores and 77 lakhs.

I would ask the Honourable the Finance Member, of course, he deprecates plans, but I hope he does not deprecate looking into the future, for, after all, he has got to be here for another three and half years, and, if the Federation comes in the meantime, he may be replaced by a Finance Minister, but even then he may continue as the Financial Adviser or a super-Finance Member which the Government of India Act contemplates . . . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Not, if I can help it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am glad to hear it. Now, Sir, let us take a few of these sources of revenue. Taking the customs revenue on imports, I suggest that a part of it is collected by taxes on the vices of the people, major and minor. Our import duties on spirits, wines, and liquors give us two crores, tobacco gives us one crore and 20 lakhs.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: It is not a vice.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: It is a minor vice.

An Honourable Member: It is the mother of vices.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes, it is the mother of vices, as my Honourable friend, Maulvi Sayyid Murtuza Sahib, says. I think the Honourable the Finance Member must know that the Congress is pledged to total prohibition of all alcoholic liquor, and there will be a genuine movement in this

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

country for controlling, at least, if not for abolishing liquor trade. The industry of tobacco must find a place in this country. If people must smoke, I am sure the country will insist that they must smoke Indian and not non-Indian cigarettes.

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): Why should they smoke at all?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: That is more than I can answer, because I myself do not smoke. If people should smoke, I suggest they should resort to the indigenous variety. My point financially is this—that the Honourable the Finance Member or his successor must be prepared for a great deal of reduction of revenue in import duties on both these items.

Then, Sir, we get 19 lakhs by way of import duties on boots and shoes. I hope all Honourable Members in this House are agreed that we ought to develop that swadeshi industry, as much as possible. There will also be a reduction in import duties on those goods.

This morning, Sir, the Honourable the Commerce Member, with that blandness for which he has become so famous, told us that he was not aware of any proposal to encourage the manufacture of motor cars in this country. I have no doubt in my own mind that any responsible Government seated on those Benches will take every step in its power to promote the swadeshi motor industry in this country. If that is so, this revenue of one crore and 40 lakhs that the Government are now getting on the imported motor cars must cease one day or another We will see to it that it ceases, as early as possible. I quite agree, Mr President, that when we are talking of swadeshi articles, such as, indigenous tobacco, indigenous boots and shoes and indigenous motor cars, it is possible to levy a reasonable excise duty on them, because, comparatively speaking, they are luxuries, and, therefore, the loss of import duties may to some extent be made up by excise duties on these goods manufactured in this country.

Then, Sir, we have a revenue of 12 lakhs on the importation of railway plant. My Honourable friend, the Financial Commissioner of Railways, is "investigating". His Department usually takes six years to finish investigations, but even six years must end sometime or other; and when these six years end, I believe this country will insist on railway locomotives and plant being manufactured in this country, more and more. This revenue also will and must go. We are getting also 15 lakhs from the import duties on cinematograph films. My Honourable friend, the Baronet from Bombay, presided at a function the other day, which I had the pleasure of attending, in which the film industry of this country protested against the unfair treatment meted out to it by the levy of import duties on raw films. That will have to go, sooner or later. Out of sugar we are getting 1 crore and 75 lakhs of revenue by way of import duties, but I take it that the object of the Government of India is to make this country self-sufficient in the matter of its own supply of sugar. If that is so, I think this import duty also is bound to vanish, or at least to be considerably reduced. They have an excise duty on sugar today; but there is a lot of complaint in the country about it, and I have no doubt in my own mind that, at any rate so far as the inferior qualities of sugar which the poorer people in the country consume largely are

1 P M.

concerned, there must be no excise duty on those kinds of sugar. It is an iniquitous tax on the necessities of the poor people of this country, and, therefore, this excise must be considerably reduced or abolished. I do not know if this House realises that on the import of cotton fabrics alone we are getting by way of import duties five crores and on artificial silk and cloth hosiery, we are getting more than two crores, and on other textiles, 48 lakhs. Therefore, on the whole, we are now getting 8 crores of import duties, on the importation of cloth and silk. The President of the Bombay Millowners' Association said the other day that there is scope for the import of foreign textiles into this country. I humbly but strongly differ from him. I feel that there is enough cotton in this country and enough cotton of the superior quality may be produced. The Imperial Agricultural Research Institute is making very good experiments in that direction. There is labour, there is talent, there is capital, by which we can make this country more or less self-sufficient in the matter of cotton and silk goods for the clothing of the vast millions in this country; at any rate, that is the ambition of every patriotic Indian. If that is so, while it may be possible, there may be some small trade going on in certain counts of goods which it may not be possible to manufacture in this country, I want the Honourable the Finance Member to prepare for a gradual reduction and the ultimate extinction of this source of revenue. Let him not forget that Japan today is importing a lot of cloth and silk goods which India feels can be and ought to be produced in this country

Mr. F. E. James (Madras: European): What are you going to import then?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Nothing.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Wait and see. (Laughter.)

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Why should we import?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: As my Leader says, why should we import, unless we want to?

Sir Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): How can we export then?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: That is a matter of arrangement, but this thing is being done in spite of you.

Then I come to the next category of duties on which I am sure there will be practically universal agreement in this country. I refer to the three kinds of excise duties, on kerosene, on matches and on sugar. I am sure all Honourable Members will agree that kerosene and matches are necessities for everybody in this country; and, as I said, the inferior qualities of sugar are used by the poorer people. We get from the excise duty on kerosene, 2 crores and 95 lakhs; on matches we get 2 crores, and, on sugar, 1·50 crores.

Now, with regard to these excise duties, I want to draw the attention of this House and of the Honourable the Finance Member to the report of the Committee on National Debt and Taxation appointed by His

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

Majesty's Government in Great Britain. They came to this general conclusion:

"In any general conclusion as to the effect of the Customs and Excise duties on the standard of living, it is necessary to bear in mind that the duties contribute substantially to expenditure on education, pensions, unemployment relief, etc., from which the wage-earning classes largely benefit."

That factor is conspicuous by its absence in India. Then:

"Again, it must not be forgotten that some indefinable part of the duties.....is balanced in many cases by an increase in wage-rates due to the tax element in the cost of living."

That element is also largely absent in India:

"When proper allowance is made for these aspects, we consider that the food duties, even at their present reduced level, must still exercise some adverse effect on the standard of living of the poor, although on the whole that standard may be slightly better than in the year 1913-14."

If this can be said of Great Britain, where the standard of living is very much higher than in this country, what are we to say of the effect of these duties on the standard of living in this country?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: What about rice?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: We shall discuss it, when the Rice Bill comes.

Sir, this is the majority report. The minority report of this committee, with which I am very much more in agreement than with the majority report, puts our case more strongly:

"We are ourselves of opinion that taxes upon commodities, regarded as part of a general system for raising the money required for State expenditure, are objectionable in principle, and that the important place which they occupy in our tax system can only be defended on the ground that they are survivals from a period when the administration of direct taxation was much more difficult than it is today..... ..... Taxation should mitigate, not aggravate, inequality in the distribution of income.

The general objections to indirect taxation apply with special force to the taxes upon food, upon entertainments, and upon artificial silk."

I say they apply here particularly to the excise duty on matches, the excise duty on sugar, and the excise duty on kerosene:

"They are thus exceptionally regressive, and they take no account of a principle which we regard as essential to any equitable system of taxation, *viz.*, that taxation should not be imposed upon any whose means are not adequate to maintain a certain minimum standard of living."

Will the Honourable the Finance Member lay his hand on his heart and say whether he is not levying the majority of his taxes on people whose means are not adequate to maintain a certain minimum standard of living:

"We recommend, therefore, that, subject to the needs of fresh expenditure, any future surplus of revenue should be devoted to abolition primarily of the food duties, and thereafter of the duties upon entertainments and upon artificial silk. We are of opinion that these reductions should take precedence of any further reductions of direct taxation."

Then, Sir, while that is the position today, under the Government of India Bill, the position of the Government of India or of the Federal Government will be much worse. I have only to draw the attention of Honourable Members to clauses 135, 136, 137 and 138 of the Government of India Bill. Certain succession duties, stamp duties, terminal taxes, and taxes on fares and freights shall be levied by the Federation and collected by them. It shall not form part of the revenues of the Federation, but shall be assigned to the States and the provinces. Taxes on income shall also be divided although the Governor General is given power to decide the manner and the time of distribution. And so far as salt duties, excise duties, and export duties are concerned, it is also provided there that, if an Act of the Federal Legislature so provides, there shall be paid out of the revenues of the Federation to the provinces and to the federated States some equivalent of the whole or any part of the net proceeds of this duty; and one knows the composition of the proposed Federal Legislature and the method of indirect election proposed; and I promise that, when that Legislature meets, it will vote away practically all these taxes, to be distributed to the provinces and to the various States forming the Federation. Therefore, it seems to me that the position, as far as one can see at present is insecure today, and will be almost disastrous if and when the Federation comes into being. At page 292 of this Bill we have the specified sources of revenue which are placed at the disposal of the Federal Government, duties of customs including the export duties, duties of excise, corporation tax, salt, state lotteries—that is a source which I think the future Finance Member of the Government may have recourse to, having lotteries—but except that, I feel that the position is, as I said, very insecure.

We have then the railways which were turned into a separate proposition—a commercial concern: that concern is today so insolvent, that it owes a debt to us of 55 crores, which I can see no prospect of its ever repaying: and the statutory railway authority will be an *imperium in imperio*, and the Government of India can whistle as long as they like, and yet they will get not a pice from this railway authority. The posts and telegraphs is another department, which I am afraid, cannot pay. Although it is supposed to be a commercial department, somehow or other, ever since it was made a commercial department, although there have been years when we had some surpluses, yet on the whole we find, that by some system of accounting, it is now more or less self-sufficient, more often less self-sufficient than more self-sufficient.

Then I put to the Honourable the Finance Member, the modern free-trader, one poser. How long can these imports continue, apart from the swadeshi spirit, apart from what future governments might do? I put it to him—only so long as this export of gold continues: according to him it shall continue: but, even according to him, gold cannot be exported which does not exist: and there are only about 500 or 600 crores more left in India; and after these exports cease, how are these imports going to come? It seems to me at any rate that at that time the customs revenue must fall. When it does fall, the future Finance Member will have to turn to the Army Secretary or to the Commander-in-Chief, who never comes to this House, and tell them "We cannot afford to pay this 45 crores to you: you must cut down your expenditure"; and I put it, as a proposition, based on some careful calculation, that the future revenues of the Government of India considering the proposed division of revenues

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

between the Federation and the Provinces, the taxable capacity of this country and sound principles of taxation, cannot be more than Rs. 50 crores; and even assuming you pay roughly half of it to the military budget, it cannot be more than 20 or 25 crores. This expenditure must be brought down: all this tall talk about the defence of the country is nonsense. Either the Army is too big, or it is too small. If there is a real invasion, it is too small unless you can organise the entire nation behind the Army, or unless there is any truth in your statement that India forms part of the Empire, and the imperial forces are placed at our disposal. On the other hand, for normal purposes, it is really too big except when a war starts; and may I ask the Honourable the Finance Member whether he honestly feels as strong in exercising his control against the Military Department, as he does against the other departments of the Government of India.

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Will the Honourable Member be much longer?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes, Sir: I will take some time.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then he can speak after Lunch.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Half Past Two of the Clock

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, I was saying, when we adjourned for Lunch that the Honourable the Finance Member should exercise, apart from questions of policy, the maximum financial control possible over the army expenditure in this country. And, on the question of British troops, in India, we have heard an elaborate discussion, and I do not want to go into it again at this stage But, Sir, I feel that, if, for any reason, British troops are to be retained in this country, the cost of it must be found by Great Britain and not by India. If really military policy dictates, besides the Indian army, a larger army, I suggest one of two courses,—either have an Indian army, consisting both of men and of officers, to the extent which military policy requires it, but if British personnel is forced upon you, I expect the Honourable the Finance Member to stand up to the British Government and say—"You pay the money for it".

Then, Sir, on the question of retrenchment, apart from the question of policy, I should like to get some information from the Honourable the Finance Member, as to whether he is satisfied that full retrenchment has been carried out in the army expenditure, remembering all the time, three

important factors,—the cataclysmal fall in prices which must be reflected in the expenditure of all spending departments,—the payment by Great Britain towards the army expenditure in this country, which practically is equal to the Capitation charges we pay, and the results of the mechanisation of the army. If it means anything at all, it must mean some saving.

Then, Sir, I should like to know whether the nature of the control exercised by the Finance Department over the Army expenditure is exactly the same as in the case of other departments,—for I read, Sir, in the Blue-book which the Army Department has supplied to us in connection with the budget the following sentence:

"The Army Department of the Government of India controls the expenditure under all the heads except that pertaining to the Military Accounts Offices which are under the control of the Finance Department."

Moreover, Sir, I want to know whether, for the expenditure on the army, we are getting full value. Is not the profession of army contractors the most lucrative profession in parts of Northern India today, and are we really getting things at prices at which they are sold in the market, and are the spending departments absolutely free from any kind of corruption?

The Honourable the Finance Member in the course of his brilliant speeches hit upon the right thing when he said that the real problem in this country is its poverty. I entirely agree with him,—all Indians agree with him. But does he not then realise that the natural consequence of it is that the most urgent need today is to increase the purchasing power of the people, and that internal prices must also rise? . . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: By calling a penny two pence?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Neither by calling a penny a tuppence, nor by sticking to the ratio at any cost! Whatever happens, he will not raise the ratio. I do not want the Finance Member to call a penny a tuppence, but why does he, who is a great believer in the policy of *laissez faire*, pin his faith in such a manipulation of the ratio? Where is the freedom in it? Why does he not agree to allow the Rupee to find its own level? Why does he want to link it to the paper currency, and where does his doctrine of *laissez faire* come in in his matter?

Then, Sir, we have the provision for the reduction or the avoidance of debt. My own personal opinion,—it may be unorthodox,—is, that until our financial position is much more secure than it is today, until we can find enough money for our national services, we may put off almost indefinitely any provision for the reduction or avoidance of debt. After all, Mr. President, our national debt, comparatively speaking, is small, and most of it is productive or protective. Under those circumstances, Sir, I would suggest to the Finance Member that that provision may well be cut down or removed altogether. Moreover, Sir, has he taken all necessary and possible steps, in view of the condition of the money market in India, to convert all interest bearing loans, that is, loans bearing interest at comparatively high rates, into loans at prevailing rates of interest? I think, Sir, the Government have got some proposals for next year. They have hinted at them in the Finance Member's speech, but I would like him to go further and see if he cannot take advantage of the present condition of the money market to convert practically all our loans into loans bearing the lowest rate of interest which prevails today; and in any case, if it is a case

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

of paying off debts, I suggest to him that we must fight for the external debt first. After all, the internal debt and the payments on it merely mean transfer of money from one hand to another inside the country,—it does not affect the entire national economy; but the Government, by keeping the external debt of the country, are sending away the wealth of the country. I, therefore, think, that if any provision is to be made at all for paying off debt, it ought to be a first charge on it, to pay off all sterling debts.

Sir, the Finance Member protested very vigorously against any kind of economic plan. My friend to my right, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, has answered him completely and effectively; but, Sir, I propose to approach this question from a slightly different point of view. There is a method in the Finance Member's madness—he says—he has no plan, but he has a perfect plan in his little head (Laughter), and he knows that that plan must work, and, therefore, he says, that he will not have any other plan. Sir, I put it to him,—he talks of free trade. When he was offered this job, did he tell the Secretary of State—'I am a free-trader, I cannot go to a country where the Government is committed to a policy of protection'? Why did he come here? If he so believed in free-trade, I think, Sir, he would have consulted his own conscience much better had he stayed in England and tried his hand against Mr. Lloyd George or Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, instead of coming here to a country which has stood and will stand by protection under certain well defined conditions . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Evidently, you are a great reader of the *Indian Finance*.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes, I am.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: And a quoter from?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I said he has a plan. I will tell the House what his plan is "The ratio shall remain as it is, I will not change it"—is it not a plan?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: If you like.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: "The gold export will and must continue, I will put no export duty on it"—is that not a plan?

Several Honourable Members: Yes.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: "I am a free-trader, but Ottawa shall stand; Imperial Preference shall stand". Is it or is it not a plan? "The military expenditure cannot be reduced, it shall not be reduced". Is it or is it not a plan? And the only thing he will do is to spend money on small schemes, on village industries, the details of which are no more known to him than to me!

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): That is a plan!

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am saying, therefore, that the Honourable the Finance Member's plea that he is against economic planning is, with all respect, as insincere as it is hollow.

I beg leave for a minute to go back to this theory of the Honourable the Finance Member that the military expenditure cannot be reduced and read to him what his friend Sir Walter Layton has said in the matter:

"Apart altogether from the question of other forms of expenditure in India, the defence charge is undoubtedly high. A recent comparison of the military expenditure of the nations of the world shows that in this respect, India is seventh on the list among the Great Powers and that her expenditure on armaments is between two and three times as great as that of the whole of the rest of the Empire outside Great Britain. . . . .

It is frequently urged that expenditure for the defence of India is not a matter that concerns India only, but is also one which is of vital importance to the Empire as a whole and should, therefore, not be at the sole charge of India. . . It is relevant to my present purpose to point out that the total is at present so large, both absolutely and in relation to the revenues of India, as to be a dominating factor in the financial situation."

On the question of relieving the poverty of the country and of how to increase the wealth of the country, the Honourable the Finance Member laid down some premises and came to the comfortable conclusion of doing practically nothing. He said public expenditure must yield quick results, and asked, are there such projects? I give a two-fold answer to him. Public expenditure in this country on the elemental needs of the people is so much behind even the minimum standards of other countries, that any expenditure on the supply of those needs will yield not only quick but beneficent results, perhaps, not in money immediately, but in the increased purchasing power of the people, in the increased health and taxpaying capacity of the people of this country. My second answer is this. There are such projects today. Speaking for Madras, I can say that the Tungabhadra project has been pending for a long number of years. You can spend crores upon it. A scheme of village roads which will give communications to the thousands of villages which lack any roads today is also an item of capital expenditure, which will yield good results. And, in cities, I can say that there are schemes waiting for slum improvement. In Madras alone, we have prepared a scheme which the Municipal Council has approved of, costing two crores. If, therefore, you tackle the problem of slum improvement, you have got projects on which you can spend your money usefully. Then my Honourable friend said no monetary return can be got from anything we do for the villages. May I remind him that man does not live by bread alone?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Would you mind quoting me correctly?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: No monetary return can be expected from anything we do for the villages.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I did not say that. I said that large schemes of agricultural improvement could not be expected to yield immediate returns.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I remind him of the biblical saying that man does not live by bread alone? We have some amount of responsibility, I take it in this country, for doing something for our villages even if we cannot get much return on account of that.

Then, my Honourable friend laid down a series of propositions, namely,—I hope I am quoting him correctly, I took them down the other day—the desire of the world is to be self-supporting; in India, industries, which can stand and prosper, attract private capital; industries which do not or cannot

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

so stand should not be helped by the Government. All is well with the world; God is in His heaven, and I am Finance Member of the Government of India; therefore, I cannot do anything at all:—it seems to me to be a conclusion unworthy of a responsible finance member of any government. And his remedies are still more curious. Evidently he believes in prayer. He said, let us all sit down here and pray for the rationalisation of the world so that international trade can flow and India can share in the resulting prosperity. I have no particular objection to praying, but it seems to me adding insult to injury to come to a responsible Legislature like this, and say at the end of introducing the Finance Bill, I suggest to you, gentlemen, please pray. It is a matter for laughter, but for the fact that it is too tragic for tears.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Instead of asking you to bray, he has asked you to pray!

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I put it to the Honourable the Finance Member, now that he says he has no plan, has he any financial conscience at all? Because I want to ask him how his financial conscience allows him to reconcile himself to the poorest country in the world, having the most numerous bureaucracy, and the most highly paid, throughout the world? Has he ever applied his financial conscience to it? Has he heard of such salaries in any other country? And has he considered that, in this country, which is so poverty-stricken, the death-rate and infantile mortality are such that ought to make any sensitive Government ashamed of its own performance or want of performance? Does he realise that owing to the weak sustaining power of our people, the epidemics claim a yearly toll of life so high, that, in any other place, it was seriously suggested as an alternative to birth control that we can rely upon nature's remedies—epidemics in this country? Does he realise that the poverty in this country is colossal, that we have made no attempt towards tackling it in any scientifically planned manner? And, on the question of illiteracy, has he ever applied his mind to the colossal sums required to liquidate this matter? And to the inadequate medical relief, the poor village communications, the primitive methods of agriculture, and, on the whole, the very poor standard of living? Sir, I put it to him that he may again usefully consult and act upon the conclusions of the report of the Committee on National Expenditure, in which they came to the following conclusions.

"That the rise in the value of money in recent years provides a strong *prima facie* case for the revision of money obligations fixed under other conditions."

Your salaries must go down, your defence expenditure must go down.

"That existing financial difficulties make it necessary for the nation, like the private individual, to consider seriously what it can afford and not merely what is desirable.

That only by the strictest regard to economy and efficiency over a long period can the trade of the country be restored to its pre-war prosperity and any substantial number of the unemployed be re-absorbed into industry."

Then, Sir, there is one matter on which I desire to make our position perfectly clear. I have been watching, ever since I came here, the Honourable the Finance Member's persistent though courteous attempts to get the House committed to a policy of free trade more or less, or to a policy which will destroy the protection which has been and is being offered to

our industries. On that matter, we, sitting on this side of the House, are perfectly anxious and willing to consider the interests of the consumers and of the poor people of this country; but, at the same time, Mr. President, we are absolutely convinced that those interests are not served by allowing this country to become inhabited by people who will be perpetual hewers of wood and drawers of water, for the industrial nations of the world. We do want to build up our industries, our large industries as well as our small industries and when these large industries are built up, we are committed to the nationalization of all key industries. (Hear, hear.) If the consumers have to pay a higher price, that price will not go into the pockets of private capitalists, but will go into the coffers of the State, and return to the people in a thousand fructifying channels. On the other hand, we do want to develop our small industries. Let the Honourable the Finance Member have no illusions in the matter at all. We shall be no party to allowing our industries to be strangled by the cut-throat competition of other countries. Let him also remember that the industries of this country were destroyed by his predecessors in this country by most unjust methods. We, therefore, stand committed to the policy of protection more or less on the lines laid down in the Indian Fiscal Commission's Report. We shall, therefore, do our very best to develop those industries, while seeing to it that the interests of the consumers are protected and that key industries are nationalised, and the profits brought into the coffers of the State.

Then he asked about various plans. I have no desire to elaborate them, but may I, as a layman, try my hand at one simple plan? We have seven lakhs of villages in this country. I suggest to the Honourable the Finance Member to spend at the rate of a thousand rupees a year on each village, for five years, intellectually conscript all the educated young men of this country, graduates and undergraduates and train them in the arts of village work, to serve the villagers; to give them the elements of the knowledge of co-operation, to impart education, to give them some small medical relief, and, above all, protect them from the corruption of the police, revenue and irrigation officials, which goes on throughout the year and throughout the country and tell them, at the end of the five years, these young men and women will have to find their own livelihood in the villages. This plan is the result of careful and prayerful thought on my part for the last many years. I feel that thereby we shall be relieving unemployment. We will make our villages real, live, and self-respecting centres, where the people will be enabled to use their opportunities to the best advantage, to have the benefits of co-operation, to have the benefits of a clean, honest administration, and to have the benefits of education and simple medical relief. It will cost about 10 crores a year spread over 11 years. On the whole, it will cost about 350 crores; at the end of that time, this country will be a much better country in which the men and women will no longer walk as the weak slaves that they walk today, but as independent self-respecting men and women who will be worthy to be citizens of a great and self-governing country.

Coming to the details of the Finance Bill, I only want to say a very few words, Mr. President. So far as the salt duty is concerned, we here represent the salt *Satyagraha* Movement. The Indian National Congress is committed to the principle that salt, the prime necessity of men and cattle, shall not be taxed. It is God's gift to man, and we believe that we can and ought to find other sources of revenue, and ought not to tax salt; and I suggest that it is not financially an impossible proposition. I suggest

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

that the cut in salaries be not restored. I suggest further that this cut be graded, that all salaries below 150 or 200 be exempted from all cuts, that salaries above have graded cuts of 5, 10, going up to 25 per cent., and that income-tax and super-tax be raised if necessary, and that, as a result of all that, we do say that the salt which the people want can be exempted from this duty. In this connection, the Finance Member has tried to throw an apple of discord among us and tried to appeal to the friends from Bengal—why do you want not to have foreign salt and why should you pay for the salt higher than you will be compelled to pay otherwise? I am glad to see that the Honourable Members from Bengal have refused to fall into the trap, and I hope that when the Bill comes up before this House, we shall have the very decisive vote of this House against this attempt to remove the import duty.

The Honourable the Finance Member in an expansive mood told us—I think on the only time on which anybody said so—that they will accept our opinion if we agree with him to remove this import duty. We tell him: "No, thank you. We are not going to allow this import duty to be removed. If we had our own way, we would raise the import duty, so that we can build up a genuine indigenous salt industry, which can satisfy the wants of the millions of this country".

Then, Sir, on the export duty on skins, we shall have a discussion by and by. I am afraid this is one of those occasions when the Government will try to fish in the troubled waters of provincial jealousies, but, speaking as a Madrasi, I do appeal to all my friends from other provinces that we want this export duty to be retained, in order to enable the Indian tanning industry to be built up. I shall give facts and figures later on, if necessary, or my friends will do it. On the question of the postal rates, I stand by the pice post card. We do not care how you do it, but you must do it, and if we had our own way we want to see that the poor people of this country get their pice post card. Keep the letters at one anna and raise the weight from half a tola to one tola. Do what you like with the higher forms of postage but the poor people of this country must get their pice post card. On the question of income-tax, we shall fight and we shall succeed, at least so far as this House is concerned, to get all incomes below Rs. 2,000 exempted from income-tax. This is all I have got to say so far as the Finance Bill proper is concerned, but I want, before I conclude, to say a few words on the general position as I see it.

Mr. F. E. James: You have not come to export yet!

Mr. S. Satyamurti: We shall export what we cannot consume and we will import what we really want. We want to be as rich and prosperous as England, and we will adopt every step to get that prosperity. Let my Honourable friend have no illusions about it. Our ambition is to be no less rich than the Honourable gentleman in his own country which has resorted to free-trade, protection, preference, quotas and what not, so long as John Bull's pocket is filled. I have learnt to profit by that lesson and to see that our country is as rich and prosperous as his. I hope he will see the justice of that.

I am sorry the Honourable the Home Member is not here, but the other day he delivered to us a speech which for bathos is hard to beat. I agree with him that terrorism can have no place in this country, but I

want to remind him that if terrorism is getting under control, Mahatma Gandhi and the Indian National Congress are today the greatest forces against terrorism. You may believe it; you may not believe it; but take it from me as one who knows the inside of things that we are the most potent and the most corrective force against terrorism in this country. The Honourable the Home Member asked us to support him. We will, but we have our own conditions. We believe from a reading of history that terrorism can never be met, and will never be met by counter-terrorism, that terrorism can be wiped out, only by enlightened public opinion being gradually arrayed on the side of Government, against all forms of terrorism. The Honourable the Home Member asks us to believe that all those who are detained are terrorists, and, therefore, we must support the Government in that action; and that, if we ask a question about their health, we are secretly sympathizing with terrorists. Sir, this is doing a gross injustice to our position. Let me read to you what a great Secretary of State wrote to the then Viceroy:

"We must keep order"—(*Lord Morley wrote to Lord Minto*)—"but *excess* of severity is not the path to order. On the contrary, it is the path to the bomb."

Sir, I want those words to be written in letters of gold on the entrance to the Viceroy's House: "excess of severity is the path to the bomb":

"It will be insupportable if you, who are a sound Whig, and I, who am an 'autoritaire' Radical (*so they say*), go down to our graves (I first) as imitators of Eldon, Sidmouth, the Six Acts, and all the other men and policies which we were both of us brought up to abhor."

Then, Sir, he referred to the long procession of widows who lost their husbands and the sufferings of other people. Honestly and sincerely, do I express my sympathy, and our sympathy, if I may, with all those unfortunate people whose relations, whose husbands, have been the victims of terrorism, but may I, in no spirit of bravado or spirit of helplessness, try to remind the Honourable the Home Member and the Government of India that we on this side believe that today there are hundreds of wives, of mothers, of sons and of daughters who have got their husbands, their fathers and their brothers detained in custody, on no evidence, on no conviction, but on the mere suspicion of the executive? Do you think, Mr. President—and you are a Bengali, you know—that the feeling in Bengal is really reconciled to all these acts of counter-terrorism on the part of the Government? Are we not entitled to demand that the great doctrine of "*fiat justitia ruat cœlum*" "let justice be done even if the Heavens fall", may be carried out in Bengal also? Sir, we shall be glad to give our full support to fighting terrorism (Hear, hear) provided civilised methods for fighting it are adopted, and people are not arrested and kept in jail on mere suspicion of being terrorists. (Hear, hear.) Sir, my friend, Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose, an elected Member of this Assembly, has publicly stated that he is against terrorism and has challenged Government to put him on his trial. Government does nothing and keeps him in imprisonment for three years! (*Cries of* "Shame, shame".) And do you think that we can accept your statement that you are honest and sincere in dealing with terrorism and are not using a few murders here and there in order to demoralize the whole of the Bengali race and making them feel that they can have no peace or good Government so long as this Government is in power? (Interruptions.)

3 P.M.

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

Sir, the Honourable the Home Member referred also to a speech of mine and said that I was inconsistent—a virtue for which he said I was "famous". Sir, I plead both guilty and not guilty to the charge. I plead not guilty in the ordinary sense; I am not inconsistent in saying "we will co-operate with you to the extent to which we can, for the interest of our country, but if *you* do not respond I am here to destroy the prestige of the Government". But, Sir, in a higher sense I plead guilty to the charge of being inconsistent, and I will tell you how. We are here to suggest to the Government measures of reform, measures of sound taxation, and measures of proper expenditure. They accept no advice from us, but, assuming they accept all the advice we give them, assuming that they become thoroughly responsive and responsible, that will not make us accept this Government one moment longer than we are compelled to accept them—because we recognize, in the words of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman that good government can never be a substitute for self-government. Be as responsive as you like, still we will use every legitimate and peaceful means in our power to displace you from the country and to take the reins of government into our hands. (Hear, hear.) In that sense, I grant I am inconsistent. Only, if you are reasonable in the meantime, it will make the transfer easy and pleasant for all concerned. If you are going to be unreasonable, all right, you make it difficult and unpleasant for all concerned. Sir, after the discussion in this House on the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report, the political future of this country has become darker. Something is going on between the Indian Princes and the Secretary of State and the Honourable the Law Member has cultivated the great art of using words to conceal his thoughts, so successfully, that we do not know what is going on.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): I tried to learn it from you. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh (Bombay City Non-Muhammadan Urban): There are many other things which you can learn (Laughter.)

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, anyhow, I am glad my friend admits that he is using words to conceal his thoughts That is all my point,—and that is a valuable admission, that this Government specialises in the art of using words to conceal its thoughts. (Hear, hear.) Sir, the Maharajah of Patiala and various other rulers are negotiating with Sir Samuel Hoare, and Sir Samuel Hoare is negotiating with them! And the Government of India looks on helplessly. It does not know what is going on, and in a brave voice, its says—"they cannot disclose it". Shall I say—"they have nothing to disclose!" They know no more about it than we do. They are simply used as door-mats, as I said the other day, and they will not say what they do not know. I suggest it would have been more honest on their part to say, "we do not know".

But the point is this, that today federation is being shaped in the House of Commons by a contract between two parties to it, namely, the British Government and the Indian Princes,—British India being completely ignored, and even in that contract—as my young friend reminds me—the dominant party, the British Government, is dictating terms to the

Indian Princes. Sir, we recognize we have no influence with the Indian Princes, and we have no part or lot with them, but let me warn them, from my place in this House, that "British India" will never forget this conspiracy between them and the British Government, if they succeed in enforcing a federation upon us. We shall fight it. The Indian Princes are not so strong in their own States; their rule is not so impeccable. They do not represent the doctrine of the "survival of the fittest". On the other hand, history convinces us that the Indian Princes are today the artificial survival of the "least fitted". (Hear, hear.) We have here these Princes who want to make the best of both the worlds Let them, I say, beware, and let the British Government beware, we shall have no peace for both of them, if this conspiracy is concluded behind our backs. (Applause.) I know, Sir, while we talk like this, that the Members of the Treasury Benches laugh, affect to be indifferent (Laughter), and an arrogant Secretary of State said the other day—"the British caravan will pass on even if the dogs bark". Sir, I do not want to use any cheap bravado, but we feel—and I say this very sincerely and honestly to the Members of the Treasury Benches and to the Secretary of State if my poor voice reaches him—that we, on this side of the House, are determined to see that the caravan of the Indian National Congress passes on to the fulness of its goal, whatever dogs, British or otherwise, bark. (Hear, hear.) Sir, the caravan passes on, in spite of the Honourable the Law Member's superior contempt for the Congress, and in spite of the Law Member's not missing a single opportunity of opposing and vilifying it, in spite of the bland answers emanating from the Honourable the Commerce Member which mean that he is after all helpless; Sir, the Congress caravan moves on, though the Honourable the Home Member shakes his fist at the Indian National Congress. And, last but not least, in spite of the Honourable the Finance Member's affected want of plan, there is, I say, a real British, Imperial plan to keep this country perpetually available for British exploitation.

Sir, I also want to repeat on this occasion our demand for a Constituent Assembly. Sir, the *Manchester Guardian*, which is usually a better informed and saner paper on the average than any other British newspaper, wrote the other day that in India the demand for such a Constituent Assembly is not taken seriously, and it quoted Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru. Sir, Sir Tej Bahadur is a great man, but I think the *Manchester Guardian* and those who agree with that paper would be well-advised to remember that the Indian National Congress stands for a Constituent Assembly, based on adult franchise or on the most democratic franchise possible. It is a democratic method, it is a practical method and it is a rational method. What more can the British Government have than this that the people of the country must meet and settle their constitution? We have no illusions in the matter. We shall make that the central issue in all elections to the Legislatures, whenever they come, and we will press the demand on the Government. If the Government will not yield to our demand, then, God help Great Britain and God help India!—because, if our methods do not succeed, I say, there is no other alternative before India than red revolution. (Hear, hear.) I am not taking in terms of despair or of mere fright, but, knowing the country as I do, unless this demand is conceded in a reasonable time, I see no alternative but red revolution. It seems to me that, when that revolution comes, nobody will be able to say what turn it will take. It is, therefore, up to

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

the Government today to grasp the hand of peace and fellowship which we offer, to agree to the demand for a Constituent Assembly, to scrap this Government of India Bill, and agree to a constitution, under which India can have full self-government, and yet remain friendly with Great Britain. That time is today; very soon it may be too late. Time and tide wait for nobody and I should like to warn the Government here and the Government in Great Britain in the words of the great Persian poet:

"The moving finger writes and having writ,
Moves on; nor all thy piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all thy tears wash out a word of it."

Sir, I have done. I oppose the Finance Bill. (Applause.)

Nawab Sahibzada Sir Sayad Muhammad Mehr Shah (North Punjab: Muhammadan): Sir,* views have already been expressed on the various aspects of the Budget and the Finance Bill and I need not, therefore, dwell at length at this stage upon facts and figures relating to them. Apart from this, I am by nature inclined to talk less. I have, moreover, a few years' experience of the other House, the Council of State, to guide me and there eloquence does not go to such a pitch as it does in the Assembly.

No matter what political parties we belong to or what political view we hold, on a discussion of the Budget and the Finance Bill it is our duty to realise our responsibility in the matter and to review the schemes now under consideration from a constructive point of view, a view which would be in the best interests of the motherland, law and order and the zemindar and commercial classes in the country.

A saying by the late Mr. Gokhale is here worth recalling. He said that on any other occasion the Opposition and non-official Members might criticise the policy of the Government from whatever point of view they pleased, but on delicate subjects, such as the Budget and the Finance Bill, it should be the duty of every responsible Member to keep in view the fact that if he were to present the Finance Bill in place of the Honourable the Finance Member what constructive schemes he would himself be in a position to present. Looking at the speeches from this point of view I find that most of the speakers want the Honourable the Finance Member to increase the expenditure on economic and social items for the good of the country and that, in view of the poverty prevailing in the country, taxes should be decreased as expenditure is increased till Government are in such happy position as to spend crores of rupees for the good of the country and need realise nothing by way of taxes.

Such a spectacle, Sir, would indeed be very gratifying; but in the dry world of facts and figures such a show of jugglery is unfortunately not possible. Discarding, therefore, all attempts at imagination, I consider it my duty to represent the real views of my constituency on the subject.

Sir, my constituency possesses a peculiar character in the whole of India. It perhaps claims the largest number of military voters in the whole country. That being so, the responsibility of representing their views rests on me, more than on any other elected Member, particularly

*Translation of the original speech delivered in the vernacular.

as it is with the blood of this military section of the people that the foundations of India's political progress have been laid. I, therefore, hope, the Chair, the Honourable Members and Government would regard my voice as the voice of that section of the people who naturally do not believe in any kind of propaganda, agitation or defection, but wish their opinion to be taken in the same spirit as when they offer to lay down their lives for the sake of their King and Country. And then, Sir, I am to express the views of those poor zemindars and petty businessmen whom I have also the honour to represent.

First of all, Sir, I have to thank the Honourable the Finance Member for the grant he has made for rural reconstruction, which to my mind is the best part of the present Finance Bill. It is a fact that the welfare of India depends upon the welfare of her rural population. It is these poor people who are largely responsible for contributing so much to the revenues of the Government and to the progress of commerce and improvement of towns. But, unfortunately, Government have been treating them as a step-child, and that treatment has given them a certain amount of anxiety and uneasiness. The provision made in the Finance Bill for rural reconstruction should, therefore, deserve every commendation from every well-wisher of the country, and upon this, I, on behalf of my constituency, offer my sincere congratulations to the Honourable the Finance Member and this House You will excuse me, Sir, if I say that this grant does not mean the whole solution of the rural problem but that it is the first step in this direction. It is now up to us to see that this grant in each Province is spent exactly for the purpose for which it has been sanctioned.

Fortunately, for the Punjab, the work of rural uplift has been going on very honestly and efficiently for a considerable period under the able guidance of Mr. Brayne, and the value of this work has been acknowledged even by Mahatma Gandhi. It is our good fortune that at present we have a Governor in the Punjab who has given it further impetus and whose solicitude for the rural masses is indisputable. It is expected that the rural policy of Government would further gain in strength at the hands of the Punjab's new and popular Revenue Member. But for deriving the full benefit from the rural grant, and in order to enable one Province to benefit by the experience of the other, it would be just as well for the Government to appoint an all-India Advisory Board to advise how best to spend the grant; and I would be glad if Mahatma Gandhi were to be the chairman of this Board and Mr Brayne its secretary, so that for once all narrow-minded persons and those prone to create trouble can see for themselves that both Government and the Congress are prepared to work wholeheartedly, with any other agency, for the good of the country and do not consider it patriotic to waste their time in finding fault with each other or meeting the unfair criticism levelled against them by interested bodies.

Sir, the soldier classes in my constituency are glad that under the present Finance Bill the cut that operated against their pay will no longer continue. They are grateful for this to the Honourable the Finance Member and hope that the tax now existing on the income from one thousand rupees to two thousand would also go in the next Finance Bill.

Then, Sir, the Honourable the Finance Member will excuse me if I draw his attention, as respectfully and emphatically as I can, to another important matter which has been causing a good deal of distress to

[Sir Muhammad Mehr Shah.]

thousands of loyal and brave soldiers and their families in my locality. I am of course referring to the operations at the Khewra Salt Mines. My able friend, Mr. Piracha, only the other day, moved a Resolution in this House on the subject and many a voice was raised in the Council of State in support of his motion. But I regret to say that it was very cruelly turned down by the Honourable the Finance Member.

Sir, in this connection, I consider it my duty strongly to submit that the idea is gaining ground in the minds of the public, that Government only listen to the voice of the agitators and that no justice whatsoever is done to those who are truly loyal. I would, therefore, appeal to the Honourable the Finance Member to give this problem his further consideration and, with the advice of the Punjab Government, immediately appoint a committee consisting of officials from both the Punjab Government and the Government of India.

Then, Sir, I have particularly to draw the attention of this House to two other equally important questions on behalf of my constituency, and I am sorry for not being able to give full consideration to the present Finance Bill. The first one relates to the reduction of duty on imported wheat. It would tend to a further fall in price and add to the distress of the zemindar classes who naturally suffer by reason of the prices of foodstuff going down. It is the duty of the Government to give this question a further thought as early as possible. Then there is the question of the price of postcards which, notwithstanding repeated assurances on the subject in this House, has not been reduced to two pice each. This means that that poor element of the population which forms the backbone of the country would, as before, continue to be deprived of the facility that goes with cheaper means of correspondence. I have no doubt that with the reduction of the price of the postcard the demand for it would automatically go up, and I would, therefore, request that the matter be given further consideration during the course of the year.

Now, Sir, I would just speak of two other matters They are Law and Order and Trade and Agriculture, and it is with these subjects that the Finance Bill has largely to deal. If peace reigns in the country the expenditure on Law and Order would be less, and the improvement in agricultural and trade conditions would yield larger revenues. To bring about this consummation both Government and Congress should take a step forward together, and, in so far as the interest of this country is concerned, there is in this nothing below the dignity of one or the other. Therefore, through you, Sir, I would appeal to the Congress to realise that His Majesty the King-Emperor has always had a great affection for India, and that his person is above all politics. Let them, for that reason, sincerely join the Silver Jubilee celebrations and help to create that atmosphere which would just be in keeping with India's best traditions and interests. Let them prove, by their action, that they are a band of large-hearted patriots who would gladly add a feather in their cap by taking a step in this direction Let no personal pique or personal differences stand in their way. I would at the same time as strongly appeal to Government and say that the person of His Majesty the King-Emperor is above everything else. If, on the auspicious occasion of the Silver Jubilee, they come forward carrying an expression of goodwill and sympathy the coming generations would judge their move not as a weakness but as a great and glorious act on their part.

Then, Sir, if we fail to check the growing unemployment among our educated classes the surplus shown in the Finance Bill would be no more than a mere paper transaction. There is, therefore, every need for tackling this difficult problem.

Sir, before I conclude my speech, I deem it my duty to thank His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief who, in the Council of State, the other day, in connection with the recruitment of Sayyads, declared that there were no restrictions to their recruitment as such in the army. With these words, Sir, I support the Finance Bill.

Sir Darcy Lindsay (Bengal: European). Sir, the alarming onslaught made on the customs revenue by my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, makes me wonder whether he was really in earnest in proposing that the imports should be practically reduced to nothing. He failed to respond to the numerous calls from my Honourable friend, Mr. James, as to what he proposes to do with exports. As we all know, if any country is to survive, it must have a more or less equal balance of export and import. I noticed my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, sitting up and taking notes, and I have no doubt he will effectively deal with some of the arguments put forward by my Honourable friend.

There is just one point on which I should like to make a reference, and that is with regard to cigarettes My Honourable friend approved of smoking cigarettes, but he strongly disapproved of the import of cigarettes. Well, Sir, the import of cigarettes is very small indeed. But there is a considerable import of leaf tobacco to be manufactured in this country into cigarettes. The reason for that is that at present the country does not grow a sufficient quantity of the right kind of leaf for making up into cigarettes. I have no doubt that when the production increases, that is, the cultivation of the leaf increases, we shall see a considerable falling off in the imports. (Hear, hear.)

Now, Sir, there is one matter that I would like to refer to, and that is the general desire of all parts of the House for retrenchment. I remember in the old days when we had the Inchcape Committee, the wonderful work they did, and, in fact, their report became almost a sacred book to many Members of the then Assembly and subsequent Assemblies. We have had departmental Committees, we have had the Lee Enquiry Commission, in a diverse form, and here I would like to suggest to the Honourable the Finance Member that a Committee be appointed with power to examine and report on the incidence of taxation, and, at the same time, make a clear examination into the present day cost of living as compared with ten years ago. To my mind, that is a very important point to take into consideration. We hear, on all sides, that the cost of living has gone down, but we do not hear of the same reduction in the expenditure and in the salary list. I observe, that in reply to a question in another place, the Government stated that "it had been decided to postpone the further consideration of the question of scales of pay of future entrants to the Indian Civil Service and the Indian Police Service until after the passing of the Constitution Act". Well, Sir, there are very divided opinions on the wisdom of waiting for so long. Talking of retrenchment, it occurs to me that it might be well to practise what we preach and possibly offer up suggestions as regards a reduction in our allowances. We could, however, in a way economise both in speech and in supplementary questions. I wonder whether we

[Sir Darcy Lindsay.]

realise that the cost to the country of the elected Members of this Assembly comes to at least Rs. 2,000 per day, and taking the debate on the Finance Bill, as an example, I have worked out that each of our speeches costs Rs. 200 and some of them a good deal more.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): But the speech of the Honourable the Finance Member costs us 154 crores!

Sir Darcy Lindsay: Then, Sir, some money has been given for broadcasting. I welcome that, as India must not lag behind other countries. But I am somewhat dubious as to the wisdom of erecting a powerful station in this City at a considerable cost, I think it was 3 lakhs 45 thousand and a recurring charge of 176 lakhs

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce (Member for Industries and Labour): Not quite as expensive as that. It is one lakh and 76 thousand.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: I intended to have said one lakh and 76 thousand. This station, although the plant will be very powerful, yet it is anticipated that it will only be able to operate effectively within a radius up to 200 miles. That, to my mind, is very insufficient, and I should like to have seen the station available for the whole of India. I would much sooner have seen a considerable expansion in village broadcasting. (Hear, hear.) The Bengal Government, to my knowledge, and I saw the plant operating, have experimented in three villages, with quite a small plant, a receiving set and a battery and a loud speaker at a cost, I believe, of about Rs 700. The receiver receives the news from the broadcasting station in Calcutta and the result is most satisfactory and thoroughly enjoyed by all the people. We could hear the loud speaker at a distance of, I should say, at least 1,500 yards. I would like to see that principle carried out throughout India, and I suggest to the Central Government that they should assist the provinces in the purchase of these outfits and let the provinces look after their maintenance.

Some years ago, at my suggestion, the Department of Education, Health and Lands made an inquiry as to the existence of mineral springs throughout India. I had the idea that India should be self-contained in that respect and have its own spa. Why should we go to Europe to be cured when we have the waters here available? I have a list of springs with me still, and I was going through it only the other day; I find that the waters of a place called Pir Shah,—I believe it is at a station called Spintangi on the Quetta-Sibi line,—are very suitable for the purpose. They contain 3·1 Mache units of radium which is considerably more than is contained in the waters of Carlsbad and Badnauheim and other places on the continent of Europe. If the Railway Board were to look into this matter, they might find it a paying proposition to build a pump house and baths and private enterprise would produce hotels and hostels and other conveniences; what is now a non-paying strategic railway might become a real good paying concern. Anyhow I do plead that India, if possible, should have her own watering Spa.

In regard to the desire expressed by some Members that Government should start industries, I am not at all in favour of this. To be successful in manufacture, it is necessary to secure expert knowledge in addition to a business training which, with all due deference, I do not con-

sider, is to be found amongst officials. It is perfectly true that Government could import experts to look after these industries, but the expert very soon becomes inoculated with the Government serum. Another point of vital interest is that the success of such undertakings is the responsibility to the shareholders. I understood from my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, that Government on behalf of the nation would be the shareholders. That, again, I do not think would be a likely proposition. Leave industrial expansion to private enterprise where the enterprise and energy of individuals and continuity of service is what an industry really requires to be successful. The advent of Government into the industrial field, as we know, has been apt to spell ruin. I give for example the coal industry There is also likely to be a lavish expenditure of public money as has been the case in connection with the Peninsular Works at Tatanagar. They were originally built as a locomotive works and were taken over by Government at a high figure. Government did not, however, continue with the scheme of building locomotives. They scrapped the machinery or passed it on to some of the railway workshops. They put in a very expensive plant for making wagons and underframes competing with concerns that were already working in the country. I would, however, be all in favour of the judicious use of Government money to assist small private industrial enterprises that show prospects of success, but are handicapped for want of capital. I understand that the Punjab Government have quite recently tabled a Bill having this object in view. It is only in recent years that young Indians have gone to Europe and the United States of America to study industry. They acquire a good knowledge, they come back to India and then the difficulty that arises is the want of money and the want of confidence in starting up industries. They do make a start, mostly with family money, but insufficient, and, for that reason the concern comes to grief. It is to assist genuine cases that I think Government might very well step in, either on a sharing basis or a low rate of interest. But to encourage these industries when the knowledge of the people is able to work them is the thing that is required. Frequent reference has been made to the term "exploitation" by the British in India, and this I venture to question. It may have been perfectly true in the old days of the East India Company when, according to records, we are told that men came out to India and shook the pagoda tree and received large profits thereby. But those days are long gone past. It is, however, true that the British have shown enterprise in the development of trade and industries, but the field has surely been opened to all. In certain instances, the capital has been raised in sterling in England, but shares were obtainable by any one at time of issue and are still obtainable in the open market. In the case of many companies, with rupee capital issued in India, a large proportion of shares are held by Indians, both as original shareholders and by subsequent purchase. Because the managing agents may be a European firm, it does not alter the fact that the company is frequently largely Indian-owned. It is common knowledge that many Indian shareholders readily apply for shares if the managing agents are a firm of sound reputation. I would point out that nothing has been said about the many failures and huge loss of money. I can refer to one instance in the Punjab where a company from England started to prospect for oil, and, after the expenditure of over a million and half, they retired, because they could not find the oil. There is one company working in the Punjab which has also spent a considerable amount of money in exploring for oil; it has found a

[Sir Darcy Lindsay.]

certain quantity of oil—not very much; and I only give this as an example of how money has been brought into the country for the development of the resources of the country and been lost. Personally, I would like to see industrial companies operating in India with rupee capital or at least a rupee share register to facilitate transfers when shares are held in India; and the corollary of this would be greater Indian representation on the Board. It is a regrettable fact that in India money is not always forthcoming in aiding industrial concerns, and, it is for that reason, money is sought from outside. I hope to see the day when industrial development will make rapid progress, assisted hand in hand by Indian and Britisher alike, and the effect would be far less talk of safeguards. In the course of a long experience in India, I have found friendship and good feeling in the knowledge that both sides are working for the welfare of India in the development of her national resources, and I am happy to think that this good feeling exists amongst the Members of the House, however bitter the speeches may at times appear to be. How very necessary we are to each other was brought home to me, only a few days ago, by a Member of this House who told me that he had to bring out from home a manager for his sugar factory to assist in the working of that factory.

Now, Sir, I think I have exhausted my Rs. 200 worth, and I hope that I have not offended any feelings. The views expressed are my own, and not as representing the Group. I thank you for the attention that you have given me.

Seth Sheodass Daga (Central Provinces Landholders): Sir,* it is a matter of no small pleasure to me that I have got a right to speak in my mother tongue and the national language of India. From this point of view, my unfamiliarity with English is a blessing to me When the Honourable the Home and the Finance Members, with all their stay for twenty years in India and with all the salt that they have eaten of India, are not familiar with Hindusthani, it is not perhaps a matter of any delinquency for me to be unfamiliar with English.

We are at present discussing the Finance Bill. Whatever may be the meaning in English of the word "Bill", "*bil*" means in Hindi a hole in the ground where rats, snakes and other reptiles make their homes. What harm is caused by these to agriculture and the zamindars and tenants, who depend on agriculture, is not hidden from any one. In order to save agriculture from rats, Government have started a scheme of rat destruction But the rats that are hidden in the Finance Bill are left unharmed by the Government. These rats also take away their earnings from the agriculturist against their will and cause a lot of harm to them. I will tell the Government that if they mean well of millions of persons residing in the villages, then they should start a process of injection to kill these rats also. These rats are not a bit behind their brothers, the real rats, in bringing about the "downfall", "slavery", "flattery" and "chicanery".

Owing to the peculiar policy of Government with respect to tax and expenditure, the villages of India, which were once famous all the world over, are today paupers and desolates. In those days, there existed in the villages a scheme of indigenous, cheap and wholesome education, and the villagers could manufacture every need of theirs and were not helplessly dependent

* English translation of the original speech delivered in the vernacular.

on others for anything. For instance, they used to maintain their health by cheap and efficacious Ayurvedic medicines. But, now, it has been replaced by useless and costly education where things like these are taught, *i.e.*, a cat has two ears and a dog has a tail. And Ayurveda has been replaced by English hospitals. By this, crores of rupees are possibly earned by English firms, but it serves no useful purpose to Mother India. This also serves the purpose of spreading the system of English medicines in the same way as was done with the Dacca muslin. Similarly, in the beginning, inducements were offered that free medicines and free doctors would be given, and that no fee would be charged for. And when, having fallen in this trap, Ayurveda became dead, money is now, demanded for every little thing. If you go and live in the hospital, then, too, money is needed both for medicines and doctors. Till now, there was no money required for operation cases. That too has now commenced. Now, as to family ward, it is built with the money raised by the public, and, for that too, rent is charged. I give an instance from my place as to how a family ward was built. From one gentleman Rs. 6,000 were taken and he was made a Rai Sahib and from his brother Rs. 11,000 are taken to build a family ward, and the condition is that he would be made a Rai Bahadur. The poor fellow had disappointment in June and January last, and now his hopes are centred in the Silver Jubilee. If these things be wrong, here is the Commissioner from Chhattisgarh.

This is from the Government which say that they are *Mâ* and *Bâp*, but they cannot protect even our health without money. May I ask from the Finance Member if he would ask for money for the recovery of the health of his son from one whom he really considers as his own son.

Sir, in the present Finance Bill, no relief is given to the zamindars, malguzars and other persons depending on land, and they are the persons who are hit the hardest. When in America the Government are helping their villagers by spending crores of rupees, we are greatly aggrieved and surprised to see the indifference of the Finance Member. Being the representative of landholders, I can say that the policy of the Government with respect to taxation and expenditure is making the villagers poorer and poorer every day. They are made to suffer heavy losses by violation of their rights. Are not Government aware that in Chhattisgarh the burden of land tax and irrigation dues are very much felt by the agriculturists? It is predominantly a rice tract. Owing to their inability to pay taxes and to maintain themselves, lakhs of people of Chhattisgarh have left their hearths and homes for Calcutta, Kharagpur, Kalimati and the Empress Mill of Nagpur. If it is not known to the Government, the Honourable Mr. Drake, who is the Commissioner of Chhattisgarh and who is occupying a back bench, may intimate them. I tell my own experience of irrigation—I have got a village, the land revenue of which is Rs. 900, and, for irrigation, over only 300 acres of land there, we have to pay about Rs. 1,000 per year. In about 20 years, we have paid about Rs. 15,000, and still we are helpless supplicants for water. If in that village Rs. 5,000 only had been spent on tanks—even if it had been raised as a loan—then the whole money would have been repaid and there would have been no trouble of water for 50 years. Tax is, of course, taken. And now let me narrate to you, to what extent the Government think about the welfare of the agriculturists. The inlets of the village irrigation tanks are stopped by building irrigation channels over them, so that no water may go to the tanks and they may be required to take

[Seth Sheodass Daga.]

irrigation water out of helplessness. Last year, there was so much oppression that even though there was excess of rain and the fields were being breached owing to excessive rain, on the report of the *Amin*, a *Sahib* came and Rs. 6 per acre was charged From these irrigation works no gain has been derived by our agriculturists, but English engineers got big salary and English firms got a lot of money as price for their various machines

Oppressed by poverty, the women of cultivators, zamindars and malguzars are forced to sell their ornaments which they hold dearer than lives in order to pay the rent and land revenue recoverable by warrants. Thus, approximately, sixty crores worth of gold goes out of India year by year. This Bill does nothing to prevent this flow of gold from India to places far across the seas

It is with a sense of pride that the Finance Member has announced the allotment of a crore of rupees for rural uplift, but we, on this side, know that today Government have thought of spending a crore of rupees. The reasons for this are well known and have been referred to in this House several times. Even if we suppose for a moment that Government have a *bonâ fide* intention of uplifting the rural areas (which in our opinion is not the fact), yet let us ponder over the fact as to how lofty is the idea in allotting one crore of rupees over seven lakhs of villages, that is to say, fourteen rupees per village. In fact, the uplift will be of those officers who will get salary and travelling allowance in the employment. I want to tell the Government that if they have genuine sympathy for the cultivators and if they want to improve their lot, they can very well do so even without incurring any expenditure, at least in Chhattisgarh, and the cultivators can also be benefited. I will ask the Finance Member to take a sheet of paper and pen and ink in hand and issue orders for the closing down of all the rice, flour and oil mills in Chhattisgarh In that case, the cultivators will again take to this work that they were doing before and they will get not only remuneration for the work and save their own money, but will also improve in health, since the machine rice and flour affect adversely the health of the people and they are not as beneficial to health as those made with hand under the old system I trust all the Doctors here will bear me out. Dr Khare has even published his views in the papers. The others will also give their opinion. Here we will have both village uplift and health uplift together and the money will also be saved We have a saying "*harra lage na fitkari rang chokha*" Here alone is the *bona fide* of the Government tested.

If the Government really want that the villagers should be benefited, then it should abolish the salt tax, reduce the price of postcard to one pice and that of the envelope to two pice, maintain the duty on hide and levy an export duty on gold and pay off the debt of the Malguzars and tenants and thus show its *bonâ fide*.

The Government's income-tax policy is also very harmful. It is nothing but oppression to tax incomes from one to two thousands. Looking to the expenses incurred in realising the tax and the harassment and sufferings that the poor have to undergo at the hands of the income-tax officials, the tax can in no way be called equitable. Every one is harassed by the income-tax laws and the treatment by their officers. There is a lot of dissatisfaction among the public over the treatment meted out, and the

powers exercised by the income-tax officers, and unless these are reformed, the public cannot be convinced of the honesty of the Government.

In our sacred books, the policy underlying taxation is described, and, if it is acted on, it would benefit and enrich the public. Kautilya says that taxes should be realised in the same way as the gardener plucks ripe fruit from the trees, so that the trees do not suffer. The other example is that of bees who collect honey from flowers and store it for the use of others. Similarly, the Government should, by taxing in a way that there is no harassment to the public, spend it for the benefit of the public. If the Government follow these precepts, they would, to some extent, be able to fulfil their duty. But it is useless to expect this from the present Government. So long the public has not the strength to compel the Government, the Government will not follow the right course.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh (Chota Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I was glad to hear two speeches in the vernacular, but I was sorry to find that the Government Members, especially those who have come from abroad, have not been able to understand those speeches. (Laughter.) Sir, our friends have referred to the doings of the British people in this country. Let me first of all begin with what our friends, I mean, the British officers are doing in this very Assembly. Look at the constitution of the Assembly first. On one side you find the representatives of a mighty organization, which is certainly unlawful, and on the other side you see the representatives of the people who are struggling for freedom. Sir, the Government today is going on with a dual policy of reconciliation and repression, reconciliation in words and repression in full swing. The representatives of the people have been personally so much oppressed by the Government, that their hearts are full of venom for this Government, and whenever they get an opportunity to speak in the House, they forget the real subject matter and they begin to talk of oppression because the venom in their heart naturally comes out first.

Sir, coming now to the Finance Bill, the principles of taxation must be borne in mind, but they are completely forgotten by the Finance Member. I would ask him to learn a lesson from the ancient methods of taxation. In ancient times the King was regarded as beneficent as the sun in the sky. The sun takes water by evaporation from places where water is collected in volumes,—the sun does not take water from the hills and mountains, but when the rain comes, and when the question of distribution comes, the sun distributes the water by process of rain all over the mountains and hills and all places in an equal order. . . . . .

(It being Four of the Clock.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order order. The Honourable Member may resume his speech tomorrow.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

FIRING AT KARACHI.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Before calling upon Mr. Gauba to move his motion, the Chair wishes to remind all Honourable Members that under the rules every speech on a motion for adjournment is strictly limited to fifteen minutes.

Mr. K. L. Gauba (East Central Punjab: Muhammadan): Mr. President, I move:

"That the House do now adjourn."

Sir, I realise the seriousness of the occasion and the shadow of the great tragedy under which we meet this afternoon. Listening the other day to a very eloquent speech of the Honourable the Home Member, one heard him speak with great emotion and feeling about the innocent relatives of the persons who had been ruthlessly shot down by terrorists and the revolutionaries and, I trust, Sir, that when he speaks today of the victims of the Karachi firing, when he speaks of the relatives of the victims of the Karachi firing,—not a few, possibly hundreds,—he will be moved with the same feelings of humanity and indignation that he expressed on the last occasion.

Mr. President, I do not propose in this debate to raise any communal issues. I realise that there are two definite opinions upon the act of Abdul Qaiyum, opinions which can never be reconciled. For my part, I fully understand and I fully respect the opinion that is held by those who are not of our way of thinking. But all we would say is this,—just as we understand and respect your opinion, if you cannot understand our particular point of view, at least you might give it respect. I do not propose to justify, in the slightest manner, the act for which Abdul Qaiyum has paid the penalty of the law. For the sake of the debate, for the sake of argument, we will assume that he was rightly convicted; that he was rightly convicted under the law; that he was executed under the due process and in due course of the law. We do not grumble with that today. But, Sir, the question before the House is different. The question is whether the execution was carried out, by the executive, in a manner and in circumstances that could not possibly have avoided the terrible tragedy which Karachi witnessed last Tuesday. We know that Government was not unaware of the grave situation in Karachi. I am not justifying that grave situation, I am not saying that it was logical or right. All I say is that there was a grave situation in Karachi, a grave situation that had not arisen suddenly. From the information in the papers, and, I have no doubt from the information of the Government from more sources than one, the situation in Karachi was grave since the first or second of March, and, Government knew full well that when Abdul Qaiyum would be executed there would be persons, who would want to take his body in procession through the town They knew that there would be a certain measure of popular demonstration—I am not justifying it now. There have been similar occasions which Government has handled, which popular leaders have handled before, and handled successfully. There was a case in the Punjab in which a man was executed for a similar offence, a procession was taken out, a procession of fifty thousand, and it passed off quietly and peacefully. I have received a telegram today from Karachi and it states that there was an understanding, between the local authorities and the leaders of the people at Karachi, that the leaders would be taken into the confidence of the Government as to the day and the place of execution, and that the co-operation of the leaders could be sought when the funeral rites of this man were to be performed.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi (Dacca *cum* Mymensingh: Muhammadan Rural): Where is the telegram? Read it.

Mr. K. L. Gauba: Did the Government carry out this undertaking? Even if there was no undertaking, I submit that the first duty of the Government, on an occasion of this kind, is to take the popular leaders into their confidence. And, Sir, I submit that on every occasion where the popular leaders have been taken into confidence there has absolutely been no trouble. It is only when you mistrust the people; it is only then that you ask for trouble and you get trouble. (Applause.)

Mr. President, what the Government have to prove to this House is twofold: Firstly, that the firing was inevitable and that it was absolutely necessary and it could not have been avoided; secondly, that only such force was used as was absolutely necessary and no more than necessary. I think the Honourable the Home Member will find it very difficult to establish the first proposition, namely, that force was necessary. After all, it is not the exact circumstances of the moment that matter; it is the events, and the general situation surrounding the particular occurrence; and he will have to justify that the situation was such that force could not have been avoided; and that within a day or two days previous the local authorities had taken all steps possible to prevent a crowd of twenty thousand—or one hundred thousand according to different reports—whatever was the crowd—from collecting and moving towards the city; that they did everything possible from the start of that crowd to the very end; and that in the last resort they had to utilise force. That is the case which the House will expect to be proved by the Honourable the Home Member. It is no good his saying that at the last minute the crowd would be entering the city walls, and, in the city, there might be looting and things of that kind, and, therefore, we brought our troops and fired at the last moment when we could not control the crowd. He will have to show to the House that the local authorities did their best to prevent that crowd from assembling, that, in the last resort, they gave due warning; that they gave the necessary information to the crowd and the time to disperse and the opportunity to disperse, and that those steps having failed, they had to resort to firing; and they fired no more than was absolutely necessary. From the reports in the newspapers it is perfectly plain that neither of these facts and circumstances can be proved. I do not know whether the Honourable the Home Member has got any special information to disprove my statement, but, from the reports of the newspapers, I say, that the allegation that the crowd was going to loot is only adding insult to injury. After all whom would the crowd loot? Whom were they annoyed with? They were not annoyed with the Hindus. They were annoyed with the persons who had executed Abdul Qaiyum—rightly or wrongly,—they would be annoyed with the authorities, who had turned down every petition for mercy. They had no annoyance with the Hindus; and why should they go and loot the Hindu shops? After this event, if any real sympathy or support has come it has come from the Hindus of Karachi. (Hear, hear.) They have attended to the wounded, and I can say with gratitude as a Muslim, that right through this sad episode, the Muslims have had the sympathy of the Hindus. So far as I know, I am not aware of any Hindu who asked for the life of Abdul Qaiyum in return for the life of Nathu Ram. So far as I know, no Hindu has ever done that; and, Sir, I can pay tribute to a distinguished Hindu on the floor of this House and that is the Leader of the Opposition. He was prepared to join in a petition for mercy, in order that this man's life may be spared. (Applause.) I say that this thing that the crowd would have gone and looted the Hindu quarter is adding insult to injury.

[Mr. K. L. Gauba.]

Mr. President, I do not know what attitude the Honourable the Home Member is going to take. Certain Members of this House would be prepared to consider the question, whether the Government is ready over this issue to face a commission of inquiry. After all it is no good here making a statement and trying to justify this act in which 35 to 40 persons have lost their lives and about 100 persons have been injured. After all, if the acts of the local officials were such that they can be justified, let them face a commission of inquiry Any honest, any straightforward Government will not shirk that inquiry; and, Sir, I submit, to the Honourable Members opposite, that they should take this opportunity of saying that they are ready to face a commission of inquiry. I have only to add this thing, namely, that so far as the innocent sufferers of this tragedy are concerned, they were not Abdul Qaiyums or Nathu Rams, they were harmless persons of Karachi, perfectly innocent. So far as the injured are concerned and their relatives are concerned, Government should pay compensation, as it has done on similar occasions. Lastly I would insist from the Muslim and the public point of view that if any official has been found to have bungled this situation, he should pay the penalty of his fault, irrespective of his position. With these words, Sir, I move my motion

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That the House do now adjourn"

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): It is really very deplorable, Sir, that so many valuable lives should have been lost under such tragic circumstances. My heart goes in sympathy to the victims of the firing and to the bereaved members of their families Sir, during the last decade, the country has witnessed several such murders of which Abdul Qaiyum was guilty. The country would be much better off if this murder were the last of its kind. We, in this House, have a clear duty to perform and that is to take stock of the situation as a whole and try to uphold ways by which repetition of such crimes is effectively stopped. Sir, the subject of this evening's debate is a very delicate one. In order to appreciate it fully, one has to consider the back ground of the picture.

[At this stage, Mr President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) vacated the Chair, which was then occupied by Mr Deputy President (Mr Akhil Chandra Datta).]

There are two facts requiring serious considerations, namely, that the murder was committed in an open Court where the appeal of the murdered man was being heard: and, secondly, that during the course of the trial, the defence counsel tried to justify the murder when he asked a Muslim witness in cross-examination that such murders are justifiable under Muhammadan law. It is clear to me that the penal laws of this country are embodied in the Indian Penal Code. To seek support of the Muslim law of another country to justify the murder of an otherwise innocent person is a thing unheard of in previous years. Again, the position is further complicated when, later on, after the law had pronounced its verdict upon the murderer, sympathy was shown in quarters where he should have least expected it. Here, I charge the Executive Government as well for having consented to receive a deputation of some Honourable Members of this House interceding on behalf of the murderer.

Why should the Executive have encouraged such an action? What were the grounds which persuaded the Executive to agree to receive such a deputation? (Interruption.) If my Honourable friend will take the trouble of looking up the newspapers, he will find that the Sikhs never waited on the Executive Government and asked for mercy for Bhagat Singh. They did not.

Coming to the incident of firing itself, Sir, when the execution had taken place, the Executive could not take better precautions than to take the body to a distance—I speak subject to correction—of about three miles from the city and bury it quietly. Well, Sir, what were the reasons which led the mob from Karachi town to that far-off distance, to exhume the body and take it in procession to the city? Are the Government going to be censured on this account, as to why the authorities quietly, without making any fuss about it, buried the body at a great distance from the city? Certainly not, Sir. When the authorities found a mob going there and coming back with the body exhumed from the graveyard, what is the duty of the Executive in order to keep peace and order? I know some gentlemen will be surprised really at my attitude. I know they would be. Sir, it is the first time I have to defend the Executive. (*Voices*: "Oh, oh"!) Sir, my reasons for doing so are very obvious. I cannot ignore the previous experience of such matters where the inactivity or non-activity of the Executive had led to many disastrous results. While speaking, in this connection, my Honourable friend, Mr. Gauba, asked—why were not the popular leaders of Karachi taken into confidence?—and he said that if they had been taken into confidence, some understanding would have been arrived at and the results would have been different from what they unfortunately were. I may remind my Honourable friend of the incidents of 1927—of what occurred in Delhi when the murderer of Swami Shraddhanand was executed. Were not the leaders of the community taken in confidence? Is it or is it not a fact that an undertaking was given by the leaders that they would bury the dead body in the graveyard opposite to the jail. Was that undertaking kept? Did not a communal riot also take place afterwards? What have they got to say? (*Voices*: "When"?) If only we take up the files of newspapers of 1927, we can see what happened in Delhi. The lesson to be learnt from such incidents is that such situations do require and call for a strong attitude.

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur (South Madras: Muhammadan): On a point of information, Sir. Will my friend, Sardar Sant Singh, prove that there was an undertaking between the leaders of the Muslim community and the Government to the effect that Abdul Rashid's body would be buried in the jail and would not be taken in procession? Will he reproduce any such undertaking?

Sardar Sant Singh: My Honourable friend has asked me to prove this undertaking, and, of course, nobody expects me to do so within the limits of the fifteen minutes at my disposal. I will only refer my friend and ask him to look up the writings in the press of those days.

Several Honourable Members: There was no such thing.

Sardar Sant Singh: I refuse to give way. Then, again, Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. Gauba, has argued that no annoyance could have been

[Sardar Sant Singh.]

caused to Hindus. Again I would ask my Honourable friend this question—is it not a fact that after the execution of Abdul Rashid was carried out by the Executive Government, the property of the Hindus was looted in the Delhi City?

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon (Sind: Muhammadan Rural): When?

Sardar Sant Singh: In 1927.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Where?

Sardar Sant Singh: At Delhi

An Honourable Member: I think you are mistaken. No looting took place.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik (Home Member): It was in November, 1927. There was looting.

Sardar Sant Singh: So this argument of my learned friend, Mr. Gauba, that there was no injury to be feared by other communities by this mob demonstration does not hold water at all. Furthermore, Sir, what I want the House to take into consideration at this stage is that, in such cases, similar things have occurred, similar was the attitude adopted by the Executive; and here I may, with your permission, refer to the case of Bhagat Singh—to which my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, has drawn attention. There, the dead body was not given even to the relatives; the body was taken, at dead of night, to some distance twenty or twenty-five miles. (*Interruption by* Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi). I will hear you afterwards. It was taken away there. Why, Sir, should it be claimed in this case that the body should have been handed to persons who were not the relatives of the executed person? In this case, I understand that the body was actually handed over to the relatives, who agreed to the burial and who went with the dead body to the place of burial. It was after the burial that the relatives went to the city and the mob came. My submission is, Sir, that the background of the whole picture is very tragic. Are we, or are we not, going to stop these things in future? Are we going to be a party to such fanatical murders? The reply to this question is the right reply to the further question whether the Government—and it may be the Government of anybody, it may be the Government of Mr. Satyamurti or of Mr. Pant or it may be anybody's Government—the question is—are we going to submit to such things?

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Which things?

Sardar Sant Singh: That there should be intercession on behalf of a fanatic who murders another.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: He has been executed.

Sardar Sant Singh: Will you receive a deputation of responsible persons asking you to commute the death sentence?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: If it is for "mercy"—always.

An Honourable Member: Why not?

Sardar Sant Singh: But

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: On a point of personal explanation, Sir, I would like to inform the House that what happened was this, that I had a personal letter from my Honourable friend, the Mover of this motion, asking me if I would receive half a dozen Members of this Assembly, all of whom, I think, I can claim as my personal friends, in connection with this matter. I said to him: "I do not think it will do any good". He said: "Anyhow, he would like to come and speak a word". I said, "In that case, I agree". I could not have done otherwise without grave personal discourtesy to my friends. I would do exactly the same to any other Member—and I repeatedly have—who asked to be allowed to see me with his friends on any matter in which he was interested. (Hear, hear.)

Sardar Sant Singh: I am glad the situation has been cleared up a great deal by the Honourable the Home Member, but still I hold, as a matter of principle, that he should have foreseen the results and the encouragement which the conversations would give to the outside world. (Interruptions.)

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It gave no result, and it gave no encouragement.

Sardar Sant Singh: I proceed further. Now, let us come to the actual firing that took place. So far, not a word has been said by the Honourable the Mover of this motion to show that the firing was excessive, or that proper precautions were not observed. We should have expected the Honourable the Mover, if he wanted the vote of this side of the House, to tell us in what way the firing was excessive. Without his doing that, certainly we cannot be a party to a censure motion unless it is definitely proved that the firing was excessive. Lastly, Sir, I would ask one simple question. How is it that out of many gentlemen, who are the elected representatives from the Bombay Presidency, not one single person among them has given a notice of this motion?

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Why? I have sent in my notice, Sir.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq (Bakargunj *cum* Faridpur: Muhammadan Rural): I have given one notice, Sir.

Sardar Sant Singh: I did not hear of them; only one was read by the Honourable the President, and I go by that. (Interruptions.) However, that is not the point. The position is this, that on such occasions, we have to take into consideration the fact that such murders are to be discouraged in the interest of humanity, in the interest of religion, and in the interests of all concerned.

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah (Sind Jagirdars and Zamindars: Landholders): Sir, I do not want to join in the communal wrangle that

[Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah.]

has been started, and I would make an appeal to the Honourable Members of this House not to treat this question as a communal question. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I support this motion on quite different grounds. The reports I have read prove that there has been indiscriminate firing (Hear, hear.) The very fact, Sir, that three small children have been seriously injured . . .

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: One—I think.

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah: and two of them have died, according to the report . . . . .

An Honourable Member: No One of them was injured

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah: I am speaking from the press report Sir, the facts as stated are that the mob was rushing towards the soldiers who had bayonets It is inconceivable that small children could be in front of a rushing mob of 25,000 people Besides, when small children see soldiers with bayonets, I am afraid they will run away, instead of remaining there My contention, therefore, is that there has been indiscriminate firing; children might have been standing in some corner, and they were shot My contention is further strengthened by the very fact that 47 rounds were fired Now, Sir, what is the number of casualties? 35 have been killed, 67 seriously injured and 33 received small injuries. If there were only 47 rounds fired, so many casualties could not have occurred Therefore, there has been more firing, and that goes to support my contention that there has been indiscriminate firing. Sir, it is also further admitted that when the firing commenced, the mob dispersed. Was it not in the fitness of things that, when the order for firing was given, they should have fired only a few rounds—say three or four—and I am sure the mob would have dispersed The firing of these few rounds would have had the same effect as these 47 rounds. If the mob had persisted after they had fired four or five rounds and did not disperse, then they might have been justified in more firing. But they started, as the newspapers say, with 47 rounds What I am sorry to see is that, if they had acted carefully and cautiously, so many valuable lives would not have been lost. Therefore, it is necessary that the Government should take action against those who are responsible for this indiscriminate firing

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Sir, I wish to intervene at an early stage in this debate, because, from the remarks that fell from my Honourable friend, Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah, it is evident that there is a good deal of misapprehension as to the facts of this very deplorable occurrence. Now, Sir, I entirely sympathise with the feelings that have led my Honourable friend to move this motion. I realise how deeply he feels the tragedy of this occurrence and how natural it is that he should wish it to be discussed at the first possible moment. At the same time, I cannot help feeling that it would have been better if the debate could have been taken at a slightly later date when we should all have been in possession of a more complete picture than we are now of the occurrences of last Tuesday and when we should have been able, I think, to form a calmer and more dispassionate judgment as to the responsibility for what has so unfortunately occurred.

Before I give the House the information that is in my possession,—I admit that it is not as complete as I should have liked it to be and that it supplements only to some extent what has been published in the press—I should like to make one preliminary observation about the Honourable the Mover's remarks. He implied that the local authorities had made a very grave mistake in not taking the leaders of local opinion into their confidence. Now, Sir, I do not know on what he based that assertion? I have no information one way or the other.

Maulana Shaukat Ali (Cities of the United Provinces: Muhammadan Urban): He got a telegram from Mr. Abdul Majid and Mr. Hatam Ali, who are both responsible Muslim leaders. I saw the telegram myself.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Well, people are inclined to think that they are the only responsible leaders in the place when, as a matter of fact, the authorities may be dealing with others. I know that the arrangements for the funeral were made with the consent of Abdul Qaiyum's relatives, that the body was handed over to his relatives with their consent and that it was against their wishes and only by using force to them that it was taken away from them It was forcibly disinterred from its grave, an act of desecration which, I think, will shock everyone and it was carried off in triumph towards the city. Such information as I have consists of three telegrams from the District Magistrate. One of them is dated the 19th, the day of the occurrence, and it really adds very little to what has been published in the press. But it does say that the crowd had swept over the graveyard and disinterred the body. They were roughly 20,000 or more strong and about half of that number, that is 10,000 or more, carried the body off in triumph towards the city. The police were overpowered at that point and had to abandon their ground on the graveyard. The firing by the military took place as the last resource The number of men who fired was then given as 25 and the number of rounds at 47 in all. My Honourable friend spoke as if he meant that each man had fired 47 rounds. Each man fired less than two rounds as only 47 rounds in all were fired. The casualties were heavy owing to the density of the crowd and the closeness of the range.

Then, on the next day—that is yesterday,—I received a sort of time-table of the riots. Abdul Qaiyum was executed at 4 A.M., and, at 5-50, his body was sent to the cemetery, two miles outside the city. At 8 A.M., after the proper rites had been performed, it was placed in the grave. At 8-30, the filling of the grave was obstructed by an enormous crowd of Mussalmans inflamed by communal feeling, and the police had to be withdrawn from what became an indefensible position. At 9-45 military aid was invoked to prevent the rumoured parade of the body through the city. Without the knowledge of the district authorities, the body was suddenly removed from the grave, against the relatives' wishes, and carried towards the city for parade. At 12-15, a frenzied crowd, about 10,000 strong, using lathis and stones, was met at Chakiwarra cross-roads on the outskirts of the city by a party of 50 police, 40 of whom were unarmed, and 50 men of the Royal Sussex Regiment, accompanied by the District Magistrate. The police were overwhelmed and the soldiers had to fire to stop the crowd and in order to save their own lives. The number of casualties was due to the soldiers being obliged to fire from the closest range and to the density of the mob. The minimum amount of force necessary was used in a situation that endangered the whole city. If the rioters had broken

[Sir Henry Craik.]

through the cordon, reinforcements from the unruly elements inside the city would have involved widespread looting and attacks on the Hindu population and general chaos. The casualties—and this is the latest figure I have—were 35 dead, 67 major and 33 minor injuries. Immediately arrangements were made for the removal of the casualties to the civil hospital, but their initial removal was hindered by crowds stoning the lorry drivers. Everything possible was done for the wounded. The body of Abdul Qaiyum was re-interred by a section of the crowd, in the original place, at 3 P.M. City life was returning to normal.

This message was supplemented by another telegram despatched and received today at about mid-day. This is also a telegram from the District Magistrate:

"The rioters had no intention of burying the body inside the City The sole object of the parade was to inflame feeling against the Hindus. A roaring crowd stoned the car containing two Honorary Magistrates, a few minutes before encountering defensive arrangements. The defence organisation was the police in front, then one platoon of the military with one platoon as a rear-guard a hundred yards behind where a large hostile local crowd subsequently formed up. The front line of the military and the police and the District and City Magistrates were stoned at sight from in front and from the flanks simultaneously The police made no stand and broke immediately back through the soldiers. Therefore, the rush of the crowd came right on to the soldiers and one rioter actually siezed a soldier's rifle The soldiers fired just in time to save themselves from being overwhelmed. The crowd was savage, violent and out for wholesale destruction."

This, again, is supplemented by certain information which has been obtained by the General Staff from the Local Staff Officers, which makes it clear that when the troops arrived on the scene, the mob was surging down a street called Chaudhuri, at the end of the tram-line on the South River road. Three magistrates tried to stop the crowd, but were stoned. The police broke and ran through the troops who had been called up at the double The troops charged with the bayonet and the mob recoiled about fifty yards, but continued to throw stones at the police and the troops from alleys and houses. I understand there were no bayonet casualties, because the mob recoiled as the troops advanced. The troops then hoped that it was all over, but the mob continued to throw stones on the police and the troops from alleys and houses and gradually, the mob, which at this time was estimated at 10,000 or even more, formed up again opposite to the troops. After a momentary delay the mob came running forward again, shouting and throwing stones and one man was ordered to pick off the ring-leader as the last hope of stopping them. That was strictly in accordance with the military instructions for these occasions. One round only was fired for this purpose. This, however, failed to stop the mob who came on at the run, and the situation was then so serious that in self-defence and to avoid being overwhelmed the platoon opened fire. The mob then halted and the officer in command immediately gave orders to cease fire A total of 47 rounds were fired by some thirty men. When the firing actually occurred, the mob were right on top of the troops, being only a few yards distant, which accounts for the heavy casualties. In those circumstances a bullet will go through perhaps three or four bodies. It was not possible for any one to give the usual warning because the noise and the din was so great that it could not have been heard. But I am informed that for some moments before the actual firing occurred, the troops were standing with their rifles at the "present", that is in the position for firing, so that the mob knew perfectly well that they would be

fired at if they again attacked the troops. The troops then assisted in the collection of the killed and the wounded and, while this was being done, they were stoned from the houses. During the crisis the officer commanding the battalion as well as the company commander were actually present and three or four magistrates, including the District Magistrate, were also present.

Now, Sir, I think that that message shows clearly the circumstances in which the firing had to be ordered. Honourable Members can picture to themselves this frenzied mob of over 10,000 people literally on top of the troops. It is all very well to say or rather to sneer as some Honourable Member did just now, 'brave troops'. Thirty men, even though armed with rifles could not have lasted a minute against a mob 10,000 strong of frenzied people, if they had not used their rifles in time. The troops had to fire in self-defence to save themselves. One point I wish to make clear is that the troops did not fire in the air as was stated in some newspapers. That is directly contrary to military instructions and would be contrary to military discipline.

I claim, Sir, that the fact that these thirty men only fired 47 rounds in all or an average of just over 1½ rounds per man shows that the firing was steady and controlled, and that the troops behaved with exemplary steadiness in a position of extreme danger and extreme difficulty.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: I do not believe it.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, you would not believe it.

I admit, Sir, that the information at my disposal still leaves some loose ends to be cleared up especially in regard to what happened in the earlier stages of the day. We still have not a complete picture of the whole affair. That I do not for a moment deny. But on the information that is available, I can see no ground for holding that any officer or any agent of the Government failed in his duty or exceeded in the discharge of his duty. I can see no ground whatever either for this House or for the Government, on the information now available, reaching a decision that is likely to be interpreted as a censure on any one concerned in this unfortunate affair. Honourable Members will appreciate the point how intensely distasteful it is to Government officers to have to use force on a mob, how greatly they dislike that duty and how reluctantly they undertake such a duty, but that is doubly so perhaps with soldiers. Such a duty is even more distasteful to the soldiers who have actually to carry out the use of force than to the civil officers who have to ask them to do so. But the officers here were faced with a situation of the greatest gravity.

My Honourable friend the Mover mentioned the case of Ilam Din, the murderer of Rajpal, who was given a public funeral in Lahore and he said that the authorities in Karachi would have been wise to have followed the steps taken by the authorities in Lahore on that occasion. Now, Sir, I happen to know a good deal about that. I was then the Commissioner of the Lahore Division and I was in charge of the arrangements. There is not the slightest analogy between what happened at Lahore in Ilam Din's case and what happened in Karachi in the present instance. In Ilam Din's case, the body was brought from a distant station at night and it was handed over to the relatives in the presence of the Muslim public of Lahore. It is quite true that I consulted the Muslim leaders, that I took them into my confidence, made arrangements with them and got an undertaking

[Sir Henry Craik.]

from them which they faithfully observed. The body, in that case, was handed over to them some miles outside the city at a place where there were no houses. It was taken from there to the burial ground only about half a mile away in my presence. I was there the whole time. There was no question of taking the body in a procession through the city and the authorities would not have permitted anything like that, as it would inevitably have given rise to the bitterest communal tension. But we have a much closer analogy in the Delhi incident quoted by my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh, and, in fact, the circumstances there were so like, indeed so almost exactly similar to, what happened in Karachi that I venture to tell the House exactly what happened in Delhi in November, 1927.

[At this stage, Mr. President (the Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) resumed the Chair.]

That too was a case of a fanatical murder, the victim in that case being the well-known Swami Shraddhanand. The murderer was hanged in the Delhi Jail and the body was, by an arrangement,—mind you,—with certain leaders and with the written consent of his relatives, who gave a written undertaking to abide by the conditions, made over to them at the jail gate to take straight to the cemetery which is a very short way off across the road. A mob swept the relatives aside, broke through the police, captured the bier and using it as a battering-ram got through the Delhi Gate into the city. They swept aside the barrier of the police at that point and they poured into the Faiz Bazar towards the Juma Musjid, surrounded and mixed up with the police who kept up with them and tried to stop them but could not get in front of them. There was in fact a running fight for a comparatively short time through the bazars of Delhi between this fanatical crowd and the police keeping up with them. Eventually the police intercepted and stopped them and succeeded in breaking them up. But what happened in this short time? In the short time, of less than an hour I think, 62 Hindus were wounded, 2 were killed, 51 shops were looted, and over Rs. 10,000 worth of goods were stolen.

That is what might have happened on a far larger scale in Karachi if this mob had been allowed to go into the city, not—mind you—a small mob that forced its way through the police picket and past the troops who were not expecting them, but a huge mob of 10,000 which, by that time, if the troops had not stopped them, would have swept aside all opposition and would have been victorious and triumphant. They would have swept through the city of Karachi leaving a trail of blood and arson and loot behind them.

That was the situation, as I have said, which the officers at Karachi had to deal with. And I ask the House to reflect most carefully whether on those facts, as I have told them, facts which were clearly not known to all the Members of the House, we are entitled to pass any motion conveying censure on any officer who acted with the objects I have explained in the face of so terrible and so sudden an emergency.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): I must confess, Sir, that the speech of the Honourable the Home Member was one which missed the real point. I equally regret,—I will not say deplore,—the

speech of Sardar Sant Singh, because he really went off the point altogether. The question before the House is, first, whether the civil authorities in Karachi did not mismanage this business. In my judgment, I venture to say that in relating the story which the Home Member related just now, having the past experience which was so eloquently described and which has no bearing on the issue before the House today . . . .

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It has every bearing.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Pardon me; it has absolutely no bearing on the issue now. And if it has any bearing you stand condemned, and I shall prove that to the satisfaction of the House. You had that experience of Delhi, you had that experience of the Punjab. I want to know from the Home Member, what did the civil authorities in Karachi do? I will read the newspaper report as to what happened on the 2nd March, and I may be contradicted if I am wrong:

"The tension, however, was so great that on the 2nd March the Additional District Magistrate of Karachi thought it necessary to serve a notice on about a dozen people and some newspapers asking them to refrain from delivering speeches or publishing news relating to Abdul Quaium."

Not only had you the experience of the Punjab and Delhi, but, on the 2nd March, the District Magistrate was fully cognisant of the high feeling that was running with regard to this question. The next day it was officially notified that the execution had been postponed. Then we come to the 4th March, and what happened on the 4th March:

"Several persons were hurt in a minor clash outside the jail gates when a demonstration was carried out by sympathisers of the condemned man. A large number of Moslems marched to the jail and collected near the gates where they held a demonstration and demanded to see Abdul Quaium."

This is what happened on the 4th. The Honourable the Home Member seems to think that the matter is very simple and plain because he has said that it is very irksome to the civil officer and doubly so to the military officer to open fire and, therefore, he has satisfied the House. But that is not the point. With your experience which you so eloquently described, with the events happening on the 2nd and 4th March, any man with any common sense must have seen that when execution is going to take place, what was to be expected?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Trouble.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: What did you do? You failed in your dutv.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: How do you say that? What do you know of that?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I know more than you do from the facts so far available.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. The Honourable Member should address the Chair.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I am sorry that the Honourable the Home Member is really nothing but complacent and facile. He has got only one idea in his head and he refuses to see any other point of view. Has he no sense to follow what I am saying? What I am saying is this: You had this evidence on the 2nd, you had this evidence on the 4th. And what I am putting before the House and the Government is this. With your past experience, what measures did you take to prevent the collection of 20 thousand people? Do you understand my point or do you still fail to see it?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I fail to see anything in that.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: If you do not, I cannot help it. Now, Sir, what happens? Where was this man buried? The report says this:

"At 5-50 the body was sent to the cemetery two miles outside the city."

This was a statement read out officially in the other House and I am reading from that. The body was sent to the cemetery two miles outside the city. Was the crowd there waiting for the body? No. How did the crowd get there and when? And what measures did you adopt to prevent the crowd getting there? None. Sir, it is said that prevention is better than cure, and the gravamen of my charge against Government is that you have not given one single word of explanation as to what preventive measures were taken before the 20 thousand people went out of the city two miles to the cemetery and collected there. I am not justifying, I am not holding a brief for Abdul Quaium; I want the Members of this House to understand that I am standing for this that citizens have got their rights. Governments have their rights and Governments have their powers. I am not saying that you were not justified in executing Abdul Quaium; you were perfectly right. The law must be carried out: but surely it is the duty of any civilised Government, it is the duty of any competent and capable authority, knowing the events of the 2nd March and the 4th March and the previous history, knowing that there was enormous excitement which was uncontrollable—would you not expect any competent authority in Karachi to so arrange that not more than a hundred people could collect together and have you not done that in the past?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: How can you do it?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Surely you could have stopped every route: even when the King comes every route is stopped: but the Honourable
5 P.M. the Home Member says no route should be stopped, but they should be butchered when they get there. Is that what you want? You create the situation. You allow the situation to develop: you know if you have any common sense and if you have got the meanest intelligence, that if you do not prevent this and if you allow twenty thousand people to collect near a dead body where religious feelings are excited: you know perfectly well that there can be only one consequence and no other consequence. The Home Member himself said that he would never have allowed that body in Lahore to be taken through the city. Why did he prevent it? For the same reason. Why did he not prevent the crowd getting within two miles outside the city? He has not answered that. There is no explanation; and I demand in the name of humanity, I demand in the

name of civilised government, I demand in the name of justice that you should appoint an independent commission and inquire into this matter. Do you want us to respect the Government? Do you want us to have confidence in you? Then, why do you refuse this inquiry? I want to know what your civil authority did.

The next point is this, and that is the only point with which the Honourable the Home Member has dealt. I certainly am unable at present to say that the force that was used was necessary. I am certainly not one of those men who is going to say that a British officer would use force and open fire upon a helpless mob wantonly; but supposing the order is given, he has to carry out the order. Who was the person who gave the order I do not know . . . .

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Military Officer Commanding

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: If the Military Officer Commanding gave the order, I admit it makes my position more difficult because I refuse to accuse the military officer of wantonly opening fire upon the crowd: but it may be that with the best of intentions he may have been hasty. The intention is all very well: you may have no intention of doing anything wrong; but there may be an error of judgment and that I would like to know: I am not in a position to say. I, therefore, say—I do not want to take up more of the time of the House—but I do ask the Government that you will be making the greatest mistake if you refuse an independent and an impartial commission to inquire into this matter, and it will be a matter of guidance to you in the future: we all wish to avoid and bury things of this kind happening; but is it in our power? and I say, appoint a commission and in future you might acquire wisdom from this commission, if you have not acquired wisdom yet.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President, following my friend, Mr. Jinnah, I wish to make it quite clear as to what the true issue before the House is. The true issue before the House has got nothing to do with the rights or wrongs of the criminal who was hanged. That is not the issue. I regret very much that any such issue should ever cloud the true issue which is before the House today. I also join with my friend, Mr. Jinnah, in the appeal that he has made and which he has pressed with all the earnestness at his command, that a matter of this kind, where lives have been lost, and children have died and men have been injured, is not one in which this House can merely accept the bare statement of an assurance that everything was done rightly and that nothing requires investigation. I am one of those who believe and believe very earnestly that a matter of this kind can never be decided and can never be asked to be decided on purely *priori* grounds and it is all the more surprising to me that on the telegrams and the other information which has been read out, a responsible Member of the Government should get up and should want to assure the House or think that he is justified, unless he is of the opinion that no wrong can ever be done by any agent of this Government so long as he is in power: that is entirely an erroneous attitude and I have not the smallest doubt that when the Honourable the Home Member reflects he will certainly not adopt that attitude at the end of this discussion. My sympathy undoubtedly, as the sympathy of every man here, goes out to those who have suffered, for undoubtedly those who have suffered are innocent. The question undoubtedly is one of

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

investigating how what occurred did occur, or perhaps to put the words of my friend a little more strongly, would not prevention have been better than shooting? Because those were the two alternatives—either prevention or shooting: and between the two, certainly this House, or anybody who represents the least idea of humanity or efficient administration, is entitled to have it investigated whether or not this was a preventible injury. The fact remains, in addition to the facts which my learned friend, Mr Jinnah, has stated, that a motion was actually given for an adjournment of this House on the eve of the anticipated execution of this man: it was disallowed on public grounds. I have no quarrel with that decision; but the fact also remains that, therefore, it was not a matter entirely concerning the local magistracy or the local civil authorities. It is a matter which was well within the knowledge,—on which actually an opinion had been pronounced, having been so sought, I presume,—of His Excellency the Viceroy, in order that that matter may not be discussed. It was, therefore, fully well-known that events must take necessarily a wrong turn, perhaps a bad turn, perhaps a most undesirable turn, unless there was a certain amount of pre-vision and caution were taken in this matter. I have not heard a single word in the statement that has been read out here of any precaution of any kind. If precaution had been taken, the graveyard might have been properly guarded in order that the body might not have been exhumed what did they do to have that graveyard guarded? . . .

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The graveyard was guarded by the police.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Yes, guarded in a manner which has resulted in what has resulted. they call that guarding. If it is guarding, I call it gross negligence . . .

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Criminal negligence.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: They should have anticipated trouble. I am not here to judge. One might say that perhaps the wiser course might have been not to deliver the body at all. That perhaps would have been a wise course. Because, I know it is not in every jail,—I have been in one myself,—it is not in every case that a dead body is handed over to the relatives There are instances in which the authorities have felt it their duty and their right in the cause of public peace to dispose of the body in the manner in which they thought best. It has been done in other instances and where disasters of this kind have been averted by caution. In this case the civil authorities had been warned long before, and they did nothing to prevent the disaster. Not a single word has been said as to what the District Magistrate or other civil authorities did, not a single word has been stated, from what I heard from the Honourable the Home Member, as to why the military authorities fired in self-defence, which almost gives me an idea as if there was absolutely no warning of any kind. Evidently the facts are such that one would certainly expect them to state clearly and precisely as to what necessitated them to take the action they did, namely, self-defence by armed men with bullets and bayonets at their command. I would, therefore, appeal again, in order to end this discussion, the Honourable the Home Member is not infallible,—he is not personally responsible, but only those under him about whose acts or neglects he does not fully

know,—there is no need to defend things of this kind in the spirit that everything must be right and must have been right,—but I still appeal to him in the name at all events of all those who speak in terms of humanity, that where life and liberty are in danger, or, more so, when they are lost, that an impartial inquiry should be made, and, without that, no public will ever be satisfied.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Sir, I find from the discussion that has gone on till now that there is a good deal of misunderstanding in the minds of Honourable Members In the first place, we have to see whether this crowd wanted to go into the city or not. Sir, according to my information, the crowd did not want to go to the city, but they wanted to go to the Chakiwada Idgah, which is hardly a hundred miles away from the place where the firing actually took place. For the information of the House, I shall just read this telegram:

"On Tuesday, the 19th instant, about noon, military fired without any notice or warning upon funeral procession Ghazi Abdul Qayoom consisting several thousand persons, including old men, women and children, without justification, when procession had nearly reached destination *viz* Chakiwada Idgah for funeral prayers Forty persons been killed, 80 others been seriously injured."

So this shows, Sir, that the crowd did not want to go to the city at all, but many people wanted to go to the Idgah to say their last prayers to the dead according to the Muslim custom.

Another thing that I find is this. Whenever such a thing takes place, the question of Hindu property being looted or a Muslim being murdered is always trotted out on the floor of this House. Sir, I have been in Karachi for a very long time, and can the Government show me a single untoward event that has happened in the Karachi city during the last six months after the murder was committed by Abdul Qayoom? None has happened, and here I may congratulate my Karachi friends, both Hindus and Muslims, on the fact that within the last 15 or 20 years, though many things have happened in many parts of the country, nothing has happened in Karachi to embitter feelings between the two communities. (Hear, hear.) I know of many instances in which, when some mischief-makers wanted to create trouble, responsible members of both the communities came forward and averted very awkward situations by timely intervention by peacefully settling disputes between the communities. What is the justification for the Government to say that the crowd in this instance wanted to go to the city and loot the Hindus or commit arson? Can they quote a single instance within the last 20 or 30 years in which the members of one community have attempted to loot the shops of another community in the Karachi city? Again, this telegram says:

"Forty persons been killed about 80 others been seriously injured."

Then, at a public meeting, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"This meeting most respectfully urges immediate impartial inquiry into conduct officers concerned being convinced that loss of life was entirely avoidably unjustifiable and due extreme incompetence on part of officers concerned."

[Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon.]

It will thus be obvious, Sir, that the public of Karachi do want an impartial investigation to be made, and I do hope that Government will pay heed to this request. In support of what I just said, I may say that the Hindus and Muslims in the Karachi city always live in amity and concord. Not only that, from today's papers Honourable Members will find that Mr. Tikamdas Wadoomal, the Mayor of the City of Karachi and President of the Hindu Association, has made a public appeal to render what little help they can to the injured people and their relatives. (Hear, hear.) This clearly shows that there is no communal feeling in the Karachi city; on the other hand, both the communities are living as friends. Therefore, I hope that this small request to hold an impartial inquiry will be acceded to. If Government do not accept this small request which has been so ably supported both by my friends, Mr. Jinnah and Mr. Bhulabhai Desai, we shall have no other course but to censure the Government

Several Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I have no intention at all to create any bitterness on this question. Let me assure the House that I feel the most about this unfortunate incident that has taken place in Karachi. Everybody would feel and sympathise with those who have been killed, but the question at issue before the House is whether the Government should be censured or not. I must say, at the very outset, that I do not hold any brief either for the Government or for anybody else, but I must say that in the interests of law and order it is necessary that a man should give his own fair opinion. Sir, I do not command that emphasis and that dignity that my Honourable friend, Mr. Jinnah, possesses, to put my views before the House. If the House is of opinion that beyond the statement that has been made by the Honourable the Home Member there is necessity for an enquiry to be made, I personally would not be against it. But I submit that all the facts have not been placed before you, and I am going to place a few facts before the House which would convince it that the situation, such as had happened, was not a spontaneous situation. It had a background, and I must say at once that we Hindus in Sind are not on inimical terms with the Sindhi Muhammadans. Sir, it is the outer element that is responsible for this, and I am going to give you a few facts.

An Honourable Member: Foreigners?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I mean Muhammadans from outside if it pleases you, but I was calling it the outer element. I may say this that we the Hindus there are so sorry over this that we have joined the Sindhi Muhammadans in collecting a fund for the relief of the injured, and I might also inform the House that all the Hindu doctors have taken upon themselves to help the unfortunate injured. (Cheers.) But the point at issue is this, what was the situation and was it necessary for the Government to take the measures that they have taken or not? To begin with, let me say that this case of Nathuram started in Hyderabad and not in Karachi. In Hyderabad, when that case was going on, there was no uproar or anything else from the Muhammadan side or the Hindu side. It went on smoothly. The case came in appeal. Nathuram was sentenced to 18 months' rigorous

imprisonment. But the Hindus made no demonstration over it to show that the man was wrongly convicted, not even a single man came forward, no funds were collected and nothing was done for helping the man. He took his own appeal to the High Court and on that unfortunate day he went and sat there in the Court as an appellant. This Abdul Qaiyum, I may tell you to indicate that the Sindhi Muhammadans of the place are not responsible—this Abdul Qaiyum happens to belong to the Hazara district outside Sind This Abdul Qaiyum came there, had the help of certain persons who were also from outside. . . .

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): On a point of order, Sir. How are all these relevant?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: It is relevant to show you the background, because the Mover of this motion said that Muhammadans had no annoyance with the Hindus. Let me say that it is not so. When you consider the facts, and, within the time at my disposal, I shall place a few of them . . . .

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Might I interrupt the Honourable Member? I think I have made it very clear that the position we take up in this House is this, that the Government did not take satisfactory preventive measures —that is No. 1, and No. 2 is that when this firing was opened we are not convinced that it was necessary and that the minimum amount of force was used. These are the only grounds on which we are supporting this motion.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I have understood you, it was not necessary to repeat that

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair is not prepared to say that any reference to what happened previously is not in order, but at the same time the Honourable Member will realise that the real question is not the execution of the man.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I say it is only relevant for the purpose of throwing light on the question, and I would give only a few facts and I am not going to be long on that. If the House wanted to discuss this question fully, there should have been a resolution to that effect and on that resolution everybody would have had an opportunity of putting forward his case. But now when you are going to censure the Government you must have a few facts before you to do that. This Abdul Qaiyum in the open Court, in the presence of two European Judges actually stabbed the man

An Honourable Member: That is not the issue.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Hear me; do not disturb me. Subsequently an outside barrister was engaged to defend Abdul Qaiyum and his defence was that under the Shariat, in the eye of God and the Phophet, Abdul Qaiyum was a martyr and that he would not be considered to have committed any offence. This incensed the Muslims there, and you must know, in Karachi there are fifty thousand Makranis belonging to the frontier and

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

twenty thousand Punjabis from the Hazara district, the North-West Frontier Province and other places. They collected funds for the defence, but the Sindhi Muhammadans of Karachi did not join in that. My friends from Karachi would bear me out. Those outside people went on inciting the masses and the situation was very critical. The situation being critical, now let us see what the Government have done and what was the conduct of those fanatics. It is asked why the Government did not take care to see that all these twenty thousand did not meet at the burial ground. The thing is like this The execution took place at 4 o'clock, and at 5 o'clock there were certain people—the relatives of the deceased who had already been sent for. Those relatives never said that they were going to take the dead body in a procession in the bazar or in the city. They only wanted that it should be given a burial. Then those people were taken two miles away because otherwise they would have gone to the city side and there would have been a conflagration, as immediately the outside limit finishes, begins the 'Chakiwara' and 'Lyari' quarters where 70,000 Muhammadans reside. And what was the intention? The intention was that they must pass those men, and after passing those men they had to go in a procession to the old town where there were Hindu respectable people and rich . . . .

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: You are misleading.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: You know that in Cawnpore and Kohat and other places, when the mob went into the city, what happened. There was arson, houses being burnt down, property looted and murders committed. And why should not Government check it? Let us see whether the Government checked it or not The point is these men took the corpse two miles away from the city and there were the deceased's relatives present. The corpse was buried in the ground with all the rites appertaining to a Muslim burial. The question is, how did these other people come, how within an hour or so did they collect twenty thousand men? They came from the town from every nook and corner and there was a critical situation. It is all very well to say that when the Governor comes there is proper police arrangement in the streets and so on. But I may say then it is organized for a long time and that the police get long time notices about it. But here when the people rushed there, look at the defiance they exhibited Would any member say that at that particular time Government should have said 'No, take the corpse away and we are not going to interfere. Let it be taken into the town and let anything happen'? Then we would have all ourselves blamed the Government. Then comes the information that at that time the police that were there were overpowered. That is the information that we have got. The police having been overpowered, they sent for the military and that the military were also about to be overpowered is not disputed. Therefore, they had to fire at that time. Therefore, the point is on the facts before you, the facts as they are, and the background I have shown you and the tension that was there, what would have happened if the corpse had been allowed to be brought into the City? There was a strong communal tension. Why for the matter of that at Sukker and in Larkana such things happened, there had been great damage and people had been killed in these riots. Would the House allow the authorities to take proper precautions as they have done at that critical moment or should they have allowed the corpse to be removed to the town, with the prospect of so much loss and damage? Therefore, I submit that

in my humble opinion, the Government have done what they had to do and if still people are not satisfied, there could be a resolution to that effect and then the whole thing will be considered but to say at this time that Government should not have done what they have done is absolutely wrong.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Mr. President, it is gratifying to find that on the whole the discussion on this very serious matter has taken place in a fairly calm atmosphere. I am not going to take more than five minutes, and, during those five minutes, I desire to place two or three points before the Home Member In the first place, in any part of the world if an occurrence of this kind had taken place, where 35 to 40 people had been shot, I venture to suggest that no Government would refuse an inquiry. Sir, it is possible that every precaution was taken. It is possible that the military acted in self-defence. It is also possible that the civil authorities performed their duties absolutely satisfactorily; but the fact remains that today we know that 30 to 40 people have been killed. We have not got all the facts before us. The Home Member has admitted that he has not been able to place all the facts before us Therefore, the only thing to do is to have a proper inquiry.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Wait till you get the facts.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: We are here to discuss the facts. We are the Legislature. The Government is not the only party in this question. When an adjournment motion is moved, this side of the House is also a party to the question. This side of the House desires that an inquiry should be made into this question, and I strongly affirm that in any part of the world if an occurrence of this sort had taken place when the Legislature was in Session, the Government would immediately agree to an inquiry I give credit to Government and their officers for having acted absolutely justifiably throughout, but that does not mean that I have not my own suspicions in the matter, which have not been by any means cleared up. I would not have given expression to those suspicions just now, had I not been interrupted. The point is, that it is admitted, that on a serious occasion like this there were only 30 troops present. That has not been denied

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Three companies of British troops were present. Only 30 men fired.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: In defence of three companies?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Not at that particular spot. At other danger spots?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: 30 men fired in defence of three companies?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: How many troops were out?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Three companies.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: What would that mean? How many troops would that be.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham (Army Secretary): About 300 or 400 men.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: That is my point. As has been already explained, the authorities had ample notice that there was going to be trouble and I place the greatest importance upon the notice of the motion for adjournment of this House moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Gauba, which was disallowed I am not betraying any secret when I tell this House that I tried to dissuade my Honourable friend from moving that adjournment on that occasion, but Mr. Gauba told me distinctly that he anticipated a riot in Karachi, when the execution did take place, and that he wanted, if he could to prevent that riot by having a discussion in this House before the execution. Well, Sir, if Mr. Gauba, from the Punjab, knew enough about this question to anticipate a riot when the execution took place, and, acting on his information, he moved an adjournment of this House, how much more must the authorities in Karachi themselves have known of the gravity of the position.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): May I interrupt my Honourable friend? Am I to understand that the trouble was within the full knowledge of the responsible Muhammadans in Sind?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Suppose feelings were excited . . . . .

Mr. M. S. Aney: I do not want to draw any inference.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: We are talking of the facts. The facts are that feelings were very much excited The fact that a riot actually did take place . . . . .

Mr. M. S. Aney: With the knowledge of the responsible Muhammadans in Sind? Is that a fact or not, and what did they do to stop it, apart from the Government, and I am asking you this question as you are standing in defence of this motion?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: I really fail to understand this excitement.

Mr. M. S. Aney: It is a bad argument that you are making.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: I maintain that there was sufficient notice that we were in troubled waters.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: May I point out to Mr. Aney for his satisfaction that, as far as I know, I entirely repudiate that any responsible Muhammadans had anything to do with it, much less to encourage such a thing as this.

Sardar Sant Singh: May I inquire with what object they waited upon the Home Member?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Mr. President, I refuse to give in any more. Mr. President, I have a grave suspicion that the three hundred troops were not sufficient at a time like this. I have had some little experience of these matters. I have also been in the midst of riots—riots that have lasted much longer than two or three hours, that have lasted days, and I know that very often it has been difficult to get a sufficient number of troops out in time; and, therefore, Mr. President, I do believe, that there was ground for suspicion that the troops in the City of Karachi were not sufficient; but there is one moral to be drawn from this discussion,—a moral which I desire Government to take note of. On previous occasions, I have heard respectable citizens of important cities protesting against the orders of Government stopping processions going through the city when feelings were excited. Here, today, what do we find? We find some of the most respected men in India asking Government why they have not taken steps to stop a procession even being formed. Is not there a moral to be drawn from these remarks? Why, Sir, here are these men pleading for peace, pleading that these processions should have been stopped, should have been absolutely nipped in the bud. Now, Sir, surely Government have got a justification for instituting an inquiry. Why not do it? Surely, there are facts which Government are not aware of. Why not have an inquiry once and for all on an occasion like this and lay down the policy? I would appeal to Government that this is just the psychological moment when they should step in and agree to an inquiry—an inquiry the personnel of which they themselves will have the power of deciding, an inquiry which will lead ultimately to the advantage of Government and of the public, and an inquiry, mind you, demanded for reasons which the Government ought themselves to support by men of the standing of Mr. Jinnah and Mr. Bhulabhai Desai. (Applause.)

Several Honourable Members: The question be now put.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the question be now put."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Mr. Gauba.

Mr. K. L. Gauba: Sir, I do not wish to reply.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the Assembly do now adjourn."

(At this stage, the Honourable Sir Henry Craik rose.)

The Honourable Member has no right of reply. The Mover has not replied.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Even so, Sir, I think under the rules I have got the right to reply with the permission of the Chair.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the Assembly do now adjourn."

The Assembly divided:

(During the Division.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. I notice one Honourable Member is smoking inside the Chamber. That is not allowed. (*Voices*: "Shame, shame.")

AYES—67.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.
Abdoola Haroon, Seth Haji
Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.
Abdullah, Mr. H. M.
Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
Baqui, Mr M. A
Bardaloi, Srijut N. C.
Bhagavan Das, Dr.
Bhutto, Mr. Nabi Baksh Illahi Baksh.
Chhattopadhyaya, Mr Amarendra Nath.
Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.
Das, Mr B
Das, Mr Basanta Kumar.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J
Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.
Fazl-i-Haq Piracha, Khan Sahib Shaikh.
Fuzlul Huq, Mr. A. K.
Gadgil, Mr. N. V.
Gauba, Mr. K. L.
Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.
Ghuznavi, Mr. A. H.
Giri, Mr. V. V.
Govind Das, Seth.
Gupta, Mr. Ghanshiam Singh.
Hidayatullah, Sir Ghulam Hussain.
Hosmani, Mr. S. K.
Jehangir, Sir Cowasji.
Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D K.
Mangal Singh, Sardar.
Mehr Shah, Nawab Sahibzada Sir Sayad Muhammad
Mody, Mr. H. P.
Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.
Muhammad Nauman, Mr.
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Syed.
Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.
Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta.
Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.
Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur Makhdum Syed.
Rajan, Dr. T. S. S.
Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.
Ranga, Prof. N. G
Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
Satyamurti, Mr. S.
Shafi Daudi, Maulvi Muhammad.
Sham Lal, Mr.
Shaukat Ali, Maulana.
Sheodass Daga, Seth.
Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib Nawab.
Singh, Mr. Deep Narayan.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.
Sri Prakasa, Mr.
Thein Maung, Dr.
Thein Maung, U.
Umar Aly Shah, Mr.
Varma, Mr. B. B.
Yakub, Sir Muhammad.

NOES—52.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.
Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan Bahadur Nawab Malik.
Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A. A. Venkatarama.
Bajoria, Babu Baijnath.
Bajpai, Mr. G. S.
Bewoor, Mr. G. V
Bhagchand Soni, Rai Bahadur Seth.
Bhore, The Honourable Sir Joseph.
Buss, Mr. L. C.
Chatarji, Mr. J. M
Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.
Dalal, Dr. R. D.
DeSouza, Dr. F. X.
Drake, Mr. D. H C.
Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya Ananda.
Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.
Graham Sir Lancelot.
Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.
Hockenhull, Mr F. W.
Hudson, Sir Leslie.
James, Mr. F. E.
Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir.
Kirpalani, Mr. Hiranand Khushiram.
Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri.
Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
Metcalfe, Mr. H. A F.
Milligan, Mr. J. A.
Monteath, Mr. J.
Morgan, Mr. G
Mukerje, Mr. N. R.
Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya Charan.
Nayar, Mr. C. Govindan.
Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
Owen, Mr. L
Parma Nand, Bhai.
Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Rau, Mr P. R.
Richards, Mr. W. J. C.
Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
Sant Singh, Sardar.
Sarma, Mr. R. S.
Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
Scott, Mr. W. L.
Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain Sardar.
Singh, Mr. Pradyumna Prashad.
Sircar, The Honourable Sir Nripendra.
Sloan, Mr. T.
Swithinbank, Mr. B. W.
Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 22nd March, 1935.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 22nd March, 1935.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

DEATH OF MR. T. A. K. SHERWANI.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President, it is indeed with a very heavy heart that I rise today to request the House to join with me in mourning the loss of one of our dearest colleagues. Mr. Sherwani was elected to this House and was really not able to give the best during the course of this Session. But, in earlier years, history has it that he has rendered great service to the cause of his country as he conceived it both in and out of this House. He was a graduate of the Aligarh University, distinguished both in sport and in knowledge. He was among the band of graduates, young men of the time, at the two great English Universities, from among whom the noblest of them all, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, the noble son of almost a nobler father is still spared among us, and, after his graduation, Mr. Sherwani returned to this country and he was called to the Bar, and there he was distinguished by that stability of judgment, courageous but restrained as he always has been. Thereafter, he joined the movement—which has now been distinguished, and many of his fellow countrymen joined in the same—known as the Khilafat movement and the non-co-operation movement which followed. In 1923, he joined this Assembly under the distinguished leadership of Pandit Motilal Nehru whose traditions we are attempting to carry on in an humbler vein, but, to the best of our sincerity and ability, we are walking in his footsteps to carry forward the work as he conceived his position to be in this House, and the great link that we had with him, at all events, one of them has been snapped by reason of the death of our friend, Sherwani. He was of the rare type of the evolved Indian of the free future India, for indeed in him there was no distinction in thought, word or deed, either of race, religion or even members of the communities of his own country. He lived and died in India and he gave all that he had to the cause which he loved most. He was a tower of strength to us, and from the height of his manhood he observed and countered to the best of his ability smaller differences of smaller men due to our frailties. He was a man big not merely physically as Providence endowed him, while he was big in mind, the biggest of all, he was big in heart, a gentleman fashioned by nature for the example of his fellowmen. I ask you, Sir, to convey the profound regret, at his untimely death, the regret of this House to the bereaved members of his family, his widow, his father and mother, his brothers and the rest, and I also move, should you so wish it and allow it, that the House do adjourn out of respect for his great memory.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): Sir, I had not the privilege of knowing the late Mr. Sherwani, but any one in touch with politics here could not have failed to know of the name of Sherwani and the leading part he took in politics for at least about 12 years. I cannot usefully add anything to what my Honourable friend has said as I suffer under the disability which I just mentioned. I join with my Honourable friend in requesting you, Sir, to convey to the bereaved family our profound regret at the loss which this House has suffered. I understand also, Sir, that it is the general desire of the House that, following the usual practice on the death of a sitting Member of this Assembly, this House should stand adjourned. While leaving that matter entirely to you, Sir, I will join my Honourable friend in that request.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Mr. President, we again meet this morning under the shadow of death, and I would like, on behalf of my Party and myself, to associate ourselves with every word that has fallen from the Leader of the Opposition and we desire to convey to the Congress Group of this House our profoundest regret at the loss they have suffered. It is most unfortunate, Mr. President, that our friends should lose three of their Members within a very short period. Two of them did not even have a chance of sitting in this Honourable House, and now one departs within a few weeks of our meeting. Mr. Sherwani was very well-known in India and specially in his own province as a man of sterling independence. I had not the privilege of knowing him intimately, but I have had opportunities of hearing a good deal about Mr. Sherwani from his friends whom I know intimately and who spoke of him in the highest terms as a man of integrity, honesty of purpose and great sincerity. India loses in him a great citizen at a very early age, for I understand he was only 53 years of age. Had he been spared to this country, we are confident that he would have continued to serve his motherland as he had done from the days of his youth. Mr. President, there are many Members of my Party who were intimate friends of the late Mr. Sherwani, I trust you will convey to his family, and especially to the bereaved father and mother, to his widow and his brothers our sincerest condolences. At a time like this, words are not of much use to those whose loss is irreparable. All we can do is to show them that we share their sorrow and I again request you to convey to them our sincerest condolences.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): Sir, in associating myself with the observations which have been made, I only wish to make a few remarks. Mr. Sherwani was a personal friend of mine. I had the privilege of enjoying his friendship for about ten years and the more I knew him the more I loved him and my regard for him also increased. Apart from my personal relations with him as a public man, the services which he rendered to this country are well-known and I need not refer to them in detail. There was one outstanding feature in that man. He was no doubt a devout Mussalman but he had in him that breadth of vision which enabled him to know how to subordinate communal considerations to the larger interests of the country. That was the example which he set before this country which Hindus, Muhammadans, Christians and everybody else can imitate. As a public man he had an inimitable way of winning over his opponents by his charming manners more than by his arguments even. That charming and magnetic personality which he possesed was a great asset. It was indeed a great asset to the Party to

which he had the honour to belong. In losing such a man, at a time like this, this country is unfortunate and afflicted with a sense of poignant grief of a very severe loss. It is very sad that in this year, during the last few months, we should have the misfortune of witnessing the passing away of friend after friend whose presence would have been of invaluable use and whose need we feel most urgently. However, we have to submit to the inevitable. Sir, I request you to carry, on behalf of this House and on behalf of the Party to which I have the honour to belong, a message of sincere and heart-felt condolence to the members of the late Mr. Sherwani's family.

Sir Leslie Hudson (Bombay: European): Sir, I wish to associate my Group and myself with all that has fallen from the other Honourable Members on this sad occasion. It is unfortunate for us,—I refer to my Group,—that his almost continuous absence from the House, from illness, prevented us from making that closer contact with the late Mr. Sherwani that we should have liked to have done and to have made his acquaintance better. My Honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, referred to Mr. Sherwani's proficiency in sport and in studies; and it certainly made a great impression upon my Group and myself to see the manly way in which Mr. Sherwani accepted the verdict of this House at a very early period of this Session. I wish to associate myself in the request that you convey the condolences of this House to the bereaved relations of the late Mr. Sherwani.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi (Dacca *cum* Mymensingh: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, the passing away of Mr. Sherwani removes from our midst a great personality and makes us feel distinctly poorer. It has added to the toll which the cruel hand of death has already levied on the Members of this Assembly ever since the recent election. Just like Sir Abdullah Suhrawardy, Mr. Abhyankar and Mr. Sasmal, whose deaths we mourned so recently, Mr. Sherwani was a man of faith, hope, charity and action. What was more, all of them shared that noble characteristic which was to act up to their convictions and live the life they believed in, fearless of consequences. Those who, like myself, have had the privilege of working with Mr. Sherwani in this Assembly could not help being impressed by the sincerity of his purpose, the resoluteness of his determination and his fairness to his political opponents. Mr. President, hushed must be the voices of criticism and all differences of opinion in the suddenness of the tragic circumstances of his death which makes us feel and realise, at any rate for the time being, what shadows we are and what shadows we pursue.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I have known Mr. Sherwani since his childhood and more intimately since 1907 when I came back from Europe. He had a very brilliant career at Aligarh. He was the Vice-President of the M.A.O. College Union, the highest distinction which any under-graduate could achieve at Aligarh. He was also Captain of the Aligarh football team and he also had a very brilliant record in sports. His record in the college was so good that he could easily have become a provincial officer had he chosen that particular career. I myself was willing to nominate him for this post and he would have been appointed immediately. But he preferred, in his college days, to choose an independent career for which he was evidently well-fitted. After leaving the college he continued to take interest

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

in all educational matters. He took a very prominent part in drafting the constitution of the Aligarh Muslim University, and after the establishment of the University he was elected a member of the Court of that University and afterwards a member of the Executive Council. And his interest in all educational matters was as keen as his interest in political affairs. Of course his public life after he left Aligarh is well-known to every person and I need not mention it here. Although he was my neighbour here it was my misfortune that I happened to be away from Delhi and could not serve him in his last few days as I would have very much liked to do. One thing which also impressed me is that all his colleagues showed the greatest sympathy for him from the very moment he fell ill. As far as we are concerned, it is of course our religious obligation to show sympathy with the sick and the diseased, but the sympathy shown by his other colleagues produced a very great impression on my mind. Within a short time he became very popular and he will long be remembered in political and other circles. In him I have lost a personal friend in whose career I have always taken very great interest. I now express my sympathy with all the members of his family whom I know very well. It is really a great blow to his family and I associate myself with everything that has been said by the previous speakers.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I fully share the feelings of sorrow expressed by Mr. Bhulabhai Desai and other speakers on this sad occasion Mr Sherwani I knew before he came to this Assembly, and I was always impressed by the charm of his manner, by his straightforward character and by his patriotic zeal. His was a personality which could not fail to impress any one who came in contact with him. He belonged to a very distinguished family of Aligarh, and several Members of that family I have had the privilege of knowing rather intimately, and Mr. Sherwani, in his life, showed in a remarkable degree those characteristics which are associated with a family like his. We all know that he was always ready to make sacrifices in the cause in which he believed, and it is a great pity that he was not spared to serve his country longer in this House. Until a few days ago, he worked among us, and on one occasion he spoke with his usual vigour on a subject in which he was much interested. I feel that the country has lost a very patriotic servant in Mr. Sherwani, and it will be my duty to convey the feelings of sorrow and regret of this House to his bereaved family, his aged parents, his widow and his brothers. As requested, I propose, as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, to adjourn the House for the day.

I wish also to notify to Honourable Members that the election to the Committee which was to be held today will be held tomorrow.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Saturday, the 23rd March, 1935.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Saturday, 23rd March, 1935.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

STATEMENTS LAID ON THE TABLE.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 147, asked by Mr. Sham Lal on the 12th February, 1935.

DELAPIDATED CONDITION OF AN OLD MOGHUL BUILDING AT BURIA IN THE AMBALA DISTRICT.

(a) and (b). Enquiries have been made, and it has been reported that the building does not possess sufficient architectural interest or historical importance to justify its being dealt with under Act VII of 1904

Information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 37 asked by Pandit Nilakantha Das on the 13th February, 1935.

LOCOMOTIVES PURCHASED FROM DIFFERENT COUNTRIES.

Statement showing particulars of Locomotives purchased by Railways during 1932-33 to 1934-35.

Railways.	No. of locomotives.	Types.	Price per locomotive delivered in India.	Country of manufacture.	Remarks.
			Rs.		
			1932-33.		
Bombay, Baroda and Central India.	1	ZB	53,000	England.	
	15	YB	64,960	India	Built at Ajmer.
Burma	3	YC	69,893	England.	
Eastern Bengal	3	CS	16,067	England.	
Madras and Southern Mahratta.	3	YK	42,520	Czechoslovakia.	
North-Western	2	ZB	53,000	England.	
			1933-34.		
Bombay, Baroda and Central India.	15	YF	61,851	India	Built at Ajmer.
Madras and Southern Mahratta.	6	YK	10,000	Old engines taken over from Mysore Railway.	
			1934-35.		
Bombay, Baroda and Central India.	15	YF	*56,000	India	Built at Ajmer. * Estimated cost.
North-Western	2	Diesel Electric.	3,31,000	England.	
	3	ZF	46,550	Germany.	
South Indian	3	XD	1,17,000	England.	

Information promised in reply to part (a) of starred question No. 634 asked by Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar on the 27th February, 1935.

EXCISE DUTY ON MATCHES AND MATCH FACTORIES IN INDIA.

Number of Match Factories.

	On 31st March, 1934.		*On 31st January, 1935.*	
	Regular factories.	Cottage factories.	Regular factories.	Cottage factories.
(a) (i) India .	47	140–145	44	76
(ii) Madras .	9	114	4	68

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 678 asked by Mr. Fakir Chand on the 5th March, 1935.

BUILDING OF *PUCCA* BOUNDARY WALLS ROUND CERTAIN BUNGALOWS IN THE JULLUNDUR CANTONMENT.

(a) The reply to the first part is in the affirmative. The reason is that the existing cactus hedges were not properly maintained, with the result that they looked unsightly and were a breeding place for snakes.

(b) Some bungalows still have cactus hedges but the bungalow-owners have promised to replace these by pucca walls.

(c) The answer is in the negative. In fact, section 194(2) of the Cantonments Act, 1924, empowers Cantonment Authorities to issue notices where considered necessary to owners of buildings to erect boundary walls of such material as may be specified therein.

(d) Nearly all Government buildings have *pucca* wire fencing or *pucca* walls around them and the rest will be provided with such fencing or walls shortly.

Information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 136 asked by Mr. M. Asaf Ali on the 5th March, 1935.

RESTRICTIONS ON INDIAN KING'S COMMISSIONED OFFICERS SERVING IN BALUCHISTAN FOR COMBINED LEAVE IN INDIA.

(a) Early in 1934 the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, Western Command, issued instructions to the effect that the grant of three months leave to King's Commissioned Indian officers should ordinarily be sufficient, but that each case should be treated on its merits and that there was no reason to prohibit the grant of the full eight months' leave if in the circumstances it appeared desirable that this amount should be granted.

The actual amount of leave to be granted to any officer, British or Indian, is left to the discretion of the District Commander and is dependent on the circumstances of the case and the exigencies of the service. Since 1933 the Commander, Baluchistan District, has granted leave to five K. C. I. Os., two *ex*-India for eight months, and three in India, one for six months, one for four months and one for three months. In the last case the officer had only just over two years' service.

(b) Regulations for the Army in India *restrict* combined leave in India to eight months. Leave *ex*-India is restricted to 12 months in the first instance, extensible up to a maximum of two years' absence from duty.

(c) The leave rules in question were framed for British officers serving at great distances from their houses. An officer of the British Army serving in England is restricted to only two months' leave in the year.

Information promised in reply to part (b) of unstarred question No. 143 asked by Mr. Anugrah Narayan Sinha on the 5th March, 1935.

SECRETARIES, JOINT SECRETARIES, ETC., IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA DEPARTMENTS.

Statement showing the number of Secretaries, Joint Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries, Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries employed in the Government of India Secretariat on the 1st January 1921, 1925, 1930 and 1935.

Designation.	Year.	Number of Officers.		Remarks.
		Total No.	No. of Indians	
Secretaries . .	1921	14*	*Nil.*	* Includes one Financial Adviser, Military Finance, one President and two members of the Railway Board, who have the status of a Secretary.
	192[illegible]	14†	2‡	† Includes one Financial Adviser, Military Finance, one Chief Commissioner, one Financial Commissioner, and two members of the Railway Board, who have the status of a Secretary. ‡ Includes one Financial Adviser, Military Finance, who has the status of a Secretary.
	193[illegible]	17§	3‖	§ Includes one Financial Adviser, Military Finance, one Chief Commissioner, one Financial Commissioner and three members of the Railway Board and one Vice-Chairman of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department, who have the status of a Secretary. ‖ Includes one member of the Railway Board and one Vice-Chairman of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department, who have the status of a Secretary.
	193[illegible]	15¶	4**	¶ Includes one Financial Adviser, Military Finance, one Chief Commissioner, one Financial Commissioner, and one member of the Railway Board and one Vice-Chairman of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department who have the status of a Secretary. **Includes one Financial Commissioner, Railway Board, and one Vice-Chairman of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department who have the status of a Secretary.

Designation.	Year.	Number of Officers.		Remarks.
		Total No.	No. of Indians.	
Joint Secretaries	1921	4*	1†	* Includes two Additional Financial Advisers, Military Finance, who have the status of a Joint Secretary.
	1925	2	*Nil.*	
	1930	5	1	† Additional Financial Adviser, Military Finance, who has the status of a Joint Secretary.
	1935	7	2	
Deputy Secretaries	1921	19‡	2	‡ Includes four Deputy Financial Advisers, Military Finance, one Secretary and one Chief Engineer, Railway Board, who have the status of a Deputy Secretary.
	1925	20§	3‖	§ Includes five Deputy Financial Advisers, Military Finance, four Directors and one Secretary, Railway Board, who have the status of a Deputy Secretary. ‖ Includes one Deputy Financial Adviser, Military Finance, who has the status of a Deputy Secretary.
	1930	20¶	5**	¶ Includes four Deputy Financial Advisers, Military Finance, five Directors and one Secretary, Railway Board, and one Secretary, Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department, who have the status of a Deputy Secretary. ** Includes one Director, Railway Board, and one Secretary, Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department, who have the status of a Deputy Secretary.
	1935	22††	9‡‡	†† Includes four Deputy Financial Advisers, Military Finance, five Directors and one Secretary, Railway Board, who have the status of a Deputy Secretary. ‡‡ Includes one Deputy Financial Adviser, Military Finance, and three Directors, Railway Board, who have the status of a Deputy Secretary.
Under Secretaries	1921	7§§	*Nil.*	§§ Includes one Joint Secretary, Railway Board, who has the status of an Under Secretary.
	1925	12‖‖	6¶¶	‖‖ Includes seven Deputy Directors, Railway Board, who have the status of an Under Secretary. ¶¶ Includes two Deputy Directors, Railway Board, who have the status of an Under Secretary.

Designation.	Year.	Number of Officers.		Remarks.
		Total No.	No. of Indians.	
Under Secretaries —*contd.*	1930	12*	9†	* Includes one Deputy Secretary and five Deputy Directors, Railway Board, who have the status of an Under Secretary. † Includes one Deputy Secretary and three Deputy Directors, Railway Board, who have the status of an Under Secretary.
	1935	11‡	6§	† Includes five Deputy Directors, Railway Board, who have the status of an Under Secretary. § Includes four Deputy Directors, Railway Board, who have the status of an Under Secretary.
Assistant Secretaries.	1921		3	‖ Includes seven Assistant Financial Advisers, Military Finance, who have the status of an Assistant Secretary.
	1925	21¶	13**	¶ Includes five Assistant Financial Advisers, Military Finance, and two Assistant Directors, Railway Board, who have the status of an Assistant Secretary. ** Includes four Assistant Financial Advisers, Military Finance, and two Assistant Directors, Railway Board, who have the status of an Assistant Secretary.
	1930	27††	20‡‡	†† Includes six Assistant Financial Advisers, Military Finance, and one Assistant Director, Railway Board, who have the status of an Assistant Secretary. ‡‡ Includes four Assistant Financial Advisers, Military Finance, and one Assistant Director, Railway Board, who have the status of an Assistant Secretary.
	1935	21§§	16‖‖	§§ Includes five Assistant Financial Advisers, Military Finance, and one Secretary, Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department, who have the status of an Assistant Secretary. ‖‖ Includes three Assistant Financial Advisers, Military Finance, and one Secretary, Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department, who have the status of an Assistant Secretary.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 767 asked by Mr. Anugrah Narayan Sinha on the 9th March, 1935.

CLOSING OF THE GATES AT LEVEL CROSSINGS NEAR THE PATNA JUNCTION RAILWAY STATION.

(a) Inconvenience to road traffic at the level crossings at the Patna Railway Station is unavoidable at times. In the majority of cases the detentions to road traffic are caused by in-coming and out-going trains as yard shunting causes the least detention. Orders are in force to open the gates every ten minutes as far as is possible. The running time for down trains from Dinapore to Patna Junction is 10 and 12 minutes respectively for Mail and Express trains, and from 21 to 25 minutes for Goods trains. Instructions have been issued that signals for down trains are not to be lowered earlier than 10 minutes before the train is due. As regards up Mail, Express and Passenger trains, the staff have been instructed not to lower signals until five minutes before trains are to start. For running through up Goods trains, the same rule applies as for down trains.

(b) *See* answer to (a).

(c) Yes.

(d) and (e). The Government of Bihar and Orissa informed the Agent, East Indian Railway, in October 1928 that they did not require either a bridge or a subway over the level crossing west of the Patna Junction station, which is by far the more important of the two. In these circumstances the railway have no reason for undertaking the work themselves.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 808 asked by Mr. Sri Prakasa on the 11th March, 1935.

IMPORT OF WHEAT INTO INDIA.

(c) Out of 2,968 tons of foreign wheat imported into Calcutta during the period April, 1934 to January, 1935, only 359 tons were re-exported as wheat flour. As regards Bombay, out of 1,068 tons of wheat passed free of duty nothing has been yet shipped as wheat flour.

Information promised in reply to parts (c), (d) and (f) of starred question No. 829 asked by Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya on the 11th March, 1935.

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE MILITARY IN MIDNAPORE.

(c) The complaint against Murari Mohan Sasmal for an offence under section 182, Indian Penal Code, was replaced by one for an offence under section 193, Indian Penal Code, because the punishment which could be imposed under the former section if the evidence warranted conviction was considered inadequate.

(d) He was discharged on an entirely technical legal point that the officer who enquired into his petition and complained could not lawfully have acted under section 202, Criminal Procedure Code, and, therefore, could not have lawfully administered the oath. No compensation was granted.

(f) The Commissioner of the Burdwan Division in a durbar speech at Midnapore on the 28th July, 1934, referred to the fact that Murari Mohan Sasmal was being prosecuted after a judicial enquiry and finding that the charges he had made were entirely false. No action against the Commissioner was called for.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 886 asked by Sir Muhammad Yakub on the 12th March 1935.

SUGAR FACTORIES LIABLE TO EXCISE DUTY IN THE ROHILKUND DIVISION.

(*a*)

District.	Khandsari sugar works.
1. Moradabad	4
2. Bareilly .	56
3. Pilibhit .	31
4. Shahjahanpur	45
5. Bijnor .	11
6. Budaun .	*Nil.*
	147

(*b*) The factories are assessed in conformity with the law in this regard.

District.	Mode of assessment.
1. Moradabad . . .	After inspection of books and registers, when made available.
2. Bareilly	80 per cent. of the assessments were made after inspecton; in the rest attempts were made to arrive at the actual number of men by inspection of wages bills and the maximum production per day.
3. Pilibhit	Assessment made after the accounts, registers and *bahi khatas* had been inspected and after enquiries regarding engine power, number and size of centrifugals, number of men employed, working hours, daily average outturn and number of *pattas* had been made.
4. Shahjahanpur . . .	After inspection and examination of attendance registers and other available sources of information.
5. Bijnor	Ten factories were summarily assessed as they failed to produce books. Assessment was based on reports received through the tahsil staff but factories were subsequently inspected.

(*c*) None of the factories assessed under the Sugar (Excise Duty) Act had previously been classed as factories under the Indian Factories Act, except 24 in the Bareilly district. A careful scrutiny of the books of the factories led to the inevitable conclusion that they had employed 20 or more men.

(*d*) None.

(*e*) 65 are working and 82 have been closed.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Owing to the adjournment of the House yesterday, the consideration of the Finance Bill and the Supplementary Grants has had to be put off. The Chair, therefore, proposes—and the Chair takes it that the House will agree—that no questions should be taken up today, with the result that there will be one more hour devoted to the consideration of the Finance Bill.

[Mr. President.]

There is a motion for adjournment in the name of Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, by which he wants to discuss the situation arising out of the demolition of a portion of the Babarthareya mosque near the railway bridge leading to the Delhi Gate by the municipal servants and the police, but the Honourable Member refused to move this motion on the 21st. Therefore, that motion lapses. There is another motion for adjournment, notice of which has been given by Pandit Nilakantha Das, in connection with the grave situation arising out of the recent decision of the Colonial Secretary on the representation of the Government of India regarding the interests of Indians in Zanzibar. But he is not here.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury (Bengal: Landholders): He did not know that there would be no questions. He is somewhere in this building, and I am just sending word to him.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): He knew, at any rate his Party knew, that the motion for adjournment would be coming on . . . . . .

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury: But that it would come at 12 I am just sending word to him.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): In the meantime, the Chair has some announcements to make, and that will give a chance to the Honourable Member to come in.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE CENTRAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR RAILWAYS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have to inform the Assembly that the following non-official Members have been elected to the Central Advisory Council for Railways, namely:

(1) Mr. Nabi Baksh Illahi Baksh Bhutto,

(2) Mr. B. B. Varma,

(3) Mr. K. Nageswara Rao,

(4) Mr. H. M. Abdullah,

(5) Mr. Muhammad Nauman, and

(6) Mr. Suryya Kumar Som.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR ROADS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have also to inform the Assembly that the following Members have been elected to the Standing Committee for Roads for the financial year 1935-36, namely:

(1) Mr. Umar Aly Shah,

(2) Mr. G. Morgan,

(3) Mr. Sham Lal,
(4) Mr. Deep Narayan Singh,
(5) Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri Lal Chand, and
(6) Mr. Fakir Chand.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND ITS GOVERNING BODY.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have to inform the Assembly that upto 12 Noon on Friday, the 15th March, 1935, the time fixed for receiving nominations for the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research and its Governing Body, four nominations were received, out of which two candidates have since withdrawn. As the number of candidates is now equal to the number of vacancies I declare Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi and Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal to be duly elected.

BILL PASSED BY THE COUNCIL OF STATE.

Secretary of the Assembly: Sir, in accordance with the provisions of rule 25 of the Indian Legislative Rules, I lay on the table a Bill further to amend the Aligarh Muslim University Act, 1920, for a certain purpose, which was passed by the Council of State on the 21st March, 1935.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): As regards the motion for adjournment that stands in the name of Pandit N'lakantha Das, by reason of undoubtedly an understanding on which we were not in law entitled to act, but, in fact, inasmuch as it was understood yesterday that there was some prospect of these things not being moved today to accommodate a continuation of the debate, will you formally allow me to move it at this stage so that it can continue at 4 o'clock.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not think that it can be allowed.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: I think the Leader of the House will bear me out that it is because of that informal understanding that I find the Honourable gentleman, in whose name the motion stands, just for the moment, does not happen to be in the House.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): As my name has been mentioned, I must state that I entirely disagree, because I had visits from Members of the same Party, and it was at their instance that questions have not been taken. They have agreed to close the debate and support closure at 4 P.M. The Leader of the Opposition as well as the representative of that Party were informed that no questions would be taken provided the President agreed to it, and we all knew perfectly well that no questions would be put, and I would object to anybody else moving this motion.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair is not in a position to accept the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of the Party, Mr. Satyamurti, knew very well that the Chair was prepared to waive questions today.

The consideration of the Finance Bill will now be resumed.

THE INDIAN FINANCE BILL—*contd.*

Dr. Bhagavan Das (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I have been hesitating greatly to take up the time of the House, for various reasons. One of these is that my notions are rather antiquated. Another is that I am perhaps too anxious to see greater prospects of peace, for the new generation, before I pass on to other worlds. It is probable, therefore, that what I say may sound foolish to both sides of the House. But I feel I must not shirk the duty of placing before the House some ideas which have come into my mind. The Christian Scriptures, somewhere, I believe, advise us to suffer fools gladly. I will, therefore, beg the House to suffer me gladly while I say my say.

I will first say something about the principles and the spirit which, it seems to me, should guide and inspire the Administration, for the carrying on of which the Budget and the Finance Bill are placed before us. Then I will make a few concrete proposals for changes in the Bill and the Budget, in accordance with those principles.

Two happenings during the present Session are particularly worthy of note. One is that the most thoughtful occupants of the Government Benches have candidly admitted, as has never been done before, that they are the helpless agents of a *vicious system*, that the existing constitution is blameworthy. The other is that the occupants of the Opposition Benches have poured out their hearts, as also has never been done before—hearts burning with the bitter experience of the manifold sufferings of the people, who are the victims of that *vicious system*, their perennial starvation, their pauperisation, their demoralisation, their intoxication with drugs and drinks, their occasional shootings down; hearts full also with memories of their own sufferings, inside and outside jail.

To the cursory view, these two happenings may seem cause for despair. Yet, it seems to me, they give ground for hope. The recounting of the consequences of the *vicious system*, face to face, by its victims to its agents, is much. The public confession, by its agents, that the *system* is *vicious*, is much more. It gives ground for hope that the agents may be willing to listen to suggestions as to how they and the victims can *co-operate*, to gradually but surely and steadily, change the *vicious* into a *virtuous* system.

My suggestions are these:

First and foremost, let each side of the House resolve sincerely that it will see itself, not only with its own eyes, but with those of the other also; will see, not only its own merits, but also its demerits, that may be pointed out by the other, in the spirit of the true and just friends; and that our discussions here shall not be in the nature of attack and defence, but of serious and earnest consultation for the promotion of the well-being of all sections of the people.

Secondly, let us recognise that there are no so-called "practical" difficulties in the way of improving the situation. The only difficulties are spiritual and psychical. If we really want to do it, we can do it. The very clever statesmen of the very civilised countries of the west find no "practical" difficulties in bringing about world-wars and world-bankruptcies, and in going on organising their nations for a yet more awful slaughter and the destruction of civilisation. The 'practical' difficulties in organising and planning for peace are surely far smaller. Only the will is wanted.

Thirdly, let us all clearly recognise that of the two functions of the State, functions undisputedly recognised by all the best modern as well as ancient political thought on the subject, the *ministrant* function, subdivided into those of *Education* and *Employment*, is far more important than the *constituent* function namely, maintenance of *law and order*, that is maintenance of external and internal *peace*. Most astonishingly, the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report ignores ministrant function altogether and has not even mentioned it. As prevention of disease by promotion of health is better than cure after developing disease, so right education and employment of the people are better than penal legislation and repression. Inner impulsion to good is much more effective than outer compulsion against evil. Moral and hygienic culture is far better than penal codes and many jails and many hospitals. It does all the work of the latter, in a much happier way, and does much more besides. The Viceroy said here, the other day, that education was at the root of national prosperity. Of course, right education was meant; for wrong education is the root of national calamity

The duties of a righteous Administration, towards the people are none other than those of the elders of a family to its younger generation, namely, to protect from disease and injury, to educate, and to put in the way of earning a decent living. All other activities and functions of the State are subservient to these. The ancient words are *dushta-nigraha* or *rakshana*, and *shishta-anugraha*, sub-divided into *shikshana* and *bharana*. Persian, equivalents would be *insidad-i-badi* and *imdad-i-néki*. All the current portfolios of the Government of India are easily classifiable under these three.

Because the *promotive* function is of greater consequence than the *preventive*, therefore, the ancient law-giver of this land, bases civilisation primarily on the *Educator*, and only secondarily on the *Soldier*, and he makes the *Soldier* and the *Executive* subordinate to the godly man of learning who is the *Educator* and the *Legislator*; for otherwise, the *Soldier* who should be the *Defender*, always degenerates into the *Offender*, the *Oppressor*, and the *Slaughterer*.

Fourthly, in accordance, then, with the best modern thought and tendency in State-administration, as well as with the ancient tradition of the land, let us all resolve to do the most we can, for the right *education* and the right *employment* of the new generation. The Educational and the Economic Councillors and advisers of the Government should form a Committee, together with some elected elders of the people, and, in full and sympathetic consultation, draw up comprehensive schemes for such Education and Employment. Japan and Russia and Italy can probably give us many useful hints in these matters, for their agricultural and other conditions are somewhat similar to ours; and the two first-named countries

[Dr. Bhagavan Das.]
though poles apart in politico-economic principles, have yet both developed admirable systems of education and have abolished unemployment, by all report.

Fifthly, I would suggest that if the Official side of this House sincerely desires the *co-operation* of this side, it should always bear in mind that what have been called "the doings and happenings" of the last fifteen or sixteen years, began with the Amritsar Massacre and the horrors of Martial Law in the Punjab, and the disregard by the Government of the request of the Congress for a very small redress of those very great wrong; and that to further strengthen the Executive, that is, the Military, the Police, the Magistracy, instead of strengthening the Educative and the Economic Departments and the Legislature, is to try to cure poison by yet more and cruder poison, instead of by antidotes. Promote the beneficent activities of the administration; then the repressive activities will be minimised automatically, will be needed less often; crime will diminish in the public; crime and corruption in the public servants also of all departments, as testified by the official Reports of the Police, Jail and Railway Commissions and the record and Reports of the Judicial Administration, and the presidential addresses at official Police Conferences, will also diminish, and vast amounts of public monies which are now wasted on extra Police and C. I. D. and Secret Service expenses of many sordid kinds, and help to cause deficits in Provincial Budgets, as complained by the Provincial Governors themselves, would be saved for far better uses.

Sixthly, I would pray the Official Members to consider that Economic Planning is not wholly impossible or futile, though the Finance Member lightly dismissed it as such, the other day. One of Britain's favourite politicians of today, Sir John Simon, after a few hours talk with Signor Mussolini last year, returned to Britain, and went about publicly declaring that the day of muddling along anyhow had gone by, and the day of planning had come. At least so the dailies reported. And, indeed, as my good brother, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, pointed out, the British Government has been doing quietly a lot of work latterly in respect of planned vocational education and planned economy, even though, it may be on lines different from those of Communist Russia, and somewhat similar to those of Fascist Italy. In respect of Agriculture, though Britain is a manufacturing country, it is reported to have established nine agricultural universities, twelve colleges, two veterinary colleges, and numerous farm institutions, to have arranged for short but complete courses of agricultural instruction in other educational institutions, and to be trying hard to develop its agriculture and food-production. This is all very sound common sense, even though perhaps the immediate incentive may be fear of another war and the cutting off of food-supplies. Here, in India, agriculture, the staple industry, is becoming less and less productive.

The Home Member did not give the needed answer to my question on the subject; but, if I am not mistaken, the total number of persons in public service of all sorts is, by the census, something like ten millions at present. These have their dependents. The various departments of the administration have their collateral non-official professions and occupations, also, thus the law courts have their lawyers; the Public Works Deparment their contractors. And so forth. It may perhaps not be incorrect, therefore, to infer, that 30 to 40 millions are dependent on the Government in

direct or indirect ways. It may well be said that the Government is planning for these. In New Delhi, quarters for public servants of all grades, from the Governor General to the *chaprasis*, seem to be provided. All this is not unlike Socialistic Planning. It needs only to be extended to the remaining 230 or 240 millions of so-called British India.

The Government do regularly secure the figures for the area cultivated annually, the crops produced, also the other raw materials, as well as the finished products, the quantities imported and exported. They also know the numbers of the human bodies that have to be fed and clothed. We have only to expand our hearts and our arithmetical calculations a little, only to feel as public *servants*, and not as public *masters*, only to develop some public spirit and self-denial, in order to make *equitable—not equal* arrangements for all the 270 millions, as we are doing now for 30 or 40.

When there is abundance of food and clothing, and not too many eaters and wearers, budgeting and counting and planning are not needed. When things are otherwise, careful planning and dividing are necessary. All the advanced countries of the West are steadily advancing towards such systematic planning, in lesser or greater imitation of Russia; though they are also advancing, most unfortunately, towards Armageddon, hypnotised by the catchword 'nationalism' and driven along by a veritable madness of lust and hate and greed and pride. Our Central and Provincial Budgets total, in round figures, about 250 crores of income, and as much of expenditure, and they provide for the maintenance, on very different scales of living, it may be of only 30 to 40 millions, as said before. Let the figures for the total annual yield of consumable goods be also taken into account and the budgets so framed by the professional experts in the service, that what is called 'a minimum living wage', *i.e.*, the necessaries of life in adequate measure, shall be left to the agricultural and other labourers, who compose the vast bulk of the remaining 230 or 240 millions. It is surely very cruel that those who, by very hard labour, provide others with necessaries, comforts, luxuries, should themselves be left without even necessaries. If the Government see that the population is growing beyond their power to keep in food and clothing, even after the best possible utilisation of the cultivable and other areas, it will become their duty to proclaim the fact, and the duty of all to help in maintaining a due proportion between the number of mouths to be fed and the available food-supply. All this is easily possible if only the Government *identify* the interests of the public servant with the interests of the public, instead of making them *antagonistic*.

India raised a loan to give away a hundred and fifty crores to Britain for the horrible and senseless butchery of the Great War. She has borrowed about 800 crores and spent them much more usefully on Railways. The suggestion of Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant that a hundred crores should be borrowed and spent on carefully thoughtout, beneficent, nation-building works, the yield of which would make repayment of the loan easy, is not so very visionary as the Finance Member tried to make it appear. Not attempt to ridicule, but earnest consultation, over these serious matters of grave import, is needed.

[Dr. Bhagavan Das.]

Let us realise that the unemployment of some 30 millions in the West, and the far greater, though uncounted, *un*employment in India, now causing suicides among the educated, and large mortality among the masses, is the result of the continued *mis*employment of another 30 millions, in the shape of standing armies and reserves, in the brutalising work of preparing to butcher each other and also massacre civilian populations. If the vast sums of money, aggregating perhaps 2,000 millions of pounds spent annually on these 60 million unemployed and misemployed, were spent on right education and right employment, in beneficent, nation-building, life-supporting, and life-refining works, and the utilisation of the vast unutilised areas of the continents, the earth, which is now becoming a hell of evil passions, would come near to becoming a heaven of friendliness and peace. But the great and wise statesmen go on saying that there are no "*practical*" difficulties in the way of promoting hell, and many in the way of making any approach to heaven. The wish is father to the thought; the whole of the new literature of psycho-analysis and psychiatry is only commentary on this ancient proverb. It seems, indeed, that as the Government here is the helpless agent of the vicious system evolved by Britain, so have the Government of Britain and all the great Governments of the civilised world, with all their very clever statesmen and army-men and science-men, become the mere puppets of a small international clique of financiers and armament-makers, which has driven away the God of Love and Mercy, and enthroned in His place the horrible Mammon of Capitalist Greed, and made the Moloch of Militarist Hate, his obedient servant. Let us struggle with all our might against the hypnotising glamour of all such vicious systems, and break the paralysing spell. Otherwise the ruin of India and Britain both, and indeed of all civilised countries, through a worse war, is certain. How India's fate affects the fate of all other countries, I will explain in a moment.

Let us, then, sincerely wish rightly, and let us grasp the fundamental principles firmly; the right thought of the details will follow of itself, and all so-called 'practical' difficulties will disappear.

Every sensible head of a family successfully *plans* out, periodically, the feeding and clothing, the educating, and the protecting from disease and danger, of his whole family. Why cannot the Legislature and the Executive, in consultation, do the same work for the great family of the Indian People? But they must talk heart-to-heart, and not fence at arm's length, if they are to do so.

The question of Indianisation is often pressed. We, of the Congress, so far as I am aware, do not lay so much stress on it. We want humanisation, good-man-isation. The colour of the skin is of no importance. The nature of the heart is of very great importance. Mother India has children of all shades, of all colours, from Scandinavian white to African dark, from Chinese yellow to American red. And she has kept them all together, for thousands of years, in the Joint Family of a Social Organisation which has now, unhappily, become very corrupt. We need, therefore, not a change of the outer colour in our public servants, but a change of heart, of spirit, from selfishness to equity, from utter irresponsibility to first responsiveness, and then responsibility, to the elected elders of the people; a change from public-*master*-ship to genuine public-*servant*-ship. With that assured, any person, of any colour, with the

needed intellectual and ethical qualifications, would be welcome. We *want* the British, but as friends and co-workers and fellow-servants, *not* as masters.

India has *not* suffered from racialism, or nationalism or communalism, in the modern sense in the past. She has begun to do so only recently. All sorts of religions and races and so-called minorities, she has fostered in all the centuries. Otherwise these minorities would not be existing here today. Christians came and settled on the south-western coast in the very first century after Christ; Arabs did so, before and after the birth of Islam; Parsis did so; Jews did so. Many tribes from beyond the Himalayas came into the north, including Scythians, Huns, Greeks, Tibetans, Afghans, Mughals; all were assimilated, and more or less loosely fitted into the Social Organisation, and given places and means of living. And now the Europeans have come. They too were welcomed at first. That the Indian people have not been able to absorb them, but have become slaves to them, is due to special well-known causes. If the Indian people have begun to suffer now from the evil passions of racialism, nationalism, and communalism, it is only because of the very evil conditions created by the *vicious system*. Their own indigenous system, now greatly corrupted, is a very *virtuous* system of principles for the Organisation of the whole Human Race, of all the four main *varnas*, which word means *colours* as well as *vocations*, with opportunity provided to every individual for appropriate education and employment.

In the present conditions of executive irresponsibility to the Legislature, a brown bureaucracy is indeed more harmful than a white one. The psychological reasons are well-known. It is very painful to me to have to hurt the feelings of any Government servant. I myself was in salaried public service, 40 years ago. But plain yet well-intentioned speaking is sometimes necessary, like bitter yet healthful medicine. Convict warders in jails are known to be more cruel to convicts, and not more sympathetic, than the free warders. The worst work of the vicious system is best done by such. It is part of the very short-sighted policy, of divide and rule, of that vicious system. Therefore, the only Indianisation that we want is that the *European* public servants here should *Indianise* their *hearts;* and much more do we want that the *Indian* public servants should keep their hearts *Indianised*, and not make them Anglicised. We see that the condition of the Indian People in much of *Indian* India today, is worse than in *British* India.

Of the same nature as this matter of racialism and nationalism is that of communalism. This spirit of communalism is the direct and recent product of the spirit of deceitful diplomacy and secret machination which animates the vicious system of which the Government here is the helpless, yet, unfortunately, all too willing, tool. The popular conviction is clear and decided, that if the Government really and sincerely wished that these communal rivalries and riots should not be, they would not be.

I do not wish to put the Official Members into a condition of internal conflict, by asking them. But I will beg the elected Members to say, firstly, if there are any among them who think that the popular conviction is not as I have described it, and secondly, if there are any among them who themselves do not hold that conviction.

I would earnestly request the Home Member to send for a sufficient number of copies, from the United Provinces Government, of the Congress

[Dr. Bhagavan Das.]

Committee's Report on *the Cawnpore Riots* of 1931, which has been proscribed, suppressed, and confiscated by the United Provinces Government, and distribute them among the Official Members, for perusal and serious consideration. I would particularly request him to read the Report himself. He will find cause there to think that the popular conviction is not groundless. I have personal knowledge of two of the worst riots of recent times, those of Benares and Cawnpore, in February and March, 1931. They were engineered for a whole year before they occurred. Things have come to such a pass now, that a riot can be started at will by interested persons, almost as an electric light can be switched on. In that Report, the Congress Committee have suggested, as the first and most effective remedy, that, wherever such a riot occurs, the Government should suspend the District Magistrate and the Superintendent of Police first, and call on them for explanation afterwards. I believe that the elected Members of this Assembly will be ready to guarantee that if the Government announces its acceptance of this suggestion, such riots will never occur again.

My very worthy friend, Sir Henry Gidney, the other day, spoke to the effect that the communal rivalries and riots made the British Army and the British Military occupation necessary and desirable. The writers of the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report refer to them also. I would ask him and them if these communal rivalries and riots of India are worse and more disastrous than the political rivalries and riots, called World-wars of Europe, including Britain? Do not these political and racial rivalries and riots of Europe require, far more, that some disinterested and benevolent power, like Japan, or now Russia, should hold the balance evenly between them all?

The compilers of the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report say that Britain has given unity to India and that this is perhaps her greatest gift Among the many grievous and injurious errors which they have committed, this is one of the worst. When Britain has not been able to preserve its own unity, in a couple of islands, totalling a smaller area and a smaller population than that of one of our provinces, *e.g.*, the United Provinces; when Ireland has torn itself away from that unity, when Scotland and Wales also show signs of separativeness, now and again; how is it possible for Britain to give any real unity to India? For the moment, she has given deep and widespread psychical and communal *disunity* to India, and stopped the process of fusion which was slowly proceeding, by her vicious system, though I believe that, under Providence, it will all ultimately work out to good, by compelling both Hindus and Muslims to reform their now much deformed religions and seek a higher synthesis. In the meanwhile the diligently cultivated spirit of 'divide and rule' has recoiled on Britain in the shape of her own internal dissensions and rupture. The unity that Britain has given to India is the compulsory and superficial unity of a centralised government,—the unity of a jail Such political unity is very artificial and very fragile. Especially are blood-cemented empires short-lived. None seems to have lived for more than two or three hundred years in past history. The British Empire was born in 1877. Within less than half a century, Ireland broke away, though wiser counsels have enabled Britain to keep it from flying apart altogether. The Colonies are, in fact, no longer parts of an Empire but

of a Federation, a Commonwealth, as is right and proper. Such Federations, voluntary, co-operative, beneficent to all members, have every chance of long life. *Alliance* for existence, on honourable and equal terms of *inter*-dependence, is far more helpful to all concerned, than domination over anyone by any other and constant *struggle* for existence. Real and long-lasting unity is spiritual and cultural unity, such as has held all the peoples of all the parts of India together, for many thousands of years now, and gradually transformed new creeds like Christianity and Islam also into Gnosticism and *Tasawwuf*, and assimilated them to the Genius of the People, until the forces of disruption began recently their sorry work, like some new disease.

Let us all, Hindu, Muslim and Christian Members of this Assembly—for the religious practice and the community of each shows much degeneration—ponder carefully the reaction of these disruption forces, set going here in India, in Britain itself.

The wise sayings of the scriptures, and of the People, which embody external truths ascertained by the experience of the ages, tell us that "as we sow, even thus must we reap", "Sins come home to roost", "With what measure we mete unto others, with that same shall it be meted unto us":

"Miyane-e do tan atash angekhtan
Na danist k-andar miyan sokhtan."

"Who raiseth fire between two brothers, falleth into it himself", for the simple psychological reason that he who cultivates deligently an evil emotion and behaviour towards strangers, becomes gradually so soaked with them, that he cannot help manifesting them towards his own family, bye and bye. Let us all then sincerely recognise that "honesty is the best policy", and "truth prevails in the end".

Hindus, dividing themselves into thousands of exclusive castes, Muslims splitting themselves into scores of sects, are paying the penalty by being enslaved. The British, a younger branch of the Aryan Race, presumably intended by Providence to uplift them, have misconceived their mission and enslaved them. But "though it needs must be that offences come, woe also unto him through whom they come." Britain has begun paying her own penalty, by her internal and external tribulations. She would be saved great danger if she would sincerely help to put India on the way to substantial self-government, and *Interdependence* with Britain on equal and honourable terms. That is what Independence really means. For, in the strict sense, *complete independence* is a *complete myth*. No nation, the most powerful, is completely independent of its neighbours. The ancient language of this land has no word for *in*-dependence; it has many for *self*-dependence and *self*-government.

The Budget and the Finance Bill can be so framed and so worked as to initiate this beneficent work, which would, without a doubt, prove a double blessing to India and to Britain both.

There is a prophecy, recorded in the *Mahabharata*, that whoever performs the *Raja-Suya* ceremony of coronation as Emperor (not as king), shall suffer dire misfortune. Yudhisthira did not heed the prophecy, performed the ceremony in this very place, now known as Delhi, then kwown as *Indraprastha*, and suffered dire misfortune, which ended in a terrible

[Dr. Bhagavan Das.]

war and the disruption of the empire after the passing of *Yudhishthira*. The prophecy is not mystical or mysterious. It is plain common sense and human psychology

Imperialism, formerly militarist, now capitalist, causes such widespread misery and such bitter jealousy and hatred, that it must necessarily cause such internecine wars.

India has been the Apple of Discord between the European nations for some centuries now. British writers have written that the key to the world-politics of the last two centuries or so is primarily India, and secondarily Egypt. It has been said that the recent World-War was fought to prevent the Berlin-Baghdad Railway from extending to Baluchistan and Burma. "World-dominion or downfall" was the slogan of Germany. If India is helped to substantial self-government by Britain, she will cease to be an apple of discord, and will become the grateful friend and firm ally of Britain, an inseparable member of a British-Indian Commonwealth, and a very Fountain of Peace for all the world. If this is not done by Britain, another and worse world-war is bound to come, and before long. European friends have told me that they, or their grown-up sons, may be whirled away, any day, into the jaws of this advancing Horror. Germany's decision to rearm seems to have caused worry everywhere presumably in the army-circles here also.

I would earnestly entrust both sides of this House to take each other into confidence, and consult frankly and sincerely over the best way to avoid this Horror, which threatens to engulf civilisation and mankind altogether. It is not only an awful shame that confidential circulars should pass between higher and lower public servants, and that there should be no confidence at all between the official elders and the People's elected elders, but it is also a terrible danger. Lord Hardinge has said publicly that India was bled white and denuded of all her troops, in the first months of the Great War, with the exception of a few regiments—if I remember rightly, he said only 1,600 fresh recruits from Britain—who were kept constantly on the move, by rail, to give the people the impression that there were great numbers of soldiers still in the land. If another world-war breaks out in Europe, the underworlds could scarcely be prevented from getting loose in India, with so much resentment against racial humiliation and serfdom and starvation smouldering always. Mahatma Gandhi's counsels would remain confined to only his Congress followers. When a whole people goes mad, fear is not sufficient to check them. We see communal riots continuing for days and even weeks, next-door to military cantonments in peace-time. But mutual affection and sympathy and trust, if they are diligently established, would surely prevent the people from going mad at all.

I would, therefore, pray those who hold the reins of power here, as agents, to tell all this to the principals of the *vicious system* in Britain. I would also tell them, in all humility, that it is because they themselves commit the great sin of disaffection for, and disloyalty towards, the people from whom they draw their sustenance and to whom they, therefore, owe inalimable allegiance—it is because of this that there is so much unrest in the land. I would also plead with them, that if they would even cursorily observe human psychology, they would see that what they call

sedition and disaffection in their penal laws, cannot be changed into loyalty and affection by bludgeoning and jailing and shooting, but by affection and sympathy. Love cannot be created by frightfulness. Terrorism breeds terrorism. Each side counts from the last wrong, and so the feud and the vendetta goes on for ever. As the Buddhist Scriptures say: "Hatred is not cured by hatred, but by love". If the Government secures the needed permission from its principals in Britain, and developes sincere affection for the people, and makes itself first genuinely responsive, and then responsible, to the people elected elders, the people will surely return that affection a hundredfold, and the God within us all will bless it.

Sir, I beseech all sections of this House to realise that considerations of expediency and policy and diplomacy really coincide now with considerations of spirituality and mortality, of humanitarianism and justice, that, indeed, "honesty is the best policy".

Sir, I will now pass on, from these general considerations, to a few concrete suggestions, as to what changes should be made in the Budget and the Finance Bill, and how the Budget should be worked, in order to start the beneficent work of changing the *vicious* into a *virtuous* system.

Sir, we have all solemnly sworn to perform our duty faithfully as legislators. Clearly our one and only duty is to enact good and wise laws, in sincere mutual consultation, laws which will not harm the just interests of any one, inside or outside India, and will promote the welfare of all sections of the public, here in the first place, and of the public servant, in the second I do believe, that every one here will agree, that the public servant, in any and every form of State—from the king or president to the *chaukidar*—is the means, and the welfare of the public is the end. Such is the clear ancient tradition of this land, and also the indubitable decision of modern political science of all schools of thought. Our head cannot but agree in this, even though our heart may try to dictate another answer. I, therefore, say, let us abolish, or at least reduce to the farthest possible, the duty on salt. The life of the poor in this country is hard enough. Let us not incur the heinous sin of making it harder. We have deprived them of bread largely. Let us not take away their salt also. What deprivation of salt means, can be told by some of my brothers on this side of the House, who have longer and severer experience of prison than I have

I would also suggest, that the revenue from opium be given up, and only a very limited cultivation of the drug allowed for strictly medical purposes. The ancient law-giver pronounces terrible curse upon the ruler who derives any revenue from sin-steeped traffic, as a parent might by deliberately debauching his own progeny, his *praja*.

The Salt duty is expected to yield 873 lakhs and the opium, 61 lakhs. How to make up the deficit?

It seems cruel, and I am exceedingly reluctant, to suggest that the tax on incomes between one thousand and two thousand a year, should not be reduced, as the Bill proposes to do. But when I have to choose between reducing such incomes by a few rupees, on the one hand, and reducing incomes between ten rupees and fifty rupees a year, by a few annas, on the other hand—conscience compels me to choose the former.

[Dr. Bhagavan Das.]

The Home Member did not find it convenient to supply me with the information But I have found since, that the Banking Enquiry Committee, appointed by the Government, reported in 1931, that "the total gross value of the annual agricultural produce would work out to about 1,200 crores, and the average income per head of the agricultural population,. . . . .at about Rs. 42 per year", or some *seven pice* per day. I believe no Member of this House has any doubt that 40 to 50 millions out of this agricultural population are living on *two to three* pice per head per day, and sometimes, in the slack season, cannot get even that. Let us think what it means to deprive such persons of a *few annas* per year, as compared with depriving those who are getting three to five rupees a day, of a few rupes per year, especially when the prices or necessaries have fallen and living has become cheaper in towns.

For these same reasons, I would suggest that the other proposed reductions in the rates of income-tax or surcharges be not made, and the salary cuts be not restored. Instead, I would suggest that the rates of the surcharges on incomes above a lakh, and of the cuts in salaries above twenty thousand a year be raised in a rising gradation.

Every at all public-spirited businessman, and every sincere public *servant* who realises that he should *serve* the public, and should promote their happiness and contentment first and his own comfort next—every such person will, I hope, support these suggestions of mine.

The Home Member declined to give the information to the House, but I have subsequently learnt, from a very prominent businessman, that the highest total amount of income-tax and surcharge paid in 1934, by a single person was *34 lakhs* The total income, on which this tax was paid, would be over 60 lakhs. The tax in such cases may well be raised by 50 per cent. The assessee would still have quite enough left, *i.e.*, about ten lakhs a year, to live as luxuriously as his heart might desire. The only joy that would be denied to him would be the unhealthy and hollow joy of larger arithmetical figures on the credit side of his account-books. I would add the suggestion that the Income-tax Department should be instructed not to be too inquisitorial and arrogant and harsh; for, indeed it is becoming as unpopular almost as the police.

As regards the one crore provided for village uplift, I would most earnestly suggest that the advice of Mahatma Gandhi may be requested by the Government as to how it should be spent. It would be a genuine gesture of friendliness, would convince the people that the Government really desires both-sided co-operation and not only one-sided obedience, would solve much wounded feeling, and would also ensure the really useful expenditure of the money.

As regards the abolition of the export duty on skins, I am not a businessman, but my feeling is that it will hurt the small leather industries of the country greatly, and I would propose, therefore, that the duty be not abolished.

As regards the expenditure on the Army, disproportionately immense as it is, in view of the poverty of the country, it seems, to a layman like me, to be utterly futile withal, in case of another world-war, as proved by the experience of the last. My good brother, Asaf Ali, eloquently pointed

out, the other day, the ever greater dangers which a more and more ambitious capitalist imperialism, trying to expand its territories and protectorates and spheres of influence ever more and more, inevitably incurs. Dr. Deshmukh and Dr. Khare have mentioned other and exceedingly relevant considerations, as regards frontier defence and internal peace. To justify the expenditure on the Army, on the ground of defence of India against foreign aggression, is, under present conditions, a very great fallacy, when the whole of the current régime, utterly irresponsible to the elected Legislature, and persistently separating itself from the people, in subtle as well as overt ways, cannot be regarded as other than one gigantic and continuous foreign aggression.

To cure this fallacy, and make the army expenditure really useful, it is indispensable that mutual trust should be created and established between the official elders of the Executive and the elected elders of the Legislature; that the former should begin to make themselves responsive and responsible to the latter; should militarise the police; should arrange for extensive militia-training of the younger generation; should assiduously teach and train the military, the police, the militia, the civic guards, to feel and behave as chivalrous defenders, and never as offenders; and finally, should take all possible measures to promote among them all, feelings of comradeship and of co-operation in the *common cause* of the good of *both* India and Britain. The most important of such measures would be those which would minimise racial and creedal notions and feelings of inferiority and superiority and separatism between Briton and Indian and Anglo-Indian, between Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Sikh and Parsi.

If this is done, the foundation will be truly laid for that Indo-British or British-Indian Commonwealth of self-governing yet inter-dependent peoples, which would be a far greater and stabler, far more human and humane, far more glorious and godly, achievement, than the so-called British Empire. Such a Federation of the many British and Indian Peoples would be, in turn, the foundation of the true League of Nations, each nation scientifically organising for internal peace, each one maintaining only a comparatively small military police for internal law and order, none needing to organise for external war, all saving the vast resources and energies now worse than wasted on Unemployment and Mis-employment, and utilising them for the ever greater refining of the life of all the nations as a whole.

All this may sound like foolish dreaming. I humbly submit that the way the world-politicians and world-economicians are going is *far more foolish*, as proved patently by the World-war and the World-Bankruptcy, that it is a Gigantic Ratio Progress, which, if not stopped, will end this time in complete ruin of civilisation. These politicians and economicians are themselves feeling, and even loudly saying, this. Yet they are allowing themselves to be driven along, as by doom.

I would entreat the helpless agents of the vicious system to make themselves, less helpless and at least to warn their principals strongly of the imminent danger.

I will conclude, Sir, with the most foolish of all my suggestions.

Let the Ecclesiastical Department be made a genuine *Ecclesia*, *i.e.*, Assembly, of—not narrow-minded secretaries of small vision,—but of true priests, presbyters, elders, benevolent, patriarchal, philanthrophic, with

[Dr. Bhagavan Das.]

large hearts and liberal minds, persons who sincerely believe in the Fatherhood of God, the Motherhood of God's Nature, and the Solidarity of Man, the child of God and Nature, of Spirit and Matter; persons who have no racial or communal feelings, who believe in the Universal Religion which runs through all particular religions and constitutes their common heart and their essential unity; men who are true men of God. Such persons should be carefully selected and drawn from all the creeds, for every one of the great living religions has the same ideal of them and gives them the very same designation. The Christian creed calls them "divines", men of *Divus, Deus*, God; the Jewish calls them 'rabbis', men of Rab, God; the *Vaidika Dharma* calls them 'Brahmanas', men of Brahma, God; and Islam calls them '*Maulavis*', men of Maula, the very same God again.

"*An ke Maula ra bandand maulavi-st.*"

If such men are selected to constitute the Ecclesiastical Department; if they diligently teach the truths of Universal Religion and Morality and Duty to the Army, the police, the magistracy, and the other branches of the executive and indeed all services, and the general public too; and if they specially co-operate with the educational and scientific departments, then the whole of the Administration and of public life will soon become inspired by high and noble and philanthropic motives, in place of the present low and ignoble motives and small and sordid diplomacies, and then, indeed, happier times will dawn for Britain and India both.

Two possible criticisms I will briefly deal with, before I close.

It may perhaps be said that I have, after all, dealt in generalities, and not made any really specific, concrete, and detailed suggestions. It may also be said that I have indulged in idealism and not taken account of realities.

To the first criticism, I would reply, that if I had, at my disposal, even a small portion of the office-staff, and of the time for such work, and of the energy of much younger age, which the Finance Member has at his disposal, I would gladly undertake to recast in detail the whole of his Budget in accordance with the generalities which I have mentioned. But it is not the duty of the elected Eldermen of the People to do such detail-work. In self-governing countries they have to decide, here to merely suggest, the general principles and policies. The detail work is for the salaried whole-time public servants to do.

To the second criticism I would reply: Yes, I have talked idealism, but I am not unaware of realities. I know the head, but I know the feet also. I know that in the waking and walking condition, we must keep the feet on the earth; but I also know that we must, at the same time, keep the head and the eyes in the air. So only shall we be able to keep the feet on the clean firm pathway. If we put our head down on the same level as the feet, in the waking and working state, we shall surely become like unclean animals, and will crawl into mud and mire and holes. Let us, therefore, make our ideals high, and let us define them clearly, and let us keep them before our eyes, always; and let us ever strive manfully to approach them the nearest we can. Otherwise we shall degrade

and confuse ourselves more and more, and fall into more and more course, sordid and evil passions, temptations, and actions, which will lead to Armageddar.

I will conclude with the great old sentences. Pride goeth before destruction, and a hard heart before a fall. The colossus of brass hath feet of clay. God will not be mocked. As we sow, thus must we reap. As we do unto others, so shall it be done unto us, therefore, let us do unto others, as we would that they should do unto us; therefore, let us all earnestly strive to achieve righteousness and mutual affection and trust; for then, most surely, all things else shall be added unto us

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon (Sind: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, at the outset, I wish to offer a few observations on the budget itself. I
12 NOON. do not know whether I should congratulate the Finance Member on the budget he has presented to us, or I should say some unpleasant things about it, because, I feel, Sir, that the estimates which he has presented in this book either give entirely wrong figures or wrong estimates have purposely been given to avoid a reduction in taxation, or the Finance Member himself or his Department are unable to work out correct figures. I cannot believe for a moment that the figures presented to us this year are correct, because last year exactly on the same day when the budget was presented to us, namely, on the 28th February, Sir George Schuster said something else, but what does the Finance Member say today? This is what he says

"When my predecessor presented his budget last February, it was anticipated that after a provision of Rs 3 crores had been made for debt reduction, the year 1933-34 would close with a surplus of 1.29 lakhs, and the actual figure would become 2,72 lakhs."

Sir, when the budget was presented to us, the Honourable the Finance Member estimated that the excess revenue would be about 1,29 lakhs, but within probably a month it was pointed out that the revenue increased to 2,72 lakhs. If this is the way in which figures are presented to us, I do not think we can place much reliance on the figures that are supplied to Honourable Members of this House. Of course, my friend, the Finance Member, has given us some explanation for the increase in revenue, but I shall be very thankful if he will kindly tell us how much increase of revenue there has been on salt and how much increase in income-tax in Bihar and Orissa, but I think the big item of increase has been from customs. Sir, if within a month we are unable to produce correct figures, how can we believe that all the figures presented to us are correct?

I shall give the House only one instance relating to sugar in which I am personally interested. The Honourable the Finance Member has estimated the income from sugar to be 1,75 lakhs, while last year his predecessor estimated it at about 2,05 lakhs, and not double the figure, and, therefore, I think that our estimate today is more correct than the estimate of the Honourable the Finance Member, namely, 1,75 lakhs. Sir, this is the opinion of not only myself, but it is the considered opinion of many important commercial bodies interested in the sugar industry, and, in support of what I say, I might, with your permission, Sir, read two telegrams which I have received from the Sugar Manufacturers' Associations

[Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon.]

of Cawnpore and Calcutta. The Sugar Producers' Association of Cawnpore say this:

"Sugarcane crop in the United Provinces and Bihar this season suffered due to adverse condition. Unless action taken adverse conditions will be accentuated Consider Provincial Governments handicap for lack of funds suggest you strongly press Government of India to allocate at least 40 lakhs out of 75 lakhs being additional allotment for remission of debt or out of at least three crores additional revenue from foreign sugar in excess of Finance Member's estimated revenue."

Now, Sir, this is a telegram from the Indian Sugar Producers' Association of Cawnpore, of which many British and Indian manufacturers of sugar are members. Besides that, I have received another telegram from the Sugar Producers' Association of Calcutta, which also supports what the Cawnpore Association has said. How can any one say that these people, who are in the actual trade, who are actually manufacturing sugar, cannot estimate correctly? But, as I have said, it is the Government policy to under-estimate their receipts, so that they may not reduce taxes, and, when they find themselves at the end of the year with more revenue, they sit on the throne like the Great Mughal and distribute the amount as they please without considering public opinion or the opinion of this Assembly. I do not think that it is fair either to this House or to the public. Let me tell you how they distribute the surplus.

I do not want to go into each and every item, and I do not want to create differences by saying something about some items, but I may say this about my own province, Sind. Everybody knows that, not only the Government of India, but the British Government have already decided that Sind should be separated. The Bill is before the House of Commons, and I hope that as soon as it has gone through the Parliament, Sind will be immediately separated. Let me tell the Government that Sind has already borrowed from the Government of India some crores of rupees, and, according to my information, today, including interest, it comes to Rs. 2.26 crores. Government have sent an expert engineer in roads to Sind to enquire about the condition of the roads there, and his report is already in the hands of the Government. Government know that without the roads, the barrage cannot pay its debt back. I am glad that the Government have already sanctioned an amount of Rs. 40 lakhs from the surplus for the Road Fund. But my previous experience has been that Sind has not been treated well, and I do not know how much of this amount will go to the Bombay Government and how much the Bombay Government will give to Sind. In the interests of the Government of India, they must put a separate amount for the Sind roads and give that amount direct to Sind. If Sind is separated, the barrage will be under the special powers of the Governor. I do not know what sort of Government of India there will be, but I might inform the House that the P. W. D. of the barrage are spending huge sums as current expenditure. I suggest to Government that as soon as Sind is separated, they should keep a close eye on Sind, so that it may pay back its debt with interest to the Government of India and the Government of India may get it without any trouble. Unless they keep a very close eye on the local officials and do not allow them to spend money as they liked, I do not think we would be able to pay the amount back. At present the interest charged to Sind and to the whole of the Bombay Presidency is exorbitant. The Government should charge the interest which they pay on their loans at the present moment. We got the money

from the Government during the years 1921 to 1924 or 1925 and, at that time, the interest rates were very high. Those loans have already been paid off and the Government are borrowing at cheap rates now, and I appeal to them to charge just and fair rates to Sind account also.

Let me now come to the sugar industry. The Government of India do not consider it wise to put more import duty on sugar in order to give sufficient protection to the sugar industry. In the Sugar Industry (Protection) Act, itself, the Assembly has given full authority to the Government whenever the import prices come down, to raise the import duty according to the recommendations of the Tariff Board. It is a pity that they do not agree with the opinion of the Sugar Mill Industry Association of Calcutta or the sugar producing associations of Cawnpore. I do not want to go into the aspect very much at present, but I have every right to say that when the Government come forward to impose an excise duty on sugar, bringing them an income of Rs. 160 or 170 lakhs a year, the industry is entitled to ask that the sugarcane cultivation may be improved and that the benefit of the duty should go to the improvement of sugarcane cultivation. The Government have given protection for 15 years, that is, till 1946, and how can this protection be removed unless the Government increase the output of sugarcane and the sucrose in the sugarcane and spend money on sugarcane research? Sir, all these associations have demanded that, if you don't want to give more protection, if you don't want to discontinue the excise duty, then please give some amount to the sugar manufacturing provinces to improve the cultivation of sugarcane in those provinces where from you are getting this huge amount as excise duty. At present it is very essential that the amount must be given to the provinces, so that they can supply the seed to the cultivators, they can make a little propaganda among the cultivators, that they will use this manure and give this kind of irrigation, and so on. If this is not done, I very much fear that this protection to the sugar industry will be lost. I find the policy of my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, is also against the protection of Indian industry, but side by side I will request him that they will do it in such a way that all this protection can be taken up within the next few years.

Then, Sir, I have great complaint against the customs authorities. You know well about the large imports of foreign goods, silk, piece goods, sugar, wines and all sorts of things at present in the Indian States, and you also know that smuggling is going on on a very large scale from these ports to British India, and, therefore, we people, trading in British India, Karachi or Bombay . . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): Are you talking of the Kathiawar ports?

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Yes

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Can you produce some specific instances of smuggling?

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Sir, I am a simple man, working in my office, living in my house, and I have only three or four servants. Government have got hundreds of servants, and if they are unable to find it out . . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: If you don't know, then why do you assert that it is taking place?

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Then, I can give you one instance. I am glad you raised this subject.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I want conclusive evidence.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: I will give you one instance, sugar. Please go into the figures and find out how much sugar is imported in the Kathiawar ports. What is the population of the Kathiawar ports and what is the consumption of sugar there in comparison with the whole of India, and what is the amount *per capita*? I do not think that Kathiawar is so rich that it can consume 10 or 20 times more than British India, I mean per head. Please take a little trouble and find out how much sugar is imported in the Kathiawar ports and how much it costs at the Viramgam Cordon and how much duty is recovered from that cordon. I am sorry I have not brought my papers with me. Otherwise, I could show that in this year alone some 82,00,000 tons were imported in Kathiawar. Of course, you have to show figures as to how much sugar passed from the Cordon at Viramgam, how much duty you have recovered and how much was consumed in Kathiawar.

Mr. A. H. Lloyd (Government of India. Nominated Official): Does the Honourable Member recollect that a large quantity of sugar which comes quite lawfully over the Viramgam line is not assessed to duty, because it comes from the Bhavnagar port?

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Bhavnagar is without duty and you are allowing the goods to come into British India.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That is one of the conditions of the treaty . . . . .

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Then it is no longer good to be in Bombay or Karachi.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City. Muhammadan Urban): Bhavnagar is the best place.

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: Bhavnagar State itself collects duty at the full British Indian rate, but we don't get it.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: I know they are collecting.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: How much rebate is given?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: They say "None".

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Of course you have got some treaty with the States. I have no objection to that.

Some Honourable Members: We have strong objection to that.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: My point is this—whether you are prepared to protect your own people living in British India and whether the time has come or not for revising your treaties? That is a big question, and a layman like myself cannot give a proper opinion on that. I must say that we have a right to ask for protection for the merchants in British India.

Then, you have reduced the duty on silver, because you know that smuggling is going on all round.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Would you like me to reduce the sugar duty?

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Of course, you are not putting me a straight question, but unless and until the Government of India reduce their expenditure and they raise high tariff walls, this smuggling will go on. Until you reduce the duty, this smuggling will go on, and you cannot reduce the duty until you reduce the expenditure I am told that you have accepted the point that smuggling could be stopped only when you reduced the duty. It is generally talked here in this House that military expenditure should be curtailed and the Government of India's expenditure should be reduced But the reply from the Treasury Benches always is that it is impossible; they will say—"we have reduced it already so much, and we are unable to reduce it any more, and this is impossible now". Well, that may be right and correct Of course, big people have big ideas, but we the merchants have quite different ideas in our own way. Sir, I am suggesting here—I do not know whether my friends here on this side will agree with me or not, but it is a very simple matter—one or two things. If you properly consider what should be your right policy in the North-West Frontier, you can reduce your expenditure by about fifteen crores of rupees immediately. (Hear, hear.) Sir, this policy of the Government of India has been going on since the last seventy, if not eighty or ninety years. I do not know about the Indian history, but, since the last eighty years, we have been squandering Indian money on the Frontier. At present, Sir, we are spending two crores of rupees on the Watch and Ward in the North-West Frontier Province and about forty lakhs of rupees in the Baluchistan Frontier for Watch and Ward, and we are wasting two crores of rupees over strategic lines, which are a loss to the Railway Department; and, besides that, we have constructed many roads in the tribal territory.

An Honourable Member: And they do not like it.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: We have to repair all those roads on which we have to spend lots of money. We have to keep our army on the Frontier—I do not know how much army—but, in my opinion, if you have a change in this policy, and if you consider the point that at present there is already an established Government in the North-West Frontier Province, and if you make some sort of arrangements or agreements with that Government, then I think you can reduce large sums of money from your expenditure and you can also relieve the sorely-presesd taxpayers of India. Sir, I do not want to go into political theories concerning our strategic or our military expenditure, but, as a simple man, I can say that our frontiers, India's frontiers, are not beyond the Indus river. And, of course, the Government know that. The Government have, during this period, since the last eighty years, been trying this policy, but up to now I find

[Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon.]

they have not succeeded, although they always say: "we want peace and prosperity in the North-West Frontier Province and Baluchistan". Sir, these countries are waterless, there are no rains there, they have no sort of industry nor cultivation, and I do not know why we are pouring away crores of rupees there. The real object is better known to the Government, but, as a business man, I have suggested one point as to how to reduce your expenditure—whether the House agrees with that or not is not my business. Sir, at present, the whole range of taxes in India are on such a high level that everybody, I think, agrees, not only on this side of the House, but even the Government Members as well, that we can raise no more taxes in India . . . .

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Excepting the taxation from sugar. (Laughter.)

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: I have no objection to that. (Laughter.) But, mind you, the time has very nearly come when the whole structure will break down.

An Honourable Member: On account of sugar!

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Sugar is not the only thing, my friend. Sir, today we find that the general condition is such that no Provincial Government can make its both ends meet. All of them are borrowing money from the Central Government, and they are going on with their budget in that way. Now, how long will this go on? How long will this continue?

An Honourable Member: Till eternity.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: The position, Sir, of the cultivators is such that, according to my information, in Bengal, large areas of land have already been auctioned and sold by the zamindars because they are unable to pay their dues, on suits brought against them for arrears.

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Many, many.

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi (Tirhut Division: Muhammadan) In Bihar also.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Sir, I know something of Sind and the Punjab. My Honourable friend, the Finance Member, said in his speech or somewhere else that gold is one of the commodities of India which are exported and the balance of trade is thus maintained all right.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): That cannot last long.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: I know that the zamindars have sold their gold to pay the revenue.

An Honourable Member: Not the zamindars alone; others also.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Now, the prices of their own produce are not going up yet, and I do not know when they will go up, but this drain of gold will continue, and in the meantime, you do not reduce your expenditure either in the Central Government or in the provinces. Sir, I think the time is not very far when the whole economic structure will break down; and, while, of course, in my opinion, no revolution can be brought about by any political party, yet, I should not wonder if this economic depression does bring about a revolution in this country.

Sir, after saying so much against the present budget, I am now coming to some concrete suggestions which I shall offer to the Government. (Hear, hear.) First of all, Sir, there is the fact that they have abolished entirely the export duty on raw hides and skins, and there is some sort of murmur in the country that this will give some blow to the industry. (*Voices*: "No, no.") But, Sir, I cannot agree with that. I have received several telegrams from different parts of the country showing that, on account of this duty, many people have been suffering very much, and I now come to the duty itself. If you will see the figures, Sir, you will find that this duty is merely useless and does not bring any sort of money to the British Government. Sir, in 1931-32, Government collected Rs. 20,23,000; in 1932-33, they collected Rs. 14,07,000; in 1934-35, they collected Rs 18,82,000; and, in 1935-36, they will get only Rs. 8 lakhs, and, in that way, if the duty is decreased, what is the use of keeping it any longer? So I must congratulate the Government that, after so many years of fight, they have at last agreed to its abolition. I am sorry, my friend, Mr. E L. Price, has passed away, but, if he was here today, he would have been the first man to send a telegram of congratulations to the Government for this purpose.

There is one thing more on which I wish to congratulate the Government, and it is this. The Government have agreed to put an import duty on rice in India. I think that there are still some friends of mine on this side who are not agreeable to the amount, and they want a little more duty. I hope that matter will be settled amicably. Then, again, Sir, Government have brought forward a Bill to levy a duty on wheat import. They have reduced the duty from Rs. 2 to Rs. 1-8. I do not know what is the policy behind this. Perhaps they expect that, because of the reduction of the duty by eight annas, it might be possible to import wheat in this country. Anyhow, I have not been able to understand it, and, therefore, I have decided that when this Bill will come before the House, I will thresh out all the points.

Now, Sir, I come to the expenditure of the Government. I cannot understand how they spend the money. As an example, I want to mention the income-tax. I find that the income from this source is being reduced every year by some thousands of rupees, whereas the expenditure is being increased every year by some lakhs. I would draw the attention of the Honourable Member to page 17 of the Explanatory Memorandum from which it will be seen that our income in 1931-32 was Rs. 17,48,00,000 and the expenditure was 73 lakhs, whereas, in 1935-36, the income will be Rs. 16,45,00,000 and the expenditure is put down at Rs. 91 lakhs. I hope Government will consider this point and see that the expenditure does not go by so much. There is a general talk about the economic

[Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon.]

condition of this country, and I think everybody is agreed that, on account of the indebtedness of the agriculturist, things are getting from bad to worse. Everybody wants that this problem should be solved. I do not know what the Government of India are doing in this matter, but I do not know how this problem is going to be solved. For the last 150 years, on account of the stabilization of the Government, the ryots have been borrowing from the money-lenders, with the result that the amount had been piling up every year, and, according to facts and figures, the land is now going to the money-lenders from the real cultivators in all the provinces According to the Banking Inquiry Committee report, the ryot is indebted to the money-lenders to the tune of nine hundred crores. This amount is registered in the Registration Office, but they have also taken some amount by hand notes and other methods. The rate of interest that is charged on this amount varies from 10 to 275 per cent, and the Banking Inquiry Committee have come to the conclusion that at least, on the average, interest at the rate of 25 per cent is charged by the money-lenders from the cultivators. If this estimate is correct, how can this indebtedness be reduced or taken away from the ryots who are paying about 225 crores of rupees in the shape of interest to the money-lenders Even the Government of India, the Provincial Governments and the local bodies all combined cannot recover so much amount. So, if the Government want peace and prosperity in this country they must consider this matter seriously. They should give their earnest attention to this matter and relieve the agriculturists from this indebtedness If the Government cannot find their way to help them, I do not know what will happen Sir, I have said what I wanted to say, but I again appeal to Government in conclusion, to consider this point very seriously as to how you should reduce your expenditure and also how to reduce the taxes. If you do not do this soon, I think the consequences may be very serious.

Dr. P. N Banerjea (Calcutta Suburbs—Non Muhammadan Urban): Sir, this House knows and the whole country feels that an enormous addition to the tax burden on the people of India has been made during the last 20 years But very few of us have taken the trouble to find out what is the exact amount of the additional taxation that has been levied. During the European War and the five years that followed it, a great deal of taxation was imposed, and, in the quinquennium 1924-1928, only as small proportion of this additional taxation was remitted. Confining ourselves to the period of the economic depression, we find that in 1930 additional taxation to the extent of over five crores of rupees was levied. In March, 1931, additional taxation to the extent of about 15 crores of rupees was levied, and, in November of the same year, a further additional taxation of nearly 25 crores of rupees was imposed. Again, in 1934, additional taxation to the extent of about five crores of rupees was imposed. This makes a total, roughly speaking, of about 50 crores of rupees. If we deduct from this sum about ten crores of rupees which may be treated as the amount of tax which failed to be realised according to the expectation of the Finance Member, even then we find that a net total of about 40 crores of rupees a year was added to the tax burden of the country in five years. Now, Sir, is this not a huge amount? Is not the burden such as may be regarded as too heavy for the country to bear?

Then, Sir, what was the object of levying this additional taxation? The only object was to strengthen the resources of the Central Government in order that this Government might carry on the ordinary day-to-day duties of administration. If this additional taxation had been levied for the purpose of improving the condition of the people of the country, there would have been many amongst us who could have agreed to its imposition. But nothing of the sort was attempted. No schemes of development were in contemplation, and even those schemes which had been mooted were not given any sort of support. Sir George Schuster on various occasions referred to the provinces. He showed his concern for the development of the subjects which are under the control of the Provincial Governments, but no practical effect was given to this desire. Only two provinces have, during the last few years, been given some measure of help. The North-West Frontier Province has been given a subvention of one crore a year and Bengal was given half the proceeds of the jute tax last year. None of the other provinces of India have been given any financial assistance. But it is admitted on all hands that the provinces are in charge of the departments of administration with which the welfare of the country is most intimately connected. The Honourable the Finance Member himself said the other day that the beneficent activities of Government are in the provinces. But he added that self-preservation was needed This is a new term which has been coined by the Finance Member for the purpose of the budget. So far we have been hearing of defence, law and order, but now the Finance Member has hit upon a new term—"self preservation". I beg to submit that self-preservation does not consist only in defence and in the maintenance of internal order, but it also consists in protection from the pangs of hunger and in protection from disease and ill-health. If self-preservation is understood in that sense, we find that Provincial Governments are, to a very large extent, in charge of this work of self-preservation. I hope and trust that the Finance Member will in future take note of this fact.

Now, the provinces, as I have already said, have been given very little assistance by the Central Government and their resources are all of a very inexpansive character, with the result that in many of the provinces considerable debt has had to be incurred and many of the nation-building activities have had to be curtailed. In Bengal, even with the financial help that has been given and promised for this year, the budget will not be balanced, because we find that there is a large gap still to be filled, although the Bengal Government have made earnest efforts to meet the situation. I hold in my hand a paper which shows that the Bengal Government have retrenched to the extent of 47½ lakhs. I do not agree with all the items of retrenchment on this list, because we find that some of the nation-building activities have been curtailed. But, on the whole, it cannot be denied that the Bengal Government have made earnest efforts to meet the situation. Five taxation Bills are now on the legislative anvil and will soon be passed. In these circumstances, I hope the Government of India will see their way to give to Bengal a larger share than one-half of the proceeds of the jute tax the whole of which really belongs to that province. At the same time, I would urge the Government of India to make over substantial proportions of their resources to the other provinces and place those provinces on a sound financial footing, so that they may carry out their important duties properly and adequately.

[Dr. P. N. Banerjea.]

Coming to the measures of taxation, what do we find? We find that these measures of taxation met with a great deal of opposition from the public even in the Assembly which was then not at all representative of the more advanced sections of the community. In 1931, even that unrepresentative Assembly refused to pass the Finance Bill as recommended by the Governor General and the Governor General had to use his special powers in order to pass the Finance Act on his own authority. This shows the unpopularity of the measures of taxation which have been passed during the last five years. Now, the question is, was there no other alternative before the Government? Of course, there was retrenchment as an alternative, and this alternative was resorted to to some extent. But, I am sorry to have to say that retrenchment was not carried out in the proper way and to an adequate extent. Sir George Schuster, in paying a tribute to the Retrenchment Committees which had been appointed, said that they had worked "like slaves" and "like devils". I have no desire to deprive these committees of the credit that is really due to them, but I wish these committees had, instead of working like slaves and devils, worked as freemen, and worked, if not like angels, at least like men with courage, imagination and foresight. If that had been done, greater economies could have been secured, not only to tide over the present crisis, but for all time to come so that the money which might have been saved could have been utilised for beneficent purposes.

Sir, coming to the question of incidence of taxation, we find that the additional taxes were levied on all classes of people. Customs duties, excise duties, the salt duty, income-tax rates and postal rates were raised. But if we carefully scrutinise all the items which were subjected to taxation, we find that the additional burden which was imposed on the poor was far greater than the additional burden which was imposed on the richer and more well-to-do classes. Now, this was a grave social injustice that was done to the poorer communities. Already the poorer people in this country had been bearing a heavier portion of the tax burden than the richer and more well-to-do classes, and to have imposed a greater and additional burden on them was an act of the greatest injustice. Sir, it is now regarded as one of the duties of all advanced States to bring about a greater equality and equitableness in the incomes of the people by means of the system of taxation. But, unfortunately, here in India, the steps which have been taken have worked in the opposite direction. This is a wrong which should be righted at the earliest possible moment; and, at the time when additional taxation is going to be remitted, I urge that the claims of the poor should receive the first and foremost consideration.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: What are your specific suggestions?

Dr P. N. Banerjea: I will come to my specific suggestions. I have given notice of several amendments to the Finance Bill and many of my friends have also given notices of amendments, and when the time comes, we will discuss those specific measures in detail. But, at the present moment, I may say for the information of the Finance Member that the tax burden on the poor should be relieved first of all and the claims of the poor should have prority over the claims of the other classes of the community. Sir, without going in details I may say that the salt duty should be reduced to a substantial extent, the

1 P. M.

postage rates should be reduced, the income-tax on the middle class people should be reduced, the taxable minimum should be raised to Rs. 2,000 and some of the excise duties and customs duties which press so heavily on the poor people should be removed or at least substantially reduced. These are the most . . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Would you mind specifying the excise duties on the poor which should be removed or reduced?

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: The excise duties on matches and on kerosene should be removed or at least substantially reduced immediately.

Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri Lal Chand (Nominated Non-Official): What about bounties to capitalists and industries?

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: You mean protection. Well as regards protection, I do think that the country ought to undergo some measure of sacrifice in order that the industries of the country may grow and prosper. But we should consider also the burden on the consumer, particularly the poorer sections of the people. Bearing these two facts in mind I hope the Finance Member will so adjust the tax system that the poorer classes are relieved of a substantial portion of the burden which lies on their shoulders at the present moment.

Sir, what is the utility of this general discussion of the Finance Bill? To my mind the utility is to give the Finance Member an opportunity to re-adjust the Finance Bill in such a way that it may meet the wishes of the elected portion at least of this House. Otherwise a general discussion has no value. I have already said that many of us have sent notices of amendments, but I would advise the Finance Member to send in his own notice of amendments in order that he may take the wind out of the sails of the popular Members of this House and in order that he may get credit for the tax burden on the poor being relieved

Sir, so far as regards taxation. Before concluding, I wish to say a few words as to the need for economic development. The Honourable the Finance Member said the other day that economists were never able to agree. But do doctors always agree? Do lawyers always agree? Does the Honourable the Leader of the House always see eye to eye with the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition? These two great lawyers would often differ even on legal questions. It will not do, therefore, to say that economists do not agree and so they are not to be listened to and what is the position of the Finance Member? A Finance Member is worth nothing if he is not himself an economist. I hope the Finance Member will try to widen his angle of vision and look at things, not through the eyes of a mere mathematician but, from the point of view of an economist as well as an administrator of experience. Sir, our Finance Member seems to fight shy of the phrase "economic planning", but I do not know why. Even in this country economic planning has been attempted in the past. Those who are acquainted with the ancient history of the country know that in ancient days the State used to play a very important part in the industrial development of the country. Those who are familiar with that great work of Kautilya known as the *Arthashastra* know

[Dr. P. N. Banerjea.]

that the State played a very important role in furthering the industrial activities of the nation. In later times, the great Akbar took a very great interest in the industrial development of the country. Even in British India, the earlier administrators took a great pride in their work. What they did was not always for the benefit of the people but in some cases it was. The great irrigation works of this country were the result of planning and these irrigation works stand to the credit of the British Government in India. Why should our Finance Member then be afraid of the term and why should he fight shy of it altogether? It is a great pity that our administrators, in recent years, have ceased to take any interest in their work and have ceased to feel any pride in their work. They are afraid that whatever they do would fail to meet the wishes of the people and would not be liked by them. But that is their own fault. If they take the proper course of action and if they take the steps in consultation with the people there is no reason why their work will not be appreciated by the people. Sir, there is vast scope for the State in this country to bring about improvements and developments in various departments of human activity. Although our Finance Member is a Cobdenite, I may tell him that the days of Cobdenism are over. Cobdenism was good for Britain a hundred years ago but even Britain has abandoned Cobdenism today, and there is no escape from the fact that various nations of the world today are taking greater and greater interest in the economic welfare of the people. The idea of the Police-State has now given place to the idea of the Culture-State, and thinkers every where now take a more enlightened view of the functions of the State. The functions of the State now comprise all activities which tend to lead to the moral, material and physical well-being of the nation, and, from that point of view, the activities of the State will have to be regulated in India in future.

Sir, one word more and I have done. When he was challenged by the Honourable the Finance Member the other day, the Honourable Mr. Govind Ballabh Pant said that the great economists of the world were all in favour of planning. It would have been more correct if he had said that they were in favour of the State taking a share in the industrial and economic development of their respective countries. But when he himself was challenged by Mr. Pant our Finance Member mentioned the name of only one economist, namely, Mr. Lionel Robbins, who was in favour of a policy of *laissez faire*. Now, if the policy of *laissez faire* has been abandoned by all countries, it should not be introduced into India. As a matter of fact, India itself had at one time adopted that policy and found it wanting. The question is, what is to be done now? A cautious policy of economic development will have to be undertaken by the State, and there is considerable scope in this direction at the present moment. Taking my own province, I find there is a great scope for river-training in Bengal. The waters of the Brahmaputra may also be utilised for hydro electric purposes by the joint efforts of the two provinces of Assam and Bengal. There is, further, a great necessity for the development of large industries, medium-size industries as well as small industries, and all these will go to add to the wealth of India. The great need of the hour today is to do away with the stagnation which prevails in the country at present, and for this purpose the State must do its best, because without the help of the State it

will not be possible to remove this stagnation. Therefore, I would appeal to the Government to extend their helping hand to the people so that the country may advance steadily towards plenty and prosperity. I do not think it would be necessary to spend 100 crores every year for that purpose, as has been suggested by my Honourable friend Mr. Pant. I admit that there is a good deal of risk involved in undertaking such big ventures, and this risk may arise from various circumstances, first from the inability of the country to bear the burden of taxation and debt and then from the inefficiency of the people who will carry out the task. Besides, if the Government has no heart in the matter, these ventures are sure to come to grief. Therefore, I would advise a cautious policy of economic development in India which is sure to lead to success and which will not only add to the wealth of the people as a whole but will also minimise—at least to some extent lessen—the poverty of the masses of the population.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Half Past Two of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): With your permission, Sir, I desire to make a statement as to the probable course of Government business in the week beginning Monday, the 25th instant. The statement has been prepared on the assumption that the House will have passed the motion for the consideration of the Finance Bill at today's sitting. If that hope is not realised, the position will be altered to the extent that the House will continue, until it has finished, the discussion of the motion that the Bill be taken into consideration, and, after it has been concluded, will proceed to the business now set out.

1. The first business will be the introduction of the Bill to amend the Cantonments Act.

2 The next business will be motions to take into consideration and pass the Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill, which places an import duty on wheat and rice.

3. Thereafter, it will be necessary to take the Supplementary Demands before going on to the detailed consideration of the Finance Bill. The remaining items of the Government programme will be placed on the paper below the Finance Bill in the following order:

(1) The Salt Additional Import Duty (Extending) Bill, which is down for consideration and passing;

(2) The Indian Mines (Amendment) Bill, as reported by Select Committee, which is also down for consideration and passing;

(3) The Code of Civil Procedure (Third Amendment) Bill, for which the motion will be for a reference to Select Committee;

[Sir Nripendra Sircar.]

(4) The Cinematograph (Amendment) Bill and the Aligarh Muslim University (Amendment) Bill, both of which have been passed by the Council of State and in respect of which the motions will be for consideration and passing;

(5) The Hedjaz Pilgrim Guides Bill, for which the motion will be to refer to Select Committee;

(6) Motions by Sir Cowasji Jehangir agreeing to the Resolution of the Council of State to appoint a Joint Committee on the Bill to amend the law relating to marriage and divorce among Parsis and appointing members to serve on the Committee

You, Sir, have so far directed that the House shall sit for the transaction of Government business on Monday, the 25th, Tuesday, the 26th, Wednesday, the 27th, and Thursday, the 28th March. Friday, the 29th, has been allotted for non-official Bills, and, in view of the volume of work remaining for disposal, I must ask you, Sir, to direct that the House shall also sit on Saturday, the 30th, for the disposal of Government business

Honourable Members will observe that, of the items in the above list, the Supplementary Demands must, if there is not to be a breach of the provisions of the Legislative Rules, be passed before the end of the week; while, if the Tariff Amendment Bill is not passed by both Houses before the end of the week, the existing duty on wheat will cease to be leviable from the 1st of April and the proposed duties on rice and wheat will not become leviable from that date. Further, if the Finance Bill is not passed by both Houses before the 1st of April, a situation will arise for which there is no parallel since the present Constitution came into operation; for the provisions of the Finance Act, 1934, in respect of salt, income-tax and postal rates will cease to be in force from the 1st of April This being the position, I feel justified in asking the co-operation of all sections of the House in the disposal of the business before us, and your directions, Sir, if necessary, for extension of the hours of sitting.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I wish that the House should not sit on Saturday, the 30th, because the annual Conference of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce is meeting on the 30th. We have convened that Conference for that date, so that Members of the Assembly may attend that meeting, and every year the meeting has been held in Delhi so that Members of the Assembly may attend the Conference I do hope that you will take that into consideration and direct that the House shall not sit on the 30th.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I do suggest this, at all events, in response to what the Leader of the House has said, that the hours of sitting, if you so please, may be extended, so as to enable the House to deal with the Finance Bill itself before the end of the week.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Before the end of the week, that is, today?

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: I mean the 30th.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair accepts the suggestion of the Leader of the House that the House should sit on Saturday, the 30th. As regards the hours of work, the Chair does not wish to say anything at present.

THE INDIAN FINANCE BILL—*contd.*

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi (Dacca *cum* Mymensingh: Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President, when the Honourable the Finance Member introduced his budget, at the conclusion of his speech he said:

"But do not let us forget that imaginative financiers usually end up in goal"

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: In jail

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Goal is jail also.

An Honourable Member: Not of yours.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I quite agree. But I think that my Honourable friend will agree that we do require the assistance of financiers with imagination. A little more imagination would have told my Honourable friend that the outflow of gold from India does not stand in the same category as the export of any other commodity of which India has a surplus, that a substantial gold reserve, whether with the public or with the Government, is necessary in the best interests of the country, that a broader foundation of gold is necessary to provide for the increasing credit due to the growing industrialisation of India, and that it may be necessary to repurchase the gold which is being exported now at a higher price when we may not be able to afford it. Sir, I am not a financier, imaginative or otherwise; nor do I claim to be one of the five economists holding six opinions, but, as an ordinary man of the world, I find that every nation values gold and that there is a scramble for it all over the world, that the people in this country, especially the womenfolk, are very reluctant to sell gold and that sheer necessity is compelling them to convert this family reserve into money with a view to meet the crisis caused by the disparity between their fixed expenditure and the falling income. Sir, let us examine the position of the export of gold from this country. Nearly Rs. 225 crores worth of gold have been exported from this country since September, 1931, when the United Kingdom went off the gold standard and the rupee was linked to sterling at a fixed ratio.

As I said, every nation values gold. I prove that by showing the anxiety of the United Kingdom and other western countries to preserve their gold reserves, the withdrawal by the foreign investors of their investment in London, which is being replenished by gold exported from India. The idea of making profits by the sale of gold is not shared by any country which controls its own currency policy. The growing industrialisation of India will require a broader foundation of gold. Sir, the wearer knows where the shoe pinches. We are in touch with the countryside and know that it is not surplus gold which is being sold with a view to make profit, but sheer necessity is compelling people to convert their family reserve into money. Ever since 1931, this Honourable House and you, Sir, when you were sitting on the Benches of the Opposition

[Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi.]

said, on many an occasion that Government should put an embargo on the export of gold from this country. Before this new Assembly, my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin, expressed on one occasion that the Government was suffering from the fourth kind of intoxication and that was that they had the votes in their pocket and they never took any notice of the protest that was made regarding the export of gold from this country.

Now, Sir, let us take the policy of Government regarding the sale of silver without investing the proceeds in the acquisition of gold reserves to strengthen the international position of the rupee. Very little exercise of the imagination is necessary to discover that the obvious has happened and the result has been shortage of money or deflation, that this deflation has intensified the evils of the fall in prices, hitting hard our exporters and agriculturists, that there has been a dangerous depreciation of the paper currency reserve, that various countries are increasing their stores of bullion and stimulating, by various means, the export of bullion by other countries and that an appreciation in the price of silver which would follow, if the Government's sale of silver is discontinued, will go a long way to increase the purchasing power of the Indian masses Sir, let us examine the Government policy of the sale of silver. The policy appears to be that purchases are made when price appreciates and it is sold when price comes down. To prevent export, during the post-war period, crores of rupees were frittered away by sale of reverse council bills, silver reserve was augmented by purchase from the United States of America at exhorbitant prices, Government selling off silver at low prices and utilising the proceeds for current purposes and not for the acquisition of gold reserves as recommended by the Young Commission and the result is the deflation, fall in the prices of agricultural products and decrease in the purchasing power of the masses. Today, the question of questions is how to raise the price of the agricultural products, that is to say, how to raise the purchasing power and the standard of living of the masses. It is as much to the interest of the Government as of the people that the situation should improve in this respect as early as possible. In this House, year in and year out, Honourable Members have made speeches on the floor of the House asking Government to take necessary steps to find out the ways and means how to improve the condition of the masses and how to raise the prices of agricultural products. Nothing has been done so far. Nothing has been attempted. (Interruption.) Something may be done in future and here we are exporting gold from this country. Every day you find the export of gold is greater and greater than before and the sale of silver without taking into consideration the effect of the two transactions. This House would, I am sure, do its best to try and force the Government to put an embargo on the export of gold.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: You will not succeed.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I know that this House will not succeed.

Some Honourable Members: Why not?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: You could never have made that statement if you had been responsible to this House. Otherwise, you would have been turned out of your seat by the vote of the House.

An Honourable Member: Don't sit there. Cross the floor.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Sir, every country is preserving gold throughout the world excepting India.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Would the Honourable Member like to know that Great Britain exported 170 crores of rupees worth of gold last year?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Because you were indebted to the United States of America . . .

An Honourable Member: That is Indian gold.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: You had to pay your debts. You did not send it to other countries.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: To France, Belgium and South America as well. (Interruptions.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better continue his speech.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: England has exported gold to Belgium and France . . . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: And America.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: . . . . because you are also indebted to France. (Loud Laughter.) There must have been some understanding wherewith you export only to France, Belgium and America, and to no other countries. You had to repay foreign investors also. You cannot say that because England has been exporting gold to America and France and Belgium, India should also export gold to your country. (Laughter.) I am almost certain that in another year, if you continue this export of gold, not an ounce of gold will remain in this country; and such gold is not at present being exported for making a profit, but you are forcing the people to sell it, because they cannot make their two ends meet. Sir, in this connection, before I proceed, let me tell this House that since 1932, I have been advocating on the floor of this House an embargo on the export of gold. This is not the first time I have been saying this. (Hear, hear.) Sir, in this connection I also advocate the discontinuance of the import duty on silver, and here I congratulate my friend, the Honourable the Finance Member. (Hear, hear.) A substantial reduction in the silver duty is a step in the right direction, and I hope and trust that ultimately it may lead to its abolition. Sir, there was no silver duty in the beginning. It was imposed, if I remember rightly, in 1929 for the first time. Am I correct?

(Mr. K. Sanjiva Row nodded assent.)

That was the beginning of this silver duty, and, from the last speech made by the Honourable the late Finance Member, Sir George Schuster . . . . (Laughter.)

An Honourable Member: He is alive very much.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I am very sorry. (Loud Laughter)

An Honourable Member: Hurry up.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Well, this is a "Bill". I can talk as much as I like. Sir, while presenting his budget in February, 1934, Sir George Schuster said this about silver, and I am only reading one passage:

"It appears, therefore, that we might reduce the duty by one-third, namely, by two and a half annas per ounce, without thereby necessarily affecting the Bombay price at all, for it would still be somewhat below the London parity."

The result of this duty was that there was no import of silver at all and there was no duty at all which they could realize, and what he says is this:

"We think it fair to anticipate a small import of silver as a result of this reduction bringing up the receipts from one lakh to five lakhs of rupees This means an increase of four lakhs on our estimates."

That is to say, when there was the duty of seven and a half annas per ounce, the import duty they could realize was only one lakh, and after the reduction to five annas, the then Finance Member expected a realisation of five lakhs—an increase of four lakhs. Now, the present Finance Member, by reducing the duty from five to two annas will surely expect a larger income thereby; and of course there will be no income if this is reduced but there will be a very great import of silver if the duty is taken off entirely. Sir, I now come to the additional duty on salt. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I welcome the Finance Member's expression of sympathy

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): You have begun in earnest

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I will prove my case. Mr. Satyamurti, I know, does not like this—therefore, I will take much of my time explaining why this particular additional duty should be knocked off at once and I will prove it to this House to the hilt. Sir, I wanted to do this when that Salt Bill came before this House, but I might not be here, and I am taking this opportunity to explain my position about that duty before I leave for Calcutta

Mr. F. E. James (Madras European): Why not pair off?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I am an elected Member, I am not going to be paired; it is a Nominated Member who has to pair. Sir, this is a duty against which the Government of Bengal and the Government of Bihar protested, year in and year out, and the Government of India, without consulting the Governments, either of Bengal or of Bihar, introduced this Bill in 1931 (*Cries of* "Shame, shame"), in spite of opposition by these two Governments. Sir, this duty on salt was introduced into this House on the 17th March, 1931. Honourable Members are aware that there was in February or March, 1931, some negotiation between Mr Gandhi and Lord Irwin for a settlement. It is known to us, who were then Members of this House, that Mr. Gandhi also wanted . . . .

An Honourable Member: Mahatma Gandhi, please.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I beg your pardon—Mahatma Gandhi wanted also the removal of the salt tax. Although I, as a Member of this Assembly, was not aware of the details of the negotiations, yet, being here at that time, many things came at least into my ears. The difficulty was how to get out of that trouble so that there may be no duty on salt. Poor Bengal was the victim of that settlement.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Did you not read the report of the Tariff Board on salt and the recommendations they made?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I am coming to that Tariff Board report which I hold in my hand. Don't you think that I have not studied that report. The Tariff Board said nothing of the kind and what is the value of the report of the Tariff Board of 1929 in 1931? You could not give effect to that report for two or three years. Talking of Tariff Board's report and inquiry it is all farce and sheer waste of time and money. The Tariff Board recommend something but you do not accept their recommendations and you make your own recommendations. It is not the first time that I have said this; I have been saying this for the last two or three years that the value of the Tariff Board reports is nil. This report was made in 1929, and the circumstances changed so much in 1931 that it should not have been taken any notice of. Sir, if I may say so, it should please Mahatma Gandhi that India will be self-supporting so far as the salt industry is concerned. Now, Sir, let us see the position of the additional salt duty. My Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti . . .

3 P.M.

An Honourable Member: Mahatma Satyamurti!

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: . . said the other day that the import duty on salt is a tax on a necessary article of diet.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: On a point of personal explanation. I said all duty on salt, and not import duty.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: You said all duty on salt, and I say that this is an additional duty which Bengal and Bihar have to bear as an additional tax on an article of diet. It is meant to help whom? Not the Indian salt industry, and that I shall conclusively prove.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): That is the object.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: It may have been in your mind, but it has not been achieved, and I shall show it presently. This additional duty is to be levied to put the money into the pockets of four gentlemen in Aden. It has penalised the Bengal consumers in the interests of these four gentlemen who are making tons of money. (The Honourable Member showed the picture of these persons.) These are the four gentlemen for whose benefit this additional duty has been imposed, and why? Because three of them come from Bombay and one from Italy. So, by preserving the Italian industry we are preserving the national industry of India! This is Indian salt industry. So, Sir, this protection is being given to these four gentlemen and not to the Indian salt industry. As I said, three of these

[Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi.]

gentlemen come from Bombay and Bombay has been dominating the Government of India all these years at the sacrifice of the interests of the rest of the provinces. If these three gentlemen were not of Bombay, I am certain that this additional duty would not have been imposed. Now, what did the Tariff Board report say? They mentioned these four wonderful gentlemen who have vested interests in Italy. Two of them are Mussalmans, one is a Parsi and one is an Italian. The whole protection is given not to the Indian salt industry but to these four gentlemen. And it will take two hours to give you the whole list of the amount of money which they have made at the sacrifice of the Indian salt industry. I will show you how. I will leave all other points and will deal only with this point conclusively today. Now, Sir, the position is this. The Government introduced this Bill on the report of the Tariff Board which was published in July, 1929. It is a long report as usual and they could not come to any conclusion after taking evidence. As usual, their conclusion is not always very clear. They submitted their report, as I said, in 1929 and the Government of India sat over it for two years. They woke up in 1931. Now, the Governments of Bengal and Bihar and Orissa strongly opposed the proposal made by the Tariff Board, which consisted of Sir Padamji Ginwala, Dr. John Mathai and another. Writing in 1931, the Government of Bengal described their proposals as "tantamount to the imposition of a huge fine on the consumers of this side of India". They considered that the Board had exaggerated out of all proportion the importance of the western and northern Indian salt producing agencies. It appeared to them that the Board had magnified these insignificant concerns with an admittedly doubtful future into a key industry of national importance, and they propose to give them a heavy protection at the expense of the Bengal consumer. Even if that was so and if it was necessary to help the western and northern India salt producing agencies to impose this duty, then we could have agreed to it. But this duty does not give protection to these western and northern India salt producing agencies. It is giving protection only to these four gentlemen

Mr. N. M. Joshi: But Aden is sought to be separated from India.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: When we are talking now, Aden is still part of India, and, by the time Aden is separated, you and I might have died. It is in the hands of God

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Honourable Members ought not to carry on conversation in this way.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Sir, the Government of India did not accept what the Governments of Bengal and Bihar wrote to them.

Mr. B. Das: Why do you talk of Bihar and Orissa? You had better confine yourself to Bengal. We in Bihar and Orissa have challenged the note of the Government of Bihar and we have condemned their action.

An Honourable Member: Let the Honourable Member talk only of Orissa. He cannot talk for Bihar.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Thereafter, a Resolution was passed in the Bengal Legislative Council on the 24th March, 1931. This question of the additional import duty on salt was debated and the Council passed the following Resolution:

"This Council considers the proposal of the Government of India, to impose a further duty of 4½ annas per maund on all imported salt and to give a rebate to Aden merchants, unjust and inequitable and calculated to throw an unfair burden on the people of Bengal and so enter an emphatic protest against the proposal and requests the Government of Bengal immediately to urge the Government of India to abandon it."

But, Sir, the Government of India would not listen to any appeals from the Government of Bengal. The Bill was passed as a temporary measure. What do we find in the report of the Central Board of Revenue and my Honourable friend, Mr. Lloyd, is also here. The Central Board of Revenue, in their report to the Legislative Assembly Salt Committee—the report is a long one, I will read only a few lines—say that Aden is securing a monopoly of the trade to the exclusion of salt made in India proper and the report further points out that this would be entirely opposed to the essential object of the Tariff Board's proposal. They also pointed out that the drop in the sea freights which had taken place in 1931-32 affected the whole basis of the Tariff Board's report of fair selling price. That is also exactly what I was making out. My point was that the Tariff Board report was made in 1929 and so their report was a back number in 1931 when we proceeded to legislate on the recommendations which they made in 1929. That is amply proved by the statements that the Central Board of Revenue presented to the Salt Committee of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. B. Das: Have you read the Pitt Enquiry Committee report published after the report of the Tariff Board?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I will come to that later on. In January, 1933, the Government of Bengal again addressed the Government of India on the matter and pressed most strongly that the additional duty should be withdrawn. Now, Sir, let us see what the Central Board of Revenue say on that matter. The Board was definitely of opinion that Aden was strong enough to stand alone. These merchants have been in Aden for years and that the industry was not an infant industry so far as the Aden salt industry was concerned, and that Aden salt has been successfully competing with foreign salt, year in and year out, and that there was no necessity of giving additional protection to these four gentlemen to profiteer and put the whole money into their pocket at the expense of the consumers in Bengal and Bihar. The Central Board of Revenue further says that:

"They are definitely of opinion that Aden was strong enough to stand alone, that Aden already possessed an established position in the Bengal market and that admittedly Aden salt did not require any assistance and they were definitely of opinion that no case had been made out for protection in regard to Karachi and Okha sources on national or economic grounds."

What has, however, been the result? During 1931-32 and 1932-33, so far as Bengal Government was aware, no supplies of salt have entered the Bengal market from northern India sources, not an ounce of salt has gone to the Bengal market from northern India or from the centre of the salt industry in India and still you are penalising Bengal to pay and enable these four Aden manufacturers to put this extra money into their pocket. What is more? The latest report mentions the breakdown of the attempts

[Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi.]

to produce Khewra crushed salt suitable for the Bengal market and this makes it abundantly clear that the prospect of supplying any part of Bengal market, with rail-borne salt from northern India, is more remote than ever and the object with which this additional import duty was originally imposed and the achievement of which has, until a year ago, always been cited as a justification of this duty could no longer be regarded as a practical proposition.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury (Bengal: Landholders): Is the Honourable Member aware of the telegram sent by the President of the Muslim Chamber of Commerce? Will he place their view before this House?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I am also a Member of the Muslim Chamber of Commerce The Honourable Member need not remind me of that.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury: Has the Honourable Member read the presidential address of that Chamber?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Certainly that Chamber will support salt additional import duty. But I am here to support the consumers and not the Muslim Chamber of Commerce. (Hear, hear.) I have, unfortunately, lost the thread of what I was saying because of this interruption. I was saying that the latest report of the attempt to produce Khewra crushed salt for Bengal market made it abundantly clear that the prospect of supplying any part of Bengal market with real rail-borne salt—mind you, it must be rail-borne salt and, here, I must mention that my Honourable friend representing the railways will never allow rail-borne salt to come to Bengal, because the railway freight is so high—is remote and the object with which this additional duty was originally imposed and the achievement of which has until a year ago always been cited as the justification of this duty could no longer be regarded as a practical proposition.

Now, I come to my Honourable friend, Mr. B. Das. Further, it was clear from Pitt's report that there was no reasonable prospect of establishing the manufacture of salt on a commercial basis in Bengal. That is his latest report and Pitt is an authority on salt.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury: There is also another version of the thing in the same report.

An Honourable Member: What is the date of that report?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I don't like to be interrupted now, but I will give you the information later on.

Still an effort is being made by the Government of Bengal to test its feasibility but that is no reason why they should, day in and day out, continue to impose this duty and make the Bengal consumer suffer at the expense of the four Aden merchants Sir, here is a letter which has been addressed to the Finance Member by the consumers of Bengal. It is a long letter and I will not take the time of this House by reading the letter in full. But it says this:

"As far as Aden goes, we think we need say no more than that they are recognised to be the pioneers of the salt trade in India and need no protection."

Then, it goes on to say that not an ounce of salt from Northern India has reached Bengal up to now. They say:

"We feel it our duty to point out that these vested interests in Aden are not entitled to any such claim We make this statement because of the fact that it has annually been stated in the Assembly that the tax was experimental and temporary for one year only."

This is what the consumers in Bengal say and these maps which I have got in my possession will show that Bengal is supplied from nowhere else excepting Aden, and Aden does not want to supply the rest of India.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would remind the Honourable Member that he is repeating himself too much.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Now, Sir, from salt I will go on to wheat and rice. Sir, the levy of an import duty of 12 annas per maund on broken rice of foreign origin to my mind is a half-hearted and long deferred measure of protection. The duty which it is intended to impose is only on broken rice It is certainly not easy to distinguish broken rice from unbroken rice. To accord real protection the duty should be extended to all rice and paddy. Personally I should have preferred a duty of Rs. 1-4-0 per maund as recommended by the Crop Planning Conference. As regards wheat, if the import duty helps my Punjab friends and the Punjab peasants and the United Provinces and Sind, I have no objection, but I shall presently show that it does not help either the Punjab, the United Provinces or Sind. When this import duty was imposed on wheat it was purely as a temporary measure with no idea of giving protection either to the Punjab, the United Provinces or Sind. In that particular year wheat was growing in enormous quantities in the Punjab and Government discovered that if something in the nature of a temporary protection was not given, the wheat growers would go bankrupt because most of the wheat was about to be distroyed as there was no purchaser. That was the reason why Government came forward in this House with a temporary measure to give relief to the Punjab in that particular year. They gave an assurance that in the following year the wheat duty would be withdrawn.

Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri Lal Chand: No assurance was given here.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I do not remember whether my Honourable friend was a Member of this House when the Wheat Bill was introduced. If he were here, he must remember that a protest was made by Bengal, Bihar and Assam, when it was said that it was only a temporary measure and would be withdrawn in the following year and there would be no necessity for the continuation of this duty. However, I have no quarrel about its being temporary or otherwise. If it helps the Punjab I have no objection, but I desire to show that it has not helped and it will not help them. Sir, this duty on wheat for the protection of the Punjab does not assist the suffering of Bengal because we cannot and do not get Punjab wheat in Bengal on account of the high railway freight. Punjab wheat is not available and cannot be available in Bengal. Therefore, you cannot put the duty as much as you like; the

[Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi.]

consumers will be restricted to your province and you do not get a market in Bengal for your wheat. All that you are doing by imposing this duty is making the Bengal people buy wheat at a higher price. But surely they are not buying your wheat and, from statistics, I will be able to show that the Punjab wheat has not gone to Bengal and Bengal is still buying and will continue to buy foreign wheat at a higher price.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore (Member for Commerce and Railways): Sir, it is entirely untrue that Bengal is continuing to buy foreign wheat to the exclusion of wheat from Northern India.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: At any rate, there cannot be any question that Bengal would have bought more from the Punjab but for high railway freight. In any case, if it is thought that it helps the Punjab I have no objection. Bengal is suffering and will suffer for the benefit of other provinces. If it helps the other provinces . . . .

Seth Govind Das (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan): But Bengal is part of India?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Surely you do not expect one particular province to suffer for the benefit of the others?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must address the Chair. He has repeatedly been asked to do so.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Sir, many Honourable Members have observed, in the course of this debate, that the expenditure of the Central Government should be kept down. Sir, I repeat the same thing, at any rate I would suggest that it should not be increased in a hurry. One has to bear in mind the fact that the limit of the taxable capacity of the people has been reached. A reduction of taxation is the principal means by which relief can be afforded to the masses, and particularly to the rural population. Therefore, Sir, if you want to balance the budget, please do not forget the fact that you have reached the taxable limit and that you cannot reasonably impose any further taxation on the people.

I now turn, Sir, to another matter of vital importance to the masses, and that has reference to rural post offices which, to my mind, should be restored and extended (Hear, hear), and I would draw the attention of my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, particularly to this matter. I congratulate him on the progressive efficiency of the postal department, which has certainly progressed very considerably during his tenure of office so far as I have been able to find, but, Sir, I must say that the rate of one anna for half a tola has been a nuisance to the people.

Some Honourable Members: Yes, we agree.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: On nine out of ten letters that I receive, I have to pay a penalty of two pice . . . . .

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce (Member for Industries and Labour): My friend is extremely unfortunate in his correspondents.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: And, I am sure, my friends are paying the same, and I have a very heavy correspondence too.

An Honourable Member: From Egypt?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Sir, the introduction of the rate of one anna per tola and half anna post cards will be very much welcomed and appreciated by the masses.

There is another thing which strikes me about the working of the post offices in India. The post offices in India perform different duties at different hours, and that is certainly another source of annoyance to the public. For instance, a post office will accept money orders say up to 3 o'clock, a registration letter say till 4 o'clock, and if an extra fee or late fee is paid, the registration letter is received till 5 o'clock. How is one to remember all these complicated hours of posting and the time fixed for receiving money orders, telegrams, registered letters and so on? There are different hours for different transactions, and this is certainly a great nuisance. In the United Kingdom the post offices remain open for certain hours during which they transact all kinds of business. For instance, in England the post offices are open from 8 A.M. to 8 P.M., and, between these hours, one can send his letters, telegrams, money orders, insurance . . . . . .

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Sir, I think I may confidently say that post offices in England are not open for all classes of business from 8 in the morning till 8 in the evening.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Sir, I am certain that they are open . . . .

Some Honourable Members: No, no. Only some are open.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Will you allow me to complete my sentence? Before I complete my sentence, you start saying "No, no". What I want to say is that in certain localities in the United Kingdom certain hours are fixed . . . . .

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Very few.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Still it is a fact that certain hours are fixed in certain localities, though they may be few. For instance, in the locality where I was residing, the post office used to remain open from 8 in the morning till 8 in the evening, and, I thought, that was the usual time observed by all post offices in the United Kingdom, but I may be wrong. One thing, however, is certain, and that is, that the working hours which are observed in the United Kingdom ought to be observed in India also, and the poor devils must be given at least a full and complete holiday; because, Sir, as we all know, even on a Sunday the poor clerks are made to work and they have to attend to at least one delivery. What is the use of having one delivery like that? Close the post offices at any rate entirely for one full day and give the poor clerks complete rest so that they may work during the next six days with much greater vigour and efficiency. What is the use of having one delivery at 12 o'clock? Let

[Mr. A H. Ghuznavi.]

us gradually get ourselves accustomed to receiving no letters on Sundays. Therefore, I am merely throwing out a suggestion for the consideration of the Honourable Member. It will be exceedingly useful if one day's complete holiday were given to the poor staff.

Then, I would suggest that one anna postage should carry one tola and half anna should carry a postcard, that the post offices should be kept open, as in the United Kingdom, with certain fixed hours when all kinds of postal business should be transacted, a complete holiday should be given to the staff, instead of asking one or two clerks to attend on Sundays to deal with the delivery of letters. There is no clearance on Sundays in the United Kingdom . .

(There were a few interruptions at this stage.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must address the Chair and should not carry on a conversation like that.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I must apologise to you, Sir.

Then, Sir, another suggestion of mine is that the postal authorities should encourage commercial advertisements in the post and telegraph offices on a large scale as we see in other countries. For instance, in England, the postage books contain advertisements, and in certain offices I found that most of the stationery like blotting paper, ink, inkpots, pen holders and so on, is supplied free by the advertisers. In the same way, if we encourage dealers in stationery to advertise in post and telegraph offices, they might give the departments stationery free which will mean a considerable saving to Government.

Then, Sir, there has been an increase, I notice, in trunk calls between Delhi and Calcutta. Those who are in business will bear me out that high prices never give a good return. The man who sells cheap gets a better return than a man who sells dear. If you think you will get more money by increasing the rates you are mistaken. I think I have been using the trunk telephone more than anybody else, but I have had to discontinue it because the rate is double of what it was last year.

Then, coming to my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, I find that he has been in certain difficulties because his predecessor had given certain pledges to this House and he had to honour those pledges. This has resulted in withholding the relief which could have come to the poor and the deserving, as well as to trade and business, by raising the limit of exemption as regards income-tax and by removing the surcharge on income-tax. The pledge was that he must restore the salary cut, and in restoring the salary cut, he has not been able to give that relief which he should have done, that is to say, at any rate, raise the taxable limit from Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 2,000, and also the entire removal of the surcharge on income-tax. Income-tax is a bad tax . . . .

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Is a good tax.

Another Honourable Member: A very good tax.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: And, last year, when the State Protection Bill was introduced, this House was told about the benefits derived by the States people,—how they live there happily and peacefully, and one of the benefits was that no State levies income-tax. It is only the British India that levies income-tax.

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: At least thirty States levy income-tax.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: However, that is what I gathered last year that they were not having any income-tax in the States. The present Bill taxes people with an income of Rs. 1,000. Just realise what this means. Rs. 1,000 a year, that is, about Rs. 80 a month. *Panwalas, bidiwalas*, and all sorts of *walas* have been caught in the net.

An Honourable Member: Do you represent them?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: And this restoration of the salary cut has placed an additional difficulty on the Bengal Government in balancing their budget.

Next, I come to the removal of the export duty on skins. Except my Honourable friends from Madras nobody else in this House wanted that the duty on skins should be retained last year.

Mr. B. Das: I wanted it to be retained.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Let us see what is the result of withdrawing that duty on skins. The Honourable the Finance Member said:

"During the eight months ending the 30th November, 1934, the export trade in our skins declined in volume, as compared with the corresponding period of the previous year from 13,133 tons to 8,938 tons, and in value from 2,24 lakhs of rupees to 1,19 lakhs."

I think a friend from Madras, a Muslim friend, has this in his brain for the last nine years at any rate, that the ratio should be changed from 1-6*d* to 1-4*d* and a heavy duty imposed on skins and hides. Of course, Members coming from Madras will always welcome a duty on skins. Telegrams have been pouring in from Calcutta and other centres:

"Informed opposition organised against abolition of export on skin. This burden of duty falls on actual owner of animals who are poor Indian. Please exert your influence in abolishing this export duty. The Skin and Hide Trader Association Calcutta."

"Strongly urge you support Government motion for abolition skins export duty same having proved extremely detrimental to India by affecting thousands of people belonging Muhammadan and depressed classes. Principle of export duties generally recognised to be unsound. Unless duty removed Indian skins export trade bound further to decline by reason severe competition from other markets. Shipments during 1934 fell by 20 per cent from 1933 figures without any corresponding increase in consumption of Madras tanning industry. Calcutta Hides and Skins Shippers Association."

"Abolition of export duty on skins highly essential otherwise we poor producers will suffer badly and business will be ruined. Producers of Bihar hides and skins."

[Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi.]

So far as Bengal is concerned, the increased yield from the jute duty has brought great relief. But Bengal will not rest content until she gets back the whole. It is only just and equitable that it should get the whole without delay. The price has gone down so low that it comes out from the peasants and it is not borne by the shippers or buyers of jute. Another argument is that it is a commodity which is a monopoly of Bengal and surely all its benefit should remain in that province, particularly when it comes out from the pocket of the cultivators. The economic welfare of the people, as a whole, is one of the foremost duties of the State to promote but it is not by that alone that the Government will be judged. The human element, after all, constitutes the best part of the national wealth of any country and men do not live by bread alone, so also nations. The Government will be judged by the human effects of the economic processes of the national policies which they encourage and foster, that is to say, the Government is to be judged by the effects of their economic and other policies on the human element which constitutes the best part of the national wealth. In India we do not believe in a very high standard of material well-being, but, at the same time, it cannot be gainsaid that a certain minimum standard of material well-being is necessary to happiness, and the general standard in India is far below that level of standard. The exercise of a little imagination on the part of our Finance Members will convince them, as it had convinced Sir George Schuster, that statistics proving the wealth of a country as a whole do not necessarily demonstrate the well-being of the masses of the population. Thus there is the Government's policy economic as well as political, which should be so framed as to meet the needs of the nation. Not only should the proper distribution of wealth be assured but everything should be done to raise our sense of national respect. A peaceful and contented national mind is also needed for making people more efficient. The constant sense of degradation and tribulation affects that efficiency. They cannot but feel that they are not the architects of their own fortune in a land which is theirs by birth. We, Muslims and Hindus, who had ruled over India and governed this ancient land with success, feel deeply humiliated when we are told that we are not competent to officer our armies. Had not all the provinces armies of their own, which at times had to be led against even the great Moghul? Had not the great Emperor Akbar to send his famous generals to conquer Bengal? Who then served as soldiers in the Bengal army? Who composed the Bengal army under the Nawabs in the early days of the European settlements in Bengal? Who fought in the South for and against the British and the French? Who fought under the great Sivaji? Where are those people now? If today the army is a close preserve for a few classes and if today India is not in a position to produce individual officers to run her army, it must have been due to the deliberate policy of Government which reserved the Indian army as the training ground for British officers and a few classes distinguished as martial classes. Again, we must have a mercantile marine. Our claim in this respect will not be satisfied by the training of a few people on the training ship "Dufferin". We desire our coastal maritime trade secured to us and reserved to Indian-owned vessels. All restrictions in this respect must be done away with and our self-respect restored with full scope for our manhood and full opportunities for our national development. Sir, in

connection of this coastal trade, I would like, with your permission, to read one or two lines from the Legislative Assembly Debates of the 25th February of this year and quote Mr. B. Das: Referring to Mr. Hossack's motion, Mr. Das said:

"My Honourable friend also talked of the Inland Steam Navigation Company. This is not the first—probably this is the hundredth time—when this House has been told how Inland Steam Navigation Companies started by Indians, were driven to the wall by the rate war which the Inland Steam Companies, controlled by Europeans in Bengal, launched on them. My Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, if he rises after me, will be able to give those distressing tales and even today we know what is happening on the Bombay side."

I have some experience of Indian coastal shipping. Just after the war, one crore of capital was raised in Bengal to start a new company called the Eastern Peninsula Navigation Company, Limited. Fifty lakhs was paid up with which we bought four sea-going vessels. When we started business, the rate-cutting by the British shipping was so intense—and we had no sympathy from Government or any support (*Cries of* "Shame, shame"), that that company was ruined and the whole of the assets of the steamship company had to be sold to a British Company (*Cries of* "Shame, shame, shame, shame") at an insignificant price, and all the money of the shareholders was lost. Even if an Indian company started today, what is the guarantee, unless this House gives protection, that it will not meet with the same fate as was met with by the Eastern Peninsula Navigation Company? With the British shipping interests now controlling the coastal shipping in these areas . . . . .

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Why? Including our Government!

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi . . . . what is the guarantee supposing tomorrow some big steamship company starts in India, that that company will not meet with the same fate as was met with by the Eastern Peninsula Navigation Company with its crore of rupees of capital? Therefore, I say, something has to be done to meet this unfair competition: and, I am sure, that if we had our Honourable friend, the present Commerce Member, he would have taken up the matter in right earnest; anyway, he saved the Scindia from meeting with the same fate as that of the Eastern Peninsula Navigation had to meet with. At any rate he saved the Scindia; but as far as I know of the Scindia and from all the recent information I have, I may say that it is for all practical purposes one of the branches of the British India Steam Navigation Company. I do not think it has any independent existence—it cannot have under the existing circumstances, unless you can prevent the mischievous practice of the British shipping companies' rate-cutting, private rebates, confidential rebates, and the freight-cutting which they will no doubt continue in order to kill any new shipping companies that are started. ("Shame, shame.") Therefore, legislation of this kind is necessary to save the coastal trade for our Indian shipping—I have no objection to the British shipping companies competing with us, but they must not do rate-cutting: that must stop, and it must be on a fair basis. (Hear, hear.) I would have no rate-cutting as between the Indian and British shipping companies; we are not, of course, concerned with foreign companies at all. Well, there we will give you preference, but, so long as we can start

4 P. M.

[Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi.]

our own companies, surely they must have the first preference, even as against yours, so far as the coastal shipping is concerned (Loud and Prolonged Applause); and until we can have our Indian maritime coastal shipping in our own hands—not to talk of our share in overseas trade and all that—there can be no peace. Sir, I have got statistics, which I have been collecting, which show the huge trade that is in the hands of this coastal shipping. It is tremendous—you have no idea of what it is,—you can have no idea of the huge profits that these British shipping companies are making from out of our coastal trade.

Sir, the volume of unemployment existing in this country does not reflect any credit on the Government. The removal of that is the problem of problems and all over the world, and not only in India, it is essential that there should be co-operation between the Government and the people in all matters of national welfare, and our Government here should take the people into their confidence. If that is done, and if they will pursue a well thought-out programme with earnestness—I do not want these haphazard measures of giving protection to Mr A. or to Mr B., whether he deserves it or not—thus, the Tariff Board may have recommended something twenty or fifteen years or five years ago, and you may now want to give protection to this industry or that,—when it is a back number—that is not the way to give protection. Well thought-out programmes are necessary, and they must be carried out with earnestness and determination and with a will to find the solution. (Hear, hear.) Sir, the restoration of prosperity will not be so difficult then as they sometimes make it out to be. There must be a realization of the fact that the principles of economics are not immutable like the principles of mathematics for all times and places. Sir, we have to devise a plan which will be effective under our conditions. This is the very least that the Britishers here can see done. Otherwise, Sir, the spectacular show of a crore of rupees for village uplift is a mere eye-wash. (Hear, hear.) It is too small to give any decisive results. It does full credit to your heart.

An Honourable Member: They have no hearts.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: But not to your judgments. Be it remembered, every nation deserves the Government it can pay for, and that we cannot pay for this top-heavy administration. (Loud Applause.) Further, Sir, let it be remembered that righteousness exalteth a nation and any departure from it will be ruinous. Sir, I have concluded. (Loud and Prolonged Cheers.)

Several Honourable Members: The question be now put.

Other Honourable Members: No, no, no, no.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair accepts the closure motion, having regard to the fact that an arrangement was arrived at between the Parties. The question is that the question be now put.

The Assembly divided:

AYES—45.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.
Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A. A. Venkatarama.
Bajpai, Mr. G. S
Bewoor, Mr G. V.
Bhagchand Soni, Rai Bahadur Seth.
Bhore, The Honourable Sir Joseph
Buss, Mr. L C
Chatarji, Mr. J. M
Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry
Dalal, Dr R D
DeSouza, Dr F X
Drake Mr D. H. C.
Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya Ananda.
Graham Sir Lancelot
Grigg, The Honourable Sir James
Hockenhull, Mr F W.
Hudson Sir Leslie
James, Mr. F. E
Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir.
Kirpalani, Mr Hiranand Khushiram
Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri
Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
Metcalfe, Mr. H. A. F.
Milligan, Mr. J. A.
Monteath, Mr. J.
Morgan, Mr G
Mukerje, Mr. N R.
Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya Charan.
Nayar, Mr. C Govindan.
Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
Owen, Mr. L.
Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C
Rau, Mr P R.
Row, Mr K Sanjiva.
Sarma, Mr. R S
Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
Scott, Mr. W. L.
Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain Sardar.
Singh Mr Pradyumna Prashad.
Sircar, The Honourable Sir Nripendra.
Sloan, Mr T
Swithinbank, Mr B W.
Tottenham, Mr. G. R F.

NOES—69.

Aaron, Mr Samuel
Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.
Aney, Mr M. S
Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
Ayyangar Mr M. Ananthasayanam.
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
Bajoria, Babu Baijnath
Banerjea, Dr P N
Baqui, Mr. M. A.
Bhagavan Das Dr
Chattopadhyaya, Mr Amarendra Nath.
Chettiar, Mr T S Avinashilingam
Chetty, Mr Sami Vencatachelam.
Das, Mr. B
Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha
Datta, Mr Akhil Chandra.
Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.
Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer, Mr. Ahmed.
Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.
Fakir Chand, Mr.
Fuzlul Huq, Mr. A. K.
Gadgil, Mr. N. V.
Gauba, Mr. K. L.
Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.
Ghuznavi, Mr. A. H.
Giri, Mr. V. V.
Govind Das, Seth.
Gupta, Mr. Ghanshiam Singh.
Hidayatallah, Sir Ghulam Hussain.
Hosmani, Mr. S. K.
Iswar Saran, Munshi.
Jedhe, Mr. K. M.
Jinnah, Mr M A.
Jogendra Singh, Sirdar
Khan Sahib, Dr.
Khare, Dr. N B.
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D K.
Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta
Mangal Singh, Sardar.
Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.
Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta.
Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.
Parma Nand, Bhai.
Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.
Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur Makhdum Syed
Rajan, Dr T. S S.
Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.
Ranga, Prof. N. G.
Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
Sant Singh, Sardar
Satyamurti, Mr S.
Shafi Daudi, Maulvi Muhammad.
Sham Lal, Mr.
Seodass Daga, Seth.
Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib Nawab.
Singh, Mr. Deep Narayan.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.
Sri Prakasa, Mr.
Umar Aly Shah, Mr
Varma, Mr. B. B.
Vissanji, Mr. Mathuradas.

The motion was negatived.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta).]

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Mr. Deputy President, before I address the House on the question of the Finance Bill, I am one of those who have been watching the proceedings of this House for the past one month and a half and my impression has always been that, if there had been one of my brothers on the Treasury Benches, things would have taken quite a different turn. Sir, for one thing, unlike in other countries, we have no Medical Member in the Viceroy's Council or on the Treasury Benches. I do believe that a certain amount of knowledge of medicine will do good even for such a successful Financier as the Honourable the Finance Member, because a financier and an economist are both talking in terms of money, in terms of business and they do not take a correct perspective of human lives and human values It is my belief that for any economic plan of working or for good finance. . . . .

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I rise to a point of order. I think we should not be expected to address empty Benches on the other side. Neither the Honourable the Finance Member nor the Member representing the Central Board of Revenue is on the Government Benches, and I, therefore, think it is not right that the debate should proceed in the absence of these Government Members. That is the point of order that I raise.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): What is the point of order? Does the Honourable Member ask for a mandamus to bring the Finance Member to the House? So far as the representative of this particular Department is concerned, he is here. What is the point of order that my Honourable friend is raising? If he tells me that, I can meet it.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: My point of order is this. The House is discussing the Finance Bill, and I am asking, is it fair that the Finance Member should not be here to listen to the criticism made by Honourable Members on this side? Is it fair that the Finance Member should slight the House by absenting himself like this?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Will my Honourable friend now tell me what is the point of order? His point is, is it fair that the Finance Member should not be here. Is that a point of order?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: My point of order is quite plain, and I am sorry if my Honourable friend has not followed it. In a Finance Bill, it is the Finance Member who has to hear all our criticisms and he has to give a reply and he has also to see that the demands of the people are attended to. If the Finance Member is not present in the House, that means that there is no one on the Government Benches to hear what we on this side say and the Leader of the House would not be considered to be in charge of every portfolio. Therefore, I would submit that this being a discussion on the Finance Bill, the House cannot proceed with the discussion without the Finance Member being in his place. I would

go further and say that the House is not a complete House without the Finance Member being present at the discussion on the Finance Bill. I, therefore, want the decision of the Chair as to whether, when the Finance Member is not in the House, there would be any use in discussing.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq (Bakargunj *cum* Faridpur: Muhammadan Rural): Let the House be adjourned till Monday.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Will the Honourable Member show the Chair any rule or Standing Order, which makes it obligatory on the Finance Member to be here? It is certainly desirable that he should be here, but if he is not here, is there any rule which empowers the Chair to compel him to be present?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I submit that common sense requires that when there is a discussion on the Finance Bill, the Finance Member ought to be present in the House. No rule or Standing Order is required. I appeal to your inherent powers.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: May I make a submission. I submit that it would be intolerable if the Finance Member cannot get away for 20 minutes, after he has been here from 11 A.M. this morning till 4-25 P.M. We know and we have been told that this is a discussion on the Finance Bill, and that the Finance Member should be present here. But, Sir, under the Finance Bill, the House may discuss all sorts of subjects. You may discuss repressive laws, you may discuss scarcity of water, and there is no rule or Standing Order that the Finance Member should always be present in the House. Surely there are enough people here to take notes of what Honourable Members are saying with regard to particular subjects. We know that we shall be dispersing for the day at five o'clock or a quarter past five, and those who take notes will amplify all the subjects to the Finance Member and he will be put in possession of all the facts. The Finance Member did not mean any discourtesy to the House by being absent temporarily. I submit to the Chair that there is no rule that he must be here from the time the Assembly meets for the day until it adjourns.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): As pointed out by the Honourable the Leader of the House, the Honourable the Finance Member was here from 11 A.M. to 4-25 P.M. The Chair, therefore, rules that there is no point of order. Let the Honourable Member, Dr. Rajan continue his speech.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena (Lucknow Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I want to rise to a point of order.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): There cannot be any discussion on this point of order which has been decided by the Chair. If the Honourable Member wants to raise any fresh point of order, he can do so.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): Sir, have you not given your ruling just now that the Honourable Member, Mr. Rajan, should continue his speech, and I, therefore, think there cannot be any further discussion on the point of order. You have decided there is no point of order, and there can, therefore, be no further discussion on that.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: My submission is that there is no rule. . . .

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member cannot discuss the ruling of the Chair. Let the Honourable Dr. Rajan proceed with his speech.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: I wish to submit. . . .

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta). Order, order. There can be no further discussion on this point.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I am rising to a fresh point of order

Mr. Deputy President (Mr Akhil Chandra Datta) Is it a fresh point of order, or the same thing over again?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: It is another point of order in the sense that I only submit and ask if the decision that the Chair gave was the final decision. Of course, I did not hear what the Chair said excepting that the Honourable Member, Dr Rajan, was asked to proceed with his speech. What I mean to submit is that I want the Chair at least to give me that ruling with some reason.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I maintain that the remarks made by the Honourable Member cast a reflection on the Chair. Sir, as long as there was a joke, I did not object, but I now protest against the reflection made on the Chair and the Honourable Member must be asked to withdraw his remarks

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta) The Chair does not propose to take any notice of those remarks and it would ask Dr. Rajan to proceed with his speech. There must not be any further discussion on the point of order which has been decided by the Chair.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Sir, I was just saying that the whole basis of economics would become a right one if the economic unit is changed from rupees, annas and pies or pounds, shillings and pence, to human life, and if economics are based upon standards of human life and the value of human life in terms of economics, we would soon arrive at a correct budget with regard to national income as well as national expenditure Take, for these economic principles, the fundamental unit, the human life You cannot have a machine working, you cannot have income, you cannot have expenditure, if you do not take into consideration human lives, and, by human life, I mean human life value which means that every one who is alive today and who has got to turn out work in terms of national economy forms a national unit of life both in his own life as well as in his economic value. If a human being starts with longer period of life and makes his body unit a national asset in terms of economics, he would soon find that every human life, whatever may be its value today, would infinitely be enhanced if the life value is increased, even though it is increased by a day. True economics would certainly try to solve the real crux of the problem, and what is the crux of the problem as it stands in India today? It is this, that human life in this country has an average of less than 50 per cent. of what it prevails out in European countries.

The average life of an Indian here in this country is roughly about 23 years, while that in Europe is over 47. If the value of human life is put down at the rate of half an anna or seven pies, as was said this morning, you can just imagine that if our national life is increased by ever so much as five or ten years as the life average of this country, if measures are taken to so arrange as to make it possible for a man to live longer in this country, then you would concede that the economic value of the income is enormously increased. It is only on the basis of human life that I want every economic principle to be planned. And, if you concede that, what does it come to? When you talk of machinery, when you talk of taxation, when you talk of income, our financiers are likely to ignore the life element in it. That is why, when I started my remarks, I said that it was better that there was a medical man who understood the real value of life in the counsels of this country. And that is why I regret it was not so. If the Honourable the Finance Member were asked to think in terms of life values in this country, he would certainly concede my argument that, whatever money is spent, it must be spent firstly and primarily on the prolongation of life in this country. The prolongation of life really means economic gain to the nation; it really means economic strength to the country, it really means a profit to the race and the nation at large. It is this value that I should like to place before him for consideration. For this object we have got one crore of rupees to be spent, and the Honourable the Finance Member has not given us any clear idea as to how that one crore is going to be spent. The other day a question was asked from this side of the House whether he has visited any village or whether he has seen an Indian village. I learnt from the newspapers this morning that the Honourable the Finance Member got himself trained in the village life of India by paying a visit to a village a few days ago under the auspices of one of the Honourable Members of this House. I suppose he has seen some of our worst villages, and perhaps, side by side, with some good villages. Now, if in the village he saw squalor and dirt and hungry men and poor men dying, and he went and saw the other good village as has been reported in the press, what is his economic gain by the two contrasts that he has seen? Will not his one crore of rupees be economically utilised in relieving that village of squalor, dirt, short span of life and hunger-stricken people? If you can spend one rupee in that village and make them live for one day more, will it not be an economic gain to this country? If that position is conceded, you next see that every endeavour which Government have to make must be with this one purpose that the life of the race ought to be extended, and in that direction alone is economic recovery possible in this country. But, if, on the contrary, as has been happening in the last so many years, if the average life of the race sinks from 40 or 50 down to 22 or 23, you can have any amount of economic planning and you may give any number of crores, you may even give one crore of rupees, but if that crore is not spent to raise the national economic value in terms of human life, it is simply an absolute waste of expenditure. It is on this issue alone that the whole plan has got to be thought out. I will put it to the Honourable the Finance Member to think about planning which would so utilise the amount of one crore,—which unfortunately is not even recurring,—as to increase the national life average, which would be a thoroughly good investment. And he will find that his economic asset will increase ten times if not more. Therefore, there should be a planned-out scientific and hygienic improvement of our slums, a freedom from epidemic diseases which are really the

[Dr. T. S. S. Rajan.]

result of dirt and squalor which can be prevented. It cannot be said that the Government, as constituted in India today, is incapable of doing it. Europe has done it, all civilised countries have done it; and, as a result of their doing it, you find that the average life has gone up in Europe to what it was 200 years ago. I put it to Government that if, with all the finances that you have at your disposal, you fail in your fundamental duty as economists or as nation-builders and in spite of spending so many crores every year you do not spend one rupee to prolong the average life of this race, you are doomed and you cannot stand up before either man or God with your hand on your heart and say that you have done your duty by the people of this country.

Then, Sir, I come to the next question which has been occupying the attention of the medical world. The necessity for a scheme to prolong the average life of this race is unquestioned. If any man has got to work with a financier to improve the economic condition of this country, the foremost duty lies in collaboration between the scientific man, the man of medicine, the man of hygiene and the financier to evolve a correct scheme and to find out ways and means of prolonging the life of our people which is really an economic asset to this country. The medical man has got to be assessed his right place. You can imagine that if there were a Ministry of Health in the present Government such a lack of consideration for such an important subject as I have raised would not have happened. If before framing his expenditure for this one crore that he has allotted for the improvement of the villages, the Finance Member had taken medical men into consultation he would have found how beneficially and economically this one crore of rupees can be spent and how the national wealth would be improved that way. But even as it is I am afraid the Indian medical man today has to work under very great handicaps. The Indian Medical Service, in spite of all this agitation in the press and the platform, has become a monopoly service in this country. After having about 200 medical men as the army reserve that is given to the civil service for the benefit of the military, Government are asked to provide for more places. In the course of the discussion, the other day, it was stated in the Upper House that the ratio of two Europeans to one Indian could not be altered in view of the fact that civil service men required European medical men to attend on them. Well, Sir, it looks a most ridiculous proposition for any Government to advance that, because a certain number of civil service men want a particular kind of medical men to attend on them, it is the duty of the country to provide for such men. Sir, in this matter it is a question of knowledge, it is a question of science, not of black, white or brown. If a qualified doctor is capable of dealing with disease and with the general health of the people, I cannot for one moment see what human argument could be adduced against a man being dark, and, therefore, he cannot be allowed to treat a white man or woman. I can also state as a medical man, who has lived and lived successfully in life, that I have yet to find a man who would tell me that, because I am a black or brown man, I should not treat him. There are brown doctors in white countries, and these doctors have got a practice amongst white people which is the envy of several well known white doctors. If Englishmen cannot serve in India unless they are provided with white doctors, it passes my comprehension why the Indian exchequer and the Indian Legislative Assembly

should go out of their way to vote enormous sums of money for providing white doctors to civil servants in this country.

Then, again, with regard to the question that there should be two Europeans to one Indian in the I. M. S., how is this ratio worked out? And, what is the basis? While you say that there should be two Indians to one European in the regular army, here the ratio is reversed; here you inflict your European officer on the civil side, not only you want a European officer for yourself, but you inflict him on the civil side too, which is a most illogical proposition. Now, take it the other way. Why do you force your men on the dark sepoy? He is quite content to be under an Indian Medical officer, and I don't see how the ratio of 2 to 1 holds good there.

The third point, and the most atrocious thing is that, after having satisfied the military authorities, the military department comes and asks the civil department: "Look here, we want to keep some men as reserves". For what?—for any unknown contingency like a war. A war may or may not take place, but the civil side has to accommodate about 300 I. M. S. men and pay them from the general exchequer, and these people not only block the intelligence and promotions of Indians, but their claim and their right to be there. Not only that. What have the Government done? They have posted all the reserve men on the top service which develops intelligence, which requires energy, which requires thought,—ingredients which go to make the profession successful, all those things which go to make the wellbeing of the race, with the result that Indians have to stew at the bottom. Indians with far better qualifications and experience than those possessed by the I. M. S. officers are kept down. For instance, there is a Medical Research Department in this country, and a few appointments were recently made. I understand there were 12 or 14 Indian applicants holding some of the highest qualifications, qualifications which no man can ever question. Some one trotted out a pious wish and said that four of the appointments to be made should be from I. M. S. men. Why should there be I. M. S. men even for research work, I ask. Has the I. M. S. man got the necessary qualification even for research work? I really fail to understand the reasoning. I. M. S. does not mean any special qualification I.M.S. simply mean a special brand of service, it means nothing more. You have got superior men in the I. M. S. and you have got inferior men in that service, but everybody is ranked as I. M. S., and, the moment a man is an I. M. S., he is considered good enough for anything. I really cannot understand why for the Medical Research Department there should be a restriction that four men ought to be selected from among the I. M. S. men. The other day, a Board met to make selections for some of these appointments, and there were Indian applicants with excellent qualifications, much better than those possessed by the I. M. S., and simply because four I. M. S. men had to be selected, most of our best brains were turned out. This is what happened . . . .

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Four seats out of how many?

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: I believe there were six posts vacant, and, out of these, four were reserved for I. M. S. men, but there were six or eight applicants who were infinitely better men than the I. M. S., but merely because they were not I. M. S., they were given the go by, and novices, who had not done any responsible work, were taken, simply because

[Dr. T. S. S. Rajan.]

they were in the I. M S., and we were asked to swallow these I. M S. men That is exactly why I bitterly complain against the system by which you ask us to reserve a certain number of posts for a certain class of people, not on account of their merits, but simply because they belong to the I. M. S. cadre, and for no other reason. Therefore, I say it is entirely unjustifiable, it is entirely unjust that you should try and thrust most of your I. M S on the civil population depriving the civil population of power, civil population of energy, civil population of intellect, civil population of brains which should naturally go to serve the civil population of this country,—you deny all that. And, what is more, all the topmost appointments, beginning from the Director General of the Indian Medical Service down to the district head are reserved for the I M. S men, and therefore, what happens is that the junior man on the civil side, however well qualified he may be, can never get to the top post Today I can show a large number of Indians holding some of the highest medical qualifications like F.R.C.S that are serving under the I. M S who have not got even a fourth of the qualifications possessed by Indians, and such a sad spectacle cannot be seen in any other part of the globe. (Shame, shame.) This is the sort of treatment you give to the medical services of this country, and naturally all the medical intelligence goes waste for want of sufficient opportunities for Indians Where is the energy, where is the inspiration to come from where is the willingness or eagerness for the poor Indian to come from? These I M S. men are put on the top and they act like a string round our neck only to throttle it That is my complaint against the I. M S. For God's sake, give the Indian medical men the opportunities that they seek. If we on this side of the House ask questions on the subject, we are told that we are dabbling with the military people, that the military people are far above the ordinary people who can give us only congenital idiots—I do not quarrel with the view that you hold, but I simply tell you this that, if there are any pig headed people in the world, the military people are perhaps the most assinine, for this reason that their calvarium is unduly thick and new ideas do not easily get into the military man's brains, and, therefore, we can find no argument to persuade him. They simply say that the civilian population wants a certain number, and, therefore, the military man must go to the civil side Is there any part of the world, is there any country in the world in which the civil side is asked to take a certain quota of military men? That exists nowhere in the world except in India It is stated that, during the time of the East India Company, barbers came in the guise of surgeons and began to treat English people, but today what is the position? We have got intelligence enough, we have got qualifications enough, we have got education enough, we have got Indians with qualifications who have beaten Englishmen in their universities, and we have got men possessing qualifications and distinction far above those possessed by Englishmen who are recruited for the I. M. S., both in England and in India. Therefore, why not give us a chance? All I say is, you can take away your military men, but why thrust them on the civil side? Leave the civil side at least free. Why thrust your military men on our Ministers in Local Governments? The Ministers are quite helpless; because you send down eight I. M. S. men, and the poor Minister has no other go but to take these men and put them over the heads of the fellows who were doing very valuable service for ages in the Local Government. This is the

condition to which you have reduced the medical services of this country. And, after having made provision for 200 of your I. M. S. men on the civil side, you have the 103 residuary men to be accommodated in the civil service, and these people are never called in for military duty, they must remain there till they die. This is the position of the medical services in this country, this is the position of the I. M. S. men, and these 103 residuary men are not called for service and yet they must be provided for on the civil side. Men recruited the other day on Rs. 350 are sent out to the front while these sinecures with Rs 5,000 a month downwards to Rs. 2,500 stick to their seats You are dumping these 103 residuary officers on the Local Governments. Can you, in the name of logic, in the name of humanity, justify this permanent imposition of 103 men on the top of one of the most intelligent branches of science? Do you advance science by this way, do you progress the medical profession by this attempt? And, in the other House, it was said that these I. M. S. men shall stay, that the ratio shall be there, and the Local Governments are asked in a convenient language—the reply given in the other House was: "What can we do? The Local Governments ask for I. M. S. officers". This is a proposition most outrageous to the intelligence of any Indian, because no son of India can ever say that he has not got qualified medical men in his province and he must ask the Imperial Government for the dole of I. M S. men from the Central Government. It is a most monstrous statement that has ever been made on the floor of any House And we are asked to believe today that all Local Governments come on bended knees to the Imperial Government and beg for doles of intelligent I. M. S. men, so that their dark province, ignoble province may be elevated from misery and starvation! That is a proposition which no sane man can ever agree to, and still it was made the other day in the other House by the Member in charge of the portfolio

Sir, this sort of agitation has been going on for years together. The other day, when I asked a series of questions on the I. M. S., it was said that the Englishmen were not coming in and their ratio was not yet filled up, that Indians were in larger numbers, and, therefore, their recruitment must stop. Just imagine a profession like the medical profession, and they say: "We do not get our men". We are many here, the qualifications of our men, mind you, are A. 1. and no man can question our qualifications, our English qualifications are better than anybody else could ever criticise or think of. We have the talents, and they apply for service. And, still, for the last so many years, you have not recruited more than about 15. You have recruited 95 unwilling European men to serve in this country, men whose qualifications can never be compared with the qualifications that we have got today. When you have got men in this country with an amount of knowledge and skill which cannot be surpassed, I put it to you, what is this economy that you are practising today? You know very well that Indian talent can be had much cheaper if you want. I can prove it to you that you are having them on the most outrageous terms, you are having cooly labour in the I. M. S. service, because, have you ever heard of temporary service in any other branch in India today? Is there a temporary service in the I. C. S., is there a temporary service in the Finance Department, or in any other Department under the Government of India? You have not got a temporary service anywhere else. And not that you have not got men, because there is an army of unemployed who, for a tenth of the wages that you are giving to your men, would always live

[Dr. T. S. S. Rajan.]

and wait at your doors for years to get jobs for a tenth of the wages, because unemployment is so keen in this country. You could have cheap clerks, temporary clerks and not bother with pensions and time scale promotion and all that. You can have temporary clerks for 20 years or 30 years and at the end kick them out without any gratuity or pension. And that is what you are doing in the I. M. S. today. Because, since the War, 1,500 temporary men were taken, and out of them there are 68 men in service permanently—45 were taken on years ago and are still hanging on. They pay the temporary men in this way. Their contract is supposed to be only for one year, and, at the end of it, they ask the men: "Are you willing to continue, my dear fellows, for another year?" What can the poor men do? They have been in the army at Quetta and in the frontier, they would have seen nothing but barren rocks and no patient except the military in camp. They could not have any private practice, and they could not go home and face starvation Having brought them out from their house and engaged them on cheap labour on about Rs. 300 a month, you take them to the base camp out at Peshawar or at Quetta and keep them for a year, and, at the end of it, you ask them if they would continue for another year, and the poor devils have to say: "We shall continue, Sir." They continue for one year more, they continue the third year, they continue the fourth year, and, at the end of five years, you again renew. There are men who have done nine years of service at the end of which they have not been taken in permanent service, because their service is all temporary. In the case of I. M. S. officers (European), if they want to go away after five years of service, you give them gratuity, passage money and all sorts of things. But here is an Indian taken on half the wages, he works for the army just as any I. M. S. Officer does . . . .

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham (Army Secretary): May I explain that these temporary service men receive exactly the same pay as the regular officers? They do not receive half the pay. And Indian as well as British officers of the I. M. S. are eligible for gratuity after six years.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: I remember the Honourable Member telling me the other day that they are not entitled to any gratuity.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Temporary officers are not entitled to gratuity, but the regular Indian officers are entitled to gratuity.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: I am simply comparing the temporary men with the regular men.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) resumed the Chair.]

Regular men at the end of five years get their gratuity, passage home, etc., and they can go home and settle down to a decent practice. But what happens to our temporary men? You say you have taken them on good pay. What about the allowance which you give them? Do you give them the same allowance as you give to other people? Your allowance is a good slice which nobody can ignore. You may give a pay of Rs. 350, but there is an allowance of Rs. 150 or so which you do not give to our temporary men. And what about the gratuity which you give after five years to the regular

men, and after a similar service of five years in the case of these temporary men you ask them to go out and you do not give them anything . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better address the Chair.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: It was in reply to a question, Sir. Therefore, I tell you, this sort of recruitment,—simply because you could have men, therefore you cut down their pay and treat them as mere coolies—does not befit any Government. Make them permanent, for God's sake alter the blessed ratio and give us something decent. Talents we have, brains we have, we can treat not only our own countrymen, but even Englishmen as well as we do our own. And we have done that. And when we have done that, I ask you, why import unwilling people, because your English people are not very anxious to come, they do not come in in the large numbers that you want? The mere fact that they do not come must be ample reason for any sensible man to come out and say: "If you fellows, 5,000 miles away, do not come, here is good material, and I will have it." What prevents you from getting this available useful material in this country which, under no canon of justice, you could refuse. Therefore, I am asking, in all fairness to the temporary service men, do not recruit temporary men, or at least take them into permanent service. You ask them to serve for five years and nine years, and, after that period, no pension, no gratuity is given to them and they have got to go back without anything. I ask you to stop this. Take them into permanent service. If you cannot make them permanent, do not recruit them. On the contrary, what are you doing? You are still commissioning a number of people, as it is, private practitioners to serve in the army for any future eventuality, not on full payment, but on some small honorarium per year, and you put them in the army list for emergency purposes. This sort of thing is most disgraceful. The medical profession is a profession which is entitled to the grateful recognition of any civilised country. We are first trained for a number of years, and we have qualifications of every sort which nobody can question, and we come to serve our own country. We do not want to treat you, at least allow us to treat our own men, women, and children, and our own army and our own soldiers. Why not alter the ratio at least to that extent? Is that asking too much of anybody? I put that question to you. If you concede that economic unity and economic principles depend exactly on human life values and that human life values depend upon the efforts of scientific men for anything that could be done in that way, you would realise the full value of medical men in the scale of life. If the medical science is at all to be developed, it can never be developed in the way in which you are handling the medical service in this country. For instance, I can tell you a most shameful fact, shameful to confess—that in the I. M. S. a man, who is absolutely unqualified for a particular job, is put in that job. Just imagine a man, who is a lecturer on Lunacy, being made a professor of anatomy the next day; a man, who has never done pathology all his life before and who is going to retire, is made a professor of pathology when he becomes a Colonel. It simply means that the I. M. S. must be kept up to the detriment of any other medical service. This virtual class monopoly for a particular class is the most outrageous institution that can blacken the face of any civilised country, and today this injustice is perpetrated on this country year after year, and when the challenge is thrown from the House, there comes the barefaced reply that the ratio must be maintained. Sir, I ask, whether this ratio is for the sake of the men or

[Dr. T. S. S. Rajan.]

the men for the sake of the ratio Therefore, do not put the cart before the horse. In the name of all that is good and all that is honest, and in the name of common sense, I ask you to utilise this tremendous talent that is lying dormant and getting wasted. I give you the instance of scientific research. Here you can see the great harm which the I. M. S. bloc is doing to the whole medical service of this country.

5 P.M. Then, Sir, what I want to do more than anything else is that these residuary posts must be straightaway abolished. They have no place and they have no justification to live there. Secondly, all these posts which have been imposed upon the Local Governments must be released and the Local Governments must have full freedom to employ their own agency for medical services without any direction or dictation from the Central Government. Therefore, the real transfer of the Medical Department from the Centre to the provinces must take place. Today it is a makebelieve Certainly we have got some power to post a few Assistant Surgeons here and there, but the direction and control of the medical and sanitary services does not lie in the hands of the provinces, for the simple reason that the I. M S insist upon thrusting some of their men on the Local Government, even against their will.

Then, Sir, I come to the preventive work Here, as I told you, any efforts towards prolonging life is a great economic asset. Today millions are dying of malaria in this country Today Ceylon is in the grip of malaria which has taken a toll of millions. Malaria may overtake India any day, because we are not differently constituted from Ceylon, and what malaria is doing in Ceylon today, it may do in India tomorrow, and what do we find? The other day, I was told that Government are holding tons of quinine, because they could not get the price for quinine. My dear Sir, the Government were *shopwallahs* and *boxwallah's* during the days of the East India Company. I never knew that His Majesty's Government today, as represented by the Governor General and his Council, have come here to sell quinine and that for a profit. Quinine manufactured in this country rightly belongs to the people who are suffering from malaria and if the Government hold large stocks of quinine and want to sell them at a profit, while millions of poor people are dying of malaria, I tell you it is the most culpable sin that you can commit against man and God. Therefore, release that quinine for the poor people free of all charges. A little charity on the part of the Finance Member will enable the Government to release this quinine for the sake of the suffering people who are dying of malaria in hundreds, and remember that, if you lose millions of lives, your economic asset will go to the wall. Therefore, it is necessary that the life average of our people must be prolonged, and, therefore, I ask you in all humanity and in the name of charity to release that quinine for God's sake; tell the post offices to distribute that quinine free to these poor people. Issue a circular to all the villages that quinine which is Government property will be given free to all people. Will the Government do it in the name of the King's Silver Jubilee for which the Government are making elaborate preparations in this country? I know an answer will not be forthcoming. Still I place my suggestion before the Government for what it is worth.

Then, there is this question of the life killing disease prevailing in this country. Government are taking particular care with regard to the army in regard to the spread of venereal diseases. The venereal disease is perhaps

most prevalent in the armies, particularly in the British army, and today, as the result of a studied campaign against the spread of venereal diseases, the army is brought up in security against the onslaught of venereal diseases. Every care is taken and preventive effort is made there, but what is it that is being done about the civilian population? A stray doctor for venereology in one of the biggest hospitals is all that is being done. People have not been made safe from the terrific havoc which the venereal disease commits on the population of this country today. Where are those public clinics where modern nations train their nationals for the prevention of diseases? We do not find them anywhere here. In Geneva, there is a makebelieve, called the League of Nations, quite an impotent body, trying to preach ideals far beyond the capacity of the nations that form the constituent parts of the League and in that League they are doing propaganda against the spread of venereal diseases. What have the Indian Government done with regard to that propaganda? What I would like to say is that Government should keep their eyes open. Let them realise that it is the individual man that goes to constitute the Indian nation. He is a real economic asset to the country and you find his life average is only 22 years as against the 30 and 40 that you find in Europe and this economic asset is infinitely better than all the subterfuges that you resort to in your budget. You want to tax salt, you want to tax incomes, pay high salaries. That is all very good, but it is all waste, because you are moving in a vicious circle. So long as the people of this country have got such a small span of human life, there is no use of any economic theory or principle. What you want to do is to promote medical research for the benefit of the poor. That will alone give you the income on your capital outlay, and I venture to say that even the Finance Member will not regret the money that is spent on it. It will give him a ten fold and a fifteen fold return and he will find that the real asset is the longevity of the people.

Sir, the only point that I want to refer to before I conclude is this. Let it be said to our shame and ignominy as a race and as an insult to our intelligence that today brothels are still being almost protected in almost all the big cities. I know there are some laws, but, in spite of that, brothels are thriving in almost every big city. They are a moral cancer to the public life of any country, more so to a country which is so poor and weak as India and which has such a low average of life. Brothels ought to be done away with and the State today is indirectly responsible for the existence of brothels in this country. A campaign has been directed and recommended by the League of Nations. That is a thing which must be taken up at once in the interests of the economic life of this country.

Sir, I need not add anything more to the long rigmarole of grievances that I have enumerated. Suffice it to say that the life average is the only average that would be of any value in any economic campaign, and I put it to the House that we must try to do our best in this campaign by using the medical talents which are lying waste and which are India's for the asking. Will Government do it, or will they respond to such suggestions as we are making on the floor of this House? But I can only put before you as reasonable, as faithful, as true a picture as I could portray, with the facts that I have in my possession and which I have tried to place before this House. Sir, if this plan of economic activity—that life is the fundamental unit of economics—is adopted, you will find it will give us a solution for almost all the ills which this country is suffering from today,

[Dr. T. S. S. Rajan.]

—apart from the foreign domination and their economic supremacy to which all our interests are subservient. The medical profession, Sir, would have been quite a different profession in this country, were it not for our political subservience to the British. It is our political subservience to the British that carries that stigma of inferiority, and the medical service suffers from that political inferiority complex—not on account of its intellectual inferiority, as has been proved so often, that you find medical men like myself, Dr. Khan Sahib and Dr. Deshmukh, wasting our time discussing all these things here . . . .

An Honourable Member: And Dr. Dalal.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: . . . . because we feel that whatever intelligence we have and whatever services we can give, we should place those at the disposal of this Assembly in order that our political institutions may be strongly represented, and we have that objective far more in view than merely claiming our just share in the medical services. We are here not as medical men merely, but as the elected representatives of a large population, and, while we are here, while we are contributing to the destruction of a foreign structure that is eating our very vitals, consistently with that work, we do, as members of our Party, want to place before this House the knowledge that we possess with regard to medical science and the medical profession and the handicaps from which this noble service is suffering in this country. (Loud and Prolonged Applause.)

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 25th March, 1935.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 25th March, 1935.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

GRATUITY RECEIVED BY EUROPEAN AND INDIAN OFFICERS IN THE INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE.

894. ***Dr. T. S. S. Rajan:** (a) What gratuity does an Indian Medical Service European officer receive after five years of service?

(b) What gratuity does a European officer receive after 12 years of service?

(c) What gratuity does a temporary Commissioned Indian receive after (i) five years of service and (ii) nine years of service?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) and (b). Regular officers of the Indian Medical Services, both British and Indian, may retire with a gratuity of £1,000 after six years or £2,500 after twelve years.

(c) The conditions on which temporary commissions are given do not provide for the grant of any gratuity at the end of the period of engagement.

SELECTION OF CANDIDATES FOR TEMPORARY COMMISSIONS IN THE INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE.

895. ***Dr. T. S. S. Rajan:** (a) Who selects candidates for temporary commissions in the Indian Medical Service?

(b) Are these vacancies advertised in the papers?

(c) Why are candidates for these commissions not interviewed by the Indian Medical Service Selection Board? What factors are taken into consideration in selecting candidates for temporary commissions?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) The Director General, Indian Medical Service, who is the head of the Indian Medical Service.

(b) Yes, in medical journals.

(c) Recruitment to temporary commissions is made at irregular intervals and often at short notice, and it would be inconvenient, if not impracticable, to summon the Selection Board on each occasion.

Age, physique, appearance, professional qualifications and experience, student career, athletic record as well as social, personal and general suitability are taken into consideration in the selection.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Does the Director General select the temporary men also?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Permanent candidates are selected by the Selection Board and temporary candidates are selected personally by the Director General.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: There is no Board sitting to make the selection?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: There is no Board

Dr. T. S S. Rajan: Is there any Committee for the selection?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: There is no Committee.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: So it is all personally done by the Director General, Indian Medical Service?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Yes.

EMPLOYMENT OF TEMPORARY OFFICERS IN THE INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE.

896. ***Dr. T. S. S. Rajan:** (a) What justification is there for Government to employ temporary officers in the Indian Medical Service?

(b) Is there a shortage of officers on the military side, and if so, why are not Indian Medical Service officers in civil employ recalled to the military side?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to my replies to his question No. 371 and the connected supplementaries.

(b) There is no shortage on the military side.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: I wanted to know the reasons for the necessity of employing temporary officers. I do not think it was answered.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: It was answered on a previous occasion.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: I know the previous question I asked, and because there was no explanation offered, I have put this question again.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I will read the answer to the previous question, if necessary.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Will you please read it?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I said:

"As I tried to explain, there is room in the I. M. S. permanent cadre for a certain limited number at present of Indians. We cannot recruit beyond that proportion. Since the War, owing to the fact that British recruitment has been considerably below requirements, we have taken on a number of Indian temporary commissioned officers to take the place of British officers. That is the reason why we have had to go in for this method of temporary recruitment, and that is the reason why we have, during the last few years, been taking on more British officers to fill up the required percentage of two to one."

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Is it in the temporary service?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I have just explained it

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What is the meaning of temporary service?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: The opposite of permanent

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Does it mean that the service ends with the end of the year?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Temporary service is service under a contract which is renewed year by year and which can be extended for a period of five years.

Seth Govind Das: It cannot be extended beyond five years?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: No, Sir

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Are there not temporary men holding Commissions for more than five years?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: There may be a few, because in the old days these temporary Commissions could be extended for nine years. As I explained on a previous occasion, in view of the objections to that rule, the period of nine years was reduced to five years. There may still be a few men who came in under the old conditions and who have had more than five years temporary service, but in future there will be no persons of that class.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Are there not now persons who have put in more than five years service?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Yes, I have just said so.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Are there not persons who have put in nine years service?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I have just said so.

Saving by the Employment of Temporary Officers in the Indian Medical Service.

897. ***Dr. T. S. S. Rajan:** What is the saving effected by Government by employing temporary officers in the Indian Medical Service during the last twenty years?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: The collection of the information asked for would involve an expenditure of labour out of proportion to its value.

RATIO BETWEEN EUROPEANS AND INDIANS HOLDING PERMANENT COMMISSIONS IN THE INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE.

898. *Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Will Government please state the calendar year in which the ratio between Europeans to Indians holding permanent commissions (excluding Indians holding temporary commissions) was two to one?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: The ratio was first introduced in 1921 and was approximately maintained until 1933. Since that year the number of Indian officers has exceeded the correct proportion.

CONTRACT UNDER WHICH TEMPORARY COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE ARE EMPLOYED.

899. *Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: (a) What is the nature of the contract under which temporary Commissioned officers of the Indian Medical Service are employed?

(b) If they serve on a yearly contract and are not entitled to pay according to service, and not entitled to any gratuity, why are they given Commissioned rank at all?

(c) Have Government considered whether Sub-Assistant Surgeons of the Indian Medical Department cannot carry on the work of the Indian Medical Service officers?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) A copy of the form of contract has been placed in the Library of the House.

(b) Temporary officers are entitled to pay according to service. In fact they receive the same pay and allowances as permanent officers. The starting pay is Rs. 500 per mensem and, after three years, this is increased to Rs. 650. Commissioned rank is necessary for the efficient discharge of their military duties.

(c) Sub-assistant surgeons of the I. M. D. do not possess the professional qualifications and training required of officers of the Indian Medical Service.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Do the temporary officers draw the same amount of allowance as the permanent men?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Yes, Sir; exactly the same.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: May I take it that there is no difference in the allowance between the temporary men and the permanent men?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: That is what I said.

Munshi Iswar Saran: What are the military duties which these Doctors are called upon to do?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: The same military duties as are done by those who are in permanent employ, that is to say, they are appointed to various military hospitals, etc.

LEAVE TO WHICH AN INDIAN HOLDING TEMPORARY COMMISSION IN THE INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE IS ENTITLED.

900. *Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: What is the maximum period of leave to which an Indian holding temporary Commission in the Indian Medical Service is entitled after (*i*) five years of service and (*ii*) nine years of service?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: A temporary commissioned officer is entitled to two months' privilege leave, in any one calendar year unless he is serving in certain concessional areas from which three months' leave is authorised. Privilege leave may, in the event of sickness, be combined with sick leave up to a maximum of six months.

STUDY LEAVE AND FURLOUGH FOR TEMPORARY COMMISSIONED OFFICERS IN THE INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE.

901. *Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: (a) Are temporary Commissioned officers in the Indian Medical Service entitled to any study leave?

(b) Are they entitled to any furlough?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) No.
(b) No.

TEMPORARY COMMISSIONED OFFICERS IN THE ARMY.

902. *Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Are there temporary Commissioned officers in any other branch or department of the Army except the Indian Medical Service?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: There is a system of short service commissions, both in the Royal Army Medical Corps and also in the Royal Air Force

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Is there no such system in the I M S.?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: There is this system of temporary Commissions in the I.M.S. There is a system of short service Commissions in the Royal Army Medical Corps, and there is also a system of short service Commissions in the Royal Air Force.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: May I take it that there is no such service for the I.M.S. apart from the temporary ones?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Apart from that, none.

INSTITUTION OF THE INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE SELECTION BOARD.

903. *Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: In what year was the Indian Medical Service Selection Board first instituted in India?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: 1920.

SELECTION OF CANDIDATES FOR PERMANENT COMMISSIONS BY THE INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE SELECTION BOARD.

904. *Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: (a) Is it a fact that candidates for permanent commissions are finally selected by the Indian Medical Service Selection Board, and if so, why does not this Board interview candidates at the start for temporary commissions as well?

(b) Why is it that those candidates who have no chance of getting permanent commissions are taken, year after year, in large numbers on the temporary cadre and sent away after several years of temporary service?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) The reply to the first part is in the affirmative, and the reply to the second is contained in the reply which I have just given to part (c) of question No. 895.

(b) Officers holding temporary commissions always have a chance of obtaining permanent commissions if they are suitable. I have already explained why they cannot all be given permanent commissions.

EMPLOYMENT OF INDIANS WITH TEMPORARY COMMISSIONS IN THE INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE.

905. *Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: (a) Has the efficiency of the Military Medical Services been affected, or the health of the Army in India suffered, in any way during the last twenty years by the employment of Indians with temporary commissions in the Indian Medical Service?

(b) Have these Indians with temporary commissions to render professional aid to British officers of the Indian Army and their families?

(c) Has any British officer or his family complained about any temporary Indian Medical Service Officer?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) No.

(b) Yes Sometimes

(c) No.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government consider the possibility of employing more Indian officers and fewer British officers, in view of the answer "No" to part (c) and "Yes" to part (b)?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I explained the other day that the whole of this matter was under consideration, and that is one of the questions which we are considering

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it that these answers and the effect which they represent will be borne in mind prominently by the Government in deciding this matter?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I can assure the Honourable Member that these facts will always be borne prominently in mind.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: The Honourable Member said that this matter was being considered. Whom is it being considered by? By the Government of India or by the Secretary of State?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: By both.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: That is to say, by the Secretary of State?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: At present the ball is with us; it will be returned to the Secretary of State shortly I hope.

PROBATIONARY PERIOD IN THE INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE.

906. ***Dr. T. S. S. Rajan:** (a) Is it a fact that those who are given permanent commissions after nine years of temporary service in the Indian Medical Service are considered to be under probation for a further period of three years?

(b) Are they liable to be discharged during these three years?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) and (b). All officers selected for permanent commissions in the Indian Medical Service are on probation for one year during which they are liable to be discharged if found unsuitable.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Why is there a period of probation, even for people who have served nine years?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I do not know why But that is the ordinary rule of service I do not think it has much effect in the case of temporary officers who have succeeded in getting permanent commissions after a number of years of temporary service, but they are formally on probation for the first year of their permanent service.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: But the rule is still there.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Yes, Sir

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Nothing can prevent the Government from asking them to undergo probation for three years more even after a service of nine years?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I must admit that it seems rather silly to make an officer who may have spent nine years in service undergo a further period of probation. I will look into the whole matter and see if it could not be altered.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: That was the purpose with which I put the question. I wanted to draw the attention of the Government.

OFFICERS IN THE INDIAN ARMY RESERVE MEDICAL CATEGORY.

907. ***Dr. T. S. S. Rajan:** (a) How many officers are there in the Indian Army Reserve Medical category?

(b) How many of these Indian Army Reserve Medical Officers were called to military service during 1933?

(c) Is it one of the conditions of the Reserve that these officers would be called for military service only during general mobilization?

(d) Was there general mobilization for war during 1933?

(e) Is it a fact that no permanent officers of the Indian Medical Service in civil employ were recalled to military service during this period? If so, why?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) 219.

(b) 15.

(c) Yes.

(d) No.

(e) No.

TRANSFER OF INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE EUROPEAN OFFICERS TO CIVIL EMPLOY.

908. ***Dr. T. S. S. Rajan:** (a) How many Indian Medical Service European officers were transferred to civil employ during 1933?

(b) Was there already a shortage of officers on the military side, and if so, why was it that several European officers were transferred to the civil side and private practitioners holding Indian Army Reserve Commissions were called in to take their places?

(c) Was there a partial mobilization during 1933 and how many private practitioners holding commissions in the Indian Army Reserve were recalled to military service to take the places of European officers who were transferred to the civil side?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) 16.

(b) and (c). There was no shortage in the military peace establishment in 1933. During that year, however, a partial mobilisation did take place which called for special measures, and 21 volunteers from the Army in India Reserve of Officers were called for not to take the place of British officers transferred to civil but to replace officers required for field medical units, the peace establishments of which had been reduced owing to retrenchment in 1931.

NOMINATIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE DELHI TEXT BOOK COMMITTEE.

964. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the total number of school-going children of Hindus and Muslims, separately, in the Delhi Province?

(b) Will Government please state the number of Hindu and Muslim members of Delhi Text Book Committee?

(c) Will Government please state whether nominations of Text Book Committee members are not done keeping in view the number of school-going children of each community? If not, why not?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai:

(a)	Hindus	25,571
	Muslims	12,387
(b)	Hindus	10
	Muslims	6

(c) In view of the answer to parts (a) and (b) just read, how would the Honourable Member divide 16 in proportion of 1 to 2? As a matter of fact out of 21 members, only 5 are nominated. While the Local Administration recognise, that the power to nominate may have to be exercised sometimes to ensure that a community is satisfactorily represented, the main condition of nomination is fitness to assist in the advisory functions with which the Committee is entrusted

Censoring of Letters addressed to Members of the Legislative Assembly.

965. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti** (on behalf of Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant): (a) Is the correspondence of any Honourable Member or Members of the Legislative Assembly censored at the Post Office? If so, why, and under whose orders?

(b) Is the delivery of letters addressed to the Honourable Members concerned often delayed on this account?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) and (b). The Government of India do not consider it in the public interest to give any information regarding the working of the postal censorship.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether any Members of this Assembly have their correspondence censored?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I am not aware of that.

Khandsari Sugar Works in the Rohilkund Division subjected to Excise Duty.

966. ***Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** (a) How many *khandsari* sugar works in Rohilkhand Division of the United Provinces were subjected to excise duty till 31st January, 1935?

(b) Will Government please lay on the table a list of sugar works, showing also full particulars as to name and place, number of workers, and nature of power used in the process of manufacture of sugar in each case?

(c) Who inspected the factories before the imposition of the duty?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: The information has been called for and a reply will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

INDO-TURKISH TRADE CONVENTION.

967. ***Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** (a) Has the Turkish Government denounced the Indo-Turkish Trade Convention 1930?

(b) Will Government please lay on the table the correspondence between the Governments of India and Turkey on the subject?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) Yes.

(b) There was no direct correspondence between the Governments of India and Turkey but I lay on the table copies of communications received on the subject from the Secretary of State.

Telegram from His Majesty's Secretary of State for India, London, to His Excellency the Viceroy (Commerce Department), No 2809, dated the 27th November, 1934.

Commercial relations with Turkey. Turkish Government have denounced Indo-Turkish *modus vivendi* as from 22nd November.

Copy of letter No. E. & O.-8035/34, dated the 18th December, 1934, from the Secretary, Economic and Overseas Department, India Office, Whitehall, London, S. W. 1, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Commerce

TRADE RELATIONS WITH TURKEY

With reference to the telegram from this Office dated 27th November, 1934 I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to forward, for information, copy of the papers noted below on the above subject.

From Foreign Office dated 15th December, 1934, with enclosures.

Memorandum from the Foreign Office No E.-7182/117/44, dated the 15th December, 1934.

The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs presents his compliments to the Under Secretary of State for India and, by direction of the Secretary of State, transmits herewith copies of the undermentioned paper.

Similar letter sent to Dominions Office, Department of Overseas Trade, Board of Trade, Colonial Office and Treasury.

Description of Enclosure.

Name and Date.	*Subject.*
H. M. Representative Angora No. 569 of 24th November.	Indo-Turkish Commercial relations.

(E.-7182/117/44).

No. 569-E.

(374/6/34).

E. & O.-8035

1934.

British Embassey,
Angora,
November 24, 1934.

Sir,

I have the honour, with reference to my telegram No. 60 of today's date, to transmit to you the accompanying copy of the note, dated the 22nd November, in which the Turkish Government announce their decision to denounce the Indo-Turkish commercial

modus-vivendi of the 3rd September, 1930, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 4 of the exchange of notes constituting that instrument. The present agreement will therefore expire three months after the 22nd November, *i.e.*, on the 22nd February, 1935.

2. I will for the present merely acknowledge the receipt of the Turkish note, and await your instructions regarding the reply to be returned to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs concerning the suggested negotiation of a new agreement.

3. I am sending a copy of this despatch to the Department of Overseas Trade.

I have, etc.,

(Signed) PERCY LORAINE.

The Right Honourable
Sir John Simon, G.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.,
etc., etc., etc.

Turkiye Cumhuriyeti
Hariciye Vekalmti.
74139-102.

Le 22-XI 34.

Monsieur l'Ambassadeur,

J'ai L'honneur d'informer Votre Excellence que le Gouvernement de la Republique ayant constate que l'arrangement Commercial conclu en date du 3 Septembre 1930, entre lui et le Gouvernement des Indes Britanniques ne repond plus aux exigences de la situation economique actuelle, se voit dans l'obligation de prendre la decision de proceder a sa denonciation en conformite de l'article 4 du dit arrangement et celui a partir de la date de cette note.

Il va sans dire que le Gouvernement de la Republique est tout dispose pour entrer en pourparler en vue de conclure une Convention Commerciale qui replacera le modus vivendi en course.

Veuillez agreer, Monsieur l'Ambassadeur, les assurances de ma tés haute consideration.

(Signe) M. NAUMAN.

Son Excellence
Le Trea Honorable Sir Percy Loraine,
Ambassadeur de Sa Majeste Britannique,
Ankara.

Debt Position of India.

968. ***Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Will Government please lay a detailed statement on the table, showing the debt position on January 1, 1935, including particulars regarding:

(a) permanent debt in India and England;

(b) floating and short term debt, such as Rupee Treasury Bills, rupee loans and sterling loans;

(c) accounts in Post Office Cash Certificates, Saving Banks Accounts, Provident Fund and Insurance balances, and balances held for provinces;

(d) Depreciation and Reserve Funds of Commercial Departments; and

(e) the total Note issue and Paper Currency and Gold Standard Reserves?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) to (d). Complete information regarding the position on the 1st of January, 1935, is not immediately available, but I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to Appendix II of the Financial Secretary's Explanatory Memorandum on the Budget for 1935-36, which gives the actual figures for the 31st of March, 1934, and the estimated figures for the 31st of March, 1935.

(e) This information will be found in the Controller of the Currency's memorandum regarding the Gold Standard Reserve and the abstract of the accounts of the Currency Department which were published in Part II of the Gazette of India, dated the 12th of January, 1935

TOTAL YIELD FROM CERTAIN TAXATION MEASURES.

969. ***Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** What was the total yield up to January 31, 1935, from:

(a) sugar excise,

(b) sugar customs duty,

(c) textiles imported from United Kingdom, and

(d) textiles imported from Japan?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: (a) Rs. 55,04,000.

(b) Rs. 3,37,71,000

(c) and (d) Information is not available in the form asked for by the Honourable Member, but the customs revenue collected on cotton fabrics of British manufacture was Rs. 2,33,27,000 and on those of non-British manufacture Rs. 2,11,40,000

FIDELITY SECURITIES OF INSURANCE COMPANIES.

970. ***Mr. A. K. Fazlul Huq:** (a) Will Government please state the particulars of the Insurance Companies approved and recognised by the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department for the purposes of executing fidelity bonds in respect of:

(i) Security Bond for service in the department,

(ii) Treasury contracts,

(iii) Stamp Vendor's Contracts;

(iv) Mail Conveyance Contracts;

(v) Building Contracts, and

(vi) supply of furniture and other articles?

(b) Will Government please state whether the candidates for postal employment and contractors have availed of the Fidelity Securities of the Insurance Companies?

(c) Will Government please state whether they experienced any difficulty in recovering the Fidelity Securities from any Insurance Company during the last three years, and if so, will Government please state the particulars of such Insurance Companies?

(d) Will Government please state the names of the Postal Circles and particulars of the works for which Insurance Company Fidelity Security facilities have not yet been provided, and if not, why not?

(e) Are Government aware that the acceptance of Fidelity Securities by the Insurance Companies transacting business in India is a real encouragement to the development of the insurance system in the country?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: Information has been called for and a reply will be placed on the table of the House in due course.

TENDERS FOR CONVEYANCE OF MAILS FROM RAILWAY STATIONS IN CALCUTTA TO POST OFFICES

971. ***Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:** (a) Are Government aware that tenders have been invited by the Post Master General, Bengal and Assam Circle, for the conveyance of mails by motor lorries from Railway stations in Calcutta to the Calcutta General Post Office and its sub-town and branch offices?

(b) Are Government aware that in the tender forms as issued by the Post Master General, Bengal, it has been stated that cash securities only would be accepted?

(c) Will Government please state why the Post Master General has done away with fidelity bonds of recognised and approved Insurance Companies?

(d) Are Government aware that this action of the Post Master General, Bengal, will deprive the Insurance Companies of the benefits accruable to them in the event of execution of Fidelity Bonds and that the intending contractors are likely to experience inconvenience and trouble in furnishing cash securities?

(e) If the answers to the above be in the negative, are Government prepared to issue instructions to the Post Master General, Bengal and Assam, to modify the tender forms by removing the restriction imposed?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a) Tenders have been called for by the Postmaster-General for the conveyance of mails by motor vehicles in the city of Calcutta and not merely from the railway stations in Calcutta to the Calcutta General Post Office and its town, sub and branch offices.

(b) The fact is not as stated by the Honourable Member. Besides cash securities, securities in the form of Government promissory notes, cash certificates and deposits in the savings bank are also accepted and this has been specifically mentioned in the tender form issued by the Postmaster-General.

(c) The provision for accepting as security fidelity bonds of insurance companies was deleted in this case as it was considered advisable to do so in the particular circumstances of the case.

(d) The reply to the first part is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, I have already explained that the cash security is not the only form of security which will be accepted and for this reason Government do not share the Honourable Member's apprehensions.

(e) Does not arise.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: In selecting these companies, are reports called for from the Provincial Governments before approving them?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: No, Sir, we make our own enquiries in the matter

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: Through whom?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: Through the Postmaster General

TRAFFIC QUALIFICATION FOR BAUDOT SUPERVISORS.

972. ***Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:** (a) Is it a fact that traffic qualification is quite outside the ordinary performance of Baudot supervisory duties?

(b) Is it a fact that the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, memorandum No. E.S.B.-342-1/32, dated 4th September, 1933, caused displacements of certain baudot supervisors at a time when—

(i) no examinations were taking place, and

(ii) no special examination for traffic was offered before the said memorandum was brought into force?

(c) Is it a fact that at the time of selection, there was no stipulation to the effect that, to consolidate their position as Baudot supervisors, they should qualify in traffic subjects later on?

(d) Is it a fact that "The Baudot Printing Telegraph" is purely a technical work and under engineering branch?

(e) Is it a fact that "Higher Baudot technique" is the only Departmental standard of efficiency which regulates the drawal of enhanced duty allowance for Baudot supervisory appointments?

(f) Will Government please state the names and particulars of Baudot supervisors qualified under part (e) above, who were displaced after holding appointments for a number of years on the plea of qualification in traffic, *vide* part (a) above?

(g) If the answers to the above be in the affirmative, are Government prepared to review the cases to redress the substantial grievance of affected supervisors?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a) No.

(b) Government have no information but they understand that practically all the telegraphists qualified to act as Baudot Supervisors are at present holding such posts.

(c) No.

(d) The Baudot printing telegraph requires both traffic and technical supervision. The apparatus is maintained by the engineering branch.

(e) Yes.

(f) Government have no information.

(g) Does not arise in view of the reply given to parts (b) and (f) above.

TIME SCALE CLERKS PROMOTED TO THE SELECTION GRADE SUBJECT TO PASSING THE LOWEST SELECTION GRADE EXAMINATION IN THE UNITED PROVINCES POSTAL CIRCLE.

973. *Mr. A. K Fuzlul Huq: (a) Will Government please state the number of time-scale clerks in the Postal Department in the United Provinces Circle, who were promoted to the selection grade subject to passing the lowest selection grade examination, before the abolition of the said examination? Were they given two chances to appear at the said examination?

(b) Will Government please state the names and particulars of the officials in the Postal Department in the United Provinces Circle, under the following categories, after the abolition of the lowest selection grade examination:

(i) those who were exempted from the lowest selection grade examination or the Inspector's examination; and

(ii) those who were reverted to their original posts without being given any chance to appear at the lowest selection grade examination or the Inspector's examination?

(c) Will Government please state the justification for the differential treatment to categories mentioned in sub-parts (i) and (ii) of part (b) above?

(d) Are Government prepared to review the cases of those reverted and restore them to their posts in the selection grade, giving them two chances to pass the examination, *vide* part (a) above?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a) to (d). Government regret that the information asked for by the Honourable Member is not available and do not propose to call for it. If any official considers that he has been unjustly reverted, it is open to him to represent his case to the proper authority through the usual official channel.

STRENGTH OF MUSLIMS AND NON-MUSLIMS IN THE OFFICES UNDER THE ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

974. *Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: (a) Is it a fact that under the Administrative control of the Auditor General the following is the strength of the Muslim and Non-Muslim officials of the cadres and ranks noted against them, and if not, will Government please state the correct figures:

		Muslim.	Non-Muslim.
(i)	Gazetted officers (All-India Audit and Accounts Service)	16	123
(ii)	Audit and Accounts Officers	2	82
(iii)	Subordinate Accounts Service	22	550

(b) Will Government please state, by communities, the clerical strength under the administrtive control of the Auditor General?

(c) Is it a fact that the percentage of Muslims in the clerical cadre under the control of the Auditor General is hardly eight per cent., and if not, what is the correct percentage?

(d) Will Government please state, by communities, the strength of the different cadres, separately, for each Accountant General's Office under the administrative control of the Auditor General?

(e) Will Government please state the ratios fixed for the various communities for recruitment, under the terms of the Home Department Resolution No F.-14/17-B -33, dated the 4th July, 1934, under the following controls and offices:

(i) (1) under the control of Auditor General as a whole;

(2) for the office of the Auditor General;

(ii) (1) under the control of each Accountant General; to be separately stated for each;

(2) for the office of every Accountant General to be separately stated for each office; and

(iii) for the office of every Deputy Accountant General to be separately stated for each office?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) The latest available figures are:

	Muslims.	Non-Muslims.
(i) Indian Audit and Accounts Service .	17	149
(ii) Assistant Audit Officers	2	75
(iii) Subordinate Accounts Service	81	624

(b) and (d). The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the statements showing the communal strength of the staff employed under the Government of India in 1933. A copy of these statements will be found in the Library of the House. Detailed figures for 1934 are not yet available.

(c) The percentage is approximately 11 per cent.

(e) The question is still under consideration.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: How many of these Muslims are from Madras?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The Honourable Member had better put down a question on that subject.

COMMUNAL RATIOS FIXED FOR VARIOUS GOVERNMENT OF INDIA OFFICES.

975. *Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: (a) Will Government please state the particulars of the Government Departments to which the orders contained in Home Department Resolution No. F-14/17-B-33, dated the 4th July, 1934, will apply?

(b) Will Government please state the communal ratios fixed for various departments and state the dates from which the ratios shall operate in each department?

(c) Will Government please state the communal ratios fixed for the offices located in Delhi and Simla, such as Secretariat and Attached Offices, etc.?

(d) Is it a fact that a special officer has been appointed by Government to watch the observance of Government orders relating to the revised ratios?

(e) Will Government please state the communal composition of the staff employed in the office of the special officer referred to in part (d) above?

(f) Will Government please place on the table a statement showing the communal composition of the staff of all Government departments as on the 31st December, 1934 and on the 31st March, 1934?

(g) Will Government please state the figures of fresh recruitments for the half year from July 1934 to December 1934, separately for each department?

(h) Will Government please place on the table copies of the instructions issued by them, if any, to the Heads of departments on the steps to be taken to ensure observance of the orders contained in Home Department Resolution referred to in part (a) above?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to paragraph 6 of the Resolution. The question of excluding from the scope of the orders services and posts for which high technical or special qualifications are required is under consideration.

(b) and (c). As regards services recruited on an All-India basis (including the staff employed in the Government of India Secretariat and Attached Offices), the percentages laid down in paragraph 7 of the Resolution apply with effect from the date of the Resolution. As to locally recruited services, I would refer the Honourable Member to the replies given on the 23rd February, 1935, to parts (a) to (c) of starred question No. 498.

(d) A temporary Additional Deputy Secretary has been appointed in the Home Department, one of whose main duties is to frame detailed instructions designed to see that the new orders are effectively implemented.

(e) As already stated in reply to starred question No. 917, a new temporary section has been created in the Home Department. The communal composition of the staff employed in it is as follows:

European	1 (Superintendent)
Hindus	3 (1 Assistant and 2 Clerks)
Muslims	2 (1 Assistant and 1 Clerk)

(f) and (g). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given on the 31st July, 1934, to unstarred question No. 27. Since then statements relating to the year 1933 have been placed in the Library of the House. Government are considering what statements will be required for the year 1934.

(h) The Supplementary Instructions which will be issued are still under consideration.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: Will the Honourable Member be pleased to state if appointments to the staff of the Special Officer were made direct or by promotion?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I think most of them were made by promotion from other branches of the Home Department.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: Is the Special Officer required to submit any report annually, and, if so, to whom, about the working of the circular?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The report will be made to me and the results shown in the statements which are placed in the Library of the House.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: Is it done at the end of each year?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: This statement will be placed in the Library of the House every year.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Is the proportion fixed with regard to provinces also?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The circular of July, 1934, relates only to the Central services and to the establishment of the Government of India Secretariat and Attached Offices.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: In recruiting to the Central Service, will the Honourable Member fix a proportion for the Muslims according to the provinces?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Resolution does not relate to provinces at all. The recruitment to the provincial services is entirely a matter for the provinces.

ABOLITION OF THE GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPH OFFICE, DELHI.

976. ***Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:** (a) Will Government please state the saving caused by the abolition of Delhi Government Telegraph Office and conversion of Delhi General Post Office into a combined Posts and Telegraphs Office?

(b) Will Government please state the number and cost of motor cycles purchased for use by the telegraph peons for transmission of messages between New Delhi Government Telegraph Office and Delhi General Post Office, and *vice versa*?

(c) Will Government please state the number of the motor cycles (i) damaged and (ii) rendered unserviceable, out of those referred to in part (a) above and the net amount of the loss sustained by Government on (i) repairs and (ii) replacement, etc.?

(d) Will Government please state the total number of public complaints received against (i) delays in delivery of telegrams, (ii) delays in transmission of telegrams, (iii) treatment of public by the staff, (iv) losses of messages and (v) other miscellaneous complaints, against Delhi General Post Office, since the abolition of the Old Delhi Government Telegraph Office?

(e) Will Government please state how many of the complaints referred to in part (d) above were found (i) well grounded and (ii) groundless?

(f) Is it a fact that every telegraph delivery peon of the Delhi Posts and Telegraphs combined office, is supposed to come back to the office within 20 minutes after delivery of all the telegrams given him, to enable the fresh telegrams, received during his absence, being made over to him for delivery?

(g) Will Government please state the number of telegraph delivery peons employed in the Old Delhi Posts and Telegraphs combined office?

(h) Is it a fact that the telegraph delivery peons have generally failed to deliver all the telegrams within 20 minutes and have been bringing back a number of them as undelivered, causing serious delays in their subsequent deliveries and resulting in numerous public complaints?

(i) Will Government please state the hours during which the Old Delhi Posts and Telegraphs Office is kept open for public business and the number (with particulars of designation) of supervisors employed during these hours, to supervise the Telegraph Branch of the office and to attend to public enquiries relating to that Branch?

(j) Will Government please state the business hours of the Telegraph Branch of the Old Delhi Combined Posts and Telegraphs Office on Sundays and holidays and particulars of arrangements of supervision on those days?

(k) Are Government aware that the abolition of the Old Delhi Posts and Telegraphs Office has not been appreciated by the general public and the Press, and if so, will Government please state the action they propose to take to remove the grievances of the public?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: Information has been called for and a reply will be placed on the table of the House in due course.

Public Complaints against the Old and New Delhi Post Offices.

977. ***Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:** (a) Is it a fact that the number of public complaints, in matters (i) purely postal and (ii) relating to telegrams, abnormally increased during the year 1934 against the Old and New Delhi Post Offices?

(b) Will Government please give a comparative statement, showing the public complaints against the Old and New Delhi Post Offices during the years 1932, 1933 and 1934?

(c) Will Government please state the number of complaints relating to the following items in the Delhi Post Offices during 1934:

(i) losses of postal articles;

(ii) abstractions;

(iii) frauds;

(iv) acceptance of illegal gratifications; and

(v) mis-payment of money orders?

(d) What action do Government propose to take to improve the administrative efficiency of the Old and New Delhi Post Offices and remove the genuine causes of public complaints?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a) to (d). Government have no information and do not propose to collect it as the matter is one within the competence of the Head of the Circle to whom a copy of the question and this reply will be sent.

APPROVED LIST OF CONTRACTORS IN THE CENTRAL PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

978. *Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: (a) Is it a fact that enlistment in the approved list of contractors was previously done by the Divisional Officers in the Central Public Works Department? If so, are Government aware that that arrangement was suitable and convenient both to the Department and to the contractors?

(b) If so, will Government please give reasons for transferring this work, to the Establishment Section of the Central Public Works Department, New Delhi?

(c) Is it not a fact that this work is now entrusted to non-technical officers, and decisions are delayed?

(d) Do Government propose to revert to the old practice? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The answer to the first part is in the affirmative, and to the second part in the negative.

(b) The work was transferred to the Central Office because it was considered that it could more suitably be done there than in the Divisions.

(c) No.

(d) No. It was decided when the question was reviewed some time ago that the present system is more efficient and convenient to all concerned, than the previous system of Divisional registration, which did not secure uniformity of treatment.

COMMUNAL COMPOSITION OF TECHNICAL AND NON-TECHNICAL MEN EMPLOYED IN THE CENTRAL PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

979. *Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq. (a) Is it a fact that a number of technical and non-technical retrenched employees of the Central Public Works Department, are still without employment?

(b) Will Government please place on the table a statement, community-wise, of all technical and non-technical men employed in the Central Public Works Department, Delhi, since the last retrenchment? How many retrenched hands were re-employed? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The information is being collected and will be placed on the table of this House in due course.

MUSLIMS IN THE ESTABLISHMENT SECTION OF THE CENTRAL PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

980. *Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: (a) Will Government please state the strength of the Establishment Section of the Central Public Works Department?

(b) How many of them are Muslims, and what duties are entrusted to them?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The strength of the Establishment Section of the Central Public Works Department is one Superintendent, three Assistants, and four clerks.

(b) One of the clerks is a Muslim who is employed on recording work.

STOPPAGE OF ANNUAL INCREMENTS IN THE CENTRAL PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

981. ***Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:** Is it a fact, that since the introduction of the permanent cadre in the Central Public Works Department, Delhi, in October 1933, no annual increments have been given to the staff? If so, why?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Yes. On the creation of the permanent cadre orders were issued to the effect that men already in service should retain their old rates of pay. Owing to changes in the names of certain appointments and to the diversity of scales of pay in existence objections were raised in audit to the immediate application of the orders. These objections have now been dealt with and increments are being granted with retrospective effect.

THEFT OF A CARPET FROM THE IMPERIAL SECRETARIAT, NEW DELHI.

982. ***Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:** (a) Is it a fact, that a carpet was stolen from the Imperial Secretariat, New Delhi? If so, was the matter investigated into by the police, and if so, with what result?

(b) Was any departmental enquiry held, and if so, with what findings?

(c) If a departmental enquiry was held, will Government please lay the papers on the table? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes. The case was investigated by the police and was finally sent up as untraced.

(b) The Chief Engineer made further enquiries and found that the caretaking establishment were mainly to blame for the loss of the carpet. Suitable action was taken against those concerned.

(c) I am not prepared to lay on the table the record of the Chief Engineer's proceedings. That record is confidential.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: What was the value of the carpet?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have no information. I venture to submit, Sir, with very great respect that the loss of a carpet is hardly a matter which need engage the attention of this House.

PUBLICITY OFFICERS WORKING ON STATE RAILWAYS.

983. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) the names of the various Publicity Officers working on the State Railways, and the monthly salary of each and the work they were doing before being appointed as such; and

(b) when the various Publicity Offices were started and how many Indians have held the posts till now and for what periods?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) and (b). I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do these Publicity Officers review the railway guides issued by the various railways?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No, Sir.

CENTRAL PUBLICITY OFFICE, RAILWAYS.

984. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Is it a fact that the Central Publicity Office, Railways, is situated in Old Delhi?

(b) What effective supervision does the Railway Board exercise over the Central Publicity Office in Old Delhi?

(c) What was the work turned out by the Central Publicity Office in 1934?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Yes.

(b) The supervision exercised is quite adequate. The Board's decisions on policy are carried out by the Central Publicity Officer who is responsible to the Board for the efficient working of the office.

(c) The activities of the Central Publicity Office are described in an Annual Report issued by the Central Publicity Officer each year. A copy of the Annual Report for the year 1933-34 is in the Library of the House.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Have the Central Publicity Office published any A.B.C. Railway Guide for Indian Railways?

Mr. P. R. Rau No, Sir.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do they propose to publish it?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No, Sir.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government consider the advisability of undertaking the publication of such a guide?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government did publish such a guide some time ago, but it was found that it was too expensive and not sufficiently patronised.

RAILWAY PUBLICITY OFFICE, LONDON AND NEW YORK.

985. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Will Government state what was the expenditure incurred on the Railway Publicity Office, London, and *New York in 1934 (January to December)? How long have these offices been in existence?*

(b) Have any Indians been appointed on the staff in London or New York till now? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) The expenditure incurred on the London Publicity Bureau in 1933-34 was Rs. 91,000. The revised estimate for 1934-35 is Rs. 1,09,000.

For the New York Publicity Bureau the expenditure in 1933-34 was Rs. 1,84,000. The revised estimate for 1934-35 is Rs. 1,63,000.

The London Publicity Bureau started functioning from July, 1927, and the New York Bureau from March, 1929.

(b) Since July, 1927, there have been four Managers of the London Bureau of whom the first two were Europeans and the second two Indians. Since February, 1932, the Bureau has been in charge of Indian Officers.

The Manager of the New York Bureau has been a European since March, 1929, but Government hope to be able to appoint an Indian Officer to succeed the present incumbent whose term expires in October next.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: What was the additional income derived last year by the work of these officers in New York and London?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am afraid it is very difficult to estimate.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Is it half or is it equal to the amount spent over it?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I would advise my Honourable friend to read the report of the Bureau, a copy of which is in the Library of the House.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is the High Commissioner for India in London expected to supervise and control the work of this Publicity Officer in London?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I believe the staff is, for administrative purposes, under the High Commissioner.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Under whose supervision is the New York office placed?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Under the Railway Board.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: How do they supervise the working of the New York office when the Railway Board office is here and the Railway Board Members are here?

Mr. P. R. Rau: By means of reports.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Do I understand that the London Office is now entirely manned by Indians?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The Manager is an Indian; I am not sure about the subordinate staff.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Why are Europeans appointed in a bureau which is meant for Indian publicity?

Mr. P. R. Rau: If my Honourable friend refers to messengers and people of that sort, the answer is obvious.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am talking of the four officers mentioned.

Mr. P. R. Rau: The four officers were not simultaneous; they were successive.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: How many Indian officers, and how many European officers are there in the London Office?

Mr. P. R. Rau: There is only one officer, and he is an Indian.

RAILWAY RATES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

986. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) What are the functions of the Railway Rates Advisory Committee?

(b) How many cases have been investigated by the committee ever since its inception, and in how many cases were their decisions accepted by the Railway Board?

(c) Is it a fact that the Acworth committee recommended the creation of a Railway Rates Tribunal and not a mere Advisory Committee?

(d) Do Government propose to create such a tribunal in place of the present Advisory Committee? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to the Railway Department Resolution No. 606-T., dated 25th September, 1930, published in the Gazette of India, dated 27th September, 1930.

(b) 44 cases have been referred to the Committee for investigation up to date. Of these, ten were either compromised or withdrawn during the course of investigation, and 29 were reported on by the Committee. The Committee's recommendations were accepted by Government in 28 cases, in two of them with some modification, and in only one case Government were unable to agree with the views of the Committee. Five cases are now under investigation.

(c) Yes.

(d) My Honourable friend has no doubt observed that clause 185 of the Government of India Bill, now before Parliament, provides for the appointment, from time to time, of a Railway Rates Committee to advise in connection with any dispute as to rates or traffic facilities between persons using, or desiring to use, a railway and the Federal Railway Authority. I might add that this is in accordance with the Sketch Proposals for the Future Administration of Indian Railways.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that the Railway Rates Advisory Committee is at present a permanent one?

Mr. P. R. Rau: It is not permanent; it is temporary, and is extended from time to time.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What is the tenure of office of a member of the Railway Rates Advisory Committee?

Mr. P. R. Rau: There is no term of office fixed.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Can the Railway Rates Advisory Committee take up grievances as regards passenger fares?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I think, not, Sir.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Do Government propose to provide in the constitution of the Statutory Railway Board that complaints as regards fares should also be taken up by the Rates Advisory Committee?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I do not know how far the Indian Legislature can deal with a matter of that description, but I shall certainly have that point considered.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What is the reason for not entrusting inquiries into passenger rates to the Railway Rates Advisory Committee?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I do not think that that was the original intention with which the Committee was appointed.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: What is the harm in enlarging its functions?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I do not see any reason for enhancing its functions.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government consider the advisability of enlarging its functions?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I have just now said that we shall consider the question raised by Mr. Joshi.

HEALTH OF MR. RASIKLAL, A STATE PRISONER, AND THE MAINTENANCE OF HIS MOTHER.

987. ***Pandit Nilakantha Das:** (a) With reference to the Honourable the Home Member's reply to question No. 386 of the 21st February, 1935, regarding the health of Mr. Rasiklal Das, a State Prisoner and the maintenance of his mother, will Government please state whether they have taken into consideration the following provisions in the Regulation III of 1818:

In clause 1 (Preamble):

"Whereas the ends of justice also require that due attention be paid to the health of every State. Prisoner confined under this regulation and that suitable provision be made for his support according to his rank in life and to his own wants and those of his families",

and the provision to the same effect in clause 3?

(b) Have these provisions been complied with in case of Mr. Rasiklal Das, and are they complied with in all cases of confinement under Regulation III of 1818?

(c) Is the spirit of these provisions respected and carried out in cases of all detentions without trial? If not, why not?

(d) With reference to the reply to question No. 525 of the 21st September, 1932, and supplementary questions thereon regarding the maintenance of Mr. Rasiklal Das's mother, etc., are Government aware that income from land, where it was even sufficient, cannot maintain the family according to its rank without substantial additional income?

(e) Are Government prepared to make sufficient provision for the old mother to enable her to live according to her rank during the absence of the son, in pursuance of the provision in the Regulation, without suggesting that the old lady should "adjust her mode of life to her reduced condition", as they have done in their reply to the supplementary questions, on the 21st September, 1932?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) to (c). The answer is in the affirmative.

(d) and (e). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given by me on the 21st February, 1935, to Mr. Basanta Kumar Das's starred question No. 386, and to the several supplementary questions on this matter. The State Prisoner was a betel-leaf-seller and a bachelor before his detention, and contributed nothing to the support of his mother or other relations.

SUPPLY OF OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS TO THE *NAVAKAL*, A MARATHI DAILY

***Mr. K. M. Jedhe:** (a) Are Government aware that *Navakal*, (Bombay), a Marathi daily, published from Bombay,—is of long standing and with wide circulation?

(b) Is it a fact that the proprietors of *Navakal* have written several times to the Government of Bombay that the Government of India publications should be supplied to them free?

(c) Will Government state the reasons why the said newspaper is not yet on the free list?

(d) What is the policy of Government in supplying, free these publications to newspapers?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) Yes.

(b) One application has been passed to the Government of India by the Local Government. The Government of India have no information regarding other applications.

(c) and (d). As a measure of economy, the various Departments of the Government of India have had to cut down their free distribution lists and additions to such lists are rarely made.

RETRENCHMENT IN THE MADRAS DEAD LETTER OFFICE.

989. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) With reference to the proposed retrenchment in the Madras Dead Letter Office (Posts and Telegraphs Department), will Government be pleased to state whether it is not a fact that according to the concluding portion of para. 2, section II, Appendix F. I., page 109, of Bewoor Time Test, the maximum out-turn of a disposing clerk in a Dead Letter Office, dealing with unregistered articles, has been fixed at 144 articles of all kinds? If not, what is the maximum out-turn, and when was it given effect to?

(b) What are the figures of unregistered articles (excluding all unpaid post-cards of private manufacture and all open and insecurely closed unpaid letters) received in the Madras Dead Letter Office during the enumeration weeks of:

(i) August, 1933,

(ii) February, 1934, and

(iii) the special enumeration taken in July 1934 under the orders of the Deputy Post Master General, Madras?

(c) Will Government be pleased to furnish the particulars under the following sub-heads of each of the three figures referred to in part (b):

(i) number of paid unregistered articles received,

(ii) number of unpaid articles received,

(iii) number of paid unregistered articles despatched, and

(iv) number of unpaid articles despatched (as required in the statement of work time test for Dead Letter Office operative staff in Appendix E.-1 of Bewoor Time Test)?

(d) How many registered articles and parcels were received in the Madras Dead Letter Office during the half years ending with:

(i) 30th September, 1933,

(ii) 31st March, 1934, and

(iii) 30th September, 1934?

(e) Is it not a fact that the Madras circle office has divided each of the three figures referred to in part (b) by the total number of days in a week (including holidays), instead of by the actual number of working days, with the result that the daily average of the receipt of unregistered articles has been shown considerably low, on the basis of which the present retrenchment has been recommended to the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs?

(f) If the particulars called for in part (c) be not available (which form a basis to assess the strength of the Dead Letter Office according to Appendix E.-1 of Bewoor Time Test), what was the other method or basis on which it was decided that the strength of the Dead Letter Office, Madras, is in excess of the requirements and consequently the present retrenchment has been recommended?

(g) Are Government prepared to request the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs to examine the question of determining the strength of the Madras Dead Letter Office, on the basis of the enumeration figures in detail before giving effect to the proposed retrenchment?

(h) Are Government prepared to urge the postponement of the proposed retrenchment in the Madras Dead Letter Office?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: The information has been called for and a reply will be placed on the table of the House in due course.

Periodical Tests for Station and Assistant Station Masters on the North Western Railway.

990. ***Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** (a) With reference to the answer laid on the table in reply to my starred question No. 630 asked on the 15th

August, 1934, will Government be pleased to state, whether it is a fact that on the day of my interpellation No. 630, *i.e.*, the 15th August, 1934, or on the 29th September, 1934, the Station Masters or Assistant Station Masters on the North Western Railway were not required either to go to Walton Training School for a refresher course or pass a local test in the rules?

(b) Is it not a fact that it was only in December 1934, that the North Western Railway Agency issued a circular, fixing in the rules a periodical test for Station and Assistant Station Masters? Why was this done?

(c) What other classes of staff besides the guards, Assistant Station Masters and Station Masters on the North Western Railway are required to pay such periodical tests? If none, why is invidious treatment accorded to guards, Assistant Station Masters and Station Masters only?

(d) Do other departments of the Government of India, enforce any periodical test upon their employees? If not, what are the special reasons to warrant such tests being prescribed for the guards, Assistant Station Masters and Station Masters on the North Western Railway?

(e) Are Government aware that this periodical test imposes hardship upon the railway staff, and further reduces leave reserve?

(f) Do Government propose to ask the North Western Railway Agency to stop such periodical tests, as examinations once passed must hold good? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know when? Notice was given a long time ago. When was the information called for?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I think it must have been called for soon after the notice was received

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Will the Honourable Member expedite the matter as there has been so much delay already, and will he inform me at least of it, as perhaps the House may not be sitting then?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I hope to place the reply on the table before the Session is over.

SURPLUS OFFICE SUPERINTENDENTS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

991. *Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that some Office Superintendents have become surplus on the North Western Railway, consequent upon the abolition of the Office of the Chief Engineer, construction and re-organization, of the Medical Department?

(b) Is it a fact that Mr. Bennet, the present incumbent of the post of the Office Superintendent, in the Divisional Superintendent's Office, North Western Railway, Karachi, is temporary, and is it proposed to revert him to make room for surplus hands according to the Railway Board's orders? If so, when?

(c) What is the policy of Government, or the Administration, as to the duration of stay of the Office Superintendents continuously in one Division?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) and (b). Government have no information. These matters are within the competence of the Agent, North Western Railway, to decide and Government are not prepared to interfere. A copy of the question has been sent to the Agent, North Western Railway, for consideration.

(c) No time limit has been laid down.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if there are surplus superintendents? That is a fact which the Railway Board must be knowing without getting information from the Agent

Mr. P. R. Rau: No: the Railway Board have no information on that point.

VACANCIES IN THE COMMERCIAL GROUP ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

992. ***Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that in December 1934, applications were invited for 50 vacancies in the Commercial group on the North Western Railway?

(b) Is it a fact that out of 50 posts so advertised, eight posts were allotted to Karachi Division of the North Western Railway?

(c) Is it a fact that the Agent, North Western Railway, Lahore, subsequently, *vide* his telegram to all Divisional Superintendents asked them to select 75 candidates, and allotted the increased number to each division, excepting Karachi Division? If so, why was Karachi Division differently treated?

(d) Is it a fact that the Divisional Superintendent, North Western Railway, Karachi, had notified to the Agent the existence of 17 vacancies in the Commercial line of his division? If so, why was Karachi Division not allotted a proper share of appointments?

(e) Is it a fact that the North Western Railway Agency have been recruiting employees in other divisions and then transferring them to Karachi Division, even for the posts which are controlled by the Divisional Superintendents? If so, why?

(f) If the reply to part (e) be in the negative, will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement for the last five years, showing the number of employees in the subordinate services recruited on other than Karachi Division, and subsequently transferred to Karachi Division, in vacancies existing there, and *vice versa*?

(g) Are Government aware of the orders contained in the Agent, North Western Railway, Lahore, letter No. 844-E./3, dated the 18th February, 1929, to all Divisional Superintendents laying down that each division represented a recruiting centre for:

(i) its employees' relations,

(ii) the general public of the area, and

(iii) the inhabitants of that province,

and state how they reconcile the policy of the North Western Railway referred to in parts (d) and (e) with these orders?

(h) Do Government propose to ask the North Western Railway Administration to rectify the treatment being accorded to Karachi Division? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

RELEASE OF MR. SARAT CHANDRA BOSE.

993. ***Dr. P. N. Banerjea:** (a) Are Government aware that a public meeting was held in Calcutta on the 31st January last, at which a demand was made for the release of Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose?

(b) In view of this reiterated public demand are Government prepared to consider the question of releasing Mr. Bose at an early date?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) I have seen a Press report of the meeting.

(b) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given by me on the 18th February, 1935, to Mr. S. Satyamurti's starred question No. 291, to which I have nothing to add.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: Are Government considering the question of releasing him?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That has already been dealt with in my reply to Mr. Satyamurti's question No. 291.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are they considering today, now, the question of releasing Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose, some time or other?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I said the question of his continued detention is periodically examined; the Government of India very recently examined the case and do not consider that he should be released at present: that was on the 18th February.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: And the same position still continues?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes.

COMPOSITION OF THE CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY CONSTITUENCY.

994. ***Dr. P. N. Banerjea:** (a) Is it a fact that a letter has recently been addressed to the authorities of the Calcutta University to the effect that the composition of the Calcutta University constituency will under the new constitution be different from what it is under the present constitution?

(b) If so, will Government be pleased to state (i) what the exact composition and size of the said constituency will be; and (ii) whether the graduates will be required to pay any fees for having their names entered in the electoral roll of the constituency?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) The Government of India are not aware of any such communication.

(b) Does not arise.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are the Government of India considering any question concerning any constituency?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I submit the question does not arise: the question was about a certain letter addressed to the Calcutta University.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are the Government of India considering any question about the Calcutta University constituency at all?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: If my friend will put down a question, I will look into the matter.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Ten days later!

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: Are not the Government of India considering the position of the constituency at the present moment?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: So far as I know, they are not considering it; but if the Honourable Member wants more information, I would like to look into the matter.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE DACCA-ARICHA RAILWAY.

995. ***Dr. P. N. Banerjea:** Will Government be pleased to state whether the project relating to the construction of the Dacca-Aricha Railway has been abandoned? If so, why? If not, when is the actual construction of the Railway likely to be taken up?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The Government of Bengal informed the Government of India in September, 1933, that after most careful consideration they had come to the conclusion that the construction of the railway was altogether undesirable and should not be proceeded with, because the construction of an embankment across the spill of the Dhaliswari River would be a serious menace to the public health and agricultural prosperity of a large area, and that the danger to public health and agriculture far outweighed the benefit to communications which would accrue from the construction of the railway. The Government of India have consequently abandoned the project.

Mr. B. Das: May I inquire how it is that the railway construction is against the public health and agriculture?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The construction of the embankment will, it is feared, interfere with the natural drainage of the country.

Mr. B. Das: That means that the Railway Board do now recognise what I enunciated in 1924 that railway embankments cause deterioration of public health?

Mr. P. R. Rau: In this particular case, the opinion of the Government of Bengal has been accepted by the Railway Board.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: Could not the difficulty be got over by constructing a large number of culverts?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The Government of Bengal must have considered that point.

FINANCIAL BURDEN IN CONNECTION WITH THE NEW CONSTITUTION

996 ***Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the new financial burden which will be imposed upon the tax-payers of India as a result, direct and indirect, of the constitutional changes proposed in the White Paper and the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report?

(b) Has any estimate of the additional expenditure been made by the Provincial Governments and the Government of India? If so, will Government be pleased to lay the same on the table?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state how it is proposed to meet the additional expenditure? Has any scheme been drawn up in this behalf? If so, will Government be pleased to lay the same on the table?

(d) What will be the total loss of revenue to India due to the proposed separation of Burma? How it is proposed to meet the loss?

(e) Have Government considered the advisability of reducing the scale of pay, pensions and other emoluments of officials in Imperial and Provincial Services before inaugurating the proposed new constitution?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) and (b). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply which I gave to Mr. Fuzlul Huq's starred question No. 242 on the 20th of February, 1935.

(c) No definite scheme has hitherto been drawn up.

(d) I would refer the Honourable Member to the concluding portion of paragraph 267 of the Report of the Joint Committee on Indian Constitutional Reforms. The question will be considered when the report of the Tribunal which has been convened in London is received.

(e) Reductions have already been effected about a year and a half ago in the scales of pay of future entrants to the services under the control of the Governor General in Council, and, so far as I am aware, all Provincial Governments have also taken similar action in regard to the services under them. As regards the All-India Services I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer given by my colleague, the Honourable the Home Member, to question No. 516 on 25th February, 1935. There is no proposal to undertake further revisions of pay and there is no question of reducing the pay of existing members of the Services.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With reference to part (c), apart from any definite scheme which the Honourable Member said does not exist, are there any indefinite proposals or amorphous ideas which are being examined by the Government of India, as regards the financing of the new scheme of Government in this country?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: No. The financing of the new scheme is not a very vital factor in the future budgets of this country.

Mr. B. Das: With reference to part (d) of the question about Burma, what steps are Government taking to represent the view point of India as apart from Burma profiting by the separation? Are Government considering how India is not made to pay more to Burma than is required? What steps are being taken to safeguard India's rights in this matter? In other words, how is the Finance Member of India now going to separate himself into the Finance Member of Burma and of India? How is he going to put the case of India apart from Burma? How is he going to safeguard the interests of India if the British Cabinet asks him to give some concessions to Burma?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That is a hypothetical question. I think that amounts to asking how can I divide myself into two bodies and safeguard at the same time the interests of India and Burma. I think the answer to that is, wait and see.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the steps that the Government of India are taking to represent the interests of India before that tribunal?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I have already said that the Government of India are being represented by Mr. Nixon, and the views of the Standing Finance Committee on the Howard-Nixon Report are among the matters which have been laid before the tribunal. An officer of the Government of India has been there on full time duty doing nothing else but to represent the views of the Government of India.

Mr. B. Das: There was a debate on the floor of the House, and are the proceedings of that debate also one of the materials to be placed before that tribunal?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That is also part of the material.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is the officer on special duty there receiving instructions from the Government of India from time to time?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: He is in constant touch with the Government of India.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Have Government taken any steps to ensure that public opinion in India can still be represented before that tribunal?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I have already answered that in reply to a supplementary question. The Secretary of State decided that it was impracticable to carry out the original proposal which was that the members of the Standing Finance Committee, both of this Legislature and of the Burma Legislature, should actually appear before that tribunal.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Then what steps are taken to ensure that the views of public bodies in India are represented before this tribunal?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I think I have already answered that question. The debate on the Howard-Nixon Report in the previous Assembly and the report on it by the Standing Finance Committee of the previous Assembly, are among the materials which have been brought to the notice of the tribunal.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Will the Honourable Member be prepared to place any other representations that may be made hereafter before that tribunal?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I think it is extremely likely that the tribunal will have finished its sittings, and unless it is done by telegram in the next two or three days, it will not be possible to do anything.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Then what steps can be taken to ensure that public opinion in India is properly represented before this tribunal?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: We have already taken the necessary steps long time ago.

Mr. F. E. James: Is it not a fact, Sir, that various representations have been made to the Government of India on the subject by both Indian and European Chambers of Commerce, and is it not a fact that such representations will be among the material placed before the tribunal?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Of course, all the relevant representations which have been made are among the materials which are at the disposal of Mr. Nixon. The question which the Honourable Baronet was raising was whether actually representatives of Indian opinion should be associated with the tribunal or they should have the right to appear before that tribunal. The Secretary of State has rejected that proposal

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: What I was trying to suggest was this, that if any public body desired to place any further information before this tribunal, would the Government of India see that it reaches the tribunal?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Subject to what I said just now, certainly, but it is, as I said, extremely likely that the tribunal will have finished its work in the next two or three days.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Is any claim being made for the recovery of the cost of the Burmese war during the course of this inquiry, and, if so, against whom?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The Honourable Member had better refer to the terms of reference.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Is Great Britain prepared to bear the cost?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The Honourable Member had better put that question on paper.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the terms of reference to this tribunal?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I answered that in reply to a previous question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Do they include Indian interests being sufficiently protected?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I never heard of an arbitral tribunal being directed to protect exclusively the interests of one of the parties as against the interests of the other.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I don't say exclusively, but is the tribunal directed to give due weight to the interests of India?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Not specifically It would be in my opinion absolutely ludicrous to direct a tribunal, which is intended to arbitrate between the claims of two different bodies, to see that the interests of one of them should be specially borne in mind.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the fact that the British Government are committed to separate Burma at any cost, even at the cost of sacrificing the interests of India, I want to know if any attempt is being made by this Government to see that Indian interests are not sacrificed.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That is an entirely different question. I have answered that to the best of my ability about six times already.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: If Mr. Nixon is representing the Government of India, who is representing the Government of Burma?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir Henry Howard.

Military Route Marches in the Contai Sub-Division of the Midnapore District.

997. ***Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** (a) Is the Honourable the Home Member aware of the fact that military route marches are now going on in the Contai Sub-Division?

(b) Is it a fact that soliders with police surround the houses of Congress workers and harass them by searching their houses?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) Military route marches have recently been completed in the Contai Sub-Division.

(b) Troops have sometimes been employed to surround houses while police searches were in progress. Such searches are made when justified by information available and are not directed against Congress workers as such.

Coloured Bengal Lights.

998. ***Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state how many factories are there is India, province by province, who manufacture coloured Bengal lights?

(b) What has been the total amount of duty realised from such factories since the operation of the Matches Act?

(c) What is the market rate in Bengal of these Bengal lights per zinc case of one and a quarter gross?

(d) What is the cost of production and the excise duty thereupon?

(e) What is the amount of license fee the manufacturers of Bengal lights have to pay for their seasonal produce?

(f) Are Government aware that these matches are used only on two ceremonial occasions, namely, the Pujas and Dewali, in the course of a year?

(g) Is it a fact that Government are contemplating compulsory use of banderols by these manufacturers?

(h) Have Government in this connection considered the fact that these matches are prepared with highly hygroscopic chemicals and the climate especially of Bengal, remains very moist, humid and damp at the time when these matches are manufactured, necessitating the drying of these highly hygroscopic matches in the sun by opening up the inner box, both by the manufacturers and the retailers before sale?

(i) Are Government prepared to exempt these Bengal lights from being banderoled especially in Bengal?

(j) Are Government prepared to exercise their power of exemption conferred on them by section 14 of Matches (Excise Duty) Order in the case of the manufacturers of Bengal lights?

(k) If the answer to part (j) be in the negative, are Government prepared to consider the desirability of amending section 4, sub-section (a) (i), so as to give the benefit of section 24 of the Matches (Excise Duty) Order 1934, to matches in boxes containing not more than twelve?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: (a), (b), (c) and (d). Except as regards the excise duty, the information is not available and cannot be compiled without a degree of labour and expense which is not considered to be justified.

The excise duty on Bengal lights is one rupee per gross of boxes but a rebate of ten pies per gross of boxes is admissible if they are manufactured in cottage factories.

(e) Rupees one hundred.

(f) I am not aware that the use of these matches is confined solely to the two ceremonial occasions referred to.

(g), (h) and (i). Government have considered the representations received on this subject and have now decided to exempt Bengal Lights from the banderol regulations.

(j) and (k). Government see no sufficient reason for totally exempting Bengal lights from the excise duty but a proposal for fixing the duty leviable on the basis of 12 sticks is now under consideration.

MUSLIMS IN THE INDIAN TEA CESS COMMITTEE AND THE INDIAN SOFT COKE CESS COMMITTEE.

999. ***Maulvi Badi-uz-Zaman:** (a) Is it a fact that there are very few Muslims on the ministerial and executive staff of the Indian Tea Cess Committee and Indian Soft Coke Cess Committee?

(b) What is the total strength of the ministerial and executive staff of each of the committees referred to in part (a) above? How many Muslims are in each category?

(c) How many men have been recruited on the ministerial as well as on the executive staff of each of the Committees referred to, since 1st January, 1934? What is the composition of this recruitment as regards different communities?

(d) Is it a fact that the non-Muslims are in an over-whelming majority in the staff of the above, and have an entire monopoly of the organisation of these committees?

(e) Do Government propose to consider the advisability of issuing instructions at an early date to the proper authorities to the effect that communal inequalities existing in the staff of these committees should be readjusted by stopping recruitment of the community or communities already preponderant?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given in the Council of State to question No. 180 by the Honourable Mr. Jagadish Chandra Banerjee regarding the staff of the Indian Tea Cess Committee. The position of the Soft Coke Cess Committee in regard to the recruitment of staff is analogous to that of the other Committee. I will, however, forward a copy of the Honourable Member's question to these two Committee.

Muslims in the Indian Cotton Cess Committee and the Indian Lac Cess Committee.

1000. ***Maulvi Badi-uz-Zaman:** (a) Is it a fact that the Indian Cotton Cess Committee and the Indian Lac Cess Committee are administered by Government?

(b) What is the strength of the staff engaged on research work under each of the Committees mentioned above? How many are Muslims?

(c) Is it a fact that Muslims are not in proper proportion on the staff of either of the two committees referred to above?

(d) Is it a fact that suitable Muslim graduates in science of Indian and foreign universities are available for employment? If so, why are they not considered for research appointments under the Indian Cotton Cess Committee and Indian Lac Cess Committee?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) A certain measure of control is vested in the Governor General in Council in virtue of the provisions of the Indian Cotton Cess Act, 1923, and the Indian Lac Cess Act, 1930.

(b) 161 under the Indian Central Cotton Committee of whom 20 are Muslims and 15 under the Indian Lac Cess Committee, of whom one is a Muslim.

(c) and (d). The Honourable Member presumably has in mind the proportion fixed for the representation of minorities in Government services. The matter will be brought to the notice of the committees.

Recruitment of Muslims on the Staff of the Indian Tea Cess Committee.

1001. ***Maulvi Badi-uz-Zaman:** (a) Is it a fact that several posts of Sub-Inspectors of Indian Tea Cess Committee have recently been filled as a result of an interview held in Lucknow?

(b) How many posts have been so filled?

(c) How many Muslims have been taken in these posts?

(d) Is it a fact that no Muslim has been taken against the posts referred to in part (a) above?

(e) Is it a fact that among the candidates who applied for the above posts there were many Muslims with experience in market work, etc.? Why were these candidates overlooked?

(f) Are Government aware that the staff of the Indian Tea Cess Committee is completely monopolised by non-Muslims?

(g) Do Government propose to consider the advisability of removing the preponderance of one community, and of recruiting Muslims in due proportion on the staff of the Committee?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) to (g). The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given in the Council of State to the Honourable Mr. Jagadish Chandra Banerjee's question No. 180 on the 3rd September, 1934.

Munshi Iswar Saran: On a point of order, Sir. In answer to a question put in this House, is it enough to refer us to an answer given in the other place?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The proceedings of the Council of State, it is understood, are supplied to every Honourable Member of this House; so there can be no difficulty in finding out the answer.

Munshi Iswar Saran: May I submit for your consideration, Sir, that in that case the Members of this House are deprived of their right of putting supplementary questions?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not see how Members of this House are deprived of their right of putting supplementary questions.

Munshi Iswar Saran: Sir, the answer is not given here, it is not before us, it is in the record of the other House, and so we can't put any supplementary questions.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The proceedings of the other House are supplied to every Honourable Member.

Munshi Iswar Saran: I know that, but what I submit is this. I put a question here, and for the answer I am referred to an answer given in the other House to question No. so and so, put by Mr. so and so. That answer is not before us, and, therefore, I submit for your consideration that the Members of this House are deprived of their right of putting supplementary questions.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member appears to be under a misapprehension. Members are not deprived of their right of putting supplementary questions. If any Honourable Member wants to get information from the Government Member by means of a supplementary question, he is at liberty to do so, and the Chair has no doubt that the Government Member will read out that answer.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the Honourable Member kindly read out that answer?

Mr. B. Das: Sir, in the other House, there was a ruling given to the effect that no Member of that House could quote a speech delivered on the floor of this Houses, and so why should the Government refer us to statements or replies made in the other place? I hope you have seen that ruling, Sir?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That has nothing to do with this. That is a different thing.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the Honourable Member please read out the answer given in the other place?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Certainly, Sir. Since you, Mr. President, request me to do so, I shall read it out. The answer given was—that appointments on the staff of the Committee are made by the Committee itself, and the Government have no hand in the matter.

Facilities for Indians for Aircraft, Wireless and Broadcasting Training and Service.

1002. ***Pandit Nilakantha Das:** (a) What facilities are provided for Indians and in India for air craft, wireless, and broadcasting training and service?

(b) What is the provision for that in Indian Budgets?

(c) Are Government prepared to elicit the information regarding Budget provisions in the provinces, if any, for training in aircraft, wireless, and broadcasting of Indians and give the same information to this House?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: As regards Aircraft: (a) Government administer a Fund, called the Petrol Tax Fund, derived from the proceeds of the additional tax on petrol consumed for aviation purposes, which is utilised *inter alia* for the grant of scholarships and financial assistance to Indians for advanced training in aviation. Facilities for training are also provided by the flying clubs in India, which are subsidised by Government. In addition, Indian National Airways, Limited, have established a flying school in Rangoon. As regards facilities for service, I would refer the Honourable Member to my answer to his next question.

(b) The estimated expenditure out of the Petrol Tax Fund during the current year on scholarships and financial assistance for training in England of Indians in aviation is Rs. 16,000.

As regards Wireless: (a) The Department of Posts and Telegraphs maintains training facilities in the Telegraph Storeyard at Calcutta for the training of its own employees in wireless. For some years all appointments

have been made in India and a large majority of these appointments have been filled by Indians in the normal course. It does not appear necessary, therefore, to provide special facilities.

(b) There is no special provision.

As regards Broadcasting: (a) No special facilities are provided for training and employment of Indians. With the exception of the new post of Controller of Broadcasting for which it was necessary to obtain a trained expert from abroad, all appointments are made in India and hitherto sufficient candidates have presented themselves who can be employed without training. The large majority of the appointments have been filled by Indians in the normal course and it does not appear necessary to provide special facilities.

(b) There is no special provision.

(c) *Generally*, aviation and wireless are purely central subjects and Local Governments make no such provision in their budgets. Some provinces are carrying out small experiments in village broadcasting, but it is so unlikely that they will have made any provision for training Indians that I do not propose to call for the information

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is the Honourable Member aware that the Madras Flying Club is charging Rs. 50 a month for each of its apprentices?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I am sorry I could not hear the Honourable Member's question.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is he aware of the fact that the Madras Flying Club charges Rs. 50 per month per apprentice?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No, I am not aware of the terms on which the Madras Flying Club entertains apprentices. It seems to me not unreasonable that the Club should charge a fee for such training.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In view of the fact that that particular Club and other similar Clubs receive subsidies from the Government of India, will the Honourable Member be prepared to consider the advisability of suggesting to them that they should not charge such prohibitive fees for their apprentices?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I am not prepared to admit that the fee is prohibitive.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In view of the considerable amount of unemployment prevailing in the country, does he not consider it rather an absurd thing that as much as Rs. 50 a month should be collected by the Flying Club from its apprentices when it receives bonuses from the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: My Honourable friend has asked me to express an opinion.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Am I to understand from the Honourable Member that there is no training being given in broadcasting in India, and, if so, may I know, why?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have already said that so far we have not found it necessary to provide such facilities. If we do find it necessary, we shall undoubtedly make suitable arrangements.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Why does the Honourable Member not find it necessary? Is it that at present there are no people to take a training, or is it because broadcasting has not extended much, and, therefore, no training need be given now?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have done my best to answer my Honourable friend's question. I said that hitherto sufficient candidates presented themselves who could be employed without training, but as broadcasting develops, I imagine it will probably be necessary to give suitable training. That is a matter on which we would wish to have the advice of the Controller as soon as possible.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it a fact that in the training institutes that the railways maintain in this country for training railway engineers and others, no monthly fee is collected from their apprentices?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I deeply regret that my Honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, has not accepted my suggestion. I cannot hear the Honourable Member.

Mr. H. P. Mody: Why not provide him with broadcasting!

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Will Government be prepared to assist financially an academy for training Indians in flying?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think that Government would give sympathetic consideration to a sound scheme if it were put forward.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Will Government be prepared to assist financially?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I said that they would be prepared to give sympathetic consideration in regard to such a scheme if it were put forward, and that implies sympathetic financial consideration also.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Would Government be prepared to initiate a scheme for an academy for flying?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think the answer to that is "No." I believe that a scheme is at present under consideration which will doubtless be placed before the Government in due course.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: To which Government will give sympathetic consideration.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: That I have said.

Mr. B. Das: If the Aero Club of India and Burma should submit such a scheme, will it receive. . . . .

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I cannot hear the Honourable Member.

Mr. B. Das: I will repeat my question. Will the Honourable Member consider such a scheme if it is submitted by the Aero Club of India and Burma, and help it financially, just as they have financed in the past the maintenance of that Aero Club?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: That is a hypothetical question. I have no information that the Aero Club of India has any intention of submitting such a scheme. From what I know of it, I think it is extremely doubtful whether it is in a position to do so.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Is there any plan of the Government for manning these services by Indains entirely, and, if so, what is the plan, and also, in how many years do they contemplate that these services should be manned by Indians?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The Honourable Member has raised a very wide question of policy with which it is impossible for me to deal in a supplementary question. It is impossible to say when these services will be manned entirely by Indians, as it is not possible for us to forecast how soon Indians will be qualified in sufficient numbers for the purpose.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Is there any plan?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No. There is only a plan for extending facilities to train Indians in aviation. It is impossible to say to what extent they will avail themselves of those facilities.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: How many Indians are now actually employed in the aircraft and wireless departments of the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I should like to have notice of that question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: The Honourable Member referred more than once in his replies to the phrase "in the normal course". He said, "In the normal course we shall have more Indians". May I know what is the probable period of time, which will be covered by this "normal course"?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I referred to the "nomal course" in my reply with regard to wireless and broadcasting. As I have explained, appointments in those two departments are made in India in accordance with the usual rules on the subject.

Mr. S Satyamurti: May I know how many Indians are being now trained for aircraft and wireless?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I must ask for notice of that questoin.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order order. The Chair may mention with reference to the point of order raised about referring an Honourable Member putting a question to the proceedings of the Council of State, the Chair's attention has been drawn to a ruling on the subject that Honourable Members representing Government might as well bear in mind the fact that references to the proceedings in another place should, as far as possible, be avoided. What the Chair would like to add at present is this. The Chair does not think that reference to the published proceedings in the Council of State as containing the answer of Government to a similar question is improper, but the Chair thinks, for the convenience of this House, the Honourable Member who replies to the question should be prepared to read out the answers, if required.

12 Noon.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

Evidence taken by the Railway Court of Inquiry.

219. **Sardar Mangal Singh:** Will Government be pleased to lay on the table of the House a copy of the evidence taken by the Railway Court of Inquiry presided over by Mr. Justice Murphy?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The evidence tendered before the Railway Court of Inquiry was not printed, and I regret that I am unable to lay it on the table of the House.

Associations declared Unlawful in Burma during the Rebellion.

220. **U Thein Maung:** With reference to the answer to starred question No. 272, dated the 14th February, 1935, will Government please state:

(a) what was the number of associations declared to be unlawful in each district in Burma during the rebellion;

(b) how many associations in the respective districts have had the ban removed since then; and

(c) whether Government have considered or are prepared to consider sympathetically the question of removing the ban from all the remaining associations as a sort of amnesty to create the proper atmosphere for the working of the constitutional reforms?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a), (b) and (c). I lay on the table a statement giving the required information.

(d) The matter is one for the consideration of the Local Government. The associations in respect of which the ban imposed in 1931 is still in force are only those in the rebel districts of Insein, Tharrawaddy and Henzada. I may add for the Honourable Member's information that the Local Government are at present considering the question of the removal of the ban from unlawful associations where this action is possible.

Statement.

District.	Number of associations. (1) Notified in 1931 in connection with the rebellion.	(2) Denotified since 1931.
Tharrawaddy	13	..
Insein	39	..
Rangoon Town	1	1
Henzada	26	..
Pyapon	1	1
Yamethin	15	15
Myingyan	14	14
Mandalay	4	4
Upper Chindwin	98	98
Sagaing	1	1
Shwebo	6	6
Katha	9	9
Total	227	149

RELEASE OF PERSONS CONVICTED IN CONNECTION WITH THE REBELLION IN BURMA.

221. **U Thein Maung:** Will Government please state:

(a) how many persons were convicted in connection with the rebellion in Burma;

(b) how many of them have been released by Government before the expiry of their sentences;

(c) how many of them are still undergoing their sentences;

(d) how often the question of releasing them is considered by Government; and

(e) whether Government have considered or are prepared to consider sympathetically the question of releasing such of them as are still in jail as a sort of amnesty to create the proper atmosphere for the working of the reforms?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The approximate figures are:

(a) 1,514, including 128 executed.

(b) 300.

(c) 676.

(d) and (e). These are matters for the Government of Burma. I understand that every case is reviewed carefully twice a year by the

Local Government and it would be seen from my reply to part (b) of the question that a great deal of clemency has already been shown. The Local Government are unable, in the best interests of the province, to regard the initiation of reforms as a suitable occasion for the grant of amnesty to all rebels. With this view the Government of India agree.

CONTROL OVER THE PIECE OF LAND WITHIN THE BENGAL NAGPUR RAILWAY BOUNDARY PASSING THROUGH DONGARGARH AND RAJ NANDGAON STATE.

222. **Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta:** (a) Is it a fact that the piece of land, within the Bengal Nagpur Railway boundary, passing through Dongargarh and Raj Nandgaon State, is British India?

(b) Is it British India for all purposes, or is there any limitation to it?

(c) To whom are the residents living therein liable to pay income-tax, *i.e.*, to the Government of India or to Rajnandgaon and Dongargarh States, respectively?

(d) Is that tract within the jurisdiction of the civil and criminal courts of British India?

(e) Is that also within the jurisdiction and authority of the District Councils for the purposes connected with their functions?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: (a) No. The railway passes through Khairagarh and Nandgaon States.

(b) No. For jurisdictional and railway purposes only.

(c). The residents will only pay income-tax to the Government of India if they are liable under the provisions of the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922.

(d) Yes.

(e) No.

ACTION TAKEN ON NON-OFFICIAL RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

223. **Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a list of all the non-official resolutions passed by the Legislative Assembly during the years 1923 to 1934, briefly showing what action, if any, Government have taken in pursuance of each of them?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: The Honourable Member is referred to the replies given to Mr. K. V. Reddy's starred question No. 994 asked on the 24th March, 1924, to Mr. C. Duraswamy Ayyangar's starred question No. 68 asked on the 3rd February, 1927, to Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin's unstarred question No. 179, asked on the 11th February, 1931, to the statement laid on the table on the 10th February, 1932, by the Honourable Sir George Rainy, containing the information promised in reply to starred question No. 105 asked by Mr. Rahimtoola M. Chinoy on the 3rd February, 1932, and to the statement laid on the table on the 8th February, 1933, by the Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter, containing the information promised in reply to starred question No. 1174 asked by Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad on the 14th November, 1932, which give the information for the period upto 1932. The information in respect of the non-official Resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly, and the action taken on each of them during the years 1933-34, is given in the following statement:

Statement showing the Non-Official Resolutions adopted by the Legislative Assembly during 1933 and 1934 and Action taken by Government thereon.

Serial No.	Date on which moved.	By whom.	Subject of Resolution.	Department concerned.	Action taken by Government.
1	7th September, 1933	Rai Bahadur Lala Brij Kishore.	Proprietory rights of citizens in the land under the new constitution.	Education, Health and Lands.	A copy of the report of the debate on the resolution was forwarded to the Secretary of State for India for his information with the request that copies might be transmitted to the Joint Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform for its consideration.
2	7th September, 1933 and 30th January, 1934.	Kumar Gopika Romon Roy.	Grievances of the travelling public on the Assam Bengal Railway.	Railway . .	No action was taken as the more important of the grievances discussed had already been examined by the Assam Bengal Railway Administration in 1931.
3	30th January, 1934 and 6th February, 1934.	Mr. N. M. Joshi .	Protection against unemployment and reduction of wages.	Industries and Labour.	No additional measures were required on the resolution as it embodied the policy that the Government had adopted and would continue to adopt.
4	14th February, 1934	Kumar Gupteshwar Prasad Singh.	Loan for the reconstruction of Bihar after the earthquake.	Finance . .	Necessary action has already been taken as explained in paragraphs 40 to 43 of Sir George Schuster's speech introducing the budget for 1934-35.
5	26th July, 1934 and 9th August, 1934.	Dr. F. X. DeSouza	Representation of Indian Christians in the services and committees.	Home . .	As regards the first part of the resolution Government are watching the position of Indian Christians in the services through annual returns and from time to time will take such steps as may be found necessary to secure their adequate representation. The recommendation contained in the second part of the resolution is also being borne in mind.

ECONOMIES EFFECTED DURING THE LAST THREE YEARS.

224. **Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement giving, department-wise, economies effected during the last three years?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Information subsequent to that contained in the Summary of the results of retrenchment operations in Civil expenditure (including Posts and Telegraphs but excluding Railways) and in Military estimates is not available and could not be collected without an expenditure of labour which the reduced staffs of the Departments could not give without detriment to their other duties. Some information about total expenditure was given in the Budget speech.

CONTRACT WITH INDIAN FIRMS FOR SUPPLYING MATERIALS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

225. **Pandit Nilakantha Das:** Will Government be pleased to state whether there is any contract with any Indian firms for supplying materials to the Government of India? If so, will Government lay on the table all such contracts?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The Honourable Member has not made it clear as to which Department of the Central Government this question relates. The Indian Stores Department places numerous contracts for the supply of Indian materials with Indian firms. The labour and cost involved in collecting details of such contracts, which number many thousands, and in preparing copies thereof, will be very great and not commensurate with the expense involved. Details of all contracts above Rs. 100 in value, placed by the Indian Stores Department, are published week by week in the *Indian Trade Journal* to which I would refer the Honourable Member and which he will find in the Library of the House.

TARIFF RATES FOR FOOD ON THE BENGAL NAGPUR RAILWAY.

226. **Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Do Government propose to prepare and place on the table of this House a comparative statement showing the tariff rates charged for different types of food on the Bengal Nagpur Railway from 1930 onwards?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am placing in the Library of the House a copy of the current tariffs of charge. The Agent, Bengal Nagpur Railway, states that the tariffs prior to the one now in force are not available.

RETRENCHMENT OF POSTAL STAFF IN CERTAIN POSTAL CIRCLES.

227. **Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the number of:

(a) officers in the administrative and controlling staff in the Posts and Telegraphs Department;

(b) employees in the Audit staff:

(c) employees in the subordinate staff in the Post Office and Railway Mail Service, including inferior staff; and

(d) personnel retrenched under each of the above categories, showing separately the figures for Bengal and Assam, Bombay, Madras, the United Provinces and the Central Circles?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a), (b) and (c). The Honourable Member's attention is invited to Appendix XVIII of the last Annual Report of the Posts and Telegraphs Department, a copy of which is in the Library of the House, which contains the information he requires.

(d) Government regret that they are unable to furnish the information as its collection would involve an undue expenditure of time and labour.

POSTAL LIFE INSURANCE AND SAVINGS BANK WORKS.

228. **Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** Will Government be pleased to lay on the table the figures for the last three years shewing:

(a) the income and the expenditure for the Postal Life Insurance and Savings Bank works;

(b) the cost borne by the Post Office for Postal Life Insurance and Savings Bank business in the shape of clerical, audit and supervision work; and

(c) the amount of credit in the Post Office account for the Postal Life Insurance and Savings Bank business?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) The receipts and outgoings are given in Account No. 86 of the Finance and Revenue Account of the Government of India.

(b) and (c). The Postal Department is reimbursed the entire amount of expenditure incurred by them on account of the postal life insurance and savings bank business. A statement giving the figure for the last three years is laid on the table.

Amounts paid to the Postal Department for Postal Life Insurance and Savings Bank Business.

(In lakhs of rupees).

	Postal Life Insurance.	*Savings Bank.*
1931-32	3	44
1932-33	3	47
1933-34	3	54

INCOME DERIVED FROM THE ENHANCEMENT OF THE RATES OF POSTAGE, REGISTRATION FEES AND MONEY ORDER COMMISSION.

229. **Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** Will Government be pleased to state the income derived from the enhancement of the rates of postage, registration fees and money order commission?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: Separate accounts are not maintained of the revenue realised from various descriptions of postal traffic, except that from commission on money orders and British Postal Orders. The rates of commission on money orders were last changed in 1921. The other portions of the postal tariff, except the rate for book packets, were enhanced from various dates during the year 1931-32. The initial book packet rate was enhanced with effect from 1st April, 1934.

The increased revenue obtained from the enhancement of the money order commission in April, 1921, amounted to Rs. 6 lakhs in the first year, the revenue in 1921-22 being larger by that amount than the revenue in the preceding year. The enhancement of the rates of postage on various articles was effected from various dates about the middle of the financial year and the figures for 1931-32 are, therefore, useless for purposes of comparison. If the revenue during 1930-31, the last complete financial year before the enhancements were effected, is compared with that in 1932-33, the revenue in the latter year was practically equal to the revenue in the former so that the enhancement served to arrest the progressive decrease in revenue that was occurring due to the economic depression. Due to the same reason the revenue decreased by another five lakhs in 1933-34. As for the increased revenue obtained from the enhancement of the book packet traffic, a reference is invited to the reply given by the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce to starred question No. 89 by Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena.

POST OFFICES CONVERTED AND ABOLISHED AND POSTS REDUCED IN THE POST OFFICES.

230. **Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement shewing Circle by Circle:

(a) the total number of departmental branch offices converted into extra-departmental ones;

(b) the total number of Head Post Offices reduced to the status of time-scale sub-offices;

(c) the total number of gazetted Post Offices reduced to the status of selection grade offices;

(d) the total number of higher selection grade Post Offices reduced to the status of lower selection grade Post Offices;

(e) the total number of departmental sub-offices converted into extra-departmental sub or branch offices;

(f) the total number of unremunerative Post Offices abolished;

(g) the total number of departmental postmen's appointments converted into those of extra-departmental delivery agents; and

(h) the total number of unremunerative Post Offices at military stations and strategic centres?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a) to (h). The Honourable Member has not stated the period for which the information is required but, even if he had, I should be unable to reply to his question, as the collection of the information would involve an expenditure of time and labour incommensurate with its value.

INCREMENTS OF EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT.

231. **Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether under the ordinary rules, service in an officiating capacity counts for increments in the time-scale;

(b) whether the increments of all the employees in the Posts and Telegraphs Department are governed by that rule;

(c) whether the officials who are officiating as Lower Division clerks are not allowed to count their officiating service for increments unless they are officiating in clear permanent vacancies; and

(d) if so, what is the reason for the differential treatment meted out to the officiating Lower Division clerks, and whether they are prepared to revise the orders, giving those officials the benefit of drawing increments for their entire officiating service, whether in clear permanent vacancies or otherwise?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a) Not necessarily. Under Fundamental Rule 26 all duty in a post to which a time scale applies counts for increment in that time scale. But this rule is subject to the general provisions of Fundamental Rule 21 under which the Governor General in Council is competent to issue orders over-riding the provisions of Fundamental Rule 26 in respect of a particular time scale sanctioned by him.

(b) On the assumption that by employees the Honourable Member refers to officiating employees, the reply is in the negative. Fundamental Rule 26 is not applicable to officiating employees in time scales for which the Governor General in Council has issued special orders over-riding the provisions of Fundamental Rule 26.

(c) The position is substantially as stated by the Honourable Member.

(d) As regards the first part of the question, the restriction regarding grant of increments for officiating services applies uniformly to all officiating clerks in the Department, whether in the lower division or in the upper division, and, therefore, no differential treatment has been meted out to those in the lower division. The reply to the second part is in the negative.

PLYING OF THE BOMBAY-VIJAYDURG MAIL STEAMER THROUGH DABHOL PORT.

232. **Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Bombay-Vijaydurg mail steamer does touch Dabhol port and connects Dabhol creek launch in its outward journey except in case of stormy weather;

(b) whether there is no other steamer except the Bombay-Vijaydurg mail steamer to touch Jaygad port in both directions and to connect the Jaygad creek launch; and

(c) if the replies to parts (a) and (b) above be in the affirmative, whether it is a fact that the Bombay Steam Navigation Company considers these ports as optional?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a) to (c). The facts are as stated by the Honourable Member.

CONVEYANCE OF MAIL BAGS FOR PLACES ON THE KONKAN LINE.

233. Mr. N. M. Joshi: Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether the mail bags for places on the Konkan line are conveyed by a steamer of the Bombay Steam Navigation Company;

(b) whether the steamer conveying such mails touches at the Dabhol port daily;

(c) whether the mail bags for Guhagar and Dabhol are conveyed by this mail steamer and delivered at Dabhol; and if not, how they are conveyed to the respective places;

(d) whether they are aware that in the present arrangement for the conveyance of mails to Guhagar and Dabhol, there is an inordinate, unnecessary avoidable delay;

(e) whether objection, if any, was raised by the Bombay Steam Navigation Company to the postal peons visiting the Mail Guards even by issuing a deck pass daily and making their own arrangements to take Dabhol, Guhagar and Jaygad mails from the Mail Guard without reference to the Steamer Company;

(f) whether Government are prepared to undertake that even if the steamer does not touch the Dabhol port on account of stormy weather and the mails for Dabhol and Guhagar are overcarried to Ratnagiri, the mails will not be delayed beyond the maximum of three hours only;

(g) whether Government have considered that such a measure would improve delivery facilities and throw open better communication with Bombay for an area over 30 miles and in addition give a saving to the Department; and

(h) if so, whether Government are prepared to ask the Postmaster General, Bombay, to make arrangements to get down the Dabhol and Guhagar mails from Vijaydurg Mail Steamer at Dabhol port through a gratuity agent, without reference to the Bombay Steam Navigation Company to which no responsibility would ordinarily attach?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a) to (h). Government have no information, but the matter referred to is one with which the Postmaster-General, Bombay, is competent to deal and a copy of the question is being sent to that officer.

NON-ISSUE OF REVENUE STAMPS IN BURMA.

234. U Thein Maung: Will Government please state:

(a) why "revenue" stamps separate from postage stamps have been issued in all provinces except Burma, as stated at page 9 of the Indian Post and Telegraph Department Annual Report for 1933-34;

(b) why such stamps have not been issued in Burma; and

(c) when they will be issued there, if at all?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: (a) As it was not possible to calculate exactly the shares of revenue from "unified" stamps distributable between the Posts and Telegraphs Department and the Provincial Governments, it was decided to introduce separate revenue and postage stamps throughout British India excluding Burma.

(b) and (c). The question of introducing separate revenue stamps in Burma has been postponed pending a decision on the question of separation of Burma from India because the Government of Burma desire to retain "unified" stamps for postal and revenue purposes if that Province is separated.

SHOWING OF BURMANS OR BUDDHISTS IN A SEPARATE COLUMN IN THE POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT ANNUAL REPORT.

235. **U Thein Maung:** With reference to Appendix XVII to the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department Annual Report, are Government prepared to consider the question of showing Burmans or Buddhists in a separate column?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The reply is in the negative.

POSTAL AND TELEGRAPHIC FACILITIES IN BURMA AND RECRUITMENT OF BURMANS.

236. **U Thein Maung:** Will Government please state what steps have been taken (a) to increase the postal and telegraphic facilities in Burma since 1933-34, and (b) to increase the number and percentage of Burmans employed there in the Post and Telegraph Departments, and especially in the superior services since 1933-34?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a) Owing to the financial stringency prevailing in the Department due to the general unfavourable economic conditions and the fall in postal and telegraph traffic it has not been possible to increase postal or telegraph facilities during 1933-34 either in Burma or in India

(b) Direct recruitment to the subordinate services of the Posts and Telegraphs Department in the Burma Circle is generally confined to candidates domiciled in the revenue division in which the vacancies occur. Necessary orders in this respect were issued in 1926 so far as the clerical cadre of the subordinate postal service is concerned. In 1933 these orders were made applicable to all subordinate services in the Department. The result of these orders is an appreciable improvement in the number of Burmans recruited during 1934, the increase being about 7½ per cent.

There are only two superior services in the Posts and Telegraphs Department to which direct recruitment is made namely,

(i) Superior Telegraph Engineering and Wireless Branches, Class I,

(ii) Postal Superintendents' Service, Class II.

In the rules published in 1933-34 for recruitment to the service mentioned at (i) above by competitive examination held by the Public Service Commission one vacancy was reserved to a member of a minority community preference being given to a person domiciled in Burma. The result of the examination held in November 1933 showed that there was no candidate who had qualified for selection to fill the reserved vacancy.

No direct recruitment has been made since 1933-34 to the Postal Superintendents' Service, Class II.

CERTAIN INFORMATION IN CONNECTION WITH THE LAST GENERAL ELECTIONS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

237. **Sir Muhammad Yakub:** Will Government please lay on the table the following information in connection with the last general elections of the Legislative Assembly:

(a) names of the constituencies;

(b) names of the candidates;

(c) total number of votes and the actual number which each candidate secured; and

(d) the amount of the election expenses which each candidate lodged before the returning officer?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I am placing in the Library of the House a statement giving the information asked for in parts (a), (b) and (c) of the question The information asked for in part (d) is being collected and will be placed in the Library in due course.

CANDIDATES FOR LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ELECTION WHO LOST THEIR SECURITIES.

238. **Sir Muhammad Yakub:** Will Government be pleased to state the names of the Legislative Assembly candidates of the last general elections who lost their securities and could not secure the required number of votes?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: The information is being collected and will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

MURAL DECORATIONS OF THE VICEROY'S HOUSE.

239. **Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha:** (a) Are Government aware that four Indian artists were sent to England to decorate the India House with mural paintings?

(b) Is it a fact that they did the work well and won universal approbation?

(c) Is it a fact that they came back to India?

(d) Is it a fact that the mural decorations of the Viceroy's house is going on?

(e) Has the work been given to an Italian artist?

(f) Were the Indian artists given a choice for the said work? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a)—(e). Yes.

(f) No. The work is not being done from public funds, and no question of control by the Government of India, therefore, arises. It is, however, observed:

(i) that negotiations with the Italian artist had been commenced before the Indian artists returned from London, and

(ii) that the Italian artist employs 15 Indian artists who work under his supervision.

NEWSPAPERS SUPPLIED TO DETENUS AND OTHER POLITICAL PRISONERS.

240. **Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that no English newspaper other than the *Statesman* is allowed to the detenus and other political prisoners?

(b) Is it a fact that no other vernacular newspaper than the *Sanjibani* is allowed to them?

(c) If the answers to parts (a) and (b) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the reasons:

(i) why of all English papers, the *Statesman* only is allowed;

(ii) why other English papers are not allowed; and

(iii) why no vernacular daily is allowed?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) and (b). I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the list of newspapers, magazines and periodicals placed on the table of the House in reply to question No. 763 on the 9th March, 1935, from which he will see that several English and Vernacular Newspapers are allowed to State Prisoners.

(c) Does not arise.

GRIEVANCES OF THE STAFF OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

241. **Sir Muhammad Yakub:** (a) Are Government aware that keen disappointment prevails among the staff of the Government of India Press, New Delhi, on account of the rejection by Government of all the memorials and petitions submitted by the clerks during the period from January, 1933 to December, 1934, for redressing various grievances, without assigning any reason?

(b) Are Government prepared to reconsider favourably the legitimate grievances of the clerks and, in case of rejection, state the reasons for not acceding to their requests?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) and (b). The reply is in the negative. Only two memorials appear to have been received during the period in question. One was for an improvement in the scale of pay, and the other for a working day of five hours, with permission to arrive ten minutes late and other relaxations of penalties for late attendance. Reasons are not ordinarily assigned for the rejection of memorials.

HOLIDAYS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

242. **Sir Muhammad Yakub:** Is it a fact that like all the offices under the Government of India and under the Central Government permanently located in Delhi all gazetted holidays notified by the Chief Commissioner,

Delhi Province, are not observed by the staff of the Government of India Press, New Delhi? If so, what is the cause of such a differential treatment?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The position as stated by the Honourable Member is not quite accurate. The staff of the Government of India, Press, New Delhi, are allowed the gazetted holidays notified by the Chief Commissioner, Delhi, during April to October; but from November to March the men in that Press are allowed the closed holidays observed by the Government of India Secretariat offices and any two of the communal holidays falling within that period. It is obviously inconvenient, especially during the Session of the Legislature, to close the Press when the Secretariat offices are working in Delhi.

SCALES OF PAY AND WORKING HOURS OF THE CLERKS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

243. **Sir Muhammad Yakub:** Is it a fact that the clerks of the Government of India Press, New Delhi, are governed by the Rules enforced in the Government of India offices only in respect of casual leave and holidays while their scales of pay and working hours are not regulated in accordance with those of the Government of India offices nor of the offices under the Central Government? If so, will Government please state reasons for adopting such a procedure?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The clerks are allowed casual leave for ten days in the year as is admissible to the establishment in the Government of India Secretariat offices. As regards holidays, I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to my reply to the previous question. The scales of pay and the working hours of the clerks are regulated by the interests of the public service, and with regard to the character of the work and the needs of the Press. They, therefore, differ from those prevailing in the Secretariat and attached offices.

APPLICATION OF THE PROVIDENT FUND RULES IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESSES.

244. **Sir Muhammad Yakub:** (a) Is it a fact that there is no uniformity in the application of certain rules in the Government of India Presses?

(b) Is it also a fact that the Contributory Provident Fund Rules have been applied in the Government of India Press, Calcutta, to the employees recruited on a certain date in the year 1929, while in case of Delhi Press, the Contributory Provident Fund Rules have been applied to all the employees recruited on or after the 15th July, 1920? If so, will Government be pleased to state why the same Contributory Provident Fund Rules have not been applied to the employees of the Government of India Press, Delhi from the date on which they have been introduced for the employees of the Government of India Press, Calcutta and what do Government propose to do to make the rules uniform?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) I am not clear which rules the Honourable Member has in mind. The rules applicable to the different presses are not identical but, where one rule covers all the presses, it is applied in the same manner in each Press.

(b) The answer to the first part is in the negative. The rules are applied to all industrial employees recruited on or after 15th July, 1920, either in Calcutta or Delhi, to the clerks so recruited in Delhi and to most, if not all, of the clerks so recruited in Calcutta. Owing to the fact that the Calcutta Press clerks were borne up to 26th March, 1929, on a combined cadre with certain other offices in Calcutta, special provisions had to be made to cover the case of the clerks employed there. But it was not intended, that these provisions should operate, to exclude any clerks recruited in that Press between 1920 and 1929. I am having an inquiry made to ascertain whether any clerks in Calcutta have been unintentionally excluded from the benefit of the Provident Fund and shall be prepared to give special consideration to such cases.

APPLICATION OF THE PROVIDENT FUND RULES IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESSES.

245. **Sir Muhammad Yakub:** (a) Will Government be pleased to put on the table of the House a copy of the Finance Department orders relating to the application of the Contributory Provident Fund Rules and state what classes of employees they cover?

(b) Is it a fact that the rules regarding the Contributory Provident Fund, applied to the clerks of the Government of India Presses, are contrary to the Finance Department orders?

(c) Are Government aware that the Finance Department orders relating to the Contributory Provident Fund prohibit the admission of clerks (non-technical employees) to the Contributory Provident Fund?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The Contributory Provident Fund is intended mainly for certain technical specialists, but exceptions are sometimes made on grounds of administrative convenience. Government do not propose to lay a copy of the orders on the table.

(b) and (c). No

REVISION OF SCALES OF PAY OF SECTION-HOLDERS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

246. **Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Is it a fact that the scales of pay of readers, clerks, copy-holders, and piece-workers of the Government of India Press, New Delhi, were revised after 1920?

(b) Is it a fact that the section-holders and the assistant section-holders of the Government of India Press, New Delhi, were left out and consequently they submitted their memorials to the Government of India in 1934?

(c) Is it a fact that the said memorials were withheld by the Controller of Printing and Stationery?

(d) If the reply to parts (a), (b) and (c) be in the affirmative, are Government and the Controller of Printing and Stationery prepared to take into consideration the revision of the scales of pay of the section-holders as well?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) On the reorganization of the Press in 1927 the scales of pay for clerks and copyholders were revised. The scales of pay of all the classes mentioned were revised in 1934.

(b) The scales for section-holders and assistant section-holders were left unaffected by the revision in 1927, but were reduced in 1934. Memorials have been submitted by section-holders and assistant section-holders, but these are not consequent on the 1934 revision, as that did not affect the memorialists, who remained on the higher scales formerly in force.

(c) The memorials submitted by the section-holders were withheld by the Controller under instruction No. 7 (3) of the instructions for the submission of petitions to the Governor General in Council.

(d) No.

EMPLOYMENT OF HINDUS AND MUSLIMS IN THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, DELHI.

247. **Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) With reference to my question No. 1603, dated the 7th December, 1932, will Government please state the communal proportion of the gazetted officers in the Education Department of Ajmer Merwara?

(b) Is it a fact that the Superintendent and the Female Superintendent of Female Education, Delhi, have been Christians since the creation of the Delhi Province?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, will Government please state why the Hindus and the Muhammadans, the two major communities of the Delhi Province, have been entirely deprived of their provincial rights?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) The communal proportion of the gazetted officers in the Education Department of Ajmer-Merwara is:

Hindus	69 per cent.
Muslims	25 ,,
Christians	6 ,,

(b) Yes.

(c) Mr. L. T. Watkins, I.E.S., was appointed Superintendent of Education for Delhi and Ajmer-Merwara on the creation of the post. He held it from 20th September, 1920 to 9th December, 1925. The post was held in abeyance for some time on account of financial stringency, the Educational Commissioner with the Government of India holding collateral charge of the duties of the Superintendent of Education. It was revived in April, 1931, and the present incumbent was appointed on the recommendation of the Public Service Commission. The selection of the Assistant Superintendent for Female Education was made at a time when Hindu and Muslim candidates possessing the requisite qualifications and experience were not forthcoming. The Honourable Member will appreciate that officers once appointed to Government service cannot be removed from service merely because they do not belong to a particular community.

EMPLOYMENT OF HINDUS IN THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, DELHI.

248. **Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Is it a fact that the gazetted inspecting staff of the Education Department, Delhi, consists of Muhammadans and Christians only?

(b) Is it a fact that the District Inspector of Schools, Delhi and the Senior Assistant District Inspectors of Schools, Delhi, have been Muhammadans for the last eight years?

(c) Is it a fact that the heads of the Training School, Najafgarh and the Girls Training School, Delhi, have been only Muhammadans and Christians since their foundation?

(d) Is it a fact that the Head Master, D. B. High School, Mehrauli, has always been a Muhammadan?

(e) If the answers to the preceding parts be in the affirmative, will Government please state why Hindus have been totally deprived of their rights?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) to (d). Yes.

(e) There is no question of depriving Hindus of their rights. Appointments and postings of educational officers are not made exclusively with regard to communal considerations.

SELECTION OF THE PRESENT DISTRICT INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS, DELHI.

249. **Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Will Government please lay on the table a statement showing the names, particulars, and the period of services of those candidates who were recommended by the Punjab Government for the post of District Inspector of Schools, Delhi, at the time of transfer of Sheikh Ghulam Mohiuddin?

(b) Will Government please state the period of service as District Inspector of Schools of the present District Inspector of Schools, Delhi, in the Punjab?

(c) Will Government please state why the present District Inspector of Schools, Delhi, was selected in preference to the Hindu candidates inspite of the facts that the Muhammadans have been holding this post for the last eight years?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) I regret I am unable to comply with the Honourable Member's request as recommendations relating to personnel are confidential.

(b) About two years.

(c) He was considered to be the most suitable candidate for the post.

COMMUNAL COMPOSITION OF THE INFERIOR SERVANTS IN THE OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE VICEROY.

250. **Sardar Sant Singh:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) what is the communal proportion of the inferior servants in the Office of the Private Secretary to His Excellency the Viceroy and how many of them are Sikhs:

(b) whether it is a fact that four new peons were employed in that office in January last, and all of them are Hindus;

(c) whether one of the Assistant Private Secretaries passed orders to the effect that every community should be represented among the inferior staff of that office, and whether this order was brought to the notice of the present Assistant Private Secretary; if so, with what result and, if not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) The communal proportion of the inferior servants in the Office of the Private Secretary to His Excellency the Viceroy is 24·2 per cent. Muslim and 75·8 per cent. Hindus. There are no Sikhs.

I may add that a year ago a Sikh was offered a peon's appointment which had fallen vacant but the offer was refused.

(b) No. The facts are that the services of two Hindu peons of the Earthquake Relief Fund Office have been retained owing to the abnormal rush of work.

(c) As regards the first part of the question, the order of the Assistant Private Secretary referred to was in connection with the superior and not the inferior establishment. The second part does not, therefore, arise.

INTRODUCTION OF THE REVISED RENT RULES ON STATE RAILWAYS.

251. **Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur:** Will Government please state the date of introduction of the revised rent rules as referred to in correction slip No. 8 to note 2 under Rule 2 of section 1 of chapter II, Residential Buildings of State Railway Code (Revised)?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The note referred to applies to non-gazetted staff and the following are the dates of introduction of the revised rent rules for such staff on the various State-managed Railways:

Eastern Bengal Railway . .	30th June, 1928.
North Western Railway . .	1st August, 1928.
East Indian Railway . .	1st October, 1932.
Great Indian Peninsula Railway	1st April, 1932, in the case of new entrants. As regards existing staff the intention is to apply the new rent rules from 1st April 1935.
Burma Railways	The revised rent rules for subordinate staff have not yet been introduced. But in the case of a staff in service on 15-7-31 who were enjoying the privilege of rent free quarters or an allowance in lieu thereof in a substantive capacity the concession was continued. The concession has been withdrawn from the staff appointed on or after 16-7-31.

INTRODUCTION OF THE REVISED RENT RULES ON STATE RAILWAYS.

252. **Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur:** Will Government please place on the table of this House a copy of the revised rent Rules on State-managed Railways?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The revised rent rules will be found in Chapter II (Residential Buildings) of the State Railway Code (Revised), a copy of which is in the Library.

RESTRICTIONS ON THE MOVEMENT OF MR. SUBASH CHANDRA BOSE.

253. **Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether any restrictions are placed on the movements of Subash Chandra Bose by the Government of India or the Secretary of State now;

(b) if the answer to part (a) be in the negative, whether Mr. Subash Bose is free to go either to England or any other foreign country in Europe and America;

(c) whether it is a fact that Subash Bose applied for a passport to go to England and the same was refused;

(d) whether it is a fact that he was asked to preside over a political conference in London and whether he was prevented from going to London; and

(e) whether Government have removed these restrictions on him now?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a), (b) and (c). Mr. Bose is in possession of a passport valid for France, Switzerland, Germany, Austria and Italy. The passport is not valid for entry into the United Kingdom, and he would, therefore, require the permission of the India Office to visit England.

(c) and (d). I have no information as to whether Mr. Bose himself applied for facilities to visit England on the occasion in question.

WEEKLY WORKING HOURS OF A NIGHT SECTION IN THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

254. **Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether the standard of weekly working hours for a Night Section, in the Railway Mail Service is fixed at 30 hours per week and sets are sanctioned on that basis;

(b) whether the authorities have applied this standard only in the case of those Sections that work between 21 and five hours and have refused to apply it to a Section which works between 17·58 hours and six hours and have applied to Sections of this type the standard of 33 hours per week, treating them as Sections working partly by day and partly by night;

(c) whether by application of 30 hours standard to a Section mentioned in part (b), a set of a Section in the Bombay Circle was reduced; and

(d) whether this anomaly was brought to the notice of the authorities by the Union; if so, whether it was rectified; if not, why not?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a) The standard for 'night' sections, according to which the number of sets is fixed, is a minimum of 24 hours, and a maximum of 30 hours of weekly duty

(b) The facts are as stated by the Honourable Member. I may add that, as regards the particular case to which the Honourable Member refers, the circumstances were very carefully examined by the Head of the Circle and, as a large proportion of both the outward and inward trips were found to be done between the hours of 5 A.M. and 9 P.M., it was decided that the working hours of the section should properly be regulated by the standard applicable for sections working partly by night and partly by day.

(c) One set of a section in the Bombay Circle was reduced by the application of the 33 hours standard, which was applicable for the reasons explained in my reply to part (b) above and not by the application of the 30 hours standard.

(d) As already explained there was no anomaly. The case was represented by the Union and the actual position was intimated to them.

DEFINITIONS OF "RUNNING TIME" AND "NIGHT" IN A RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE SECTION.

255. **Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) the circumstances that led to the (i) change in the definition of the "Running Time" of a Railway Mail Service Section as laid down in Mr. Bewoor's Time-Test Report, and (ii) to the revised interpretation of "Night" as meaning the period between 21 and 5 hours instead of between 20 and 6 hours, which was the principle laid down in the said Report; and

(b) the principles underlying the classification of the Railway Mail Service Sections, into "Night" and "Semi-night" ones?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a) (i). In accordance with orders issued in 1906 the time occupied by a Railway Mail Service section to complete its journey from one end of its beat to the other was accepted by the Department as the "Run" or the "Running Time", of the section. In his report Mr. Bewoor recommended that the running time should be reckoned from the time of the arrival of the train at the starting station to the time of its arrival at the end of the beat of the section for the purpose of preparing the staff-hours statement for sections of the Railway Mail Service. This standard, however, was not adopted by the Department, as, on close examination, it was found that it would involve practical administrative difficulties particularly in the case of sections commencing their beat in trains made up at terminal stations considerably before the actual time of departure.

(ii) The interpretation of "night" as the period between 20 hours and 6 hours as given in the report applies only to Mail Offices and this has not been altered.

(b) Sections whose period of duty falls entirely between 21 hours and 5 hours are classified as "Night" sections; sections whose period of duty falls entirely between 5 hours and 21 hours are classified as "Day" sections; the rest are classified as sections working partly by day and partly by night. The question of modifying these definitions is, however, under examination.

BAD CONDITION OF THE ROAD BETWEEN TURKMAN GATE AND CIRCULAR ROAD IN NEW DELHI.

256. **Mr. Ahmed Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer:** Is it a fact that the road between Turkman Gate and Circular Road in New Delhi is in a very bad state of repairs? If so, will Government please state when they propose to repair it?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The road is new and settlement always takes place in a newly constructed road.

It is proposed to resurface it during the coming year.

FENCE WIRES IN THE UNORTHODOX QUARTERS IN MINTO ROAD AREA, NEW DELHI.

257. **Mr. Ahmed Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer:** Is it a fact that quite a number of concrete posts set up to hold the fence wires in the unorthodox quarters in Minto Road area have already broken down, though they were erected less than a year ago?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: A few of the concrete posts have been damaged by children and cattle. The fence is temporary and will ultimately be replaced by hedges.

TARRING OF ROADS IN THE MINTO ROAD AREA, NEW DELHI.

258. **Mr. Ahmed Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer:** Do Government propose to tar the roads in the Minto Road area? If so, when?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Yes. During the coming year.

CHANGE IN SYSTEM OF ELECTRIC CURRENTS IN NEW DELHI.

259. **Mr. Ahmed Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer:** Do Government propose to change the D. C. current at present supplied to Government quarters in New Delhi to A. C. or A. C. current in Minto Road area to D. C.? If so, when?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The matter concerns the Municipal Committee of New Delhi who are in charge of the electrical supply of the city.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION AND ANSWER.

PRESERVATION OF THE HIGHLANDS IN KENYA FOR EUROPEANS.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether their attention has been drawn to the questions and answers in the House of Commons on the 14th February last for preserving the Highlands in Kenya for Europeans;

(b) whether His Majesty's Government are intending to pass an Order in Council in the matter.

(c) whether the Indian Government made any representation in the matter;

(d) whether His Majesty's Government will be requested to stay their hands pending request by the Government of India;

(e) whether it is a fact that within the extended area no person other than a European shall be entitled to acquire by grant or transfer agricultural land or to occupy land therein;

(f) whether Government propose to take any steps to see that the position of Indians in Kenya is not adversely affected?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) Yes.

(b) His Majesty's Government propose that the boundaries of the Highlands should be declared by Order in Council.

(c), (d) and (f). The Government of India approached His Majesty's Government with a request that an opportunity be afforded to them to make representations before an Order in Council was made. This request has been acceded to and representations to safeguard Indian interests will shortly be made.

(e) If the condition that no person other than a European shall be entitled to acquire by grant or transfer agricultural land in such area or to occupy land there be prescribed by Order in Council, this would probably be so.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know if the Government are aware that the Kenya Land Commission have included in their report areas as highlands where no restriction was ever imposed previously even on the plea of administrative convenience prohibiting Indians from acquiring either free grants of land or transfer thereof and where in fact transfers of land had taken place from Europeans to Indians and *vice versa*?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The report referred to by the Honourable Member has already been noticed by Government, and their representations relate not merely to the racial character of the restrictions but also to the territorial extent of the area in which restrictions should apply.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: When did this Government make this representation to His Majesty's Government about staying their hands before they passed the Order in Council? On what date did they make this representation?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The representation was made on the 12th February, 1935.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Did that representation include *inter-alia* a representation from this Government that this recommendation of the Kenya Land Commission, that is to extend the area and to prohibit transfers, was really *ultra vires*, because it went beyond the terms of reference of this Commission?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Well, Sir, as a matter of fact, we did not enter into any very elaborate argument as to whether a particular thing was *ultra vires* or not. We said that we had examined the recommendations of the Commission and we found that in two respects they went beyond the existing position, namely, first, the conversion of the restriction into a statutory restriction, and, secondly, the extension of the area, and that we wanted to submit detailed representations in regard to both.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have the Government of India sent those detailed representations, Sir?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The representations are in the course of preparation now, and I hope they will go by the next air mail

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will an opportunity be given to public opinion, either on the floor of this House or outside to strengthen the hands of the Government in preventing this injustice to Indians in Kenya?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I think if my Honourable friend will refer to the earlier proceedings of this House which date back to 1923, he will find that there has been ample demonstration of the strength of Indian opinion on the question of the reservation of land in the Highlands. I do not think that any fresh opportunity is necessary for putting the Government of India in possession of Indian opinion in this matter.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are Government aware that the Land Commission has defined the Highlands in Kenya as being merely the land where any European holds land irrespective of the geographical or climatic considerations and have also recommended that where Indians hold land at present in the neighbourhood of any land owned by Europeans, that such land held by Indians should also be considered as Highlands if and when such land held by Indians passes into the hands of Europeans, and that any transfers thereafter to Indians of the land previously held by them should become illegal?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I can assure my Honourable friend that this voluminous document which has been in our possession since last May has been most carefully examined, and that every recommendation which, in our opinion, adversely affects Indian interests, has passed through our scrutiny.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government give an opportunity to this House to express its opinion, so that they might forward it to His Majesty's Government, in order to show His Majesty's Government the resentment felt in this country over this attempted act of injustice in Kenya?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I have already answered that question. I have informed my Honourable friend that really there is no aspect of this question which has not already been sufficiently examined and canvassed and discussed both by this House and by representative Indians outside.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government write to His Majesty's Government that public opinion in this country feels very strongly on this matter and considers it a great insult to it, that this injustice should be perpetrated?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I submit to my Honourable friend that in the representations we have made, we have referred to the strength of Indian feeling on this subject.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask whether the reservation of the Highlands is an act of, what is called in the Government of India Bill, discrimination against the British subjects?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: That is asking for an expression of opinion.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask whether it is not a question of interpretation, instead of opinion?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is purely a matter of opinion.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask whether the British Government and the British people are responsible for this discrimination?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: My Honourable friend is sufficiently familiar with the history of the case to be able to answer that question for himself.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask whether the Government of India Bill provides reciprocity, or power to discriminate against those people who are responsible for this discrimination?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: So far as the holding of property in this country is concerned, I speak from memory, but I think I am right in saying that there is no restriction to be placed on the Legislature of the future in regard to this matter.

Mr. B. Das: May I ask the Honourable Member how he expects to receive better treatment on his representation to His Majesty's Government, on the Kenya Highland question when he has got a kick over the representation on the Zanzibar issue?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: My Honourable friend's metaphor in regard to Zanzibar is neither accurate nor happy.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Then, what is the reply that he has received, if it is not a kick?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I submit that that does not arise out of this question.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): With your permission, I desire to make a statement of the course of business in this House. Owing to the discussions having taken longer than we expected, and owing to the fact that it is not possible to form any accurate idea as to how long the supplementary demands will take, we propose, after the present discussion on the motion for consideration of the Finance Bill is finished, to take up the supplementary grants, and, after that is disposed of, to go on with the Finance Bill until its final disposal

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non Muhammadan): Are there going to be any night sittings?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City Non-Muhammadan Urban): May I draw the attention of the Leader of the House to the fact that he has placed as the last item in the list of business the Bill which I have the honour of moving. It was placed immediately after the supplementary demands in the previous list. It won't take three or four minutes, and I suggest to him most respectfully that that item of the agenda be placed in its original position, namely, immediately after the supplementary demands It is a reference made by the Council of State to this House. It will not take more than three minutes. I shall merely read it out straightaway, and I would suggest that it be placed immediately after the supplementary demands and before the consideration of the Finance Bill in detail. I hope, Sir, I have the support of all Parties in my request.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Well, Sir, I am not prepared to accept the optimistic statement that the thing will be finished in three or four minutes We have no hold over that. Anybody can get up and speak I am afraid we are now driven to the position that the business must be taken up on the lines I have suggested.

Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah (Nominated Non-Official): May I know what is the position about the Bill regarding the duty on rice and wheat?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: The position is this, that that Bill will be taken up after the Finance Bill; and there is the possibility, or rather I should say a fair probability, that there will be no duty on wheat and rice on the 1st April unless the Bill is passed by that date.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Sir, the Honourable the Leader of the House objects to a change on the ground that there may be a discussion. I can assure my Honourable friend that there will be no discussion this time. It will take not more than the reading of it and no further. If he does not desire to accept my suggestion, of course we have no control, but I think it is only fair that a reference from the Council of State should be disposed of as early as possible and that the appointment of a Select Committee for this Bill should be allowed with this assurance from all sides of the House that I will merely read out the Resolution passed by the Council of State and mention the names of the Members of the Select Committee.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is it a very urgent matter?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: It is an urgent matter, Sir. It is a pity that I am not allowed to use three minutes of the time of the House on a matter connected with a community that never comes up before this House with any legislation or any question of their own or for their own interests. This is the first time this is done, and I regret to find that the Government should now object (Loud Applause.)

I understand, Sir, the Government still objects?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Well, Sir, I still object, because, although I know my Honourable friend honestly believes that the thing will be over in three or four minutes, we have some experience of how such assurances are kept, because my Honourable friend has no control over other people.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): May I ask the Leader of the House whether Sir Joseph Bhore's Bill is proposed to be taken up, after the Supplementary Demands? (*Voices*: "No, no.") What is the position?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: The present discussion will continue, then there will be the Supplementary Grants, then the Finance Bill.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair finds in the List of Business two motions in the names of Mr. Tottenham and Sir Joseph Bhore. Then comes the Supplementary Demands?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That is the agenda. If No 2 is called today—there is no possibility—if No. 2 or No. 3 are called today, we do not propose to move them. I only wanted to give notice to the House as to what would happen.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thinks, the Honourable Mr. Satyamurti wanted to know—whether these two items will come after the Supplementary Demands.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Sir, let me once more explain that we are going on with the discussion on the motion for consideration of the Finance Bill. That is No 1. No. 2 will be the Supplementary Grants. No. 3 will be the Finance Bill. No. 3 will be the detailed consideration of the Finance Bill.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Nos. 2 and 3 come after the Supplementary Demands and the amendments to the Finance Bill?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Nos. 2, 3 and 4 are transposed.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): They will not come on after this consideration?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That is so.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: On a point of order, Mr. President No doubt it is open to the Governor General in Council to intimate to the Secretary of the Assembly the order of business. Now, once he has done it, and the Secretary has arranged that business and the agenda has been circulated, I submit it is not in the power of anybody to change the order of business, except by a vote of this House; and I submit also that it is a question of convenience. Government have no right to give notice to us that they will take up business on certain dates and then change it. I invite your attention to the rule on this matter—the arrangement of the business so far as the Government business is concerned.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What is the rule?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Rule 22, Standing Order 8:

"On days allotted for the transaction of Government business, the Secretary shall arrange that business in such order as the Governor General in Council may direct."

That has been done Your Secretary has arranged the business and he has circulated the agenda to us. Once that arrangement has been done, the Governor General is *functus officio* so far as this matter is concerned. He cannot come in and say, "I will now again change that order of business" without the leave of the House. But it is open to my Honourable friend to move here that that order of business be as follows: "that items so and so shall be taken up after items so and so".

Sir Lancelot Graham (Secretary, Legislative Department): No, no.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: My friend, Sir Lancelot Graham, says 'no, no". He is not yet the President of the House, and I suggest that it is the inherent right of this House to arrange its own business, which is placed before it. Once the Government have placed that business, they have no further right of interferring with that business, and I ask you, Sir, as the custodian of the privileges of this House to uphold our rights and see that this is not allowed to be done by the Government.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Sir, nobody is disputing the effect of Standing Order, No. 7. But there is no provision under which we can be compelled to move No. 2. Just as, on a non-official day, if several of the different motions are not moved and a particular motion was allowed to be taken,—that is what will happen. If No. 2 is called on now, for instance, well, somebody gets up and says he does not move,—so I made the statement in order to give the House an idea of what will happen, so that there may not be any question of surprise. There is no power, I submit, to compel us to move, if we do not want to move.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: You cannot compel me also not to move. I may point out to the Honourable Member that he cannot compel me not to move. (Loud Applause and Laughter.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable the Leader of the House has stated a general proposition that Government cannot be compelled to move any particular motion on the agenda. That is perfectly correct. But if the Government Member does not choose to move any particular motion, would not the effect be that he cannot move it again?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Sir, I should say he can, but when that situation arises, I shall ask for your ruling.

Mr. H. P. Mody (Bombay Millowners' Association: Indian Commerce): Sir, can you not give us three minutes today at the end of the proceedings?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair shall consider the point of order raised. The Chair does not think the situation will arise, because the further consideration may take the rest of the time; if it does not, then the Chair will give its ruling today. The Assembly will now resume further consideration of the Finance Bill. Before that, the Chair has to make an announcement regarding the election of Members to the Committee on Public Accounts.

ELECTION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have to inform the House that the following Members have been elected to the Committee on Public Accounts, namely:

(1) Mr. B. Das,
(2) Mr. S. Satyamurti,
(3) Prof. N. G. Ranga,
(4) Dr. Thein, Maung,
(5) Sir Muhammad Yakub,
(6) Mr. J. Ramsay Scott,
(7) Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan, and
(8) Bhai Parma Nand.

STATEMENT LAID ON THE TABLE.

NET EARNINGS OF CERTAIN NEWLY CONSTRUCTED RAILWAY LINES.

Mr. P. R. Rau (Financial Commissioner, Railways): Sir, I lay on the table a statement, giving the information at present available as to the net earnings of certain newly constructed railway lines, during the financial year 1933-34, and a comparison of the return given by these earnings on the capital outlay with the return anticipated in the original estimates.

Statement showing net earnings during the Financial year 1933-34 of new lines opened after 1st October 1927 throughout for traffic for a full year.

Serial No.	Name of Project.	Working railway.	Gauge.	Mileage.	Date of opening.	Net income creditable to the project for 1933-34.	Percentage return of income (Column 7 of capital outlay).		Estimated percentage return of income on capital outlay some years after opening as estimated originally.	Remarks.
							8			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1932-33.	1933-34.	9	10
						Rs.				
1	Chittagong—Nazirhat	A. B.	3′ 3½″	22·97	17-3-30	13,639	0·14	0·60	8·50	
2	Chittagong—Dohazari	A. B	3′ 3½″	25·05	10-6-31	—55,761	—0·24*	—1·06	8·50	* Revised figures.
3	Feni—Belonia	A. B.	3′ 3½″	16·88	1-12-29	—27,361	—2·05*	—1·91	5·80	
4	Furkating—Badulipara—Jorhat	A. B.	3′ 3½″	42·28	1-8-28	1,61,615	5·78*	4·70	7·00	
5	Karimganj—Lungai Valley	A. B.	3′ 3½″	39·45	1-1-29	30,174	0·18*	—0·86	5·50	
6	Netrakona—Mohanganj Extension.	A. B.	3′ 3½″	17·55	1-4-29	29,734	0·95*	1·43	9·60	
7	Shaistaganj—Habiganj—Balla.	A. B.	3′ 3½″	25·29	1-12-29	61,948	3·12*	2·86	6·47	
8	Senchoa—Mirabari	A. B.	3′ 3½″	30·25	20-4-30	68,593	1·60*	3·05	13·0	
9	Sibsagar—Khowang	A. B.	3′ 3½″	38·79	10-11-27	72,486	2·85*	2·08	7·00	
10	Mashrak—Thawe Extension	B. & N. W.	3′ 3½″	39·32	12-1-31	78,393†	2·56†	3·34†	6·00	† Excludes net earnings of existing lines from new traffic interchanged with new railway.

11	Raipur—Parvatipuram Section.	B. N. . .	5′ 6″	242·14	31-3-22	14,45,485	2·6	2·95	5·40
12	Boriavi—Vadtal . . .	B. B. & C. I.	5′ 6″	8·71	18-4-29	53,519	17·42	23·77	5·00
13	Jambusar—Kavi . .	B. B. & C. I.	2′ 6″	17·87	1-8-29	27,653	5·03	3·47	8·00
14	Samni—Dahej . . .	B. B. & C. I.	2′ 6″	24·72	1-3-30	20,246	—0·76	2·02	8·90
15	Vasad—Katana . . .	B. B. & C. I.	5′ 6″	26·61	1-9-30	2,85,037	11·15	13·11	8·00
16	Heho—Shwenyaung . .	Burma. .	3′ 3½″	11·25	2-5-28	—13,626	—0·61	—0·48	6·00
17	Kayan—Thongwa . .	Burma. .	3′ 3½″	10·80	5-12-28	—16,548	0·73	—1·08	10·75
18	Myingyan—Paleik . .	Burma. .	3′ 3½″	68·86	13-1-30	—21,845	—0·11	—0·31	5·50
19	Nyaunglebin—Madauk .	Burma. .	3′ 3½″	11·06	15-8-29	80,354	4·18	6·00	3·37
20	Taungdwingyi—Kyaukpadaung.	Burma. .	3′ 3½″	71·82	17-7-30	41,796	0·0012	0·38	6·00
21	Abdulpur—Nawabganj .	E. B. . .	5′ 6″	57·02	10-2-30	—1,50,000	—1·07	—1·06	6·20
22	Baruipur—Lakshimkantapur	E. B. . .	5′ 6″	23·26	15-12-28	—37,000	—0·34	—0·88	7·00
23	Dinajpur—Ruhea . .	E. B. . .	3′ 3½″	47·80	8-5-28	3,30,000	4·30	9·69	6·50
24	Kalukhali—Bhateapara .	E. B. . .	5′ 6″	53·08	1-3-32	—2,70,000	—3·24	—4·58	5·00
25	Purnea—Muriganj (with branch from Banmanki to Beharigan j).	E. B. . .	3′ 3½″	51·98	1-10-29	2,29 000	2·61	7·10	6·50
26	Tangla Rangapara . .	E. B. . .	3′ 3½″	52·50	6-2-33	1,36,000	‡	3·18	0·68§
27	Chandpur—Bijnor Muazzampur Narain.	E. I. . .	5′ 6″	37·00	5-1-30	84,776	5.47	2·61	6·10
28	Lucknow—Sultanpur—Zafarabad.	E. I. . .	5′ 6″	136·00	25-5-32	—6,05,884	‡	—5·24	5·80
29	Unao—Madhoganj . .	E. I. . .	5′ 6″	48·60	21-12-30	24,7	1.96	0·61	6·30

‡ Not available.

§ The Government of Assam have agreed to pay the actual loss incurred working the railway for an indefinite period subject to a maximum of Rs. 1,75,000 each year, provided that, if and when the line yields a return of over 5 per cent. on its capital cost, the balance will be utilised in repaying any sums that may have been paid under guarantee.

Serial No.	Name of Project.	Working railway.	Gauge	Mileage.	Date of opening.	Net income creditable to the project for 1933-34.	Percentage return of income (Column 7 on capital outlay).		Estimated percentage return of income on capital outlay some years after opeing as estimated originally.	Remarks.
							8			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1932 33.	1933-34.	9	10
						Rs.				
30	Agra Bah	G. I. P.	5′ 6″	43·00	10-4-29	—27,632	—1·23	—0·89	6·30	
31	Dharwa—Pusad . . .	G. I. P.	2′ 6″	42·65	15-12-31	38,985	1·03	1·13	6 81	
32	Cocanada—Kotipalli . .	M. & S. M.	5′ 6″	27·08	1-11-29	—1,80,854	—3·04*†	—4·25*	6·00	* Calculated on capital expenditure only excluding interest during construction.
33	Guntur—Macherla . .	M. & S. M.	3′ 3½″	79·03	15-1-30	1,36,306	4·40*†	2·08*	5·25	† Revised figures.
34	Gudivada—Bhimavaram .	M. & S. M. .	3′ 3½″	40·60	17-9-28	1,24,026	2·32*†	3·05*	6·61	
35	Nidadavolu—Narasapur .	M. & S. M. .	5′ 6″	47·16	3-2-29	2,37,054	3·49*†	3·46*		
36	Kamlvihalli—Swamihalli Extension	M. & S. M.	3′ 3½″	11·74	15-3-28	1,65,162	58·20*†	43·53*	‡	‡ This line was sanctioned for construction on the assurance that a minimum output of 35,000 tons of manganes ore annually by the Sandur Mining Company would be enough to guarantee the railway against loss
37	Amritsar—Narowal . .	N. W. . .	5′ 6″	39·11	6-5-29	6,92,624	6·95	10·03(c)	5·50	
38	Chak Jhumra—Kishab .	N. W. . .	5′ 6″	70·47	12-3-32	11,17,403	2·59	6·42(c)	6·00	
39	Jassar—Shakargarh Chak Amru.	N. W. . .	5′ 6″	20·97	21-12-27	90,849	3·72	5·51(c)	6·00	

40	Lyallpur—Jaranwala . .	N. W. .	5′ 6″	20·75	3-12-27	—14,456	—4·72	—0·91(*c*)	5·48	
41	Rohtak—Gohana—Panipat .	N. W. .	5′ 6″	44·01	15-5-28	1,53,829	—7·47†	6·00(*c*)	6·33	§Loss to the extent of Rs. 20,000 guaranteed by local Government so as to obtain a return of 5·5 per cent. on capital outlay.
42	Shahdara Narowal . .	N. W. .	5′ 6″	40·33	21-12-26	98,575	5·50†	3·33(*c*)	4·84§	
43	Sind Left Bank Feeder Railways.	N. W. .	5′ 6″	164·49	10-12 31	1,81,874¶	1·25¶	2·02¶		The annual loss in working the Sind Left Bank Feeder Railways was estimated at Rs. 4,60 lakhs during the first 5 years after opening and Rs. 2,63 lakhs after the first 5 years of opening for traffic. To recoup the loss the Government of Bombay will pay a fixed Rs. 4 lakhs annually for each of the first 5 years and thereafter the actual loss in working subject to a maximum of Rs. 2 lakhs per annum. ¶Includes a guarantee of Rs. 4,00,000 payable by the Bombay Government.
44	Kangra Valley . . .	N. W. .	2′ 6″	103·00	1-4-29	58,591**	0·58**	0·18**(*c*)	5·50**	**Includes a guarantee of Rs. 4,00,000 payable by the Punjab Government.
45	Cuddalore Vridahachalam .	S. I.	5′ 3⅜″	35·59	21-6-28	1,00,552††	3·08††	3·77‡‡	††	††The line was considered unremunerative but the District Board of South Arcot, who were interested in it, have expressed their willingness to guarantee the Government of India against loss, if any, arising out of the construction and working of the line.
46	Dindigul Pollachi . .	S. I. . .	5′ 3⅜″	75·10	19-11-28	4,44,585‡‡	6·25‡‡	5·44‡‡	9·44	‡‡ Excludes net earnings of the existing lines from new traffic interchanged with new railway.
47	Madura Bodinayakkanur .	S. I. .	3′ 3⅜″	55·94	20-11-28	1,06,449‡‡	3·97‡‡	1·98‡‡	8·73	
48	Pollachi Palghat . . .	S. I. . .	3′ 3⅜″	33·45	1-4-32	1,67,074‡‡	1·54‡‡	3·13‡‡	5·20	

Serial No.	Name of Project.	Working railway	Gauge.	Mileage.	Date of opening.	Net income creditable to the project for 1933-34.	Percentage return of income (Column 7 on capital outlay).		Estimated percentage return of income on capital outlay some years after opening as estimated originally.	Remarks.
							8			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1932-33.	1933-34.	9	10
49	Salem Mettur Dam . .	S. I .	5′ 6″	23 20	15-4-29	Rs. —13,336‡‡	3 00‡‡	(*d*) 0·12‡‡	4·75§§	‡‡ Excludes net earnings of the existing lines from new traffic interchanged with new railway. §§The estimated percentage return took into account a maximum payment of Rs. 41,000 to be made good by the Madras Government against loss.
50	Salem Attur Vriddhachalam .	S. I. .	3′ 3½″	82·58	17-8-31	20,250	0 39	0·24	5·90	
51	Shoranur Nilambur . .	S. I. .	3′ 6″	41·35	26-10-27	(*b*) 35,682‡‡	(*b*) 0 33‡‡	(*b*) 0·45‡‡	4·00(*a*)	(*a*) The estimated percentage return took into account a maximum payment of Rs. 1,39,000 guaranteed by the Madras Government against loss. (*b*) Includes maximum guarantee of Rs. 1,39,000 from the Government of Madras. (*c*) Decrease in working expenses due to write back in accounts of certain depreciation charges. (*d*) The fall in earnings is due to the completion of the Mettur Dam, resulting in considerable drop in traffic.
52	Villupuram Trichinopoly .	S. I. .	3′ 3½″	109·00	1-2-29	8,57,635‡‡	5·45‡‡	4·26‡‡	6·50	
53	Trichinopoly Manamadura Chord.	S. I	3′ 3½″	94·22	1-7 30	3,73,377‡‡	5·05‡‡	3·30‡‡	5·37	

Dr. Khan Sahib (North-West Frontier Province: General): Sir, I thought that my golden opportunity was slipping away, but I am glad that it has come again, and I shall be able to lay before this House the case of the Frontier which has been either neglected or misrepresented in this House. Sir, the Frontier Government, whether wisely or unwisely, has always sent a nominee to represent their point of view and cloud the real issue, and now the people of the Frontier have been given a chance to send me to this House, so that you may know the other side of the picture. Sir, as long as I retain my seat in this House, I shall never shrink from the duty of making my protest—no matter how powerless it may be—against the wicked crime of official terrorism perpetrated on the people of the Frontier. But before I proceed, I should like to draw the attention of the House to my speech on the last occasion which, fortunately or unfortunately, created such a flutter among the opposite Benches. I was surprised that the Honourable Members, who are the holders of the power, were extremely un-nerved, and the Leader of the House, in the intoxication of his battle against the Congress barbarity, called my language vile and violent.

Now, Sir, I am sure, there has been no cause to justify the extraordinary behaviour of the Honourable Member with the exception that he might have been dosing, which privilege he often enjoys in this House, and must have been dreaming of the Kabuli moneylender with a big stick demanding his pound of flesh. I mean that nightmare of the Calcutta Anglo-Indians which the Honourable Sir Henry Gidney so graphically described the other day in this House, and when, suddenly roused from his slumber, he saw me speaking, and, without any thought, imposed upon the House the mysterious confusion between appearances and realities which bewildered him at the time. There is no doubt that my criticism is a strict investigation of what the work is good for and the exposition of all evils existing in the present administration. This may appear a strange novelty to Honourable Members who occupy the Treasury Benches, because they are not accustomed to be told what their duty is. But, Sir, if we go on drumming into them the necessity of a healthy criticism, I am sure, they will get accustomed by habit to the new life. I shall always consider it my special duty to place before the House a true and honest picture of the situation and will request the Honourable Members to judge the case on its merits and never to be led away by the exploiter's slogan, that though true, it is not done. That is the mentality which can only be forced on the faint hearts and cannot fit into the present-day scheme of our life. Sir, it is a unique argument of the Honourable the Leader of the House to justify the misdeeds of his Government by citing the sins of the Congress organisation, and he is always prompt to mention the name of Mahatma Gandhi in connection with Congress condemnation, but he restrains himself to follow his example and own up to the infamies and absurdities of this misguided Government. Whatever Congress may do, this Government is responsible for the administration of this country, and if the Honourable Members of the Government cannot stand the strain of criticism, they should make some other arrangement for their livelihood instead of draining the taxpayer's pocket.

Now, Sir, the Honourable the Finance Member, whom I do not see in his seat, said that I was inconsistent. I accused the Government of

[Dr. Khan Sahib.]

sluggishness on the one hand, and, on the other hand, I prevented them from going on with their forward policy. Well, Sir, what is their forward policy? Is it for the good of the people or for the destruction of the people? Sir, the forward policy they have been carrying on for the last 80 years, and what is the outcome of it? The outcome of it is the drain on the treasury of this country? Millions of rupees have been spent and we still have to go on spending. Now, if the Honourable Member means by forward policy to create a split between the two sections of the Afridis and make them fight amongst themselves, that will never bring peace to the Frontier. Moreover, all the money which the Government have earmarked to be spent in that place will go into the pockets of fortune hunters and to those who attach themselves to the Political Officer on the Frontier, and whatever portion is left will go to one section of the community in order to create hatred among the Afridis and then to make them fight against one another. Well, Sir, they have tried this policy for the past eighty years, and we all know the vast sums of money spent by the Government under this head. If the Government really want friendship and reconciliation, I say they must appoint some straightforward officers of their own. I myself offer my service without pay and without remuneration, and I will carry on the work on the Frontier in such a way that only one-thousandth part of the money spent now will be required for me to carry on my work there. This money is quite enough to bring about reconciliation and friendship among the Frontier tribes. I am also sure that the House will never grudge to vote one thousandth part of the money now allotted for that purpose and this would also enable the Government to save vast sums of money which are now spent by them on fortune-hunters and other interested people.

Now, I come to the question of the raids on the Frontier. I submit that these raids are never committed by the tribal people. The raids are committed by outlaws who run away from this country into the independent territory, and I think, in many cases, I cannot say this for certain, there are rumours that the police are shareholders in their loot.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon (Sind: Muhammadan Rural): What about the watch and ward?

Dr. Khan Sahib: I have dismissed all of them. I have left all of them to you. There is no watch and ward.

Now, Sir, I come to the Army Secretary. I wonder what he will think of me when I say that I am not standing for Indianisation. I am standing here for the absolute removal of all army from India. In my opinion, an army is an instrument of violence, and that is the instrument which oppresses the people for the sake of the exploiters. Therefore, we do not want engines of oppression like the army. We want to create peace, and as long as you have in this country that instrument of violence, namely, the army, you can never have peace. However, for the sake of argument, I will say something about Indianisation. Now, the Army Secretary says that Indians have never had enough experience to be able to command. The other day, the name of a Pathan in this House was mentioned, and that man, it was said, led his regiment and regained the ground which was lost during the Great War in France, and, for this deed of bravery, that

Pathan was awarded the V C., the first of its kind ever awarded to an Indian. Well, Sir, those who know something about the army know full well that if a V. C. is given to an Indian and that for the first time, then surely he must have done something meritorious to deserve it. During the War, this fact was recognised, namely, that all the young officers who were put in command did their work far better than the old people who really want rest and who cannot, on account of their age, move about quickly to do their duty. The example of that Pathan is before us. I will give another example. I am sure, the Army Secretary knows that when the Russians came to power, who were their officers? All young people. Who were the men who organised all those military trains and defensive trains? It was Trotskey who has never done any field work as an army officer. The Russian army was officered by young people. Who were their opponents? The famous Russian General Kolchak, Denikin and Kharkove, and the English army, the French army, the American army and the Japanese army. Who won in the end? The young people of Russia won notwithstanding all the gigantic forces arrayed against them.

I will now come to the Foreign Secretary. I should never have been surprised if the Finance Member, the Law Member or the Commerce Member or the Home Member had mentioned the expression "distinguished civil servant" in connection with the man whom I referred to in my speech the other day. I was not only surprised, but I was grieved because the Foreign Secretary, notwithstanding the fact that he knew everything about this civil servant, he should challenge my statement and characterise my statements as wrong. Why should he not call me a liar? Even if he had called me a liar I would not have sought the protection of the House.

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe (Foreign Secretary): On a point of personal explanation. I never said that any Member of the House was a liar. I merely asked for your protection for a distinguished public servant who was then being attacked in this House.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not recollect if any Honourable Member of the House used that word. If he had used that word, the Chair would have at once pulled him up.

Dr. Khan Sahib: I say he must call me a liar if I am making any statements in this House which are not true. The Foreign Secretary knows that all that I was saying in this House was correct and yet he asked for protection from attack for that "distinguished civil servant". What we want in this House is a true statement of facts, we do not want false answers. If we want to have peace and friendship in this House, if we want to have good feeling among all the Members, it must be based on truth and honesty. (Hear, hear.) I want to refer in this connection to one point which would go to show the real mind of the Political Department. At the time of the Disarmament Conference in London, Sir Henry Wilson, the famous Field Marshal, said:

"It is amazing to see the frock mind. In St. James palace is sitting the League of Nations, their principal business being the limitation of armaments. In Downing Street is sitting the allied Conference of Lloyd George, Millar and Nitte and a Japanese who are feverishly arming Finland, the Baltic States, Poland, Roumania, Georgia, Azarbajan and Persia."

[Dr. Khan Sahib.]

How can you possibly expect that disarmament will take place, because, on the one side, there is a disarmament meeting and just a few yards from it is another meeting to arm people. That kind of duplicity, we want to remove. Let us remove all falsehood, let us have correct answers in this House, and, in that case, we will have real understanding and we will be true friends, otherwise it is an impossibility.

I am sorry that my Honourable friend, Colonel Gidney, is not here. I must thank him for reminding me about the Pathan moneylenders. We are all against all moneylenders whoever they may be, whether they are Pathan moneylenders, or English moneylenders or Hindu moneylenders. Whoever they are, we are against them. They are the people who draw the life blood of the poor people. We are against them, and we request the Government to remove all the Pathan moneylenders from this country and send them to their own country. They cannot run that profession in their own country. They have run away from their Frontier homes, they are more or less outlaws. They come here, and when they go back to their homes, they never even tell their kinsfolk that they were doing moneylending business while they were out here in these parts. If they say like that, they could not even live there. I say, why not remove these Pathan moneylenders who are always terrorising the people? We do not want anybody who is a terror to society.

An Honourable Member: What about other moneylenders?

Dr. Khan Sahib: Yes, my remarks apply to all the moneylenders. At that rate you too will have to go away if you are carrying on moneylending business

Now, I come to another point which was referred to by an Honourable Member, I think he was from the Punjab. There is a great misunderstanding about this subject. He referred to the attempt on the life of the Governor of the Punjab by Hari Kishen, a man belonging to the Frontier. He was a Frontier man, and we, on this side, are against terrorism, and the man did something against the law and he was hanged for it. There the matter should have ended; but do my Honourable friends know what happened to his family? What was the fault of his poor old father who was arrested and put in chains,—not only in iron fetters, but handcuffed too,—and died? I do not see why the father should be punished for the sins of his son. Then, his brother, Jamnadas, who was in Government service, was dismissed. Bhagat Ram and Iswar Das are his two other brothers. One of them was sentenced to eight years and what was his fault? A letter was written by a society, which was called the Shamsher Society, and they caught hold of him and said that although he did not write the letter, he had induced somebody else to do it. And no proof was brought before the Court. You can imagine the justice that is done on the Frontier when I say that the man was sentenced to eight years imprisonment, though he was released afterwards on appeal. Bhagat Ram and Iswar Das are still confined to their village. They are not allowed to go out of the village, and, apart from that, every week they have to go to the Mardan police station, under police guard, seven miles away to report themselves. Now, if you are keeping two C.I.D. people and one policeman to guard them,—the policeman is a free boarder and lodger;

he gets free food and lodging there,—what is the necessity of reporting to the thana every week? That is the sort of thing we protest against and not against the hanging of Hari Kishen, because, if I do anything against the law, I must be prepared to abide by the judgment, but my children and relations should not be punished for it.

Now, Sir, one word to the District Magistrate from Bengal. He gave me an idea that there must be something in the transmigration of souls, because he is still living in the glory of the good old Mughal Emperors or all the Emperors. I suppose he is all the time sitting in his bungalow and thinking that he is one of them. Instead of wasting his time on those ideas, it would be far better for him to go out and mix with the people who are his own people, because he is a Bengali himself, and thus learn the true state of affairs.

Now, I come to the Peshawar firing, and let me tell you at the very outset that that was done by the military people and four military columns were organised. Now, Sir, you all know about the Peshawar firing, and I am not going to take your time by telling you about that. I will only mention one thing. When the Peshawar firing was going on, I did not have any help to look after the wounded, could not cope with the situation and I thought, it would be far better to co-operate with the civil hospital people. The doors of the city were closed, and the first time I took one or two patients there, the police were kind enough to let me out,—but they said that, the next time I brought any patients, they must have an order from the District Magistrate. I went to the place where firing was going on, and when I approached the District Magistrate, he was frightened and said that he could not give me the permit so long as the riots went on. I told him there were no riots, but only useless firing on account of which the people were dying, and, as I could not cope with the work, I wanted permission to take them to the civil hospital. He said he could not do anything until the riots were over. And, then, I lost my temper and told him that he was not going to do anything until everybody was dead. I left the place, and while going through a side street, I found that although there was no procession, a young boy was shot. They were shooting in the streets, and I was not alone when this boy was shot, there was another doctor with me. I took him along with me, they shot at anything they saw.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must remember that the House cannot discuss any particular incident in detail.

Dr. Khan Sahib: This is done by the army and it is a Central subject.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member cannot discuss the details.

Dr. Khan Sahib: I am telling you what they have done.

This was on the 23rd April, 1930. Then, unfortunately, a child was accidentally shot by a soldier. It was a pure accident. A procession over the funeral of that child was allowed, and that child was the son of a Government servant. But while the procession was going on with that little child in the arms of a man, they fired on that procession. And why

[Dr. Khan Sahib.]

this firing took place? Not because anybody threw a stone, because they cannot show me a single person who did it, but simply because the man who was in charge of the shooting party had one eye and he did not care whom he killed. There was no District Magistrate in charge. They never do their duty, and that is why these things take place.

Now, Sir, at present there are no political activities on the Frontier, because you all know that civil disobedience has been withdrawn, but many of the Khudai Khidmatgars are arrested under the manufactured plea of helping the absconders. As I cannot discuss it in detail, I cannot tell you all about this. Then, in the Frontier, there are several young men who are still under those Ordinances which are only fit for terrorists. They are confined to their houses and *mohallas*. There is a lady, named Shrimati Niki Devi, who has been all along under restraint orders; and when she was ill she wanted to come to Delhi for treatment. They refused, and now also she cannot go anywhere although they cannot prove anything against her. Then, there is the case of Maulana Abdur Rahim: he was released when he had finished his sentence, or because his father died; but that gentleman is still under a restraint order and he is not allowed to go outside the city for treatment, because the Lady Reading Hospital is outside the city: apart from that, he asked for a passport to go to the Haj as he is a very learned man and a very religious man, but they refused him a passport. 500 young people were arrested under section 109 in 1932 and 1933, simply because they went from one place to another to visit their relations. All the arms have been collected from the people—not the Khudai Khidmatgars' because they keep no arms—I am the representative of everybody here—all the arms have been collected and no money has been paid or at least only a very small sum has been paid, and not the proper price.

There is another matter to which I should like every one to listen very carefully. When they started this terrorism in 1932, red dolls were dropped from aeroplanes, and with every doll they had a little pamphlet attached, stating "Where are your Khudai Khidmatgars? Where are your red shirts? What can they do now?" Can you possibly expect from any civilised Government that they would spend money on spiteful things like that?

In the village of Sukar, people were beaten with thorny bushes: this is very difficult for some to understand: they did cut out a stout branch from trees covered with thorns—they cleared one end of the stick to be used as a handle and then they beat the people with it. In the village of Tehkal, Arhab Jumma Khan who was a Government servant was arrested on the 25th December, just because he was the father of a Khudai Khidmatgar. His son was in jail and they dismissed the father from Government service and kept him two months in jail for nothing, and then they released him. Two other pleaders from Peshawar were also arrested who had nothing to do with this movement, simply because they were our friends: they were asked to give a guarantee which they refused, and for seven months they were kept in jail without anything being supplied to their suffering families and children and then they were released. In the villages of Thur Dhir, Murghus, and Bhushkale, they tore off the clothes of the people and made the Khudai Khidmatgars naked before the women in order to provoke them to commit violence. In the village of Amazu Garai there is a Bukhu *Mohalla* where they looted the houses and beat the

children, and tortured the president of the village Congress to give the names of the Khudai Khidmatgars, and he told them there is no need to ask, that for the mere asking all the Khudai Khitmatgars will come out; and 300 Khudai Khidmatgars came out and were treated very badly . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has already reminded the Honourable Member that he cannot discuss details of these incidents, for the simple reason that there is nobody here to answer the Honourable Member: these are local incidents and cannot be answered here.

Dr. Khan Sahib: This was all done by the army. The other day, in the other House, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief was very proud of his army for perpetrating all these acts of terrorism on the Frontier: he mentioned it with pride. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): So long as the Honourable Member confines himself to observations on general features of the Frontier Administration, there may be no objection.

Dr. Khan Sahib: Then, in the village of Manarai, they maltreated the people. I am not mentioning cases of people who have gone against section 144: all that I have never mentioned. These are people who were either in their houses or offices of the Khudai Khidmatgars. In Akhura, four teeth of a man were broken and a little boy was taken to the *thana* and kept there for eight days and beaten to say that he would not become a Khudai Khidmatgar, but he would not say it and ultimately he was let off. In Bannu, village Kakai, after arresting the leaders, they looted the houses, brought out their tea sets and utensils and broke them and threw them into the *nullahs* and took away the *ghee* for their own use. The same thing happened in Barath and Kujri. In Tehsil Tonk, in the village of Pai, they arrested the leaders and then imposed a fine of Rs. 500 on the people and they wanted the money on the spot: they collected all the cattle and were taking them away, when Khan Bahadur Abdur Rahim Khan, who is the Deputy President of the Frontier Council, came and paid the Rs. 500 and the cattle were returned. In another village Gul Imam, they did exactly the same thing. Then, in Bannu, they brought in military carts one thousand Khudai Khidmatgars and put them in an electrically wired camp, and it was the month of January, and very cold on the Frontier—those who have seen the Frontier only can know what the cold is like there—and they were given only one blanket and half a pound of gram a day for their rations: they kept them in these camps for three days, and one poor old man—Haq Nawaz Khan—contracted pneumonia and died. . . .

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham (Army Secretary): On a point of order, Sir: the Honourable Member is continuing to give instances of what happened several years ago, to which he must know that no Honourable Member in this House can give a proper reply without referring to the local officers.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would ask the Honourable Member not to recite these details of incidents which occurred some time ago.

Dr. Khan Sahib: It is their duty, Sir, to find out these things and answer them. . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has already given a number of instances: the Chair thinks they will be quite enough for his purpose. This is a general discussion on the consideration motion of the Finance Bill.

Dr. Khan Sahib: All right, Sir. I will now come to the jails. About the Peshawar jail, in 1931, there were some complaints in the papers, and the Inspector General took me there. I do not suppose I need describe what I saw there, but I can tell you this, that he was convinced that what the jailor was doing there was wrong: he told me that the jailor was a bad fellow: afterwards he wrote to me a letter that I should not make any statement about what I saw in the jail; but, as soon as I was arrested, he issued a statement and attached my name to it. I do not know whether the letter is there, because the police came and took away everything from the house and that jailor has been promoted.

Then, Sir, there is one point to which I should like to draw the special attention of Honourable Members of this House. In the course of conversation, the Inspector General told me that my brother was an enemy of the Government. I asked him, why? He answered, that he lectures and tells the people that the Inspector General made a major into minor for tuppence. Well, Sir, I do not think that my brother is the enemy of the Government. All my brother wants is to help the Government to remove corruption.

1 P.M.

Now, Sir, I shall take the case of the Haripur jail. There, for four or five months about four or five thousand Khudai Khidmatgars were given only one blanket each in the months of January and February to cover their bodies with, and in the month of Ramzan, they had to keep their fast by taking one *chapati* every other day. (*Cries of* "Shame, shame" from the Congress Party Benches.) There is another thing which I should like to mention. In the Haripur jail, a prisoner who was convicted and who had iron fetters and handcuffs was shot at inside the cell, and that action was taken for a disciplinary purpose. I ask this House, is it human to shoot a man with his arms tied down, and locked inside a cell? (*Cries of* "Shame, shame" from the Congress Party Benches.) He was then taken in a blanket and shown to the people, and then the District Magistrate wrote a report about it and justified that action. Sir, these District Magistrates think that they are the only people on the face of this God's earth. They cannot tolerate truth, and I will repeat here the saying of a great philosopher, which applies to these District Magistrates:

"Whoever is wise is apt to suspect and be diffident of himself and upon that account is willing to 'harken unto counsel', whereas the foolish man being in proportion to his folly full of himself, and swallowed up in conceit, will seldom take any counsel but his own, and for that very reason because it is his own."

Sir, some Honourable Members suggested that we should co-operate with the police, I am afraid they have not had much experience in such matters. I may tell them a small instance. The District Magistrate in the North-West Frontier Province wrote to a friend of mine, who was Assistant Inspector General of Police and an Englishman too, as follows—I shall quote his own words:

"Your going about with Dr. Khan Saheb is not doing any good to our cause.'

This man was declared as a Red Shirt and was removed from the Frontier and is getting his pension. So the dream of co-operation is useless.

Again, in the Naini jail, one thing really surprised me, and it will surprise everybody. There they have got a system of convict prisoners guarding the brother prisoners, and these convict prisoners have got big sticks. One afternoon, I saw in the circle in which my cell was, a convict prisoner beaten in a manner which I am really unable to describe. One cannot certainly beat a human being like that, it was like the Pathans beating Indian corn on the ground, and that poor man was put in a blanket and thrown aside, but he did not die. Ultimately, they wanted to sentence him to death, because he did not die. Sir, this is how justice is being administered in this country, and when we say all these things, the Honourable Members sitting on the Opposite Benches tell us that they have got no power, it is imposed on them by the Secretary of State.

Then, again, in the Hazaribagh jail, I will tell you what happened Sir, here I may tell the House that it is a great mistake to have a medical man as Superintendent of the jail You should never put a medical man in charge of a jail as its Superintendent, because you give him a double weapon, his executive power, then his professional privileges to certify anything. I will just tell the House how follies are committed by these Superintendents. In one jail, the Superintendent wanted to carry on a search which the jailor did not approve of. Some of the prisoners had razor blades, but the Superintendent had to go away without finding anything with them, because the jailor, in the course of search, put the blades in his pocket. Therefore, I say, remove the medical men who are working as Jail Superintendents, keep proper people in their places. Those were jobs created in the days when there was not a sufficient number of suitable persons to fill those posts. These Medical Superintendents of Jails must be removed and proper persons should be appointed.

Again, Sir, another thing I should like to mention. In the Haripur jail in the Frontier, Abdul Ghafur Khan, the grandson of a Nawab and an undergraduate of the Islamia College, Mr. Ghulam Muhammad Khan, Taj Muhammad Khan and several others were flogged. They brought out my son by force to watch his best friends, the floggers were dressed in red shirts uniform and had masks on them. Why do you mask everything? Why don't you do everything openly? Remove your masks and do everything in the open.

Lastly, Sir, I shall conclude with one sentence. The starving millions of India are the creation of God, and we consider it our sacred duty to emancipate them. We have realised this and have decided to enter fearlessly into the field of the Battle of Freedom, and those who are hesitant and reluctant today will join us soon, for to bequeath slavery to our children is the unpardonable sin to commit. With these words, I resume my seat.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq (Bakargunj *cum* Faridpur: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, so much has been said about the Finance Bill that I don't wish to prolong the torture of the officials on the Benches opposite by going over the ground which has been covered already by so many speakers. I wish, however, to emphasise one point, and if possible to

[Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq.]

bring forward one or two new points for the consideration of the Honourable the Finance Member. The Finance Member is not for the moment in his seat.

Some Honourable Members: Yes, he is in his seat.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: He may be somewhere in the House, but I don't see him in his seat.

Several Honourable Members: He is in the House.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: At any rate, he has not been in his seat for some time.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): He is in his seat.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: However, I think, the Finance Member must have been convinced by this time that official roses are not without their thorns (Laughter), and that once at least, in the course of the year, officials have got to subdue their autocratic instincts and submit themselves to the torture of listening to speeches and criticisms, which, in their heart of hearts, they very much condemn. Now, I wonder if Honourable Members have ever tried to find out why this is so. There can be no doubt that many of the speeches delivered during the last few days on this side of the House might as well not have been delivered, but they were delivered, if I may make a frank confession, merely to drive the officials to despair. Now, Sir, if the officials will for a moment forgive me, I wish to point out to them that, so far as non-official Members are concerned, at least in the present Assembly, they are not satisfied with the state of things that is going on outside the House or in this House So far as things outside are concerned, the situation is fairly serious. The officials by their unsympathetic administration have alienated the sympathies of almost every community in India. They have alienated the sympathies of almost all sections of the Indian population by the pursuit of an imperialistic policy, which is resented by the growing political consciousness of the Indian masses and which is distinctly hostile to those irresistible forces which are inevitably forging the future nationhood of India. Within this House I must say that their conduct has at times been most provoking. Whenever Members on this side rise to speak, these autocrats generally leave their seats, and not one or two, but almost all of them go out. I do not know where, but I am certainly convinced that they have got no reasonable explanation to offer. It cannot be any emergent call, because all of them cannot be seized with emergent calls at the same moment. They want to show by their absence from the House, by their indifference to what we say, that they do not care two brass farthings for our speeches and for our criticisms. If that is their attitude, I wish to tell them that we on our part, either, do not care two brass farthings whether they listen or not. We are going to do our duty and place before the House, not merely for the consideration of Members of Government, but for the wider world outside, that whatever may happen, whether they listen to us or not, we will go on and place before the House whatever we consider to be in the best interests of India and in the best interests of all the communities which go to make up the population of India.

Sir, I must say a word or two about the arrangement of business in this House. There are certain ways in which we can bring up for the consideration of the House questions of public interest. One is by means of questions, another, by means of moving Resolutions, a third, by moving token cuts during the budget and occasionally by moving motions for adjournment of the House. So far as questions are concerned, the answers that are generally given are so evasive and they are so much beside the point . . . . . .

An Honourable Member: And inaudible

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: . . . . and also inaudible, that it is difficult even by the most searching supplementary questions to get the informations which we want. Then, as regards Resolutions, I know that notices were given of no less than about 200 Resolutions, and what the Government did was to set apart only three days for the discussion of non-official Resolutions. Is there any meaning in saying that we have got the privilege of discussing public questions by moving Resolutions, and, at the same time, setting apart only three days for the discussion of 200 Resolutions? Do the Honourable Members on the other side of the House take us to be little children, or are they going to give us concessions like baby soothers, that we may be soothed and may be tempted to say that we have got all that we wanted and that we want nothing more? Let me tell them that we resent their action of this character most strongly, and I say that it is nothing short of absolute hypocrisy to give us the right to move Resolutions and then give us no opportunity of discussing them or moving them in this House. As regards the discussion of the budget, two days are given for the general discussion. Even at the rate of four Members to an hour, we cannot have more than 15 or 16 Members to speak. So far as the Finance Bill is concerned, this is the only occasion on which there is no limit, theoretically, to the number of speakers or to the time which may be taken up by a speaker. . . . .

An Honourable Member: Or the subject of discussion.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: I do not know so much about the subject of discussion, because we have got to be somehow relevant to finance, but, whenever this opportunity comes, more as a matter of revenge than anything else, most of the non-official Members get up and talk on all sorts of subjects in a manner which perhaps the official Members do not very much like.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): We like them very much.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: I do not want any appreciation from the Honourable the Leader of the House, because he himself can well understand that what I am saying represents the exact truth and it is only for the purpose of emphasising the thing that I am referring to it.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Did you remedy all these things in Bengal when you were a Minister? I hope you did.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: In Bengal these things can never happen. (Laughter.) Coming to the Finance Bill itself. . . . .

An Honourable Member: Why so soon?

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: . . . . I want to bring to the notice of the Honourable the Finance Member that one prominent feature of this Bill is that he has kept up the high standard of taxation of previous years. I do not blame him very much for that. The general extravagance of the Government, during the last few years, has been such that it is impossible to cope with the expenditure without maintaining the high level of taxation that has prevailed. Now, this extravagance of the Government of India began really with, what are known as, the Durbar announcements leading to the transfer of the Capital to Delhi, and the expensive outlay on building up a Capital here in the midst of graveyards. The original estimate was about Rs 6 crores and we are told that it has exceeded 15 crores, it is very nearly 16 crores at the present moment, and, as regards the future expenditure, one does not know when it will end. Even if it was necessary to transfer the Capital from Calcutta, I do not see what was the necessity for embarking on such large expenditure in building up structures. Possibly, being in the City of the old Mughals, the British rulers thought that they might imitate them in something. But instead of imitating the Emperor Shah Jehan in all his architectural glories, they would have done better if they had followed and imitated the tolerance of the Mughal Emperors, especially of the great Emperor, Akbar. Instead of that, they tried to imitate. . . .

[At this stage, Mr. Fuzlul Huq resumed his seat as the Honourable the Finance Member was seen conversing with the President.]

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Has the Honourable Member finished his speech?

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: No, Sir.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can go on with his speech.

[At this stage, the Honourable the Finance Member was again seen conversing with the President, at which Mr. Fuzlul Huq resumed his seat.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House stands adjourned till Half Past Two.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Half Past Two of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

[Mr. Fuzlul-Huq stood up to speak.]

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thought the Honourable Member had finished.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: No, Sir. I have not.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Honourable Members are reminded that this discussion has been going on for five days and so the House would perhaps like the debate to be closed today. The Chair would remind the Honourable Member, Mr. Fuzlul Huq, that it expects that he would soon finish his speech.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: I shall not be very long. I shall make one or two remarks about certain points to which reference has been made by one or two speakers, and I shall make my remarks as brief as I can.

When we rose for the interval, I was referring to the extravagance in the building up of this Capital at Delhi. Now, according to the census and other Government reports, there are roughly about 220 millions of people in British India. Assuming that there are about 20 persons in each household, there are about 11 million homes in British India. Of these 11 millions, roughly about 10 millions are no better than mud hovels which have not even got a regular roof on their top. Is it in the fitness of things, that in a country like India, at the present moment, where the homes of 90 per cent. of the inhabitants are no better than wretched mud hovels, that we should have a magnificent building like the one in which we are now sitting, for the purpose of carrying on nothing better than academic discussions which have no real meaning either for the officials or the non-officials? This is not all. When the Durbar announcements were made, the Government very hurriedly built up a temporary Capital to the north of the Metcalfe House in continuation of the place called Alipore Road, costing the general revenues, a few crores of rupees. What was the necessity of abandoning it and building up a new Capital in Raisina? They might have built up a temporary Capital here and might have added one or two structures, but the construction of these buildings have cost no less than 15 or 16 crores according to the Government estimates, and it may be some few crores more before these works come to an end. I am told, to take a single instance, that the structure called the "India Gate" cost the public revenues no less than three or four lakhs of rupees. What purpose is intended to be served by it is a thing which is for the officials to say. I find, somewhere in the sector which is outside this House, small caves painted blue and these luxuries must have cost some thousands of rupees for no other purpose than mere show. Can India afford all this? (*A Voice*: "They do not care".) If they do not care, it is our duty to place these grievances before the House, so that they may be publicly known.

Then, as regards the high level of taxation, to which I have referred, I will not say anything further than this, that the Government of India are not only extravagant, but they are setting a very bad example to the Provincial Governments in the matter of extravagant expenditure of public money. Take the case of Bengal. I am glad that the Finance Member has been able to allocate a portion of the jute export duty to Bengal, but he has done so with a condition which, I submit, was utterly uncalled for. The Honourable the Finance Member has reminded this House that when a promise was made by his predecessor to allocate a portion of the jute export duty to Bengal, it was expected that the Bengal Government should do all that lies in their power to balance their budget. One can understand what that means. It is never expected that the officials of the

[Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq.]

Bengal Government would balance their budget by cutting down their own salaries. The only other way in which the budget could be balanced would be by the imposition of fresh taxes, and, as a matter of fact, to tell the Bengal Government to balance its budget is a very broad hint to embark on new items of taxation. Now, I submit that the money should have been handed over to Bengal without any condition whatsoever, at least by the present Finance Member. He is well aware that in the report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee, paragraph 260, on page 167, the following remarks occur:

"The particular instance of export duties requires special mention, since it is proposed in the case of the jute export duty that it should be obligatory to assign at least one half of the proceeds to the producing units. We understand that this proposal is made largely in the interests of Bengal, which has undoubtedly suffered severely under the existing plan of allocation and the circumstances are so special as in our opinion, to justify special treatment"

The White Paper also endorsed this view, and, as a matter of fact, the Government of India Bill recognises this principle in clause 137 which deals with the allocation of the export duty. It is there laid down that one-half, or such greater proportion, as His Majesty in Council may determine, of the net proceeds in each year of any export duty on jute shall not form part of the revenues of the Federation, but shall be assigned to the provinces or Federated States in which jute is grown. If that is the position, one fails to understand why the Finance Member should require any schemes of fresh taxation to be taken up by the Provincial Government before they can claim to have a portion at least of the jute export duty, I submit that this was utterly uncalled for, and I charge the Government of India with having forced the hands of the Bengal Government to undertake taxation at a time when the people of Bengal have been taxed to the utmost limit.

I shall refer very briefly to another tax, namely, the salt tax. Some of my friends have suggested that the tax should be abolished altogether. I am not going so far as that, but I would certainly make the suggestion to the Honourable the Finance Member that he should try to earmark the proceeds from the salt tax and the additional import duty on salt for the purpose of incurring expenditure for the direct benefit of the masses of the people and for the development of the salt industry in the country.

Now, there is one word which I wish to say regarding the expenditure on military and the police. A good deal has been said in the course of the general debate on the budget as regards the almost extravagant expenditure in maintaining a military force which is not only unnecessary, but absolutely uncalled for. I wish to draw the attention of the Honourable Members of the Government of India to the opinion of no less a person than Lord Roberts, one of the greatest military authorities England has produced in recent times. Speaking at a meeting in the United Kingdom immediately after his retirement, he said as follows—I am quoting from that speech quoted by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in his book on "Poverty and Un-British Rule in India", page (vii).

"And with still more emphasis he pointed out upon what essential condition such retention of the Indian Empire depended—not upon brute force; but 'however' he said, "efficient and well-equipped the army of India may be, were it indeed absolute perfection, and were its numbers considerably more than they are at present, our greatest strength must ever rest on the firm base of a united and contented India'."

That is what is wanted—not a huge military army, unsuited to the requirements of the time, and entailing a degree of expenditure which the people cannot bear.

Sir, I wish to say a word now regarding the restoration of the salary cuts. Some of my Honourable friends have already pointed out, and I wish also to say that we have got a right of protest against the manner in which, without consulting the opinion of this House, the salary cuts were restored. We do not mind the restoration of the salary cuts in the case of small salaries, say, up to Rs. 200 a month, but such restoration in the case of salaries above Rs. 200 a month was absolutely unjustified. If there was money enough to justify such restoration, that money should have been utilised, not for the purpose of restoring such cut, but, for taking up those schemes for the betterment of the people for which we have been often told that there is no money in the coffers of Government. Instead of doing all that, they restored the salary cuts, thereby making it necessary for the Government to embark upon fresh taxation.

As regards the income-tax, Sir, I do not wish to repeat what has already been said that the taxable minimum should be at once raised to Rs. 2,000 a year and the rates should be lowered.

I do not think I can usefully take up more time, but, before I sit down, I wish to draw the attention of the Honourable the Finance Member to the almost unanimity of opinion amongst the non-official Members, and, perhaps the whole Indian public, that it is high time that the postal rates should be reduced, and that we should go back to the one pice post-card of our childhood and the half-anna envelope. There is that story of the Nawab of Bengal, Shaista Khan, who closed the doors of the Dacca City when rice was selling at eight maunds per rupee, and he said that this door should not be re-opened until rice sold again at that rate; and, it was at the time of Murshed Kuli Khan, when rice was selling at eight maunds to the rupee, that he was entitled to open that door. Sir, fourteen years ago or thereabouts, we had the privilege of using postcards which cost a quarter of an anna. (*A Voice*: "Not fourteen—it is earlier than that.") Be it four years ago, it does not matter, but let it be to the credit of the present Finance Member to restore those happy days, and I can assure him that, if he apprehends a loss of money, that apprehension is absolutely unfounded. The volume of correspondence that will increase will certainly make up for the apparent loss that may ensue by lowering the rates.

There is one last appeal which I would make to the Honourable the Finance Member. He may have heard a number of different opinions in the course of the discussion of this Finance Bill, but I would appeal to him to pay particular regard to the remarks that have been made by the Members of the Congress Group. Whatever may be said against the Congress, Sir, there can be no denying the fact that either from choice or from necessity, they really reflect the view of the nationhood of India. (Loud and prolonged cheers.) They really are the one organised party in the country and they represent really the national voice. (Applause.) It is no use ignoring the views of the Congress: and the Members of the Government would be well-advised not to treat the opinions of the Congress with contempt, but to harness in their own service the opinion of persons who have been earnest and zealous and sincere in their labours, for the good of the country, and who have given sufficient proof, by their

[Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq.]

trials and the sufferings which they have undergone, that they are always willing to stand up, not for race or creed or party, but for the whole of the entire population of India. (Loud and Prolonged Applause.)

Mr. Ahmed Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer (Bombay Central Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I should like to first draw the attention of the Honourable the Finance Member to a Resolution moved by my father in the Council of State in 1926. He moved that the interest accrued on Savings Banks and Government securities which is not claimed by the Mussalmans on account of religious susceptibilities should not be confiscated by the Government, but should be handed over to charitable institutions. The Government of India accepted the proposal and invited the opinions of Muslim bodies No action was, however, taken on the proposal. The Government did not deposit the money in a separate account. Even the amount under this head has not been calculated year after year. I have reasons to believe, Sir, that the amount of unclaimed interest on the deposits of a Mosque fund in Bombay amounts to several lakhs of rupees. A large number of persons invested the money in Government securities, not so much for the purposes of income, but to assist the Government during the Great War and they did not take any interest and this interest is now absorbed in the general funds of this country. I take this opportunity to impress that all unclaimed interests on Savings Banks, Government securities and also the Imperial Bank, which is a semi-Government Bank may be deposited in a separate Fund whose administration may be left to a small committee of the Legislature I object that the expenditure of this amount should not be made by demanding public opinion about the choice of the institution to which this amount may be paid. Every institution would like to have a share in this amount It is evident that every institution cannot get it But the Committee of the Legislature will be in a position to advise the Government as to the best use of this amount The Muslim Members of the Assembly and the Council of State are quite competent to lay before the Government the manner in which this amount may be spent. I take this opportunity to emphasise the fact and I will continue to take the opportunities on other occasions to emphasise that the amount which is left unclaimed on account of the religious susceptibilities of the Mussalmans should be calculated and deposited in a special account, and the Finance Member may make a reference to it in his annual report.

If I remember aright, the amount was calculated about the time the Resolution was moved by my father. The amount must have been accumulated during the last nine years, and the Mussalmans feel very strongly that the Government should not levy this tax on the Mussalmans on account of their religious susceptibilities A large number of Muslim Waqfs deposited the amount in the Imperial Bank, but they have not taken any interest on it. Such interest should also be calculated and credited under this account. I hope my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, will find out the exact amount under this head and they should not have a difficulty in paying this usurped loan to the proper creditors. Their financial position has now very much improved. *The Muslim Members of the Central Legislature are the proper and natural trustees of this* amount, and we do hope that Government would agree to the reasonable *demands of the trustees of this unclaimed Fund.*

The second thing I should like to press is that all the unclaimed money belonging to the Mussalmans who die in foreign countries or in India and which is confiscated now by the Government should also be credited in the Funds which I am discussing now. A number of Mussalmans die in foreign countries and their property is confiscated by the Government. I suggest that it should not be confiscated by the Government, but should be handed over to the trustees of this Fund. A number of Mussalmans purchase return tickets while going to pilgrimage. They do not use the return half on account of death or some other reasons The passage money for the return journey should be collected from the Government and should be handed over to the Haj Committee to meet the expenditure. This fact has repeatedly been pressed on the floor of this House, but no action has so far been taken on it.

The budgetary position of Government has improved. The Finance Member has shown a balance of Rs. 3,89 lakhs on the 31st March and a surplus of one crore and a half in the estimates of 1935-36, thus making a total of about 5½ crores. In this improved position an allowance has already been made for the restoration of five per cent. cut on salaries. We expected, the Finance Member will remove the surcharge levied in the year 1931 on account of the financial stringency In view of the improved financial position of the Government, the surcharge on the income-tax should have been easily removed, and especially the income-tax on an income between Rs 1,000 and Rs. 2,000. The Government will get only about a quarter crore under this head, but it is realised after giving enormous troubles to a large number of shopkeepers, *ekka* drivers and *panwallas*. Those people are very hard pressed. They in many places have thought that the new tax was a municipal tax and there was a great fight in some places between the municipal councillors and their voters. The poor people thought that it was an income-tax levied by the municipality and it took them more than a year to realise that it was an income-tax levied by this Honourable House and collected forcibly from the people by the tahsildars just like the arrears of land revenue. I take the opportunity to press that on account of the budgetary position: we should remove this tax altogether.

The enhanced rate in postage is another source of trouble to poor people, and I would very much like to emphasise the fact that the price of the postcard should again be reduced to half-anna and the weight of one anna letter should be increased from half tola to one tola. This is a just and reasonable demand, and we hope Government would agree to it.

The excise duty on sugar which was levied as a temporary measure on the ground of emergency has become permanent and has almost killed the infant sugar industry, but the Finance Member has deplorably ignored it in the budget.

With regard to the fall in the rate of the int rest and the fact that Government are able to borrow at a lower rate, I must point out that it is not due so much to the credit of Government having improved, but for *the reasons of the general economic depression* and the shyness of the *capital to seek new avenues of investment. It is the accumulation of large* balances in the hands of banks and investors that explains the cheapness of money. India is today 350 crores more in debt than in 1922-23, and this is the first occasion in history where the deeper a Government or a person goes into debt, the greater are the claims of its solvency and its credit.

[Mr. Ahmed Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer.]

I now refer to a crore of rupees proposed to be given to provinces for rural development which is haphazard and ill-considered. It is merely a counter-blast to Mahatma Gandhi's village industrial movement and merely an item of propaganda to show that Government have a great deal of sympathy to rural interests. Where was this sympathy all these years? India can ill-afford a crore of rupees to be squandered on a scheme without plans and without any details. In the absence of a reduction in the income-tax and super-tax and in the absence of some implicit particulars from Government as to how they propose to spend the crore of rupees and an assurance that it will not be squandered in setting up big secretariats, creating armies of officials and be wasted on useless inquiries and reports which often leave things worse than they were before, the House should oppose the proposal in regard to the so-called rural and economic development and save the crore of rupees to be applied to more satisfactory productive purposes. With these words, Sir, I conclude my remarks.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President, I confess that having regard to the long drawn out debate on the Finance Bill, I am afraid I am addressing a somewhat stale and tired House and I will confess even to a feeling of a staleness in myself. At the same time I think I owe it to myself and to the Party I represent and if I am not attracting too much credit to myself, I owe it even to the Honourable the Finance Member to state some broad principles of national financial policy by which and for which we stand in order that the observations may not be drawn from stray speakers on stray issues in order to represent these disjoined passages to be the lines of national policy as represented by us. For it is not unlikely, that, during the course of a debate of this kind, from a division of offices from the smallest to the highest, between communities, provinces and every other kind of division which can be imagined, claims have been and will be pressed, observations have been and will be made from which it would be entirely wrong on the part of the Treasury Benches to draw any generalisation for the purpose of representing a policy. So long as the position of India remains what it is, this kind of remarks and claims are inevitable, and in what proportion and how they can be met with justice to all is another proposition. Sir, in making remarks on the Finance Bill, though I may be fully at large according to Convention, it is not my desire to be more at large than I can help, in order only that our points of view may be clearly understood and met. I will claim for myself the same liberty from certain amount of doctrinaire economics which my Honourable friend, if he will allow me to call him so, the Honourable the Finance Member claimed for himself. I will also remember, during the course of the observations, the limitation imposed upon us and on other Members of this House that we are within the limits of the Government of India Act, a reminder indeed which is too frequently emphasised. But I will give that reminder according to my estimate, for a better reason than the one for which it was used. The occasion on which I was reminded of the limitations of the Government of India Act was when we were talking of the futility of the majority votes of the House being still disregarded if the Government and their representatives so thought. I am now referring to that in an entirely different context, and I hope for a better purpose. I have read and re-read the Government of India Act,

3 P.M.

professionally and otherwise, but I do not find anything in it which imposes an obligation upon the Government of India to do what they do, *i.e.*, to invariably and constantly and for all time disregard all that we say and all that we vote for. That certainly is not to be found in the Government of India Act. It would be an abuse of the Act, it would be a perversion of the Act. (Hear, hear.) In fact, all that the Act says is, should they differ from us, they have the power, but the Act does not say and I hope the Act will not be used for the purpose of saying that because they have the power, they will use it and abuse it. I shall, therefore, remind both those on this side of the House as well as those who remind me now and who reminded me before of the limitations of the Government of India Act that those limitations do not include the power which is said to be exercised and which is not by any implication to be found in the Act at all. If the Act is designed to any purpose (apart from other purposes which are alien for the purpose of the present discussion), it certainly enables a wise, and a prudent Government who have still some respect left for their own opponents who claim to represent the people that their vote shall not be disregarded, because, it has not been made obligatory so to do. But if they maintain the attitude which they do and if the Government say, because we have the power, we shall use it, then they cannot blame those of us who sit on this side of the House to continue our efforts, not for the purpose of obtaining justice of which we shall then despair, if that view of the Government of India Act is to prevail, but to prevent such injustice as it is possible by a vote of this House At least those are the limitations which I shall bear in mind during the course of the discussion and during the course of the few observations that I propose to make.

That brings me to the description that the Honourable the Finance Member gave as to how I described his object. There are two parts of it which certainly call for a somewhat detailed reply. I did not take part in the budget debate at all, but it was only as introductory to one of the cuts on the Demands for Grants that I gave a short resume of what I conceived to be the true aspect of the budget. But I think the Prophet of Christianity has said, truth very often comes out from the mouths of babes and much more so from the mouth of one of the responsible advisers of the Government of India. I have read his speech over and over again, he does not deny the correctness of the description, but all that he says is that the description is only half correct, because I have not looked elsewhere than his own budget. But to the extent to which he admits the correctness, he must also admit the condemnation, and I will read out to the House in no better language than he himself used for the purpose of the budget. This is how it is described.

Omitting the reference to myself, he says, there is a somewhat malicious analysis of the Central budget in terms which may be freely paraphrased as follows: 45 crores of rupees for an alien army of occupation. Here I must say, I think, that I am spared any further description of that subject, because it is not denied, it is not merely that it is attributed to me as a description, because, at the end of it all, when I read it, there is neither a repudiation nor even an attempt at correction. The next description he gives is, "X" crores for police and watch and ward and other

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

agents of repression. That, I take it, is his description, and I have no quarrel with that either. Next he says, we had so many crores for the bloated agents salaries, of parasites and civil servants. "Z" crores for pensions of retired parasites of the above class and one crore for the welfare of the country. I do not think I could have found a better master for the purpose of giving a more apt description of the budget as it was presented to this House, and I am indeed indebted to the Honourable the Finance Member for the description that he has provided without the correction which he did not dare give us. What he did say was this: that it is a malicious analysis. I have asked myself often the question, as a lawyer, I have been called upon to define what "malice" means. If malice means illwill for a designed evil purpose, then I am quite certain that I should ask to be acquitted of it, but if malice merely represents a reaction on his mind of the bitter truth that his description represents, then I wish to plead guilty to the charge. (Hear, hear.) It is undoubtedly a malicious description in the eyes of those who use the revenues of this country for the purposes for which they are described to have been used. He says that I have done him an injustice in not looking at the budgets of the Provincial Governments in order to see if there was any money found for the purpose of the very large poor man who represents for all practical purposes the great Indian people.

I am happy to have noticed in the newspapers and also overheard a conversation that when Sir James Grigg paid a visit to two villages, it was rather a pity, if my report is correct, that during the course of that visit he also visited a monastery which is somewhat largely, endowed and which might, therefore, give him a false picture of how sometimes the highest class of priesthood manage to live also as parasites upon the poor men whose souls they offer to save no less and no more than those other parasites who are trustees of ours. (Applause.) But when he did visit these two villages, I am quite certain that he saw what a village truly represents and what India, therefore, represents in its seven lakhs of villages. He saw indeed in the felicitous language of my Honourable friend, Mr. Fuzlul Huq, he saw indeed I hope huts with mud walls, just able to stand with either perhaps a thatched roof or perhaps a few straggling tiles if at all—may be neat by reason of their industry and by their habits, but beyond that nothing more. It is quite necessary now to remind him of that, in order only that he might understand that the crore of rupees that he says with which he wishes to begin the reconstruction of India from below instead of the super-construction of India from above which has been the policy of the Government for the past 150 years, he has not only all my sympathy, but all my support. Only if he will apply himself to that task not in the half hearted manner, the word "half" is not appropriate, probably in a millionth-hearted manner in which he has begun during the course of the budget, he will have my full support. He then says: "Oh! there is division in the taxation policy and the expenditure policy of the Government of India". He says if you want to look for self-preservation, look to us, we, who sit here, the Government of India. And if you wish to look at self-development, please go down to the provinces and their provincial budgets. I again ask him and the House a question, what does he mean by self-preservation? If he means self-preservation referring to himself, I think he is again correct,

and I offer him my congratulations upon it. Indeed the best part, if not the whole of the income of the Central Government, is spent for the purpose of the preservation of self that sits on the other side of the House, and it is certainly undoubtedly self-preservation and nothing else, not in order that we only are to be preserved, but in order that they may be preserved, in order that we might just enough be working skeleton and that we may have at least one meal a day in order to be able to pay the taxes. That is the division that he has offered us, and I am glad that he is right in his description. He says indeed rightly that the Government of India's revenues are only intended for self-preservation, whereas they look to the Provincial Governments for self-development. Going to the Provincial Governments for what? In order only to understand whether there was anything, any value in the statements that are usually made in the solacing comforting written statements that are made, in order to see whether there was anything, any reasonable proportion, in fact, any mentionable proportion at all of what are to go towards what are normally described in every civilised country as nation-building purposes. In fact, in every country, they do those things for the purpose of preserving the people and for the purpose of giving them at all events sufficient food, sufficient shelter, sufficient clothing, perhaps just a little education, perhaps just a little leisure in order to make their life worth living. That is the minimum for which my friend would have stood in England. He must have his bread and his butter, his beer and his tobacco and nothing less than that the poorest man's minimum living can ever admit of. Whereas, here, in a country where the poorest man's minimum living does fall short by 50 times of what would be the actual minimum standard of living in his own land, undoubtedly it is comfortable sitting in this House to say that the Central Government preserves itself, the Local Governments give some assistance to the people to crawl on their feet. And, looking to the budget of the Bombay Presidency for the year 1933-34, these are the figures which I found out of a budget of 18 crores and 73 lakhs. The only items that I can find were. Education,—1 crore and 80 lakhs; Medical—48 lakhs; Public Health,—25 lakhs; Agriculture,—25 lakhs. That is the grand total of what the Provincial Governments give and devote for the purpose of the development of the people; in other words, out of the moneys that were raised all that the Government of India have done hitherto is, preserved itself, preserved the country for themselves, and, in so far as the people are concerned, at the end of 150 years of rule, there is eight per cent. barely literate populace in this country. If this is all that they can claim as having devoted their great arts of government for the purpose of the government of this country indeed not even he can congratulate himself that they have done a modicum of the duty by way of the professed trusteeship that they claim for the purpose of the masses of the people of this country. That, Sir, is the first part of his speech in so far as his criticism of my criticism of the budget was concerned. On the first, I submit with respect that he stands self-condemned. On the second, there is little that he has offered. Only he has asked me to look where I did look; and the only result of looking at it was that there is little or nothing in the matter of the advancement of education. And, in so far as actual village life is concerned, I hope the Honourable Member was able to see with his eyes that once you get within the precincts, within the limits of the village itself, there is neither a road nor a street, nor any means of public health

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

nor drinkable water on which money is spent by Government. And if that is what they have been doing for the villages, the seven lakhs of villages of which India consists, all I can say is that the description is not inapt that we live for them, and probably during the course of that process of living for them their parasitical instinct will some day kill this country. And perhaps, if it is to survive this dragging, unendurable existence, I am one of those who are prepared to face a quicker death than the slow bleeding process that is going on. That is the account which they present, sitting here in their offices, of the money which they raise and the expenditure to which they apply it.

I next wish to apply myself to the other problems in their due order. I daresay and I hope it will be admitted that the function of a State, whether it is the Indian State who are the agents of the British Government on their confession, even their function I hope does not begin and end at the administration and the policing of this country. I hope their conception has within it a little larger ideal, a little larger practical realisation of their interest and their duty to the people whom they govern and from whom they draw their resources. If that is so, what is it that they have prepared to do by way of expenditure of the revenues raised from them. The Army Secretary or His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief will say, nothing short of 45 or 48 or 50 crores will do for the matter of an efficient army. And it would have been very much better for the Honourable the Finance Member to say, "I dare not justify what I do, but that is what I am obliged to do". If he came to us in that spirit, we could better understand him; for what do we see? From 29 crores we went up to 55 crores. From 55 crores we have now come to 45 crores; and the comfortable or rather the uncomfortable assurance is given that we must not take it that the military expenditure is stabilised at 45 crores. That is the situation now. With us it is a moral question, a moral question in the sense that the manhood of this country cannot adequately raise itself to its proper height. It is not a question of the personnel, of the mere ordinary soldier; it is a question equally of the personnel of those who command. It is no use indeed asking, as I have constantly heard it asked during the last two months, when will this class or this group be Indianised,—a thing against which I have protested and which ought never to be asked. The answer is as soon as they are qualified. As if the question has ever been approached! And I submit that in the Indian State, whether autonomous, despotic or otherwise, if it were only the interest or exclusively the interest of India, the question is not how soon they will be qualified, but the question is how soon you will make them or allow them to be qualified. That is the only issue. It is not impossible. How could it be impossible? Has any question of the Government of India and the application of its money been considered from this point of view? Here is a country where the honest expert adviser would merely say, "I wish to make the best for it". From the very necessity of the situation, has it ever been asked? Supposing, for instance, the great Englishmen had not arrived here a hundred years ago, does it mean that except where the Englishman resides, the rest of the world is without arms, either in the personnel of the natives of the land or in the personnel of those who govern, command and lead them to success, as if this country had not Sikh officers and generals, Rajput officers

and generals, Jat officers and generals, Mahratta officers and generals, Gurkha officers and generals, Mussalman officers and generals, and as if today the Nepal army has not its own officers generals saluted by the British themselves. It, therefore, really means this that the question has never been approached from the true point of view from which it ought to be approached by those who, if they regard their offices as of trustees, would approach it. Here is a country with resources of every kind, mines, minerals, natural products, agricultural or otherwise. Can we and how soon can we make as much of it as would make this country self-sufficient? It is a test which they refuse to apply. They wish to drive us, in boxing language, merely towards the ropes,, it being taken for granted that we must submit to the period which they have laid down, perhaps a period of eternity. That is not the way in which we are prepared to face the situation. Those of us who stand on this side of the House have this view that it cannot be impossible and shall not be impossible if their vote counts for anything. It is the duty of the Englishman, if he does not regard this as a different country, if he eats the salt from taxing my own people, to regard this question from no other point of view than this. Here are the men, here are the materials,—how soon can we raise and make an army of their own. I may have to submit to the inevitable, I may have to submit to their power and to their dictation, but I certainly shall not admit either the principle or the propriety or the decency or the justice of contrary argument or process. The argument in this House has been, "Oh, there are two per cent. and five per cent. and in some cases it is three per cent". Only this morning, in answering a question which I believe referred to the Air Force or other allied departments, it was said: "Oh, the numbers are not available", and there the matter ended. The truth of the matter is this: that the question has never been regarded properly: here is India's money: here are India's men: here are Indian resources; and here are we as honest servants of India: let us apply ourselves properly to the work: supposing you are asked to equip the army for the purpose of fighting, would you simply lay down your hands and say "Nothing doing"? Would you say "No, we are not in a position to do it"? When you found it necessary, you raised the standing army from 170,000 to 14,00,000 and equipped it properly for the purpose of defence of the empire: if it was possible then, it should have been possible in a lesser period of time if only you had an honest intention, a genuine desire to make of India what it could become. That is the real truth and that is really the criticism.

Coming to the way in which the matter of the raising of the monies is concerned passing from taxation and expenditure to borrowing, on that question the policy for which we stand is this: all books on economics, indeed, testify to one great fact, that if a country must borrow at all, it must, as far as possible, never borrow at all events in those foreign countries who will make the borrowing an excuse to make that a ground of political domination. You will find that from the time of Adamson ,where he has given instance after instance in which, under the excuse of lending money, the time arrives when the preservation of the credit, because money is lent, becomes the next easy excuse for a permanent domination and political and military occupation of that country which is illustrated by the history of this country. Our external debt is in sterling, and here I wish to point out how our finances have been dealt with by our trustees. A time arrived—I am sure, the Honourable the Finance Member can easily

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

ascertain it if he looks into his archives—during the period of the War when the rupee was not tied to the juggernaut's car, but was free and the sterling stood at Rs. 8; and the time arrived, when the amount honestly to the credit of India by reason of the services and equipment and money which we had spent on their account on their own estimates, when the 200 crores which sterling debt represented could have been paid off and cancelled by credit and debit entries. But the time also arrived, unknown to the people how the accounts stood, when one day the Finance Member got up in this House and said "Yes; you have assisted the British Empire more than any other part, more than any of the colonies who had freedom conferred on them, although India has provided 11 lakhs of men and every other form of assistance during the War: you must now make an additional gift of £100 millions out of the generosity and out of the bounty of poverty-striken India". This was followed by another grant of some £46 millions out of which 29 millions were actually drawn; and, computing sterling at the then rate, it was perfectly easy for them to have paid off and be now without any sterling debt at all, but for the fact that £129 millions were made a gift of: but for that gift our credit and our debit on sterling account stood cancelled against each other. But, at the moment when this generosity was drawn upon, nobody knew what was behind this great act of generosity. Of course it was a forced act of generosity which was made in our name: we had no power against it, except on the second occasion when I believe it was voted to the extent of £46 millions: but in so far as the £100 millions was concerned, no vote of this House was taken, not even a formal vote of this House. That is the position at which we stand so far as the finances of the country are concerned; and today I am one of those who believe that it is best as time advances not to incur any debt whatever in any foreign country. Indeed, the complaint has been made that India is a hoarding country; the complaint has been made that every Government loan is over-subscribed: facts are trotted out that the rate of interest in India is going down: this is, then, the Finance Member's opportunity to call out all the resources—what he would call the stale unproductive hoarded resources of the country—in order that we may be free at all events of that claim which will always be made so long as some portion of the sterling debt remains for them to say "We have vested interests in this land, and it is for that purpose that we must keep hold on you". It is couched in different language from time to time, but its ultimate and actual objective and significance is always the same. I, therefore, submit that, in so far as we are concerned we stand for a policy that if and when borrowing is necessary at all, the borrowing should be internal altogether; and the speediest measures should be taken in the speediest period of time to make arrangements at all events to pay off the sterling debt: I do not wish to intervene the issue here or question as to its propriety or its legitimacy or our genuine liability for the same. That is an issue which does not arise in this House.

The next point to which I wish to refer is the manner in which the monetary system of this country is being used. I am one of those who believe that, in the matter of currency and exchange, while to the extent to which it is necessary and always necessary, the stability of credit must always be aimed at, I am not one of those persons who is going to make of that an excuse all the time to manipulate it with a somewhat difficult

and somewhat different and an ulterior motive. Why should we be tied up to a certain definite ratio with sterling? All that we heard from the Finance Minister was an emphatic assertion, without any justification—almost an instinctive assertion when he got up and said "That will never be done". But has he ever attempted to justify it? because he knows in his heart of hearts that such a policy of linking the rupee to the pound cannot, as a matter of economic measure, be justified, cannot, supposing India were to consult her own interests, be justified: let alone the claim of Britain that she is the moral guardian of India: I say it cannot be done if it were the interests of India alone that were to be consulted. But they know that it has one obvious result, and that result has been emphasised on the floor of this House, and that is that it confers some considerable percentage of advantage which may be easily calculated for trading between certain countries. that is the position in which we stand so far as that is concerned.

I shall now come to the question of the export of gold. A good deal has been said on the floor of this House in general terms: the question was discussed by the Honourable the Finance Member in the address he gave to this House in that opening speech: he says, that is the natural flow of this as of any other commodity from one country to another as a matter of voluntary selling. Therefore, he thought it was unnecessary, considering the matter from that point of view, for the Government of India to interfere in this natural flow at all. Taking the issues one by one: what did the other countries in the world do, whatever may be the opinion, the almost unfettered opinion of the Honourable the Finance Member of India? I would prefer to take the actual conduct of principal countries of the world in order to understand its economic consequences rather than merely rely on emphasis. If England feels that it is worth while taking gold, if France feels that it is worth while taking and keeping gold, how can it be that a contrary policy is good for this land? And he asks the question—how is to be done? He said—if an embargo was placed on the export of gold, he would have to buy the gold which people, who are in distress, are obliged to sell, and he has carried out the thesis in this way; then we shall have to issue paper money equivalent to the price of the gold at which the Government would have to buy it, and he stopped at that, because, forsooth, he dared not carry that process of analysis any further, and it is my duty to carry that process of analysis to the next three steps. If ever the State of India was forced to that condition, what is the harm that is going to happen, and what is the gain to be made out of it. If the Government of India had to buy the gold and for that purpose to issue money, the first and foremost thing is that, in so far as that money was issued against gold, it cannot affect the stability either of the monetary or any other credit of this country, because, for the test of this stability of currency, what is it that you have to back it with when you have to exchange it for any kind of metals which you have set up as a standard for the purpose of exchange, so that issuing paper money against an actual accumulation of gold in the hands of the country cannot be an evil at all. In the second place, it will have this great advantage which somehow or other is an anathema to the Honourable the Finance Member,—it will have a tendency to give a certain relief in the depreciated prices of the natural products of this country. He said the other day, and it has been suggested so often, and, therefore, I have taken the trouble of examining this question,—he said that by calling a penny a tuppence, you don't produce wealth. I agree with him in that verbal proposition, but where I disagree with him, I shall

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

presently show. Where the prices of commodities fall, what do you do by calling your penny a half penny? You recover the same sum of money on taxes from the people who have no other sources of paying them except by selling their agricultural and other products. They have, therefore, to pay twice or one and half times the quantity of their produce to pay the same sum of money, in other words, under cover of the same denomination, you recover 1½ times of the taxes, and the bloated salaries become 150 per cent. that is to say, 50 per cent. more than that they really ought to be. In other words, when it suits you, you call a penny a half penny. That is so. He says, it does not matter. I am merely asking what are you taking from the people of India in the shape of taxation that you take? If you take your 86 crores of rupees, you are very glibly comparing that 86 crores with the earlier taxes of previous years. It is an entirely unfair, uneconomic, unjust and a veiled form of imposing 50 per cent. additional taxation. But that can be endured, but a little rise in the internal prices of the commodities cannot be endured. He says that is inflation. It is a dangerous experiment. That is his economics; at all events, so far as we are concerned, though perhaps we may not have the right and the authority so to do, we are speaking with a considerable amount of knowledge, with a considerable amount of restraint, and we dare put to test, if we had the right and the authority and the power to do so. President Roosevelt can be laughed at in the comfortable and irresponsible atmosphere of this House, but his results cannot be wiped out from the United States. He is a responsible man,—I hope he is certainly much more responsible than the Honourable Sir James Grigg. ("Hear, hear" from the Congress Party Benches) He represents an infinitely wealthier, infinitely stronger, infinitely more educated class in his country compared with ourselves and yet he has dared to try that experiment, and he thinks he has given relief to his people. His people think they have got relief, and yet we are to be governed and tutored by a doctrinaire economist who comes and says: "You will not try that experiment, I will not let you try that experiment so long as I stand here professedly in your interests". Sir, I have never heard such a grotesque statement. A man, may be my adviser in my pay for the purpose of looking after my economic situation, says: "I will not try an experiment, I will not let you try that experiment"—because I know he is in that strong position, and because he knows I cannot displace him. But that position cannot last long, that sort of arrogance cannot last long They may call us futile. Indeed, we are futile,—I agree with what my friend, Mr. Fuzlul Huq, said—we are futile in the votes that we are giving. You may be quite certain, whether you accept them or not, every single refusal that you make means you are digging a grave for yourself. (Cheers.) I know that no amount of ridicule, no amount of contempt, no amount of facile easiness will ever quench the sincerity and earnestness of our people to take charge of these new affairs. We are those who dare put to test the theories for which we stand if only we had the right and the power to do so, and all that we call upon you to do is this,—if you must serve us, at all events, serve us, but do not serve another country from which you come. At all events, that is the honesty, that is the standard, that is the economics, that is the application which we always demand from you, and those of us and those of my other friends who belong to this land need make no other appeal to them at all. Therefore, I say that checking the flow of gold from this country is not going to do the least harm to India; but it will have the result, in a small measure, to relieve the fall in the

commodity prices today, and, remember, if you are honest in framing your budgets, you must attune them to the conditions of this country in which the people are very poor, in which the people can only pay taxes from what they grow on their land in so far as land revenue is concerned. In so far as all indirect taxes are concerned, you are really by maintaining the same nominal amount of taxation increasing the taxation by 50 per cent. and yet the military Moloch is not satisfied even by that. We are told: "Don't think that we are going to spend over the bloated services, no, no, but we must have our cut restored". But may I ask the question—if the prices of commodities have gone down 40 per cent. could you not bear even a five per cent. cut in your salaries? (Shame, shame.) Suppose you were true to your salt would you say this, "Let us take from the country its real equivalent of taxation and at all events release the rest for the benefit of the people"; at all events every man, who serves this country on salaries above Rs. 200, ought not to find himself in any difficulty whatever if he surrendered back to the country what belongs to the country and what the country cannot pay.

That brings me next to the question which my friend, Mr. James, often asked—what about the exports and imports? Sir, I am one of those who believe,—and I am also in a position to put it to the test had we the power and the opportunity to do so,—I am one of those who believe that India is a country which can be thoroughly happy. It need not be wealthy, but it can be thoroughly happy being entirely self-sufficient to the extent to which you will allow it to be self-sufficient. I am one of those who do not believe that the inflation or increase of exports and imports,—that is the usual phraseology employed in the Annual Reports,—is a necessary indication of the prosperity of a country at all except perhaps a highly industrial country. I daresay, and I admit as an ordinary proposition of economics that we cannot always pay those in gold by importing more than what we export, in other words, in the normal course of trade, the two must balance as reasonably as possible. That proposition is not denied, but what is denied is that the increase of exports and the increase, therefore, of imports do either or both of them taken together necessarily indicate the prosperity of a country. For it is easy if you look at the exports,—and I will give you the figures which I have got here and show you what it is possible to do.

An Honourable Member: What is this Book?

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: This is the Indian Year Book, and I am using the figures which are authenticated. But it is not so much the figures which I am concerned with, but to test the issue whether it is necessary at all to test the prosperity of a country by what is called the increase of imports and the increase of exports. In a country like India, which can have enough internal trade, it is not at all events necessary, except, as I have said, for the purpose of paying an obligation that I cannot avoid in any foreign country, to export anything at all. And I will deal in a moment with what happens to cotton.

I know I have got here a gentleman who has stated two propositions with a confidence which I think he ought not to have applied to this matter. He said two things, the first thing he always thought of was about the purchase of cotton by two foreign countries, in particular, Japan and England, and he also stated glibly that there was room in this country for

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

textiles from foreign land. I am presently going to deal with his observations, but let me continue the point on which I am now. The point on which I am now is this. Let me first read to you the first six items of imports of this country. Cotton and cotton goods, 1932-33, 34 crores of rupees, machinery and millware, Rs. 4 crores; metals and ores, Rs. 9 crores; oils, Rs. 8 crores; silk, Rs. 4 crores; sugar, Rs. 4 crores; instruments and apparatus, Rs. 3 crores; vehicles, Rs. 3 crores; the rest I do not wish to read, because they are in small dimensions. Which of these cannot be manufactured here? As I have said, it ought to be possible and must be made the policy of this country. Why is it impossible, when, a hundred years ago, we were able to clothe our country, when we were able to export our textiles to other countries—by the mere fact that you have the spinning jenny and the power loom does it mean that we should for all time depend upon you that we should export Rs. 34 crores worth of produce of this country in order to balance our import of Rs. 34 crores worth of textiles? It is perfectly competent to this country to make itself entirely self-sufficient and I do not know where my Honourable friend, Mr. Mody, gets it from—that there is some kind of cloth, for health or for comfort or for what I do not know, which this country cannot produce for its own clothing, that it must go to a foreign land? I leave him to his absurd dreams and still more to his absurd policy? Because what is there in the cloth produced in this country—what quality is it, has it poison in it? What is it that is impossible to do in this country? If we have displaced two-thirds of the cloth already, why should not we be able to displace the rest of the one-third? And here my answer is that it is possible to balance my foreign trade without an export of 34 crores worth of actual raw produce. But I shall be asked the question, and that question also I propose to answer. I ask the question next, but what will you do with your raw products? My answer is twofold. In so far as the raw produce is concerned, I will call your attention again, if you will allow me,—I will read also the heads of principal exports. Jute raw, Rs. 9 crores; jute manufactured, Rs. 21 crores; and it is admitted that so far as 30 crores worth of jute produce is concerned, it is a monopoly of this country and you need not fear that you will not be able to export it. Then, I come to cotton raw, 20 crores worth,—in other words, if what I have learnt—and I have investigated the matter in great detail—about six to seven annas worth of cotton requires nine to ten annas worth of cost in order to make it into a cloth of an ordinary kind. That is the estimate that we get when we ventured to form the Swadeshi Sabha, a little larger institution than the Bombay Millowners' Association, of which Mr. Mody was the President, and from which he has now withdrawn his great protection and he now serves himself in serving in another industry. That is the economics he wishes to teach me . . . .

Mr. H. P. Mody (Bombay Millowners' Association: Indian Commerce): I will tell you all about it later, if not today, on some other day.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: At all events, there is no reason which Mr. Mody can give which any sane man can be convinced of, that cloth cannot be produced in this country—which may be poison enough for him, and I have no quarrel with him, but a good enough cloth which can be produced in this country and avoid this import of 34 crores worth of textiles. If we could do it before, why should we not be able to do it now and why should

I go and enter into a pact, in order that my name may be mortalised or immortalised, in order that . . . .

Mr. H. P. Mody: If the Honourable Member can come to my place, I will teach him economics.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: That is the last thing I want to learn from my friend; he cannot teach me. . . .

Mr. H. P. Mody: I shall deal with that at the proper time. Does my Honourable friend think that he has the monopoly of wisdom?

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: I am not going to give way to my Honourable friend. The point I am making before the House is not personal at all. I regret very much that my Honourable friend, Mr. Mody, should have taken it so much to heart.

The whole point is this. Can we or can we not displace the import of 34 crores here? That is the issue, and if we can, here we have the avenue of being able to keep the raw produce of the country within itself, and I next proceed to answer the question, what will happen to your cotton. I will not now refer to any gentleman by name, so that he may not feel offended. It is quite clear that Japan is buying cotton, and I was told the other day, and that is the kind of threat to which I was accustomed, "Oh, yes. Japan was on the eve of changing its machinery in order to consume American cotton. But, forsooth, in order to oblige India, she purchases a million or a million and a half bales of Indian cotton". I am not one of those who believe that a Japanese or an Englishman for that matter is so charitable as to buy your cotton if he does not want to, it is a theory which I cannot accept, it is so contrary to human nature I am one of those who believe that out of the 20 crores that we export, it is perfectly easy to so adjust, and that is what brings me to my next point, a planned economy of this country, not the kind of economy to which my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant referred, but a planned economy of this country. There is no reason why this country should not plan its agricultural operations in the same way as is done in other country. There is no reason why, if we were able to change to cotton from foodstuffs in the hope of getting higher prices in those times we should not restrict our produce of cotton and use the land for the purposes of produce of food, for, so far as the total produce of food in the world is concerned, the average is not of much use to us. If the food in the world is more than sufficient for the purpose of individuals, so far as India is concerned, the outstanding fact remains that there is not food enough except for one meal for a large part of the population of the country. Therefore, there is room enough for expansion in this country, of the produce of more food to be redistributed within the county itself, and I am not at all terrified by the fact that we shall not be able to export that food to foreign countries. In fact, I do not wish to do so. I am one of those who believe that our foreign trade should be so balanced that we shall be able to produce as much of manufactured goods in this country as we can so as to enable us to prevent our raw produce being exported outside. Therefore, I am not at all frightened by the idea as to what will happen to our imports and what will happen to our exports. It will be the

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

business of those who are in charge of the State to see to it, if cotton is produced in quantities which cannot sell. In fact, even the State would not be required. Natural economics would adjust themselves. If cotton cannot be sold at a remunerative price, people naturally would not be so foolish as to leave their land fallow, but they will certainly cultivate in the same land food which at least they could eat. In fact, I will go further and say that I am one of those who believe in the answer that the Honourable Mr Gokhale gave to the Welby Commission:

"I would rather have my land fallow than cultivate it for my neighbour's benefit."

I have not the time to analyse projects like the Sukkur Project and other projects which are intended to increase the production of the country, but the question is how much of it remains here for the person who grows it, for you have got to provide for the 30 crores which have been spent, the machinery that has been bought and the skilled labour that has been applied to it. You have, therefore, to provide out of what grows, in addition to the land revenue, for the purpose of the annual interest and the ultimate sinking charges Take it from me that so far as we are concerned, we stand here for a policy of self sufficiency. We are not of those who believe that it is not at all necessary for the purpose of the true advancement of the country that its exports and imports should necessarily swell, but they should be so adjusted as to make India thoroughly self-sufficient which it has the capacity of doing by reason of the manifold products of every type that this country can produce. We stand for the nationalisation of all the key industries and of the utility services of this country. We maintain that position and we are proud to maintain that position If private industry tries to squeeze the consumer, it will be the duty of the State, if the State is right, to protect him and to provide the service at the minimum reasonable cost and without any profit If the State acknowledges that it is incapable or inefficient in its management, it is the State's acknowledgment of its own effeteness with which I am not concerned I am thinking of a State which believes in itself, and that brings me last within the few minutes that are left to this discussion to this question of planning.

I congratulate my friend, Mr. Milligan, and entirely agree with him in the observations that he made during the course of the cut motion which my friend, Mr James, moved before this House. I may not agree with him in all the details and in the reasons that he gave, the only reply that he got from the Finance Member was that he was a Socialist I would rather be a Socialist with Mr. Milligan than a free trader with the Honourable Sir James Grigg. That is the position that I take up and we say all the time that it is the business of the State to so reconcile the interest of the consumer with other interests as to bring about an all round development of the country. We have often heard a specious argument, sometimes in this side of the House, but largely on the other side. When it suits them, the consumer's head is brought out, when it suits them, the industry is brought out, and it is difficult to understand which one they are going to bring out at the next opportunity. In our opinion, and in our judgment, there is no real antagonism between the two. It is the duty of the State to co-ordinate the two—a kind of duty which on a larger canvas might well be found written into the beautiful

speech of my friend, Mr. Milligan. We stand here for a policy of discriminating protection, but there is one more amendment to that policy which ought to be added. That policy does not include any new industry at all. So far as I read it, I am content with that policy if my reading is not incorrect. In the larger interests of the State as a whole, it is essentially necessary that the consumer should tax himself and that is what happens in many countries, and now I shall turn to a few remarks of the Honourable Sir James Grigg.

Turning to the subject of industries, he said that the world's desire was for national self-sufficiency and if my friend is right, then I hope that everything that I have said ought to be right. If we stand for national self-sufficiency, do not other countries also stand for national self-sufficiency from the point of view of the consumer? If by reason of a conflagration a country should find itself in the miserable condition of being cut off from its food supplies, would it not be justified in taking every possible step to be self-sufficient within her own borders? That must be the aim of every country, much more so in India. Here is the money that we raise from the country and it should be possible to say how it should be spent so as to make for real development of the country and not simply preserve the country for other lands. The latter cannot be the object; that ought not to be the object, but if that is the object, we are quite right in saying that such a policy is unsound and such a budget cannot stand the test of any popular vote in any Assembly whatever. (Applause.)

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I move that the question be now put.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not think there is any other speaker. The Honourable Member can begin his speech.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Before I begin my speech, perhaps I might lay on the table a declaration by the Governor General in Council, under Section 67-A (7) of the Government of India Act, regarding certain demands refused by the Assembly:

"In pursuance of Section 67-A (7) of the Government of India Act, the Governor General in Council is pleased to declare that the following demands which have been refused by the Legislative Assembly are essential to the discharge of his responsibilities:

Demand	*Amount.*
	Rs.
1—Railway Board	*8,24,999*
39—Army Department	*4,30,999*

(*Cries of* "Oh" and "Shame" from the Opposition Benches.)

Perhaps I might start by expressing my agreement with the Leader of the Opposition on perhaps the only point on which I shall agree with him, and that is the natural tendency to staleness at the end of a debate which has lasted for nearly a fortnight. Though it may be presumption on my part, I should like to say that he showed very little evidence of staleness—in his manner at any rate. I might now go on to his remarks

[Sir James Grigg.]

on my analysis or my account of his analysis of the budget. It certainly showed an entirely new method of controversy. I described in certain terms his analysis of the budget and he then attributes them to me and says I have admitted his argument. I never heard of such a method of controversy. As he challenges me to deny the accuracy of his argument, in order to make quite certain that there shall be no misunderstanding at all, I repeat that his analysis was malicious and I say it, for the first time, nevertheless, quite definitely, that not only was it malicious, but it was misleading and unfair and I certainly do not wish to have attributed to me the remarks which I was attributing to him and his friends For the rest, the Leader of the Opposition gave us one of his political propaganda speeches in which he is such an adept and which we have by now learnt to expect on each and every occasion, however appropriate or inappropriate it may be But, as a great part of it had nothing whatever to do with the Finance Bill, I must excuse myself from following him into the purely political sphere, but perhaps I might say that during the course of his speech I saw very little trace of that spirit of co-operation which, when it suits the Opposition, they offer, but which, when it does not suit them, they entirely ignore.

Before coming to the speeches which are by now somewhat hoary and aged, I might take up some of his points of detail. First of all, he said, let us make quite certain that we pay off our sterling debt as soon as possible. That is a very praiseworthy sentiment, and up to that point I can agree with him within the bounds of the possible, but the cloven hoof appears later on. He expressly put aside the question of repudiating the whole debt until a more suitable occasion. But the cloven hoof was there, and the issue of repudiation was there quite definitely. Then, he expressed another grievance that the rupee has been linked to sterling, and here I am bound to say that he seemed to me to have one of those agile changes of direction for which he and his Party and his friends inside and outside this House are so skilful He made a complete *volte face*. He complained bitterly that owing to the fact that the rupee had depreciated forty per cent with sterling, the United Kingdom had got entirely fictitious against, say, Germany, which had adhered to the gold standard Well, if that argument means anything at all, it means that his complaint is that the rupee is under-valued But so far as everything else I have read about this controversy goes, the complaint of the Congress Party particularly and their commercial friends—and they have been complaining for years—is that the rupee is over-valued and they have not got a free hand to let the rupee sink as far as it is necessary, until they have made their fortunes

4 P M

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural) We still want it to be left free

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: But the only kind of freedom that is any good to you is that it should go in both directions at once. (Laughter.) Then, of course, we had the usual inflation argument and the usual comments on the obscurantism of one who dares to think that inflation will do people more harm than good and will do the cultivator especially more harm than anybody else. And he said: "Who are you to dare to set up your opinion against the President of the United States? The

results are there for everybody to see! Who are you?" Well, I shall come later on in my remarks upon this subject to the matter of the New Deal.

Sir, perhaps I might now come to the Pandit's speech, and, in the course of that, I shall deal with the Roosevelt plan. I might, by way of a preliminary remark, say that in the course of that not inconsiderable part of the Pandit's speech, which was devoted to mildly offensive personal remarks, he complained about my temerity in daring to be cheerful in a country like India and he attributed my cheerfulness to the fact that I had a profound contempt for "the dismal science". Perhaps I might be allowed here to give the House a story about Dr. Johnson who met an old college friend of his youth and was talking to him about their fates and careers since they had finished living together at Oxford. His college friend said: "You are a philosopher, Dr. Johnson. I have tried, too, in my time to be a philosopher, but, I do not know how, cheerfulness was always breaking in". (Laughter.) So if you substitute economics for philosophy, I can say that too. Well, if this cheerfulness is the result of not being over-impressed by the bewildering nostrums of modern economics, I for one should regard that as an additional inducement not to pay too much attention to these bewildering nostrums, and those who voice them until they sing much more in unison than they are doing at present; and, in spite of what the Pandit says, there are not amongst them such signs and measure of unanimity as would justify us in taking them as infallible guides in this pass of our affairs. Sir, the Pandit challenged me to produce the names of economists to set against those of the exponents of economic planning and he mentioned the following names. I am not going to give them in any order of merit of course. (Laughter.) The Pandit mentioned the following names:

Mr. Keynes,
Sir George Schuster,
Mr. Lloyd George,
Sir Arthur Salter,
Sir M Visweswaraiya,
Mr. Darling,
Mr. Harold Laski,
Lord Allen,
Lord Passfield.

Apart from the fact that only one, or at most two, of these are economists in any strict sense of the term, I accept his challenge, and I produce Prof. Lionel Robbins (who the Pandit appeared not to have read of, but if he has not read his book called "The Great Depression", I will lend it to him.)

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I have no intention of reading books of men below thirty-two.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: He is older than that.

Then, I will produce Dr. Benjamin M. Anderson, of the Chase National Bank of New York. I have got some of his remarks here, if the House cares to hear them.

[Sir James Grigg.]

Then,—I shall produce Monsieur Charles Rist of the Banque de France, and the whole French School of Economists. They are all against this "planning" business. Further, I read in the *Sunday Statesman* of two weeks ago a review of two new books. The first was "Collectivist Economic Planning", by Professor Hayek, who, I believe, is the great luminary in the modern economic firmament, and the second is "Economic Planning in Soviet Russia" by Professor Brutzkus, and, if I understand the review aright,—I have not read the books—the attitude of these two authorities towards economic planning, even in its special sanctuary of Soviet Russia, is of the most critical character Perhaps I might be allowed to read a passage. According to Brutzkus

"The success of the Five Years Plan has been of a very meagre and doubtful character. Even in evaluating the considerable expansion of heavy industry it has to be remembered that Russia is still a young country industrially, and that progress under such conditions is easy. In a great many industries, on the other hand, no progress has been made."

While the authors of the Five Years Plan expected to increase the productivity of labour by no less than 110 per cent., actually, however, hardly any improvement took place. The result of the Plan on the agricultural side is to be judged from the fact that "Russia is now no longer in possession of grain surpluses for shipment abroad", while, before the war, the grain exported amounted in value to nearly half her exports. The crops harvested per unit of land have fallen off considerably and the decline of livestock-breeding threatens Russian agriculture from another direction.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: What did Bernard Shaw or Aldous Huxley say of Russia after their visit?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Then, the Pandit went on to point to the example of all the other nations of the world who have gone in for economic planning. Is he quite certain that things are as prosperous as he appears to think? Let me read a passage about the New Deal in America. This is from the *Statesman* of March the 15th:

"The Washington correspondent of *The Times* says that Congress has been in session since January 3 and so far has not passed a single 'New Deal' measure—(*There has been one since then.*)

This would mean little if it meant only delay. It meant danger, however, if it showed that, in American football parlance, the President had lost the ball. It would take more than courage if he were to touch currency in order to stabilize it, yet the present state of the money exchanges and the possibility of serious oscillations are one of many sources of anxiety which now overshadow Washington.

The fate of the National Recovery Administration hangs in the balance and nobody would be surprised if it disappeared as an entity; some of its functions being scattered over other agencies of the Government.

Mr. Wallace, the Secretary for Agriculture, has become gloomier in his public pronouncements.

tration is forced to borrow all the money which it can secure. With the passage of the 4,880 million dollars Works Relief Bill the chickens of the 'New Deal', said one critic today, are coming home to roost."

I will give another quotation from the *Statesman* of the 18th March . . .

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Which *Statesman* is this?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: It is the *Statesman* of Calcutta, but it is quoting from the *London Times*:

"The last two years have seen the passage of many profoundly important laws which have spawned (*I do not think there is much planning about spawning*) thousands of pages of codes, administrative orders, rulings and regulations—so many of these last that the Supreme Court was once moved to request that some guide to their infinite variety be provided. They leave two questions still lacking answer—first, will the New Deal bring recovery; and, second, will the huge costs of the New Deal be paid out of the abundance of that recovery or by resort to inflation?

The fact that these questions still abide, that after two years of amazing activity 20,000,000 people are still on the relief rolls, that the expenditure of billions of dollars has not primed the pump of business is a source of legitimate anxiety, but not the only source. Laws may be admirable codes of conduct, may be fair regulations, may be wise, but it is in the field of administration that their effectiveness is tested. There the New Deal is weak, not so much in individual efficiency and the devotion of its servants, as in the jealousies which divide them one from each other."

I can produce another quotation about the present state of the "New Deal" in the United States. This is a quotation from the *Christian Science Monitor* of February the 4th and is much shorter than the others.

"The desire is still to sell without buying. Until that attitude is changed there is little hope for permanent improvement of American trade."

I gather, and, in fact, I have seen quotations from Mr. Cordell Hull, the Secretary of State, and from Mr. Wallace, the Secretary of Agriculture, who have said very much the same thing in different words. So much for the results of the "New Deal" which are there, as the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition says, for everybody to see. Let us next take Japan which is always held up as one of the prime examples of successful economic planning. If I do not weary the House, I might be allowed to read a few extracts from an article which appeared in the *London Economist* of February the 16th:

" In spite of exchange depreciation, cheap money, Government spending on 'Public Works' and—until recently—a promise that taxation would not be increased. Japanese prosperity is confined to a few large industries, and the main obstacle to more widespread prosperity is the poverty of farmers and the coincidence of low wages with industrial unemployment. (*Here I miss out a sentence or two.*) Thus the prosperity of which Japan boasts is seen to be only skin deep. The depreciation of the yen increased the Japanese manufacturers' costs for all imported raw materials, and it seems fairly clear that in order to offset this increased cost of working capital the manufacturers have improved the 'efficiency' of production. It is, of course, certain, that in many cases there have been genuine improvements in technical and commercial methods, but labour has made a substantial contribution to 'technical efficiency' by working longer hours for less real wages. (*I again miss out a sentence.*) It seems fairly clear that Japan's economic structure has been subject to increasing strains. So far she has suffered all the burdens of imperialist expansion, in the form of increasing public debt, booming armament industries and incipient depression, without as yet reaping any of the economic gains for which she hoped from wider markets and an enlarged area under one economic control. Japan lives today in an atmosphere of crisis, and while this is maintained she will continue to enjoy the paradox of 'prosperity' with a falling standard of living."

The Pandit also referred to the United Kingdom. Perhaps it would be a little invidious on the part of one who was after all until recently an English Civil Servant, and who is continually accused by the Honourable Members opposite of still being an emissary of the British Government to discuss the policy of those who have been his masters. Certainly there have been, as the Pandit pointed out, a considerable number of subsidies

[Sir James Grigg.]

in shipping, beef, wheat, sugar beet, milk, bacon, and so on. Perhaps I can escape from my own dilemma in the best way possible by making a quotation from one of the books of the late Antony Hope where he says: "The oysters are eaten and are put down in the bill" Italy and Germany are other examples of planning but they do not appear to be very happy about it. But, after all, the main example of economic planning is found in Soviet Russia. Russia is clearly the kind of political and economic system that the Pandit hopes to see introduced into India. I am not so sure about his Leader, but, in so far as I could gather on the spur of the moment, his economic structure was not essentially different. As far as the Pandit was concerned, he would allow a little more latitude in the matter of belief in God, but a little less latitude in the matter of stealing another man's wife. But, apart from these two minor exceptions, he finds the Russian system wholly admirable.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: It is much better than your system at present.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Now, we know where we are. The Pandit and his friends want to introduce the Communistic system into India. Here, let me say that I found the speech of Mr. Gupta particularly illuminating in this respect. Although it is probably so long ago that it has passed from the memory of the House, it will be remembered that Mr. Asaf Ali hastened to him and tried to induce him to curtail his remarks. Nor am I surprised that the Leader of the Opposition should find it necessary to give me to understand that he alone was the true exponent of the Congress Party and that anybody else is unauthorised. However, let me give some of Mr. Gupta's remarks:

"Now, Sir, many objections have been raised that the army is costing much. I say that probably if it were my army, it might even cost more, and I would not grudge that. Even a small country like Japan or Germany is probably spending more than what we were spending."

Further on, he said:

"If it were my Government, if he were my Viceroy, I would say 'You have autocratic power, you may hang a man without trial, you may send him to jail'; but India has to be built. Did not Hitler send out one of the biggest men in the world, Einstein? He was turned out bag and baggage within 24 hours. I want my Viceroy to have that power."

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan): I stick to it.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: So, now, we know where we are. For the mild and benevolent regime that now exists, we are to substitute the autocratic sway of a party caucus. Pandit Pant made great play of the agony he suffers now at the thought of the slavery of his people. What his agony will be when a real tyranny is instituted I shudder to imagine. But perhaps he will, under the new regime become a Commissar, he and his friends who are leaders of the Congress Party. They will be completely free while the rest of the 350 millions of India will be under complete subjection. So, now, we know what this battle for freedom means. Freedom for the Pandit and a small number of his friends and complete slavery for everybody else. (Hear, hear.) When Charles II was being exhorted by his very unpopular brother, who afterwards became James II, to take great precaution against the risk of assassination, he said: "They will

never kill me to make you King". Nor do I believe that India will ever forgo the chances which are now open to it gradually to realise self-government within the British Empire for the prospect of the autocracy of a Communistic Congress regime.

Another part of the Pandit's speech was an eloquent plea for large capital expenditure upon the development of India. I wonder whether he or any other of the Members of the Party opposite have any idea of what has been spent by Government upon economic development in the last 15 years. It is customary to belabour the Government for being blind on this side of the needs of India, but how unjustifiable this is can be seen when I say that from capital sources and by Government agency alone 377 crores have been spent in that time. Three hundred and seventy-seven crores in 15 years, five of which at least have been years of crisis when money was almost impossible to come by. Three hundred and seventy-seven crores, apart from all the expediture from ordinary revenue on agriculture, road and other forms of development. Of course, I know that during the crisis programmes had to be cut down drastically, but we hope that we are moving out of that atmosphere of crisis and that we can resume on an adequate scale the process of development in those spheres in which it is legitimate for the State to intervene. Now, let us look at the figures for the coming year 1935-36. The borrowing programme for ordinary capital works amounts to eleven crores nearly. In addition, there is well over one crore on road development to be paid out of the provincial share of petrol duty, between one and two crores on special programme of road development as a result of the Economic Conference that was held at the end of my predecessor's regime, I think, last April. There is about 8½ crores on civil works including roads and bridges, half a crore on works on the various Frontiers. Then, there is about 2½ crores on agricultural development. In addition to all these, there are the special grants provided for in this year's budget of 1,00 lakhs for economic development in the villages, 40 lakhs for special road schemes, 25 lakhs for roads on the Frontier, 20 lakhs for broadcasting, 93 lakhs for civil aviation, 36 lakhs for the removal of Pusa Institute to a more salubrious spot; in all, thirty crores of developmental expenditure undertaken in a single year. Surely, Sir, this does not betoken indifference to India's economic development. But the Pandit may say to me, if you are prepared to spend thirty crores a year on development, what is your objection to accepting my plan? The difference between the two plans as I see it is this. First, the Government confine its development to schemes which can either be paid for out of revenue without increasing the existing burden of taxation, or, so far as borrowing is concerned, to schemes which show a good prospect of being remunerative in the near future. This means that we scrupulously eschew any programme which requires for its financing any inflationary process which will shatter credit at home and abroad. It also avoids intrusion into the sphere which should properly be left to private enterprise and it rejects any idea of accompanying its capital expenditure by the introduction of any communistic system of control. In other words, it recognises, as all sane people will, that you cannot turn a poor country into a rich one in a night or even in a year or so. The process must be a gradual one in which the Government does whatever it can to stimulate the efficiency of Indian producers on which after all the whole process of enrichment depends and, for the rest, it tries to avoid taking short cuts which can only end in greater disaster and impoverishment.

[Sir James Grigg.]

Perhaps, Sir, this would be a suitable point for me to turn aside and with a view to removing certain misconceptions which have arisen, or rather, have been created, to explain in what sense I am a disciple of *laissez-faire*. I certainly do not believe in *laissez-faire* of the old school (Hear, hear) in the sense which allowed employers of labour to exploit women and children and even men by working them for very long hours in unhealthy surroundings. The later exponents of *laissez-faire* were convinced believers later in factory and welfare legislation. They were also believers in the necessity of relieving distress and in education, health services and so on. And so am I. Again, I do not believe in *laissez-faire* to the extent that I deny all necessity of protecting infant industries in a country like India. But I do not believe in burying my head in the sand and of failing to recognise that the protection of infant or any other industries involves, for the time being, a net loss to the country, or that, generally speaking, that loss falls upon the poor, and here, if you think I have got a bee in my bonnet, let me quote a passage from the speech of my Honourable and learned friend opposite:

" . By itself the policy of protection is vicious."

—I think the Leader of the Opposition agreed with that in almost so many words—

"It is what may be called a tax of a regressive type that is, it enables money to flow from the poorer to the richer classes upwards, which is unnatural. The second thing which it does is, it places a premium on inefficiency. The third thing that it does is it enables the State to waste away the funds of the nation by giving them the opium of protection; it tells the people that it is protecting their industry and it has enough money to waste and it creates extravagance. The fourth thing that comes out of protection is the growing inefficiency inside the country, prevents it from facing as man to man other industries and other people in other countries, and whenever those artificial props are removed, the whole order crumbles down again Therefore the policy of protection has its disadvantages. At the same time this policy leads to a certain amount of corruption inside the State."

Well, Sir, if I may say so, without any risk of being accused, as I was accused by the Leader of the Opposition of attempting to patronize the Opposition, that is an extremely illuminating and cogent analysis. To resume the thread of my own arguments after this adventitious aid, the lesson that I would draw is, that in embarking upon any policy of promoting new industries, we should recognise that the policy is only worthwhile if we are sure that the future generations will derive the full benefit, at least of the sacrifices of this generation, if we are sure that the sacrifices of this generation are well within their capacity to bear and if we are sure that the future benefits are not too incredibly remote in time.

Again, I admit it is quite legitimate to undergo a certain amount of economic loss in order to establish an industry the absence of which in time of War would threaten the very existence of the country. That is not in the least contrary to the principles of *laissez-faire*. And, moreover, neither do I say that a general belief in that doctrine which is compendiously if rather inaccurately called *laissez-faire* excludes the public ownership and conduct of public utilities such as railways, electric supply, and so on. My view would certainly not rule out public ownership and conduct of public utilities, but I am disposed to think that the State ownership of the crude form is not the form which will ultimately be found best. I think it probable that the ultimate development

in this sphere should be some form of public utility corporation like the Central Electricity Board to which the Pandit referred with such evident and whole-hearted approval . . . . .

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: With that *laissez-faire*, few can have much to quarrel. You have to define what is not *laissez-faire*.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I will do that presently.

None of these generally admitted exceptions affects my main point which is that over the greater portion of the economic sphere the free play of private interprise is certain to produce greater wealth than any system of Government regulation or interference, however disinterested and however intelligent that interference may be. Certainly that particular form of *laissez-faire* in which I believe amounts to a profound disbelief in any system under which the Government,—which of course in the last analysis means the tax-payer—if that remark also is not of a patronising order—bears all the losses while private enterprise gets all the profits It also amounts to a profound disbelief in any system under which Government keeps the ring closed for private enterprise, by which I mean, that it concerns itself to give private enterprise a free hand to exploit the poor, for, after all, in any country, the bulk of the consumers are the poor In short, I believe that in general the producer should be capable, without any adventitious aid, of providing what the consumer wants at a price which he can afford to pay; and that if he is not, he had better make room for somebody else who is. Sir, I must apologise for having taken up a certain amount of time in explaining what particular form of *laissez-faire* it is in which I believe, and incidentally of having exposed myself to a retort from my Honourable friend opposite that it is not *laissez-faire* at all. But I maintain that this belief of mine is consistent with the Pandit's doctrine that the supreme object of a State is to secure and promote the economic well-being of the people. I do not think his Leader would accept that dictum I think, in so far as I could understand it, his theory is that the supreme business of a State is to ensure that its members live without having any intercourse whatever with anybody outside its borders, commercial or otherwise. Anyhow I agree with the Pandit in this matter and I unreservedly accept that doctrine that the object of a State is to secure and promote the economic well-being of the people. But at the risk of being accused of vain repetition I say that I do not believe that this object can be secured either by the enslavement of any communistic plan at one end of the scale or, at the other, by giving industrialists a free hand to explcit both the consumers and their own workmen.

Now, Sir, I hope my Honourable friend will not think that I have devoted an undue portion of my speech to him.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I am thankful for it; only I do not admit that the criticism is fair.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: It is now time for me to reply briefly to some of the other speeches which have been made during the course of this debate. Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji took up,—so I was informed by one of our more pontifical newspapers,—my challenge to make constructive suggestions which would have the effect of improving the lot

[Sir James Grigg.]

of the poor. Let us see what his suggestions were First, to allow the carry-forward of losses for income-tax purposes. This is in principle a perfectly reasonable request but it would cost a crore of rupees a year and its primary effect would be to help the urban industrialist or trader and not the rural producer or consumer in the slightest degree. I, therefore, having regard to existing needs and past pledges, should put this in a comparatively low order of priority. His next constructive suggestion was that the additional import duty on salt should be perpetuated and, I think, increased. Whatever the course of salt prices during recent years, nobody can deny that the price is now higher than it would be if there were no salt import duty. So this suggestion amounts to helping the poor by taxing him. The third and last suggestion was to retain the export duty on skins in order to ensure to the industrialist a cheap supply of his raw material at the expense of the much poorer agriculturist. So much for his constructive suggestions to help the poor

I then come to two Honourable Members, Mr. Hockenhull and Mr. Bardaloi, who raised the question of Assam and its finances Here, of course, I have a great deal of sympathy with the case made by these two Honourable Members. There is no doubt that the financial position of Assam is deplorable That is universally recognised, and the Joint Parliamentary Committee made it clear that Assam would have to have a subvention from the Central revenues if it was to start its autonomous way with any chance of success So that there is a term to Assam's financial difficulties and that a comparatively short one But, say the two Honourable Members, Assam cannot wait even for a short time. Well, I quite understand that point of view and sympathise very deeply with it, and I have, as a matter of fact, considered very carefully whether it would be possible to deal with Assam specially in advance of the general settlement Unfortunately, however, I have come to the conclusion that it is not. Assam is not the only deficit province; her case differs only in degree from that of some others And, on the whole, I think it is undesirable that she should arouse any inter-provincial controversies for the sake of being put straight one year, or at most two years, earlier. In the meantime, whenever there are Central funds available, as has happened particularly in the case of roads and the Central Road Reserve as fortified by the 40 lakhs grant this year, we are doing our best and, I think in that particular case of roads, succeeding in seeing that Assam secures a generous share of whatever benefits there are going.

I come now to another point of Mr Bardaloi's. He raised an interesting point in connection with the sales of silver, and I think his remarks had reference to the *pronunciamento* or ukase of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce. The Honourable Member disagreed with the Federation in so far as they deplored the sales of silver, and I agree with him and not with them The Reserve Bank will have 50 crores of silver; Government will have another 40 crores or so; and the idea that sales of silver, on the scale now in vogue, will so deplete the reserves available in India that there is certain to be a shortage of silver available for coinage, seems to me to be fantastic, unless the Federation envisages such a rise in prices as can only be produced by a violent wave of inflation *plus* a devaluation of the rupee. Incidentally I might, to illustrate my point, tell the House that the absorption of silver rupees in the five years from 1914-15 to 1919-20, which cover the gigantic inflation of the

war period, the absorption of silver rupees for the whole of that period was only 42 crores and that 36 of those 42 crores came back in the two following years. I said that the idea that there would be a shortage of silver for coinage purposes was fantastic unless the Federation envisages such a rise in prices as only can be produced by a violent inflationary wave. I suspect that this is what the Federation is really after.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): No.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I said I suspect that that is what they are really after; and as I have repeatedly said, in spite of the alarm, despondency or indignation which it generates in the breast of the Leader of the Opposition, Government are going to have none of that.

There was another point in which, however, Mr. Bardaloi agreed with the Federation, and that was in deploring the deflationary effect of the sales of silver which have already taken place, and, I think, Mr. Ghuznavi, supported this view. Here, Sir, I am afraid—apologising for my presumption—I disagree with both the Honourable Members and with the Federation as well. The fact is that they are all wrong in imagining that there has been any deflationary effect at all. And, here, if the House will excuse the "address"—I think that was Mr. Desai's word—I might explain exactly what happens.

When silver coinage is melted down and shipped to London we place in the paper currency reserve *ad hoc* treasury bills to the nominal amount of the silver coinage. When the silver is sold in London we purchase with the proceeds sterling securities to the amount of the bullion value of the silver and cancel *ad hoc* treasury bills in the paper currency reserve to precisely similar amounts. There are still left in the paper currency reserve *ad hoc* treasury bills to the value of the difference: so there cannot be possibly any deflationary effect. I hope that with that explanation I have reassured the two Honourable Members from Assam and Calcutta.

I will next take up some of the points raised by Seth Abdoola Haroon. First of all he repeated his criticisms on the budget estimates and set himself up as a better prophet than me; he may be right; time will show: there are far too many uncertain factors in the world at present to justify dogmatism one way or the other, and, therefore, I can only suggest to the Honourable Member that we should both console ourselves by reflecting on Mr. Bonar Law's dictum that it is no good arguing with a prophet—you can only disbelieve him. That certainly is the fate of both of us. As regards the Sukkur Barrage loans, I think, here too, the Honourable Member from Karachi is labouring under a misapprehension: I will try and make the position clear to him. The original advances to the Bombay Government for the Sukkur Barrage loan were, and are regarded as having been made, out of the proceeds of certain specific Government of India loans which were raised in the market at the time that the advances were being made. When any particular one of those loans is converted, the interest on the appropriate portion of the advance is adjusted accordingly but, until conversion takes place, the original rate of interest must continue to run, for obviously the Government of India cannot lend at less than it costs them. That is why, because there are still unconverted large portions of the loans, which were raised in the years in which advances are made which are still outstanding, some part of the advances still carry high rates of interest. These rates will, of course, come down when further conversions are made. But

[Sir James Grigg.]

in any case I am not sure that the Honourable Member is not being unduly alarmed so far as the new province of Sind is concerned. The alarm, if any, should be on the part of the Government of India, because, it is admitted on all hands that Sind will have to have a subvention for a good many years after it is separated from Bombay.

The only other point in the Honourable Member's speech I wish to mention is in relation to the Kathiawar ports. This is a very difficult and complicated question; and, as I have said several times in the House, negotiations are proceeding upon it. Naturally, it is impossible to give the House very much information while those negotiations are going on; but I may perhaps say, if it is not begging pardon in advance for using a vulgarism —if it is not teaching your grandmother to suck eggs—that there are two aspects of the problem, the first being the inroad upon the revenues of British India, and the second the conditions of competition between the ports in Kathiawar and in British India. Naturally we are doing our best to bear both standpoints before our eyes but I should like to assure Honourable Members from Bombay that the second is in our eyes not one whit less important than the first.

I will now come back to those parts of the Pandit's speech which contained his specific suggestions in connection with the Finance Bill, as opposed to his general political and economic theories He wants the salt duty reduced, or abolished, the income-tax swept away up to Rs. 2,000, and the postage rates on letters and postcards reduced. Of course we shall debate the merits of these proposals during the actual consideration of the clauses of the Bill: so, for the present, I shall confine myself to his suggestions for financing these changes. First of all we assume that the railways are making a contribution of Rs. 6 crores a year to general revenues. We know that they are not, but that does not matter. We then raise the rates of interest on cash certificates and post office savings bank deposits, so that we can borrow more under those heads; and, thirdly, we increase rates of income-tax in the higher reaches, particularly on unearned income and companies. In other words, money is to be raised, partly by an effort of pure imagination, partly by borrowing money at rates of interest which are uneconomic, and partly by increasing taxation. One thing is clear about the new economic planning at any rate, and that is that all old principles of budgeting have been discarded:—No silly nonsense about balancing your budget: no silly nonsense about even thinking in terms of real money. The European Group have been exhorting me in the House and in the press to write up my revenue estimates because they think there is more money there than I do. The Pandit says what does it matter whether the money is there or not. if it is not, it ought to be and there is an end to it. As regards his one comparatively orthodox proposal, that of increasing the rates of income-tax, is he quite sure that his Party consists so exclusively of the poor and hungry that his proposal will receive the unanimous support of the Party caucus? I very much doubt it.

Next, I would like to spend a few minutes examining Mr. Satyamurti's speech. The Honourable Member from Madras's form of economic planning is having it both ways. Nawab Sir Mehr Shah, if I understood his speech correctly (Laughter), called the Honourable Member from Madras an acrobat; and, if one of the characteristics of an acrobat is standing on his head and feet at the same time, the word seems to me to be more than apt. Let me give a few examples of his having it both ways. But before I do

so, I had better analyse briefly his conception of the budget of the future. All revenue from liquor, tobacco and other forms of vice will be suppressed: excise duties on salt, kerosene and sugar and matches will be abolished: all import duties to be raised to a level when there are no imports and, consequently, no revenue: income-tax to be swept away in the lower ranges At a guess I should say that we have now reduced our Central revenue to something like 20 crores. Now, we come to the expenditure side: first of all, we increase expenditure heavily on all the nation-building services, one of which appears to be to send all the urban unemployed into the villages to teach the cultivators agriculture—there was a certain vagueness about the figure here, but I think it was estimated that this would cost 250 crores. Taking these two together, we have probably made a difference of something like 100 crores to our budget. How are we going to get it back? Let me tell you. We knock 20 or 25 crores off the Army, we abandon the provision for reduction . . . . .

An Honourable Member: Reduce your salaries.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: . . of debt, and we make certain increases in the upper ranges of the income-tax, the only point in which the two Leaders of the Congress Party are agreed is the one where they approached most nearly to orthodoxy. By these means we gather together some 30 crores and we are left with a deficit of only 70 crores. This we deal with in the manner of the Ostrich by burying our heads in the sand and saying that it does not exist. Truly, in the sphere of finance, Mr. Satyamurti is even more imaginative than Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant. Now, after that analysis, let us see what Mr. Satyamurti claims to do by his imaginative finance. He says that he will reduce the burdens on the poor. But how? First by sweeping away the excise duties on salt, kerosene and sugar. But he carefully leaves out of account the effect of his other proposals to increase the import duties on salt, sugar and everything else that the poor consume which are bound to cause an intolerable increase of their burdens and at the same time reduce the exchequer to bankruptcy. Then in order to make the assurance doubly sure we will, by currency manipulation, raise internal prices and so increase still further the cost of living of the poor. I know that he will say, and indeed his Leader has anticipated my argument and said it for him,—that it will at the same time increase their income but, as I have said over and over again, I have never known an inflationary movement that did not on balance leave the poor much worse off than before.

Sir, Mr. Satyamurti's method is typical of the early stages of all Extremist Left-Wing Parties. Knowing that they will never have to undertake the responsibility of carrying out their promises or putting their wild cat schemes into effect, they, with bacchanalian abandon, promise everything to everybody. They go on repeating chimerical and gargantuan suggestions in spite of the fact that it has been demonstrated over and over again that they would bring untold misery to the people, the people whom they claim to represent. They go on deceiving the people by telling them that they can all be made rich by a stroke of the pen and they jeer when more sober minded and responsible people . . . . ("Hear, hear" from the Congress Party Benches.)

Some Honourable Members: Like the Finance Member.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: . . . . point out (*Voices*: "Responsible to the British Government") that making a poor country rich is a long and toilsome job. They go on expounding a programme which promises something to everybody irrespective of the fact that many of their promises are mutually destructive. In short, they go on promising, they go on and on, promising what they know to be impossible, secure in the knowledge that they will never have to attempt to implement their promises.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Wait and see—We will displace you soon.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: But let them reflect on, I think it was Abraham Lincoln's words—though it is a little risky to quote Abraham Lincoln in this House (Laughter)—"You can fool all of the people some of the time—("Hear, hear" from the Congress Party Benches); you can fool some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time". ("Hear, hear" from the Congress Party Benches.) And this remark I commend to Mr. Desai especially, in spite of his evident dislike of anybody daring ever to question any of his opinions and in spite of his easy assumption that he alone is entitled to speak for India. (Cheers.)

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Just one word of personal explanation, Sir. I owe it to my friend, Mr. Mody, that I spoke vehemently, and strongly objected to his views, but I never meant to be in the least personally offensive to him. I want him to accept it from me.

Mr. H. P. Mody: I accept this assurance of my Honourable friend, and, so far as he is concerned, the incident is at an end.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the Bill to fix the duty on salt manufactured in, or imported by land into, certain parts of British India, to vary certain duties leviable under the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, to fix maximum rates of postage under the Indian Post Office Act, 1898, to fix rates of income-tax and super-tax, and to vary the excise duty on silver leviable under the Silver (Excise Duty) Act, 1930, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 26th March, 1935.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 26th March, 1935

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

TECHNICALLY QUALIFIED MEN EMPLOYED IN AIRCRAFT AND AVIATION IN INDIA.

1003. *Pandit Nilakantha Das: (a) How many technically qualified men are employed in India in aircraft and aviation (i) military and (ii) civil?

(b) How many in each case are Indians, how many British (including Irish) and how many others?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) and (b) The information is being collected and will be placed on the table in due course.

PERSONNEL OF THE PROPOSED BROADCASTING SERVICE.

1004. *Pandit Nilakantha Das: Is it contemplated that the proposed broadcasting will be manned by Indians? Is there any definite plan for it? If so, what is it?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The immediate developments in broadcasting for which a scheme has actually been prepared comprise:

(a) the appointment of a Controller of Broadcasting;

(b) the establishment of a small Attached Office under the Department of Industries and Labour to deal with Broadcasting; and

(c) the establishment of a Broadcasting Station at Delhi with the necessary personnel.

The Controller of Broadcasting will, it is hoped, be an officer recommended by the British Broadcasting Corporation from its own expert staff and recruited in England on behalf of the Government of India. The remainder of the staff will be recruited in India. It is not proposed to issue rules or orders regulating recruitment at present, as Government are not yet in a position to estimate their permanent requirements.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will it be one of the conditions of appointment of this expert from the British Broadcasting Company that he should train an Indian to take his place within, say, five years?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I cannot commit myself on that point.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know the reason why the Government do not propose to make this gentleman, who is to be recruited from England, responsible for training an Indian to take his place within a specified period of time, say, five years?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The question of future arrangements is one that cannot be considered at this juncture We have to wait and see how matters develop.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: May I know if the appointment of the expert is permanent?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No. It will be for five years in the first instance.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is it one of contract?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Yes

Sardar Sant Singh: Is there any other country in which broadcasting was introduced where foreigners were employed to run the department?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I strongly resent the contention that the British are foreigners in this country.

An Honourable Member: They are

Sardar Sant Singh: May I know, if they are not foreigners, whether they are subjects of India, British subjects in India?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: They are British subjects in India.

Sardar Sant Singh: Are they Indians?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair cannot allow a discussion like that.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: But even economically are they not foreigners?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No.

TECHNICALLY QUALIFIED MEN EMPLOYED IN THE WIRELESS SERVICE IN INDIA.

1005. ***Pandit Nilakantha Das:** (a) How many technically qualified men are employed in the wireless service in India?

(b) How many of them are Indians, how many British (including Irish), and how many others?

(c) What attempts have been made or facilities given to recruit Indians?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: I presume that the Honourable Member desires information regarding the Wireless Branch of the Indian Posts and Telegraphs

Department. It is on this presumption that I have to give the following information.

(a) 183

(b) According to the latest figures available, 92 of these are Anglo-Indians and members of the domiciled European community, 46 are Indians, 44 are Europeans and one is a Burman.

(c) Recruitment to the Wireless Branch of the Posts and Telegraphs Department is made in India either by an open competitive examination or from volunteers from the grade of general service telegraphists. There is thus every facility given to the recruitment of Indians to this branch.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know from the Honourable Member what arrangements are being made to increase the number of Indians in the wireless branch?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: I have already informed the Honourable Member that recruitment is made exclusively in India at the present moment

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: What I meant to ask the Honourable Member was this. The number that he gave of Indians in the wireless is much less, and I want to know what arrangements are going to be made to increase their number.

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: The existing number is due to recruitment in the past. I have already informed the Honourable Member that for the future and at present, recruitment is made entirely in India either by an open competitive examination or from volunteers from the grade of general service telegraphists.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I take it the term "Anglo-Indian" there does not include Englishmen.

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: It includes domiciled Europeans.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: By domiciled European I take it that it does not mean Englishmen who have interests in England.

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: I have already mentioned that there are 44 Europeans.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: May I take it that the men in technical control and management of this department are Europeans?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That does not arise from this question.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Did the Europeans also pass the competitive examinations here?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: Recruitment in the past was not made by competitive examination. It is to be made in future.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: By whom is the department controlled?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: The control is under me.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order Next question, Mr. Asaf Ali

Mr. S. Satyamurti: On his behalf, may I put only No 1007 and not 1006?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I want to put No. 1006, because I also gave notice of the question

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): No. 1006 The Chair understands the Honourable Member also has given notice

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Yes, Sir.

INDIAN AND PROVINCIAL CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS HELD ON *JUMATUL-WIDA* AND *ID* DAYS.

1006. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** (on behalf of Mr. M. Asaf Ali): (a) Are Government aware that the Indian and Provincial Civil Service Competitive Examinations were held on days including *Jumat-ul-Wida* and *Id* in Allahabad and Rangoon?

(b) Do Government propose to direct the authorities concerned to see to it that in future no candidate, Hindu, Muslim or other, should have such grievance?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the reply I gave on the 21st February to starred question No. 404

(b) Full consideration is always shown for the religious susceptibilities of candidates of all communities in fixing dates for the examinations conducted by the Public Service Commission

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is it not a fact that the examinations were held on the *Jumat-ul-Wida* and the *Id*?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have already had a question on the subject which I replied, and I referred the Honourable Member to that reply.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I want to know as a fact whether the examination was held on the *Id* and *Jumat-ul-Wida*?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: May I ask, when the Government say that they always consider the religious susceptibilities of all communities, do they exclude the Muslims from that statement? The Honourable Member just now said that in fixing dates the religious susceptibilities of the people are considered. May I ask whether the religious susceptibilities of the Muslims also were considered?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: If the Honourable Member had read or been present when I gave the previous answer, he would have seen that I stated that it was not possible to forecast on which of the two days the

Id would fall, but full consideration was shown to the religious susceptibilities of Muslims on each of the two possible days on which *Id* might fall by keeping them free for Muslim candidates till 2-30 in the afternoon.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: There may be a doubt about the *Id* day, but there cannot be any doubt about Friday.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I do not think it is possible to arrange that no examination should ever be held on Fridays

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: But this Friday is *Jumat-ul-Wida*, the last Friday of Ramzan.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The previous question did not refer to the last Friday of Ramzan. It referred to *Id*, and so far as I know, no examination was held on the last Friday of Ramzan.

MR. MAHADEO DESAI'S BOOK CALLED "TWO SERVANTS OF GOD".

1007. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti** (on behalf of Mr. M. Asaf Ali): (a) Has Government's attention been drawn to Sjt. Mahadeo Desai's book called "Two servants of God"?

(b) Are Government prepared to reconsider their view about the Khudai Khidmatgar movement in the light of the facts revealed in this book?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) No

(b) Does not arise.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know the reason why Government have not perused this book? (Laughter.)

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: May I know the reason why Government should peruse the book? (Laughter.)

REPORTS REGARDING THE ANTECEDENTS OF CONGRESS AND NATIONALIST MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

1008. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government please state:

(a) whether the Government of India have called for reports from the C. I. D. officers of various provinces or of the Local Governments, regarding the antecedents of Congress and Nationalist Members of the present Legislative Assembly;

(b) whether they propose to compile a confidential book on the basis of these reports for the guidance of Government Members in the Legislative Assembly;

(c) whether this book is in the process of preparation and will be in the hands of Government Members before the close of this Session;

(d) whether copies of this book will be supplied to all the Members of this Legislative Assembly;

(e) the cost of the preparation and printing of the book; and

(f) whether this is the first instance in the history of the present Legislative Assembly when Government prints such a book, and the reasons therefor?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) to (f). As has been done on the occasion of previous general elections, the Government of India asked the Local Governments, and not the Criminal Investigation Department officers, to supply them with a statement giving, for all newly elected candidates, a brief account of their position and political antecedents and showing the party to which they belong. This information is clearly useful to Members of Government The reports received from Local Governments have been printed so that they may be in a more convenient form, and have been supplied to Members of the Executive Council and will be for departmental use, but will not be supplied to Members of the Assembly. The reports have been printed as part of other departmental work, and Government do not see that any useful purpose will be served by obtaining any information as to the cost of printing these papers; no separate account is kept and the cost will not be large

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know the reasons why copies of this book will not be made available to Members of this Assembly?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Because it is a confidential document.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know if Government consider it right that they should have information about us and we should have none about them?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Perfectly right. You have plenty of information about us.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will a copy of this book be placed in the Library at least?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: In the case of wrong information, are we not entitled to correct it?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: We get the best information available.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Are you perfectly sure that is correct information?

Seth Govind Das: May I know by whom the information is given?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Local Governments.

Seth Govind Das: Do Government think that all the information which Local Government give are right?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know what is the information about me in the possession of the Honourable Member?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Honourable Member perhaps takes himself more seriously than I do. Actually I have not read what is said about him.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am very glad to hear that. In that case, may I know why this book is being printed at the cost of the tax-payer, when the Honourable the Home Member does not even read that book?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have read parts of it, not the whole of it.

APPOINTMENT OF GUARDS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1009. ***Mr Ram Narayan Singh:** (a) What are the different grades of guards on the East Indian Railway and what are the methods of their recruitment?

(b) Is the recruitment to all grades direct?

(c) Which is the authority which makes the appointments of the guards, and on what principles and rules?

(d) Are the methods of recruitment and rules regarding them similar all over the line?

(e) What are the various duties of guards, and are they meant to relieve on occasions Platform Assistants and other station officers, and if so, whom?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) to (c). I place a statement on the table giving the different grades of guards on the East Indian Railway. The methods of recruitment will be found in the 'Rules for the recruitment and training of subordinate staff' issued by the Agent, East Indian Railway, a copy of which is in the Library of the House.

(d) Government have no reason to believe that methods of recruitment and rules regarding them are not similar on all the divisions of the East Indian Railway.

(e) The duties of guards will be found enumerated in Chapters 3 to 5 of the General Rules for all Open Lines of Railways, a copy of which is in the Library of the House. Guards are utilised, when necessity arises, in any capacity for which they may be qualified such as Assistant Station Masters, Station Masters, Yard Foreman, Platform Inspectors, etc.

Statement showing the different grades of Guards on the East Indian Railways.

	Rs.
Guard, grade I	100—10/2—120
,, Relieving, grade I	100—10/2—120
Guards, grade II.	30—3—45/5—60
,, Pilot	100—10/2—120
,, Conductor	65—5/2—85
,, Gunner	30—3—45/5—60

OFFICE OF THE MARKETING EXPERT.

1010. *Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: (a) Is it not a fact that the office of the Marketing Expert is attached or subordinate to the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research?

(b) What is the present strength of the staff in that office?

(c) Is it a fact that the Office of the Marketing Expert is located at Timarpur far away from the main office of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research? If so, why?

(d) Are Government prepared to consider the desirability of locating the Marketing Expert's Office in New Delhi, so that there may be proper co-ordination?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) It is an attached office

(b) 19 Executive and 17 ministerial.

(c) Yes. It could not be accommodated in any of the Government buildings in New Delhi.

(d) The matter will be considered again, when accommodation in a Government building in New Delhi becomes available.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: May I know how many marketting officers have been appointed in the provinces?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I have no information about it I have only information as regards appointments made at the Centre.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CONTROLLER OF RAILWAY STANDARDISATION.

1011. *Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: (a) Will Government be pleased to state when the Office of the Chief Controller of Railway Standardisation was formed and what is its present personnel?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is proposed to enlarge the office in the near future?

(c) Will Government please state whether it was proposed at any time to keep the office down in Delhi permanently? If not, will Government please state whether they have considered the desirability of keeping the office down in Delhi in view of its growth?

(d) If Government have decided to treat the office as a moving office, will they please state the reasons for not keeping the office down in Delhi during the summer months?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) The Office of the Chief Controller of Standardisation was formed in March, 1930. The present strength of the office is five officers and 41 Assistants, clerks, draftsmen and tracers.

(b) Yes. It is proposed to enlarge the office from the 1st April, 1935. The addition will be one officer, one Superintendent and 20 Assistants, clerks, draftsmen and tracers.

(c) and (d). The question has been considered and Government do not propose to locate the Central Standards Office permanently in Delhi as it would necessitate re-establishing a technical section and drawing branch

in the Railway Board's office which work is now undertaken in the Central Standards Office.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: May I know if the Railway Retrenchment Committee suggested the abolition of this office?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The Retrenchment Committee did suggest a reduction of the personnel of that office or rather a sort of amalgamation of this office with the Railway Board's office.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What action has been taken on that recommendation?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The action has been described by me.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: It is now made permanent?

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: As a result of the Railway Retrenchment Committee's recommendation, the office has now been enlarged?

Mr. P. R. Rau: It is proposed to enlarge it. The action was approved by the Standing Finance Committee and has been approved by the Assembly in the last budget.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: Did the Railway Retrenchment Committee recommend an enlargement of this office?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No. They suggested an amalgamation of this office with the Railway Board's office.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: In contravention of that, you have now enlarged it.

ATTACHED OFFICES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA SECRETARIAT.

1012. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state what are the attached offices in the Government of India Secretariat, and what is their respective personnel?

(b) Will Government please state whether all these offices move up to Simla, or whether any portion of any of them is kept down at Delhi during the summer?

(c) Will Government state the cost incurred annually in the move of these offices between Simla and Delhi?

(d) Will Government state if they have considered the possibility of keeping down portions of the Government of India Secretariat Departments which can be kept down at Delhi without loss of efficiency? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a), (b) and (c). I lay on the table a list of Attached Offices which shows whether they move to Simla wholly or partly. The rest of the information required is being collected and will be laid on the table in due course.

(d) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply which I gave to Mr. Satyamurti's question No. 721 on March 7, 1935.

List of Attached Offices.

Offices.	Whether moves to Simla wholly or partly.
Office of the Central Board of Revenue	Wholly.
Office of the Controller of Printing and Stationery, India	Partly (only the duplicating staff moves to Simla).
Office of the Chief Controller of Stores, Indian Stores Department	Wholly.
Office of the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs	Partly (only the Camp Office moves to Simla).
Office of the Director of Civil Aviation	Wholly.
Office of the Chief Engineer, Central P. W. D.	Partly (only the Camp Office moves to Simla).
Office of the Public Service Commission	Wholly (only one inferior servant is left at Delhi).
Office of the Intelligence Bureau	Ditto.
Office of the Director General, Indian Medical Service	Wholly.
Office of the Bureau of the Public Information	Wholly.
Office of the Director General of Archaeology	Wholly.
Office of the Military Accountant General	Wholly.
Central Standards Office for Railways	Wholly.
The Supervisor of Railway Labour	Wholly.
Statistical Research Branch of the Department of Commercial Intelligence and Statistics.	Wholly

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is the actual cost involved in the move annually?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I said that the information is being collected and will be laid on the table.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: The Honourable Member said that (c) was being answered in the statement laid on the table.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (c) is not included The information is being collected.

Mr. S Satyamurti: Will the answer to (c) also be laid on the table?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes.

APPOINTMENTS OF THE *EX*-APPRENTICES OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY WORKSHOP, LILLOOAH.

1013. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** With reference to the unstarred question No. 16 of the 18th July, 1934, and unstarred questions Nos. 129 to 130 of the 31st August, 1934, by Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen,

regarding the appointments of the *ex*-apprentices of the East Indian Railway Workshop, Lillooah, will Government please state:

(i) whether they have now received the required information from the Agent, East Indian Railway;

(ii) whether they are now prepared to lay the statement on the table; and

(iii) the reasons for such long delay?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (i) and (ii). Information regarding question No. 16 was laid on the table on the 21st January, 1935, and information regarding questions Nos. 129 and 130 on the 5th March, 1935.

(iii) The delay was due to the time involved in the correspondence between the Railway Board and the East Indian Railway administration in connection with the collection and examination of the information.

APPOINTMENTS OF THE TIME-EXPIRED APPRENTICES OF LILLOOAH WORKSHOPS UNDER THE CHIEF MECHANICAL ENGINEER, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1014. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Are Government aware that with reference to the replies to part (c) of starred question No. 1530 of the 5th December, 1932, part (b) of unstarred question No. 23 of the 5th September, 1932, and part (d) of unstarred question No. 424 of the 16th September, 1931, regarding the appointments of the time-expired apprentices of Lillooah Workshops under the Chief Mechanical Engineer, East Indian Railway, *ex*-apprentices on the waiting lists are not appointed, and that the results of the technical school are not at all considered at the time of appointments?

(b) Are Government aware that some junior *ex*-apprentices, who passed in lower divisions, have been appointed with posts under the Chief Mechanical Engineer, East Indian Railway Workshop, Lillooah, in preference to many better qualified senior *ex*-apprentices who passed in higher divisions?

(c) If the answers to parts (a) and (b) above be in the negative, will Government please state:

(i) why some junior *ex*-apprentices of 1930 and 1931 who passed in lower divisions have been appointed in the Lillooah Workshops, East Indian Railway, in preference to many seniors of 1930, who passed in higher divisions and who had better training, as stated by Government in their reply to unstarred question No. 19, dated the 5th September, 1932;

(ii) whether they are prepared to lay on the table a list showing the names of the *ex*-apprentices who have been appointed under the Chief Mechanical Engineer, East Indian Railway, in Lillooah Workshop since 1933, with the dates of completion of apprenticeship training, particulars of training, divisions in which passed in technical school, dates of appointments and starting salaries; if not, why not; and

(iii) whether they are prepared to make enquiry into the matter without delay and take necessary steps against such action of the Railway Administration; if so, in what way, if not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply questions Nos. 1014 and 1015 together. I am calling for information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

APPOINTMENTS OF THE TIME-EXPIRED APPRENTICES OF THE JAMALPUR TECHNICAL SCHOOL TO POSTS UNDER THE CHIEF MECHANICAL ENGINEER AND CHIEF ELECTRICAL ENGINEER, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

†1015. **Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will Government please state whether they have acted in accordance with the procedure cited in answer to starred questions Nos. 296 (b) and (d) of the 10th September, 1929, and 471 (d) of the 5th March, 1930, regarding the appointments of time expired apprentices of Jamalpur Technical School to posts under the Chief Mechanical Engineer and Chief Electrical Engineer, East Indian Railway?

(b) If the answer to part (a) above be in the affirmative, will Government please state the names of the time-expired apprentices who have been provided with posts since 1933 under the Chief Mechanical Engineer, East Indian Railway, with the following particulars:

(i) dates of completion of apprenticeship training,

(ii) name of workshop from which training was completed,

(iii) division in which passed in technical school,

(iv) dates of appointment and confirmation,

(v) name of the workshop in which employed,

(vi) designations, and

(vii) starting salaries?

If not, why not?

MOSQUE NEAR SHAHJI TANK AT MINTO ROAD PARK IN NEW DELHI.

1016. ***Sir Muhammad Yakub:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state detailed facts about the mosque near Shahji Tank at Minto Road Park in New Delhi?

(b) Is it a fact that the police raided this mosque on January 19th and took forcible possession of the mosque and threw on the road the belongings of the *Imam* including the Holy *Quran*?

(c) Will Government state what action they have taken against the police officers concerned, and whether the mosque has been restored to the Muslims and any compensation paid for the loss to the *Imam*?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) I lay a statement on the table giving the facts.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

†For answer to this question, *see* answer to question No. 1014.

STATEMENT.

When the ground between the Shahji Tank and Turkman Gate was being levelled by the Public Works Department last hot weather, with a view to its conversion into a park, the ruins of a building were discovered. This building was alleged by some Muslims to have been a mosque. No authentic proof of this assertion has been provided. As the Muslims were desirous that the remains of the building should not be removed it was decided to place a wire fence round the site

Certain Muslims commenced visiting the spot to offer prayers and a few mats and earthen pitchers were placed on the site. Subsequently, without the permission of the Nazul Department which administers the land, some poles with curtains were also erected. These temporary encroachments were, therefore, ordered to be removed A temporary hut with a canvas roof and a tin shed which had also been erected were removed at the same time. Police were present on the Chief Commissioner's instructions when the removal took place, but the police themselves took no part in it, as there was actually no trouble of any kind. The ruins of the old building were not interfered with. The belongings of the person who claimed to be the Imam were not thrown on the road but were allowed to remain on the premises While Government cannot agree to the erection without permission of any new building on the site, no objection has been raised to Muslims assembling at this place for prayers.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is it not a fact that the police raided the mosque on the ground that some *chappar* was put on somewhere without the permission of the Municipality and then everything was confiscated?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir. That is not a fact at all. If the Honourable Member would like me to read the statement, I will do so with the permission of the Chair. It is not very long

(The Honourable Member here read the statement.)

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Will the Mussalmans be permitted to repair that particular mosque if it is in ruins?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It is a matter for the Municipal Committee.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is the permission of the Government necessary to repair the mosque?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I think it is the permission of the Municipal Committee that is required, but I am not certain.

PROSCRIPTION OF THE BOOK "INDIAN STRUGGLE" BY MR. SUBHAS CHANDRA BOSE.

1017 ***Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if they have proscribed the book *Indian Struggle* written by Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose?

(b) Was the proscription due to the matter of the book being objectionable, or to the politics of the author? If the former, what law is infringed by the matter? If not, what were the reasons for proscribing the book?

(c) Has the Honourable the Home Member read the book or the objectionable passages?

(d) Have Government seen a review of the book in the *Manchester Guardian* by Mr. J. T. Gwynne, an I.C.S. officer?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) to (c). I invite attention to the reply I gave on the 23rd February to question No. 488.

(d) Yes. Mr. Gwynne is a retired officer.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the Honourable the Home Member be pleased to state whether he is satisfied, on a reading of this book, that it is a direct incitement to violence?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: What I said in my previous reply was that the book tended generally to encourage terrorism or direct action.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: What does Mr. Gwynne say about that book?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I cannot recollect exactly what he said.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: Is that a favourable review? Or does the reviewer say that it is a seditious book?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I suggest that the Honourable Member should read the review for himself.

Seth Govind Das: Will the Honourable the Home Member kindly say if it is not the case that all books that are considered worth having are generally proscribed by the Government in this country?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Next question Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon.

REPORT OF THE POSTAL ENQUIRY COMMITTEE.

1018. ***Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon:** (a) Is it a fact that the Postal Enquiry Committee appointed in the year 1934, with Mr. M. L. Pasricha as Chairman, has since submitted its report?

(b) Will Government please state the total expenditure incurred in connection with the Pasricha Postal Enquiry Committee?

(c) Will Government please state, in brief, the recommendations made by the Committee and the savings likely to be caused in the working expenses of the department by the acceptance of the recommendations?

(d) Will Government please state the particulars of the recommendations they propose to give effect to in the year 1935-36?

(e) Will Government please state the particulars of the recommendations which were unanimously agreed to by the members of the Committee and those to which the majority of the members could not agree?

(f) Will Government please state the time by which the Report of the Committee could be made available to the members of the Legislatures and the public?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to questions Nos. 1018 and 1020 together.

As regards part (a) of question No. 1018 the reply is in the affirmative and as regards part (b), the total cost was about one lakh of rupees.

As regards the remaining parts of question No. 1018 and question No. 1020, the Report is being printed and has not yet reached Government. I, therefore, regret that I am not at present in a position to reply to the Honourable Member. A copy of the Report will, however, be placed in the Library of the House as soon as printed copies are available.

REVISED SCALES OF PAY FOR THE SUBORDINATE EMPLOYEES OF THE POST OFFICES, RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE, ETC.

1019. ***Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon:** (a) Will Government please state the revised scales of pay proposed to be introduced for the subordinate employees of the (i) Circle Offices, (ii) Dead Letter Offices, (iii) Post Offices and (iv) Railway Mail Service?

(b) Will Government please state the time and date from which the revised scales of pay referred to in part (a) above will be introduced?

(c) Will Government please state whether the new scales will affect the existing employees on their promotions to the higher scales, and whether on promotion they will be brought on to the existing higher scales or to the new revised scales of pay?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a), (b) and (c). A copy of the orders of Government on the subject has been placed in the Library of the House. The orders furnish all the information required by the Honourable Member

CONCLUSIONS OF THE POSTAL ENQUIRY COMMITTEE.

†1020. ***Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon:** (a) Has the Pasricha Postal Enquiry Committee come to any conclusions on the following points, and if so, what are the conclusions reached:

(i) reduction of the scales of pay for all classes of subordinate staff;

(ii) revision of Time Test;

(iii) entire separation of Railway Mail Service and Post Office administration;

(iv) reduction in the number of Superintendents of Post Offices and Railway Mail Service;

(v) reduction in the number of Inspectors of Post Offices and Railway Mail Service;

(vi) transfer of audit and accounts work from the Offices of the Deputy Accountants General to Circle Accounts Offices;

(vii) centralization of Dead Letter Offices;

(viii) lowering of the status of first class Postmasters;

(ix) introduction of a cadre of Sub-Inspectors of Post Offices and Railway Mail Service;

(x) reduction in the number of mail and cash overseers;

(xi) revising of Time Tests for the staff of (1) Circle Offices, (2) Divisional Superintendents Offices, (3) postmen, (4) lower grade staff, and (5) Inspector of Post Office and Railway Mail Service;

(xii) examinations for (1) recruitment, (2) confirmation and (3) promotions;

(xiii) training of probationers; and

(xiv) promotion of postmen to the cadre of lower division clerks?

†For answer to this question, *see* answer to question No. 1018.

(b) Will Government please state which of the recommendations referred to in part (a) above were agreed to by the majority of the members of the Committee and which of them by the minority, with particulars of the names of the members for and against the above prospects?

(c) Will Government please state the particulars of first class head offices likely to be converted into second class head offices in the year 1935-36, and what will be the savings thereby?

COMMUNAL COMPOSITION OF CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS IN CERTAIN POSTAL CIRCLES.

1021. *Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: (a) Will Government please state separately for each circle the communal composition of the holders of the following appointments in the (i) United Provinces, (ii) Bengal and Assam, (iii) Bihar and Orissa, and (iv) Central Provinces Postal Circle:

	Christian.	Hindu.	Muslim.	Others.
(1) Postmaster General				
(2) Deputy Postmaster General				
(3) Assistant Postmaster General				
(4) Head clerks in the Selection grades in the Circle Offices				
(5) Superintendents of Post Offices				
(6) Superintendents of Railway Mail Service				
(7) First class Postmasters				
(8) Second class Postmasters				
(9) Sub-Postmasters in Selection grades				
(10) Inspectors of Post Offices				
(11) Inspectors of Railway Mail Service				
(12) Qualified candidates— Superintendents of Post Offices and Railway Mail Service				
(13) Qualified candidates— Inspectors of Post Offices and Railway Mail Service				
(14) Sub-Postmasters in Time-Scale				
(15) Clerks in Upper Division				
(16) Clerks in Lower Division				
(17) Sorters in Upper Division				
(18) Sorters in Lower Division				
(19) Branch Postmasters				

(b) Will Government please state the communal ratios for recruitment fixed by the Local Governments of (i) the United Provinces, (ii) Bengal and Assam, (iii) Bihar and Orissa, and (iv) Central Provinces?

(c) Will Government please state the communal composition of the new recruits entertained in the year 1934 in the Postal Circles referred to in part (b) above in the cadres to which direct recruitment is made?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) and (c). Such information as is available is given in appendix XVII of the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department Annual Report for the year 1933-34, a copy of which has been supplied to all Members and is also in the Library of the House. Government regret that the information, in the exact form asked for by the Honourable Member, is not readily available and could not be obtained without an undue expenditure of time and labour which Government consider would not be justifiable.

(b) So far as Government are aware, the Governments of the United Provinces, Assam, Bihar and Orissa and the Central Provinces have fixed no definite ratio for the recruitment of the various communities. In Bengal the Government have reserved for Muslims 45 per cent. of the vacancies in certain services to which recruitment is made by competitive examination. For other services a minimum percentage of reservation for Muslims has been prescribed; in most cases this is 33⅓ per cent. and in some cases it is 50 per cent.

Salaries of the Branch Postmasters.

1022. ***Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(i) whether any representations have been made to them by the Branch Postmasters, or the Union of Postal workers regarding the inadequacy of the salaries paid to them;

(ii) whether the Branch Postmasters are expected to distribute the letters, etc., to the addressees in their respective areas in addition to discharging their other postal responsibilities;

(iii) whether they are aware that most of these Branch Postmasters are obliged to engage men to distribute letters, etc., paying them out of their meagre salaries; and

(iv) whether Government are prepared to consider the advisability of raising the salaries of the Branch Postmasters?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (i) Government are unable to trace any such representations.

(ii) In those branch post offices, which are not provided with a separate delivery agency on account of the very small volume of delivery work, branch postmasters have either to peform the functions of postmen or village postmen themselves or to make arrangements for delivery of mails on their own responsibility.

(iii) Government have no information.

(iv) No.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What is the scale of pay granted to village branch postmasters?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: *Village branch postmasters get no pay; they get an allowance.*

Prof. N. G. Ranga: *How much?*

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: It varies in different offices. There are 17,000 offices. I cannot possibly tell the Honourable Member what is the pay given in each office.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What is the minimum allowance and what is the maximum allowance?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: It varies from Rs. 6 to Rs. 20 per month.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that as many as 1,500 village post offices were abolished last year?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: I cannot say; the Honourable Member had better put down a question.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): This is not the occasion for regular cross-examination.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, we are supposed to be asking questions . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government consider the advisability of increasing the number of village post offices during next year?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: That does not arise out of this question; there is another question on the subject which will be replied to later on.

OPENING OF NEW POST OFFICES.

1023. ***Prof. N. G. Ranga:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state:

(i) the number of new Post Offices and Branch Post Offices opened every year during the last ten years;

(ii) what is the average number of new Post Offices and Branch Post Offices that are proposed to be opened every year;

(iii) what is the number of villages from which applications have been received every year during the last ten years for the opening of Branch Post Offices; and

(iv) the number of Branch Post Offices which are worked voluntarily by Postmasters?

(b) In view of the fact that much the greater number of villages are not yet provided with Branch Post Offices, are Government prepared to consider the advisability of accelerating the rate of opening new Branch Post Offices?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) (i) and (iii). Government regret that they are unable to furnish the information required by the Honourable Member as its collection would involve an undue expenditure of time and labour, but I may state for the information of the Honourable Member that the total number of post offices at the end of the financial year 1923-24 was 19,490, and at the end of the year 1933-34 the number was 23,676, showing a net increase of 4,186 offices in ten years, or an average of about 419 per annum.

(a) (ii). New post offices are opened as and where justified and no definite number of new offices to be opened is fixed for each year in advance.

(a) (iv). It is presumed that the Honourable Member refers to the branch post offices in charge of extra departmental agents. The total number of such branch post offices on the 31st March, 1934, was 17,328.

(b) Government fully recognise the advisability of providing postal facilities in rural areas. On account of the financial position of the department the extension of postal facilities has had to be considerably restricted in recent years but for the year 1935-36 a provision of Rs. 50,000 has been made for the opening of new offices.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that, contrary to previous arrangements according to which Government used to pay some subvention for the maintenance of even village post offices, Government now have given up that practice?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: Will the Honourable Member please say what he means by "subvention"—to whom?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, in connection with experimental post offices, Government used to make certain contributions for the maintenance of village postmasters. Is it not a fact that Government have given up that particular practice of making contributions towards the maintenance of these temporary village post offices?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: The point raised by the Honourable Member has already been mentioned that, owing to the financial position of the Department, the extension of postal facilities has had to be considerably restricted in recent years. It is a fact that a grant was not made in recent years, but for the next year, 1935-36, a provision of Rs. 50,000 has been made for the opening of new post offices in rural areas.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: How many new post offices are proposed to be established?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: About two hundred.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: How many village post offices were abolished during the last year?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I should have to ask for notice of that question.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that in the report of the Director General on the management of post offices and telegraphs for last year, it was mentioned that as many as fifteen hundred village post offices were abolished?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: As the Honourable Member has studied the report and gathered the information, I am not quite clear why he should have put that question to me.

BUSES ENGAGED TO CARRY ROYAL MAILS.

1024. ***Prof. N. G. Ranga:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state:

(i) in how many and in which places, buses have been availed of to carry Royal Mails to quicken the despatch of mails;

(ii) at what rates they are being carried by buses; and

(iii) subject to what rules and regulations they are doing this?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether:

(i) it is not a fact that there are many places between which regular bus-services are being run;

(ii) such bus-services are not availed of by the Postal Department for the despatch of mails; and

(iii) Government will hereafter try to utilise the bus-services to an increasing extent for this purpose?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: (a) (i) and (a) (ii). Government regret that they have no information and do not propose to collect it as it would involve undue labour. The rates are determined by competitive tenders and vary largely.

(a) (iii). The services are regulated according to the conditions of an agreement entered into by the Posts and Telegraphs Department and the contractor in each particular case.

(b) As regards parts (i) and (ii), Government have no information, but it is probable that there are cases such as are referred to by the Honourable Member. As regards part (iii), I may inform the Honourable Member that the Department is fully alive to the advantages likely to be secured by utilising such services for the conveyance of mails and has been actually utilising them to an increasing extent every year, subject to considerations of efficiency and economy, with the result that the distance over which mails are conveyed daily by motors has increased during the last ten years from 3,670 miles to over 19,000 miles.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will the Honourable Member consider the advisability of trying to overcome the difficulty of collecting information and supplying that information at the earliest possible opportunity?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: No, Sir. It cannot be done.

RELEASE OF SEPOYS OF THE GARHWALI REGIMENT.

1025. ***Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta:** (a) Is it a fact that some of the sepoys of what is commonly known as the Garhwali Regiment are still in jail?

(b) Will Government please state the names of those prisoners?

(c) Will Government please state the charge under which they were sentenced?

(d) When is their sentence going to expire?

(e) Do Government propose to release them in view of the suspension of the civil disobedience movement?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) to (d). If the Honourable Member is referring to certain *ex*-soldiers of the 2nd Battalion, 18th Royal Garhwal Rifles, who are still undergoing terms of imprisonment for mutiny, to which they were sentenced in June, 1930, their names are Chandar Sing Bhandari, Narain Sing Gurain, Keshar Sing Rawat and Jit Sing Rawat.

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: A little louder, please. I cannot generally hear the Honourable Member (Laughter)

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: The sentences of the first two expire on the 6th June, 1950 and 1945 respectively and of the last two on the 6th June, 1940.

(e) No. The circumstances in which they were convicted had no connection with the civil disobedience movement.

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: May I know the acts of mutiny committed by them?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Disobedience of orders, Sir.

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: Is that classed under "mutiny"?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: That particular disobedience of orders amounted to mutiny.

INDIANISATION OF THE POSTS OF AGENTS OF THE IMPERIAL BANK OF INDIA.

1026. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Is it a fact that the Imperial Bank of India is not following the policy of Indianisation in the matter of selection of its agents?

(b) Is it a fact that Indian agents are being replaced by European agents?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, are there any Indian agents who have been replaced by Europeans as a result of this policy?

(d) If it was necessary to replace these Indian agents at certain places, were they given other branches for direct charge? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Government have no information regarding the domestic arrangements of the Imperial Bank of India.

Mr. B. Das: May I ask the Honourable Member whether it has not been the practice of his predecessors to supply such information about the Indianisation of the Imperial Bank of India?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: *I do not know and cannot say off-hand; evidently the Honourable Member knows more about the practice of my predecessors than I do.*

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know whether the Imperial Bank will continue to remain irresponsible to the Government as it is now, even under the new Constitution?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: After the 1st April, a new agreement comes into force as provided for in the Reserve Bank Act.

TEMPORARY CLERKS IN THE OFFICE OF THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL, CENTRAL REVENUES.

1027. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the number of temporary clerks in the office of the Accountant General, Central Revenues?

(b) Is it a fact that a majority of these clerks were employed as far back as 1927 and are still continuing in temporary service in spite of their having put in about eight years' continuous service?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state if there is any other office of the Government of India where there is such a large number of temporary posts and the staff thereof has continued to be temporary for such a long period?

(d) If the answer to part (c) be in the negative, will Government be pleased to state why differential treatment is being meted out to the staff of the Accountant General, Central Revenues?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) 17.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes. Two examples are the office of the Audit Officer, Lloyd Barrage and Canals Construction and the temporary staff employed in the office of the Accountant-General, Punjab, in connection with the Sutlej Valley Project.

(d) Does not arise.

TEMPORARY CLERKS IN THE OFFICE OF THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL, CENTRAL REVENUES.

1028. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Is it a fact that about 30 of the temporary posts of clerks in the Office of the Accountant General, Central Revenues, can be made permanent at once?

(b) Is it a fact that the Accountant General, Central Revenues, has suggested to the Auditor General to convert these clerical posts and a few more into those of Record and Routine clerks, and proposed very low scales of pay for these new types of clerks?

(c) Are Government aware that nine Record clerks were taken in the Office of the Accountant General, Central Revenues, in 1933 on an experimental basis against some of the clerical posts, and seven out of these nine

were such who had worked in the late Central Accounts Office, Public Works Department, under the present Deputy Accountant General, Central Revenues (Civil), New Delhi, and this scheme of Record clerks was introduced by the above officer?

(d) Is it a fact that it is contemplated to confirm these Record clerks and many more to come against the clerical posts in preference to the other temporary clerks who were recruited long before their existence in the Office of the Accountant General, Central Revenues?

(e) If the answer to the above be in the affirmative, are Government prepared to protect their staff who have served them for about eight years? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) No.

(b) Proposals for the conversion of some clerical posts into posts of Record Clerk and for the introduction of a separate grade of routine clerks on lower rates of pay are under consideration.

(c) Nine record clerks were appointed in 1933 in the office of the Accountant-General, Central Revenues, but they were not taken against clerical posts. Only three of the nine were formerly employed in the Central Accounts Office, Public Works Department. **It is not a fact, as** suggested by the Honourable Member, that the scheme was introduced in order to provide for these men. The employment of record clerks is not peculiar to the office of the Accountant-General, Central Revenues, but these posts are being introduced as a general measure of economy in all Civil Audit Offices under the Auditor-General.

(d) No. The Auditor-General has given instructions that in the offices where the scheme of employing record clerks has been approved, it should be introduced gradually.

(e) Does not arise.

Temporary Clerks in the Office of the Accountant General, Central Revenues.

1029. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table the orders under which members of the minority community in the Office of the Accountant General, Central Revenues, who were pretty junior on the waiting list or recruited very recently, have been confirmed in preference to those who have rendered eight years' continuous service in those posts?

(b) Are Government not prepared to safeguard the rights of those who have already served them for a very long period? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) and (b). The action to which the Honourable Member has referred was taken in accordance with the general instructions issued in 1926 with regard to recruitment of members of the minority communities. The purport of those orders was explained by my predecessor in his answer to question No. 1226 asked by Mr. Mukhtar Singh on the 27th of March, 1929.

UNIFICATION OF THE KANARESE SPEAKING PARTS OF THE BOMBAY AND THE MADRAS PRESIDENCIES AND OF COORG.

1030. *Mr. S. K. Hosmani: (a) Is it a fact that a number of telegrams and letters were received by His Excellency the Viceroy from the people of the Karnatak in connection with the unification of the Kanarese speaking parts of the Bombay and the Madras Presidencies and of Coorg? If so, what is the number of the letters and the telegrams received by His Excellency the Viceroy?

(b) How many of them are from the Local Boards, Municipalities, public bodies and prominent citizens, and what are the names of those local and public bodies?

(c) Is there any letter or telegram against the unification?

(d) Are Government in receipt of the books called "United Karnatak", "A case for Karnatak Unification" by the Karnatak Unification Sabha and the Karnatak Unification Association, respectively?

(e) If so, have Government noticed that the authors of those books have established by statistics that the future Karnatak Province would be self-supporting?

(f) Is it a fact that the said Association submitted a memorial to His Excellency the Viceroy in this connection as directed by His Excellency?

(g) If so, what was the conclusion arrived at by His Excellency after considering the demands of the memorialists?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) and (b). A number of such communications have been received. They have not been enumerated or classified.

(c) Government have received no such letter or telegram

(d) Yes.

(e) The authors may have done this to their own satisfaction. Government are not prepared to express any opinion in this matter.

(f) Yes.

(g) The Government of India are of opinion that any redistribution, on a linguistic or racial basis, of territories other than Sind and Orissa, should be governed by the provisions which the new Act may contain for the alteration of provincial boundaries. For a further statement of the views of the Government of India on this question I would refer the Honourable Member to the speech made by Sir Harry Haig in this House on the 26th July last.

Mr. S. K. Hosmani: May I know, Sir, what that speech was?

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: May we know, Sir, what Sir Harry Haig said in this House?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better read the speech.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: With respect to the answer to clause (e), will Government be pleased to state whether they have satisfied themselves?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: May I read out answer to part (e) again:

"The authors may have done this to their own satisfaction. Government are not prepared to express any opinion in this matter."

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Government may not express any opinion, but have they considered those statistics? Have they collected them?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: They have read the views put forward by the authors.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Have they made any independent investigation?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: No, Sir.

INCOME-TAX ASSESSED ON REGISTERED COMPANIES AND FIRMS IN BIHAR AND ORISSA

1031. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh:** Will Government be pleased to state the amounts of income-tax assessed in the preceding year on those registered companies and firms that are carrying on their business exclusively in the province of Bihar and Orissa but have got their registered offices outside the province?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: If I were to read the Honourable Member's question literally, the answer would obviously be *"nil"*, as any concern that had its registered office outside the Province would carry on part of its business, such as management and the making of contracts, at its registered office. On the assumption however, that the question is meant to refer to industrial concerns which carry on the whole of their industrial operations in the Province but have their registered offices outside, I have made certain enquiries and am able to inform the Honourable Member that there are twenty-three companies and two firms at Calcutta and Bombay which satisfy this description. The amount of income-tax and super-tax collected from these concerns in 1933-34 was Rs 2,86,000.

AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL LABOURERS AND LABOURERS EMPLOYED IN COAL MINES.

1032. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) what is the approximate number of agricultural and industrial labourers, separately, in this country;

(b) what is the number of labourers employed in coal mines and mica mines of the country;

(c) what is the number of labour organisations in this country in general and in coal and mica mines in particular; and

(d) what is the attitude of Government towards the labour organisations in this country?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) According to the Census of 1931 the number of workers employed in the exploitation of animals and vegetation was in that year approximately 103¾ millions. The number of workers employed in the exploitation of minerals, in industry, and in transport, was 18 millions.

(b) The average number of persons employed daily in coal mines and mica mines, subject to the Indian Mines Act, was 144,707 and 12,559 respectively in the year 1933.

(c) In March, 1934, there were 189 trade unions and five federations registered under the Trade Unions Act, 1926. Three of these unions were connected with collieries and none with mica mines.

(d) Government would welcome the development of trade unionism along healthy lines.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: May I know, Sir, if these trade unions have been recognised by the Government of India?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That question does not arise.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will the Government of India consider the advisability of collecting information about the scales of wages paid to the agricultural workers in different provinces from year to year?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: If the Government of India were to do that, they would be embarking on an inquiry of vast magnitude. As I pointed out, the number of workers employed in the exploitation of animals and vegetation was in 1931 103¾ millions. If you collect statistics about their wages, you are undertaking a big job.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact that in several provinces there are Labour Commissioners and there are Economic Inquiry Boards which are collecting this information?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Those inquiries embrace rather a limited field. Their results are open to the inspection of my Honourable friend and he can gather the information from them in just the same way as anybody else.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In view of the fact that there are collectors in different States who are collecting this information and supplying it to Provincial Governments, and as the information placed at the disposal of Provincial Governments is not available to every Member of this Assembly or to the public at large, is the Honourable Member prepared to consider the advisability of sending for this information and publishing it every year in an annual report?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No, Sir, not with regard to the wages of agricultural labour. As I have already pointed out, it would be a Herculean task and the Government of India have not got the staff for the compilation of detailed statistics of that character.

CONCLUSIONS REACHED BY GOVERNMENT AS REGARDS THE JOINT PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE REPORT.

1033. ***Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state what conclusions they have reached as regards the result of the debate on the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report held on the 4th, 6th and 7th February in the Legislative Assembly, and whether they have communicated their conclusions to the Secretary of State?

(b) What conclusions have they reached as regards the results of similar debates in various Provincial Legislatures?

(c) What conclusions have they drawn from the opinions expressed in Indian edited English and Vernacular newspapers of India on the proposed Government of India Bill?

(d) What conclusion have they drawn from the resolution of the Indian National Congress, the All-India Liberal Federation and the All-India Muslim League relating to the same subject?

(e) Are Government prepared to lay on the table a copy of the despatch, if any, they have sent to the Secretary of State for India relating to parts (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this question?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) to (d). The questions are directed to find out opinions or inferences drawn by Government of India, and they submit they are not bound to disclose those opinions. Moreover it is impossible to answer the questions which proceed on the assumption that conclusions or opinions were formed separately on the separate items mentioned in the parts (a), (b), (c) and (d), which assumption is not admitted to be correct. Nor is it admitted that conclusions were formed only on the materials mentioned in (a) to (d).

(e) Government, in public interest, is not in a position to disclose the confidential communication which is the subject matter of this question.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Is it of a confidential nature? Are the conclusions you have reached of a confidential nature?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Apart from the fact that they are confidential, there is no document which contains only the conclusions, if any, and nothing else.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have Government come to any conclusions on matters included in (a) to (d), and other matters which they may have considered on this subject at all?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Does my Honourable friend want to know what is the conclusion formed, not only on materials mentioned in (a) to (d), but on every other possible material?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Which they have considered.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: We have very definite opinion on that.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have they come to any conclusion about (a) to (d)? That is what I want to know.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Yes, Sir, conclusion on all materials.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have they been included in the Despatch to the Secretary of State?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: What we have written to the Secretary of State, I have already said, is a confidential communication, and it is the subject matter of this question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Does that document contain the conclusions of the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That will be giving out part of the contents of the document which I am refusing to disclose, but I am prepared to tell my Honourable friend what our conclusion is.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes, Sir.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: The conclusion is that in spite of the disclaimers everybody will come and work the Constitution.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have the Government of India said so to the Secretary of State?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: What we have told the Secretary of State is a confidential information which I cannot disclose. I have stated what our opinion is.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: But he has disclosed the conclusion He has told the House what he has said to the Secretary of State, that everybody will come and work the Constitution. May I ask what are the grounds on which he has come to that conclusion?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: The grounds are mentioned in parts (a) to (d) of the question Besides these, there are about hundred other different items, for instance, other speeches made, the inference drawn from the speeches, whether the speeches are to be taken at their face value, and there are hundred other materials to be considered before any conclusion could be reached. I have not disclosed what the Secretary of State has been told.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir . . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. The Honourable Member cannot have another debate on the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: But this is of his own doing. He said what were the conclusions drawn.

Sardar Sant Singh: Will the Honourable Member say whether he sent any Despatch on part (e) of the question?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Next question.

SENIORITY LIST OF TICKET COLLECTORS AND TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS IN THE MORADABAD AND LUCKNOW DIVISIONS.

1034. *__Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:__ (a) Will Government be pleased to enquire and state whether it is a fact that in the Moradabad and Lucknow Divisions of the East Indian Railway, the seniority list of the Ticket Collectors and the Travelling Ticket Examiners is still kept confidential from the employees concerned? If so, why? If not, will Government be pleased to state on what date it was supplied to the staff?

(b) Is it a fact that despite requests, the employees concerned are not given a copy of the seniority list?

(c) Is it a fact that in other divisions the seniority list has been communicated to the staff and they have been individually supplied with a copy of the same?

(d) Are Government prepared to see that seniority list is no more kept confidential from those concerned?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government have no information, but are making enquiries, and I will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

RULES REGARDING CONDONATION OF BREAK IN SERVICE ON STATE RAILWAYS.

1035. *__Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:__ Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) the rules regarding condonation of break in service on Indian State Railways;

(b) whether the condonation is admissible at the time of retirement only, or it can be done at an earlier stage; and

(c) whether on the condonation of break in service he can claim the rights and privileges that he was entitled to at the time of his initial appointment, *i.e.*, before discharge from service?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to Rules 16 and 17 of the State Railway Gratuity Rules, a copy of which is available in the Library of the House.

(b) The question of condonation of a break in service for gratuity is under existing rules, to be fully considered at the time an employee is re-engaged.

(c) The condonation of breaks in service under the Gratuity Rules merely permits service before the break to be added to the subsequent service for purposes of calculating gratuity and does not automatically confer any other privilege.

TESTS IMPOSED ON THE TICKET CHECKING STAFF ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY AT THE TIME OF PROMOTION.

1036. ***Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that educational qualifications of an employee on State Railways are to be taken into account at the time of his appointment only?

(b) Is a Ticket Collector, grade III, on the East Indian Railway required to undergo a test in English dictation, failing which he is denied promotion to grade II?

(c) Is such a test permissible for promotion to the next time-scale as per orders of the Railway Board circulated by the Agent, East Indian Railway in his letter No. 548/A. E. 2460, dated the 1st October, 1932?

(d) Is an increment in a time-scale subject to a test of English language?

(e) Is it a fact that employees who have qualified in departmental examination of ticket checking duties, held triennally, are also subject to selection when a time for their promotion in the next time-scale comes, and the said triennial examination is not taken into account?

(f) Is it a fact that other commercial staff are neither subject to any triennial examination or dictation test? Is it a fact that they also have regular public dealings and they get promotion according to seniority?

(g) Is it a fact that in other branches of the Railway a test in the duties of the individual employees is taken at the time of promotion to the next time-scale? If so, why are such tests imposed on the ticket checking staff?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) The requisite educational qualifications for appointment to subordinate posts are laid down in the Rules for the recruitment and training of subordinate staff on State-managed Railways, a copy of which is in the Library of the House.

(b), (d) and (e). The information is being obtained and will be laid on the table

(c) The rules referred to by the Honourable Member require that Ticket Collectors should be given opportunities to attend promotion courses.

(f) Other subordinate commercial staff have to undergo periodical refresher courses every five years and promotion courses, as necessary, up to the age of 45 As regards the second part the answer is in the affirmative.

(g) Certain categories of subordinate staff in the other branches of railway service, such as guards, station masters, etc., have also to undergo refresher and promotion courses periodically.

RULES REGARDING FREE QUARTERS OR HOUSE RENT FOR THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY AND OLD OUDH AND ROHILKUND RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

1037. ***Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:** (a) Is it a fact that there are separate rules regarding free quarters, or house rent in lieu thereof, in respect of the old East Indian Railway and Oudh and Rohilkund Railway employees?

(b) Is it a fact that new rules were framed by Government, as published in State Railway Code in 1931 regarding house accommodation?

(c) Have these new rules superseded the old rules, or are the employees to elect them according to their choice or can they not elect them under any circumstances?

(d) Are these rules (in State Railway Code) applicable to Railway employees in general, or have different employees of different branches different rules?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) and (b). Separate rules regarding the classes of employees entitled to free quarters or house rent allowance existed on the old East Indian and Oudh and Rohilkund Railways. Under the new rules, regarding the residential buildings which were published as Chapter II of the State Railway Code (Revised) in 1933, members of non-gazetted staff who were in service on the date of introduction of revised rent rules and who, at any time in the course of their previous service, held in a substantive capacity a post which carried the privilege of rent-free quarters or a house allowance in lieu thereof, continue to enjoy this privilege subject to certain restrictions.

(c) The new rules supersede all previous rules on the subject in so far as the latter are inconsistent with them. The question of election does not, therefore, arise.

(d) The new rules apply generally to employees on State-managed Railways.

Recovery of House Rent from Ticket Collectors on the East Indian Railway.

1038. *__Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:__ (a) Is it a fact that Ticket Collectors drawing salary below Rs. 50 are debited with house rent and directed to pay several hundred rupees each, because they were given rent free quarters since 1925, which it has now been discovered they were not entitled to?

(b) Is it a fact that such debits have been raised on the East Indian Railway?

(c) Are Government prepared to look into the matter and see that no undue hardship is entailed on the staff concerned?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Ticket Collectors, whatever their pay, who are appointed after 1925, are not entitled to rent-free quarters.

(b) Enquiries are being made and the information will be placed on the table of the House.

(c) Cases of real hardship will, I am sure, be examined carefully by the Railway Administration.

Passes for Inferior Staff at Madhupur and Sahebgunge Stations on the East Indian Railway.

1039. *Mr. N. M. Joshi: Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the inferior staff of the East Indian Railway, stationed at Madhupur and Sahebgunge, have been denied the privilege of getting passes on the East Indian Railway? If so, why?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The Agent, East Indian Railway, states that no passes, for which they are eligible under the rules, have been denied to the inferior staff of these stations.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Will the Honourable Member say whether these inferior servants are eligible for these passes?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The question was whether they were denied the privilege of these passes.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Whether they have these privileges?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No, that was not the question

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Then, I will put down another question.

HOUSING OF THE INFERIOR STAFF AT DHANBAD IN CONDEMNED WAGONS.

1040. *Mr N. M. Joshi: Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the inferior staff on East Indian Railway at Dhanbad have been housed in condemned wagons? If so, why?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Inferior staff at Dhanbad are housed in the usual type of quarters. The only exceptions are:

(a) One waterman temporarily accommodated in a wagon body, and

(b) 70 gangmen under the Permanent Way Inspector, Dhanbad, who have been allotted wagon bodies.

The Agent explains that normally gangmen live in the villages along the line and are not provided with accommodation by the Railway, but, owing to the difficult conditions at Dhanbad, the railway have tried to help these men by providing some sort of accommodation for them.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask whether Government will consider the question of improvement of this accommodation?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Does my Honourable friend suggest that they should be turned out of the wagon bodies at once?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: My suggestion is that they should be provided with better houses.

Mr. P. R. Rau: I will send that suggestion to the Agent.

NON-GRANT OF HOUSE ALLOWANCE TO CERTAIN RELIEVING CLERKS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1041. *Mr. N. M. Joshi: Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the relieving clerks appointed after 1925 on the East Indian Railway, are denied the privilege of house allowance in lieu of free quarters, whereas the other relieving staff of the same Railway are granted house allowance? If so, why?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The information has been called for and will be placed on the table of the House.

GRANT OF HIGHER GRADE OF PAY TO SWITCHMEN IN THE ASANSOLE DIVISION.

1042. *Mr. N. M. Joshi: Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that switchmen in the Asansole Division of the East Indian Railway are granted higher grade of pay, whereas the switchmen in the Howrah Division are not given the higher grade, even when they draw the maximum of the lower grade? If so, why?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government have no information. I am forwarding a copy of the question to the Agent, East Indian Railway, who is entirely competent to deal with such matters.

BOX *Khalasies* FOR EUROPEAN AND ANGLO-INDIAN DRIVERS ON STATE RAILWAYS.

1043. *Mr. N. M. Joshi: Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that on the State-managed Railways, box *khalasies* are sanctioned for European and Anglo-Indian Drivers but not for the Indian Drivers? If so, why?

Mr. P. R. Rau: So far as the East Indian Railway is concerned, I would refer the Honourable Member to the information laid on the table of the House on the 12th April, 1934, in reply to question No. 192 asked by Mr. S. C. Mitra, on 21st November, 1933. As regards the other State-managed Railways, information is being obtained and I will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

Mr. V. V. Giri: Will the Honourable Member read the reply to the previous question referred to by him?

Mr. P. R. Rau: That is a short answer which I will read:

"The Agent, East Indian Railway reports that box coolies are provided at other than a driver's home station for the carriage of boxes of drivers in Grades I and II irrespective of their nationality and that box coolies are not provided for drivers in Grades III and IV."

REFUSAL OF PASSES TO *ex*-INFERIOR EMPLOYEES ON STATE RAILWAYS.

1044. *Mr. N. M. Joshi: Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the State-managed Railways grant passes to the *ex*-employees in the subordinate grade but not to the *ex*-employees of the inferior grade? If so, why?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The rules for the issue of passes to retired employees vary on the different State-managed Railways, both as regards the number of passes that may be issued and the period of qualifying service prior to retirement. All subordinates are, however, given passes after retirement

and those of inferior grades are also given such passes on the North Western and Great Indian Peninsula Railways, and on the Oudh and Rohilkund Section of the East Indian Railway, in the latter case, only to those who were employees of the old Oudh and Rohilkund Railway at the time of its amalgamation with the East Indian Railway. The question of uniformity in the pass rules is under examination.

NON-SUPPLY OF WATERPROOF CLOTHING TO STAFF DOING OUTDOOR WORK ON THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

1045. *Mr. N. M. Joshi: Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that on the Eastern Bengal Railway shunting staff and the staff who are to do outdoor duty, are not all given waterproof clothing? If so, why?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am sending a copy of the question to the Agent, Eastern Bengal Railway, for such action as he may consider necessary.

COLLISION OF GOODS TRAINS AT SHAMNAGAR ON THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

1046. *Mr. N. M. Joshi: (a) Are Government aware that recently an accident occurred at Shamnagar on the Eastern Bengal Railway, where a goods train collided with another goods train, resulting in a heavy loss to the Railway? If so, what is the extent of damage to the rolling stock and permanent way, and what would be the approximate cost of the repairs?

(b) Is it a fact that the cabin was previously manned by Cabin Assistants, but at the time of the accident, it was under the charge of a Cabin Jemadar? If so, why were the Cabin Assistants withdrawn? Was it due to economy?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) If my Honourable friend is referring to the accident on the 5th February, 1935, the estimated cost of the damage to rolling stock and permanent way was Rs. 66,210.

(b) Yes, but the change was made over 25 years ago. The cabin was manned by cabin assistants prior to August, 1909, when they were replaced by cabin jemadars whose designation was subsequently altered to block signal men. The change was made, as it was considered that cabin jemadars were quite capable of working this class of cabin efficiently.

GRANT OF A COMPENSATORY ALLOWANCE TO CREWMEN AND CREWS IN CHARGE ON THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

1047. *Mr. V. V. Giri: (a) Is it a fact that the Crewmen and Crews in charge on the Eastern Bengal Railway are required frequently to go out of headquarters in the course of the performance of their duties like other classes of running staff?

(b) Is it a fact that other ticket checking staff of the same railway are given compensatory allowance while out of headquarters, whereas the Crewmen and Crews in charge are denied this allowance?

(c) Are Government aware that the All-India Railwaymen's Federation has submitted a representation in this connection to extend the privilege of mileage or consolidated allowance to Eastern Bengal Railway, as now done on the East Indian Railway?

(d) Will Government be pleased to state whether they propose to sanction the necessary compensatory allowances without delay?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The representation referred to by the Honourable Member in part (c) of the question was received in January and is under examination.

APPOINTMENT OF INEXPERIENCED CREW INSPECTORS ON THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

1048. ***Mr. V. V. Giri:** (a) Is it a fact that four persons who had not even previous railway experience were appointed as Crew Inspectors on Rs. 200 on the Eastern Bengal Railway last year?

(b) Is it a fact that due to these new appointments, the claims of senior staff have been overlooked, and are Government aware that there is discontent on account of such recruitment?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state whether these new appointments contravene instructions laid down by the Railway Board regarding re-employment of retrenched staff?

(d) Is it a fact that there is a proposal to appoint four more Crew Inspectors on Rs. 200 each on a similar basis on this Railway?

(e) Are Government prepared to ascertain whether any of the existing ticket checking staff on the Eastern Bengal Railway are qualified to be Crew Inspectors on this Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) , (b), (d) and (e). Recruitment for these posts is a matter entirely for the Agent to whom the question has been sent for consideration.

(c) Government will enquire into this allegation and lay a reply on the table in due course.

REMOVAL OUT OF INDIA OF CERTAIN BOTANICAL SPECIMENS OF GREAT SCIENTIFIC VALUE.

1049. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** (a) Will Government state whether there is a proposal to remove out of India certain irreplacable botanical specimens of great scientific value, including type specimens, hitherto preserved in the Herbarium of the Royal Botanic Gardens at Sibpur (Calcutta)?

(b) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the resolutions of the Indian Botanical Society passed at its annual meeting on the 4th January, 1935, published in the *Current Science*, and *Indian Science Congress Special Supplement*, page 315?

(c) Has the Botanical Society at its annual meeting on the 4th January, 1935, protested against this removal and communicated this protest to the Government of India and the Government of Bengal?

(d) In view of these protests, have the Government of India given up this proposal? If not, what have the Government of India decided about this matter?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) to (c) Yes.

(d) Government never made any such proposal; it came from an outside source. They have no intention of allowing irreplaceable botanical specimens in the Herbarium of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Sibpur, to be transferred out of India.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is the Honourable Member aware that some specimen collections from the Coimbatore Agricultural College have been taken outside the country?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The Coimbatore Agricultural College is under the control of the Government of Madras.

NEW APPOINTMENTS MADE IN THE LUCKNOW DIVISION OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1005. ***Sir Muhammad Yakub:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state how many new appointments were made in the Lucknow Division of the East Indian Railway in its different offices and work-shops, including the Carriage and Wagon Shops at Alam Bagh, and how many of the new appointments were given to the Musalmans?

(b) What steps, if any, have Government taken to ensure the recruitment of 25 per cent. Muslims in this Division?

(c) Is it a fact that a Select Committee, which employed coolies in the Carriage and Wagon Shops, Alam Bagh, Lucknow, consisted of one European, one Hindu and one Sikh, and that there was not a single Muslim on the Committee and that, out of 200 Muslim candidates for the jobs of coolies, only three Muslims were taken?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) The available information as regards communal composition of railway services is contained in the annual administration reports. Government are not prepared to obtain statistics relating to a particular branch of a service or to an individual unit of a railway.

(b) I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the Railway Board's letter No. E.-34-C.M.-113, dated the 12th December, 1934, to the Agent, East Indian Railway, and to the Memorandum accompanying it, which explains how the reservation of 25 per cent. of vacancies for Muslims, in future direct recruitment in the subordinate railway services, is to be obtained on Railways as a whole. As regards inferior servants and labourers the policy is to reserve 33 1/3 per cent. of direct appointments for the redress of marked communal inequalities on each State-managed Railway as a whole and not by individual units. Copies of both the documents referred to above are in the Library of the House.

(c) Government have no information but it is not practicable to arrange that an official of each minority community shall be appointed to every Selection Committee.

CASES IN WHICH CINEMA POSTERS WERE FOUND OBJECTIONABLE.

1051. *Mr. N. V. Gadgil: (a) Will Government be pleased to state the total number of cases in which the posters of cinema were found objectionable?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state what is the criterion applied in judging posters as objectionable?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state how many posters other than posters for cinema films were held objectionable during the last three years?

(d) Will Government be pleased to state how many of the posters held objectionable were posters received from foreign countries and how many were posters printed in India?

(e) Will Government be pleased to state the number of cases in which prosecutions have been launched under the existing law in this connection?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) and (d). Posters, used in connection with the exhibition of cinema films, are not at present subject to censorship and I have, therefore, no statistical information.

(b) There has been a good deal of public complaint in this matter and I hope to have an opportunity to satisfy the Honourable Member on this point in the course of the debate on the Bill to amend the Indian Cinematograph Act which will shortly come up for discussion.

(c) No complaints have, as far as I am aware, been made in regard to other posters.

(e) I have no information as prosecutions are instituted by local authorities. I would add, however, for the Honourable Member's information that prosecution under the law is restricted to "obscene" publications while the objection to many posters, in connection with cinema exhibitions, is that they are "suggestive" and "salacious" rather than "obscene".

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE RAILWAY RETRENCHMENT COMMITTEE.

1052. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) how many of the recommendations of the Railway Retrenchment Committee of this House have been carried out;

(b) the net savings to the Railway thereby;

(c) how many and what recommendations have not been carried out; and

(d) the reasons why they have not been carried out?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a), (b), (c) and (d). The information asked for by the Honourable Member is given in the statements circulated to Members of the House on the 4th November, 1931, and also in the statement circulated in February, 1932, with the Budget Papers showing the further action taken on the Retrenchment Sub-Committee's Report.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Since 1932, have any further recommendations been carried out?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the recommendations left over, and how many are yet to be carried out?

Mr. P. R. Rau: All the recommendations that have been considered by the Railway Board and that have been carried out will be contained in that Memorandum?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know the reasons why other recommendations have not been considered, or, having been considered, why they have not been carried out by the Railway Board?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The reasons why some of the recommendations were not accepted by the Railway Board are contained in that Memorandum.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are Government considering at this stage the possibility or the desirability or both of carrying out those recommendations, which have not been carried out?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No, Sir. The reasons for the conclusions arrived at by the Government will be found in those statements which I referred to just now and I would ask my Honourable friend to read them at leisure.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is that the last word on the subject?

Mr. P. R. Rau: So far as the Government are concerned, yes.

ENQUIRY IN THE CASE OF STATE PRISONERS.

1053. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) the nature of the enquiry conducted by them in the case of State Prisoners twice every year;

(b) who conducted the enquiry;

(c) whether any judges take part in the enquiry;

(d) the evidence oral or written, if any, considered during the enquiry;

(e) whether any opportunity is given to the prisoners to state their cases, and, if not, why not;

(f) whether the results of the enquiries are considered by the Government of India as a whole; and

(g) whether the results of the enquiries will be placed on the table of this House; if not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) to (d) and (f). I would refer the Honourable Member to section 3 of Regulation III of 1818, which requires a report to be made each half year to the Governor General in Council

to enable him to determine whether the orders of detention in each case should continue in force or should be modified. That procedure is followed and each case is examined by the Government of India in the light of the then existing conditions, and of the reasons which made the original order under Regulation III necessary, the question for consideration being whether orders of restraint in any particular case can be relaxed without detriment to the public safety or peace. No question of a judicial enquiry arises nor is any such enquiry required by the Regulation, and orders are passed by the Governor General in Council.

(e) Every State Prisoner is at liberty to submit at any time any representations he may desire to make to the Governor General in Council and every such representation receives full consideration.

(g) No, as the reports on which the decisions are reached and the decisions themselves are confidential.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know approximately when, as a matter of fact, the last inquiry into the case of the State Prisoners was conducted by the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Approximately about the 30th June and 31st December in each year.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know who constituted the tribunal, or the inquiry committee, or the board on the last occasion?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: There is no tribunal.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know who conducted the inquiry? Is it the Home Member of the Government of India, or is it any independent person?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I do not conduct the inquiry myself. If the Honourable Member will read the Regulation, he will find that it requires a reports to be made each year to the Governor General in Council.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know who made the last report to the Governor General in Council?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The various Local Governments concerned in whose custody these men are.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it, therefore, that this inquiry is conducted only by the Local Governments?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir. The report is made in the first instance, I think, by the officer to whose custody the State Prisoner is committed. It is then considered by the Local Government who forward their report and their conclusions to the Governor General in Council, who in turn considers them and comes to a decision.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it, therefore, that there is no kind even of a *quasi*-judicial inquiry, but it is merely a departmental inquiry?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The procedure is as I have stated and I have nothing to add.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know if the persons who are detained are notified in advance, that an inquiry is going to be conducted into the necessity for their detention, and that they can, if they so choose, make any representations for being considered at the time of the inquiry?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Regulation states clearly that:

"Every officer in whose custody a State Prisoner is placed shall on the 1st January and 1st July each year submit a report .... in order that the Governor General in Council may determine whether the orders of the State Prisoner's detention shall continue in force or shall be modified."

The State Prisoners are presumably well aware of that.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know if any evidence is considered by the Local Government or the officer in whose custody the State Prisoner is, concerning the need for detention of the State Prisoner?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: All relevant circumstances are taken into consideration.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will the Government of India consider the advisability of sending down one of their own officers to make these inquiries?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: What are the purposes of this inquiry?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have said that about four times and I have read the words of the section. It is in order that the Governor General in Council may determine whether the orders of detention shall continue in force or shall be modified.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What is the reason for which they do not wish to send down their own officer to make these inquiries instead of depending upon the provinces?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: In the first place, it would involve considerable extra expenditure; in the second place, the Governor General in Council has no officer who can discharge such duties without detriment to his other work; and, in the third place, there is no reason to believe that the reports sent by the Local Governments are in any way defective or prejudiced.

Seth Govind Das: Have they ever differed from the recommendations and findings of the local officials or the Local Governments?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It is obvious that I cannot reply to that question without going into the history of the last 60 or 70 years.

PLACING A COPY OF THE *STATESMAN* UNDER THE FOUNDATION STONE OF THE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE.

1054. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether a copy of the *Statesman* of the 19th February, 1935, was placed along with treasure under the foundation stone of the Agricultural Research Institute on the 19th; and

(b) whether any other newspaper of Delhi were so placed; if not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes.

(b) No. There was not room in the cylinder for more than one paper.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: If there was no room for more than one paper, what prevented them from making a bigger cylinder or choosing the *Hindustan Times* in preference to the *Statesman* ?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I can only say that no one in the department had the bright idea which has struck my Honourable friend. It may comfort him to know that at another foundation-stone laying recently, that of the Y. M. C. A. Hostel, by my Honourable friend, the Commerce Member, matters were put right by placing under the stone a vernacular paper.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: May I ask whether newspapers of all schools of thought were put in in order to strengthen the foundation? (Laughter.)

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have pointed out that in this case only one paper was put in.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Why was this paper put in?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: It is an old custom, so that future generations may know the wisdoms and follies of this one. (Laughter.)

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of that answer, how does the Honourable Member know that future generations will be more interested in the *Statesman* which is "His Master's Voice" of Government, than in the *Hindustan Times* which is the organ of the people of this country.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Sir, I rise to a point of order. I submit that that kind of insinuation about a certain paper being the "Master's Voice" of Government and so on cannot be allowed in a question. The Honourable Member can only ask for information.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Why was that insinuation made about my "bright idea", and so on?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. All sorts of insinuation and sarcasm are prohibited.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, I submit that that remark about my "bright idea" was a sarcastic reflection at my expense.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable Member will go through the Standing Orders he will find that the sort of remark that he made is not permissible

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know why the *Statesman* was chosen?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thinks the Honourable Member has already answered that question.

OPENING OF THE TRANQUEBAR PORT PERMANENTLY.

1055. ***Mr. S. Satyāmurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether they have received any memorial from the Tanjore District Delta Mirasdars and Land-owners' Association, Mayavaram, for declaring the port of Tranquebar open permanently instead of temporarily;

(b) whether Government are considering this question; and

(c) when they propose to declare the Port permanently opened?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: (a) The Government have received a copy of a Resolution passed at a meeting of the Mirasdars of Tranquebar, Porayar and suburbs held on the 17th December, 1934, to the effect that Government be asked to declare Tranquebar permanently open as a port.

(b) and (c). The only effect of a declaration under section 11 of the Sea Customs Act is that the shipment and landing of goods at a port so declared ceases to be a Customs offence. This in itself cannot attract trade to a port or induce ships to call at it unless there is some economic advantage. Tranquebar port was declared to be a port for the shipment and landing of goods for a period of one year on the 17th February, 1934. During this period no trade passed through the port. Government have now declared it open for another year. Actual experience of the trade that may be attracted to the port can alone indicate whether the port should be kept open permanently or not.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Have Government received any other memorials about any other ports in the Madras Presidency?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: I am not aware of any other memorial of the kind.

PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE DUTY ON FOREIGN SALT.

1056. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is any proposal to increase the duty on foreign salt;

(b) if so, the time from which it will be so imposed; and if not, why not?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I would refer the Honourable Member to what I said on this subject in the Budget speech.

RESULTS OF THE WORKING OF THE OTTAWA PACT.

1057. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether they received a representation from the Indian Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta, dated the 7th September, 1934, on the results of the working of the Ottawa Pact;

(b) whether they have taken any action thereon; and

(c) whether they will place before this House the statements of the working of these preferences; if so, when?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) A report on the working of the Ottawa Trade Agreement has already been placed on the table of the House.

LOSS TO GOVERNMENT AS A RESULT OF A PREFERENTIAL RATE OF DUTY ON IMPORTS OF KEROSINE OIL.

1058. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that as a result of a preferential rate of duty on imports of kerosine oil into India, Government lose a revenue of 88 lakhs of rupees per year;

(b) whether Government have examined this position; and

(c) whether they propose to take any steps to make up the loss of this revenue?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) There is no preferential rate of import duty on kerosene oil. The Honourable Member presumably refers to the difference of 11¼ pies per imperial gallon between the excise duty on kerosene produced in India and the customs duty on kerosene imported into India. Whether this involves a loss of revenue can only be stated in relation to a proposal to equalise the two duties at a particular level. It is obviously not true in relation to all possible equal rates.

(b) Yes.

(c) This year's Finance Bill contains no proposal for equalising the excise and the import duties.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are Government considering that possibility for next year?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I am unable to go beyond the troubles of this year. (Laughter.)

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Are Government aware that this particular duty presses very hard upon the poor people?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the fact that Burma is going to be separated, will the Finance Member consider the possibility of getting more revenue out of this?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Obviously that is one of the considerations which arises in connection with the Indo-Burma Trade Agreement.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is it being considered now, as part of the Indo-Burma Trade Agreement?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Naturally, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is this consideration being borne in mind?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Yes.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS BETWEEN INDIA AND BURMA.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have received notices of two motions for adjournment, one by Mr. Vissanji and the other by Mr. Satyamurti. Mr. Vissanji's notice is that he proposes to ask for leave of the House to make a motion for the adjournment of the Assembly to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the grave situation in regard to the financial adjustments between India and Burma as revealed in answers given by the Honourable the Finance Member in the Assembly on the 25th March, 1935.

12 Noon.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): Sir, as I have unintentionally brought this trouble on my own head and as I equally unintentionally slightly misled the House yesterday, perhaps I might correct something I said then. I had put into my hand, shortly before I came into the House, a letter from the Government of India representative in London on the subject of this tribunal. I read it hastily, and then, on the spur of the moment, answering supplementary questions from the Honourable Member opposite, I said that the Committee would finish its labours in two or three days. I should like to place the real position before the House, for that was not quite accurate. The real position is that the Committee has finished taking evidence from the official representatives of India and Burma in these negotiations and it is considering all the material before it, and it is expected to make its report early in April. I gave the impression then that there was no time for further representations to be sent to them. That is not quite accurate: there is time, although not very much time.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does the Honourable Member wish to press his motion for adjournment in view of the statement made by the Honourable the Finance Member?

Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji (Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau: Indian Commerce): Yes, Sir: really speaking, we wish the Government of India to place the views of this House before the Secretary of State, so that he can have a chance of knowing them and placing them before the Committee.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Then, I submit, Sir, that the question of urgency has disappeared, because the fact of the tribunal's existence has been known to this House for over a month.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What has the Honourable Member got to say on the question of urgency?

Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: The urgency is apparent from the fact that the answers were given only yesterday and we came to know only then about the imminent completion of the work which was entrusted to the tribunal, in such a short time as this. From the answers given on the 21st February last, we thought that the tribunal would be sitting for a fairly long time, and that all questions will be taken into consideration: we thought it would take a much longer time than we are now told, because it was then said that it would not be advisable to take Members of the Assembly to London and waste their time there and all that: under that impression, we were making preparations to place our case before the tribunal and we were considering ways of securing that object. In the meantime, this surprise was sprung upon this House. So, really speaking, this is the earliest opportunity that we had to bring up the matter. In that view, I personally feel that if this House is allowed to give an ex pression of its views, it might have some effect on the Tribunal, and on the Secretary of State who has been riding rough-shod in this matter. As mentioned in paragraph 482 of the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report, a pledge was practically given that an impartial tribunal will be created to deal with all these matters . . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): When was the tribunal constituted?

Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: We were told that it was some time in February; and at the time we were told it was going to be a prolonged discussion as the matter was very complicated and that it will take a pretty long time: no one knew anything as to how long it would take, and now we are told that they have practically finished their job, and, within a week or so, they will report . . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Was not the appointment of the tribunal announced?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: It was announced on February 16th.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): How was it announced?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: By a communiqué by the Secretary of State in London.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Why were no steps taken to make representations to the tribunal?

Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: It was only announced to us on the 21st February here that a tribunal was sitting: and it was mentioned, at that time, that it was going to take a very long time to discuss the matter and take evidence and all that: and we were thinking of making a formal representation.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: May I point out that this is not the first time that this tribunal has been discussed here: a debate has already

taken place and it has been already forwarded to the tribunal—the debate took place in 1933, I think—so that it is not as if all this has happened for the first time

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): But that was not this tribunal?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: But it is only a question of the material to be submitted to this tribunal.

Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: The other tribunal that the Honourable Member is talking about was dealing with the adjustment of other things. This tribunal is concerned with other matters, and, on this, we want our representations to be heard. This is a different thing altogether.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I am sorry, Sir, I did not make myself clear to the Honourable Member, in the correction of the statement I made: I suggested that provided there was no delay about the question, there was time to send forward representations, and I would undertake to do so.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): May I just supplement what Mr. Vissanji has said. The original idea, as given out by the Secretary of State, was that the representatives of the Legislature would be associated with this inquiry by the tribunal . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That was in the communiqué issued in February?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: That was in the Round Table Conference. Then, on the 21st February, we were told by the Honourable the Finance Member that the Secretary of State had not been able to adhere to that original proposal as this inquiry was to be rather prolonged, and it was thought that the Members of this House would not be able to spare the time necessary for this prolonged inquiry. Naturally we thought, or those interested in the matter thought, that the question would be open for a considerable time and that it would be possible to debate it on the floor of this House now or hereafter for we know that "a considerable time" in the language of the Government means at least several months, for "shortly" in their answers always means some months. So, under that impression, we naturally expected that we would have a legitimate opportunity for discussing this matter in ordinary course; but a surprise was sprung on us yesterday when the Honourable the Finance Member told us that the tribunal would be finishing its labours in two or three days. He has slightly modified his statement today and told us that it may not be one or two days, but two weeks or so. He thinks, in fact, that it is now likely that the views that may be expressed now or hereafter could be communicated to the tribunal and they might be considered by them, so that there is time for it, and just enough time for it. Therefore, the question is really an urgent one, and if we do not discuss it now . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is the object of the motion to consider the question of adjudication by the Tribunal?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: The object of the motion is to press for the representation of the views of the public before this tribunal within the time available for that purpose. Sir, I submit that this is a most urgent question, and this is the only time when this can be done, otherwise we shall not get another opportunity.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has heard the facts bearing on the question of urgency. Under the special circumstances of this case, the Chair is inclined to hold that this is a fit motion to be taken up by the House. Is there any objection to the motion being heard? (No Honourable Member objected.) The motion will be taken up at 4 o'clock today.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, may I ask your guidance as to the scope of the debate? The Honourable Member opposite said that the purpose of the debate was first of all to protest against the non-representation of their views—that is what I understood him to say,—and also, within the time available to express their views on the merits of the question. Is the second question in order, Sir?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The second question will be in order so far as it bears on the first, as regards the importance of the question that the public here had not the chance of being represented.

ELECTION OF THE STANDING FINANCE COMMITTEE FOR 1935-36.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have to inform the Assembly that the following Members have been elected to the Standing Finance Committee for the financial year 1935-36, namely

(1) Mr. H. A. Sathar H. Essak Sait,

(2) Mr. Lalchand Navalrai,

(3) Rai Bahadur Sir Satya Charan Mukherjee,

(4) Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar,

(5) Mr. Shri Krishna Sinha,

(6) Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant,

(7) Mr. M. Asaf Ali,

(8) Major Nawab Ahmad Nawaz Khan,

(9) Mr. G. Morgan,

(10) Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad,

(11) Rai Bahadur Seth Bhagchand Soni,

(12) Mr. N. V. Gadgil,

(13) Sir Leslie Hudson, and

(14) Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE COURT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DELHI.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have to inform the Assembly that the following Members have been elected to be members of the Court of the University of Delhi, namely:

(1) Dr. Khan Sahib,

(2) Syed Ghulam Bhik Nairang,

(3) Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra, and

(4) Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta.

GOVERNMENT S RIGHT TO MAKE ANY MODIFICATION IN THE BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Before asking the House to deal with the Demands for Supplementary Grants, the Chair wants to give its ruling as regards the point of order raised by the Honourable Mr. Satyamurti yesterday. The point of order was whether Government have got the right and the power to make any modification in the business of the House *after* it has been already announced. The Chair has considered the matter carefully, and it finds that Standing Order No. 7 is in general terms and gives power to the Governor General in Council to arrange the Order of Official Business in this House. The Chair quite sees the force of the contention of Mr. Satyamurti that once the Order of Business has been announced to this House, it is extremely inconvenient if that order is altered, but the point of order is whether Government have got the power and the right to do so. On that point the Chair has not the least hesitation in holding that the Government has such power. The Chair has also made inquiries and it is informed that in the past modifications in the list of business as announced have been made. At the same time, the Chair must point out that it must cause considerable inconvenience to the House if the Order Paper is materially altered without sufficient previous notice. But Mr. Satyamurti also urged that once the business is announced or the List of Business is placed before the House, the House has the seizin of it, and, therefore, no alteration can be made in it without the consent of the House, but, as a matter of fact, a motion, unless it is moved, is not in possession of the House, and any Honourable Member who has given notice of any motion can refrain from moving it. Therefore, it cannot be said that once a particular programme of business has been placed before the House, the Government is not in a position to alter it.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): In view of your ruling, Mr. President, may I once more make an appeal to the Honourable the Leader of the House to allow my item to come in after this. I won't take more than two or three minutes.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): May I make an appeal to my Honourable friend to renew his request the day after tomorrow?

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS IN RESPECT OF RAILWAYS.

AUDIT.

Mr. P. R. Rau (Financial Commissioner, Railways): Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 80,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Audit'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 80,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Audit'."

The Chair does not think there are any amendments. The question is . . . .

Pandit Nilakantha Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, this supplementary sum refers to the appointment of more senior officers than originally contemplated. As it appears from the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee, these appointments of new senior officers were not given out in detail, and, if these posts were not contemplated at the beginning of the year, I should like to know from the Honourable Member why it was necessary during the year to appoint more senior officers, specially when this department is directly under the Railway Board This is a Central Department.

Then, again, with regard to the question of gratuities to retiring staff, they have exceeded the original estimates. The retiring staff must be known to the department. It is generally known when an officer is to retire, and, therefore, I want to know how it is that Rs. 30,000, which is practically 1/16th of the entire voted amount of the department, could remain unanticipated at the beginning of the year I want information on these two points

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, my Honourable friend is a Member of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, and I should have thought that the more natural course for him would have been to ask these questions, on points of detail, in the Committee Room rather than spend the time in this House for this purpose, but I have no objection to give him the information.

The first question he raised was regarding the appointment of more senior officers than originally contemplated. My Honourable friend is under a misapprehension in thinking that this grant is under the control of the Railway Board. The grant is administered by the Auditor General who is not under the control of the Railway Board. The difficulty with regard to anticipating who are the officers that will be in the Railway Audit Department is that the Department of Accounts and Audit is worked as a whole by the Auditor General, and it happens sometimes that officers are transferred from the civil offices of accounts and audit to railway offices of audit, and, consequently, it might happen that the programme in contemplation in the beginning of the year cannot be strictly adhered to. The net result is, however, that if there is an excess under this grant to the Railway Audit Department, there will be a corresponding reduction under the grant for Audit in the General Budget.

[Mr. P. R. Rau.]

My Honourable friend's second point is as regards gratuities. Here again my Honourable friend is quite right in thinking that ordinarily gratuity is admissible to a man who retires and it is possible to foresee this at the time of the preparation of the budget. But, in the particular circumstances of the last two or three years, when a number of people have been retrenched with the consequence that they are paid gratuities earlier than they would have drawn them in the normal course, it has been found difficult to make proper estimates.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 80,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Audit'."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. P. R. Rau: I do not propose to move the next motion that stands in my name, because, since giving notice of this motion, I have received information from local administrations which leads to the conclusion that this demand is not necessary. The excess that is anticipated on the share of surplus profits payable to railway companies will be more than made up by a reduction in the net earnings payable to worked lines.

As I had already placed this demand before the Standing Finance Committee and as they had agreed to it, it was necessary for me to make this explanation for not moving this demand. With your permission, Sir, I shall move the next demand, No. 3

WORKING EXPENSES—MAINTENANCE OF STRUCTURAL WORKS.

Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 11,50,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved.

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 11,50,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works'."

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): I understand that No. 2 is not moved by the Honourable Member. But since this amount is already shown in the revised estimates, there will be a net saving equivalent to this amount in the total of the budget?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Yes.

Permanent Way and Bridge Materials.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I have two different motions, namely, 1 and 2

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There are five motions in the Honourable Member's name.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: But I refer to motions Nos. 1 and 2 for the present. They are two different motions on two items in the demand. So, may I be allowed to move them one after another and speak on them together?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Certainly.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,50,000 in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works' be reduced by Rs. 3,00,000."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. The Chair does not understand the Honourable Member clearly. His object is that it should be reduced by six lakhs—that is the idea?

Pandit Nilakantha Das:

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then, the Honourable Member had better confine himself to the first motion

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I have moved it But the two motions are inter-related and I may speak on them together.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member should move them separately.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,50,000 in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works' be reduced by Rs. 3,00,000."

I refer to items Nos. (ii) and (iii). One is disposal of obsolete and unwanted permanent way materials on the Bengal Nagpur and Burma Railways —three lakhs, and the other is writing down the value of bridge material and other miscellaneous stores of the Frontier Railway Reserve to market prices on the North Western Railway—three lakhs. As to this, I hope the Honourable Member will not take shelter under the fact that I am a member of the Standing Finance Committee. In fact this year the whole budget, including supplementary grants was taken up and finished in one day, and I am sorry I could not go into all the details. This even in the Finance Committee I expressed to my Honourable friend. However, that is all private. I shall refer only to what I see from the proceedings of the Finance Committee. At page 77 of the report, you will find:

"One of the Members of the Committee (*Pandit Nilakantha Das*) desired that details should be furnished to him about the obsolete and surplus permanent way materials on the Bengal Nagpur Railway on account of which a loss of 3 lakhs was expected to be incurred during the current year."

At first, in the Finance Committee's proceedings, only the Bengal Nagpur Railway appeared, there was no mention of the Burma Railways, and it was three lakhs.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member wants this reduction by way of economy?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Yes. The Burma Railways has been added afterwards, and it was not mentioned then. The Bengal Nagpur Railway and the North Western Railway are the two railways concerned in these two motions, and, if you see the stores balances report, you will find that these two railways are the worst culprits so far as reduction of stores balances is concerned. In 1922-23 when the stores balances went up to 23½ crores, the Bengal Nagpur Railway's was 161 or 162 lakhs, and they have reduced it to 97. Now, it is practically one crore. In the North Western Railway, it was three crores 93 lakhs. Now, it has been 1,65 or 1,66 lakhs. As compared with other lines, these two lines have been the slowest in reducing balance. I need not quote more figures. The Honourable Member knows it well. But this writing down the surplus bridge material to market price perhaps does not belong to this commercial section. It belongs to the military or the strategic section for it belongs to the North Western Railway reserve and, in that military section, just as for military stores, to which I am not referring here, the stores balance has been 57 lakhs 68 thousand in 1922-23, when the balance was highest. Now, in 1932-33, it rose up to one crore and two lakhs Now, it is 93 lakhs 25 thousand So it is quite probable that there is a very heavy pressure on these two lines for reducing the stores balances. Besides, I may enter into the history of these stores purchases, particularly of these two companies. So far as the Bengal Nagpur Railway is concerned, my Honourable friends in this House might remember how, during the last 15 years, which was referred to by my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, yesterday, 377 crores have been spent for the development of India, and, during this period, this Bengal Nagpur Railway particularly have spent on materials, if we look to the accounts, more in England than in India, unlike other railways.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): On a point of order. These are questions of policy which cannot be debated now.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member knows that questions of policy cannot be debated now

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I simply want to show that these reductions should not be granted. Why was that surplus there? That is what I mean to prove

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): No question of policy can be debated.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: All I say is that this surplus should be examined into. That is what I wish to prove. If my friends do not want proof, then I shall simply move that these should not be given.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I never objected to that

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): So long as the Honourable Member does not debate any questions of policy.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I never go into any policy. I refer to the heavy purchases from England by these two companies particularly and want to prove that there has been an excess in the stores balance. These two companies want to reduce it at any cost now. It is a fact that this Bengal Nagpur Railway were receiving patents from their own officials under some name, the name of Henry Williams in which the partners were their own officers, their Chief Engineers, their own Agents and from them this company used to purchase universal sleepers and other sleepers . . . . .

Mr. P. R. Rau: On a point of order. May I point out that these sums are required purely for adjustments of accounts. The charge to revenue will be counterbalanced by a credit to capital and the only question is whether for correct accounting these stores should be held at the original value or should be reduced to the present market value I think all these various other matters are quite out of order on this question.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: How am I to prove how these surpluses came to be there It is their own fault—due to extravagance of the companies. We must inquire into the reason for these surpluses, whether they were necessary, whether they were ordered under the instructions of the Railway Board or whether the Agent who was then and is now . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) The Chair understands the question here is only one of adjustment of accounts.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural): Does the Honourable Member mean to say that Item No. 2, where they talk of the disposal of obsolete and unwanted permanent way materials, is a mere book entry? The third I appreciate—writing down the value of bridge material—that you should debit it to revenue and credit to capital but does he mean to tell me, unless the words mean something quite different in his English language, that the disposal of obsolete and unwanted permanent way material is a matter of book entry?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The result of it is that the capital at charge will be reduced and the difference between the original cost and the amount we get by disposing of these materials will be charged to revenue.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: There is an intended sale at a less price, if it means anything at all?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Yes, there is, if we can find purchasers.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Therefore it is not a mere question of book entry on either side. It cannot be.

Mr. P. R. Rau: This expenditure will be counterbalanced by a credit to capital.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: How can it be if you are disposing of the material at a lesser price?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am afraid it is a technical question of accounting and it is not very easy to explain here

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: If this is the information to be given, I object to it Either it should be explained or not explained. I object to the preface.

Mr. P. R. Rau: The point is that certain permanent way material was obtained some years ago in these railways They are now obsolete. I do not know the price at which they were obtained Assuming that the original price was ten lakhs and it is now sold at seven lakhs, the result will be that the capital will be reduced by 10 lakhs and the amount of seven lakhs that we are disposing them for will be credited to revenue and the reduction of capital will be counterbalanced by a charge to revenue of ten lakhs. The net result is that the revenue is charged with the difference between the original cost and the proceeds of the sale.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Whatever that may mean, these obsolete materials are going to be scrapped or to be sold to other companies or disposed of in any other way. That explanation in detail is necessary. I am ready to discuss them and to show that this company has been guilty of purchasing things which are obsolete and it is not a question of three lakhs only. There may be other items and there may be other items in future too So, we should like to know about the exact nature of this reduction--either scrapping or disposing of the material in any other way So I propose that this money should not be granted now and there should be a proper inquiry about the details of these materials Then and then alone it can be taken up for consideration Then again, about these bridge materials, I find from the books that the North Western Railway were purchasing more than 50 per cent. bridge material from outside India, when bridge materials are made in this country. Sir, they are doing this year after year, and I may also point out that complaints have often been made that bridge materials are purchased unnecessarily . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That has no bearing on the matter now in question.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Sir, I am going to show why this bridge material was purchased at all. If it was purchased at the risk of the Agent or somebody else, they should be taken to task if it was unnecessarily purchased. Why should we write it down to the present market value? Was it under the orders of the Railway Board that those things were purchased? That is what I want to know If I know the details, then I shall be satisfied. Otherwise, if I am told that these things should be written down to the present market value without any rhyme or reason, I shall not be satisfied. Sir, many things may be purchased, and at any future date they may be written down to the present market value, and it will be a book entry. I do not really understand the explanation. So I propose that proper details should be given to the House, and they should be properly examined, before these two grants are made. Otherwise the blame should be apportioned. So, I do not discuss the matter any more, but shall simply put this simple question on these two motions.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Amendment moved:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,50,000 in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works' be reduced by Rs. 3,00,000."

Further amendment moved.

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,50,000 in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works' be reduced by Rs. 3,00,000."

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Sir, I should like to say a few words about this item and the next item No. 2 The question of asking for it does not arise now. After the materials are sold ultimately and that sale results in a loss, that is the proper time to ask for it. If I understand the explanation to have any meaning at all, it is that, the stores having been purchased, what is now stated is that, inasmuch as they have not been used but are in the hands of the railway companies and, when sold, are likely to result in a loss of Rs. 3 lakhs, therefore this grant is asked for. Now, it is premature to ask for that sum at all now; the only time to ask for that sum is when the materials have in fact been disposed of. As regards the second item, this is not a demand for actual money wanted—that is the short answer to it—this is not money that is required for "disbursements" but I understand the Honourable Member to explain, as far as I am able to understand his explanation, this. He has got a certain material that is going to be disposed off, but he anticipates that, on its disposal, there is likely to be a loss of Rs. 3 lakhs. That is the only explanation that he has vouchsafed to this House, and if that is so, it is premature to make that demand at all. No money is required for the purpose of actual disbursements. That is the first point. As regards the other—the writing down of the value of bridge material and other miscellaneous stores, if that means merely this that there is a book entry representing, I presume, the cost, but for some reason or other he wants to write down the material but showing it at a lesser cost because today the market value has gone down, if that is the explanation, again, in so far as the actual demand for money is concerned, actual money is not required. What is required is permission to debit it to revenue and credit it to capital. If I have still failed to appreciate these two points, then it is up to my Honourable friend to explain them to the House.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I quite appreciate the point of view laid down by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, but the only point about this is that it is quite contrary to all existing accounting principles. So far as the first point is concerned, though the actual loss is known, only after the bridge material and other miscellaneous stores have been sold, the point is that we are required, under the Constitution, to obtain from the Assembly a grant for the expenditure expected to be incurred during the year, and I submit that it would not be constitutionally correct to wait till the money is spent before coming to the Assembly for the grant. It would not be a supplementary grant, but would then be an excess grant. As we know that the expenditure is to be incurred, it is our plain business to come to the Assembly and ask for a grant likely to be required.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): What is the expenditure on?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The expenditure, Sir, is the charge to revenue in reduction of capital. I think it is sufficiently well-known to all businessmen here

[Mr. P. R. Rau.]

—that, when you reduce your capital at charge, you have to find the money somehow by charging to your current expenditure. As regards the second point, the writing down of the value of bridge material and other miscellaneous stores, the point there is exactly the same. Under the ordinary accounting procedure, we try to keep the value of our stores to market price, and I do not think it would be held to be correct from an accounting point of view—and I appeal on this point to the businessmen in this House—to show all your stores at higher prices than they would fetch if they are sold in the open market; that would not be giving to the House the true financial position of the Railways. That is all I have to say on this matter, Sir.

Prof. N. G. Ranga (Guntur *cum* Nellore: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I wish to say a few things in this connection. I learn from Honourable Mr. Rau's explanation just now that he must ask for permission of this House for the expenditure of these three lakhs in order to dispose of certain unwanted permanent way and bridge materials, and so on. (*Voices* "No, no.") Now, I do not think he has to incur any additional expenditure actually, but just to employ his own staff for them to go into the market and sell these materials . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member does not appear to have followed the Honourable Mr. Rau.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, I am trying to answer his explanation. If, on the other hand, he thinks that he has got to buy some permanent way material and he must dispose of this and replace it by some other material . . . . .

Mr. P. R. Rau: Not necessarily replace it, Sir.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: . . . . and he expects to incur a loss of Rs. 3 lakhs, then, certainly he has a right to come to this House for permission to incur the expenditure of Rs. 3 lakhs. Otherwise, there is really no justification for his coming to this House for this particular grant of Rs. 3 lakhs. Coming to the other point of writing down the value of the bridge material and other miscellaneous stores, I ask, why has it become necessary? Because he has got this material on his hands. And he has this material on his hands evidently because when he was purchasing it, he knew that he would deal with this material on an emergent occasion. Therefore, he has purchased it. After having purchased it, he finds now that it is useless,—not that it is absolutely useless, at all events the market price has gone down, and, therefore, he thinks its value should also be brought down; and, if that is the case, I would like him to explain to me one or two relevant facts. The total value of the railway stores in this country was valued at Rs. 23 crores 67 lakhs in 1921-22, but here, during this year, as was stated in the Railway Budget, the present value of the railway stores has come down to 8¾ crores. Now, I would like to know whether this reduction from 23 crores 67 lakhs to 8¾ in the value of the stores that the Government of India in its Railways keep with them has been due to a similar procedure having been followed in the past either with or without the knowledge of the Legislative Assembly as is now followed in writing down the value of bridge material and other miscellaneous stores and so on. Sir, it is a well-known fact that the prices of railway materials as well as other materials have come down very considerably,—by fifty per cent. and so on. Is it because a certain procedure has been followed that this particular decrease has been shown in the value of the stores maintained by the railways?

Mr. P. R. Rau: May I interrupt the Honourable Member? The decrease that he is referring to is certainly not due to revaluation. A very large part of the decrease is due to the fact that stocks have been consumed.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: This explanation also makes it perfectly clear that at one time they had too much of stores, instead of continuously purchasing stores and at the same time utilizing their own stores and in that way reducing the total stock of stores in their own hands. Thus, the N. W. R. had at one time 3,94 lakhs of stores, and now by 1934-35 it came down to 1,65 lakhs. That shows also that they have found that their former policy or former programme was wrong in taking so much stores. Therefore, they were utilising the stores which they already had in their hands and they have now come down to the policy of reducing the stores. If that is the case, then it proves my contention that this Government, for some reason or other, have been following not the policy, but the wrong programme of having on their hands too much of stores? For what purpose did they have them? I suspect that it is because they have, from time to time, to make it convenient for private manufacturers in this country and also the manufacturers in England who are interested in manufacturing all these railway materials. Whenever those people were anxious to sell their stores and whenever they were anxious to go on with their building programme, according to my suspicion, they approached the Government of India and requested them to purchase something from them. Whether they needed them or not, the Government of India was continuing to purchase these stores and in this way this result has been achieved.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is simply repeating himself.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: And what is the result? The result is this that they have got too much of stores on their hands.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has said that more than once.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: It is not out of order anyway.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is repeating himself.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Excuse me, Sir, I do not propose to repeat myself in future. The result has been this that they have these surplus stores, useless stores, unwanted stores and they find it necessary to bring down the value of these stores to the market value. The market value of the stores has really gone down and they have no use for the stores which they have in their hands, and, therefore, they want to get rid of them. The only way to show us a satisfactory account of great reduction in the value of stores is to ask us to write down the value of these materials and other miscellaneous stores. Therefore, the present programme of the Government of India in these railways is not at all satisfactory. It is really ruinous and is uneconomical and results in continuous process of loss of financial resources of this country as well as the railways. Therefore, this House, I am sure, will be justified in refusing to pass this particular supplementary demand.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Mr President, I wish to refer to item (ii)—disposal of obsolete and unwanted permanent way materials on the Bengal Nagpur and Burma Railways. So far as I understood the Honourable Member, he meant to say that this was a proposal to write down this material by three lakhs of rupees and that no money was asked for. Is that so?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The money has to be asked for under this demand because finally it will be accounted for as an additional expenditure under demand No. 6-A and a minus expenditure under another grant.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: That is a book entry, but actually the money is not being spent from the revenues or from capital. This is merely a book entry to show that you expect that this material has depreciated by three lakhs or it has become obsolete to the extent of three lakhs. You will dispose of this material

Mr. P. R. Rau: The real point is that if it is re-valued at moderate rates, the loss will be found to be equivalent to three lakhs. Whether it is disposed of or retained in stock, the loss in value is already there.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: You cannot dispose of it?

Mr. P. R. Rau: If we can find purchasers, we shall dispose of it.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Then, I understand your proposal is that your material has depreciated in your own estimates by three lakhs. Whether it is correct or not can only be ascertained when you sell it or try to sell it, but in the meantime you want to make a book entry to the extent of three lakhs and you want the sanction of this House for the purpose of doing so.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar (Madras ceded Districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, the Honourable Member says that the deficit is due to the disposal of obsolete and unwanted permanent way materials. But are they really obsolete or is it merely a book adjustment? The adjective "obsolete" clearly indicates that these articles cannot be in use any longer. They have either to be sold away or converted into raw material, and once again fresh material would be purchased for the purpose of new designs. I would like the Honourable Member to give us information about the total cost of materials that have now become obsolete. When were they purchased and how have they been allowed to become obsolete? What is the total loss? Who are likely to purchase it? I am afraid there is a likelihood of a fraud in this connection because many articles which are useful may be disposed of as obsolete articles and a loss incurred to the extent of three lakhs of rupees. What is the agency which purchases these articles? What are those obsolete and unwanted articles? If they were purchased a number of years ago, when was it discovered that they were obsolete and unwanted? If it is more than ten years that they have been allowed to become obsolete and unwanted . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thought the Honourable Member wanted some information.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: And, then, whether it is likely . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable Member wants information, he ought to give the other side a chance to give the information.

Mr. P. R. Rau: If the House wants to have these details, I can read the information supplied by the Bengal Nagpur Railway. The total consists of eight items, aggregating Rs 2,66,000, the details of which are as follows:

	Rs.
(1) 90 lb and 85 lb. rails not fit for Main Line use, written down to equivalent value of 75 lb. rails . .	22,000
(2) Unwanted guard rails of level crossings. . . .	2,000
(3) Short obsolete and unwanted check rails and crossing components	17,000
(4) Short switches and crossings of obsolete design . .	5,000
(5) Obsolete old rails and fish plates, such as double headed 62 lb. rails.	23,000

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member need not give all the items These are matters on which information ought to have been obtained in the Standing Finance Committee.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): May I invite your attention to this note which says that one of the members of the Committee, Pandit Nilakantha Das, wanted the details to be furnished to him about the obsolete and surplus permanent way material on the Bengal Nagpur Railway on account of which a loss of three lakhs was expected to be incurred during the current year

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Those details have now been given.

Mr. P. R. Rau: That information was supplied to the Honourable Member.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,50,000 in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works' be reduced by Rs 3,00,000."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,50,000 in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works' be reduced by Rs. 3,00,000."

The motion was negatived.

Fencing on Burma Railways.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Sir, in my amendment No. 5, I want information about these 108 miles of fencing on the Burma Railways. I should like to know when that was made and why it was made and why was that fencing dismantled? I want some detailed information about it.

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): Sir, I rise to a point of order. May I know that when supplementary demands are moved in this House, is it or is it not permissible for token cuts to be moved to discuss questions of policy to get information?

1 P. M.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Token cuts cannot be moved to discuss questions of policy.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I want some information about fencing on the Burma Railways.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I understand that my Honourable friend does not wish to move his motion, but only wants some information on the question of dismantling of this fencing. The explanation is that some years ago, in 1928, to be exact, certain fencing on parts of the Burma Railways, which were inferior to the Indian State Railways pattern, has been so broken or destroyed, to a great extent by the act of the inhabitants of the adjoining areas, that it was useless as a fence. The renewal of the fencing was estimated to cost over six lakhs, but the expenditure was, however, not considered justified. The Railway Board, after consulting the Government Inspector of Railways, sanctioned the removal of the fencing in 1929, subject to the condition that it should be maintained along the railway boundary between the railway and the road or village for such distance as the road or village was within a distance of 300 feet from the centre line of the railway. This, I understand, was done in consultation with the civil authorities.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I do not wish to move my next amendment No. 6*

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim). The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 11,50,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works'."

The motion was adopted.

WORKING EXPENSES—MAINTENANCE OF CARRIAGE AND WAGON STOCK.

Mr. P. R. Rau (Financial Commissioner, Railways): Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 18,00,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Carriage and Wagon Stock'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 18,00,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Carriage and Wagon Stock'."

*"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,50,000 in respect of 'Working expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works' be reduced by Rs. 100 (Bridge material and other stores of the Frontier Railway Reserve)."

Pandit Nilakantha Das: May I move my amendment No. 7*?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's amendment seeks to reduce the demand by Rs. 100.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Yes, Sir. Is it not allowed?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Discussions of policy are not allowed. All token cuts are not allowed.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I want to know if this expenditure has been incurred.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Seeing that today is the 26th day of March, most of it has probably been spent

Mr. S. Satyamurti: If that is so, I rise to a point of order, and I want your ruling on that. I would refer you, Sir, to Rule 50 of the Indian Legislative Rules (Article 160 of the Manual of Business and Procedure) which says:

"An estimate shall be presented to the Assembly for a supplementary or additional grant when :

(i) the amount voted in the Budget of a Grant is found to be insufficient for the purposes of the current year, or

(ii) a need arises during the current year for expenditure for which the vote of the Assembly is necessary upon some new service not contemplated in the budget for that year."

There is a proviso which follows which is not relevant for the purpose of my present point of order.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is a new service.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am on the point that this expenditure, according to the statement of my Honourable friend who moved this demand, has been incurred. I submit that where expenditure has been incurred the proper procedure is to come to this House by way of a demand for excess grant, and not by way of a supplementary grant, because a supplementary grant implies a demand for expenditure to be incurred. I have also got a ruling governing this point, which I shall also place before you for your consideration. It is Case No. 509 in the Book, "A Selection from the Decisions from the Chair".

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What is laid down there is the correct parliamentary procedure, but the practice in this House has always been to treat such grants as supplementary grants.

---

*"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 18 lakhs in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Carriage and Wagon Stock' be reduced by Rs. 100 (Purchase and Repairs—where and how made)."

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Your predecessor, Sir, said stmething else. I am now reading out that ruling:

"On a motion for a supplementary demand under Railways (Appropriation from Depreciation Fund), it was stated by Government that the total expenditure would exceed the original grant.

The President pointed out that for monies already spent motions in that form should not be made.

Sir George Rainy explained that that had been the usual practice and that the greater part of the supplementary demand asked for had already been incurred.

The President thereupon observed: I think the Honourable Member will agree with me when I say that if money has been spent already in excess of the grant voted by this Assembly, the Government can only come by way of a motion for excess grant That is, as I understand, the right Parliamentary procedure. However, as the Honourable Member points out that this practice has been in vogue for the last few years, I do not wish to raise any objection at this stage, but will see that the procedure is regularised in future"

Well, Sir, this took place on the 16th March, 1929

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Will the Honourable Member point out whether it was regularised?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I was not here then. I submit, Mr. President, it is my duty and privilege to point out the defects, and I have to ask you to see that we establish right precedents, when a point of order is raised.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What will be the substantial difference?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: The substantial difference is a great deal. If you look into these demands, they will come to nearly 12 crores. All this huge sum, the Government go on spending without the previous consent of this House, as if this House does not exist at all. It is not a case of only one supplementary grant. If the financial procedure is properly followed, the Government ought not to incur a pie of expenditure without the previous vote of this House (Hear, hear), unless unforeseen circumstances compel them to come forward with an excess demand.

Indeed, I shall have to raise another point of order. According to May's Parliamentary Practice, supplementary demands can only be moved for meeting unforeseen contingencies, for example, a charge levied by statute which they could not have foreseen, or something like the Bihar earthquake disaster which the Government could not have foreseen. I submit, Mr. President, that the Government are going on as if supplementary budget is additional budget, and not a real supplementary budget as we would like it to be. I ask you, Sir, therefore, in the interests of the financial control of the House not being attenuated further than it is at present, to follow the procedure laid down by your predecessor. and to regularise the system of these supplementary and excess grants in future. I quite see that it may not be possible, here and now, for you to rule them out. But I am quite willing that you should give the Government notice that you will not allow them to put down, as supplementary demands, sums which have already been spent. I want you to lay down the procedure hereafter.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The real question is not whether it is called excess grant or supplementary grant. The point raised really amounts to this, that it is an expenditure actually incurred in excess of the estimate that is sanctioned and upon that a much wider question has been raised. That is not really a question of procedure which only the Chair can regulate. It is for the House and for the Government to see that proper estimates are made and that excess expenditure on any large scale is not to be incurred. But that is a very different thing from the question of mere procedure.

Prof N. G. Ranga: Sir, I should like to know what the real position is in regard to the maintenance of carriage and wagon stock of the Government of India. In the report of the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, Vol. IX, No 4, it is stated that owing to decreased traffic, in the last few years, a large number of wagons have been scrapped without replacement and a large number are due for renewal. But no efforts were made to improve some of these wagons before they were scrapped No attempt seems to have been made to find out whether, without scrapping them, Government could not have economised their expenditure by trying to improve them. And this scrapping was done in a very peculiar manner The rolling stock programme, approved by the Committee at their meeting in January last in Simla, involved an expenditure of 278 lakhs, the expenditure to be met from the depreciaion fund being three crores and so on. This programme did not include any general service wagons. The report runs:

"As I informed the Committee at the time, the question of the number required was then under investigation by the Railway Board."

They were then investigating about the number of wagons they would need. In the meanwhile, somehow,—whether it was in the meanwhile or a little in advance of that,—a large number of wagons had been scrapped because it was found that there was no use for them.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What is the information that the Honourable Member wants? He is only giving certain information.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: All this information is in support of my question.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What is the Honourable Member's question?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I should like to know why it was that before all these wagons were scrapped there was no attempt made to maintain them by improving them. Secondly, the Government of India now come forward with this proposal to improve a large number of carriages and wagons at an enormous cost of 18 lakhs of rupees while, at the same time, ordering for a large number of wagons at a very much greater cost from the private firms. I wonder why the Government of India are not trying or have not tried to manufacture these wagons themselves and why the Government of India. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): In raisng the point about the manufacture of wagons, the Honourable Member is surely embarking on a very large question.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I want to know why the Government of India have not tried to maintain and improve the old wagons before they were scrapped; and I should like them also to explain. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has put that question; let him take the answer.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Have I to put one question after another or simply to put all questions together and take the answer at one time. If you want me to put one question after another, I have no objection.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable Member has more than one question, he can put them. What are the questions?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Here is a demand for 18 lakhs for maintenance of carriage and wagon stock. They want to improve them. Before they have come to this particular decision they have scrapped a large number of wagons and they give the reason that they did not want those wagons because there was diminishing traffic. They scrapped them first; then they came to the conclusion that they wanted some more wagons and they wanted some of their existing wagons to be improved. I should like them to explain why they have not followed this particular policy of improving their old wagons before they scrapped them. Secondly, while they propose to carry out these particular improvements for these carriages and wagons, do they propose to carry out these improvements in their own railway workshops or do they propose to ask for tenders from private firms and so on. If they want private firms to place their tenders before them, are they sure that by getting these wagons improved by private firms they would not be incurring a very great loss?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, most of my Honourable friend's speech might perhaps have been relevant when the question of the money required for the purchase of wagons next year was considered by the House a few days ago. At the present moment the demand that is made here is for repairs and maintenance of existing wagons and not for the purchase of new wagons. My Honourable friend has referred to the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee where it has been stated that for two or three years, when traffic had been slack, we were able to refrain from buying new wagons in replacement of old wagons which had reached their normal life and were considered unfit to carry the traffic. I take it that is not a point on which my Honourable friend would like to condemn Government because, after all, what we did. . . .

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Did all these wagons run out their normal life?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am quite sure that these wagons which were scrapped were either damaged in accidents or were approaching the end of their normal life or for other reasons were quite unfit to run. But the point is that for the last two or three years we did not think it necessary to renew wagons because the traffic did not justify it. Now that traffic is improving, a certain number of wagons have to be renewed and a large number to be repaired. The expenditure which is referred to in this

demand is for the repairs and maintenance of our existing wagons. A large number of these had been kept in lines and not put in traffic; and when they had to be put in traffic naturally a considerable amount of expenditure has to be incurred on repairs.

As regards the other point raised whether we could not recondition the old wagons, that, as explained in the budget speech . . .

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Will the Honourable Member give me the number of wagons repaired?

Mr. P. R. Rau: As regards reconditioning the old wagons, my Honourable friend knows from the budget memorandum that we have already taken up that question, and in the Tatanagar workshops of the East Indian Railway we are proposing to recondition a thousand wagons to find out whether it is not cheaper to spend, say, a thousand rupees on each wagon which is nearing the expiry of normal life,—say a wagon between 25 to 30 years of age,—rather than buy new wagons each costing Rs. 4,000.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Will the Honourable Member tell me what is the number of these wagons repaired with these 18 lakhs as compared with as many new wagons and their price?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I do not know. I think the repairs on each wagon might ordinarily cost about Rs. 200 or Rs. 300, but a new wagon would cost about Rs. 4,000.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir,

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has made a speech already; he cannot have more than one speech.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 18,00,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Carriage and Wagon Stock'."

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Half Past Two of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

MAINTENANCE OF PETTY STEAMERS AND HARBOURS.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 3,90,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Maintenance of Ferry Steamers and Harbours'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 3,90,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Maintenance of Ferry Steamers and Harbours'."

The motion was adopted.

WORKING EXPENSES—TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 12,85,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Traffic Department'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 12,85,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1935, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Traffic Department'."

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta has given notice of a cut under this demand to discuss the grievances of the traders of Katni: that has nothing to do with this demand. The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 12,85,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Traffic Department'."

The motion was adopted.

WORKING EXPENSES—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 15,30,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 15,30,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses'."

There are two motions, one in the name of Professor Ranga and the other in the name of Pandit Nilakantha Das: both are apparently token cuts.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I do not move it, Sir.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does the Honourable Member, Pandit Nilakantha Das, want to move his motion or does he want some information regarding it?

Inception of the Sterling Provident Fund.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I want some information—I do not intend moving the motion. There is not much to speak. I want information regarding the inception of the Sterling Provident Fund as a result of which the retrospective bonuses to certain subscribers are to be calculated and credited to their account on the 1st April, 1934, instead of as previously at the time of their retirement. What is this Sterling Provident Fund and why is it given retrospective effect from the 1st April and not as usual? I want to know.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, it is not the Sterling Provident Fund that has retrospective effect: these provident fund bonuses, which are admissible to railway staff, are now at the rate of 100 per cent. of their contributions. When the bonus scheme was originally started, it was at varying percentages depending on the profits made by the railway in question. But some years ago it was considered that it was unfair that an employee belonging to a certain railway should get less than an employee belonging to another railway because of the fact that his railway was not making the same profits as the other railway, and it was decided that from the beginning of the inception of the provident fund system every subscriber should be deemed to have been credited by the railway with an amount representing 100 per cent. of his own contribution. It was, however, arranged at the time that the calculation for this purpose should be made only when he retires and that all the accounts of the existing provident fund subscribers need not be altered wholesale on that date. With the institution of the Sterling Provident Fund it has been found more convenient that accounts of all the members who are eligible to join the Sterling Provident Fund should be recalculated. There is no question of any extra payment involved: it is only a question of calculation and whether the account should be made up at the time the railway servant retires or on the 1st April, 1934. So these two lakhs is only credited to the provident fund earlier than it would otherwise be.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Is there any distinction between the rupee and Sterling Provident Fund here? Is the calculation distinct from the rupee provident fund? That is what I want to know.

Mr. P. R. Rau: The orders of the Government of India are that certain of the staff will be allowed to have their accounts kept in sterling from the 1st April, 1934, instead of in rupees.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: What about other provident funds?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Retrospective bonus is also admissible to subscribers whose accounts are kept in rupees; but the accounts will be made up at the time of the retirement and not earlier.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): We are already having a foretaste of the New Constitution!

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 15,30,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses' "

The motion was adopted.

WORKING EXPENSES—ELECTRIC SERVICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 2,35,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Electric Service Department'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 2,35,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Electric Service Department'."

Does the Honourable Member, Mr. Nilakantha Das, wish to move his amendment?

Repairs to Units and Locomotives.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I am not moving my amendment, Sir, but I want some information. I want to know whether these repairs were carried out in respect of units and locomotives which ran their full course of life, and whether these repairs were carried out in some of our own Railway Workshops or somewhere else.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I can re-assure my Honourable friend on this point, all the repairs were undertaken in the workshops of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Had these units and locomotives run their full course of life like the wagons?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am sorry I could not catch my Honourable friend's point.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Sir, these units and locomotives have a certain course of life. I want to know if these repairs were made after they had run their full course of life or before that.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I am afraid my Honourable friend is confusing the question of renewals with that of repairs. There is no question of renewing these locomotives. As explained in the supplementary demand, the majority of the multiple unit stock coming in the shop had been on the line longer than the normal period of service and needed very heavy repairs, and so there was no question of premature repairs.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhuri (Bengal: Landholders): What type of locomotives?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Electric locomotives.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is.

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 2,35,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Electric Service Department'."

The motion was adopted.

APPROPRIATION TO DEPRECIATION FUND.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I beg to move.

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 8,00,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Appropriation to Depreciation Fund'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 8,00,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Appropriation to Depreciation Fund'."

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I would like to know . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair understands that the Honourable Member does not wish to move his motion.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I would like to know how it is that the Honourable Member had forgotten all about the necessity for making provision in respect of Appropriation to Depreciation Fund all these years, ever since the Depreciation Fund was established, and what action they took or have taken since against the officer or officers who were responsible for this omission, since, because, of their fault, it has been found necessary, for the Government to make provision for such a big grant as Rs. 8,00,000.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I have already explained that it is due to an oversight, and to err, I believe, Sir, is human. I do not think that Government will be justified in going back 11 years to find out who was the clerk in question who made this mistake.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, is there no way by which a mistake could be rectified once it is made? Can't it be rectified either at the time of the discussions of the Public Accounts Committee or when the Government Accounts are audited by the Auditor General? I think such mistakes can be found out without so much lapse of time.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, the process of keeping these accounts is such that once the mistake was originally made in 1925, it was difficult to discover it, because the contribution for the next year took as the starting point the

[Mr. P. R. Rau.]

contribution for the previous year. In future this sort of mistake cannot arise, because we are basing our calculations on the total capital charge, and are taking a proportion of 1·60 thereof as the contribution to the Depreciation Fund.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 8,00,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Appropriation to Depreciation Fund'."

The motion was adopted.

OPEN LINE WORKS.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Open Line Works'."

In moving this motion I should explain that no excess is anticipated over the grant voted originally by the Legislative Assembly in February last for this demand, but expenditure has been incurred on certain new services which were not contemplated at the time the original grant was obtained, and a token grant is, therefore, required under the legislative rules. The expenditure was on account of certain urgent works which had to be undertaken for purposes of safety. They have been enumerated at page 10 of the Supplementary Demands for Grants.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 1,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Open Line Works'."

Method of bringing in Supplementary Demands for Grants.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, I want to oppose this motion. I had almost raised a point of order on this, but in view of what fell from your lips this morning, I have decided to take more suitable opportunity to deal with it, but, in the meantime, I should like to draw the attention of the House, if I may, to the fact that these supplementary demands are being reduced to a farce by the Government. The rules and May's Parliamentary Practice alike contemplate that, whenever they feel a need for additional expenditure, Government should come to this House as early as possible. The Honourable the Finance Member has no use for our criticisms or suggestions, but may I gently ask him, if he will not be vulgar in replying . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: If you will not be vulgar in asking.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I have never been vulgar.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. That expression ought to be avoided.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes, I quite agree, but the need for it should also be avoided. I was asking, if my friend, the Finance Member, has applied his mind to the way in which these supplementary demands are being brought before this House? Has he looked into this matter, has he looked into this particular Demand No 12,—Railways? I should like to know from the Financial Commissioner, Railways, when the need for this expenditure arose, when the expenditure was actually incurred, what was there to prevent the Government from coming to this House, with a demand for a supplementary grant as early as they came to know of the need for this expenditure? Now, Sir, if you will kindly look into the items at page 10 of this Supplementary Demand for Railways, you will find under item (1) Additional stones for slopes of bund on the right upstream side of Kosi bridge The river was cutting in behind this bund and it was found necessary to strengthen it by additional pitching with stones in order to prevent its being breached I want to be told when the Government became conscious of the need for this expenditure, when they sanctioned the expenditure, and when this expenditure was incurred. Is there a person called the Auditor General in the Government of India? What are his duties? How was this expenditure sanctioned? Where was the vote of the House for it? There was nothing done. The expenditure is incurred, and the Financial Commissioner for Railways tells us there is no need to exceed the grant originally made, and, therefore, he says, he moves a token demand Now, Sir, I put it to him that it is consistent with canons of financial propriety that as soon as the need for expenditure arises, unless there is a contingency under which it is impossible for the Government to come to the Assembly before incurring the expenditure, they ought to come to us and take our sanction . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does the Honourable Member confine himself to new services or to the supplementary demand for services that have already been sanctioned?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: My point is with regard to the new services which came into existence owing to circumstances arising after the last Budget was passed by this House. So far as the new services are concerned, the Government cannot spend money on new services which were in their mind or could have been in their mind at the time they presented the original Budget, but sometimes an earthquake may happen, sometimes a flood may happen, prices may suddenly rise, a war may happen, and Government may be compelled, owing to circumstances which they could not have foreseen or beyond their control, to incur expenditure beyond what was sanctioned by the House. In that case, I submit to you and to the House, that if there is a reasonable time for them to come to this House, they should come before incurring the expenditure. But if, owing to the House not being in Session, or to the very extreme urgency of the case, the Government feel that they cannot afford, without serious consequences to them or the country, to avoid spending money, they can spend the money and then they ought to come to us by means of an excess grant. In this case you will find every pie was spent already. . . .

Mr. P. R. Rau: Not every pie of it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: But most of it no doubt. I can only go by the words, "Expenditure has been incurred on new services".

Mr. P. R. Rau: If my Honourable friend will read the Explanation at page 10, he will find that the expenditure proposed to be incurred on the first item, in 1934-35, is Rs. 1,13,000, while the total is Rs. 1,32,000. Part of the expenditure will be incurred next year.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: About Rs. 19,000?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Yes.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: My point still remains. So far as this first item is concerned, Rs. 1,13,000 has been already incurred. I submit that the Government must satisfy this House that they could not have come before this House, for sanction for this expenditure.

I come to the next item:

"Permanent retired alignment of the main line between Karagola and Kursela (estimated to cost Rs. 5,69,000) The Kosi river was cutting in very seriously in September, 1933, towards the railway line between Karagola and Kursela stations, and it appeared almost certain that the line would be breached in the next monsoon season. As the retired alignment entails very heavy earthwork throughout and the construction of two bridges, it was necessary to start work immediately to ensure completion by June, 1935."

The dates here are still more significant. This thing happened in September, 1933, that is, about six months before the presentation of the Budget to this House last year. May I know from the Honourable the Financial Commissioner for Railways when the Government came to be in possession of facts which made them feel that they should take up this work of retired alignment as they call it, why they did not put it in the budget of last year, and if they did not put it in the budget of last year, when they actually sanctioned the expenditure, who sanctioned the expenditure and under what authority the expenditure was sanctioned, and when the expenditure was actually incurred? Also why did they not come before the House much earlier than they have actually done? I come to the third item:

"Cut to divert the Mudgorge Nullah (estimated to cost Rs. 1,96,000). The Mudgorge tunnel is on the side of a steel hill and the Nullah at the bottom became so much deeper in the floods of 1933 that it was feared that the whole hill side would slip into the Nullah. Consequently, it was thought necessary to divert the Nullah at once."

When was it thought necessary? When did the Government get the information about the need for this work, and why did they not come to this House earlier than now? Also when did they sanction the expenditure, and when was the expenditure actually incurred? There is another matter that I should like to bring before you and the House. The Government are taking advantage of the proviso to Legislative Rule No. 50 which says:

"Provided that when funds to meet proposed expenditure on a new service can be made available by re-appropriation a demand for the grant of a token sum may be submitted to the vote of the Assembly and if the Assembly assents to the demand, funds may be so made available."

I should like to know the details of this re-appropriation. Did this reappropriation have the sanction of the Finance Department? Did it come before the Public Accounts Committee, and, if so, what are the details of this reappropriation? Are you satisfied, is this House satisfied

that the reappropriation has been made in a manner as not to defeat the purpose for which the original grant was made by this House? These are pertinent questions which are always raised and answered on the floor of any responsible House, before reappropriation is approved of by the House. But, as far as I can see, neither in this explanatory note, nor in the speech of my Honourable friend, to which I listened very carefully, is there any mention of how this expenditure is to be met by reappropriation. He simply says no excess is anticipated over the grant voted originally by the Legislative Assembly for this demand. I submit with some confidence that something more than that ought to be stated and proved by my Honourable friend, namely, that this expenditure can be met by reappropriation, and that is a matter, I think, again which requires sanction not only of the particular spending department but of the Finance Department and of the Public Accounts Committee, and ultimately this House must have some control over the manner in which this reappropriation is proposed to be made.

On the merits of this question, I have nothing particular to say against any of these items, because, as far as I can read them, they are urgent necessary works. But my simple point before you and before the House is that as soon as—as far as I can judge, the need for this expenditure arose long before today, and two of them arose in 1933 on the Government's own statement, it was either open to them to put them in the budget of last year, or if they could not, they should have come long before this time to this House. I wonder what my Honourable friend has got to say. If Honourable Members will add up the totals of these two supplementary demands, it comes roughly to between 11 and 12 crores, and I submit, including the surplus of Rs. 3½ crores which is being distributed to the various objects . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does the Honourable Member mean the Railway as well as the General?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes. Taking the whole thing together, I submit that it is really abusing the right of moving supplemental demands to ask the House to vote away such large sums of money, towards the end of March by way of supplemental demands. I will not re-state the point of order, it is for you and not for the House, but I do want to appeal to the House to exercise a very close scrutiny over these supplemental demands, and not to support them, unless the House is satisfied that these are new services which could not have been contemplated at the time the budget was introduced, or, in the alternative, the expenditure is necessary because the original estimates could not be as accurate as they should have been. I do not like the Treasury Benches to be encouraged in the belief that a supplemental demand is not a supplemental demand, but a kind of additional budget under which they can get large sums of money. After all, we are working, I know, under a very defective Constitution, but even that Constitution confers some powers upon us, and unless we are vigilant in the exercise of those powers and the Government at least co-operate to the extent of getting our vote at the earliest possible opportunity, I submit that even such attenuated powers as we have, will become still more attenuated. I, therefore, want answers to these three specific questions. What is the reappropriation proposed, and how is this money going to be met by reappropriation? When did the need for this expenditure come first to the notice of the Government? Why was it not

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

put in the last year's budget and why is it brought up so late as this? Again, if expenditure has been incurred, why is it not put forward as an excess grant, which really the rules contemplate in all cases, where expenditure has been incurred? Why is it brought forward as a supplemental demand, has it not in most cases been completely incurred? Though there may be some small amounts left over, still, on the whole, the bulk of the money is stated to be, "expenditure has been incurred". I, therefore, think that the House should establish its own right, such as it has over this expenditure, and tell the Government that they must be scrupulous in spending public money, and not to imagine that they could come to the House towards the end of March when we are all pressed for time, and place supplemental demand after supplemental demand before us, except in the very specific exceptional categories which parliamentary practice elsewhere and our rules and standing orders have established.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I have no quarrel with my Honourable friend in his theoretical exposition of the proper duties of the executive in relation to the Legislative Assembly in this matter, and I 3 P.M. am quite prepared to agree with him that it is part of the duty of the Government to bring forward motions for supplementary grants as soon as practicable after the necessity is known. But, I think when laying down principles of this sort, we must take into account the practical necessities of the situation. Each of these three works, which had to be started during the course of the year, were essential for the purpose of safety, and the Railway Department have, on grounds of practical convenience, to authorise, if necessary, Agents to start works of this sort as soon as they find it essential. In these particular cases, I am sorry I do not remember when exactly these were brought to our notice, but I must point out to the House that when the budget was passed last year for 1934-35 a special provision for emergent works of this sort was included in the budget—a special provision of Rs. 10 lakhs. I assume that the Assembly intended in making that special provision that it would be utilised for works of this nature which are essential. It is obvious that it would be impossible for us to wait, especially when the Assembly is not in Session, to start these urgent works till we get the prior sanction of the Assembly. On the second point as regards reappropriations, my Honourable friend wanted to know whether the reappropriations are possible. To that I can only say that the original estimate sanctioned by this Assembly was 13 crores and 24 lakhs and the revised estimate which we require is only 9 crores and 25 lakhs, so that the savings in other directions are ample enough to meet the small expenditure involved in this. The reappropriations have been duly sanctioned by the Financial Commissioner, who represents the Finance Member in this matter. As regards the point that no reappropriation should be made without the sanction of the Punblic Accounts Committee, I can only say that such a procedure is not contemplated in the legislative rules and it has not been the practice in the past. If the Auditor General considers that any of these reappropriations contravene the ordinary procedure he will bring it to the notice of the Public Accounts Committee in his Appropriation Report and it will then be for the Public Accounts Committee to examine it and see whether Government were justified in making the reappropriation. And finally my Honourable friend referred to the fact that as-

regards the second work the original emergency arose in September, 1933. Apparently what happened was that the administration was considering whether the action of the Kosi river was emergent enough to require certain works to be carried out but we had no information at the time the budget was prepared to justify us in putting this work in our programme. It is only after the programme was prepared that the seriousness of the situation was appreciated by the Railway administration and then it became a question of saving the railway from being breached in the monsoon season. The total expenditure involved is 5 lakhs 69 thousand of which it is expected that 3 lakhs will be spent in the current year. In view of the fact that a grant for emergencies is specifically sanctioned by the Assembly every year for this purpose—and I may add that this procedure of obtaining a grant for emergencies was started on the recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee—I do think that the objections raised by my Honourable friend are not valid.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of that statement, I raise a point of order. If you will look at the proviso, you will find that it reads like this:

"Provided that when funds to meet proposed expenditure on a new service can be made available by re-appropriation a demand for the grant of a token sum may be submitted to the vote of the Assembly and if the Assembly assents to the demand, funds may be so made available"

Now, the question I would submit to you, Mr President, is whether the authority which can sanction the reappropriation has sanctioned it. It may be the Financial Commissioner or the Finance Member or both. I do not know who sanctions it, but the reappripriation has not yet been made

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim). Supposing it has been sanctioned by a proper authority?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: If the reappropriation has been sanctioned by a proper authority, I submit it is perfectly consistent with the proviso as it stands, but, as I listened to my Honourable friend, he simply says that funds are available hereafter, which may be or may not be. We must have a definite statement by the Financial Commissioner or the Finance Member that this money has been reappropriated by the appropriate sanctioning authority. If it has been done, then this thing comes into force. Otherwise it comes to this, that the powers of this House are reduced, because only a token sum is placed before us. We want to be satisfied that the token sum represents merely a token demand for expenditure, which has been provided for by reappropriation by the appropriate sanctioning authority.

Mr. P. R. Rau: May I add a word of explanation in connection with what my Honourable friend has said—the funds have been sanctioned by the Railway Board with the concurrence of the Financial Commissioner out of the grant of ten lakhs which was made by the Assembly last year for the purpose of meeting expenditure of an emergent nature. Secondly, this proposal has been placed before the Standing Finance Committee, which is an elected Committee of this House, and has been approved by them.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has any reappropriation been made?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have already explained that funds have been provided from a grant voted by the Assembly. It is only because these works are not in the programme that according to the legislative rules this new service has been brought to the notice of the Assembly at this time.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That seems to be sufficient explanation, so far as the point raised by the Honourable Member is concerned.

The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 1,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Open Line Works'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS.

CUSTOMS.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): Sir I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 11,01,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Customs'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 11,01,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Customs'."

There is an amendment in the name of Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena. That is apparently for discussing something which is outside the scope of this demand.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): In this connection, may I invite your attention to page 2 of the Explanatory Memorandum of the Supplementary Demands? On the top of that page, you will find: Charges on collection of excise duty on sugar Rs. 6,300. You will find in every province like that. I submit that, so long as the particular question raised is within the scope of the supplementary demand, the ordinary rule with regard to cuts will apply. It must be within the scope, I agree. We cannot raise questions outside the scope. You will find that in Madras, Bombay, Bengal and the United Provinces there are items for this purpose. I, therefore, submit that it is in order.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The point really is whether it attempts to discuss a question of policy?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I invite your attention to ruling No. 510 reported in the Chair's rulings:

"A token cut was proposed under a supplementary grant and objection being raised on the ground that general questions of policy could not be raised on a supplementary demand:

The President ruled: In view of a large number of cuts that have been put down on these supplementary grants, I have taken some trouble to examine the question and I invite the attention of the House to a summary of the position as stated in May's 'Parliamentary Practice.'

Debate on supplementary and excess grants is restricted to the particulars contained in the estimates, on which those grants are sought and to the application of the items which compose those grants; and the debate cannot touch the policy or the expenditure sanctioned, on other heads, by the estimate on which the original grant was obtained, except so far as such policy or expenditure is brought before the Committee by the items contained in the supplementary or excess estimates.

That is the practice of the House of Commons and the President ruled that, in so far as they are included here, they will be in order."

Mr. A. H. Lloyd (Government of India: Nominated Official): May I suggest, Sir, that the inclusion in the supplementary demand of certain items of expenditure for the collection of a tax does not raise the question of the policy of having that tax at all, but merely raises the question whether the right machinery is employed or too expensive a machinery is employed for collecting that tax. I suggest that the question of abolishing the tax is entirely outside the scope of the issue raised by the entry in that demand.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The expenditure is for the collection of the tax?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: Yes, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I must point out, Sir, that the words there are:

"except so far as such policy or expenditure is brought before the Committee by the items contained in the supplementary or excess estimates."

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That policy could not have been brought before the Assembly because the heading of the estimate is "expenditure in connection with the collection of customs revenue" . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There is force in what is pointed out by the Honourable the Finance Member, but the Chair finds also that in the very ruling No. 510 it was held by the President:

"I now rule that no questions of policy can be raised on supplementary demands for grants except to the extent indicated in the summary I have read."

As regards the particulars of that particular demand. Now, what is the demand here? The demand is for the expenditure in connection with the collecting of all customs duties—the demand is not with respect to the particular tax—unless the contention be that there is no other tax to be collected excepting this. That is not so because the demand is in respect of expenditure in connection with the collection of customs duty, including excise and sugar excise. The Chair, therefore, holds that this motion is not in order. Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural) Mine is ruled out, Sir, by the observations you have already made.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 11,01,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Customs'."

The Assembly divided:

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order . . . .

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division Non-Muhammadan Rural): Before you declare the result—I do not want a recount—I want the Chair to intimate that once the voting papers are returned, they cannot be taken back.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Has anything like that been done?

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly Non-Muhammadan Rural): For the information of the Chair, I may say that the lobby paper had been returned to the Secretary and it was handed over to him and the other lobby paper was actually taken from his hand. I noticed that and I protested against it In fact, it was taken inside the lobby and one or two votes might have been recorded, and then it was returned back. I have already lodged my protest to the Secretary, because I actually saw the division list being taken in and then brought back from the lobby. We do not want any division again, but this fact I must certainly bring to the notice of the Chair.

Khan Bahadur Mian Abdur Aziz (Punjab: Nominated Official): Sir, there is nothing peculiar in this. On the occasion of the first Reserve Bank Bill, the voting had been counted and still a Member was allowed to vote with permission.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Is it denied that the paper was taken back? I ask for an answer.

Several Honourable Members: Whom do you ask for an answer?

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: If it is not denied by the Secretary that the paper was taken back I will assume that the paper was taken back irrespective of the fact whether further votes were recorded or not.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair understands that the paper was taken back, but the votes were not recorded. The paper ought not to be taken back except with the Chair's permission.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: That is all we want. I am quite content.

AYES—53.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian
Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.
Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan Bahadur Nawab Malik
Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A A. Venkatarama
Bajoria, Babu Baijnath.
Bajpai, Mr G S
Bewoor, Mr. G. V
Bhagchand Soni, Rai Bahadur Seth.
Bhore, The Honourable Sir Joseph
Buss, Mr L. C.
Chatterji, Mr J M
Crank, The Honourable Sir Henry
Dalal, Dr R D.
DeSouza, Dr F X
Drake, Mr D H C
Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya Ananda
Ghiasuddin, Mr M
Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.
Graham, Sir Lancelot
Grigg, The Honourable Sir James
Hockenhull, Mr F W
Hudson, Sir Leslie.
James, Mr F E
Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir
Jehangir, Sir Cowasji.
Kripalani Mr. Hirnand Khushiram.
Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri.
Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
Mehr Shah, Nawab Sahibzada Sir Savad Muhammad.
Metcalfe, Mr H A. F.
Milligan, Mr. J. A.
Mody, Mr. H. P.
Monteath, Mr. J.
Morgan, Mr G.
Mukerjee, Mr. N R.
Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya Charan
Nayar, Mr C Govindan.
Noyce, The Honourable Sir, Frank.
Owen, Mr L.
Rajah, Raja Sir Vasudeva.
Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur Makhdum Syed.
Rau, Mr P R.
Row, Mr K Sanjiva.
Sarma, Mr R. S
Scott, Mr. J Ramsay.
Scott, Mr. W L
Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain Sardar.
Singh, Mr Pradumna Prashad.
Sircar, The Honourable Sir Nripendra
Sloan, Mr. T.
Swithinbank, Mr B W.

NOES—54.

Aaron, Mr Samuel
Asaf Ali, Mr M.
Ayyangar, Mr M Ananthasayanam.
Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad
Ba Si, U
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
Banerjea, Dr. P N
Bardaloi, Srijut N C.
Chattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra Nath
Chettiar, Mr. T. S Avinashilingam.
Chetty, Mr Sami Venkatachelam.
Das, Mr. B.
Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.
Fakir Chand, Mr.
Fuzlul Huq, Mr. A. K.
Gadgil, Mr. N. V.
Giri, Mr. V. V.
Govind Das, Seth.
Gupta, Mr. Ghanshiam Singh.
Hosamani, Mr. S. K.
Iswar Saran, Munshi.
Jedhe, Mr. K. M.
Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
Khare, Dr. N. B.
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr D. K.
Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
Mangal Singh, Sardar.
Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Syed
Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.
Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta.
Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.
Parma Nand, Bhai.
Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.
Rajan, Dr. T. S. S
Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.
Ranga, Prof. N. G.
Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
Satyamurti, Mr. S.
Sham Lal, Mr.
Sheodass Daga, Seth.
Singh, Mr Deep Narayan.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.
Thein Maung, Dr.
Thein Maung, U
Umar Aly Shah, Mr.
Vissanji, Mr. Mathuradas.

The motion was negatived.

TAXES ON INCOME.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 77,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Taxes on Income'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 77,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Taxes on Income'."

The motion was adopted.

SALT.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 18,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Salt'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 18,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Salt'."

The motion was adopted

STAMPS.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move.

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 3,41,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Stamps'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 3,41,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Stamps'."

The motion was adopted.

INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT (INCLUDING WORKING EXPENSES).

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs 7,50,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 7,50,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)'."

The motion was adopted.

INTEREST ON ORDINARY DEBT AND REDUCTION OR AVOIDANCE OF DEBT.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 3,64,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Interest on Ordinary Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 3,64,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Interest on Ordinary Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt'."

There is a motion in the name of Prof. N. G. Ranga for reducing this demand by Rs. 100. It is a token cut The Chair wants to know if Prof. Ranga desires to move his amendment

Floating of Loans in England and in India.

Prof. N. G. Ranga (Guntur *cum* Nellore: Non-Muhammadan Rural): No, Sir. I do not wish to move my amendment*. But I want to put a few questions. I find on page 8 of the Memorandum of Supplementary Grants that for the purpose of management of the rupee debt, the Government of India had to spend Rs. 1,000 whereas they spent one lakh two thousand in the management of the sterling debt. I should like to know why so much more had to be spent upon the management of the sterling debt in England than what they had to spend in the management of the rupee loan. Next, as regards brokerage, commission, etc., on loans, the Government have incurred an expenditure of Rs. 2,27,000 on the rupee debt loans and I should like to know who are the brokers employed by the Government of India, what is the rate of commission that is paid to them and the other expenses that have been incurred by the Government of India which go to make up this sum of Rs. 2,27,000? Then about the sterling debt in England, the Government of India spent Rs. 16,000 on other items. What are those other items? Why only Rs. 16,000 has been spent there whereas there is a miscellaneous expenditure of Rs. 17,000 which is spent in India? If details are not provided to us with regard to these items, it would mean that the management of the debt in India is certainly very much cheaper, many times cheaper than it is in England and that brokerage, commission, etc., on loans, are being paid here in India at a very high rate indeed.

Then there are other questions. I should like to know who manages the floating of the loans in India and in England?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Will the Honourable Member please speak up. I cannot hear except a few words.

*"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,64,000 in respect of 'Interest on Ordinary Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I should like to know, Sir, who manages the floating of our loans in England and in India and on what basis is the management of the loans remunerated in England and in India? Who are the people who are engaged as brokers for the Government of India for floating the loan, and for the management of these loans in England and in India? What percentage of the loan raised is paid as commission in England and in India? Is there any difference in the commission paid in England and in India? If so, what is the difference and why?

Another point on which I want information is this: does it cost more to manage the floating of a loan in India than in England, for a corresponding debt? If so, what is the difference? What was the rate of interest payable on the sterling debt raised in England? I find here in the report of the Standing Finance Committee Vol XIV, No. 2, that in India the rupee debt was raised at three per cent while on the other hand the Government of India has raised a sterling loan in England, but no information is given as to the interest payable on that particular loan. Lastly I would ask the Honourable the Finance Member to tell us whether it is not a fact that the management of the debt and the floating of a debt in England is very much more costly than it is in India? If so, what is the percentage of difference between the cost of the management and floating of a debt in England and in India?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The management of the sterling debt is entrusted to the Bank of England. Up till the present, the management of the rupee debt has been shared between the Government of India and the Imperial Bank. The rates of commission paid on loan transactions are the same as have been paid for a good many years past in England and they are the same as those paid by all the Dominions

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What is the rate?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: It works out to about 1½ per cent. The main reason why it is very much less in India, is that the Government themselves do a large part of the work. In India the actual brokerage only comes to about one-sixteenth per cent. Now, as regards this item "A-4,—Brokerage, Commission, etc. on loans", I think my predecessor made up his last year's budget estimates on the assumption that there would be no rupee loan in India during the financial year, *i.e.*, the year which is just ending. In point of fact there have been two loans. As regards the sterling debt of Rs. 1,02,000, this excess is due to the fact that it was decided to take a sterling loan in London after my predecessor's budget estimates had been closed but before the end of the financial year. I think those are all the points that my Honourable friend raised, from all I could hear, and I hope I have satisfied him.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, arising out of the answer given by the Honourable Member . . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): This is not question time and the Honourable Member cannot go on asking questions.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, it is my painful duty again to draw your attention and that of the House to the financial impropriety of this supplemental grant. If you will kindly look at the note at the bottom of page 8, you will find this:

"An additional expenditure of Rs. 3,66,000 has been incurred, etc."

If it has been incurred, why should not the Government bring up an excess demand? Why should they bring up a supplemental demand for expenditure already incurred? Then, Sir, I want to know when this expenditure was incurred, when this expenditure was foreseen as being a liability on Government, and if this is the first opportunity on which Government could come up before this House. If it is not the first opportunity, why did they not come before us earlier? Then, Sir, regarding (1), I find that an excess of two lakhs was brought to the notice of the Standing Finance Committee and approved by them. May I know when this was brought to the notice of the Standing Finance Committee? And if it was brought to the notice of the Standing Finance Committee, is this the first opportunity after that meeting of the Standing Finance Committee, when the Honourable the Finance Member could come before this House? If it was brought before the Standing Finance Committee at an earlier stage, why was it not brought immediately before this House, unless this is the first opportunity which the Finance Member has of bringing it before this House? Then, Sir, I want to know when this increase of Rs. 45,000 arose owing to the subsequent flotation of another loan, *i.e.*, three per cent. bonds, 1941. When was the loan floated, when was the expenditure incurred, when was the liability foreseen? Why was not the House taken into confidence as early as possible? Is this again the first opportunity when they could have come? Then, again, we are told that the sterling loan of Rs. 1,21,000—

"represents the carry over of expenditure on account of the sterling loan floated in England during the last financial year"

Does it mean the financial year 1933-34? If it means that, may I know if this is the first opportunity when this expenditure could have been brought up before this House? Why was it not brought up earlier? Why was it not put in the budget last year, if it was an expenditure on account of the sterling loan floated in England during the last financial year, that is, 1933-34? It says:

"It has been found possible to meet a small sum of Rs. 2,000 by reappropriation within the demand."

May I know the details of that reappropriation? It concludes by saying:

"A supplementary grant of Rs. 3,64,000 is, therefore, required."

It is not easy to speak with restraint on this outrage on all elementary canons of financial propriety. You go and incur expenditure beyond what is sanctioned to you, and you come gently along, as and when it suits you, and you come and tell us at the end of March that this expenditure has been incurred which you want to be sanctioned. It seems to me, Mr. President, that it is not right. They ought to come at the earliest possible opportunity, and I do hope that this House, with your help, will be able to assert itself so as to make the Treasury Bench realise that to the extent to which there are certain rules and standing orders, they must at least obey them, if they will not listen to us otherwise.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, with your permission I will say,—because it is only with your permission that I may speak again,—that I am afraid the Honourable Member is again pushing his head into a mare's nest. It has been definitely recommended by the Public Accounts Committee that

[Sir James Grigg.]

demands for supplementary grants should only be brought to the House when it is quite certain that the extra expenditure cannot be met within the existing provision. And previous Public Accounts Committees have also recommended that supplementary grants should normally be brought only in March unless it is a case of a new service.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, when it is said that the sterling loan was floated in England during the last financial year, does it mean 1933-34?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I have already explained that the loan in question was issued after my predecessor had introduced his budget but before the end of the financial year.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: In that case it should come in as an excess grant and it would be very irregular to bring it as a supplementary demand.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Not in the slightest degree. As is said at the bottom of the page, the expenditure was in respect of transactions which occurred during 1933-34 but the money was not paid till 1934-35.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, I want to know whether the other Governments, which float their loans in London, also get their loans managed and floated by the Bank of England.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): Sir, I rise to a point of order. On one occasion when I wanted to speak twice I was stopped on a very reasonable objection taken by my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti. In the present case my Honourable friend, Mr. Ranga, has already spoken on this motion.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Yes, the Honourable Member cannot speak again.

The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 3,64,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Interest on Ordinary Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt'."

The motion was adopted.

INTEREST ON MISCELLANEOUS OBLIGATIONS.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I move;

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 5,92,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 5,92,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations'."

The motion was adopted.

COUNCIL OF STATE.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 36,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of the 'Council of State'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs 36,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Council of State'."

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, may I ask a question on this? I only want to know how it happened that the expenditure on the Council of State was under-estimated. The note says:

"This is required to meet excess due mainly to under-estimation of expenditure in respect of the Spring Session, 1934, debitable to the current year's grant."

I only want to know the circumstances under which the expenditure was under-estimated.

Mr. F. E. James (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): The Assembly did what it is doing now.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I think I heard the criticism. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Let that question be answered first.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I am going to answer the question, because I was a Member. . . .

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I want the Honourable the Finance Member to answer.

Sir Lancelot Graham (Secretary, Legislative Department): Do I understand that the learned Doctor desires to answer the question?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I want an answer from the Government.

Sir Lancelot Graham: As far as I know, the explanation is that it is due to the fact that the budget was prepared in the hope that the Assembly would get through its work rather quicker than it did.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Sir, I heard various criticisms about the procedure in connection with the supplementary demands. There may be something in that criticism; but the present procedure is according to the practice of the last five years with which I am familiar: I think there is a good deal of room for improvement: what really happens is this. Each Department is asked to keep within the budget as far as possible: if they cannot do it, it comes before the Finance Committee which scrutinises the control of expenditure and afterwards it comes in one block before the

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

Assembly. The Finance Committee scrutinises from time to time. I do not justify the practice as correct or that it cannot be improved. But it has been the practice during the last five years, and I say that the Honourable the Finance Member is simply following the traditions. If he is responsible for something, it can only be this, that he has not yet devised anything better: he has only followed the traditions of the last five years with which I have been acquainted. As regards this particular demand, I think I scrutinised it and we ourselves are responsible and I am mostly responsible for this additional expenditure, because I dragged on the Assembly last year for two weeks longer: it ought to have finished earlier. (Interruption.) This is nothing new, and my friends are doing the same thing. (*Some Honourable Members*: "No".) I was responsible for this expenditure last year—longer Session necessitated this extra expenditure both in the Council of State and the Legislative Assembly. I think the Government anticipated that we would finish by the 31st March and there would be no sitting in April and they budgeted accordingly. This year, I am sure, if they continue the work on for some time in April, additional expenditure would be required in the budget in 1936.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs 36,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of the 'Council of State'."

The motion was adopted.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEPARTMENT.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 82,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the course of the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of the 'Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Assembly Department'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 82,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the course of the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of the 'Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Assembly Department'."

Mr. Saksena has given notice of an amendment which I rule as being out of order. The amendment is to reduce the demand by Rs. 100 to censure the Government for having prolonged the Assembly Session last year and rushing with legislative measures which normally would have come before the new Assembly.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, this is a typical example of putting off a supplementary demand, long after the expenditure has been incurred, long after the Government knew the liability was incurred. No doubt, the Honourable the Finance Member has told me that he has got the authority of the Public Accounts Committee behind him. I hope the new Public Accounts Committee will change that wrong order. I suggest that, after all, the

Rules and Standing Orders govern us; and I am merely taking my stand on the well-known parliamentary practice with which I am sure the Honourable the Finance Member is familiar. . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Yes; but it is not as you state it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: It is not what you do. It may not be as I state it, but it certainly is not what the Government does. . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Yes, it is.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Perhaps, my friend is a greater authority than May. I have got May's Parliamentary Practice with me, and I will read from it:

"A supplementary estimate may be presented either for a further grant to a service already sanctioned by Parliament, in addition to the sum already demanded for the current financial year; or for a grant caused by a fresh occasion for expenditure that has arisen since the presentation of the sessional estimates, such as expenditure newly imposed upon the executive government by statute, or to meet the cost created by an unexpected emergency, such as an immediate addition to an existing service, or the purchase of land, or of a work of art. The need for a supplementary grant to an existing service is not infrequently caused by the system in force to ensure the control of Parliament over public expenditure. To provide for the early presentation of the annual estimates, the departments are obliged to compute in the month of November their anticipated expenditure for the ensuing financial year, dating from the coming 1st April. Fallibility must attend calculations which range over sixteen months in advance; and as too large a demand for money is a grave departmental error the official tendency is to make the demand too small."

Mr. F. E. James: Hear, hear.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will my friend kindly hear what follows, before he says "Hear, hear".

"If the lesser error occurs, to avoid the still greater evil of excess expenditure, recourse of necessity must be had to a supplementary grant."

I put it to my friend, who is more loyal than the Finance Member, that this expenditure has been incurred, and May says—though Sir James Grigg may deny it—that it is the duty of the Parliament to avoid the still greater evil of excess expenditure, that recourse must be had to a supplementary grant. Our Rules and Standing Orders also provide for both the categories of supplementary and excess grants. On the merits of the question, perhaps the motion deserves passing and we will vote for it; but I want to know what is the financial propriety which waits long after the expenditure has been incurred and then comes along and tells this House when we are all here pressed for time, "You must now vote these demands". May says again in regard to excess grants.

"The need for an excess grant arises when a department has, by means of advances from the civil contingencies fund, or out of funds derived from 'extra receipts' carried expenditure upon a service beyond the amount granted to that service, during the financial year for which the grant was made. The title of this class of estimate attests the nature of the grants..."

Here we have got 70 demands, in almost every case of excess expenditure, and I should like to know what is the financial propriety on which these demands are hurled at our heads? Take this estimate. The Assembly sat last March or April a few days longer than according to some

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

Members it should have sat; and then again in August; and the Government knew it perfectly. Why did they not put the supplementary demand before that Assembly, and ask them to vote that expenditure? As my friend reminds me, there would have been no difficulty at all then. I put it to all the independent Members of this House, except those who think that whatever the King does must be right and that the King can do no wrong, the Pope can do no wrong, and the Finance Member also can do no wrong—unless that is the maxim on which we are all expected to act in this House, I feel that we will be making a farce of this House—even as it is—if we do not exercise our legitimate control over this excess expenditure. At any rate, I feel that this excess expenditure is expenditure which should have been easily foreseen by the Honourable the Finance Member, and should have been placed before this House. It is not right to use the machinery of supplementary demands which ought to be reserved for very definite purposes understood in Parliamentary practice . . . .

(It being Four of the Clock.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order: the motion for adjournment will now be taken up.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENT BETWEEN INDIA AND BURMA.

Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji (Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau: Indian Commerce): Mr. President, I rise to move that the Assembly do now adjourn to consider the serious situation arising out of the answers given by the Finance Member in regard to the tribunal considering the problem of financial adjustment between India and Burma. . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): Sir, I am very sorry to interrupt the Honourable Member, but I have not yet been able to hear a single word.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Will the Honourable Mr. Vissanji kindly come lower down?

[At this stage, the Honourable Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji came and occupied a seat in one of the front Benches.]

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan): What about ourselves, Sir? We will not be able to hear Mr. Vissanji then.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh (Chota Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): When we cannot hear Honourable Members on the Treasury Benches, will they come near our seats on this side and speak?

Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: Sir, I rise to move that the Assembly do now adjourn to consider the serious situation arising out of the answers given by the Finance Member in regard to the tribunal considering the problem of financial adjustment between India and Burma.

This House, Sir, and the Indian and Burman people, have several reasons to feel seriously aggrieved by the action of the authorities in this matter. Though the question is one of admitted delicacy and complexity, involving grave considerations of finance as well as politics, and though repeated assurances had been given that the matter would not be disposed of without consultation with this House, or with its representatives on the tribunal, the Secretary of State has thought fit to disregard all those considerations; and has appointed a Committee on which there is no representative of India or Burma

That is in itself, Sir, a serious cause for feeling aggrieved. Add to this the further consideration that the problem is by no means of our creation, that we do not desire to separate Burma, nor, I believe, does Burma desire that. If the parties mainly concerned had their say in this matter, perhaps the problem of financial adjustment would never have arisen at all. But now that the problem has been foisted upon us, a moment's reflection will show any impartial person the rank injustice of keeping no representative of either of the two parties principally concerned on the tribunal, despite repeated assurances to the contrary.

The absence of any Indian or Burman from this tribunal is not, Sir, the only reason why this House and the two countries concerned have a right to feel aggrieved. The actual personnel announced is in itself a reason for the gravest apprehension in this country. I have no desire, Sir, to cast any reflection on any distinguished public servant like Mr. Amery or Mr. Justice Rowlatt. But, Sir, the name of Rowlatt has but to be mentioned for any Indian of the Post-Jallianwalla Bagh era to conjure up long-forgotten ghosts of injustice and repression. The policy and outlook of Mr. Amery, again, one of the most reactionaries of British Tories, are too well known in the Colonies and Dependencies of the Empire, on which the sun never sets because God himself is afraid to trust an Englishman in the dark, to permit any hope of the rights and dues of subject races receiving a proper hearing.

In this connection, it is necessary to point out, Sir, that the parties concerned are not merely India and Burma. British interests are also vitally involved; and they cannot, therefore, claim to be so utterly impartial and disinterested in the matter as to leave their right to constitute such a tribunal beyond cavil. The suspicion is widespread in this country, Sir, and deeply founded, that Britain has for her own ends decided to separate Burma from India, so that the former could be more easily exploited, without the protection that the better organisation and stronger public opinion in this country might afford to any of its units. There is, likewise, reason to believe that in this very problem of apportioning assets and liabilities, British interests in Burma, and the still larger interests of British industry and commerce, are most vitally concerned. How then can the representatives of only one of the three parties concerned claim to be alone and exclusively impartial?

I need hardly point out, in support of this my main contention, the analogy of the Capitation Tribunal of two years ago. The parties there concerned were: The British War Office and the Government of India.

[Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji.]

The dispute there was also no less important, on financial grounds alone. And yet that tribunal was made up of high judicial representatives of both the parties concerned. In the present case, the issue is important on financial as well as on broad political grounds, which cannot be left to the tender mercies of a tribunal composed exclusively of representatives of one of the parties concerned. We are entitled to plead the gravity of the issue involved; we are entitled to urge promises given when the matter was first broached, that representatives of the countries concerned will find a place on any tribunal ultimately appointed to dispose of this question. We are entitled to point out that Britain is no less a party to the suit than India or Burma; and that, therefore, representatives of the two latter countries should have as much a place on the tribunal as those of Britain herself.

This, Sir, is my first demand. Even more important than this is our second demand, for a right of audience before that tribunal. Even if it be now too late to permit a reconstitution of the tribunal as demanded above,—a contingency, which I do not admit,—but cannot ignore,—it cannot be, and must not be allowed to be,—too late to afford us a right to be heard before the tribunal. I will not refer once again to the precedent of the Capitation Tribunal, except just to point out that, had not Sir Shadi Lal and Sir Shah Suleman pointed out the Indian side of the case, most probably the very little relief obtained by India on that account would have been much smaller still. Such a danger is very much more to be apprehended in this case; and I, therefore, cannot agree that the reconstitution of the tribunal as demanded by us, and as had been promised, is too late. But granting for the sake of argument only, that *that* is too late now to be complied with, I cannot concede, even for the sake of argument, that it is too late even now to permit of the Indian and the Burman case being presented to the tribunal by competent representatives of public opinion in this country and in Burma. We have been told, Sir, that the Governments of India and of Burma have already been represented by Mr. Nixon and Sir Henry Howard. But, Sir the Government of India do not represent the people of India, nor does that of Burma represent the people of that country. There is, besides, in all such matters a wide divergence of opinion and viewpoint between official spokesman in this country and its non-official representatives. Without, therefore, impeaching the good faith or competence of these official representatives, we may justly fear that there might be an unconscious bias in *their* representations of *our* case, an unconscious difference in outlook and viewpoint, which, if left unchecked, may result in incalculable mischief to the peoples of this country and of Burma.

That this danger is by no means imaginary may be illustrated and supported by a previous report on this subject by these very officials. Their report, Sir, has not yet been officially published; and so, I doubt if I would be quite in order, were I to quote from that document. But there are such radical divergences in their views on specific questions considered, that it is necessary to ask if the Government of India as such have issued any instructions to Mr. Nixon and Sir Henry, on which they are to prepare their case; or whether they would be preparing the case without instructions from their clients, or reference to them. Whether or not, however,

any instructions have been given to these official representatives before the tribunal. I demand that, in mere justice and decency, non-official representatives of the two countries principally concerned should be accorded the fullest hearing possible. And, for that purpose, not only should the Government of India furnish every necessary facility for organisations of public opinion in this country and in Burma to make their submission; but they must even prevail upon the British Government to make the tribunal stay its proceedings, pending the arrival of such of our representatives in Britain. I need not point out, Sir, in an Assembly whose President is a distinguished jurist, and whose Leaders are eminent advocates on either side, that it is but the most elementary principle of jurisprudence that no real justice can be done unless and until all the parties in a case are given a full hearing. The policy, however, adopted by the Government in this case appears to violate this most elementary principle of judicial propriety. I trust, Sir, this House will not suffer them, without raising its voice in emphatic protest, to perpetrate such a violation of the barest elements of justice and fair play.

I submit, Sir, that for these considerations we cannot remain content with only the official reprsentatives appointed by Government to do justice to our case on either side. These official representatives are not only not sufficiently detached and sympathetic to make good representative for the parties principally concerned; they do not command that fullness of knowledge, that amplitude of data, which is indispensable for a full and proper representation of such a case. Their own previous essay, moreover, in this direction, reveals a margin of difference on certain specific questions which must give the strongest possible ground for apprehension. In calculating the liability of Burma—to give one example of the margin of difference in their expert findings and recommendations—Sir Henry admits an annual liability of only Rs. 35 lakhs, while Mr. Nixon calculates it at Rs. 105 lakhs, a difference of 200 per cent. Now, I put it to you, Sir, that, if two such experienced officials, absolutely free from any nationalist bias or political prejudice, could take such widely divergent views on a given subject, calculating from the same data and applying the same principles of reasoning, what difference there may quite likely be when representatives of Indian or Burman opinion discuss the same questions, and offer their views upon the same assets or liabilities.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has only two minutes more. On an adjournment motion, the time limit is peremptory.

Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: I shall now pass on to mention a few specific considerations which have led me to think that our case will not be adequately represented in fact as well as in argument, if we trust it entirely to official representatives. I have already mentioned the case of the Pensions charge in which these officials have differed widely in the past. Their difference argues one thing at least; the same facts might be made to yield varying results. Let me add further that in considering the allocation or apportionment of the currency, including the liability for the redemption of the rupee coins circulating in Burma at the date of separation, though the previous Committee of officials, considering this problem, has not differed as widely as they have in regard to Pensions, there is indisputable need of Indian as well as Burman points of view on this matter being submitted to the tribunal. The Howard-Nixon Committee, again, were strangely

[Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji.]

remiss in calculating the Debt charge, and making its apportionment. Certain items, like deficits incurred on account of the local administration of Burma and met out of the Indian revenues; or those in connection with the railways in Burma, have either not been specifically mentioned at all, or not adequately allowed for. Certain other items, again, have either not been properly stated, as, for example, the War Contribution from India. It is stated there at £100 millions, while actually it was, I believe, over £125 millions. This, if admitted, would mean a difference to the total of 40 crores. Or again, certain items are altogether overlooked While, for instance, they mentioned the losses on sales of silver, they have utterly ignored the much heavier losses on account of the Reverse Councils gamble of 1920. This would add another 40 or 50 crores to the total, if admitted. They have, moreover, resorted to an *ad hoc* principle of apportionment, on the simple excuse that the necessary records are lacking and that it is difficult to disentangle all the material necessary to arrive at accurate figures in regard to such matters as the aggregate of the Debt.

You will notice, Sir, that in these observations I have studiously avoided going into the merits of the case. This is neither the place nor the occasion for me to express any opinion on the merits of the case. I must leave it to experts. Nor have I entered into any consideration of those large issues of national policy.

Finally, Sir, before I conclude, let me make my position clearer in one respect. Throughout these remarks, Sir, I have spoken of the two countries,—India and Burma—separately. Wherever by context it was necessary to add Burma, I have taken care to add its name specifically lest I should be understood to be pleading the cause of India alone, and to the prejudice perhaps of Burma. No Indian, Sir, has any desire to do the slightest prejudice or harm to Burman interests; on the contrary, Sir, I know several who, if they can help it, would be prepared to put up with some sacrifice by India if we could have Burma and our Burmese brothers with us. You know, Sir, the idea of separating is not ours, nor, I would venture to add, is it originally or entirely the Burmans'. But, since the problem has been forced upon us, may we not, without the slightest injury or prejudice to all legitimate Burman claims, point out our side of the case? I see in such a demand neither greed nor injustice. And because I want nothing more than what is justly due to this country in the event of separation, I have asked for Burman as well as Indian representation on the tribunal

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would ask the Honourable Member to conclude his speech now.

Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: I do not believe my demand is either unjust or unreasonable, and I trust its essential moderation would ensure its immediate and ungrudging acceptance. For only those could refuse to accept such a demand who have something to conceal, who fear to lose something if full investigation was made into the problem, and all relevant considerations placed before the tribunal appointed to adjudicate upon this. Have the Government of India anything to conceal in this deal, or do they apprehend anything unacceptable to them if they concede these demands? By their deeds shall we judge them. (Cheers.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That the Assembly do now Adjourn."

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, very often has trotted out the sanctity of pledges on the floor of this House Somehow, being unfamiliar with the treatment of the British Government towards India, he does not know that the British Government in India is built up on broken pledges. If his predecessor gave us an assurance on the floor of this House that members of the Standing Finance Committee would be associated with the tribunal that would be set up to discuss the financial implications of the Indo-Burma separation, my Honourable friend, the present Finance Member, is not bound by it. Although he assured this House, only this morning, that he is not a servant of the British Government, that he has not to obey the behests of the British Government or the Secretary of State and has not to see that the interests of Britishers are not in any way injured . . . .

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta).]

It is not one pledge that has been broken. What about the pledges that were given to the first Burma Round Table Conference, one of the members of which, my Honourable friend, Mr. Mody, is present on the floor of this House and also Captain Sher Muhammad Khan. I hope both of them will speak this afternoon. There, Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra, who represented no doubt the Government of India and not the people of India, insisted that the question of Indo-Burma finance should be referred to a tribunal and that tribunal should be the standing tribunal of the Imperial Conference, and, at that conference, it was assumed that such a tribunal exists Again, alternately, Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra also suggested that the whole question should be referred to a committee of the Privy Council and he did point out that in India people have great respect for a judicial tribunal. Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra and my friend, Sir Joseph Bhore, were signatories to the Government of India Despatch which said:

"In arriving at a financial settlement, the main point to be considered is the need for satisfying public opinion in both countries that each is being fairly treated. Indian public opinion would watch this aspect of the arrangements very jealously, more particularly the allocation of debt burdens."

This opinion of one of the Members who formed the Government of India Cabinet at the time was not accepted, nor was the tribunal that was suggested by the predecessor of the present Finance Member. The Secretary of State is so anxious that Burma should be separated from India! I know that the Government of India did not want the separation of Burma. The present Government of Burma do not want separation, nor the present Governor of Burma. Then, who wants separation, not even my friends, the separationists, who are present on the floor of this House, Dr. Thein Maung, U Thein Maung and U Ba Si want separation on the conditions laid down by the Joint Parliamentary Committee . . . .

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): On a point of order. On an adjournment motion not more than one matter can be discussed on the same motion and the motion must be restricted to a

[Sir Nripendra Sircar.]

specific matter of recent occurrence. The question of whether the Government of India wanted separation from Burma, what was done by Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra five years ago and so on are not relevant to the motion we are discussing now.

Mr. B. Das: I am incidentally referring the House to what was the opinion of the Government of India and the Government of Burma. If my Honourable friend will not disclose it, I have every right to disclose it.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member has every right to deal with financial adjustments, as he has said, but the Chair is afraid he will not be in order in discussing the merits of the question of separation.

Mr. B. Das: Thank you, Sir. This issue was discussed in 1932, not in 1933, as my friend, the Finance Member, pointed out this morning. His predecessor pointed out that there are five points which the tribunal should consider; these are the questions of currency, pensions, military burdens, debts and the revenue position of the two countries, and, again, that revenue position of the two countries is so much dependent on that most important thing which has been done behind the back of this House, the Indo-Burma Trade Agreement. If the Indo-Burma Trade Convention materialises in the form in which the European Group desire it, then the surplus, which was referred to by the Howard-Nixon report, will vanish to nothing. Mr. Nixon was moderate all along, Sir Henry Howard was very partial to Burma. Look at the injustice of the case. While Burma enjoys a revenue of 10.5 per cent., in the Howard-Nixon report 21 per cent. of the gold reserve is demanded for Burma, 35 per cent. of the silver reserve is demanded for Burma. Under what principles of justice and equity does Sir Henry Howard demand it? Then, Sir Henry Howard wants that Burma should only pay five per cent. of the charges on pensions. Why not Burma pay 10.5 per cent. of the charges on pensions? Then, he wants that Burma should only pay Rs. 1½ crores of the military burden, while the Simon Commission recommended that Rs. 2½ crores of military burden should be borne by Burma in case it is separated, and if Burma demands 10.5 per cent in receipts and other things, then why should not Burma pay ten per cent. of the military expenditure which will amount to Rs. 4½ crores and not 1½ crores? Although Mr. Nixon was the representative of the Government of India, I do not agree with some of the conclusions which he has reached in that conference. So he cannot represent the Government of India or the popular side before that tribunal.

About the debt position, the Howard-Nixon Report, in its modesty, assessed it at Rs. 62 crores as Burma's share, but Sir George Schuster came to the conclusion that it might be about 70 crores, but we, the people of India, think that it cannot be less than Rs. 100 crores, and that is the view of that great economist, Professor K. T. Shah, who estimated it at Rs. 100 crores. I do not think that my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, has analysed the position, but I hope he will agree with me. No Indian was allowed to participate as a member of the Joint Parliamentary Committee when the Burmese delegates were examined. This shows how dishonest the British Government were in their expression of views that Indians would participate in the deliberations when this question was discussed. They were excluded from the Joint Parliamentary Committee.

The Europeans of Burma want one thing: they want a minimum disturbance of trade relations, but the British Government want the separation of Burma, so that the Burma Oil Company can enjoy certain advantages at the cost of India, and enjoy—in the words of the present Finance Member—Rs. 80 lakhs of excise duty rebate on the kerosene oil, but, according to me—I gave those figures four years ago,—Rs. one crore and 25 lakhs in the shape of rebate in the excise duty on kerosene, petrol, etc. Now, the Europeans want that the trade relations should not be disturbed, but, at the same time, they opine that Burma should not be separated if the Burmese tax-payer will have to pay more in the shape of additional taxes, and, Sir, the tragedy, the conspiracy that is going on in England is to thrust on India a portion of the financial burden of Burma, so that, by this Indo-Burmese Trade Agreement or Convention, India will go on paying Burma a large subvention so that a few British Imperialist administrators would remain satisfied that they have got the chance to convert Burma into a colony, for her economic exploitation, while India is made to pay for Burma's defence and a permanent invisible subvention by the so-called Trade Convention. Therefore, I wish to assert emphatically on the floor of this House, both for myself and for those on whose behalf I speak, that I have no confidence in the tribunal that has been appointed. Sir, it is an insult to India to appoint a tribunal where Rowlatt can become a member (Hear, hear), and it is an insult to the financial genius of India that no Indian financier could be put in as a member, although, when my friend, Mr. Mody,—I find he has slipped out—rises, he will say that some of his colleagues, including Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra, insisted that Indians should be assessors or members on that tribunal. Sir, we have a story of broken pledges all along . . . .

An Honourable Member: Indians and Burmans too.

Mr. B. Das: Yes, that is so; but I am not pleading the cause of Burmans because my stout-hearted friends of Burma will plead that; I am pleading the cause of India. Therefore, Sir, I wish to reaffirm the point emphatically and I would ask my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, to re-read the speech I delivered in 1932 (Hear, hear), where I said that we have no confidence in any tribunal unless a member of the League of Nations presides over it and unless the members of other nations, and not Britishers alone, happen to be on that tribunal. (Hear, hear.) Now, the question of the separation of Burma is one in which the Burmans themselves are not so much interested as the British Government and Britishers—probably incited by the Burma Oil Company—and the few persons that engage in the trade in the ruby mines of Burma.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member has one minute more.

Mr. B. Das: Thank you, Sir. The Honourable the Law Member took three minutes of mine. Sir, therefore, if England wants to have a colony for its surplus products to be sold in Burma, then England is welcome to have Burma, provided the Britishers can command the assent and the sanction of the people of Burma, but, whatever extra money will be required for good government of Burma, it should be paid by England and not by India, and India should not be asked to shoulder the military defence of the Eastern Frontier of Burma. Sir, the military advisers of the Government of India are building up a territory on the North-East Frontier of

[Mr. B. Das.]

India, and while they are spending ten crores of rupees annually on the North-West Frontier, they expect the Burmans to carry out the defence, not only of Burma, but of the North-East Frontier at the small, paltry sum of Rs. 1½ crores! So, I say, let the defence expenditure be properly allocated; let the pension charges, let the military burdens and the Currency Department burdens be all properly investigated and properly allocated. I have no faith in these English arbitrators; it must be referred to a body of arbitrators who have no direct interest in England and who are not swayed by the imperialistic dictators of England With these few observations, Sir, I whole-heartedly support the motion. (Loud and Prolonged Cheers.)

U Thein Maung (Burma: Non-European): Mr. Deputy President (Loud Applause), we feel that we should explain our attitude at this stage of the debate. Sir, we, the people of Burma, have asked for separation as long ago as 1917, because we felt that it was only through separation that we could realise our political goal—the goal of full responsible government with dominion status. At the same time, we recognised the fact that we must part from India as friends and remain good neighbours ever ready and willing to help each other along the path of progress in all spheres of life. (Hear, hear.) Sir, we do not wish to start our political career, after separation, with the curse of any feeling of injustice or grievance as between India and Burma. We wish to start our new career with the blessing of India's goodwill and friendship. (Hear, hear.) Such being our attitude towards the question of separation and towards India, we recognise that a reasonable trade agreement as well as a just financial settlement between the two countries are essential. We also recognise that we cannot fully appreciate each other's case as regards the financial questions unless both India and Burma are represented on the tribunal to settle the financial affairs of the two countries. (Hear, hear.) We also feel that we shall never be satisfied with the ultimate award of the tribunal unless non-official representatives of both the countries have been associated with the tribunal throughout its proceedings. (Loud Applause.) This is the first reason, Sir, for our supporting the motion before the House. (Cheers.)

Our second reason for doing so is that the financial adjustment between India and Burma is not a matter in which only the Governments of the two countries are interested. It is a large financial problem closely concerning the people of both the countries, and it is but just that their representatives should be there before the tribunal, if not actually on the tribunal and, I submit, there has been a very strong and persistent public demand in my country that the Burmese people should be represented on the tribunal, or at least before the tribunal. As a matter of fact, there was a public meeting held as recently as January last repeating the demand that there should be such representation. The demand was repeated on account of a passage in the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report that a tribunal was about to be set up. In this connection, I wish to add that however clever and however efficient the official representatives may be, they cannot appreciate the non-official point of view and place it before the tribunal with such clearness and such force as can be done by non-officials in respect of their respective countries. For these reasons, we shall vote for the motion.

Maulana Shaukat Ali (Cities of the United Provinces: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I have very little to say in support of this motion. I only want

to remind my friend, the Mover, and the House that Burma and Zanzibar and most other places of that type have lost their independence simply under pretence of safeguarding the interests of the British Indian merchants in those countries. Whenever they wanted to declare war, Indian interests were trotted out, but it was the Indians who had to go and conquer the land. The same thing happened in Burma and the same thing happened in Zanzibar. I know both the cases very well, because I have visited both the places. My heart goes out to my Burman friends when they want that in their own country their voice should be the most prominent voice to be heard.

An Honourable Member: It should be the only voice.

Maulana Shaukat Ali: When this question was mooted at the Round Table Conference and, when my brother, Muhammad Ali, was alive, he supported them from the very beginning, and said that if the Burmans really wanted the separation, everybody in India should satisfy their legitimate demand. There was in Delhi the other day a Burman deputation of responsible Indians who are working in Burma, whom I had met before when I went out on a tour in Burma, and they told us in very clear terms that they had no objection if the Burmans really wanted separation. But they were afraid, at the back of this movement, there were the British tradesmen who were jealous of the position of Indian traders who competed with them and beat them too. The same story is told in South Africa, in Transvaal, in Kenya, Zanzibar, and in Cape Colony. In all these countries, it is the Indian trader who is successful, because he has got no top-heavy expenditure and he competes with the British traders fairly and squarely and beats them too. I was told when I was not allowed to enter South Africa and had to stop in Loranza Marques in Portuguese Africa that it was the Jews in Africa who objected to the Indian traders to compete with them. The same story I heard when I was in Burma. We know how Jamal Brothers were ruined by their own partners and how gradually their business passed into the hands of the British merchants who were settled down there. Let me tell my Burman brothers over there that they are a fine people, they are a picturesque people and very nice to deal with. But they are very fond of amusement, and any amusement or holiday the Burmans cannot miss. In fact, to enjoy themselves they will even neglect their offices and their business. They are not in business, and if the Indians are handicapped in this business struggle, I am afraid the poor Burmans will also lose themselves and the trade will practically pass into the hands of foreign merchants. If they want separation, notwithstanding the presence of this danger, I for one would support them. In the meantime, the Indian merchants who came here told us that it was their rights that they demanded to be safeguarded. They have invested over 125 crores in their business in Burma and they naturally do not desire to run any risks. I am not a financier, and I do not know what high and low finance is. With me the finance begins practically with a zero or on the minus side. Therefore, I have left this matter to the Honourable the Finance Member alone and have not said a single word to get the gibes or the praises of the House. With me, as a Muslim, the question of finance is a very simple thing. We understand only two extremes. If we have got money, we eat well and live well and are happy. Everyday is an *Eid*. If there is no money, we have our Ramzan and we fast and fast. (Laughter.) So, I do not complain that I do not know questions of finance. Somehow or other I do not worry

[Maulana Shaukat Ali.]

much and I get on all right without much knowledge of it, because, when there is money, we spend it all right, and when there is no money we wait. But I cannot understand the financier who has got the money and even then we find that the national constructive programmes have to be practically starved. When you make this Indo-Burma treaty, it should be your duty to see that the Indian trader, under no circumstances, gets an unfair deal. I hope the Finance Member, who is eating India's salt and who is showing such an interest in India, will see that its natural interests are not sacrificed in case Burma is separated.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, it is not necessary for me to make clear the point of view of the Congress about the separation of Burma. We have absolutely no objection to it. In fact, if the people of Burma want separation, we will not stand in their way. But we are certainly against the separation of Burma for the sake of leaving it to the exploitation of a foreigner.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: May I raise a point of order? Is the Congress view of separation of Burma relevant?

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: If the Honourable Member is going to raise points of order like that, there will be no end to them. So, Sir, we have the benefit of the presence of the Honourable Members from Burma who can say whether they want separation or not. What I submit is that when the trade relations of two big countries are under consideration and when the financial arrangements which will be arrived at between these two countries are under consideration, it is but just and proper that the representatives of these two countries should be taken into confidence. In the Round Table Conferences it was promised, not once, not twice, but even thrice, that the Legislatures of both these countries should be consulted and they should be consulted at every stage before any conclusion is reached over these matters. Even the other day when I put a short notice question to the Honourable the Finance Member, he accepted that those promises were made at the Round Table Conferences and made another statement which he contradicted today. When we asked him the reason why the Members of the Indian Legislature were not taken in the Committee, he replied that the Assembly was in Session now and the time that will be taken by this tribunal will be so long that it will not be possible for any member of the Finance Committee to go there, and so, the Secretary of State thought that it was not necessary to have any member from India. But today he says that it will be finished within a week. So, there is no consistency in his statements. They say now that the time is so short that it is no use making a representation. I will suggest to the Members of the Government that when they talk they should not talk for the sake of expediency but they should have some sense of responsibility. At least they should not make contradictory statements within a few days of each other. The statement that was made about the second week of February and the statement that is made within a month after that are quite contradictory to each other. Now that they are trying to come to a conclusion with such feverish haste and are not giving any opportunity to the representatives of India and Burma, what other motive can there be except other than *bonâ fide*. If they want to do good to us, nothing can be easier than to take us into their confidence.

Now, Sir, I wish to say a word about the Indo-Burman Trade Agreement.

(Interruption.)

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Surely that, at any rate, is irrelevant to this debate.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Surely, Sir, when the financial relations between the two countries are under investigation, the trade relations also should be discussed.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: This is a case of a financial arbitration. The present discussion has nothing to do with the Indo-Burmese Trade Agreement.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta): The Honourable Member has just mentioned the expression Indo-Burmese Trade Agreement. Let us see how he develops that subject.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: I am now talking about the financial aspect of the Trade Agreement between India and Burma. We were told the other day, in reply to a question, that the Honourable the Commerce Member was the representative of Commerce in this country, that the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce, who is anything but a labourer, represents the interests of labour in this country, and so the inference is that everybody who sits on the Treasury Benches represent some interest or other of this country. If that is the way in which representation is to come, then there is no need to consult the elected Members of the Legislatures and what I mean to say is that I cannot too strongly condemn this tendency that everybody on the side of the Government represents everything in this country. I was submitting, Sir, that this was the way in which the thing was rushed through in haste, in indecent haste. We are told that they are about to come to a final conclusion within a short time. If that is so, I suspect there is something brewing behind it all and I say it is not just, it is not honest and it is not fair for this country or for Burma.

I have not got much more to say except one point and that was the question which was very pertinently and very relevantly put by my Leader yesterday. We want the Government to tell us as to whom is the cost of the conquest of Burma being allocated. Burma is sought to be separated, not in the interest of the people of Burma, but it is solely in the interest of the Englishmen who are exploiting that country. Fortunately for us in India, we have awakened to this spirit of exploitation that has been going on in this country for the last several years and as the Englishmen are becoming nervous of any further being able to exploit India, they want to reserve Burma for their uninterrupted exploitation. (Hear, hear.) I submit, Sir, that the Englishmen do not want to tolerate the small, petty Indian traders who get bits here and there and that is the reason why the Government are pushing on with this discussion with such indecent haste. I now ask the Honourable the Finance Member what has been the cost of the conquest of Burma. It must be an immense amount. I am not here in a position today to give you the exact amount. I submit through this House and through you, Sir, to the tribunal that

[Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar.]

is investigating this question, that the amount of the conquest of Burma should be paid by Great Britain and by nobody else. The conquest of Burma was effected from the Indian revenues and, if we take into consideration the fact that the conquest was made not in the interest of India nor in the interest of Burma, then the amount incurred in such a conquest should be incurred not from the Burmese people nor from India; but it should be recovered from England. I submit most emphatically that this amount should be paid down by the British Government, for, it is for the sake of Britain alone that this separation is made and these discussions about financial relations are going on. (Applause.)

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I trust that my Honourable friend, the Leader of the House, will not rise to a point of order I promise him that I will not give him an opportunity of doing so. My Honourable friend, Maulana Shaukat Ali, when he spoke, was more or less out of order, but yet my Honourable friend, the Leader of the House, did not rise to a point of order I think there are some advantages in having a big physical body in this Honourable House. Sir, I promise to keep to the point. The point at issue is a comparatively simple one It is as follows: A tribunal has been appointed by the Secretary of State. The first issue is, is that tribunal in accordance with the promise given to this House and according to the recommendations of the Round Table Conference? I say it is not. I am going to prove that in a minute or two Secondly, had we any notice, or were we given any warning that the tribunal would be appointed, not in accordance with the undertaking given at the Round Table Conference? No Have we any information just now, any definite information as to what evidence beyond the Howard-Nixon Report will be placed or is being placed or has been placed before this tribunal? No, Sir.

[At this stage, Mr President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) resumed the Chair.]

The next issue is, has there been any opportunity for public opinion expressing itself before this tribunal through recognised associations such as Chambers of Commerce? No, Sir. A definite, no. All these points, Mr. President, I contend, are grounds for serious consideration by this side of the House.

Now, Sir, the Round Table Conference recommended in agreement with the Government of India Despatch that a tribunal should be appointed to consider the materials that may be worked up by the Government of India. The material that was worked up was the Howard-Nixon report. But the Conference also recommends that the representatives of these committees, namely the Finance Committee of this House and the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council of Burma, should be associated with the experts in the proceedings of the arbitral board No such thing has been done. I think it has been admitted on the floor of the House that the Secretary of State has turned down this recommendation. Our complaint is that he has done so without any warning to us, he has done so without hearing our reasons for not taking such a decision. Sir, we, in this country, are vitally interested in this question. I would submit that there are three main parties vitally interested in this

question. Firstly, ourselves in India. Secondly, Burmans themselves, and, thirdly, Englishmen in Burma. If there are these three parties interested in the settlement of the financial relations between India and Burma, I should have thought that the tribunal, that was to have been appointed or that should have been appointed, would have been a tribunal on which at least all these three interests might have been represented. Well, Sir, this was not done and, therefore, we have strong grounds of complaint on this score. I may be told by my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, or by some other Member of Government that the Howard-Nixon report has considered our financial relations with Burma most carefully, so much so that there was a difference of opinion between these disinterested officials, the one serving Burma and the other serving India and that this difference of opinion was convincing evidence of the thoroughness with which they had investigated the matter. I admit it. I admit that they disagreed, they honestly disagreed, the one serving India and the other serving Burma. But there are issues which we consider of great importance and which the Howard-Nixon report does not touch upon. I think one of them has been mentioned by my Honourable friend, the Mover of this Adjournment Motion. We made a war gift to England, and Burma was included in the war gift. Was it 100 crores or was it 126 crores? It is only a question of 26 crores, a trifling sum for England, but certainly a very substantial amount for this poor country. Twenty six crores! Surely we ought to be represented when such a large sum is involved and there should be somebody who will really point out the actual facts.

Then, losses on silver, I think that was also mentioned. What are our losses on silver? If the question of losses on reverse council bills have been put before the tribunal in the proper way, it will really carry weight. The losses on silver may be only 20 million, but the losses in respect of reverse council bills were 50 crores of money. Yes, the Honourable the Finance Member may take it from me that it is more and not less. Then comes the question of deficits in the local administration of Burma from 1886 to 1920. Are these included in the Howard-Nixon report and have they been really carefully considered? We know Mr. Nixon found it very difficult to adjust all these conflicting interests and he was inclined to adopt a rough and ready method. Well, I think there ought to be somebody over and above Mr. Nixon and Sir Henry Howard to represent the interests of India. And surely when there have been such differences of opinion we should have been given a chance of at least representing our case to this tribunal, a tribunal with the composition of which we may not agree, but the appointment of which is an established fact. But here are we left in the lurch in India, not even being allowed to put our case clearly and emphatically before that tribunal. It is this against which we have come here to protest today.

Sir, then there is the question of the Burmese Railways. They are going to keep their railways after they are separated. I hope my Burmese friends will long continue to enjoy their railways, but I am sure my Burmese friends do not desire that we Indians should pay for those railways.

5 P.M.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official): They cost us seven or eight crores.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Seven or eight crores? They cost us nearly 30 to 40 crores! Well, Sir, those are the points which we want to be assured will be placed before this tribunal by our own representatives. There are many other points. Of course we have this complaint—and I have expressed my opinion very definitely,—that the promise given to us through the report of the Round Table Conference has not been carried out. Perhaps I may be too strong in my language if I call it a promise; it may not be construed as a promise. But even if you do not construe it as a promise, I contend that you had every reason and every ground to warn us before you adopted another policy; but we were never warned. The first thing we saw was a telegram, an ordinary Reuter's telegram, saying that the tribunal had been appointed and that the personnel of the tribunal was as has been announced in this House. We were not informed in that Reuter's telegram whether anybody was associated with this tribunal according to the undertaking or,—shall I say,—according to the recommendation of the Round Table Conference. It was on the 21st February, 1935, when an answer was given by my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, in this House, that the terms of reference were placed before us and it was then that we realised that things were not as we expected, that there were grave grounds for fear and doubt; and I am glad that we have had an opportunity today of expressing publicly on the floor of this House our fears and our apprehensions. Now, Sir, take a broader view of the question. If the reforms are to be a success, if Burma is to be separated from India,—even that is not an established fact as far as I know,—if Burma is to be separated, if the machine is to run smoothly, surely the preparation of the machine should be undertaken in a manner which is approved of by those most vitally interested. Even the method of the preparation of that machine is not approved of in this country; this tribunal is the machine that is preparing the ground. Is it not a short-sighted policy not to take us into your confidence? The Government of India, Sir, under the present Constitution have to be very secretive; they are not even to divulge to us policies adopted in contravention of recommendations made by conferences of the greatest importance appointed by themselves and to which they were themselves a party. I do not know, Mr. President, how much the Government of India know or do not know themselves. I have grave suspicions from the way the news was imparted to this country about the appointment of this tribunal that the Government of India are nearly as ignorant as ourselves. I have not the heart, therefore, to condemn them outright, realising that it is possible that my suspicions may be correct, that they are nearly as ignorant as ourselves, that,—shall I say in the language of Mr. B. Das,—they are nearly as impotent as ourselves. Well, Sir, in the circumstances all we can do is to voice our grievances on the floor of this House, trusting and hoping that they will reach across the wide area that divides us from the tribunal, that is sitting to settle the destinies of Burma and to a certain extent our financial destinies. I trust and hope that our voice will carry and that even if there are only a few days left for the work of this tribunal, Government will see that our public bodies do get an opportunity of representing their views. Now, Sir, I believe my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, is under the impression that our views have been represented before this tribunal by communications that public bodies may have made to the Government of India on this vital question. I honestly confess I am not very definite about my information, but so far as my information goes today, it is, that no public bodies such as Chambers of Commerce have communicated with the Government of

India on this question and, therefore, no communications could be before the tribunal. The only discussion that took place was in this House in 1932. The Finance Committee were seized of the Howard-Nixon report and they reported to this House. This House discussed that report and a copy of the debate was or is before the tribunal. I have been through that debate just now . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's time is up.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Yes Sir, I am going to finish. You, Sir, took an important part in that discussion and several other Members also. But it was in 1932 and most of the important points that the tribunal really ought to consider are not mentioned in that debate at all. And, if that is the only report or communication voicing public opinion in India that is before the tribunal, I consider we have the strongest grounds for complaint, the strongest grounds for protest; and I trust that Members of the Government will join with us in our protest, if not openly in this House, privately in their communications to the Secretary of State. We still hope and pray for justice, but if an injustice is done to us by this tribunal, we shall hold the Government of India and the Secretary of State responsible and we shall not in any way be committed to any decisions that may be arrived at.

There is just one more point that I would like to mention before I sit down. It is called a tribunal; I say that it is merely a committee to advise the Secretary of State, that nothing that this tribunal reports is final. Will the Government of India at least make sure that we get this report of the tribunal before the Secretary of State makes up his mind on the recommendations of this tribunal, that public opinion has an opportunity of expressing its views before the Secretary of State takes action on the decisions of this tribunal? I think the Government of India owe this at least to us that they will give us an assurance that if they do nothing else they will strongly place this point of view before the Secretary of State namely, that he should take no action until we have seen the report and have had time to study it and to express our opinion on it.

Some Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Sir James Grigg.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The first part of this debate, Sir, was a complaint about the constitution of the tribunal and about the absence of representatives of the Standing Finance Committee on the two delegations appearing before the Committee . . . .

Dr. N. B. Khare (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): We cannot hear anything on this side. (Laughter.)

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: This was all perfectly well-known a month ago, and no question of urgency arises about that. Anyhow, in my answer to questions a month ago, I told the House that the Secretary of State had changed the previous decision on this point. As the Honourable the Baronet who spoke last said there was no formal promise in this matter: I think my predecessor's words were that the present view was

[Sir James Grigg.]

that members of the Standing Finance Committee might properly be associated with the delegations in arguing the case before the tribunal and he went on to say that, in the absence of any new decision, that decision would stand: so that, quite obviously, it was regarded by him as a question which was subject to review at a later stage; and, as I told the House when I announced. . . . .

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: The recommendation of the Round Table Conference to which the British Government were parties: the Secretary of State himself was a party to it.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I announced in the House the composition of the tribunal. The Secretary of State has taken a new decision. And I think the House must assume that the Secretary of State's decision is final in that matter.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): It is a breach of promise.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: No.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: On a point of personal explanation, Sir: I did not ever say that the Government of India had broken their promise. I said that the recommendations of this Round Table Conference have not been carried out, to which the British Government including the Secretary of State were parties.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I quite understood it the first time. The second point raised in the debate was that there were a number of new points which Mr. Nixon had not been clever enough to spot, of which the Standing Finance Committee of the last Assembly were completely ignorant and which the last Assembly as a whole completely ignored, which ought to be put to the tribunal. Well, I am bound to say that my impression of this debate, added to my recollection of what occurred in the previous debate and what was set out in the report of the Standing Finance Committee and in the Howard-Nixon report, is that no serious new points have been raised; but in any case, I said this morning, that if there were any new points to put forward, I would, provided they were furnished to me quickly, ask that the Tribunal should not actually report until it had sent them. But even apart from all that, as the Honourable the Baronet has pointed out quite correctly, the tribunal is not a final arbitral body: it is an advisory body to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of State has to make his final conclusions after getting the report of this tribunal . . . .

An Honourable Member: Why do you call it tribunal then?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I did not call it a tribunal . . . .

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Here it is called a tribunal: that is an inconsistency.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: All that I meant to say was that I was not responsible for christening it. (Laughter.) As I said, the Secretary of State has to reach a final conclusion in the light of the report of this tribunal. In my answer on the previous occasion, or rather in the question which I was answering on the previous occasion, one of the points specifically raised by one of the Honourable Members from Madras was whether the report would be made available to Members of this House. during the current Session and whether the House would be afforded an opportunity for discussion of the report. I said that I did not know how soon the tribunal would be able to complete its examination and present its report; and I said that when the report was published and if Government find that there is a general demand for its discussion, they will endeavour to provide an opportunity. I am quite prepared to represent to the Secretary of State the desire of this House that the report should be published and debated in this House and that before reaching a final conclusion he should consider the views expressed in this House. I am quite prepared to do that.

For the rest, as regards the general sense of this debate, I am not quite sure whether Honourable Members realise the implication of what has been said in various quarters this afternoon. The first is that Mr. Nixon is a very inadequate representative of Indian interests and there are lots of better ones and that being an Englishman he cannot adequately represent Indian interests . . .

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Who said that?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That was my impression, my very definite impression of the purport of the remarks of the Mover of the motion.

Some Honourable Members: Yes, yes.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: And that suggestion I absolutely repudiate. The second suggestion made this afternoon by implication was that the Standing Finance Committee of the last Assembly of which my Honourable friend, Mr. B. Das, was a member. . . .

Mr. B. Das: No, I was not.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: All right. that the Standing Finance Committee was so incompetent that it missed all the points that it ought to have raised; and the third implication is that the last Assembly of which the Honourable the Baronet was a Member also was extremely incompetent and that, therefore, in debating this question it was completely incapable of raising any point . . . .

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: The Honourable Member forgets or does not realise that that debate took place in 1932 and we are now in 1935 and that much water has flown under the bridge since 1932, that we were continually told that we should have other opportunities of expressing our opinion on this important matter between 1932 and the year of grace 1935.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: As the Honourable Member points out, two years have flown since then, and yet as he himself says, commercial opinion in India which is so anxious to express itself and has so many new points to raise, has been completely silent the whole time. (Interruption.) Surely the implication is that there are no new points of substance to raise and that this debate is merely another example of trying to make the easy assumption that no servant of the Government of India is capable of doing his job efficiently or sincerely (Interruption) and the only people who could really represent India are the people who have no responsibility whatever.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President . . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Has the Honourable Member any right to speak after the closure has been moved?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I did not accept it.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Sir, I regret very much and I think every Member of this House will join with me, in the manner in which this House was addressed today. I think the House deserves to be treated with certainly much greater courtesy. (*Opposition cries of* "Hear, hear".) Argument is one thing; but assertion is certainly not very much appreciated. The points of view that I wish to place before this House are very brief. The question is not a mere technical constitutional proposition. It is not denied that it is a matter of constitution. Honourable Members of this House, sitting opposite, represent the broad interests which are allotted to them for the purposes of their portfolios. That is not the issue. The true issue before the House is that there are interests, not merely governmental interests but the interests of the country at large, both of public finances as well as the finances of the traders concerned in this issue. The only issue that I know that is before this Tribunal is how to allocate the past and future liabilities when Burma comes to be separated from India. It is an issue which has been neglected all the time, but it does not matter, I always face the issue. I may be told that it escaped the attention of others. It conveys no reflection in my mind of any kind whatever that it did escape. After all, if matters do not escape, there would not have been even in case of civil tribunals no less than three appeals right up to the Privy Council, and at the end of which too it may easily be found that the point was missed. Therefore, the mere argument that a point need not have or ought not to have escaped is no argument for saying that people who wish to be represented and whose interests are determined ought not to be represented. The short question before the House is this—for what valid reasons did the Secretary of State go back upon a representation,—I will not call it a promise,—for what valid reason did he go back upon a representation with which, according to Sir George Schuster, the Government of India was in agreement, that Indian interests would be represented,—and at least one of the forms of representation then contemplated was through the Members of the Standing Finance Committee of this House. It may easily happen that the then Members may not be present now. The one important question, which I attempted to raise yesterday at question time, was the main question which would have to come up before such a Tribunal if that name is to be given to this

rapporteurs, because I am told now that they are no better. It is not merely a question between India and Burma, and the very fact that it is made to be represented as a question between India and Burma is our first grievance, the idea being that all other claims ought to be thereby suppressed. The first and foremost question is the whole of the cost of the conquest of Burma was debited to the Indian revenues. I understand that throughout all these arguments the question has been, whenever the question of allocation has been raised,—"Oh, yes, as a result of these conquests India has become bigger and greater by reason of the annexation of these territories as part of India", and that is the only way in which a justification has been given to put down to the debit of India the cost of the conquest of these countries, but if they are to be given up,—it does not matter whether they are to be given up at the request of the Burmans or they are to be given up for the convenience of the Britishers or for purposes of any Imperial policy,—but if they are to be given up,—who is to bear those charges which only, on the hypothesis that they form part of an extended India, were thrust upon us. I daresay that the Government of India, considering themselves as one entity, believe themselves to be Burmans, believe themselves to be Indians, believe themselves also to be Britishers. It is not a matter of honesty. It is a question of looking at it from a proper point of view. Has ever a question occurred to the Finance Member of India, either to the present Finance Member or to his predecessor, that a very important question involving crores of rupees is at stake not merely as between Burmans and Indians but as between Burmans and Indians both *vis-a-vis* the Britishers. That is the real question which we would have been entitled to raise. We would say that in so far as any allocation is concerned, inasmuch as it would refuse to listen to us it would not be doing justice. Therefore, the primary question is that the whole basis of that tribunal was never announced. I should like to know, though I did not hear from the Honourable the Finance Member at all, as to whether the Government of India was consulted before this tribunal was appointed a week before the question was answered in this House and the communiqué was issued. I am inclined to think from the absence of information that the Members opposite themselves were probably not aware as to what was happening during the interval. Therefore, it is no use complaining that two years have gone by, that there is a body to whom a case has to be presented, so that they are as much ignorant as ourselves. They have represented no case on behalf of India. It is not a question of the competence of Mr. Nixon that is in issue. The question is when was the Government of India informed about the constitution of that supposed Tribunal and its creation, what time does the Government gave to prepare the case at all events from the Indian point of view? It is not a question of competency or otherwise of Mr. Nixon, an officer who was appointed for the purpose merely of representing the views of the Government of India. He represents the opinion of nobody; their work is merely a preliminary preparation of materials —in so far as Mr. Nixon and Sir Henry Howard were concerned. The question, therefore, is that the Government of India and India ought to have been apprised that a tribunal was going to be appointed, and they should have been asked what they had to say as to its constitution. That was not done. Then, after the tribunal was appointed, sufficient notice ought to have been given to the Government of India and the Indian public generally, or at least to this House so as to ask them what case, if any, they had to present before this tribunal. This Report

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

is no case of any kind, it is merely a collection of materials on which a case is to be based. Therefore, you always raise a wrong issue, and you think you have answered it by saying that Mr. Nixon is not dishonest. We are not here to tell such things. The whole question is, if we had a fair dealing first before the appointment or the constitution of this tribunal, after its appointment, and if there was sufficient time given to present the case both by the Government of India, and associated with the representatives of the Government of India, representatives of the Indian people in any form howsoever constituted. Then, the other question was not also raised as to whether or not this allocation was merely a matter of accounting between India and Burma, but also whether the British Government had not a certain amount of responsibility and liability. Inasmuch as all these three things have been omitted, this House is entitled to express its opinion in terms of the motion that has been moved.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): May I, Sir, trespass upon the precious time of the House, because I know there is probably a strong desire that a division ought to be taken on this motion, but, Sir, I do not propose to occupy more than a few minutes. May I, first of all, tell the Finance Member—please do not adopt this sort of militant attitude, please do not try to evade issues. I know you have your difficulties, but remember you are sitting there as a responsible Member in charge of Finance Do not forget your position, therefore, and that you must not come down to the level of a back-Bencher

Some Honourable Members: Back-Benchers are much better.

Mr. M A. Jinnah: Sir, the Government of India do not realise in the first instance, I mean the Government of India in this sense that the Governor General in Council represented by the Front Bench here, do not realise that they owe some responsibility to this House. I know perfectly well that in several matters they are not even consulted probably, and in several matters they are overruled by the Secretary of State for India. But, Sir, we have no other course; we cannot separate the Governor General in Council from the Secretary of State for India, and we have got to get hold of some party with whom we can deal, and the only party with whom we can deal on the floor of the House is the Government of India as representing even the Secretary of State for India. Now, let us examine the question I don't think really the Finance Member was justified in saying that it was suggested by the Mover of this motion that Mr. Nixon was dishonest. I have got his words here, and may I read them out to the House . . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: He certainly said incompetent. Would you mind dealing with the question of incompetency?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Incompetency is a matter of opinion. That is not a word which ought to give such an offence to the Honourable Member. That is a matter of opinion. The Honourable Member could have got up and said that in his judgment that such and such a person was the most competent person. But, no, the Honourable Member tried to play with this word and he said that you call Mr. Nixon dishonest. It was not so stated by my Honourable friend, Mr. Vissanji. I have got his speech here, the very words here. On the contrary he says that he does not challenge the *bonâ fides* of Mr. Nixon. Let me read it. Or take my word for it, I do

not want to waste the time of the House. It is not a question of dishonesty, it is not the question that every Government official is dishonest. Nobody says that. Let us get to the issue. The Joint Parliamentary Committee have laid down that a tribunal will be appointed—the words are "an impartial tribunal". When they used the expression "impartial tribunal" what did they mean? A tribunal is impartial not only because it is honest but because it commands that confidence and that respect, that the parties concerned, will feel after the decision is given, that justice is done. ("Hear, hear" from the Opposition Benches.) And that is the principle which I ask the Honourable the Finance Member to bear in mind. When the Round Table Conference came to an agreement to which the Secretary of State was a party—why did they say that Indians and Burmese should be associated with such a tribunal? Why? Did they think that Englishmen were so dishonest that they could not be trusted? No. But in order to assure, nay, doubly assure, that when their recommendation was made it would command the confidence and the respect of the bodies and parties concerned. When did the Secretary of State—I have not heard a single word,—and why did the Secretary of State change his mind? No reason has been given Are these arrangements to be flouted in this fashion *ex parte*? I ask the Finance Member. Was he consulted, and if so,—I ask the Finance Member, remember you represent India, your responsibility is there—did you fight for that on our behalf? We do not know. Were you consulted as to what should be the terms of reference? Were you consulted as to what was to be the procedure?

An Honourable Member: Chair.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I am addressing the Chair. Don't you teach me. Did the Government then say on our behalf that "you must not infringe the arrangement that was arrived at?" Did the Government then insist that we should have a fair hearing before that body? I am told now it is not a tribunal. The words are "impartial tribunal", the Joint Parliamentary Committee says, "impartial tribunal". The Government of India give us no information, we are not told what the Government of India did. We are not told what they did on our behalf Surely, for your own sake, for your own credit, cannot you tell us that you made some fight on our behalf but you were overruled? Why not say that frankly? Tell the House, that "We, as the Government of India, made this or that representation, but we were overruled by the Secretary of State, and, therefore, we are not able to do anything more". Now that, your superior authority whose commands and whose orders you are bound to obey has decided what he has decided, and if this House rightly shows its resentment and rightly condemns all this, you, as the Government of India, should, in deference to our wishes, in deference to our desires, do your utmost now, even at this stage, to see that we secure some kind of hearing before that tribunal on behalf of India. No. What does the Honourable Member say? He says, after the report is made by this impartial tribunal (Laughter,) we will have an opportunity to discuss it in this House . . . .

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: He said we may have.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I beg your pardon. I stand corrected. He said that he will recommend that to the Secretary of State . . . . .

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): To be overruled again!

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I do not know what the answer of the Secretary of State will be. Really I assure you, and I assure the Government that it is not a pleasure to me to stand here and be a party to passing one vote of censure after another against Government. Believe me, if I may say so, I am as loath as anybody else, I am not doing it with a light heart, but I find that on every occasion we get no satisfaction, ("Hear, hear" from the Opposition Benches), we get no frankness, and we do not get one single word from this Government of India making us feel that they are *our* Government. I support the motion. (Applause.)

Several Honourable Members: Let the question be now put.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is that the question be now put.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: I do not want to reply.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is

"That the Assembly do now adjourn."

The Assembly divided.

AYES—78.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.
Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.
Abdullah, Mr. H. M.
Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.
Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.
Ba Si, U.
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi
Bajoria, Babu Baijnath.
Banerjea, Dr. P. N.
Baqui, Mr. M. A.
Bardaloi, Srijut N. C.
Bhagavan Das, Dr.
Bhagchand Soni, Rai Bahadur Seth.
Chattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra Nath.
Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.
Chetty, Mr. Sami Vencatachelam.
Das, Mr. B.
Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.
Essak Sait, Mr H. A. Sathar H.
Fakir Chand, Mr.
Fuzlul Huq, Mr. A. K.
Gadgil, Mr. N. V.
Gauba, Mr. K. L.
Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
Giri, Mr. V. V.
Govind Das, Seth.
Gupta, Mr. Ghanshiam Singh.
Hidayatallah, Sir Ghulam Hussain.
Hosmani, Mr. S. K.
Iswar Saran, Munshi.
Jedhe Mr. K. M.
Jehangir, Sir Cowasji.
Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Khare, Dr N. B.
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
Mangal Singh, Sardar.
Mehr Shah, Nawab Sahibzada Sir Sayad Muhammad.
Mody, Mr. H. P.
Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
Muhammad Nauman, Mr.
Murtuza Sahab Bahadur, Maulvi Syed.
Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.
Pahwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta.
Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.
Parma Nand, Bhai.
Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.
Rajah, Raja Sir Vasudeva.
Rajan Dr. T. S. S.
Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.
Ranga, Prof. N. G.
Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
Sant Singh, Sardar.
Satyamurti, Mr. S.
Sham Lal, Mr.
Shaukat Ali, Maulana.
Sheodass Daga, Seth.
Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib Nawab.
Singh, Mr. Deep Narayan.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Satya Narain.
Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.
Sri Prakasa, Mr.
Thein Maung, Dr.
Thein Maung, U.
Umar Aly Shah, Mr.
Varma, Mr. B. B.
Vissanji, Mr. Mathuradas.
Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr.

NOES—36.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.
Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan Bahadur Nawab Malik.
Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A. A. Venkatarama.
Bajpai, Mr. G. S.
Bewoor, Mr. G. V.
Bhore, The Honourable Sir Joseph.
Chatarji, Mr. J. M.
Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.
Dalal, Dr. R D
Drake, Mr. D. H. C.
Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya Ananda.
Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.
Graham, Sir Lancelot.
Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.
Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir.
Kirpalani, Mr. Hiranand Khushiram
Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri.
Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
Metcalfe, Mr. H. A. F.
Monteath, Mr. J.
Mukerje, Mr. N R.
Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya Charan.
Nayar, Mr. C. Govindan.
Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
Owen, Mr. L.
Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Rau, Mr. P. R.
Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
Sarma, Mr. R. S.
Scott, Mr. W. L.
Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain Sardar.
Singh, Mr. Pradyumna Prashad.
Sircar, The Honourable Sir Nripendra.
Sloan, Mr. T.
Swithinbank, Mr. B. W.

The motion was adopted.

(*Cries of* "Shame" and "Resign and go home" *from the Opposition Benches.*)

Major Nawab Ahmad Nawaz Khan: (Nominated Non-Official): Behave like gentlemen!

Several Honourable Members: Shut up.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 27th March, 1935.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 27th March, 1935.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

REPRESENTATION FROM THE BANK OF HINDUSTAN, MADRAS, REGARDING LOST HALVES OF THE CURRENCY NOTES.

1059. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state whether they have received a representation from the Bank of Hindustan, Madras, about the hardships resulting from the working of the rules under the Currency Act in respect of the lost halves of the currency notes; if so, whether they propose taking any action in the matter; if not, why not?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: A representation was received by the Government of India from the Bank of Hindustan, Limited, Madras, but after careful consideration, it was decided that, under the Currency Notes (Refund) Rules, their claim could not be entertained.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is there any proposal pending before the Government to amend those rules?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: No, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know the reason why, in view of the facts alleged by the Hindustan Bank about the applicability of the rules—there I have no quarrel with the Government—they are not considering the question of amending rules with a view to avoiding such hardships in future?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I do not admit any hardship.

INDIANISATION OF THE ARMY.

1060. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) what are their latest policy and programme in respect of the Indianisation of the Army, namely, Air Force, etc.?

(b) the period of time at the end of which, according to the programme, the Army will be completely Indianised; and

(c) the results from the military point of view of the Indianisation of the Army carried out so far?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I do not think I can add anything to the information that I gave to the House in my speech on the Army cut motion on March 12th.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Since that motion was carried in this House, have Government begun to reconsider their attitude in this matter?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: No, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Do Government propose to do so?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: No, Sir—not to any greater extent than I explained in my speech.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With regard to clause (c) of the question—namely, what the results are from the military point of view of the Indianisation of the army carried out so far—what is the answer?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Well, Sir, as I explained, the army authorities regard the Indianisation programme at present as being in the experimental stage; that is to say, they cannot pronounce a judgment on it for some years yet. It is equally impossible for them to say that the experiment has been a success, or that it has been a failure, at this stage.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is the earliest year when the Government expect to be in a position to arrive at some results at least?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: As I indicated before, probably the year 1938.

INCREASE OF THE PROTECTIVE DUTY ON SILK AND SILK FABRICS.

1061. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether they have received representations from the Mysore Government and others, regarding the absolute necessity of increasing the protective duty on silk and silk fabrics to such a level as would effectively counter the fierce foreign competition and save the industry not only in Mysore but throughout India from its threatened collapse;

(b) what action Government propose to take in order to protect the silk industry in India; and

(c) when such steps will be taken?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given to part (c) of his question No. 638 and its supplementaries on the 5th March.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has any progress since been made?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Yes, Sir. Progress has been made in examining the question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are Government in a position now to define more accurately as to when they think they will come to a conclusion in this matter?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: No, Sir. I am afraid not.

PACKERS IN THE POSTAL DEPARTMENT.

1062. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether packers in the Postal Department get only one *pugree* and one shirt every year as their uniform from the Department;

(b) whether these packers are often refused leave of absence;

(c) whether the packers get only a pension of four rupees per mensem after a full service of thirty years;

(d) whether telegraph messengers and peons are similarly treated in respect of their pension; and

(e) whether they are prepared to redress their grievances? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The fact is substantially as stated by the Honourable Member.

(b) Government have no information but they have no reason to believe the case is as stated by the Honourable Member.

(c) The fact is as stated, except that the officials are also eligible for temporary increases in pension varying between Re. 1 and Rs. 2 according to locality.

(d) Yes.

(e) By the term grievances, the Honourable Member presumably refers to the items mentioned in parts (a) to (d) of his question.

The question of the adequacy of the uniform supplied to packers is under consideration. As regards pensions to packers, telegraph messengers and peons, I would inform the Honourable Member that the question of the revision of pensions of these, as well as other inferior servants in the Posts and Telegraphs Department, will be considered with the main scheme of revision of pensions of the general body of inferior servants under the Central Government which has had to be postponed until the financial position improves.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: When will that examination be, Sir?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think my Honourable colleague, the Finance Member, stated the position in that respect in recent discussions in this House.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The matter will be very carefully considered before the next budget.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With reference to the answer to clause (b) of my question, may I ask whether the Honourable Member will be pleased to call for information in view of the very strong and just grievance in this matter that these unfortunate, low-paid men are often refused leave of absence?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think, Sir, it would be very much better if my Honourable friend could furnish me with information in that respect. If he knows of any offices in which packers are often refused leave of absence, I should be glad to know so that I can make inquiries.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I inform the Honourable Member . . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not think the Honourable Member can rise to furnish any information now.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I am putting a question, Sir, I want to inform the Honourable Member first (Laughter)—very well, may I ask a question—whether it is not a fact that there have been complaints with regard to the Karachi office that these packers are not given leave even on very urgent business?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have no information on that point, Sir, but I shall be very happy to send a copy of this question and of my reply to the Head of the Circle so that he may take suitable action if necessary.

CONFERENCE OF REFORMS COMMISSIONERS.

1063. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether a Conference of Reforms Commissioners or officers from the Provinces is to be held shortly at Delhi; if so, when, and

(b) the purpose of the conference?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) A conference of Reforms Officers was held on the 5th to the 8th of March this year.

(b) The conference was held on an entirely informal basis for the purpose of exchanging and co-ordinating the provisional views of Provincial Governments, particularly on matters connected with electoral preparations.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Does that include an examination of the electoral rolls on the basis of the Lothian franchise, or any amended franchise?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Sir, so far as I know, I would like to give my Honourable friend all the information I have got. The information I have got is this, that the Reforms Commissioners, when they met here between the 5th and 8th of March last, considered the following subjects: the question of delimitation; the question of preparation of electoral rolls; the question of corrupt practices during elections, and so on. They proceeded, provisionally, on the recommendations of the Lothian Committee. I do not know exactly as to whether that would be the final form, but they did not proceed in any other wise except that indicated by the Lothian Committee.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With regard to the important question of the delimitation of constituencies, is there any proposal on the part of Government for consulting public opinion, as to whether there should be single-member constituencies or plural-member constituencies, and so on and so forth?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: As I told my Honourable friend, no conclusions whatsoever have been arrived at. This was an exchange of views provisionally between the Reforms Officers in the different provinces, and the question whether it will be necessary to consult public opinion or not has not yet arisen, and I can only say that I shall bear that in mind when the situation arises.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the conclusions of this Conference be reported to the Government as "recommendations" of the Conference?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am not sure of that, because it is quite possible that, before the report is made, things may change; but, if there is any such report, and if my Honourable friend wants information, I shall be glad to give it to him.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it, therefore, that no action will be taken till after the Government have had an opportunity of deciding whether to take public opinion into their confidence or not in implementing these conclusions?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Certainly, Sir.

Provision of Two-Seater Benches in certain Trains on the South Indian Railway.

1064. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** (a) Will Government please state if they are aware that in trains other than local trains, and sometimes in long distance trains, the South Indian Railway authorities put third class carriages with benches which can accommodate only two persons sitting? If not, are they prepared to ascertain and lay the facts on the table?

(b) If the fact stated above be correct, are Government prepared to issue early orders to stop this practice of providing two-seater benches?

(c) Are Government aware that in many of the through trains on the South Indian Railway the third class compartments are small and designed to hold eight or ten persons, thus enabling small parties of families to travel together, but that in others there is no partition between the compartments?

(d) Are Government prepared to issue orders to see that in all the through trains and trains running for more than a hundred miles distance, this type of carriage, with separate compartments designed to hold not more than ten persons, is introduced and that the system is extended to other railways also?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) to (c). I have called for information from the South Indian Railway and shall place a reply on the table later.

(d) The question of providing smaller third class compartments will be considered.

PROSECUTIONS UNDER THE INDIAN STATES (PROTECTION AGAINST DISAFFECTION) ACT.

1065. *Sardar Sant Singh: (a) With reference to their reply to question No. 233 of the 5th February, 1930 asked by Dr. B. S. Moonje, will Government be pleased to state how many prosecutions under Indian States (Protection against Disaffection) Act, 1922 were sanctioned by them and against what papers and on what grounds?

(b) What was the cost incurred by Government in each case?

(c) What was the result of the prosecution?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: (a) Since 5th February, 1930, there has been only one instance of a prosecution authorised by the Governor General in Council, *viz.*, of the *Taqat* newspaper of Delhi by the Jaipur Darbar, for publishing two articles intended to bring His Highness the Maharaja of Jaipur into hatred or contempt or to excite disaffection towards him.

(b) and (c). In a later issue the newspaper published a full apology which was accepted by the Jaipur Darbar. The prosecution was accordingly dropped.

Sardar Sant Singh: The Honourable Member has not answered part (b). What was the cost incurred by Government in this case?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: I imagine that no cost was incurred by Government, but I have no information on that point. The suggestion certainly is that no cost was incurred.

Sardar Sant Singh: Is there any prosecution still pending against any newspaper under this Act?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: Not so far as I know. I should have to have notice of that question.

Sardar Sant Singh: My question was how many prosecutions were going on. How many prosecutions are there? You said that there was only one prosecution by the Government. Is there any prosecution which is pending now under this Act?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: I have already stated that I am not in a position to answer that. I have given the information which I have received from the Department saying that only one instance of a prosecution authorised by the Governor General in Council is known of to me. That is the question which the Honourable Member put down.

Sardar Sant Singh: Is it not a fact that the prosecution against the *Riyasat* newspaper is still pending in the Hoshangabad Court?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: There may be; I am not aware of that point. The point is that if it is pending, it was presumably either not sanctioned by the Government of India or it is not under the particular Act which the Honourable Member has put down in his question.

REPORT OF MAJOR-GENERAL SIR JOHN MEGAW ON CONDITIONS OF HEALTH OF RURAL AREAS IN INDIA.

1066. *Mr. B. Das: (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the report made by Major-General Sir John Megaw in 1933 on conditions of health of rural areas in India?

(b) Is it a fact that the suggestions of Sir John Megaw for a review of the health situation in India by the appointment of a commission of experts on public health and every aspect of rural life in India has been supported by the Public Health Commissioner with the Government of India?

(c) What steps do Government propose to take on these recommendations?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) and (b) Yes.

(c) Government have decided that the first step should be to constitute a Central Medical and Health Advisory Board and it is their intention to do so as soon as financial conditions permit.

Mr. B. Das: What will be the nature of this Central Medical and Health Advisory Board and whether the Indian Medical Council will be amalgamated with it or not or will it be a separate organisation?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Sir, according to the examination which we made sometime ago, it will be entirely independent of the Indian Medical Council which is a purely educational body.

Mr. B. Das: Have Government decided upon the principles on which this body will function?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The one principle upon which the Government have decided is that it should be a representative body.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: With regard to part (b), did the Honourable Member say that any subsidies are being reduced or there will be any reduction?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I am afraid I am not aware of anything about subsidies.

TRANSMISSION OF AIR MAILS BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND INDIA.

1067. *Mr. B. Das: Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) the nature of the proposals made by the representatives of the British Post Office and the Air Ministry during their recent visit to Delhi to the Government of India, regarding transmission of Air Mails between Britain and India;

(b) whether any suggestion of a subsidy out of Indian revenues has been made; if so, the amount proposed and whether the Government of India have agreed to any payment;

(c) what arrangements will be made for transmission of Air Mails between Karachi and Singapur, when the new scheme comes into operation;

(d) whether the question of reducing mail subsidy to the P. and O. Steamship Company has been or will be considered in view of the diversion of first class mail to the air route;

(e) whether the new scheme will offer facilities for the use of the air route for first class mail to other parts of the British Empire or to non-British areas also;

(f) whether, if any concessions are granted to any airway company in this connection, the Government of India will insist on adequate training facilities being given to Indians;

(g) whether there will be uniformity of rates all over the British Empire regarding first class mail;

(h) whether any revision of rates is under consideration; and

(i) whether this Legislature will exercise control over the policy of Government in regard to the development of aviation?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) to (h). The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the statement made by the Under Secretary of State for Air in the House of Commons on the 20th December, 1934, which is reported in Volume 296, No. 23, of the official report of Parliamentary Debates in the House of Commons, a copy of which is in the Library of this House. The whole scheme is at present under the careful consideration of Government and I regret I am not in a position to make a detailed statement on the various points raised by the Honourable Member. I hope it is unnecessary for me to assure the Honourable Member that Government are giving, and will continue to give, careful attention to the protection of the interests of this country. Among other things, they will take the necessary steps to ensure provision for the training and employment of Indians.

(i) The Legislature will have the same control over Civil Aviation as over any other subject expenditure on which is required to be voted by it.

Mr. B. Das: Was the attention of the Honourable Member drawn to the two special contributions which appeared in the *Statesman* of Delhi where it was mentioned that the air mail rates will be the same as the British post office rates, namely, one anna and six pies, and that the Government of India had reached their conclusions on this matter and have agreed to the rate?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No, Sir; my attention was not especially drawn to these articles.

Mr. B. Das: Did not the Honourable Member's Department supply those special informations which were published in the *Statesman* about the very time when those three gentlemen representing the British Government were negotiating with my Honourable friend, Mr. Bewoor and others?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I can assure my Honourable friend that the facts are exactly as I have stated, and that, if anything beyond this was published in the *Statesman*, it was entirely unauthorised.

REPORT OF SPECIAL OFFICER ON THE AMENDMENT OF THE INDIAN COMPANIES ACT.

1068. *Mr. B. Das: Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) if the Special Officer has completed his report on the amendment of Indian Companies' Act;

(b) if the report will be published and circulated for opinion of commercial bodies;

(c) whether opinions of commercial bodies, commercial lawyers and the various provincial Governments were consulted before the Report was submitted;

(d) which are the Provincial Governments and Chambers of Commerce that supplied their opinions;

(e) whether they intend to submit the report for examination to a committee of commercial experts before they introduce the amending bill; and

(f) when they propose to introduce the amending bill?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) Yes.

(b) There is no intention of doing so at present. The report is purely departmental.

(c) Yes. Proposals received from time to time from various commercial bodies and individuals, before the appointment of the Special Officer, were also taken into consideration by him.

(d) Most of the Local Governments, the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry and a few other commercial bodies.

(e) The question as to the further procedure to be adopted is at present under consideration.

(f) Government are not yet in a position to say when the amending Bill will be introduced.

Mr. B. Das: May I inquire, Sir, if Government received opinions of the Associated Chambers of Commerce and the various European Chambers of Commerce in this matter?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I could not tell my Honourable friend that straightoff, but I believe so. That is merely my recollection.

Mr. B. Das: May I just inform the Honourable Member that those bodies did not contribute any opinion with regard to the amendment of the Companies Act? I say this subject to correction. Let my friend, Mr. James, or any other Member reply.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I am always happy to receive information from my Honourable friend.

Mr. B. Das: I said that the European Chambers of Commerce did not express any opinion in this matter, and how is it that the Government of Bengal did not supply any information?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I cannot answer either for the Chambers of Commerce or for the Government of Bengal

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the large and strong demand in the country for a radical amendment of the Companies Act in order to promote commercial activities in this country, will Government consider the desirability of expediting legislation on this matter?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: My Honourable friend will realise that this is a most important matter and Government are fully aware of the desire in this country for a very radical alteration of the existing Companies Act. My Honourable friend may rest assured and content that no avoidable delay will be allowed to occur.

Mr. B. Das: May I inquire when a Bill to this effect is likely to be introduced in this House and when the commerical bodies will be consulted?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: My Honourable friend has already had that question answered. I answered his part (f) by saying that Government are not yet in a position to say when the amending Bill will be introduced. Obviously a Bill of this magnitude and importance will have to be most carefully canvassed before we put it before this House.

EXPENDITURE ON STRATEGIC AND COMMERCIAL RAILWAYS.

1069. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the expenditure on strategic railways and commercial railways each year for the past five years?

(b) Is the expenditure on strategic railways met by Railway Department or Army Department?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Full information regarding the expenditure on strategic and commercial railways, since the separation of the Railway Budget till the end of 1933-34, will be found in the statistical compilation 'Financial Results of Working of Indian State Railways from 1924-25 to 1933-34', copies of which are available in the Library of the House. For later years the information is contained in the budget memorandum for the current year.

(b) Under the present arrangements the expenditure on strategic lines is initially met from railway revenues but is ultimately recovered from general revenues as the loss on strategic railways is deducted from the contribution payable by Railways to general revenues.

CASE OF MR. AMIR HYDER KHAN, A STATE PRISONER IN THE COIMBATORE JAIL.

1070. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** (a) Will the Honourable the Home Member be pleased to state what the conveniences are to which a State Prisoner is entitled? Is he entitled to have books and writing materials? If not, why not? If so, what is the nature of the books that can be allowed to him?

(b) Have the jail authorities any right to search the person and the cell of a State Prisoner, and how often can they do so?

(c) Are Government aware that this right, if it exists, has been abused in the case of Mr. Khan?

(d) Is it true that Mr. Khan's cell is opposite to the condemned prisoners' cell?

(e) Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of placing Mr. Khan in a more convenient cell?

(f) Will Government please state on what grounds they arrested and detained Mr. Khan as a State Prisoner within forty days of his release from jail?

(g) Is it true that the prisoner was tested by the Medical Officer and that the latter has stated that the prisoner is on the verge of lunacy owing to the effects of continuous isolation? If so, do Government propose to allow him to move about more freely, or transfer him to some jail where other detenus are kept?

(h) Is it a fact that even after Government allowed the prisoner to have whatever books he liked, the Superintendent of the Jail under instructions from the Criminal Investigation Department has not granted even one book?

(i) Do Government propose to stop the Criminal Investigation Department dictating to Government in the matter of the supply of books to Mr. Khan?

(j) Is the Honourable the Home Member aware that the State Prisoner, Mr. Amir Hyder Khan, who is now in Coimbatore Sub-jail, is subject to various indignities, such as frequent searches, abuses from the Superindent, etc.?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craig: Sir, with your permission I propose to answer questions Nos. 1070 and 1076 together.

State Prisoners are permitted to have writing materials and books and newspapers, which are not considered undesirable, and are granted allowances to cover the cost of diet and personal requirements, including clothing. Amir Haider Khan is detained as a State Prisoner, under the Madras Regulation II of 1819, on account of his dangerous Communist activities. He was first detained in the Central Jail at Coimbatore, where he was accommodated in an "A" class block, which though near the condemned cell, is the most comfortable building in that jail, consisting of four rooms each 18 ft. × 11 ft with a yard, the whole of which was at his disposal. He was not subjected to any indignity or abuse and was allowed all books asked for, except one which was considered undesirable. Owing to the difficulty of finding another prisoner with whom he could be permitted to associate, the Local Government issued orders for his transfer to the Central Jail at Rajahmundry where he is now confined in association with other State Prisoners. He has been permitted to buy and keep writing materials and allowed books from the jail library and booksellers, subject to the approval of the C. I. D.

In the matter of search, the jail authorities are required to search State Prisoners and their cells at least once a week, but may do so more frequently if considered necessary.

Seth Govind Das: Is there any daily paper supplied to the Prisoners?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I am not sure about that, but I think pobably there is.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: Under what Regulation is this prisoner detained?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Under Madras Regulation II of 1819.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: Is it not a fact that Mr. Khan claimed to be tried in an ordinary Court of law?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir. I do not think so.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With reference to the answer to part (f), what are the specific grounds on which Mr. Khan was arrested within 40 days after his release from jail?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Because he was engaged in dangerous Communist activities.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Was any overt act alleged against him?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are those?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I am not prepared to say

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know what is the latest report about his health, in possession of the Honourable the Home Member?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have no adverse report about his health. He was removed from the Coimbatore Jail to the Rajahmundry Jail, because there was no prisoner in the Coimbatore Jail with whom he could associate, and he is now in a position to associate with other State Prisoners in the Rajahmundry Jail

Mr. S. Satyamurti: When was he removed?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I do not know the exact date.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has his health improved since his removal to the Rajahmundry Jail?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have never had any report about his bad health

Prof. N. G. Ranga: With reference to answer to part (d), is the Honourable Member aware that to be kept in a cell opposite to condemned prisoners cells will have the most depressing effect upon the prisoner's mind and heart?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: He is no longer there in that cell. He was in that cell formerly.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will the Honourable Member consider the advisability of transferring him to some other jail?

An Honourable Member: That question has been already answered.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member ought to listen before putting his question.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: It is not always possible to hear what Members on the Treasury Benches say.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Next question.

Police Force in the Criminal Investigation Department in the Centrally Administered Areas.

1071. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will Government please state:

(a) the number of constables, head constables sub-inspectors, Inspectors, Deputy Superintendents, Superintendents and other higher officers in the Criminal Investigation Department in the centrally administered areas;

(b) what is the total amount spent on that department;

(c) whether the amounts spent in that department are audited, if not, why not;

(d) of the total staff, how many are engaged in the regular criminal investigation; and

(e) how many are employed in watching the movements of men engaged in political activities?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The information is being collected and will be laid on the table in due course.

Relief to Agriculturists in India.

1072. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** (a) Are Government aware of the following measures adopted by the American Government to give relief to agriculturists:

(i) passing the Agricultural Adjustment Act;

(ii) raising the price level of agricultural products by restricting cultivation;

(iii) giving subsidy to agriculturists in compensation for the unuse of cultivable land; and

(iv) passing the Farm Mortgage Act to provide money to farms at cheap rates of interest?

(b) What action have the Government of India taken, or propose to take, to give relief to agriculturists in India?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) Government have no information beyond what has appeared, from time to time, in the Press.

(b) I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to my speech on the late Lala Brij Kishore's Resolution on the 6th April, 1934. As the Honourable Member is aware the Government of India have decided to allot rupees one crore next year to the provinces for rural reconstruction. This will mainly benefit the agriculturist.

CASE OF MR. VATSAYANA OF THE DELHI CONSPIRACY CASE.

1073. ***Pandit Nilakantha Das:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the news appearing in the *Hindustan Times*, dated the 17th February, 1935, town edition, on page 9, under the heading "H. S. Vatsayana (S. H. Vatsayana)" ordered out of Delhi?

(b) Is it a fact that Mr. Vatsayana was acquitted in the Delhi conspiracy case and was interned in Lahore just on his acquittal?

(c) How long has he been so interned?

(d) Was he recently wanted to appear as a prosecuting witness at Ajmer?

(e) Is it a fact that on his way back, he was served with a notice by the Local Government of Delhi to quit Delhi within 24 hours?

(f) Is there any news in possession of Government that he was not leaving Delhi within 24 hours?

(g) Is it also a fact that he was to leave Delhi and he actually left it within two hours of the service of the notice?

(h) Are Government in possession of anything to show that he was not engaging himself in Delhi, during the few hours he was here, in some strictly vocational occupation, including negotiation for sale of his manuscripts?

(i) Have Government ascertained the present occupation of Mr. Vatsayana? If so, what is it?

(j) Do Government pay him any allowance?

(k) Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of making it possible for him by giving him all facilities, including free movement, to look for an honest and suitable occupation for himself? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) I have seen the article.

(b) Yes. He is restricted to Lahore under the orders of the Punjab Government.

(c) Since February, 1934.

(d) He was permitted to go to Ajmer on summons from the City Magistrate, Ajmer.

(e) Yes.

(g) He left Delhi four hours after the service of the order.

(f) and (h). He was externed from Delhi as his presence was considered to be undesirable. When the order was served on him he stated that he had had no intention of staying in Delhi and was on his way to Lahore from Ajmer.

(i) to (k). As the order restricting his residence to Lahore has been passed by the Local Government, it is for the Local Government to decide these questions. I understand that no allowance is paid to him.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Why was his presence considered undesirable in Delhi?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: He is considered to be a dangeous person.

PROBLEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT AMONGST THE BHADRALOKE CLASSES.

1074. ***Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the fact that the problem of unemployment amongst the Bhadraloke classes throughout India is becoming more and more acute?

(b) Has the Government made any arrangement for having reliable statistics about the number, status, education and other particulars of the unemployed?

(c) What remedial measures, if any, have been suggested and formulated by Government for the solution of the problem? What steps have actually been taken to give effect to the same in the provinces?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Government are aware that "middle class" unemployment is causing considerable anxiety.

(b) An attempt was made, at the 1931 Census, to obtain figures of unemployed graduates but it did not yield any satisfactory results.

(c) As the Honourable Member appears to be aware, the question is one that primarily concerns the Provincial Governments and a number of them have appointed special Committees to consider the question in recent years. It is impossible for me to give any indication of the various steps suggested by these Committees within the limits of a reply to a question, nor am I in possession of a record of the steps taken. The opportunity was taken to discuss the subject at the Fifth Industries Conference in Simla in 1933 and a summary of the views expressed and the deliberations will be found on pages 121 to 134 of Bulletin No. 50 of the Bulletins of Indian Industries and Labour, a copy of which is in the Library. Partly as a result of their deliberations, Local Governments were recently addressed on the subject of educational reconstruction by the Department of Education, Health and Lands.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know whether in view of the fact that there are graduates unemployed who aspire for service under the Government of India, the Government are prepared to make some arrangements to see that these graduates who have passed examinations are employed and thereby the discontent of unemployment is removed?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I take it that the Government do employ the unemployed. How else can they enter Government service?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are the Government of India taking any steps, therefore, to relieve unemployment among the middle classes, or, to the best of their knowledge, have any Local Governments taken any steps positively to relieve middle class unemployment?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Sir, I can only suggest that my Honourable friend should study the Local Governments' records on the subject. It may be of interest to him to know that of the Governor's Provinces, Bengal, Madras, the Punjab, the United Provinces, Assam and Bombay have held enquiries into middle class unemployment and the Government of Bihar and Orissa are now about to hold such an enquiry. I think my Honourable friend is also probably aware that in the United Provinces an enquiry committee is at present sitting under the chairmanship of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru. I am absolutely certain that, with Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru as Chairman, that committee is bound to produce a most useful report.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Apart from enquiries and committees, will the Honourable Member state whether any single step has been taken either by the Government of India or any Local Governments to their knowledge to relieve middle class unemployment?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I cannot possibly say in reply to a supplementary question what Local Governments have done to implement the recommendations made by the various committees I have mentioned.

Seth Govind Das: Are Government aware that in the Central Provinces the Government are doing nothing in this matter?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I cannot believe that they are doing nothing. It is true that they have not held any enquiry as other Local Governments have done, but I am quite certain that this undoubtedly serious problem is engaging the attention of the Government of the Central Provinces.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: How long have they been dealing with this problem?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: It will go on engaging the attention of the Local Governments until they are nearer a solution of a problem which I admit is serious.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: Are Government aware that a young man recently committed suicide in Lucknow because of unemployment?

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Why one young man? There are scores of them.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask, what steps have Government taken to collect statistics regarding unemployment after their failure to get statistics in the last census?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: There is another question down on the paper in regard to that point, but I can say at once that it is impossible to ascertain the number of unemployed at any time without a census of the most elaborate kind. It is questionable whether it would be possible to get reliable statistics by means of a census, owing to the difficulty of discriminating between voluntary and involuntary unemployment. We all know the problem is there, and I do not think that the collection of statistics would help towards its solution.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask whether the Government of India are aware that they have undertaken to supply figures relating to unemployment to the International Labour Office on account of having ratified the convention passed at the Washington Conference?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think my Honourable friend had better put down a question on that subject

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government consider the suggestion of conscripting all these educated unemployed and training them and engaging them in eradicating the colossal illiteracy in this country?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: That, Sir, is a matter for Local Governments. I do not know whether you, Sir, will permit me to take a little more time than I might otherwise be allowed to take in replying to a supplementary question, but it may be of interest to the House to know what the conclusions of the Industries Conference of 1933 on this subject were. They held that:

"(1) The true remedy for unemployment amongst the middle classes, as indeed amongst other classes, is the rapid development of the resources of the country.

(2) In most provinces an undue proportion of the resources available is being devoted to purely literary education, particularly in the higher grades.

(3) An industrial bias from the earliest stages would be useful in changing the general outlook of the educated classes.

(4) All possible new careers for instance, in the Army, the Navy, Mercantile Marine, Civil Aviation, etc., should be opened up to Indian educated young men as rapidly as possible."

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government consider the advisability of establishing a Central Employment Bureau to serve the needs of the middle class unemployed?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think that is more a matter for the Local Governments than for the Government of India.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In view of the fact that the Local Governments cannot establish a Central Employment Bureau . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): A matter like this cannot perhaps be debated fully at question time.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: May I know what steps Government have taken to solve the problem of unemployment among the educated youth in Delhi and other centrally administered areas?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: There, again, I think my Honourable friend had better put down a question on the subject.

FINES IMPOSED UPON THE CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE PRISONERS IN THE MADRAS PRESIDENCY.

1075. ***Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(i) the number of cases in which fines were imposed in the Madras . . . Presidency upon civil disobedience prisoners since 1932;

(ii) the total amount of the fines realised until the civil disobedience campaign was stopped by Mahatma Gandhi;

(iii) the amounts realised after that withdrawal of mass as well as individual civil-disobedience campaign;

(iv) whether it is a fact that even now attempts are being made to realise the fines imposed during the civil disobedience campaign withdrawn so long ago;

(v) if the answer to parts (iii) and (iv) be in the affirmative, whether Government are prepared to stop such proceedings and excuse the fines, thus far unrealised?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (i) to (iii). I regret I have not this information and cannot undertake to impose on Local Governments the task of collecting it since the labour involved would be incommensurate with the results obtained.

(iv) and (v). The fines were imposed by the Courts under the law. It is open to Local Governments to remit them if they consider this desirable on the merits of each case in the light of local conditions. The Government of India see no reason to interfere with the discretion of the Local Government in this matter.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: With regard to clause (iii), have the Government of India any policy in this matter?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, Sir; the policy is to leave the matter to the discretion of the Local Governments who have the legal power.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is there any harm in the Government of India suggesting to the Provincial Governments that in view of the withdrawal of the Civil Disobedience Movement, the collection of the fines imposed during the second civil disobedience campaign might be remitted or excused?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That seems to me to be asking me for an expression of opinion

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will it be impossible for the Government of India to make that suggestion to the Local Governments?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Next question.

CASE OF MR. AMIR HYDER KHAN, A STATE PRISONER IN THE COIMBATORE JAIL.

†1076. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) what are the conveniences and comforts to which a State Prisoner is entitled, and whether he is entitled to have books and writing materials; if not, why not;

(b) what kinds of books could safely be provided for them;

(c) what are the orders of Government to the jail authorities to search the person and the cell of the State Prisoners;

†For answer to this question *see* answer to question No. 1070.

(d) how often such searches can be made by the jail servants under the rules;

(e) whether it is a fact that State Prisoner Mr. Amir Hyder Khan who is now in Coimbatore Sub-jail is subjected to various indignities, such as frequent searches, abuses from the Superintendent, etc.; and

(f) what action Government propose taking in the matter, and if not, why not?

AMENDMENTS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL SUGGESTED AT THE MEETING OF PRINCES AND MINISTERS OF INDIAN STATES.

1077. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that certain decisions have been arrived at at the meeting of Princes and Ministers of Indian States on the 25th February, 1935, at Bombay, suggesting certain amendments to the Government of India Bill;

(b) whether these decisions have been communicated to the Viceroy and the Government of India;

(c) what those decisions and recommendations are;

(d) what action they propose to take thereon;

(e) whether the opinion of the Legislative Assembly will be sought thereon; if not, why not; and

(f) whether these decisions and recommendations will at least be placed on the table of the House?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) and (d). A White Paper containing the documents received from the Princes and the comments of His Majesty's Government thereon has already been published. In this connection the Honourable Member's attention is invited to the Press Communique issued by the Foreign and Political Department on the 18th March, 1935.

(e) No. The matter is not one calling for a references to this House.

(f) Does not arise.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know the reasons why the Leader of the House thinks that this is not a matter calling for any expression of opinion by this House, in view of the fact that this Federation is a tripartite affair between British India, the British Government and the Princes? Why should not the Assembly have an opportunity of expressing its views?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I have answered that. So far as the negotiations between the Princes and the Secretary of State are concerned, the Government of India have no function in the matter at all.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it, therefore, that the Government of India have not been consulted at any stage of these negotiations?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I have no such information before me. I can answer that question on short notice if my Honourable friend will put down one.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Arising out of the answer given by the Leader of the House that the Government of India have no function in these negotiations between the Princes and the British Government, I am asking for further elucidation whether, since these negotiations started, the Government of India have never been consulted by the Secretary of State

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member wanted a question to be put down.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I will answer it on short notice.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has the attention of the Honourable Member or of the Government of India been drawn to the statement made in the House of Commons by the Secretary of State that today, the legal advisers of the Indian Princes are negotiating with the legal advisers of the Crown in Great Britain over the various points they have raised in respect of this Federation?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am not aware that the attention of the Government of India has been drawn to it officially, but I remember to have read something to that effect in the newspapers

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have the Government of India been officially told about it?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Do the Government of India propose to take any action to represent the Indian point of view, at least the Government of India point of view, with regard to these very important negotiations affecting the future form of the Federation?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: As I have said already, in these negotiations the Government of India have no function whatsoever.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know why an opportunity will not be given to the Assembly to express its opinion? If the Government of India think they have no function in the matter, we think we have

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That is a matter of opinion. We think that the Government of India have no function in the matter and we see no necessity of placing it before this House for getting the opinion of the House on the matter

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has the Honourable the Leader of the House examined these various amendments suggested by the princes, and does he realise that, if some of these amendments are carried, this Federation will be at the mercy of any Indian Prince, and does he think the Indian people should have no voice in the matter?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I do not agree with my Honourable friend's view of the inference to be drawn from these negotiations.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has my Honourable friend examined those negotiations?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I have seen those negotiations so far as they appeared in the newspapers and other publications.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has he come to the conclusion that, whatever the result of the negotiations may be, British India is not at all concerned with it?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I have not come to the conclusion that British India is not concerned with the Federation.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know then why the Leader of the House thinks that the Government of India have no part in the matter, in view of the fact that the Government of India will be changed out of recognition by this Federation?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): They said they were not consulted; at any rate they have no function in this matter.

Mr. B. Das: May I ask the Government of India why they did not publish the White Paper which was recently published in London giving the correspondence between the Princes and the Secretary of State and circulate it to the Members here?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: It was published in the newspapers.

Mr. B. Das: Why did not Government publish it in the form of a book and circulate it?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Will my Honourable friend indicate how it would have been better if another republication had been issued here?

Mr. B. Das: Has it not been the practice of the Government of India to publish the White Paper and every other document connected with the new Constitution and circulate those to the Members of this House?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am not aware that there has been any uniform practice, and I do not see any occasion, when the matter was before the public and everybody knew it, for printing it over again.

PAUCITY OF MUSLIMS IN THE CENTRAL STANDARD OFFICE, RAILWAY BOARD.

1078. *Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi: (a) Is it a fact that there is not a single Muslim in the clerical staff of the Central Standard Office, Railway Board?

(b) Is it also a fact that this office is going to be made permanent and as a consequence, additional staff will be required?

(c) If so, will Government please state what steps have been taken to recruit an adequate number of Muslims against the new appointments with a view to give them their due share?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) There is no Muslim in the clerical staff of the Central Standards Office, but nine out of 31 draftsmen and tracers are Muslims.

(b) Yes.

(c) I can assure my Honourable friend that the latest orders of the Government regarding communal representation will be followed in filling the new posts.

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi: I did not ask whether there was any Muslim in the draftsmen cadre: why did the Honourable Member give me that figure?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I gave that figure because it enables the House to have a better idea of the position in the Central Standards Office.

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi: Is it because the Department concerned sent him the figures in order to hide their sin in this matter?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order.

DAMAGE TO THE SUGAR-CANE CROP IN THE DELHI PROVINCE.

1079. ***Seth Govind Das:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the news published in the *National Call*, dated February 14, 1935, under the heading "Village Sugar Crop Spoiled", in which the villagers in Delhi Province are reported to have sent in a complaint regarding the inattention on the part of the canal authorities, although they had paid the *abiana* in full?

(b) Will Government lay on the table a statement of figures showing the extent of damage to the sugar-cane crop and the extent to which the canal authorities are responsible for it?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes.

(b) In any irrigated district complaints of this kind are not uncommon, and, if properly represented, are dealt with as a matter of course. The case referred to in the press report is not a case of general importance and I am not, therefore, prepared to lay on the table the statement for which the Honourable Member asks.

UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM IN INDIA.

1080. ***Seth Govind Das:** Will Government please state whether they are adopting any steps to gauge the extent and measure of unemployment in various parts of the country? If so, what?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The matter is primarily one for the Local Governments. So far as I am aware none has conducted any elaborate statistical inquiry relating directly to unemployment, but statistics are published annually giving the average numbers employed in factories, in mines, on railways and in certain other branches of activity.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: May I know what have the Government of India done for the Centrally administered areas?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That question does not arise.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: I submit that it arises from this question. The question is:

"Will Government please state whether they are adopting any steps to gauge the extent and measure of unemployment in various parts of the country?"

Therefore, the Government of India being interested in the administration of the Centrally administered areas, I am entitled to know what steps have been taken in those areas.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I do not agree that the question arises out of the original question; but I think the Honourable Member is confusing this question with the one I answered previously. This question merely asks whether the Government are adopting any steps to gauge the extent and measure of unemployment in various parts of the country. In any case, I have already answered the question. I have asked my Honourable friend to put down a question on the notice paper in regard to it.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: I want to know whether the Government of India have adopted any steps for gauging the extent of unemployment in the Centrally administered areas.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: And I have asked my Honourable friend to put down a question on the paper.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: My submission is . . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable Member is not prepared to do it, he will not get an answer.

SILVER JUBILEE OF HIS MAJESTY THE KING EMPEROR.

1081. ***Seth Govind Das:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state what special instructions, if any, have been issued to Local Governments, and through them to district and local officers, to secure India-wide celebration of the Silver Jubilee of His Majesty the King Emperor?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state what expenditure, if any, is proposed to be incurred in connection with the Silver Jubilee celebrations?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state if in the Delhi Province special leaflets have been circulated in the villages in connection with the Silver Jubilee?

(d) If the answer to part (c) be in the affirmative, will Government please state (i) the contents of those leaflets, (ii) the authority circulating these leaflets and (iii) the money spent on these leaflets?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) The Honourable Member is presumably aware of the official statement which was made in the Press on the 31st July last announcing the wishes of His Majesty the King-Emperor in regard to the celebration of the Silver Jubilee. It was His Majesty's express desire that the celebration should be on a local basis, and that His Majesty's subjects should, wherever practicable, have the opportunity to

observe the occasion near their homes. It was also his wish that the celebration should be as simple as possible and that all undue expenditure should be avoided. In conformity with the wishes of His Majesty, the Government of India asked all Local Governments to arrange for celebrations at provincial and district headquarters and at such other centres in each district as appeared to them to be suitable. It was suggested that local and provincial Committees should be appointed to arrange the celebration and according to press reports all Local Governments have taken this step. The decision what form the celebration should take thus rests with these provincial and local committees but it was suggested to Local Governments that they might suitably be on the same lines as on other similar occasions in the past, *e.g.*, distribution of alms to the poor, entertainment of school children, illumination of public and private buildings, etc., etc. As the celebrations in England will start with a Thanksgiving Service on May 6th at St. Paul's Cathedral to be attended by Their Majesties the King and Queen, similar Thanksgiving Services will be held on that day in India in all churches, and the Government of India have no doubt that followers of other religions will recognise that this is a most appropriate way of inaugurating these celebrations and will hold similar religious services in their places of worship. May 6th has been declared to be a Public Holiday and the Local Governments will declare one other day within the period from 6th to 18th, during which the celebrations will be carried on in all parts of the Empire, to be a local holiday.

I may add that at Simla where His Excellency the Viceroy will be in residence at the time, there will be a religious service on the Ridge on May 6th, a Military Search Light Tattoo at Annandale on May 11th and a *Mela* arranged by the Government of the Punjab, as well as the other items arranged by a Local Government.

(b) The Government of India anticipate an expenditure of about two lakhs to cover their illuminations throughout India and the Military Tattoo. Local celebrations in the Provinces will be financed, as far as possible, from public subscriptions. Local Governments are, it is understood, devoting some funds to illuminations and other official functions but the Government of India have no information as to the amount of expenditure proposed.

(c) No.

(d) Does not arise.

Seth Govind Das: Do Government not think that it is all practically a waste of money when the whole country is suffering from such poverty?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair will not allow such questions.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Certainly not.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: With reference to part (c), may I know from what item of the budget this item of Rs. 2 lakhs is proposed to be spent?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: It is being submitted to the Standing Finance Committee on Friday.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know whether any force is brought to bear upon local bodies to contribute to these funds?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan: Are Government aware that *lumbardars* in the Punjab province are putting undue pressure upon the peasants to contribute to this fund?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No. Government are not aware of that.

MESSAGES OF LOYALTY IN CONNECTION WITH THE CELEBRATIONS OF THE SILVER JUBILEE.

1082. ***Seth Govind Das:** Will Government be pleased to state if in the villages of the Delhi Province attempts are being made by local officials, directly or indirectly, to obtain signatures of villagers on specially devised messages of loyalty in connection with the celebrations of the Silver Jubilee? If so, will Government please state:

(a) what are its contents;

(b) with what object these signatures are being obtained;

(c) what expense is likely to be incurred to obtain these signatures; and

(d) whether these signatures are being obtained in the Delhi Province or in other places?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The reply to the first part of the question is in the negative. Parts (a), (b), (c) and (d) do not arise.

FORMATION OF A MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND COMMUNICATIONS.

1083. ***Seth Govind Das:** (a) Will Government please state if they have taken any steps towards the formation of a ministry of agriculture and communications to serve as a link between the producers and transport agencies?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government please state what action they propose to take in providing efficient machinery at the centre with a view to co-ordinate the activities of the Local Governments and evolve common policies?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The Government of India have accepted the principle that there should be a redistribution of portfolios within His Excellency the Viceroy's Executive Council so as to bring all questions relating to transport and communications into one. As my Honourable colleague, the Finance Member, has already informed the House, it is hoped that it may be possible to put the new arrangements into operation before the end of the current calendar year. The question of adding agriculture and connected subjects to the portfolio of Communications has not been considered.

(b) The question does not arise in the form in which it is stated, but the Honourable Member is doubtless aware of the existence of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research in the domain of agriculture; and his attention is drawn to the recent creation of a Transport Advisory Council in the domain of transport and communications, particulars regarding which were given in reply to question No. 108 asked by Professor N. G. Ranga on the 22nd February, 1935.

PROVISION OF MEDICAL AID IN THE RURAL AREAS.

1084. *Seth Govind Das: (a) Will Government please state what has been their policy for providing medical aid in the rural areas?

(b) Can Government state the number of free dispensaries in Delhi and the extent of relief provided to the villagers?

(c) Is it a fact that the doctors incharge of the dispensaries demand a fee from the villagers, thus making it impossible for the villagers to even take advantage of the meagre facility provided to them?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) Medical aid in the rural areas of Delhi Province has, for many years past, been provided by the District Board in the form of Charitable Dispensaries.

(b) There are five such dispensaries which provide, in addition to free diagnosis and medicines, a limited number of beds for urgent cases.

(c) Doctors in charge of these dispensaries are not allowed to charge fees from patients who attend the dispensary, and, if any instance in which a fee has been demanded is brought to the notice of the local administration, an enquiry will be made. These doctors are, however, permitted to charge a fee for attendance upon patients in their houses.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do Government propose to have any more dispensaries in the next year?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: That is a question really of financial prosperity: when there is a little more money, we shall probably establish more dispensaries.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: Are Government aware of the suggestion made by Mr. Darling that the medical officers should be required to tour in villages also, to attend on patients without charging them any fee?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: No, Sir; I am not aware of any such suggestion.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: Will the Honourable Member care to read the latest book by Mr. Darling entitled "Wisdom and Waste"?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: When I have a little more leisure, I shall certainly familiarise myself with its contents.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government care to accept the suggestions made in that book?

(No reply.)

PUNJAB MARTIAL LAW PRISONERS STILL IN JAIL.

1085. *Seth Govind Das: (a) Will Government be pleased to state the number of Punjab martial law prisoners, serving sentences in the various jails in India?

(b) Have Government considered the question of releasing any one of these convicts?

(c) Do Government propose to release Mahasha Ratto and Ch. Buggo in view of their long incarceration and their present state of weak and bad health?

(d) Are Government aware that the wife of Mahasha Ratto is financially in a bad way?

(e) Will Government be pleased to state whether they intend to help her financially?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) Seven.

(b) The question of the release of these prisoners is considered periodically and each case will again be considered on dates which have already been fixed.

(c) I presume the prisoners referred to by the Honourable Member are Ch. Bagga Mal and Ch. Rattan Chand. The former was released on June 1, 1934. Government do not propose to release the latter at present, as his conduct in jail has been unsatisfactory.

(d) The answer is in the negative.

(e) Does not arise.

Action to stay the Deterioration of Literacy.

1086. ***Seth Govind Das:** Will Government be pleased to state what action, if any, they propose to take to stay the deterioration of literacy as reported by Sir George Anderson in his report of 1932-33?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Education is very largely a provincial subject, but Provincial Governments are making strenuous efforts to remedy the defects referred to in the Report.

The Government of India hope that the advice of the Central Advisory Board will be of great value to Provincial Governments.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What are the duties discharged by Sir George Anderson?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Sir George Anderson primarily concerns himself with the collection of statistics and data relating to Education throughout India which are published annually and also the Quinquennial Reports. He also advises the Government of India on such educational matters as are referred to them by Local Governments.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is he expected to convene from time to time conferences of Educational Advisers belonging to different provinces?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Well, Sir, it is in order to put these conferences on a regular basis that we are creating the Central Advisory Board of which, I think, Sir George Anderson will be the Chairman.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Who will be represented on the Central Advisory Board, may I know?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I cannot say off-hand, but certainly all the provinces, and university and other important educational interests.

PROMOTION OF HAND-WORK INDUSTRY AND SERICULTURE.

1087. *Seth Govind Das: Will Government state what action has been taken so far towards the promotion of the hand-work industry and sericulture, for which the Government of India allotted a special amount to be distributed among the various provinces, following the last Industry Conference at Simla?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: By "hand-work industry" the Honourable Member presumably means handloom weaving industry. As far as this industry is concerned, the Government of India have recently approved the revised schemes submitted by the provinces and have already allocated grants to them amounting in the aggregate to Rs. 1,76,000 for the current financial year and Rs. 3,97,500 for the ensuing financial year. With regard to the sericultural industry, a meeting of the Imperial Sericultural Committee was held on the 25th of the last month. The Government of India have accepted the recommendations of the Committee and the grants for the year 1935-36 have just been allocated. They amount in the aggregate to Rs. 93,962.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Has the Legislative Assembly been given an opportunity to discuss the manner in which the grants to handloom weavers ought to be spent?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I am afraid, Sir, I cannot state the position offhand, but I think,—I speak subject to correction,—that the proposal for the grant of this money was duly placed before the Standing Finance Committee. The exact method of its allocation was left to Government, and, as I have already stated in reply to questions on the floor of this House, that allocation was made in consultation with a conference of representatives of the Local Governments, and I am glad to say that a unanimous decision was arrived at which was duly implemented.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not a fact, Sir, that the schemes of Local Governments on which they had to spend these grants made by the Government of India are subject to the supervision and control of the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Yes, it is proposed to review the progress made at the next meeting of the Industrial Conference.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: And, therefore, ...

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question, please.

MISREPRESENTATION AGAINST INDIA IN THE FILM "INDIA SPEAKS".

1088. *Seth Govind Das: (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the press report wherein it has been stated that a film "India Speaks" by R. K. O. Radio makes wild statements about the civilization of India?

(b) What action do Government propose to take against such sort of misrepresentation against India?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair believes there is a short notice question on the same subject, notice of which has been given by Dr. Banerjea. Perhaps the Honourable Member in charge would like to answer both.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, Sir, I think it would perhaps suit the Honourable Members if I answered both together.

As regards No. 1088, the answer is as follows:

(a) Yes.

(b) The film is, I understand, being exhibited in America. The Secretary of State for India has been addressed in the matter with the suggestion that the necessary representation should be made in the proper quarters. I might add for the information of the House that the British Board of Censors refused to certify this film in June, 1933, for public exhibition in the United Kingdom and that it is unlikely that any Board of Censors in any other part of the British Empire will permit its exhibition

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know, Sir, when the Honourable Member came to know of this film being exhibited in America for the first time?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I think it would be more convenient if I answered the short notice question first.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I have also put down a question on this subject, and, therefore, I ask this question.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Short notice question. Dr. Banerjea.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION AND ANSWER

FILM NAMED "BENGALI" EXHIBITED IN EUROPE.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to a letter from Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose, published in the *Hindustan Times* of the 12th March, 1935, in the course of which he states that a film called "Bengali" is being exhibited in Europe?

(b) Are Government aware that this film follows closely the film "India Speaks" and that it is a part of a propaganda against Indian people?

(c) Are Government aware of the scandalous nature of this film, and if so, are they prepared to make an enquiry as to the brains which are directing the propaganda and the money which is financing it?

(d) Do Government propose to consider the desirability of making representations to the Governments of the countries concerned to stop this anti-Indian propaganda?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have no information regarding this film beyond what is stated in the press report to which the Honourable Member refers. The Secretary of State has, however, been addressed in the matter, as in the case of the film "India Speaks" to which reference was made in an earlier question today, with the suggestion that similar action may be taken if inquiry shows that the film is objectionable.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know when the Government came to know of this film being exhibited in America, and when did they come to know of it for the first time here in India?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Which film?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: "India Speaks".

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I cannot say the exact date, I think it was quite recently.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Is it a fact that the papers in India wrote about it about three months ago, and I think the *Bombay Chronicle* wrote something about it. What steps did the Government of India take then?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I don't remember the exact date, but I don't think I saw that in the *Bombay Chronicle*.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if the Honourable Member came to know of this film only when questions were put in this House or before that?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir; I had seen some notices in the press before.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: How long ago was it?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I can't remember exactly.

Mr. F. E. James: May I ask a supplementary question on this? Has the Government's attention been drawn to the malicious suggestion made in certain quarters that this film emanates either from British official sources or from British producers? Is the Honourable Member satisfied that there is no truth whatsoever in that suggestion?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have seen certain innuendos to that effect, but I should have thought that sufficient answer to any such suggestion was given by the fact that the Board of Censors refused to certify the film as fit for exhibition in the United Kingdom, and I understand that no Board of Censors in any other part of the British Empire will permit the exhibition of films which have been refused by the British Board of Censors.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: What is the exact request made by the Government of India to the Secretary of State with regard to this film "Bengali"?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: We have asked the Secretary of State to address a representation to the Government of the United States pointing out that we in India so work the censorship as to avoid the exhibition of any film which is offensive to the susceptibilities of other countries, and asking that corresponding action should be taken by the Government of the United States.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: That is with regard to "India Speaks"?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That is with regard to both.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: But the film "Bengali" has nothing to do with the Government of the United States, the reference in regard to "Bengali" must be made to the European Governments?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Anyhow, a representation has been made to the Secretary of State.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: To approach all the Governments concerned?

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi: Is it a fact that the said film was produced in India by a foreign company?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir; I have said that that film was never produced in any part of the British Empire.

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi: Was it not produced in India?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Made in India? On that point, I have no information.

Mr. H. P. Mody: What happens when a film is banned? Is it confiscated by the Government in the same manner as they confiscate objectionable literature?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I must have notice of it; I am not familiar with the practice.

Srijut N. C. Bardaloi: Are not banned films in India exported out of this country?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I do not think there is any censorship on films exported. Any film exhibited in India must be censored before exhibition, but, so far as I am aware, anybody can make a film in India and take it out.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

RESERVATION OF THE HIGHLANDS OF KENYA FOR EUROPEANS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. I have received a notice from Mr. Satyamurti that he proposes to ask for leave of the House for making a motion for an adjournment of the business of the Assembly for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the criticial position of Indian settlers in Kenya in respect of the proposed reservation of the Highlands for Europeans. I should like to know from the Honourable Member when this proposal was made.

12 NOON.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): This proposal was made by the Carter Commission some time last year; but after that there was a series of questions and answers in the House of Commons, on the 14th February, 1935, in which the point of the questioner

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

was that the Commission went beyond their terms of reference in reserving a larger area than was originally contemplated and in also recommending that that reservation should be made statutory by an Order in Council of His Majesty's Government. That report was received in the Library of this Assembly on the 18th March, 1935. On that very day, a short notice question was put by me which was answered by my Honourable friend, Mr. Bajpai, on the 25th of this month. In that answer, he *inter alia* stated:

"The Government of India approached His Majesty's Government with a request that an opportunity be afforded to them to make representations before an Order in Council was made This request has been acceded to and detailed representations to safeguard Indian interests will shortly be made."

In answer to a supplementary question of mine, my Honourable friend stated that they hoped to despatch the same by the next air mail. My submission to you, Sir, is this that this is the earliest opportunity I could have taken, after the answer from the Government that His Majesty's Government, who originally stated that they would pass an Order in Council, had agreed to stay their hands, pending consideration of representations to be made by the Government of India Therefore, I have come to ask your leave and the leave of the House to make this adjournment motion, in order to strengthen the hands of the Government in representing public opinion and their opinion in this matter. If I do not do so today, the Order in Council will be passed, before the House can have another opportunity of representing on this matter.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What is the specific matter?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: The specific matter is this The proposal to pass an Order in Council by His Majesty's Government reserving an area of about 16,000 square miles in the Highlands of Kenya for European settlers and making it a statutory segregation or reservation, and the statement of my Honourable friend, Mr. Bajpai, that His Majesty's Government have decided to stay their hands pending consideration of representations made by the Government

Mr. G. S. Bajpai (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): I should like to place a few facts for your consideration. In accordance with paragraph 44 of the Manual of Business and Procedure, one of the conditions of admissibility of an adjournment motion is that it must be restricted to a specific matter of recent occurrence. I submit that my Honourable friend has not shown what exactly is this specific matter of recent occurrence. The fact of reservation is not of recent occurrence; that goes back to 1906. The recommendation of the Carter Commission that the area known as the Highlands should be declared by an Order in Council to be reserved in certain ways—that, again, is not of recent occurrence The report of the Carter Commission was published in May, 1934: so also was the declaration of the intention of His Majesty's Government to pass an Order in Council defining the boundary of the Highlands. The only thing that can be said to be of recent occurrence is the definition of privileged position which the Secretary of State for the Colonies gave in the House of Commons on the 14th February, 1935. But even with regard to

that, I should like to submit for your consideration that in its issue of the 10th March, 1935, the Special Correspondent of the *Leader* newspaper in London referred to these questions and answers, as also to the implication which I brought to the notice of the House the other day, namely, that that definition will have the effect of converting what is an administrative into a statutory restriction. I submit that even the fact of that intention being entertained by His Majesty's Government has been known in this country since the 10th March and that therefore the matter cannot be said to be a matter of recent occurrence.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What about the short notice question and the answer to it?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: In the answer to the short notice question, I stated nothing beyond this, that the Government of India are making representations to His Majesty's Government The Government of India first asked the Secretary of State for India to represent to the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 12th February that an opportunity should be given to the Government of India to make representations. That request of the Government of India has been acceded to. I think the fact that His Majesty's Government have agreed to receive representations from the Government of India is not by itself a matter which calls for an adjournment motion.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I hold that the motion is in order. It will be taken up at 4 O'clock.

ELECTION OF A MEMBER TO THE COUNCIL OF THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, BANGALORE.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have to inform the Assembly that Dr. G. V. Deshmukh has been elected to represent the Assembly on the Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore. (Cheers.)

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS—*contd.*

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEPARTMENT—*Concld.*

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House will now resume consideration of the Supplementary Demands for Grants.

Difference between a Supplementary Grant and an Excess Grant.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): I do not propose to take more than a minute or two. I was just submitting to you and the House, in respect of this supplemental demand for the Assembly, that that was certainly an expenditure which the Government could have foreseen, and should have placed before this House. Both on this and other demands, I have raised a number of questions and I find no answer is forthcoming. I recognise that we have no power to compel the Government to answer the questions, but it seems to me. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would like to know exactly what are the questions. Perhaps some Government Member will explain the procedure as regards supplemental demands if you specify the questions.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: My questions are these. What, according to the Honourable the Finance Member, is the difference between a supplementary grant and an excess grant? Are supplementary grants introduced only after expenditure has been incurred, or before expenditure has been incurred and when the need for it arises? Does the Honourable the Finance Member consider that supplementary grants should be introduced as early as possible when the Government come to realise the need for expenditure, beyond that voted by this House; and my next category of questions is this. Does the Honourable the Finance Member consider that supplementary grants may be used for the purpose of incurring expenditure, not this year, but the next year, in view of the definition of supplementary grants in Rule 50 of the Legislative Rules which says that supplementary demands for grants may be moved when the necessity for exceeding arises during the year or when expenditure on a new service, not contemplated at the time of the budget, is made compulsory? How does the Government construe the phrase 'new service' not contemplated at the time of the budget? Is it merely the case of a service which was in their minds for which they omitted to provide for any reasons which they considered proper at that time, or is it because of a new service which actually arises after the budget had been submitted and voted on by this House? Then, Sir, as regards increase of expenditure, according to May's Parliamentary Practice, the expenditure can be exceeded only under one or two well-defined categories of unforeseen circumstances,—either a sudden war or a rise in prices or a statutory obligation cast on the Government by an action of this House or something of that kind, which arises out of circumstances which were not and could not have been foreseen, at the time when the budget was presented.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thinks the Honourable Member wants to know the procedure relating to supplementary demands and the circumstances in which the supplementary demands are made. . . .

Mr. S. Satyamurti: . . and the distinction between excess and supplementary grants.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would like to know whether the Honourable Member draws any distinction, so far as the scope of the discussion is concerned, between supplementary grants or excess grants?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Most certainly. When a Government has incurred expenditure any reasonable Member of this House will bring to bear on it different considerations from those which he will bring to bear. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What about scope of discussions? Questions of policy for instance.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: On that matter, I am in your hands.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is there any difference in that respect between supplementary grants and excess grants? I have looked up the Parliamentary procedure and I do not find that there is any distinction as regards the scope of discussions so far as supplementary grants and excess grants are concerned.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I would respectfully draw your attention to the fact that there is a distinction both in our Rules and Standing Orders and in May's Parliamentary Practice. Rule 49 of the Legislative Rules refers to excess grants, that is to say, when money has been spent on any service for which the vote of the Assembly is necessary, during any financial year, in excess of the amount granted for that service and for that year, a demand for the excess shall be presented to the Assembly by the Finance Member and shall be dealt with in the same way by the Assembly as if it were a demand for a grant, and Rule 50 provides:

"An estimate shall be presented to the Assembly for a supplementary or additional grant when the amount voted in the Budget of a grant is found to be insufficient for the purposes of the current year or a need arises during the current year for expenditure for which the vote of the Assembly is necessary upon some new service not contemplated in the budget for that year."

You will notice at once, comparing the one with the other that, whereas supplementary demands can be moved for new services, excess grants cannot be moved for new services.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Apart from the designation, the Chair wants to know the substantial distinction the Honourable Member draws in the matter of scope of discussion.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): May I explain? An excess grant relates to an excess which only emerges after the end of the financial year. A supplementary grant relates to an excess which emerges during the course of the financial year.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I entirely differ.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What the Chair wants to know is about the scope of the discussion.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: On the point made by the Finance Member. . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is another matter. What is the distinction you suggest regarding the scope of the discussion.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: The scope of the discussion is this. In one case, the expenditure has already been incurred. . . .

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): The point that the House would like to know, as I understand from your suggestion, is this—that when the grant is brought before the House what are our rights as to the discussion, namely, can we make a cut motion, can we really discuss the policy and so forth. That is what the House would like to know.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: So far as the actual words of the rule are concerned, I admit that the rules are the same in both, but, with your leave, I should like to comment on what the Honourable the Finance Member said, because he is the custodian of the rights of this House, so far as financial matters are concerned. Rule 49 says: "When money has been spent on any service for which the vote of the Assembly is necessary, during any financial year, in excess of the amount granted for that service", that is to say, the expenditure has to be incurred during the year. The only point that I should like to submit to you is this, that supplementary demands can cover new services, which excess grants cannot. So far as expenditure actually incurred is concerned, that is a different matter from an expenditure proposed to be incurred, and in May's Parliamentary Practice a distinction is drawn between supplementary grants and excess grants.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair knows the distinction. The Chair knows the circumstances in which one is called an excess grant and the other a supplementary estimate. The Chair simply wanted to know whether the Honourable Member can discuss questions of policy. What is the Honourable Member's suggestion on that?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I submit that we can discuss questions of policy on both. That is my submission to the Chair, because the Chair can change its rulings.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has given its ruling.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: But the Chair can change its ruling.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): What is the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has already ruled that no questions of policy can be discussed in connection with these demands.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: On either the one or the other?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Yes.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In the case of the excess grants, unless we surcharge the officials with actually spending the money, the House can do nothing. The money has been spent and the only thing we can do is to say that we will make these gentlemen pay the money out of their pockets. In the case of the supplementary demand, that is for future expenditure. If we cut it down, the Government may either certify it, if they are so advised, or they may accept the vote of the House.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House is at liberty to reject any sort of grant.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In the case of an expenditure already incurred, the scope becomes narrower, because the money has been spent, and it is a case of shutting the door after the steed has been stolen. In the case of the supplementary demands, we can reduce them.

Mr. K. Sanjiva Row (Government of India: Nominated Official): The first point raised by the Honourable Member is the difference between an excess grant and a supplementary grant. I shall try to explain the position so far as I am able to understand it. I shall deal with the excess grant first. As regards the excess grant, May's Parliamentary Practice says:

"The need for an excess grant arises when a department has carried expenditure upon a service beyond the amount granted to that service during the financial year, for which the grant was made."

This means that when, after the close of the year, it is found that there is an excess the question of presenting an "excess grant" arises. That an "excess grant" is to be presented only after the close of the financial year is also clear from the following quotation from May:

"Demands for excess grants, having been first brought before the committee of public accounts are presented to the committee of supply in the form of a single resolution which includes all the occasions for excess expenditure that have occurred in the branch of the public service to which the resolution applies"

The Committee on Public Accounts is "for the examination of the accounts showing the appropriation of the sums granted by Parliament to meet the public expenditure". The Committee also scrutinises the causes which have led to any excesses over parliamentary grants. It is clear that the examination by the Public Accounts Committee of the excesses over sanctioned grants can only be after the year has closed—that is, when the accounts of the year are placed before the Committee.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is the Honourable Member referring to the procedure here?

Mr. K. Sanjiva Row: I am explaining the procedure in England, Sir. As, according to the quotation from May which I have read out just now, demands for "excess grants" can be presented only after they are brought before the Public Accounts Committee, it follows that demands for "excess grants" are in respect of excesses of a year which has already closed. I may also read out a passage from Parliamentary Grants by Durell which makes the position quite clear:

"A deficit on a civil vote or on the gross army and navy grants is met by either a supplementary estimate or an excess vote, according to the time at which it is discovered" "If a Department exceeds parliamentary provision and fails to take a supplementary estimate either from misapprehension or because it ascertains the fact of a deficit too late to do so, the only alternative is to obtain an excess vote in the following year"

—*not in the same financial year.*

This is exactly the procedure which we follow in the case of "excess grants"—that is, in the case of excesses which are discovered after the accounts of the year are closed, these excesses are first scrutinised by the Public Accounts Committee, and it is only after their recommendation that we come up to the House for "excess votes" at the time the Report of the Public Accounts Committee is taken up for consideration by this House.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): When does the Auditor-General come in?

Mr. K. Sanjiva Row: The Auditor General comments on the appropriation accounts which are examined by the Public Accounts Committee, and in the report of the Public Accounts Committee, that Committee make a recommendation to the Assembly to pass the excess votes and it is only then that we go up to the House with the excess votes. Now as regards the supplementary grants, this is what May says, Sir:

"A supplementary demand may be presented either :

(1) for a further grant to a service already sanctioned by Parliament in addition to the sum already demanded for the current financial year"—for the current financial year, be it noted— "or

(2) for a grant caused by a fresh occasion for expenditure that has arisen since the presentation of the sessional estimates."

I think it is quite clear from this that a demand presented to the Assembly before the close of the financial year for expenditure within that financial year is a "supplementary demand", whereas a demand presented to the Assembly for an excess which has already occurred during the previous financial year is an "excess grant."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): As regards the sanction of the Assembly, in the case of a supplementary demand, in what way is that sanction obtained?

Mr. K. Sanjiva Row: I am coming to that, Sir. The next point raised by Mr. Satyamurti is that a supplementary demand should be presented to the Assembly as soon as possible after the need for a supplementary demand is foreseen. This is indeed extremely difficult. The mere fact that certain extra expenditure, not provided for in the Budget, is being incurred does not necessarily mean that there will be a need for a supplementary grant. In most cases, such extra expenditure is met from unforeseen savings in the sums already voted by the Assembly It may be, that in other cases, a portion can be met from the sums already voted by the Assembly and a supplementary grant may be required only for the balance. If, in such cases, supplementary grants are obtained from the Assembly for the full amounts, they will prove, at the end of the year, to be wholly or partially unnecessary. In spite of these difficulties, Sir, we have been, until 1932, obtaining supplementary grants during the Simla Session which is the earliest time in the financial year when we could obtain them. As a matter of fact, until that year, it has been our practice to obtain during the Simla Session all the supplementary grants which could be foreseen at the time. The result was, that owing to the difficulties mentioned by me already, some of the grants were, at the end of the year, found to be wholly or partially unnecessary. This question was considered by the Public Accounts Committee in 1932, and I may say here that it was at the instance of the Auditor-General that the question was considered by the Public Accounts Committee. We certainly had no intention of delaying coming up to the House till as late a date as possible. Sir, the Auditor-General in forwarding the appropriation accounts for 1930-31 said as follows:

"It will be observed on the other hand in paragraphs 24 to 25 of the Report that cases occurred in which Supplementary Demands were presented which subsequently proved to be unnecessary and I think it would be advantageous for the Public Accounts Committee to discuss once more with the Finance Department the possibility of improving procedure in such a way as to minimise such unnecessary grants of supply."

The Committee, after examination, accepted the following view of the Auditor-General.

"We are on the horns of a dilemma. If you incur expenditure without putting up for a supplementary grant, that is objectionable from one point of view of the Assembly. On the other hand, if you put up for a supplementary grant and get larger spending powers than you require, that is objectionable from another point of view, and I think myself in the end that the lesser evil consists in making departments not incur expenditure without appropriation except when it is absolutely necessary and urgent to do so, and in arranging to come up for your supplementary grants only when you have good reason to believe that extra money is necessary. I think in the end that is the lesser evil from the point of view of the Legislature,—that it should not be asked to vote money until it has been proved conclusively that additional money is required."

This view of the Auditor General was accepted by the Public Accounts Committee and was incorporated in their report as a definite recommendation.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: In what year?

Mr. K. Sanjiva Row: In the Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the accounts of 1930-31,—that is, in 1932. It is in accordance with this recommendation that we gave up the practice of presenting demands for supplementary grants during the Simla Session, as, with only two or three months' actuals, it was impossible to foresee what, if any, savings would occur in the original grants voted by the Assembly. For example, take the supplementary demand now under discussion, *viz.*, Legislative Assembly. Mr. Satyamurti said that when we found that the Delhi Session of the Assembly in 1934 continued beyond the first of April, we should have known that there would be an excess, and that we should have presented a demand in the Simla Session of 1934. Sir, all that we knew at the time was that some expenditure which would have ceased in March, 1934, continued till about the third week of April, 1934. We could not possibly say at the time by how much the grant, voted by the Assembly, would be exceeded because that amount would depend upon certain other considerations, for example, whether there will be a Session in November and, if so, how long it will last and also when the Budget Session will begin and when it will end. If we are to carry out the recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee we have to take into account these things before fixing the amount of the supplementary demand. As a matter of fact, this year, even in January when we prepared the supplementary demand, we found it difficult to fix the exact amount as we had to guess whether the Assembly would go on beyond the 31st of March. Exactly the same difficulties arise in the case of other supplementary demands, and, it is, therefore, in accordance with the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee that we presented supplementary demands in March and not in July.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): As regards "new service", the Chair thinks it is obvious that Government must obtain the sanction of the Assembly.

Mr. K. Sanjiva Row: As regards "new service", I may explain that as soon as the need arises we try to go to the Assembly. For example, take the case of the transfer of the Agricultural Institute from Pusa. It was a new service and it was altogether a new demand and we knew for

[Mr. K. Sanjiva Row.]

certain that it could not be met from other demands, and, therefore, we presented the demand in respect of the Agricultural Institute in the Simla Session last year.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What about broadcasting? The Chair is just giving as an example of one of the new items.

Mr. K. Sanjiva Row: That is a new service and we are asking for a supplementary grant only during this Session.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is asking for sanction by this grant.

Mr. K. Sanjiva Row: Yes, Sir. Then my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, said that the total amount of the supplementary demands was about 12 crores. I do not know where he got the figure from.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): He said the railway demands as well as the general demands.

Mr. K. Sanjiva Row: The total amount of the general supplementary demands is only 380 lakhs and the total amount of the railway demands is 82 lakhs, that is, 4 crores and 62 lakhs. Out of this, 314 lakhs are on account of the special items for which we had to submit a supplementary demand, and, excluding this amount, the general supplementary demand is for 66 lakhs. The total amount of the voted expenditure of the Government of India is 40 crores, and I think an excess of 66 lakhs in a sum of 40 crores, which comes to about 1½ per cent., cannot be said to be excessive. In the case of the railways, it comes only to 82 lakhs in about 100 crores; so it comes to less than 1 per cent. Then my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, asked the question whether we could present a supplementary demand in the current year for expenditure during the next year. The answer is certainly not. We can never do that. A supplementary demand is always presented for expenditure during the financial year in which the expenditure is being incurred and not for expenditure in the next financial year.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, the practice that we have been following during the last five years with regard to the excess grant and the supplementary grant is this. Take the budget of 1934-35. If about this expenditure any demand is made before the 31st March, 1935, it is a supplementary grant. If the demand is made after the 31st March, 1935, it becomes an excess grant and not a supplementary grant. That is the first difference. The second difference is that the supplementary demand filters through the Standing Finance Committee and the excess demand very often filters through the Public Accounts Committee. In one year only they demanded a supplementary grant for the last several years because of the objection raised by the Accountant General. The fact of the matter is that whenever there is a motion for an excess grant, there is always the idea of a vote of censure behind it because these things are always pointed out by the Public Accounts Committee and by the Auditor-General and they always insist on the permission being taken before the 31st March of that particular year. So, to avoid that, it should be brought in the shape of a supplementary grant and not as an excess grant, because an excess grant is really a sort of a vote of censure on the spending authority by the

Auditor-General and by the Public Accounts Committee. It is a kind of *post mortem* examination. As regards the new item which comes in the shape of a supplementary grant, it is always discussed first by the Standing Finance Committee. Take, for instance, the case of the Agricultural Institute, Pusa. The Standing Finance Committee, on its own recommendation, said that that matter ought to be discussed separately in the Legislative Assembly and it was discussed in the last Simla Session. So, whenever a new expenditure is to be incurred which, in the opinion of the Standing Finance Committee, involves a new principle, then the Standing Finance Committee of its own accord, recommends that that matter should be discussed separately by the Assembly and there should be a separate vote demanded so that the Assembly may have a full discussion on the policy and the principle of the new undertaking. This has been the practice so far; we may change it in the future. The practice so far has been that in the case of all these supplementary grants we have never raised the question of policy. We discuss these grants only from the point of view of economy and whether the amount should be sanctioned or not. In the case of the new expenditure, we pointed out very clearly that it should be discussed separately and then usually we allotted a day to discuss this particular question either in the shape of a Resolution or in some other way. The other point raised by my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, is that these supplementary grants should not be shoved in in the last week of the financial year. They could have been taken up in the month of January or February. But this year, the case was rather exceptional, because in the month of January there was no Standing Finance Committee till the Assembly actually met and then the Standing Finance Committee was elected. So, we should not take this year as an example; it is an exceptional year. But I certainly agree with the point raised by my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, the difference between an excess grant and a supplementary grant is plain enough. The one is the result of a *post-mortem* examination as has been said and is ordinarily brought to notice by the Auditor-General in his report of the examination of the accounts for a completed year. So, in the case of an excess grant, the motion before the House is essentially of a formal character. The House has willy-nilly to accept it.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Or pass a motion of censure.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: So far as the censure is concerned, it is something distinct from the approval of the grant by the House. This is certainly the result of some sort of oversight on the part of the Finance Department. But that is not the material part of it so far as the excess grant is concerned. The important characteristic of the excess grant with reference to the House is this that the House is practically powerless and cannot effectively reduce that amount which the Government places before the House for sanction, for the expenditure has already been incurred.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): But sanction had already been given to that scheme.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: It is not necessarily so. It may be a new service altogether. Suppose the Government incur cost of a service that had never been brought before this House . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member was referring to an excess grant.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I am referring to an excess grant. Even in the case of an excess grant, it is just possible that the Government may incur expenditure for a service which had never been placed before this House for examination or consideration. Even in that case, the only remedy open to the Finance Department will be to place it before this House. But, as I said, it is more or less a formal affair and that is what distinguishes it from a supplementary grant. Now, what is the characteristic of a supplementary grant? Is it also of a purely formal character?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair finds they are all called supplementary demands for grants.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I am submitting that if the proposals for supplementary grants are brought before the House after the expenditure has already been incurred, there is nothing to distinguish supplementary grants from excess grants. The two then would stand for all practical purposes on a similar footing. The House will have, unless it chooses to cast the responsibility for the expenditure on the individuals concerned, to approve the amounts involved. But, the supplementary grant in fact stands on a different footing from an excess grant. A supplementary grant is exactly of the nature of the demands that are made in the course of the budget discussion at the start of the financial year. It should be from its very nature a demand which the House can consider on its merits, and either accept or reject not only in form but in substance also. But if the demand is brought before the House after the expenditure has already been incurred, what can the House do? It would then have to give its formal consent in the matter of supplementary grant in the same manner as it is expected to do in the case of an excess grant Sir, the occasion for a supplementary grant may arise in three cases though one feature will be common to all. When the provision for a service in the budget is found insufficient for the needs of that service, then alone the occasion for a supplementary grant arises, and, it may be met in three ways. Firstly, it may be only a transfer from one sub-head to another under the same main head in the budget. And, that need again may arise in two ways. In one case, it may require only an administrative sanction to transfer the spare amount under one sub-head to another. In that case, the occasion for a supplementary grant does not arise at all. The Department concerned having the authority under the rules to make a transfer from one sub-head to another could sanction or refuse. The second case may arise when spare money is available under one head or sub-head, but cannot be transferred to another without the sanction of this House In that case, the course open to the Finance Department is to move for a token sanction of one rupee for the transfer of that amount from one head of account to another. It is not necessary that they must always require extra and additional funds. They may have funds at their disposal yet those funds may not be appropriately and constitutionally used for a different purpose and the proper and appropriate course then is to seek approval by means of a token demand for a rupee for the transfer of that amount.

Mr. K. Sanjiva Row: May I interrupt my Honourable friend?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: The Honourable Member will have his opportunity to say what he wishes to. Then, Sir, there may be a third case where money is not available at all for carrying on the service for which the funds have fallen short. In that case, obviously they have to seek the sanction of the House for fresh additional funds, and it does impose distinct responsibility on this House if it sanctions funds for which there was no provision in the budget itself. Now, Sir, if you were to approve of the practice of these supplementary demands being introduced in the House after the expenditure had been incurred, that would be very dangerous and very risky. The Government may go on spending money and then confront us with the expenditure and tell us that there is no option to us except to sanction. I submit there is no point in submitting a supplementary demand if it is not to be treated just in the same manner as an item in the budget, and I would stress that just as they cannot incur any expenditure which is not included in the budget, so they cannot incur any expenditure unless it has been sanctioned by the House in the form of a supplementary demand, in case the necessity for it actually arose after the budget had taken final shape in this House. So, I submit it is absolutely necessary for the Finance Department to place their proposals before this House for sanction before they actually incurred any expenditure in excess of the amount provided in the budget itself. In case of emergency when the House is not sitting, it is open to them to obtain a certificate from the Governor General in Council if they have to meet any expenditure outside the budget. But it would be highly improper and I submit repugnant to all elementary canons of finance to allow the Finance Department to spend money for which no sanction has been obtained from this House either in the budget itself or subsequently in the form of a supplementary demand. (Applause.)

Dr. P. N. Banerjea (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Urban): May I suggest a compromise in regard to future procedure?

Some Honourable Members: No compromise, please.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: Supplementary demands may be placed before this Assembly twice in the year, once in the month of August or September when only half the year is out, and then, again, if necessary, in the month of February when there is still one month of the year to be finished. If that is done, the Legislative Assembly will have the opportunity of considering the necessity for most of the supplementary demands in the month of August or September; and, in the case of small grants, where, by means of re-appropriation, the additional expenditure ought to be met, but ultimately the Government find that this cannot be met, supplementary demands may be placed before the Assembly in the month of February. If this procedure is adopted, the question whether the grants are really necessary or not may be discussed once in August or September and again in February—this time only in the case of very small grants. In any case, the supplementary demands, as has been suggested by Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, should not be placed before the Assembly in the last week of March.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, while I bow to your ruling that we cannot raise questions of policy in supplementary demands I should like to point out that in these supplementary grants are included such things which have not been submitted to us in the Standing Finance Committee, and I, therefore, submit . . . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: In so far as they are new services, I imagine your ruling, Sir, was not intended to apply to these.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): May's Parliamentary Practice, page 536, says:

"Debate on supplementary and excess grants is restricted to the particulars contained in the estimates on which those grants are sought, and to the application of the items which compose those grants; and the debate cannot touch the policy or the expenditure sanctioned, on other heads, by the estimate on which the original grant was obtained, except so far as such policy or expenditure is brought before the Committee by the items contained in the supplementary or excess estimates."

As regards the ruling which the Chair gave, the Chair wishes to make it perfectly clear that as regards the demands that refer to schemes which have already been sanctioned by this House, there can be no question at all of discussing any question of principle or policy. But as regards demands which come up with respect to a new service and for which previously no sanction has been obtained of this House, no doubt that rule has to be relaxed to a great extent (Hear, hear) (Applause), but the question of policy must be confined within the item on which the vote of the House is sought.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Sir, I understand that if there is a supplementary demand for a new service, the Finance Committee will not allow it to be brought before the House as a supplementary demand, but will insist upon its being brought before the House by way of a Resolution: the point in case is the demand for the removal of the Pusa Institute which was brought forward in the shape of a Resolution at the Simla Session.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The supplementary demand is itself a Resolution or a motion; it is always brought in that form.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Can you bring by way of a supplementay demand a demand for a grant for a new service?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Yes, Sir. That is the only way you can bring it.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: In all these cases, the Finance Committee pointed out that an opportunity should be given to the House to discuss it.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not know which are the items for which the previous sanction of the Assembly has not been obtained. That can be made clear in the course of discussion of particular items.

There is an amendment standing in the name of Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena which the Chair holds out of order.

The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 82,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department'."

The motion was adopted.

HOME DEPARTMENT.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 5,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Home Department'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs 5,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Home Department' "

The motion was adopted.

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move.

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 12,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Legislative Department'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 12,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Legislative Department'."

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh (Chota Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I beg to oppose this demand. So far as I know, when a proposal is made in the House, it ought to be supported by some statement. We do not hear on this occasion what the Honourable Member has to say in support of the motion.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: It is in the Finance Committee's report.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: In opposing this motion, Sir, I have to talk of things which to the fastidious man may appear to be small things, but I am of opinion, that those people who cannot attend to small things are not capable of attending to big things either. Sir, it was during the time of the late Mr. Patel that, after considerable struggle and endeavour, the Assembly Department was separated from the Legislative Department of Government, and after that it was thought that in the Assembly Department there was something like *Swaraj* and that the bureaucratic nature of the Department was gone. But, as soon as the Congress left the Assembly, we see the bureaucratic nature has again crept in. Sir, when we, the elected Members, have come here by summons or by invitation, we are in the position of guests. The members in charge of the Assembly Department should regard themselves as hosts and inquire into our needs and grievances.

Sir Lancelot Graham (Secretary: Legislative Depatment): Sir, I rise to a point of order. Is all this relevant? It seems to me that if the Honourable Member is talking of any Department at all, he is talking of the Legislative Assembly Department.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Legislative Assembly Department is quite separate from the Legislative Department. Perhaps the Honourable Member is not aware of it.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: I am aware of it.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then the Honourable Member must address himself to the Legislative Department.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: Is not the Legislative Department controlling the Legislative Assembly Department? (*Cries of* "No, no".)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): No, the Honourable Member is entirely under a misconception.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: Then, am I not entitled to refer to what is going on in the Assembly administration?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Not under this head.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: Then, I postpone my remarks.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs 12,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Legislative Department'."

The motion was adopted.

CENTRAL BOARD OF REVENUE.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs 6,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Central Board of Revenue'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs 6,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Central Board of Revenue'."

The motion was adopted.

POLICE.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Police'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Police'."

Pandit Nilakantha Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, in the proceedings of the Finance Committee, I find on page 384 of No. IX and pages 223-24 of No. VII, that there was some suggestion about the employment of police in the Madras Harbour. We should like to know what has been done with regard to that.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): Sir, I am in a position to answer that question and satisfy my Honourable friend that the suggestion of the Committee has already been acted upon and the Government of Madras asked to employ a Sub-Inspector if they prefer it.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: I want to give a practical suggestion in this matter. I suggest that in the notes which are given at the bottom of the page, the whole of the recommendations of the Finance Committee may be given.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Surely the whole proceedings of the Committee are set out in a separate document.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: But they may also be given in the foot-notes, because it is only two or three lines.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Police'."

The motion was adopted.

SURVEY OF INDIA.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 36,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Survey of India'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 36,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Survey of India'."

1 P.M.

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta (Central Provinces, Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, in view of the ruling just given, I do not propose to move my motion; but I shall beg leave to ask for certain information with a view to which I have given in this motion. There are three circles of the Survey of India Department and the Central Provinces is in the Eastern Circle: there is one party, No. 5, in the Eastern Circle which has been working there for about twenty years—that is my information, I am speaking subject to correction, and I want to know

[Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta.]

whether it is correct or not—and the whole of this party move to Shillong for six months in the year and the cost is very considerable. They not only take every man, but all the instruments and the whole of the records from the Central Provinces to Shillong and they get shifting expenses and probably Assam compensatory allowances also. Is there any utility in making this exodus, something like the Government of India exodus to Simla, of a Department which has been working there for full twenty years? I think the money could be saved. This is the information I want.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Sir, if I were induced to be technical, I might perhaps take the line that inasmuch as we are not asking for any money for compensatory allowances the point which my Honourable friend has raised is not in order I can only tell him that the process of recessing has been in force for a period of years, for the simple reason that after the field work is finished during the winter these people have to move somewhere because they have no provincial headquarters and we found on examination that it is just as economical to allow them to move up to a hill station as to try and get accommodation all the year round perhaps at the headquarters of the Local Government. But this particular suggestion of my Honourable friend's namely, that these people should not move from the Central Provinces to Shillong does appear to me to be worthy of examination because I should personally have thought that Ooty would be nearer the Central Provinces if they wanted to recess in a hill station than Shilling; but I will look into it.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): Why not Pachmarhi?

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: Why is a hill station necessary? Why not Raipur or Nagpur or some such station?

Mr. M. S. Aney: Why do you not suggest Pachmarhi?

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: I do not want to suggest a hill station. Therefore, I will not suggest Pachmarhi: I will suggest Nagpur, or Raipur, or Chattisgarh (Laughter) . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has made his suggestion.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Sir, I find from the records that the services of this Department are less and less requisitioned, and, therefore, the Finance Committee recommended that efforts should be made to accelerate retrenchment in this self-same grant. The House would like to know what is being done and if there is any plan for accelerating the retrenchment.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I think, Sir, my Honourable friend is referring to the suggestion of the Committee, not in regard to the Survey of India as a whole, but as regards the services of the Mathematical Instrument Office. I do not think much time has been given to us since the Committee considered this matter to come to a complete decision; but, as the House is aware, we have already taken up this matter with the Army Department and we have told them that, unless they are prepared to give us a guarantee that they would get a certain minimum amount of work done by us, we may have to close or greatly curtail this Mathematical Instrument Office.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 36,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Survey of India'."

The motion was adopted.

METEOROLOGY.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,09,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Meteorology'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,09,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Meteorology'."

The motion was adopted.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 3,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Geological Survey'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 3,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Geological Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

ARCHÆOLOGY.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 44,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Archæology'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 44,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Archæology'."

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar (South Arcot *cum* Chingleput: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I have no wish to move my motion, provided you permit me to say a few words on a matter that I wish to refer to.

[Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar.]

The office of the Superintendent of Archæology, Southern Circle, is at present located at Kothagiri near Ooty. The circumstances under which the office was shifted from Madras to Kothagiri are as follows: Mr. Longhurst, sometimes Superintendent of Archæology, was the owner of big tea and coffee estates in the Nilgiri Hills and he wanted to be as near to them as possible. Dr. Sir John Marshall, the then Director General of Archæology, happened to be the brother-in-law of Mr. Longhurst, and through his kind offices Mr. Longhurst had the office shifted to Kothagiri. It is unnecessary to point out that the office of the Superintendent of Archæology situated at a comparatively long and secluded distance cannot be of any help to a scholar who is interested in the subject. Foreign visitors to India take a good deal of interest in the Archæological work of ours and they naturally find it difficult to go out of the way to a place like Kothagiri to visit the office. From the point of view of the Government, Kothagiri is certainly a place more expensive than Madras. Recently, the Government of Madras shifted the office of the Inspector General of Prisons from Ooty to Madras for purposes of reducing the unnecessary extra expenditure involved in the retention of the office at a distant and expensive place like Ooty. I wish to suggest that on that analogy, the office of the Superintendent of Archæology, Southern Circle, should be shifted back to Madras. This transfer will be beneficial both to the Government and the public in that the former can have their expenditure retrenched and the latter have easier access to the office.

The office of the Government Epigraphist for India is also at present situated in Ooty. The purpose, for which the office is at present located at one of the corners of India near the vicinity of which not a single inscription could be formed, is not clear. The office can very well be either at Madras in which case it can be accommodated in the same place where the Assistant Superintendent for Epigraphy, Southern Circle, Madras, has his office, or at Delhi, which, from the point of view of all India, is centrally situated.

Archæological monuments of South India consist mainly in Hindu and Buddhist remains. The present Superintendent for Archæology, under whose charge these monuments are, is qualified not in Archæology, but in Architecture only. So, I would impress on the Government the necessity for appointing only such people to the Southern Circle as are fully conversant with Hindu and Buddhist monuments. Sir, I have done.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Sir, I do not think that my Honourable friend was quite in order in talking about whom we should appoint to the Southern Circle, because that has nothing whatever to do with the proposal which is before us, but we had notice from the questions addressed by him of his desire that we should consider the question of locating the headquarters at Madras instead of at Kothagiri. We have taken up this question already with the Government of Madras, and my friend will be glad to hear that in consultation with the Government of Madras, we are exploring the possibility of finding of a suitable place at Madras for locating this office.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, my friend has referred to points of order twice. As I understood your ruling, Sir, it simply means this—that we cannot move what are called token cuts, but undoubtedly we can give any reason pertaining to the demand. So long as the remarks pertain to

the demand asked for, my friend has no right to object. I will refer to any grievance which concerns the Department, and if my friend will not answer our questions, we will refuse the demand.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The demand is for the repair of buildings damaged by earthquake in Bihar and Orissa and the United Provinces.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): In that case, it is quite irrelevant.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Sir, this demand is intended for repairing the monuments and buildings in Bihar and Orissa and the United Provinces. There was no earthquake in Orissa, but Orissa, as my friend knows, is famous for monumental buildings. So I may suggest to him in this connection that though these monuments have not been damaged by the recent earthquake, yet they have been damaged during the course of ages, and nobody has so far paid any attention to some of the most important of them. My friends might have heard the name of the Black Pagoda at Konark in Orissa—now covered with lichen. Money is going to be spent. . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): No such grievances can be brought up now.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I merely suggest, Sir, that some of the money which is going to be spent in Bihar and Orissa may be spent on the preservation of some of the old monuments in Orissa.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Sir, this is definitely a demand for carrying out repairs to buildings which have been damaged by earthquake. . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is the Honourable Member making some suggestion?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I am making a suggestion.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 44,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Archæology'."

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Half Past Two of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

EDUCATION.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Education'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Education'."

There is an amendment in the name of Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta, which is out of order.

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: I am not moving my motion, but I only wanted to compare notes whether my experience of the students that come out of the Rajkumar Colleges tallies with the experience of Honourable Members opposite. We have got a Rajkumar College at Raipur situated in Chhattisgarh. My experience is not so vast as the experience of Honourable Members occupying the Treasury Benches. My experience is very limited, but I have seen that students that come out of the Rajkumar Colleges know very well how to dress when they have to go out for tennis or how to change their dress when they have to go out for cricket. But very soon after, when they manage their affairs, it generally becomes necessary for the Court of Wards to assume charge. I only wanted to compare notes whether my experience tallies with that of the Government, and I wait for an answer.

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe (Foreign Secretary): Sir, I am afraid I have no experience of the students from the Rajkumar College, so that I am not in a position to give any information or to compare notes with my Honourable friend. In any case, I suggest that that is irrelevant to a small payment to be made to an assistant master at the Mayo College, Ajmer.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Education'."

The motion was adopted.

MEDICAL SERVICES.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 6,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Medical Services'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 6,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Medical Services'."

The motion was adopted.

PUBLIC HEALTH.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 4,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Public Health'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 4,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Public Health'."

The motion was adopted.

TRANSFER TO THE FUND FOR THE TRANSFER OF THE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE FROM PUSA TO DELHI.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 36,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Transfer of the Agricultural Research Institute from Pusa to Delhi'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 36,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Transfer of the Agricultural Research Institute from Pusa to Delhi'."

Mr. S. Satyamurti: This is another case—till now we had expenditure already incurred, for which they were moving supplementary grants. Now, it is a case of expenditure for next year. I expected some remarks from the Honourable the Finance Member to intimate to this House the scope of what this demand was. He talks of a "Transfer to the Fund for the Transfer of the Agricultural Research Institute from Pusa to Delhi". What is this fund? Where is it being instituted, and under what rules or standing orders? Is it, again, a block grant which is being made, to be spent, as and when the need arises, on expenditure connected with the transfer of the Research Institute from Pusa to Delhi? The reference is to page 23 of the speech of the Finance Member in introducing the budget proposals for 1935-36. I have got paragraph 33 which is referred to:

"After these special grants have been made there should remain a balance of Rs. 2,04 lakhs. A large part of this sum I propose to put aside for two schemes which it was provisionally decided to finance from capital. These are the civil aviation programme, which is expected to cost Rs. 93 lakhs and the transfer of the Pusa Institute to Delhi which will cost about Rs. 36 lakhs. and now that we have an accrued revenue surplus it seems to me sound policy to use part of it for these purposes and to avoid the creation of what might have become an awkward precedent."

I am not now on the merits of the question, I am only dealing with the procedural aspect of it. What is the actual supplemental demand which is being moved? It certainly is not for excess expenditure on any grant already made. I take it, it is common ground that this is a new service. If so, my submission to you is, a need must arise during the current year for expenditure for which the vote of the Assembly is necessary upon some new service not contemplated in the budget for that year. Does the need arise for expenditure this year of this sum; or is it a case of disposal of surplus for the next year? My submission to you is this, if it is the latter, the surplus ought to go into the opening balance of next year, and should come as one of the demands for the expenditure next year on this or any other purpose. I submit, to ask for a supplementary demand for the disposal of the surplus for expenditure in the future year is not consistent with the letter or at least the spirit of Legislative Rule 50.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: It is a question merely of intercepting a surplus which would otherwise arise in this year, and, therefore, it is appropriate to deal with it by a supplementary demand this current year.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: When is it proposed to spend the amount?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That will be spent as and when the bills have to be paid for the building of the Institute. It will be taken to a suspense account for which separate records will be kept, and, although the money will be merged in the balances of the Government of India, the suspense account will be debited as and when the expenditure is incurred over the next year or so.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is the expenditure likely to be incurred this year?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Some expenditure has already been incurred, and a supplementary demand was taken earlier this year on the assumption that the expenditure would be charged to capital, I think, Rs. 7 lakhs. Now, we propose to alter the method of charge and charge it to the revenue surplus of this year. That means that 7 lakhs of rupees charged to capital will not now be needed. The expenditure will be charged to this fund.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the Honourable the Finance Member's statement, I submit that all this demand, except the expenditure which is actually to be incurred before the end of this financial year, is out of order. It is not a demand for any expenditure this year. It is a demand for being paid to a suspense account to be spent, as and when the need arises. I submit that it is not within the scope of Legislative Rule 50, defining the nature of supplementary demands.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: On the same analogy, if there is anything in it, would apply to the expenditure which was incurred on the relief of the Bihar earthquake sufferers, and it would be equally out of order.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: That is irrelevant.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Also all payments paid to the Railway Depreciation Fund would be equally out of order.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I understand there are two distinct points. One is about the merits of the case, whether the Agricultural Research Institute should be transferred from Pusa to Delhi.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am not on that now. That is not the question.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: As regadrs the other thing, I thought it was a kind of paper transaction. We sanctioned last year that 36 lakhs of rupees should be spent. The idea at that time was that part of it will be spent out of the capital fund and part out of other reserves. Again, on account of the saving which has been effected, I understand the

Finance Member has changed his mind and instead of borrowing the money, he would like to spend the entire amount from the saving of the current year. This is to my mind a paper transaction. No principle is involved in it and it is a right principle of accountancy. If I decide to spend a certain amount by borrowing and afterwards find that I have got enough money in my pocket which I have saved from somewhere else, then I can certainly change my mind. This is the principle which we have been following in a number of other cases. To my mind it is a paper transaction and it must come up for sanction.

Mr. M. S. Aney: The point which my Honourable friend has raised is this, whether this whole amount of 36 lakhs is going to be spent during this year or any part of it is going to be spent a year after. If the latter is the case, then it is not covered by Rule 50. That is the point of order to which Dr. Ziauddin has given no reply.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair takes it, it is really a point of accounting, and, in view of the practice that has been pointed out by the Finance Member, the Chair is not prepared to say that by putting this amount in the suspense account, he is infringing Rule 50. The Chair, therefore, holds that the point of order is not valid.

There are several motions with regard to this demand. One is in the name of Pandit Nilakantha Das that the demand be omitted. That will be a direct negative. Therefore, the Chair does not think that is in order. Then, Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena has a motion that the demand be reduced to Rs. 100.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Before the debate proceeds, may I ask for your guidance in one matter? This is not a new service. The only thing which is new is the alteration in the method of charge. Is the scope of the debate confined to the alteration of the method of charge?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair understands that so far as this demand is concerned, the scheme has already been sanctioned by this House, but it is open to the House when the demand is made to veto it.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena (Lucknow Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Since there is another motion in the name of Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, I do not wish to move my motion.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 36,00,000 in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Transfer of the Agricultural Research Institute from Pusa to Delhi' be reduced to one rupee."

Sir, it is a pity that the debate on the Finance Bill had to be suspended to make room for the supplementary estimates. It was particularly unfortunate that the discussion was switched off immediately after the very interesting, I would not say, provocative speech, of the Honourable the Finance Member. I will, however, restrict myself strictly to the four corners of the supplementary demand for the present but I do feel that it would have given me immense relief if I had an opportunity of having my say in respect of many of his remarks immediately after they had been uttered. It is a load on me that I have to wait for some days yet. However, I have to restrict myself, for the present, to the motion that I have just made.

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

Sir, the Agricultural Institute was established about 30 years ago. It owed its inception to the munificence of an American gentleman, Mr. Phipps, who contributed £30,000 for scientific research which was utilised by the then Viceroy for founding this Agricultural Institute at Pusa.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I do not wish to interrupt my Honourable friend, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, ...

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Is that a point of order? Otherwise I am not going to give way.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: It is a point of order. I want to know, Sir, whether, in view of the ruling which you gave this morning, as I understand it, namely, that the question of merits could, with your permission, be discussed if a new service were being proposed to the House, the question of the merits of the transfer of the Institute of Agricultural Research from Pusa to Delhi is not in order. That is the point which I wish to submit for your consideration.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is open to the House to reject this demand if it so chooses. If that be so, then the Chair takes it that any Honourable Member is in order in giving appropriate reasons for that rejection.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I think there is an amount of confusion in the minds of several Members of this House as to the exact import of your ruling. I interpret it as meaning that where a person wants to raise a discussion on a point which does not directly relate to the demand before the House he cannot be allowed the same amount of latitude in the consideration of supplementary demands as is available in the course of budget discussion. But so far as one chooses to make out a case for throwing out a demand, he can say anything from Timbuctoo to Cape Camorin as his reasons for throwing it out. So long as I base my case on pertinent facts they are perfectly relevant. I on my part do ask the House to throw out this demand because I do not want the transfer of the Research Institute from Pusa to Delhi. Let there be no misapprehension about it and I say that I am perfectly within my right in asking the House to revise its decision.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair hopes the Honourable Member will bear in mind that this question has been fully discussed.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I bear that in mind and therefore feel the necessity of advancing my arguments in greater detail in order to induce the House to revise its decision. I know that this House has already arrived at a decision—rather, to be more precise, previous Assembly had allowed the decision to go by default at the eleventh hour of the last day of its protracted life. Sir, I must confess that there is nothing new that I will be able to add to the illuminating discussion that was held on the floor of this House at Simla last year. Sir, as I was submitting, the Agricultural Research Institute was established at Pusa about

thirty years ago. It has rendered very useful services in the course of the last thirty years. Crores of rupees have been spent, I believe that a large number of original papers have been contributed to research journals in this country and outside by the staff of the Pusa Institute during the last thirty years. The Pusa Institute has made an abiding contribution towards the agricultural development of his country, at least in certain parts, during this long period. Its discoveries and research work in the matter of improved varieties of staple crops and other agricultural products have been really of great help, and we owe a genuine debt of gratitude to Pusa and to all that it has done. We have also to bear in mind that the Pusa Institute is a memorial to the generosity of a gentleman from America who went out of his way to make a handsome donation for this institute. I feel it would be an illustration of ingratitude on our part if we were now to remove this institute from Pusa. We will be in a way unfaithful to the memory of the donor who gave £30,000 for the establishment of this institute.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Was that a condition—that the institute should be at Pusa?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: It was used for that purpose. I have not seen the correspondence—I was not in the confidence of the Viceroy then, as I am not now. (Laughter.) Sir, the fact remains that it commemorates and perpetuates the generosity of that gentleman. Sir, Pusa has secured a conspicuous place in the research world. It has found a permanent mention in such a respectable work of reference as the "Encyclopædia Britannica". I will just read out to the House what that book says about Pusa:

"The Institute, which owed its inception to Lord Curzon, has within the comparatively short period of its existence, done magnificent service to Indian agriculture by producing improved varieties of crops. In particular, it has achieved remarkable success by evolving strains of wheat which give a high yield, have powers of resistance to rust, are able to mature with less water than the generality of Indian wheats, and give good results under diverse conditions of soil and climate. The Pusa varieties are now grown on over one and a half million acres of the United Provinces, the Punjab and the North-West Frontier Province. The Institute has also produced a heavy-yielding variety of bearded wheat suitable for areas where the crop is liable to damage by birds. The Institute has introduced berseem, or Egyptian clover. It has been proved that a small irrigated area of poor land, in which berseem is followed by early maize, can provide a large herd with all the bulky green food it requires—a discovery of immense importance in a country depending so largely on cattle, where the pasture lands are for a large part of the year parched and bare.

Further, valuable results have been obtained by selective breeding of cattle, *e.g.*, by doubling the milk yield of a pure herd in ten years.

In order to improve both the quality and quantity of the sugar production, a sugar bureau has been established which gives advice to cultivators, manufacturers, etc. The institute studies soil improvement and the use of phosphates found in India."

Sir, Pusa is also a household word in the remotest villages in this country. The villagers are familiar with the Pusa wheat, with its various numbers; and, wherever you go in the interior of, at least, the United Provinces, you find people familiar with the name of Pusa. Sir, Pusa possesses a rich and appropriate soil and can produce a large variety of agricultural crops than Delhi and many other places. There have been experiments at Pusa not only in the matter of wheat, not only in the matter of cotton, not only in the matter of tobacco, but also in the matter of

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

paddy and other things. Sir, Pusa has a rainfall of about forty inches as compared with fifteen inches of Delhi. Pusa has a mild, gentle climate throughout the year, as compared with the sharp conflicts and abrupt fluctuations that we notice in Delhi and are its characteristics in the matter of climate as in so many others. So, Sir, Pusa is intrinsically and on its merits in every way a better and more suitable place for a research institute than Delhi, and Pusa has also the virtue of being free from storms, and the dust and turmoil of political controversy (Hear, hear), and the fortuitous gaze of the dazzling eyes of the Government of India. So Pusa can conduce more towards the dispassionate study of scientific subjects than Delhi. From whichever point of view one might look at it, Pusa is on intrinsic merits a more congenial place for the purpose for which the Agricultural Research Institute was founded than Delhi can claim to be. Sir, Pusa has vindicated during its career of the last thirty or thirty-five years its choice for the purpose for which the institute was founded; it has notable achievements to its credit and through the assiduous labours of the gentlemen associated with the Pusa Institute, the agriculturist has derived substantial benefits. Sir, the proposal for the transfer of the Pusa Institute to Delhi has been made on the grounds that some of the buildings at Pusa have been damaged by the recent earthquake, and Pusa is not as centrally situated as Delhi. I believe Mr. Bajpai will agree with me that those are the only two reasons for which the Government press for the transfer of the institute from Pusa. I had thought, Sir, that in the matter of locomotion, there was a considerable progress made since the year 1903 when the Central Research Institute was established at Pusa. At that time people were more handicapped than they are today, but those in charge of the Department in the Government of India seem to think that, with the progress of aircraft and wireless, the need of locating the institute at a physically central place in India had increased! Yet I do not know what they mean, for I find Mr. Bajpai actually said, in answer to one question last year, that the Pusa Institute was devoted only to matters of fundamental research as distinguished from field research, and consequently it was not necessary to establish it at a central place.

The House will please note that it is not necessary, even according to Mr. Bajpai, to have this institute shifted to a centrally-situated locality in the country. Then, Sir, what is the reason? Why is this transfer being advocated? Bihar had the calamity of suffering from the disaster of earthquake Is the Government adding to that disaster by taking away from Bihar what it possessed formerly? Is that just? Is that a sympathetic treatment? When Bihar deserves every possible sympathy and every possible relief, is it the time when they should give it a stone when it is asking for and undoubtedly deserves a piece of bread? It is, I submit, most inequitous and atrocious to put forward a proposal of this character at a time like this on the ground that Bihar has been the victim of earthquake. Then, Sir, is it the proper time when we can be a party to the reckless waste of an enormous sum of no less than 36 lakhs of rupees? I ask the Honourable Members of this House whether they would be faithfully discharging their responsibility to the tax-payer who can ill-afford to spare even a rupee if they encourage such extravagance on the part of the capricious Government of India? I submit it would be unpardonable. What I am submitting is not solely my personal

view. Sir, the Government of India have been making too much of a theatrical pose these days in proclaiming their regard for the press in India. I find that so far as the question of the transfer of the Pusa Institute—I should not say Pusa Institute, because that is the endeavour on the part of the Government, let me say the Agricultural Institute—to Delhi is concerned, it has been opposed by almost every paper in this country, be it edited by an Indian or a European. I will read out a few extracts for the information of the House. Firstly, I refer to the *Statesman* which had the honour of being placed along with the foundation-stone so that it may be preserved for ever and in perpetuity for the edification of the Members of the Government of India. It says:

"Those of us who know our India would not regard such disabilities in too serious a light about Pusa being inaccessible They may sound rather tragic to people accustomed to the accessibility of all concerns of England but in this country such difficulties of access can be taken almost as a matter of course not only in getting to Pusa but in getting to many other parts."

Sir, I will also read out what other papers say. The *Times of India* remarked:

"In these days, when it is so difficult to get even the smallest sum for beneficial State activities, it is right and proper that an estimated outlay of 36 lakhs of rupees for the transfer of this Institute should be very critically regarded. Estimates of cost when they are put up by those who support a scheme naturally tend to be conservative. It is an open question whether the sum of Rs. 36 lakhs would be the end of expenditure on the transfer suggested."

It ends its leading article in this way:

"The proper way to judge the plan is solely in relation to the great financial stringency of the moment and the inability of Government to finance many a measure of social importance, let alone reduce the crushing burden of taxation their first duty. It would be interesting to have more details as to how the Rs. 36 lakhs estimate of the cost of the transfer has been compiled, and whether it has been proved that the capital outlay will be recouped in a reasonable time by savings effected through removal from Pusa. There would be a case for the transfer if that were demonstrated beyond a doubt, but unless and until it can be the Assembly should turn down the plan."

Then, Sir, the *Federated India*, Madras, says:

"India will condemn with one voice the monstrous proposal to spend 40 lakhs of rupees on the erection of an Agricultural Research Institute at Delhi to take the place of the Institute that has been located all along at Pusa. When the estimated expenditure is 40 lakhs, we may expect the final expenditure to close at a few annas less than 50 lakhs. The question that has to be faced is whether when the agriculturist is in need of practical relief in so many directions, money should be wasted on research in this lavish and light-hearted manner."

Then, Sir, I will quote the *Statesman* again:

"After the lakhs or crores that have been expended on Pusa during the last decade, and just when the past 30 years of experiments are now bearing fruit, all this public money and all this valuable work shall not be wiped out at a minute's notice, without giving each Province time to ponder and realise what their action means. For Pusa is now at a state when each year they are producing new kinds of wheat, barley, oats, paddy, linseeds, pulses of all varieties, jute, hybrids of hemp sugar cane and many types of tobacco, all of which are definite benefits to the agriculturist."

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

Sir, I will not read other extracts. I read only recently an article in the *Leader* of Allahabad very vigorously opposing the idea of the transfer of the institute from Pusa to Delhi. I know that Mr. Bajpai has a soft corner for the *Leader*, and I also know that the Leader of the House has a great respect for the *Leader* as he quoted the other day some extracts from an article contributed to the *Leader* by the son of the editor of the *Leader*. In these circumstances, I hope the opinion of the *Leader* will weigh with the Government. Sir, I do not see any reason why this transfer should be made. And, what is, after all, the policy of the Government of India? Is there a single Central Institute, with which they are concerned, situated in Delhi? What are they going to do in the matter of the Bacteriological Institute at Muktesar? It is in an inaccessible place, and I challenge if a single Member on the other side has been there?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce (Member for Industries and Labour): Yes, Sir, I have been there.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I am glad to know that. Sir Frank Noyce, then, is an enterprising adventurer, and, as he is connected with the Department of Labour and Industries, we can expect much from him. Anyway, the fact remains that Muktesar is a place where many Members of this House have never been and with the name of which very few in this House are familiar. Then, what are you going to do in the matter of the Dairy Institute at Bangalore? Will it also be transferred to Delhi, because it is not centrally situated? What are you going to do in the matter of the Forest Institute at Dehra Dun? Is that also to be transferred to Delhi because Dehra Dun is situated in the United Provinces? There are many other such institutes and the tale would be too long to mention on this occasion. Then, we are told that they want this transfer not because there is any physical necessity but to establish cultural contacts. I wonder if in Delhi there is too much of this cultural and aesthetic contact. Only if the Honourable Member concerned were to visit some day our residences he would have some idea of the taste of his department. I am not supposed to be a fastidious man. A plain man as I am, I feel the strain of living in that building and also feel that it is culturally obnoxious. But that is by the way. Now, where are these cultural contacts? Are they to be found in the colleges affiliated to or constituting the Delhi University? Are there other research institutes dealing with that branch of scientific research? Is any agricultural research work being done anywhere in the neighbourhood of Delhi? What does all this sham and hypocrisy mean? Delhi is so far altogether devoid of any atmosphere or medium for scientific research, study or contact. The local University has only recently come into existence and I wish it all success. But we have to accept the fact that it is just in the initial stage and no more than a small infant. Why do you want to throw it into a shade by lodging by its side such an advanced rival institution at the very start. Instead of advancing the cause of the University, you will really be embarrassing it at the very outset. I, therefore, submit that, from whichever point of view you may look at it, it will mean a tremendous waste of public money. Then, I object on principle to this policy of the Government of India transferring from revenue surplus money for the purpose of transferring this institute which they had originally intended to finance from

capital account. Why should they do so? It is unfair to the tax-payer. (Hear, hear.) When we have surplus money, we are entitled to ask and to press for a reduction in the burdens and in the taxes. We are entitled to press for the reduction of the price of the postcard. We have this surplus of 36 lakhs and we are entitled to urge that the salt duty or the income-tax rate should be reduced. It is just to deprive us of that opportunity that the Honourable the Finance Member wants to appropriate these sums for other purposes for which provision had already been made. So, I repeat that, on financial grounds, on cultural grounds as well as on the ground of progress and development of the institute itself which has been steadily growing at Pusa for the last thirty years and doing very good work, it is absolutely necessary that the institute should be retained where it is, and in view of the fact that Bihar needs every relief and every assistance; I feel that it would be heartless, it would be cruel on the part of this House to effect this transfer at such a critical juncture. (Hear, hear.) (Applause.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 36,00,000 in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Transfer of the Agricultural Research Institute from Pusa to Delhi' be reduced to one rupee."

The next motion is in the name of Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta and he wants to raise the question of neglect of rice on this motion.

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: I would support the motion moved by Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does the Honourable Member want to move his motion?

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: I do not wish to move my motion*, but I wish to speak on the motion of Pandit Pant.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must take his turn in the debate.

There is another motion in the name of Pandit Nilakantha Das.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I do not wish to move my amendment.†

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi (Tirhut Division: Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to support the motion moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Govind Ballabh Pant, on very important grounds. He has got his own reasons for standing up against the motion for transfer of this Institute, and I have got my own reasons.

---

*"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding 36 lakhs of rupees in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Transfer of the Agricultural Research Institute from Pusa to Delhi' be reduced to Rs. 100 "

†"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding 36 lakhs of rupees in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Transfer of the Agricultural Research Institute from Pusa to Delhi' be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi.]

The first reason that I would like to advance is that since I heard of the transfer of the Institute from Pusa to Delhi, I am assured that students of research had no place whatsoever to do their work. The whole research work has been dislocated. The work which was going on so smoothly at Pusa and which could have gone on in spite of the disaster which was caused by the earthquake has been hopelessly dislocated and no substitute has been found up till now in place of that great institution at Pusa.

The second ground is that the lands which the Government have acquired for the purpose of erecting the buildings to substitute the work at Pusa have been seen by all of us here and we have found them to be absolutely unfit for the work for which they have been chosen. Now, the other day we were taken to that part of the country about ten miles from this place and we found that it was on a desert sandy land on all sides with no prospect whatsoever of ever growing into importance as Pusa did. The very appearance of the locality showed that the selection was the worst possible.

Now, the third ground that I would give is this: that the Pusa Institute was said to be inaccessible, because it was at some distance from a central place called Muzaffarpur. But what of Delhi? We find the same drawback here. If one would like to go to the newly selected site in Delhi, he has to travel ten miles before one could reach that place. I submit, Sir, that Muzaffarpur is not the place which could be called inaccessible. It is a place, where the planters had once upon a time their good days. When the planting community was in affluence, at every ten miles of the country we found factories established by planters for growing indigo, and at present we find sugarcane grown in abundance. It appears that those who were responsible for the selection of the site at Pusa in 1904 were the wisest men who had no other consideration before them except the interest of the agriculturists and nothing else. I have read the documents of that time which convinced me absolutely that the selection was made simply for the reason that it was the best part of India where a Research Institute of this kind could be located and it justified its selection, because during all these 32 years that the research had been going on at Pusa, no trouble whatsoever was found by the students who were engaged in research or by the scientists who had to do research work there. All went on well and quite smoothly. It was only the officials who had no time to go to Pusa that raised all these objections. The directors of some of the departments who could not take the trouble of motoring a few miles from the railway station would find it a little difficult.

Major Nawab Ahmad Nawaz Khan (Nominated Non-Official): Has the Honourable Member read Dr. Keane's report?

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi: All the reports that have been made against Pusa go to show nothing else except that it is some miles distant from the railway station and that it is on the Bengal and North Western Railway. I do not know if the place being on the Bengal and North Western Railway is a curse; if so, the Government could remedy it at once. That railway, after all, has a lot of capital, and it can certainly improve the train service and it can easily run a mail train to Muzaffarpur and from

thence we could motor to Pusa just as we are obliged to motor from Delhi to this newly selected site ten miles off. What I find is that the new place that has been selected for the location of this institute is absolutely rotten as compared with the Pusa institute at Pusa. The damage done by the earthquake had been very slight as compared to the damage done to other buildings in the Division. We were told at that time that the damage was very heavy. I have made it a point to inspect the land myself and see whether the damage could be repaired by spending a few lakhs over it. From the statement given by Government on this question we learn that about 20 lakhs was spent over the buildings from the very inception up to 1934—only 20 lakhs. and, with these 20 lakhs, we had a huge building in that locality and an area of about 1,650 acres of land all round full of green and full of fertility. You cannot have anything like that here near Delhi with these 36 lakhs which Government are demanding at the present moment. I am sure that an equally good site in this part of the country can be had for not less than a crore or more. We find that 7 lakhs were granted last September and we are again asked to grant 36 lakhs now. I do not know how many 36 lakhs we will have to grant in future if we allow this thing to go on. It is true, of course, that they once got this House to pass the demand for transfer at the eleventh hour when people were very tired and did not want to devote their attention to it. I know that that was a very tactful moment that my Honourable friend, Mr. Bajpai, selected for putting the demand before the House. Provincial jealousies were also very much awakened, and it was said that the transfer from Pusa to Delhi is a question of provincial considerations. The Punjab Members were asked to support it, because it was coming to the Punjab and the United Provinces Members were to support it, because it was nearer to the United Provinces. I would ask my Honourable friends from the Punjab and the United Provinces to consider the question dispassionately and find out for themselves without colouring their mind by any provincial considerations whether the Institute had done satisfactory work at Pusa or not during the 32 years of its existence in that locality, whether there have been any complaints whatsoever on behalf of the students and on behalf of the scientists who were doing research work there, whether they had any complaint about the land or the climate or the water of the place. There was nothing of the kind. Simply on the statements and reports of these few highly placed officials who feel it troublesome to go to Muzaffarpur and thence by motor to Pusa, that this transfer is going to take place. I submit to this House most earnestly that this is a very good opportunity that has come to us. Now the buildings have not been started, only the site has been selected, and that I am told at Rs. 10 an acre It is a very cheap site because no one would like to have anything to do with that site. Therefore even Rs. 10 per acre is enough for those people. We have seen the site now. On the last occasion, there was a difference of opinion as to whether the site selected is more suited to agricultural research than Pusa, and my friend, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh, made a very elaborate speech on that occasion which I need not repeat. He showed that the site which was then in contemplation was not worth having. Now we have seen for ourselves what it is. Nothing has yet been done there and no money has been spent on the site. We can therefore very well throw out the demand and ask Government to reconsider the position and at least for once they should on this occasion show consideration to the feelings of Members of this House I submit,

[Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi.]

Sir, that those who are interested in pure agricultural questions would find it absolutely detrimental to transfer the Institute from Pusa to Delhi. Those who have got the interests of the agriculturists at heart would find it quite satisfactory to leave it at Pusa so that the work of research may be done in a quiet place where no politics will mingle with it and where, if any political calamity happens in Delhi, the research work may go on unhampered. I want that research work should not be mixed up with politics. Agriculture is a thing which should be looked at from its own standpoint and not from any other consideration. I would therefore very earnestly appeal to my Honourable friends here not to say that the question has been once considered; there was no consideration given to this subject at that moment. This is the time when we have an ample opportunity and we have Honourable Members here who appreciate the difficulties of the agriculturists, and therefore it is high time for us to consider this question. We should throw out this demand and let Government reconsider the position; we can advance a few lakhs to repair the houses at Pusa and carry on research work there as they were doing, instead of wasting the money of the taxpayers on a new project in this way.

Now, Sir, there is one more point that I want to urge before this House. We have seen in what dire necessity the agriculturists are; depression has brought them to the verge of ruin. Do these agriculturists feel the transfer of this Institute from Pusa to Delhi as being to their advantage? Has any representation been made by any Association dealing in agriculture to transfer the Institute from Pusa to Delhi? Has any public body ever passed any resolution that the transfer of the Institute from Pusa to Delhi would be more advantageous to them? Nothing whatsoever. It is simply the official view that wants the transfer of the Institute to Delhi. I submit that institutions of this nature should not be transferred simply because officials make a demand of that kind. If the people who are affected by it have any grievance against Pusa it should certainly be transferred by all means at once. But the people, the public, the organisations and non-official bodies have never made this demand. And it has also been pointed out by my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, that all the papers in the United Provinces, Bihar, Calcutta and Madras, had unanimously demanded that it should be retained there and a few lakhs spent over it so that the research work may go on as smoothly as before. But still this huge expenditure of 36 lakhs and much more than 36 lakhs will have to be made if this scheme is allowed. I would, therefore, ask the House to support the motion of my friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta: Sir, I support the motion of my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant. Almost all that could be said has been said as to what Pusa stood for. I am just going to add one word and I am saying what Pusa did not stand for and has just commenced to stand for. Rice is the principal food crop of India, and, after almost criminal neglect of rice by the Institute at Pusa, it has just commenced to experiment upon it. It is an experiment on the isolation of

paddy; and out of about 44,000 lbs. of seed distribution it has just commenced to distribute 126 lbs. It has just commenced to tackle rice. I say, after almost a criminal neglect of rice which is the principal crop of India, when it has just commenced to tackle rice, it is very cruel for us, the rice cultivators, that the Institute should be shifted from Pusa to Delhi. We have some chance that rice might have some attention at Pusa because rice can be grown there. (Interruption.) I shall stop now, as I received a Party Whip to do so.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Sir, I do not remember any subject which we have discussed more often, during the last twelve months, than this question of Pusa. It came four times before the Standing Finance Committee and we had to examine a large number of witnesses, we sent for agricultural experts, we sent for all kinds of experts and we had interviews with them. A large amount of literature and a number of memoranda were placed before us and they were examined very closely by the members of the Standing Finance Committee; and, later on, we had a series of questions in the Assembly followed by a full dress debate lasting for two days. I have before me the debate on Pusa on the occasion when my friend, the Honourable Sir James Grigg, moved:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 7 lakhs be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Expenses in Connection with Capital Outlay on Schemes of Agricultural Improvement and Research'."

On that motion we discussed in detail the whole thing from every point of view. Fortunately or unfortunately, Pusa did not happen to be in my constituency: it is not in the district of Gorakhpur: it is in the district of my Honourable friend, Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi. Had Pusa been in Gorakhpur or Basti, then my position would have been very difficult—it would have been a case of my constituency on the one side and my conscience on the other. I heard the speech of my distinguished friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant; and every point he brought forward today was discussed and made before the Assembly during the debate on the 30th and 31st August, 1934. But there is one point which is entirely new, that no one quoted from the Encyclopædia Britannica which my friend quoted from today. This quotation from the Encyclopædia Britannica reminded me of a story which happened at Cambridge: there was a very distinguished Professor, Professor Myer, who happened to know everything possible under the sun. Whenever the students went to him they would talk on all topics and the Professor would be ready to explain everything to them. The students thought that they should introduce a topic which the Professor may not know. They consulted the Encyclopædia. They jumped on a certain article on Chinese song and they said on this particular subject Professor Myer would not know anything; and then a group of them approached the Professor and asked him about the Chinese song. He immediately said: "My friends, you have perhaps seen an article in the Encyclopædia Britannica: that article on Chinese song was written by me. Unfortunately, the whole thing has now changed and I have now changed my mind, and the new theory is such and such." . . . .

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: That is how Professors behave. (Laughter.)

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Wait and see. If my Honourable friend would examine the whole thing more closely, he will find that the article might perhaps have been written by some member in the Secretariat here. Coming to the subject itself, this is a topic on which I have been thinking, not recently, not from the time when the earthquake happened, but, since 1917, when I was a member of the Calcutta University Commission. I said in August, 1934, my own views, and I pointed out at that time—which I repeat today—that Pusa was selected merely by accident: it was not selected as a result of any agricultural or scientific inquiry. Two circumstances happened and fortunately or unfortunately they happened simultaneously. A certain gentleman, as was pointed out also by my friend, Mr. Govind Ballabh Pant, gave 30 thousands sterling for research work; at the same time a military ground at Pusa was given up by the military authorities and they did not know what to do with this land; and they said, "Here is this place and here is this money for this purpose. Let us put the two together". These are the facts.

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi: No, no.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I just ask whether any inquiry was made about the land in Pusa . . . . .

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi: A Committee was appointed to select the soil, and the Committee selected the place: you will find it from the Government record.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: This was pointed out on the floor of the House even by the Government Member at that time, and it was not challenged. This land was selected because it was ready and available and because the money was there. Now, of course, on account of continuous labour it has been transformed: but by these means you can transform even a wilderness or a forest into a garden. There is nothing in the ground itself: it was really on account of concentrated work that this place has been changed into what it is now. My point is—and I have emphasised it before and emphasise it now—that research work should be located at a place which should be easily accessible to scientific workers in other field of investigation. This is really very important. We have now passed from the time of Diogenes who always wanted to live in a tub and to avoid human life and culture. The kind of research which can be performed in a tub has now passed away: we have now come to a stage when people would like to meet and exchange ideas; and they would like to stimulate each other in research work. (Interruption.) Research work nowadays is carried out with mutual co-operation and that can only be done if scientific people can come in contact with each other Pusa is in my Honourable friend's constituency, but I can tell him from my own experience that I tried for two years to see the place, at a time when I was travelling at Government expense and getting an allowance of Rs. 30 per diem; but, in spite of that fact, I could not spare one week which was necessary to visit this particular place. I am merely giving my own experience that this is a place which is exceedingly difficult to approach. This is not merely my own personal view, but I have come across a number of scientists who would have very much liked to visit Pusa and see with their own eyes the results of the experimental work carried on there so that there may be an interchange of opinion, but they could not visit Pusa, as it is situated in an out of the way place.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Is there any railway station at Pusa?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I am speaking of the year 1917. At that time, a visit to Pusa would have taken a week.

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi: Railways have been there since 1880.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Railway communications to the place were very bad.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: That is how my Honourable friend is generally misinformed.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I am speaking of my experience in 1917, and at that time Pusa was not easily accessible from Calcutta. Therefore, I think that the Research Institute at Pusa ought to be located at a place like Delhi which is easily accessible to scientists and to all classes of people Here, in Delhi, there are numerous occasions when University Professors meet together, Delhi is a place where agricultural research workers meet together, and where we generally hold innumerable meetings and conferences of people from all parts of India, and, therefore, if this Institute is located in Delhi, it will be possible for reputed scientific workers and others interested in research work to visit the place easily. Therefore, I say, if Honourable Members desire that our Research Institute may be well-known, if its work is to be properly advertised among the scientists, not only of India, but of the world, the Institute must be located near a central place like Delhi. If you keep it in an out of the way place like Pusa, it will not be easily accessible to many scientists and research workers.

An Honourable Member: What about Calcutta.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: My friend asks why not Calcutta, if you want to give up Pusa. Then, there will be a tug-of-war between all the provinces. My friends from Bengal will want the Institute to be located in Bengal, my friend from Karachi will want it to be located in Sind.

An Honourable Member: Bombay?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Yes, my Bombay friends will want it in Bombay and thus, there will be provincial jealousies created. I think that this Institute should be located at a place where the Government of India is located, because it is really the centre of the whole of India. The very fact that there are demands made by Honourable Members that this Institute should be located in one's own province shows that they do not want it to be kept in Pusa, and so I think there cannot be any better place than Delhi where this Institute can be suitably and conveniently established.

Then, Sir, much has been said about the climate and soil of the place. I would very much like, that the experiment should be tried not on ideal grounds, but on grounds which are very much similar to those which we find in different parts of India. If you choose a particularly good soil for carrying on your experiments, the results may be valuable, but they will not be of practical value to places where the conditions of

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad]

soil may be different. Therefore, I say, that we should do these experiments not on very ideal grounds. The climate and soil of Delhi are such as may be considered to be typical so far as Upper India is concerned . . . .

An Honourable Member: We question that.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: . . . . and, therefore, I say that Delhi would be an ideal place for the location of this Institute. Of course, if there had been no earthquake, and if there had been no question of spending money, probably I would not have made the suggestion to transfer this Institute from Pusa to Delhi, but on account of dislocation of work due to earthquake I thought that this was a most suitable time to consider the quesion of the transfer of this Institute . . . .

An Honourable Member: There are many other things which have been damaged and which require attention, and would you care to transfer them?

(There were other interruptions at this stage.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better go on. He need not mind the interruptions.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I love interruptions, because I can go on better, I don't mind the interruptions.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: You have nothing better to love! You love interruptions.

An Honourable Member (From the European Group): But think of us.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Sir, the point I should like to emphasise in the end is this. In all our debates, there should be some kind of finality. This is a matter which we have discussed very minutely in the Standing Finance Committee, this is a question which we debated for two days at the Simla Session, on a motion moved by the Finance Member in connection with the Supplementary Grant, and that was a new grant on which we had a two days' debate, and it was decided very definitely by the vote of the Assembly that this grant should be sanctioned. The present demand does not really relate to a question of policy. It really means that on account of the surplus, in the budget of the current year, a sum of 36 lakhs is to be set apart for this purpose. I think on account of the vote of the Assembly in the Simla Session we are committed to the establishment of this Institute. The only point before us is whether, out of the saving in the current year, this sum of Rs. 36 lakhs should be set apart for the establishment of this Institute or an equal amount provided in the budget for the year 1935-36. I thought it was a very simple proposition. There is a saving in the General Budget that we set apart . . .

An Honourable Member: On a point of information, Sir. Which does my friend consider would be preferable—the cost of repairs or the cost of transfer?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: We have already settled this point. As I said Sir, we have already discussed the question in very great detail, and this Assembly sanctioned in principle that the Pusa Institute should be transferred to Delhi. Therefore, the question before us is not really the transfer of Pusa, but whether the savings of the present year ought to be devoted for the transfer of the Institute. If we begin to discuss *de novo* at each stage, on each demand, the principles of every step taken by Government, I am afraid there will no finality. With these words, Sir, I support the decision of the Assembly about the transfer of Pusa should be adhered to, as there is no need or occasion for the revision of that decision, no new points having been brought before the House.

Some Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair will accept the closure as soon as the Government Member has spoken.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Sir, I have no sympathy for Delhi, nor have I any antipathy for Pusa. I only want some information from the Honourable Member on one or two points. Before deciding on the question of transfer of the Institute from Pusa to Delhi, I should like to know whether the Government of India consulted the various departments of Agriculture in different provinces. I think their opinions must be of considerable importance in this matter . . . .

An Honourable Member: The opinion of the public.

Mr. M. S. Aney: It is a research work, and, therefore, institutions, whether governmental or non-official, which are carrying on the research work in this direction, are entitled to be consulted and their opinions ought to be duly respected by us.

An Honourable Member: They have been consulted.

Mr. M. S. Aney: They might have been consulted, but I want to know from the Honourable Member as to what were the opinions given by them and the provincial departments of Agriculture. On knowing that, I shall make up my mind as to how I shall vote.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I would like to remind those Honourable Members who were Members of the old House that last August, I dealt with this question of the merits of the transfer at very great length; I dealt with that in a speech which extended over 35 minutes. Now, at 4 o'clock today, I have to stop automatically, because the adjournment motion comes on, and, therefore, I am contending against time. Even so, I shall endeavour to give as much information as I can today, and if I do not finish today, I hope I shall have an opportunity of going on tomorrow.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Yes.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Let me begin first by dealing with the speech of the Honourable the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant. He made, as is characteristic of him, a very powerful speech. He also, if I may say so, made a skilful. elusive speech. He

[Mr. G. S. Bajpai.]

turned the passions or the feelings of the House, shall I say, not so much on to the merits of the question as to whether the Institute should be transferred, but he said: Here is poor, desolate, hard hit Bihar and Orissa: It is overtaken by earthquake and the Government of India decide to exploit the misery of hard hit Bihar in order to advantage Delhi. I think my Honourable friend will admit that that is more a dialectical point than a statement of the truth, for the simple fact is that anybody who reads the speech of the Finance Member last year and the speech of the Finance Member this year will appreciate and recognise that the one thing that the Government of India did promptly and without a moment's hesitation was to come to the help of the Government of Bihar and Orissa to overcome a trouble which every one deeply deplores, and the fact that this year we are considering the transfer of 1·87 crores from the surplus to the assistance of Bihar and Orissa should, in my opinion, completely and definitely repel the suggestion that what the Government of India have done is to take an unfair advantage of the misfortunes of Bihar and Orissa. I hope that that will disprove that there is any sinister idea behind the decision to transfer the Institute from Pusa to the neighbourhood of Delhi. The second point which I should like to deal with before I come on to the main argument is one which my Honourable friend made as regards desecration, shall we say, of the memory of the late Mr. Phipps whose generosity brought about the foundation of this Institute at Pusa. Now, one thing which I should like the House to remember is that the late Mr. Phipps gave £30,000 for the establishment of an institute of agricultural research. As far as I know, he had never visited Pusa; he certainly had no particular fondness for Pusa in preference to any other place in India, and I am not aware of any provision either in the terms of the gift or of a codicil to his will that he desired that the institute of agricultural research should be raised in Pusa and retained there. I submit that the question of desecration would arise if the Government of India had decided to abolish the Institute of Agricultural Research. They have done nothing of the kind.

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi: You are exhuming his soul from Pusa!

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: If his soul is being perturbed in any way, I hope that he, being, at any rate, possessed of rational faculties, even in the next world, will be assuaged by the arguments that I am advancing now. (Laughter) The point I was making was that what would be an act of sacrilege to the memory of this generous man would be the abolition of the Institute. But that is not what is contemplated. We are carrying on the Institute. As a matter of fact, I contend that we are transferring it to a place where it will fulfil the functions for which it was created, much more satisfactorily than it was fulfilling them in the place it was before. (*An Honourable Member*: "Question.") The Honourable Member is entitled to his opinion.

Now, there is another point that I should like to make. My Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, very rightly laid great stress upon the value of scientific opinion in determining where an institute of research should be located, by implication I mean, if not directly, because he said: Here are the scientists who have done extraordinarily good work in Pusa;

why should not this Institute be allowed to continue in Pusa? I infer from that that if scientists both inside and outside this country hold the view that it would be of greater advantage to agricultural research to locate the institute elsewhere than in Pusa, then my Honourable friend will alter his opinion and agree with me. Now, I am not at the present moment going to quote the opinion of a single agricultural expert in India, and I tell you why. Because it will be said that these agricultural experts are in the pay of the Government of India and they will simply repeat their master's voice; if the Government of India have decided that the Institute shall be not at Pusa but at Delhi, they will say, the Institute shall be at Delhi and not in Pusa. Let me express the opinion of an outsider, Dr. Keane, a man of great distinction, a member of the finest agricultural institute in the Empire, the Institute at Rothamstead, He was for a time at Pusa, and, therefore, knew both the advantages and the disadvantages of the place This opinion was expressed by him spontaneously without any invitation from the Government of India at all, and it was expressed by him more than a year after he had left this country in order to return to his post at Rothamstead.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq (Bakergunj *cum* Faridpur. Muhammadan Rural). But does he know the financial stringency in this country?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: My Honourable friend will, I hope, discriminate between two shades of an argument. I am not dealing with finance here at all.

An Honourable Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I did not say I will never deal with finance: I say, I am not dealing with finance at the present moment. I am dealing with the question of the merits as to where this Institute would best serve the purpose for which it has been founded. What did Dr. Keane say?

Prof. N. G. Ranga (Guntur *cum* Nellore: Non-Muhammadan Rural). When did he say?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Last year, in the month of June. Dr. Keane said, "We think the Government are wise in deciding to bring this Institute from Pusa to Delhi", and, further, when the decision had been taken and he learnt that steps were in progress for transferring the Institute from Pusa to Delhi, he confirmed that expression of opinion. I think my Chief, the Honourable Sir Fazl-i-Husain, had a communication on that subject from him only the other day. Therefore, you have the expression of an opinion by an eminent scientist who is outside this controversy, no longer associated with Government, independent as it were both in his judgment and in his outlook, and yet not incompetent or uninformed, because he was actually in India and served at this Institute.

An Honourable Member: Why was Pusa chosen before?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: My Honourable friend there asks, why was Pusa chosen before? I was coming to that, because my Honourable friend, Mr. Shafi Daudi, had made a great point of that in the speech which he made. The position is exactly as my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad,

[Mr. G. S. Bajpai.]

stated. Pusa was chosen, because, at the time, there was an abandoned estate which had been previously used for the purpose of horse breeding. That abandoned estate was available. No expenditure on the acquisition of land would be required, and so they said; "Let us go and put this Institute at Pusa". There is another point which Honourable Members ought to take note of, namely, that at the time the provincial departments of Agriculture were either non-existent or extremely feeble, and there were no reflections, cogitations and consultations, as was suggested. There was the Inspector General of Agriculture who looked at the matter like this. He said, the Government of India is located at Calcutta; Pusa is not very far from Calcutta; we shall have the thing under our supervision, there is land readily available, let us go and locate the Institute at that place . . . .

(It being Four of the Clock.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can resume his speech tomorrow.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

RESERVATION OF THE HIGHLANDS OF KENYA FOR EUROPEANS.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, it is a far cry from Pusa to Kenya, but, whether we are at Pusa or in Kenya, we meet Mr. Bajpai. (Laughter.) Sir, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

4 P.M.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): What for?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: The matter which I seek to bring to the notice of this House is the critical position of Indian settlers in Kenya in respect of the proposed reservation of the highlands for the Europeans. This is not a Party issue, Mr. President. There are two issues in the public life of this country, namely, the Indianization of the army, and the position of Indians overseas, in which all parties, including the Liberals, the Moslem League and others, have always taken a practically unanimous view, and I hope, Sir, today we shall have the support of the non-official European Group in this House, because this is a matter which concerns the honour and the self-respect of India as a whole. The position of the Congress, Sir, is that so far as Indians overseas are concerned, they cannot come by their own, until India is mistress of her own destinies. Meantime, we shall do our best, with the co-operation of other Parties, to see to it that their rights are vindicated. The history of this question is given more or less accurately in a memorandum published by Parliament in which it is stated:

"The history of the position of Indians in Kenya up to the end of the late war may be summarised briefly. There have been Indian merchants established along the East African Coast for a long time and with the opening up of Uganda and Kenya, and particularly with the development of British administration in those countries during the last 38 years, Indian traders have penetrated into the interior. Many Indian artisans and labourers employed on the construction of the Uganda Railway remained to engage in commerce, and, at the beginning of the present century, the number of Indians in Kenya was greatly increased by the arrival of artisans, clerks and small traders."

My position is that, in the making of Modern Kenya, Indians have played a large and distinguished part, and, therefore, deserve to be treated as honoured citizens of that country. Moreover, this question of the reservation of highlands is a very important one, because thereabouts will be the centre of Government of the future East Africa, and it is not right that Indians should be excluded from that area. This trouble began in 1908 when Lord Elgin, as Secretary of State for the Colonies, decided to reserve, for the purposes of administrative convenience, lands in the highlands to Europeans; but then the Indian community was assured that there would be no legislation passed against them in the matter of land tenure. Indians accepted that on the understanding that this order referred only to the first transfer of Crown lands, and that second transfers and sales would be open to Indians. In 1915, an Act was passed by which the Governor-General was given the right of veto in all sales or transfers of land in the highlands, and, I must say, that at that time the Government of India protested and protested very strongly, but as usual, that protest was of no avail.

Now, Sir, the position today is that, as far as original transfers of Crown lands are concerned in the highlands, all the entire land belongs to the Europeans; but what the Europeans wanted was that they should prevent all further purchases by or transfers to Indians. The second fact is that the Indians are not likely to take up much of agricultural land in the highland portion, but the Indians cannot get land even for any other purposes there. In 1920, the Government of India addressed a long despatch to the British Government in which they say and say very strongly:

"We would point out that this (reservation) goes far beyond Lord Elgin's decision and is incompatible with his own pronouncement that it is not consonant with the views of His Majesty's Government to impose no legal restrictions on any particular section of the community in regard to the acquisition of land."

Then, Sir, they add:

"We submit that it is not easy to reconcile the land policy of the East African Government with Lord Milner's assurance that it has been the avowed principle, and it is the definite intention of the British authorities to mete out even-handed justice between the different races inhabiting those territories'."

Then, Sir, we come to the last paragraph in which they say:

"The Government of India cannot and will not disclaim responsibility for the welfare of the Indians who are settled in East Africa."

I bring that to the notice of the House this afternoon. Then, we have the Parliamentary Paper, to which I have referred, in which Parliament, for the first time, laid down this. Tracing the history of this question, they say:

"His Majesty's Government have decided that the existing practice must be maintained as regards both initial grants and transfers."

That was specifically stated, and they added:

"It has not been possible to meet the wishes of the Government of India whose views have received the fullest consideration from His Majesty's Government at the instance of the Secretary of State for India."

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

That was the position, and after the publication of the White Paper, there was a debate in the Council of State, in which Sir B. N. Sarma, then Member in charge of this portfolio, stated certain facts. He said that some of the best lands is included in this 11,859 square miles and he added that this decision was only a temporary decision and the Government of India hoped that it would not become a permanent decision, and he said that he would take steps to see that it did not become a permanent decision. After that, a Commission called the Carter Commission was appointed with a specific term of reference in these words. I am referring to the sixth term of reference. They were asked to define the area generally known as the highlands, within which persons of European descent ought to have a privileged position, in accordance with the White Paper of 1923, but they went beyond this term of reference. Attempts have been made in the House of Commons to elicit how they were authorised to go beyond the terms of reference and the Secretary of State admitted that he stated in answer to a question from the Chairman that, the phrase 'privileged position' means securing the rights of Europeans in regard to the two points, on which I seek the support of this House today,—first the extent of this area which has been considerably added to from the 11,000 odd square miles, which the Honourable Sir B. N Sarma mentioned in his speech, to 16,000 odd square miles, and, secondly, and more important than this, that His Majesty's Government should, and they have practically made up their minds to, issue in the form of an Order in Council, almost more immutable than a parliamentary statute, this reservation of the highlands for Europeans. The gravamen of the charge against the British Government is that they have agreed to reserve this land by statute and they have also agreed to extend the area of the land. The position, as I see it, Mr. President, is this that what has been more or less an administrative arrangement, which, although it has gone on in spite of the Government of India, may yet be capable of adjustment when India becomes stronger and more and more powerful in international councils, is now sought to be made into an Order in Council, which really precludes all possibility of future adjustment on terms of mutual advantage.

Secondly, we believe that this idea of reserving a very large area of a very desirable part of a colony, to the making of which Indian labourers and Indian merchants contributed a lot, is unjust to the Indians. Sir, I am not bringing forward this motion directly as a censure on the Government, for the simple reason, that, as far as I have read the papers, the Government of India have consistently supported the claims of Indian settlers in Kenya (Hear, hear), but because time and again they have been overruled—overruled in practically all matters concerning Indians in South Africa, Indians in East Africa and elsewhere, and I believe, Sir, that I am right in asking the Government sincerely and honestly to vote with me on this motion. (Laughter.) That is the only way in which the Government of India can show to the world how strong, how earnest, how sincere is the feeling of all India in this matter. Sir, let us recall how well Mr. Jinnah put it in that picturesque language of his when he said: "we cannot get hold of the Secretary of State: you are the only gentlemen whom we can get hold of; we shall really talk to the Secretary of State through you"; and we want the Government of India to communicate to His Majesty's Government that this perpetual attempt on the part of the

European settlers in Kenya and their friends in London to reduce Indians in all self-governing colonies and also in Crown colonies to the position of helots is one which we Indians cannot approve of.

Sir, I want to address just one more argument and conclude. In the case of the self-governing Dominions like South Africa, Canada and Australia, the argument has been advanced by the British Government: "What can we do? After all, they are self-governing Dominions. They have a right to control their own emigration and immigration They can make their own laws By all means, make your own laws". Those were the conclusions arrived at at the Imperial Conference. Very well. I shall have no quarrel with them. We shall deal with them as equals now or hereafter. But, so far as the Crown colonies are concerned, like Kenya, for the Government of which His Majesty's Government is, in the ultimate resort, fully responsible, I think no other argument is available to His Majesty's Government excepting the argument that, because India is weak, we will not fight India's cause, and will always allow the Colonial Office to have its own way. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the justice of the case is obvious. No man can accept the position that a particular land of about sixteen thousand square miles of very desirable residential qualifications should be reserved for one community alone for all time, and that Indians should not have any part or lot in that territory, and we, therefore, want that the sense of this House and of this country as represented in this House should be communicated to His Majesty's Government, that we do not want this reservation to be made by an Order in Council, that we do not like the extension of the area, and that we want freedom to negotiate and assert the equal and just rights of Indians in Kenya. With these words, Sir, I move that the House do now adjourn. (Applause.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That the Assembly do now adjourn."

Mr. G. S. Bajpai (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): Mr. President, I venture to intervene early in the debate, because I feel that, in view of the long history, and the complicated history of this subject, Honourable Members may like to be put in possession, in the brief time available to me, of the background. Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, ended upon a note which I am sure has the sympathy and the response of every section of this House (Hear, hear), namely, that, in those territories for the administration of which His Majesty's Government themselves are responsible, there shall be no discrimination against Indians but there shall be absolute equality. If I may remind the House, Sir, this was the language which the Government of India used in the Despatch which they addressed to the Secretary of State on this very Kenya question in 1920. They said: "We are unable to agree that the Indian claim to acquire agricultural land anywhere in the colony is neither just nor reasonable. We do not consider that this proposal"—the proposal was the reservation by way of compensation of land in low-

[Mr. G. S. Bajpai.]

lying areas of Kenya—"is compensation for the exclusion of Indians from the uplands. We hold most strongly that there is no justification for the extension of Lord Elgin's decision so as to prohibit the transfer of land to Indians, which, in our view, is incompatible with his own pronouncement"—the pronouncement of Lord Milner that, in territories administered by His Majesty's Government, it shall be the policy of His Majesty's Government to wield even-handed justice. That was the language which he used. I would like further to remind the House that when the White Paper of 1923 was published and His Majesty's Government announced their decision that both in regard to fresh alienations and to transfers of land, the existing practice would be retained, the Government of India made it abundantly clear that they reserved to themselves the right to re-open this question whenever opportunity offered itself. When the Hilton-Young Commission was out and sat in East Africa in 1927, these desiderata were repeated. It will therefore be clear to the House that, in so far as the position of the Government of India is concerned, throughout these years of controversy it has in no way altered. It remains what it was in 1920, namely, that there shall be no racial discrimination against Indians in East Africa; and, to the extent that His Majesty's Government had decided in 1923 to overrule that contention of theirs, the decision was accepted only under protest. Now, Sir, I would like to come to the change—and I think this is really what the House will be most interested in—in the position that would arise if the recommendations of the Carter Commission were actually incorporated in an Order in Council by His Majesty's Government My Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, referred to one point, namely, the extension of the area where this restrictive policy prevails at the present moment. Undoubtedly, that is objectionable, but there are two further points which I think ought to be clearly explained to the House. The other day, Sir, answering a short notice question in the House, I read out the reply of the Secretary of State for the Colonies to a question asked in the House of Commons on the 14th February. The question was as to what exactly were the implications of the words "privileged position" as regards these highlands. The reply of the Secretary of State for the Colonies was that the words "privileged position" implied, *inter alia*, that none but a European shall acquire or occupy land in the highlands. Now, Sir, our view is that that definition, if it be incorporated in the terms of an Order in Council, will go beyond the existing position. In other words, not only would it prejudice the position that we have all along taken, namely, that at a suitable opportunity we would like the existing position to be relaxed, but it would make the existing position even worse. And I would like, Sir, in support of this, to quote the interpretation which His Majesty's Government themselves gave in the White Paper of 1923. They said:

"We claim that the existing restrictions meant no legal discrimination against Indians for it would be possible for the Executive Government to grant land in the Highlands to an Asiatic or to approve of the transfer of land from a European to an Asiatic without any alteration in the existing law."

The position, if the restrictions which the Secretary of State for the Colonies outlined the other day were incorporated in an Order in Council, would be that what is now a restriction imposed by administrative practice

would become a statutory restriction. That, Sir, in our opinion, is much the most vital objection or point of objection that we have got to take with His Majesty's Government. There is a third point which perhaps by reason, as I said, of the complexity of the question and the voluminous nature of this document escaped the piercing eye of my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti. That point is that in a certain area in the Highlands, where these restrictions prevail, prior to 1906 land was alienated to Indians without any restrictive condition or covenants. The recommendation which the Carter Commission make is that if hereafter this land be transferred by an Indian to a European, then the restrictive covenant will apply and the European will not be at liberty to alienate it to an Indian. There you have the three objections which we have to the implications of what the report says and what the Secretary of State for the Colonies says. First, the extension of the area, second, the conversion of what is an administrative restriction into a statutory restriction and, third, the removal of an existing privilege and the substitution for it of a racial discrimination. Those are the three points which are under our attention. We had examined the report, and because we felt that these difficulties had to be faced, we asked His Majesty's Government not to make an Order in Council until this question had been fully represented by us. As I announced to Honourable Members the other day, His Majesty's Government have agreed that such representations be made and that no Order in Council shall be issued until those representations have been made. I have within the time at my disposal sought to indicate the points upon which representations will be made. I have also informed the House that the Secretary of State for the Colonies and His Majesty's Government have given us a pledge that they will make no change in the existing position until those representations have been made. Now, Sir, I do not really know that in this particular matter there is any difference between the Honourable Members opposite and ourselves. If I may say so, I had a slight grievance against my Honourable friend's otherwise admirable statement of the position. He prefaced his remarks by saying that on this matter all Parties—the Liberals, the Nationalists and the rest—are agreed. I wish he had also added that not only all Parties, but the Government of India are also agreed. (Hear, hear.) Because, if there are any matters on which there has been complete unanimity, this is one of those matters.

An Honourable Member: What about fiscal autonomy?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I am not talking about fiscal autonomy at the present moment. It has its own place important though it may be. The position, then, is that there is identity of outlook; there is unanimity of objective and there is determination on all sides that we should forward and put this case before His Majesty's Government. My Honourable friends may ask: What will be the result? None can predict the result. But, Sir, this House considers the work of its own executive, the attitude of its own executive and the line that that executive takes in response to public opinion. I submit that by the account that I have given of what we have done and what we propose to do, I have established to the satisfaction of every fair-minded man that in this matter the executive, that is to say, the Government of India, deserve not the censure of the House, but their whole-hearted support and approval. (Applause.)

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I had very little dreamt when I was speaking here yesterday on a similar motion that my words will have that magic effect upon the Government of India. Sir,

[Mr. M. A. Jinnah.]

I congratulate the Honourable Member who spoke on behalf of the Government of India. The question is not whether the Government of India can successfully fight our battle. It is also not the question whether we can successfully fight our battle. The constitutional position in this House is this that when we want to raise a question of definite, specific character and of great public importance, it is initiated definitely not in the inimical sense towards the Government but for the purpose of finding out the real position and the real situation and the attitude of the Government or the actions of the Government. If the House is satisfied that our Government has done what is right or that they have done their level best, surely it will be positively unreasonable that the House should proceed further and pass the vote of censure on the Government. Now, Sir, on this question—and it is, of course, a very rare question and I do not want the Government to run away from this fact—we are able to speak, as we did, whole-heartedly and not censure the Government. Therefore, speaking for myself, in view of what the Government have done and in view of the position which they have taken up from the very start and stoutly maintained that position. Although the Honourable Member speaking on behalf of the Government did not say so, I will even give the credit to the Government of India that they have held the hand of the Secretary of State for the Colonies in not passing the Order in Council till their representation reaches him which would have, of course, by now become a statute and law of Kenya. Therefore, speaking for myself, as I said yesterday, I am always loth to unnecessarily pass votes of censure on the Government and on this occasion certainly I shall not be justified. But before I sit down, may I point out to the Government that when the reply was given—perhaps the Honourable Member is already aware of it, but I would like his attention to be drawn to it—the Secretary of State for the Colonies was heckled by the Members in Parliament on this very question. I have got a report from a newspaper which is called the *Weekly Edition*, and its correspondent sends this report which is dated London, the 15th February. Major Milner asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies:

"Has the Colonial Secretary asked or does he intend to ask for the comments of the Government of India on the text of the proposed Order in Council defining native reserves in European Highlands in Kenya?"

Sir Philip Cunliffe-Lister replied:

"I shall of course be prepared to consider any representations which may be received from the Government of India, but (*I want the Government of India to mark this 'but'*) I think it will to point out that the effect of the proposed Order in Council so far as the White Highlands are concerned will be merely to confirm what has been an administrative practice for the past quarter of a century. This practice was formerly re-confirmed by His Majesty's Government in the White Paper in 1923 and has not been challenged by any successive Government."

Of course, there he was referring to the British Government not our Government. I want the Honourable Member therefore to bear in mind that it is not only for the successive Governments of Great Britain only to challenge but I think ours is a greater right to challenge and we have challenged it from the very inception. The result of this law—if the Order in Council is passed—would be this.

First, what was originally supported, or rather maintained was on the ground of administrative convenience, from that we have now come to the stage when not only an area which was kept on the plea of administrative

convenience, that area is enlarged to a very great extent and now it is not on the ground of administrative convenience but on the ground that it is going to be the white island, that is a special reserve for white people. That is one. If that law is passed then it follows that the restriction which did not find a place in the way of any Indian acquiring before this law comes into operation, that is to say any Indian could have acquired any property in that highland, but the moment this law comes into operation no Indian could acquire any land within that area—that is a restriction which does not exist at the present moment. Not only that, but those Indians who happen to possess lands within this enlarged area, if those lands are sold once to a European, then that European cannot alienate or transfer those lands to an Indian any more. So far really it seems that the words of that great man, Mr. Bonar Law, are thrown to the winds, namely, even handed justice. Sir, it is far from being even handed justice, it is downright injustice (Hear, hear), and I am glad that on this occasion at any rate the Government of India have risen to the occasion and I wish them god-speed in their fight, and I hope they will win. (Applause.)

Mr. F. E. James (Madras: European): Sir, it is indeed a happy circumstance that finds all sections of the House of one mind on this subject. (Hear, hear.) I should like to make it perfectly clear from the outset that we, in this small and somewhat insignificant Group in this part of the House, join whole-heartedly in the remarks made by my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, and also in congratulating the Honourable Mr Bajpai on his exposition of the actual steps taken by the Government of India. We have on previous occasions—I claim from the days when my Honourable friend, Sir Darcy Lindsay, was the Leader of this Group—identified ourselves whole-heartedly with those in this country who have been working for the establishment of justice for the Indian communities overseas. Whether men and women of our own race are concerned or not, we shall continue, in so far as it lies in our power, to join our Indian brethren (Hear, hear) in this campaign for the establishment of justice. Having said that, I would like to say straightaway that I trust that this motion will not be pressed to a division. I understand the desire of my Honourable friends is to have some vote which will place on record their position. But I would ask them, whether, in fact, the establishment of any vote in this House on this issue is going to alter the circumstances at all. The person we are really anxious to get at is the Secretary of State for the Colonies and through him the British Government. We cannot, in fairness censure the Government of India. Those of us who are on the Standing Committee on Emigration, at our last meeting, had the pleasure of placing on record our warm appreciation of the magnificent fight which the Honourable Member in charge of that Department, Sir Fazl-i-Husain, has put up (Applause), during the time of his office, for the cause of Indians overseas, and it would be a most unhappy thing if on this, his first appearance in this House during this Session, this House were to record a vote which would ordinarily be recognised as a censure vote upon the Government of India. Therefore, I trust that my Honourable friend, the Mover of this motion, will not persist in that policy. Sir, we feel in regard to this matter that the proposal to turn, what is somewhat euphoniously called "an action of administrative convenience". into a discrimination embodied in statute is not only detrimental to the interests of India, but it is injurious to Indian inhabitants overseas not only in Kenya but elsewhere. If my voice could go from

[Mr. F. E. James.]

here in any way with any power or any authority or any persuasion to those in authority in the United Kingdom, I would ask them to pause before they do anything which will establish a position by Order in Council, that is to say, by a prerogative of His Majesty the King in this his Jubilee year, a position which will undoubtedly be resented, not only by Indians in Kenya but by Indians throughout the length and breadth of this land. (Hear, hear.) I trust, Sir, that the Government of India, in the great effort which they are making, will be supported by every section of this House and every community in this country and that they will be successful in achieving what we all desire and, in preventing, what I believe will be not only an act of injustice but an act of great "un-statesmanship" on the part of His Majesty's Government. (Hear, hear.) (Applause.)

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, this is one of those rare occasions when we find,—if I am correct, this is the fourth occasion—when we find that the Government of India and the Opposition are agreed on the subject matter that is under discussion and it is rather surprising that on all these four occasions, it happens to be a subject that is handled by the Department of Education, Health and Lands and that Department finds itself in complete agreement with the people of India in their unanimous demand over the overseas question. Sir, I am glad that my Honourable friend, Mr. James, gave us his partial support, though not his full support, I do not feel he gave his whole-hearted support, but he gave his partial support . . . . .

An Honourable Member: No, he gave his full support.

Mr. B. Das: No, in my interpretation it is not full support.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) vacted the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta).]

I am glad that I have at least got the sympathy of my Honourable friend, Mr. James. We had it on another occasion when we discussed on the floor of the House the evidence of the Secretary of State for India given before the Joint Parliamentary Committee where the people of the Colonies and the Dominions were given further amount of status in India over which we condemned the attitude of the Secretary of State and my Honourable friend, Sir Fazl-i-Husain, joined his full strength with us to condemn that attitude of mind of the British Government. But, Sir, what is the genesis of this question? What I find in this matter is that however united we may stand on the floor of this House the Government of India are impotent, as Sir Cowasji Jehangir put it yesterday. The Government of India, however, united they may be in their protest with the Indian people, cannot impress the Secretary of State and the Secretary of State who happens to represent the Indian interests in the British Cabinet in no way carries weight with the Colonial Secretary. So the colonising policy of the British people goes on merrily and the Indians who go to the colonies, whether it is South Africa or East Africa or Kenya or Tanganyika, and contribute to its economic development are slowly pushed out.

My Honourable friend, Mr. Bajpai, grew eloquent over this question; I admire his eloquence and also his sincerity, but I think his voice did not contain the note of sadness which I expected there, because he must be burning with the sense of injured feeling over the kick that the Government of India received over the Zanzibar question. If the Colonial Secretary can kick the Government of India in curtailing the rights of Indians in Zanzibar, how can we expect, by expressing pious hopes on the floor of this House, that the united voice of the Government of India and the people of India will carry any weight with the Colonial Secretary over this Kenya Highland question? Sir, the whole trouble I locate in another direction. In this new Constitution that is contained in the White Paper and the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report, Indians are not given freedom over their overseas problems or over their foreign policy. The Secretary of State still remains the master and he is to negotiate on behalf of the Government of India and on behalf of even so able an advocate as my Honourable friend, Sir Fazl-i-Hussain, with the Colonial Secretary And however much my Honourable friend, Sir Fazl-i-Hussain may agree with us he cannot make the Secretary of State move in the matter. The Secretary of State in this matter tacitly agrees to what the Colonial Secretary says. Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. James, wished that in the King's Silver Jubilee year Indians all over the Empire would be happy or some such thing he said. Sir, I do not expect any such thing. In India we are not happy. Indians in South Africa are not happy; Indians in Zanzibar are today condemned to live from hand to mouth and their trade is destroyed by those Ordinances that were recently passed and over which the protests of the Government of India have gone fruitless. So I think, in a month or two, the Secretary for the Colonies will further tighten the control over the rights of Indians in Kenya and Tanganyika and their freedom will be further restricted. So what I urge on the Government of India is to test how long Indians will be pariahs in these colonies of the Empire. Sir, people talk of our rights and status, people talk of India's position in the League of Nations. What is the use of our claiming a position in the League of Nations when, throughout the Dominions and Colonies, we are treated as pariahs? The Government of India may be sympathetic, but they are as helpless as we are in this matter to advance the status and the rights of Indians in these Colonies So when my Honourable friend, Sir Fazl-i-Hussain rises to speak, I do hope he will tell us what he himself feels in the matter, whether he sees any light ahead or whether the Indians in Kenya and Tanganyika will have the same fate as the Zanzibar Indians. With these few remarks, I support the motion.

Sir Lancelot Graham: Sir, the question may now be put.

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali (Lucknow and Fyzabad Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, it is really a matter of very great satisfaction to all Members of this House that at least once, though it may not be in the beginning of the Session, the Government of India have seen their way to compromise and go hand in hand with the Indian public. It is not only a matter of felicitation to us, but it augurs well, not for the Government of India alone, but also for the country. Sir, we have known it always that united we stand and divided we fall; and today the Government of India can very well see that whenever they are prepared to extend their hand of unity to the Opposition, the Opposition will not fail to extend its

[Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali.]

own hand. Our object in moving this motion today, as Mr. Satyamurti pointed out, is not to censure the Government of India, but to strengthen their hands in putting our case before the Government at home, although it is already a very strong case. In every paper like the White Paper and the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report, we find that there is always mentioned the question of partnership with Indians. Every Englishman says and all the papers in England also say that they want partnership with India But there can be no partnership with India unless and until the rights of Indians overseas, the rights of Indians in this country, the rights of Indians everywhere in the world, are recognised by the British Government and the Government at Home, and they also take care that our rights are protected everywhere wherever we are in the world

Sir, yesterday my Honourable friend, Mr. Jinnah, said that we find that this Government is not our Government. I am glad to see that today we find this Government to be our Government. Some friends say that it may be that tomorrow the Government of India will change. Sir, if the Government of India will change, we also will change, and if one Party can break the peace of this House the other Party will also be prepared to do it. The rights of Indians in Kenya have been the subject of discussion for a long time not only in this House but outside it I remember reading in the papers once that about three lakhs of pounds were invested by these Indians in the hospitals of Kenya but still Indian ladies are not admitted into those hospitals. Whereas every kind of arrangement is made for European women in these hospitals, it is not so for Indian ladies. It is things like this that Indians resent, that protection and assistance is given to Europeans only whereas the money is invested by Indians as well. I do not think it is necessary for me to say more, but again to thank the Government at least or extending the hand of friendship even for once to this side. I support the motion.

Seth Govind Das (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to support the motion moved by my Honourable friend, Mr Satyamurti. There is no doubt in the fact that racial discrimination is being made in this respect There are both highlands and lowlands in Kenya and Indians are being kept away from the highlands. In the beginning it was an administrative question, but now in spite of our prolonged wish, in spite of our unanimous opinion in this country, including that of the Government, an Order in Council is being proclaimed, by which Indians would be kept away from the highlands permanently, and they will not be allowed to buy those lands from others as second-hand or even third-hand property. Now, I shall read in this connection what an eminent English paper has said, I mean the *Manchester Guardian*. In its issue of the 11th February, 1935, it said:

"When the long and comprehensive report of the Morris Carter Commission on Land in Kenya was published last May it was rightly praised for the evidence it gave of the care with which the claims of the various tribes had been considered But one feature of the report caused dismay to many acquainted with Kenya's problems The Commissioners were requested in their published terms of reference to 'define the area generally known as the Highlands within which persons of European descent are to have a privileged position' They did so Their report contains a map of the recommended area which includes an addition of 6,355 square miles to the 10,345 already in the possession of Europeans. Moreover, paragraph 1979 of their report recommends that 'the boundaries of the European Highlands should be safeguarded by Order in Council so that the European community may have the same measure of security in regard to land as we have recommended for the natives'."

[At this stage, Mr President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) resumed the Chair.]

"It seems superficially a harmless proposal. In fact, it is a highly unwise departure. At present land in the Highlands can be transferred to others than Europeans, though only with the consent of the Governor. In future, if the Order in Council is passed, the greatly extended Highland area will be a close European preserve. The Commission would seem here to have exceeded its terms of reference. It was asked to define the Highlands, not to hand them over to Europeans for all time But, as is pointed out by a correspondent whose letter we print today, it proceeded upon the advice, unknown to Parliament at the time, of the Colonial Secretary. Sir Philip Cunliffe-Lister has admitted that, in reply to an inquiry from Sir Morris Carter for a definition of the 'privileged position' of Europeans in the Highlands alluded to in the Commission's terms of reference, he declared that:

'no person other than a European shall be entitled to acquire by grant or transfer agricultural land in such area or to occupy land therein.'

Kenya contains a non-native population of some 39,000 Indians, 16,000 Europeans, and 12,000 Arabs. The proposal without Parliamentary discussion permanently to exclude the Indian population from acquiring land in the Highlands is not likely to pass unnoticed in Delhi."

Sir, this is what the *Manchester Guardian* has said. We are not censuring Government by moving this adjournment motion, but, in fact, we want to strengthen their hands, to advocate our cause to the Secretary of State. The Government of India always act as subordinates to the Secretary of State. They never even press our views before him, but this is one point in which they have been pressing and advocating our views. By passing this adjournment motion, we shall be strengthening their hands, and in that way we are not, in fact, censuring the Government of India. We, in this country, are not independent—we are considered as slaves in this country of ours; and we occupy the same position overseas, and no respect is being given to an Indian outside the country also. Under these circumstances, I hope that the House will carry this adjournment motion. In fact, Government Members also ought to vote for this motion, because we are making it clear that we are not censuring them and that we are only trying to strengthen their hands. With these very few remarks, I support the adjournment motion moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty (Madras: Indian Commerce): Sir, while I do not wish to underestimate the value of co-operation and support which the Government on such rare occasions is affording to the point of view that is well canvassed by Indian public opinion, I am afraid I cannot resist the feeling that after all these are all merely empty words and they do not bring in any desirable result. The struggle of the Indians overseas is a long one and has been as protracted as the struggle for Swaraj by the Indians in their own country. I was not surprised at the support of my Honourable friend, Mr. James, not only on his own behalf but also on behalf of the Europeans sitting with him, because I say that they saw that the Government was of that view. But the whole question is, are we to end these representations by merely verbal protests or have we got any power either to persuade the Secretary of State for India or the Secretary for the Colonies to enable the Indians overseas to enjoy equal privileges and opportunities with the other nationals of that country? As regards that, I am afraid there has been no answer in the very able and sympathetic exposition of the case of the Government in this matter.

[Mr. Sami Venkatachelam Chetty.]

Unless one feels certain that we can, notwithstanding the verbal protest, by other means, by means of retaliation or by means of anything else, afford the same kind of treatment to their people in our country, unless we are able to persuade the Colonial Government like that, there does not seem to be any hope of getting most of the great grievances and disabilities, which the Indians suffer, redressed. I would rather like the Government to tell us whether we have the power or not. We shall be prepared to go to any length with the Government of India in the matter of persuading the Secretary of State to take a very strong attitude in this matter and see whether the Secretary of State for the Colonies can ask the Colonial Government to agree to the legitimate, reasonable and just demand of Indians overseas. In this attempt I should expect the European Members to give us their whole-hearted and unstinted support. Much lies in the attitude they adopt, not only in this Chamber, but also either in private correspondence or in representations to the authorities at home. The value of the words of the Europeans here will certainly have far greater effect than even the Government of India in this matter. Because they must be generous enough to feel that though they are in such a small minority here, yet they are able to enjoy such privileges and such responsibilities in this country that they should be grieved that their brethren in other parts of the Empire should deny the privileges which they themselves enjoy at the hands of the people of this country. Well, Sir, if, when a change of Constitution takes place, the rights and privileges of Europeans and other Englishmen could be safeguarded in this country by means of conventions, by statutory rules and other things, would it be unreasonable for us to expect that the same kind of thing should be done by Englishmen in the Colonies so far as our people in the Colonies are concerned? Therefore, unless the Government of India give us an assurance that they will do all in their power, not only by means of strongly worded protests but also by every means which they have in their power, we can get no satisfaction in this matter; nor do we think that the Colonials will be so unreasonable as to turn down our representations. I join in the statement made by several Members of this House that this adjournment motion does not mean a censure on the Government, but it is intended to strengthen the hands of the Government, and I hope that Government will take this in the same spirit in which it is offered, and will do all that lies in their power to support the claims of Indians in Kenya.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhuri (Bengal: Landholders): Sir, I consider it a great privilege to get this opportunity to express my views on this important question. I am glad that my friend, Mr. Satyamurti, tabled this adjournment motion, because it is really a matter which is of the vital importance affecting the self-respect of our countrymen abroad. Sir, I belong to a party which is supposed to be the Independent Party, and my view should be really independent in this matter, and, as my Leader rightly expressed, this is the only question on which there has been complete unanimity of opinion in this House. I also congratulate my friend, the Mover, on the able and eloquent manner in which he put forward his arguments which has enabled him to secure the support of every side of this House. I am also glad that the Government have given an undertaking to the effect that they will

5 P. M.

go as far as they possibly can and do all that lies in their power. At the same time, I must also express satisfaction at the speech by my friend, Mr. James, who spoke not only for himself, but for his Party also, and that shows that they wholeheartedly support our case. I, therefore, suggest, Sir, that the unanimous decision of this House should be forwarded to the Secretary of State for the Colonies requesting him to consider this matter very seriously. Sir, there is a certain section in this House which believes that all recommendations we make here are merely of an advisory character and are not binding, but this recommendation should be regarded with the greatest seriousness it deserves, because, unless and until Indian interests overseas are sufficiently safeguarded, we in this country can never remain satisfied Sir, this is a solemn occasion, because all our friends outside the House will be watching with keen interest the result of our debate, and it will give universal satisfaction if it is known outside that there is complete unanimity on this important question affecting the interests of our countrymen abroad. Sir, in my career in the Legislature this is the first occasion on which I find complete agreement between the Government and Honourable Members of this House belonging to all sections. I heartily congratulate the Honourable Sir Fazl-i-Hussain on the bold stand he has taken in this matter. Sir, I wholeheartedly support this motion.

Maulana Shaukat Ali (Cities of the United Provinces: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, this Session is now about to close in a few days, and I was feeling despondent that the peace maker was getting nothing but kicks from this side and that side. (Laughter.) Today, when an hour ago, speaker after speaker was speaking about Pusa, I was wondering whether we were going to have another new quarrel. Hindu-Muslim quarrels were there, there were provincial jealousies present and to this was added another quarrel between wheat and rice. So I was getting very despondent, but when this adjournment motion came, I heard the speeches with very great pleasure. My friend, Mr. Satyamurti, spoke with great restraint. There was not very strong language anywhere in his speech. I also heard my friend, Mr. Bajpai, cooing like a loving dove reciprocating all the sweet advances made by Mr. Satyamurti. Sir, there is an old saying in Persian:

"Kahba chun Peer shawad pesha kund dallali."

"When the bad woman becomes old, she accepts the profession of procuress."

That is why I am a peace maker. This is the spirit in which I like that all our affairs should be settled in India. There is no lack of talent, there is no lack of public speaking, there is no lack of people with temper,—there are many people in this House who, like me and the Finance Member, have short temper (Laughter), and if we all speak with a glass of cold water in front of us, the atmosphere will be much nicer.

An Honourable Member: Not with a glass of water, but with a glass of *Sharbat.*

Maulana Shaukat Ali: I have no objection to *Sharbat.* I rather like it. I have travelled a good deal in Kenya and Tanganyika and Portuguese East Africa, and I did over a couple of thousand miles by motor. I saw thousands and thousands of miles of beautiful country both in the Highlands and in the Lowlands lying fallow and waiting for human

[Maulana Shaukat Ali.]

energy, human intelligence and human enterprise to develop. In all that tract in that beautiful land, I also saw that the population was very scarce, and, as the people were primitive and backward, all the peoples, whether in Europe or Asia or elsewhere, white, brown, blue or of any other complexion combined together and made a serious effort to develop the land and kept it as a trust for the people over there, there ought to be no dearth of land for at least a hundred years or so. But if human selfishness goes to such an extent that we should want every bit of land to ourselves, then you can eat my food, you can eat all your neighbour's lunch and dinner, but there is bound to be some day cholera and you will have to throw out all including your own reserve food strength. Though we may go on grabbing other people's land, the time will come one day when we may be obliged to give all back. I had been a rebel, and the *Hindustan Times* always says that, whenever Maulana Shaukat Ali gets up, he always brings in the fact that he has been rebel and an outlaw. I want to remind the *Hindustan Times* and everybody in this House that so long as there is life, and peace efforts give no results, there is a likelihood of my being a rebel and an outlaw against all. Today I am flattering everybody for peace and I am going on bended knees for peace, but, some day, there is a chance of my being an outlaw again. When an outlaw makes up his mind to fight, then everybody likes to go and make friends with him. I do believe, the time has come when we ought to make friends with each other, and I am glad that the House has made a beginning today and I hope that it will continue it for another week or ten days and that this good spirit will last. If so, it will make me very very happy. I will go back to my constituency and the country and tell them that though I did not succeed in the beginning, but later all realised that peace was better than war and there was a friendly atmosphere. There is no part of the world which I have seen which is better populated and better cultivated than Zanzibar. In Zanzibar, you will not find an inch of land which is uncultivated, but as for Kenya and Tanganyika, thousands and thousands of miles are lying fallow. One night, when I was going in my motor car from Tabaru to Wawanza it got stuck up in mud owing to rain and I had to wait the whole night and half a day, that is about 36 hours, before I could get the help of anybody or get an axe to cut down a tree to get some wood. Humanity should not be selfish, we should meet as brothers and divide the good things of life among all of us, and then our lives would be better, our families would be happier, and deaths from heart failures and other diseases would be few and far between. The House has made a good beginning in the matter of peace, and I hope that it will last. There is an Urdu couplet in which the lover says:

"Gale liptay hain woh bijli ke dar sai
Elahi yeh ghata do din to barsay"

"My sweatheart has embraced me through fear of lightning and thunder.
May God this cloud-burst may last two days."

I hope this peace will last for at least two days. I pray that peace may come into India and make our lives happier, that we may become younger again and enjoy life better, and let us not go into divisions, but let us congratulate ourselves on the beginning we have made, and let us go back and have a happy time.

The Honourable Khan Bahadur Mian Sir Fazl-i-Husain (Member for Education, Health and Lands): Sir, I am most grateful to Mr. Satyamurti for his adjournment motion. It has afforded me an opportunity to come to this House, in the first place, to congratulate the new House, and in the second place, to make a few observations on the floor of this House before I leave my present appointment in the Government of India. So, my present speech is one of welcome to the new Members of the House.

Mr. M. S. Aney: And a farewell.

The Honourable Khan Bahadur Mian Sir Fazl-i-Husain: . .and a farewell speech so far as I am myself concerned.

Five years ago, when I took up this appointment, I had set an ideal to myself. I said to myself that the question of Indians overseas is an extraordinarily difficult one no doubt, but at the same time, a most interesting one, and it shall be my business to act in a manner which would be in accord with the Indian opinion, and at all events, Indian opinion as expressed in the Central Legislature. I knew that there was possibly some difficulty, as there were occasions when the view that was taken by a Government Member was misunderstood by public leaders, and there were times when the views taken by public leaders were not fully appreciated by the Member in charge. I made it my business to see that I was in contact with all the Indian leaders who took keen interest in the matter of Indians overseas. I was, I am in a position to say, most fortunate in that respect, as I had the privilege of being instructed as well as supported by the Leader of the Congress who is probably the best informed Indian on all questions concerning Indians in South Africa. I had his guidance as well as his support in the matter of the Indian delegation which I had the privilege of taking to South Africa in 1931. An *ex*-President of the Congress, I had the privilege of having as one of the members of the delegation. I had also the privilege of having direct touch with experts in the matter of Indians overseas like the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri. I had the privilege of being in direct touch with the great Indian Peoples' Association in Bombay which has done a great deal of good work in this matter. I was equally fortunate with the Indian press. The Indian nationalist press has invariably taken a strong line in this connection and given us their full support. Foremost among those papers is the *Hindu* from Madras whose well-informed criticism and very well-conceived leaders on many questions have been of great help to us. I was in the fortunate position of feeling that what I was doing, had the Indian support behind it, and further that I was not in any way departing from the Indian views on the various subjects that came up from time to time for decision and with which I had to deal. Thus, I was able in a few cases to achieve very minor successes. These successes really are very minor and dwindle into insignificance when one thinks of the numerous failures that one has come against. There is nothing to be proud of in the line of achievement. The utmost one could say is that I have not lost very much ground. It would be wrong on my part to say that during my term any great advance has been made, because none has been made. It would be equally wrong if I were to say that I had any difficulty in doing my best with the British Government in the matter of my colleagues or the Viceroy. They have invariably supported every effort made to improve the conditions of Indians overseas. We have acted like one team and the

[Sir Fazl-i-Husain.]

Viceroy has been the strongest of us in these matters. (Applause.) I have, Sir, to pay my tribute of gratitude to all the Indian leaders, including the leaders of the Congress for the support they have given. But for their support, I do not think I would have had much heart even to put up such a hopeless struggle. We must remember that the struggle is more or less a hopeless one. We must not run away with the idea that we are united and there is no difficulty in the way of our achieving our desire. Nothing of the kind. There is a conflict of interest. We must not forget that India is a part of Asia. We must not forget that Asia is not Europe. Again we must not forget that even Asiatics, who are not in our position do not have a look in, in places which are worth going to. So Indians must remember their two-fold disability, firstly they are Asiatics. Secondly, they are situated as they are. Remembering these two disabilities, there is nothing that an Indian Member of Government or for the matter of that an European Member of Government would not be prepared to do that any one of you would like to do. Therefore, Sir, it is a matter of gratification to me to see, on the eve of my retirement, that on this point, not only there is a tacit understanding that the policy of the Government of India is the Indian policy, but there has been, through the good offices of Mr. Satyamurti, an opportunity for a public declaration, on the floor of this House, to that effect. I trust that this significant fact will have some value. It may add a little more strength to the representation which will issue from the Government of India. Let us hope it will, but if it does not by any chance, the struggle cannot be given up. It has to be fought. It has to be continued. (Applause.) It will never do to lose heart. Nobody, who believes in the future, can afford to lose heart. We believe that there is a future. If we begin to believe that there is no future, there would be no fun in my standing here or your sitting there. I trust that in a matter which is so dear to our hearts we should realise that unless we are in course of time able to create a certain amount of sympathy in the minds of Britishers in Britain and possibly a few in the Dominions and in the Colonies, the difficult task of persuading people in authority to take even a fairly just view of Indian claims is very remote indeed. When I mention the matter of the support that the Viceroy gives to our representation, I ought also to have mentioned that much as we may disagree with the Secretary of State in many matters, in matters relating to Indians overseas, he has invariably assured us that he has done his very best with his colleague, the Colonial Secretary, in pressing our representations on him. However, we must be just to others, if we want others to be just to us. The Secretary of State for the Colonies is not so much responsible to us as he is to his own constituents, the British Parliament. If there were responsible government here, the Member of the Government sitting here would think more of you sitting there than of people elsewhere.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: That is what we want.

The Honourable Khan Bahadur Mian Sir Fazl-i-Husain: Even when you do get it, the question of Indians overseas is not settled.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: We must go to war on that.

The Honourable Khan Bahadur Mian Sir Fazl-i-Husain: You will require many Hitlers and many Mussolinis before you could even talk of war like that. So, that is rather remote, I am afraid.

An Honourable Member: We have not got one yet.

The Honourable Khan Bahadur Mian Sir Fazl-i-Husain: You had better try to develop some by and by. That seems to be your only chance. To come back to my point, I was saying what is really wanted is a certain amount of honourable propaganda enlisting the sympathies of people in Britain and elsewhere to take up the Indian case for a sympathetic hearing. Mr. Satyamurti shakes his head.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Nothing doing.

The Honourable Khan Bahadur Mian Sir Fazl-i-Husain: I am prepared to join issue with him. Britain is a very funny place.

An Honourable Member: Very.

The Honourable Khan Bahadur Mian Sir Fazl-i-Husain: There may be people who are dead against you, but you will always find some people who are with you.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Cranks.

The Honourable Khan Bahadur Mian Sir Fazl-i-Husain: I assure you that a crank is not a man to be despised. Many great things can be achieved through cranks. I have never despised cranks, and I have always solicited the co-operation even of cranks. From small beginnings, you can achieve a successful organisation but that has got to be done. Anyhow that is my humble view and I would be the last person to profess to dictate the soundness of that view to people who have much more experience, sitting opposite than myself. However, that is a view which I have always entertained and I have thought it a great misfortune that one little Congress organisation, that existed in London for certain reasons, had to be closed down. It may be found necessary to revive it. Those who are in authority will decide that point. In conclusion, I wish to thank every part of the House for the appreciation they have expressed of the Government policy, and inasmuch as my name has been associated with it, I very sincerely tender my gratitude to everybody. (Applause.)

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Mr. President, the presence of the Honourable Member for Education, Health and Lands in this House, for the first time after we entered it, has been significant, not only because of the physical addition to the Treasury Bench, but also because of a new atmosphere which he seems to have brought with him. We have been sitting here for the last nine weeks, and, during the whole of that time, we have had nothing but jibes, sneers, and any amount of contempt thrown on our devoted heads, for all our labours on behalf of our countrymen. It is, therefore, some solace to our lacerated souls that there is at least one Member of the Treasury Bench who can appreciate our point of view and, whether he agrees with us or not, can recognise that we are patriotic

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

and are anxious to serve our country according to our humble lights, and it is a matter for regret to me that the first speech of his should also be the last speech in this House, but I hope, Sir, his example will not be lost on his colleagues and they will profit by a lesson which he has taught us that a soft word turneth away wrath.

Coming to the subject, I agree with the Honourable Member in his diagnosis of the situation. It was somewhat cynical but profoundly true. He has not won any new ground, but he claims that he has not lost any, and he believes that, simply because we are united, we are not going to gain our objective immediately. So far, he and I are at one, but he added a statement that, by enlisting the sympathy of Britishers, shall I say British cranks and others, we will get this matter settled right. Sir, we have no such illusions. We believe that the right of Indians in Kenya, in South Africa, and in other countries will be settled satisfactorily, only when we are free, and only when those European settlers know that, if they treat our fellow countrymen unjustly, we will go to war with them. (Hear, hear.) Sir, that is the way in which other nations have won their freedom and status. (Hear, hear.)

I want to know, if only half a dozen Britishers had been ill-treated, as so many of our own countrymen are today ill-treated, whether this very country—Great Britain—would not have gone to war, and India would not have been compelled to take part in that war also? Therefore, that is the position in which other countries place themselves, when their own nationals are ill-treated. Sir, as my Honourable friend, the Panditji, reminds me, practically all the British wars have been waged ever since "Jenkins's ears", war down to the present day in order to vindicate stray British missionaries and traders: and, if India were free as Britain today is, India would be able to tell those Colonies that they dare not treat our Indian fellow-countrymen as they are treating them now. My Honourable friend paid a tribute to his colleagues, to the Viceroy and to the Secretary of State. I am not in the confidence of the Government of India, and I have no desire to question the truth of his statement; but it seems to me somewhat peculiar that, with this combination of His Majesty's Secretary of State for India, His Excellency the Viceroy and the Government of India, nothing has been achieved! (Hear, hear.) Sir, what is this co-operation worth? Are we children? Are we to be told that, "we are all united; the result is nothing; therefore, please be satisfied"? It seems to me, Sir, that if this Government means business, if the Secretary of State means business, they ought to have been able to achieve some result.

Then the Honourable Member went on and told us the position of the Secretary of State for Colonies, who is responsible to the British Parliament. Well, that is exactly why we want this country to be free and self-governing! That is why we do not want the Constitution which is now embodied in the Government of India Bill. (Hear, hear.) Coming, Sir, to my Honourable friend, Mr. Bajpai, between whom and myself my Honourable friend, the Maulana, saw signs of love-making, I merely want to thank him for the addition he made to the points I made, namely, that with regard to a small portion of this territory, lands are in the possession of Indians today, but, when they pass to Europeans, they can never pass back to Indians. I thank him for it. The position is really very bad.

Now, Sir, so far as this House is concerned, it is a curious position. If today we can all get rid of the idea in our minds that this adjournment is a censure on the Government of India, I expect every Honourable Member, including the Honourable Member in charge of the portfolio, to vote for this motion, but, by some reasoning, it is understood to be a vote of censure. I said, in my very first speech, that I do not intend this to be a vote of censure, but somehow there is a tradition that, if this motion is carried, it will amount to a vote of censure. Therefore, I am in this position that, while everybody wants to vote for this motion, everybody supports this motion with his arguments, and everybody, except the Party to which I have the honour to belong, does not want the motion to be pressed to a division lest he be compelled to vote against his own judgment . . . .

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: May I point out, Sir, that we are not supporting the motion, but we are supporting the subject-matter of the motion.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I know, but there is no other way of bringing up the subject-matter.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: We have got it. We have brought it up. It *has* been discussed.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: The subject-matter is one which commands everybody's support, but because of a formal defect, unfortunately in this being a motion for adjournment, some Honourable Members feel, they cannot vote for it. Personally, being a fighter, I should like to vote for this motion. It seems to me a good enough way to "impress" the Secretary of State and the British Government with the strength of feeling in this country and in this House, but I hope, Sir, and I beg of my Honourable friends, the Honourable Member in charge and the Secretary of the Department concerned, to convey to the Secretary of State not "impressions", not mere "conclusions", not mere soft phrases, but that the subject-matter of this motion commands the unanimous approval of the House. (Loud and Prolonged Cheers.) From there not being a vote recorded, it must not be misunderstood as if there is any lack of strong feeling in this matter on the part of a single individual in this House. (Hear, hear.)

One last word, Sir, and I have done. I am also grateful to the other Parties in this House who have expressed their profound agreement with the desire of Indians to assert the rights of their fellow-countrymen in Kenya; and, Sir, in order to make sure that this motion is not allowed to be voted on, thereby creating a difficult or delicate situation for our friends in this House and elsewhere, I would beg leave of you and of this Honourable House to withdraw this motion for the present. Let me, however, tell the Government that we, on this side of the House and in fact on every side of the House, feel very strongly. I wish god-speed to the Government in this matter. I have, of course, no hope of success any more than has my Honourable friend, Sir Fazl-i-Husain. But, if just a ray of light penetrates the dark chambers of Downing Street, and they do the right thing, we shall be grateful; but, if not, let me assure the Government here and in England, that we shall later on, take every opportunity of bringing up the subject again and again, and make it an issue in the forefront of our political life, until we see that our fellow-Indians' rights are safeguarded, and respected and protected in all the Colonies and

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

Dominions. Our Indian fellow-countrymen abroad may rest assured of our deep sympathy and concern in this matter, and I hope the Government will represent our views correctly and sincerely. I would now ask your leave, Sir, to withdraw this motion. (Loud and Prolonged Applause.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Has the Honourable Member the leave of the House to withdraw his motion?

(*Voices*: "Yes, yes.")

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 28th March, 1935.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 28th March, 1935.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

INSURANCE BUSINESS IN INDIA.

1089. ***Seth Govind Das:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state what is the amount of premium income earned in respect of Insurance, Fire, Motor, Marine and Life by (i) Indian companies, (ii) foreign companies, during the last five years?

(b) Are Government aware of the fact that great competition is being experienced in insurance business in India owing to the unrestricted entry into India of Colonial, American, Continental and Japanese Insurance Com-

(c) Will Government be pleased to state whether they consider 'Insurance' as an important national industry and, if so, will Government be pleased to state what steps they contemplate taking to protect this industry and to prevent its progress being given a set-back by foreign competition?

(d) Are Government aware of the restrictions placed against foreign insurance companies by several countries on the Continent and in America? What steps do Government propose to take against those countries which impose restrictions on the admission of Indian Insurance Companies thereto?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) On the presumption that the Honourable Member refers to premium income earned in India, a statement showing the information so far as available is placed on the table.

(b), (c) and (d). The question of the amendment of the existing insurance law in India is under the consideration of the Government of India.

Statement showing premium income earned in India in respect of Life, Fire, Marine and Miscellaneous insurance businesses by (i) Indian Companies and (ii) non-Indian Companies during each of the financial years ending in 1928 to 1932.

(In thousands of rupees.)

—		Life.	Fire.	Marine.	Miscellaneous.*	Total.	Grand Total.
1928	Indian Companies . .	3,34,78†	16,44	10,76	14,10	3,76,08	8,79,79
	Non-Indian Companies .	2,90,25	1,28,17	43,52	41,77	5,03,71	
1929	Indian Companies . .	3,89,67†	22,88	11,25	17,61	4,41,41	10,31,53
	Non-Indian Companies .	3,42,91	1,31,63	56,97	58,61	5,90,12	
1930	Indian Companies . .	4,09,02	25,22	10,16	25,59	4,69,99	10,81,71
	Non-Indian Companies .	3,88,90	1,20,58	41,32	60,92	6,11,72	
1931	Indian Companies . .	4,51,00	28,42	7,19	24,11	5,10,72	11,09,92
	Non-Indian Companies .	4,10,39	99,89	35,56	53,38	5,99.22	
1932	Indian Companies . .	4,96, 0	28,48	7,30	28,28	5,60, 26	11,65,23
	Non-Indian Companies .	4,23,46	97,64	36,47	47,40	6,04,97	

*All classes of insurance business other than Life, Fire, and Marine are included under this head, separate figures for motor insurance business are not available.

† This includes figures for business outside India for which separate figures are not available.

Seth Govind Das: May I ask, Sir, when the Government will be able to say anything definite on this matter after due consideration of the case?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Perhaps my Honourable friend is not aware of the fact that the same officer who has been dealing with the question of the companies law is now dealing with the insurance law. References have gone out, I understand, not only to Local Governments but to public bodies inviting their observations, and I should say that his report would be ready by about August.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Are Government aware that in America and in some European countries large amounts to the extent of nearly £50,000 are required as the initial deposit by foreign insurance companies who want to carry on their business in those countries?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: That may be so. I will not say that my Honourable friend is wrong.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: Are Government aware that in England they impose an initial fee of £20,000 on any Insurance Company which does its business in England?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I will not contest my Honourable friend's information on that point.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is any such deposit required here?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I shall have to ask for a notice of that question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the proceedings of a Conference held in Bombay recently about Indian Insurance Companies? I believe it was presided over by Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, and they passed several resolutions, asking for protection to Indian Insurance Companies.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: All those matters will be taken into account before the revision of the present law is undertaken.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government answer the second part of the question contained in part (d), namely, whether they propose to take any steps against those countries which impose restrictions on the admission of Indian Insurance Companies thereto?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: That, Sir, is not a matter connected with the revision of the ordinary insurance law, and, as I said in connection with the question which was put pertaining to Italy, the matter was under our consideration.

Seth Govind Das: Will Government consider the advisability of imposing a large amount of deposit on foreign companies who want to trade in this country?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Well, Sir, as I said, the whole matter is receiving consideration, and I am not prepared to say what steps will or will not be taken.

IMPORTATION OF SILVER INTO INDIA FROM KUTCH TERRITORY.

1090. ***Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether importation of silver into any part of India from Kutch territory is prohibited?

(b) Is it a fact that Government instead of proving that the silver was so imported from Cutch, throw the burden on the people to prove from where they obtained the silver? If so, under what authority?

(c) Is it a fact that the Collector of Karachi decided that no one should be prosecuted for past transactions, but some people are still being prosecuted?

(d) Do Government propose to issue orders that no one should be put to trouble and expense by being prosecuted on the mere allegation of some past transactions without such silver having been seized, or found in the possession of the person implicated? If not, why not?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: (a) The import of all dutiable articles by land from Cutch into British India is prohibited.

(b) The answer to the first part is in the negative. The second part does not arise.

(c) No. The decision to which the Honourable Member refers related to the facts of a particular case. It did not apply, and was not intended to apply, to all cases irrespective of the amount of evidence which might be obtained regarding past transactions.

(d) Proceedings are not taken on mere allegations. Government are not prepared to make the seizure of silver a necessary condition precedent to the institution of proceedings.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know from the Honourable Member that, although silver may not actually be detected in the possession of an importer, yet he could be prosecuted after two or three years?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: I think, Sir, it is improbable that evidence would be forthcoming after two or three years. At the same time, it is not impossible. As I have said in my previous reply, it is not essential that the silver should actually be seized, if there is other evidence of a convincing nature which establishes the fact that the crime has been committed.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Does the Honourable Member propose to give instructions to the officers there to prosecute only when they have got very satisfactory and convincing evidence?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: No such instructions are necessary. They are well aware of the necessity of having clear proof.

CERTAIN RAILWAY SURVEY WORKS.

1091. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state:

(i) when the following survey works were first undertaken;
(ii) the mileage extent of each;
(iii) whether survey was completed;
(iv) whether budget estimates were prepared, if so, how much for each;
(v) whether budgets were sanctioned; and
(vi) why the projects work were not begun in each case:
(1) Cumbum—Kalabasti,
(2) Nandyal—Atmakur,
(3) Nandyal—Koilkuntla,
(4) Yerragudipad—Prodattur,
(5) Kanivihalli—Swamihalli,
(6) Kalikiri—Royachoti,
(7) Madras—Tirupati,
(8) Kalabasti—Udayagiri,
(9) Renigunta—Tirupati *via* Chiratanur,
(10) Cumbum—Kanigiri.
(11) Yerragudipad—Nandyal,
(12) Trichinopoly—Madura Electrification scheme, and
(13) Trichinopoly—Puducottah—Karaikudi?

(b) In view of the famine conditions prevailing in the area where the projects from (1) to (11) were surveyed, are Government prepared to take up these works immediately in order to give work for the starving labourers?

(c) In view of the survey of Trichinopoly—Madura Electrification scheme, are Government prepared to take up the work in hand?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) A statement giving the information required is laid on the table. I might add that two of the thirteen lines mentioned have been constructed.

(b) It is for the Local Government to take the initiative in this matter.

(c) It was not established at the time that the scheme was necessary, as it was doubtful whether electrification or doubling the line would be the most suitable solution. The present traffic does not justify the expenditure involved.

Project.	When survey was first undertaken.	Mileage.	Whether survey was completed.	Whether Budget estimates were prepared, if so, how much for each.	Whether budgets were sanctioned.	Why the work on the projects was not begun.
1. Cumbum-Kalabasti	Reconnoitred in 1925.	238·00	The reconnaisance was completed.	Yes. The cost was estimated to be Rs. 221·15 lakhs.	No.	The project was unremunerative.
2. Nandyal-Atmakur	1909	30·14	Yes	Yes: Rs. 20·64 lakhs	No.	The prospects of the line were poor.
3. Nandyal-Koilkuntla	1909	18·78	Yes	Yes. Rs. 12·58 lakhs	No	The prospects of the line were poor.
4. Yerragudipad-Prodattur.	..	11·27	..	No, but cost roughly placed at about Rs. 12¼ lakhs.	No	The prospects were not promising.
5. Kanivihalli-Swamihalli	1924	12·00	Yes	Yes. Rs. 5·12 lakhs	Yes	Line completed and opened on 15th March 1928.
6. Kalikiri-Royachoti	1899	34·42	Yes	Yes. Rs. 10·76 lakhs	No	Was unremunerative and was held in abeyance.
7. Madras-Tirupati	1912	78·68	Yes	Yes. Rs. 80·93 lakhs as brought up to date in 1928	No	Financial stringency.
8. Kalabasti-Udayagiri	..	..	..	....	..	The consideration of this project, among others, was with the concurrence of the Local Government abandoned in 1928 in favour of a line from Nellore to Kanigiri.

Project.	When survey was first undertaken.	Mileage.	Whether survey was completed.	Whether budget estimates were prepared, if so, how much for each.	Whether budgets were sanctioned.	Why the work on the projects was not begun.
9. Renigunta-Tirupati *via* Chiratanur (Realignment).	1928	4·4	Yes	Yes. Rs. 1·74 lakhs	No	The prospects were found to be poor.
10. Cumbum-Kanigiri	..	..	..	....	..	*Vide* remarks against Item 8 above.
11. Yerragudipad-Nandyal	1909	71·5	Yes	Yes. Rs. 40·85 lakhs	No	It was found to be unremunerative.
12. Trichinopoly-Madura Electrification.	1925	96·00	Yes	Yes. Rs. 81·54 lakhs	No	The scheme was not established to be necessary at the time.
13. Trichinopoly-Pudukottah-Karaikudi.	Part in 1887 and part in 1908.	94·22	Yes	Yes. Rs. 133·61 lakhs for whole line from Trichy to Manamadura.	Yes	Line completed and opened in full on 1st July 1930.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government give preference to these railway projects when additional funds are available for development?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No, Sir. Government propose to utilise any funds that are available for remunerative projects.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: May I know what is the answer to sub-clause (vi) of part (a) of the question?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The answer will be found in the statement I am laying on the table.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, when statements are laid on the table and we are not given a copy of them, we are not able to put supplementary questions.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can put supplementary questions afterwards, by putting down these questions.

EXTENSION OF THE ELECTRIFICATION SCHEME FROM TAMBARAN TO CHINGLEPUT.

1092. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Are Government prepared to consider the feasibility of extending the electrification scheme from Tambaram to Chingleput, the district headquarters, at a distance of 20 miles?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have forwarded the question to the Agent, South Indian Railway, for consideration.

ELECTRIFICATION SCHEME BETWEEN MADRAS AND ARKONAM AND PONNERI.

1093. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Are Government prepared to consider the feasibility of an electrification scheme between Madras and Arkonam and between Madras and Ponneri in the suburban area of the Madras City?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No such scheme has yet been suggested: but I am forwarding a copy of the question to the Agent, Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway, for consideration.

IMPORT DUTY ON INDIAN RICE AND PADDY IN CEYLON.

1094. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the Government of Ceylon impose an import duty on Indian rice and paddy? If so, how much?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state on what commodities from Ceylon, an import duty is levied in India, and the rates for each?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) Yes, Sir. The rates of import duty on paddy and rice in Ceylon are 66 cents and Re. 1 per cwt. respectively.

(b) All commodities from Ceylon or elsewhere, excepting those which are duty-free under the Indian tariff, are subject to import duties. The rates of duty are given in the First Schedule to the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, to which the Honourable Member is referred. A copy of the Act is in the Library.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: May I ask, Sir, what commodities are duty-free?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I should have to go through the list which is a fairly long one. If my Honourable friend will refer to the publication to which I have referred, he will see at a glance what are duty-free and what are dutiable articles.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: May I know the name of the publication? I could not hear it.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Sir, this is the first time that I have been accused of being inaudible in this House. The rates of duties are given in the first Schedule to the Indian Tariff Act of 1934, a copy of which is in the Library.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: I did not mean that. I want to know the Schedule in which duty-free articles are mentioned.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: My Honourable friend will find it there. He can get the information from the Schedule.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: May I ask, Sir, if there is any preferential treatment shown in Ceylon to Indian goods?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Not, Sir, by Ceylon.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Why not, Sir?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Because that matter is still under consideration with the Ceylon Government

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Is it since 1932?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Since the Ottawa Agreement was entered into.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Why do not this Government take reciprocal measures until it is settled?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: For the simple reason that we hoped that the Ceylon Government would give us the preferences which were given to us under the Agreement itself.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: When do Government expect to have a definite settlement from the Ceylon Government?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I cannot say that.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Do this Government propose to wait indefinitely?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim). Order, order.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is it not a fact that the Indian rice going to Ceylon is taxed, whereas the Ceylon rice coming to India is not taxed?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I do not know that any Ceylon rice does come to India

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are Government giving any preference to Ceylonese articles?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Cocoanut and copra.

BUILDINGS OF HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OCCUPIED BY THE MILITARY AUTHORITIES.

1095. ***Mr. M. Ghiasuddin:** (a) Will Government please state how many buildings of historical importance are at present occupied by the military authorities?

(b) Are Government aware that such occupation of the historical buildings tends to deteriorate them? If so, are Government prepared to evacuate these buildings and to use them as national museums, etc.?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Information is being collected and will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government consider the advisability, from a historic and artistic point of view, of stopping the occupation of historical buildings by military authorities?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: As far as I am aware historical buildings of archæological interest are not occupied by military authorities.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: Are Government aware that the Delhi Fort has been definitely disfigured by the military barracks being put up there?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: That is another matter. It does not conflict with the answer which I gave. These are new structures that have been put up within the precincts of the Fort. That is another point.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Do Government realise that they form an ugly spot and they disfigure the whole beauty of the buildings of the great Emperors, who constructed these Forts and their very ideas?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Aesthetically, I am inclined to agree with my Honourable friend here.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Is it not a fact that the mausoleum of Anarkali at Lahore is already occupied by a Government office?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The question was about the occupation by troops, not as regards the use of buildings as an office.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: That is the same.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are Government aware that the Tirumal Nayak Palace at Madura, one of the greatest architectural buildings in Southern India, is occupied by the District Munsif's Court there?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: As far as I know, there are about 1,900 protected buildings under the Ancient Monuments Preservation Act, and if Honourable Members seek to cross-examine me regarding the archæological value of each and the use to which they are put, I regret that I shall not be able to answer.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: All these show that they are put to very bad use.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is the great Fort at Agra, which we all go and see often, occupied by the military authorities, and, if so, why?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: According to my information, even in the Agra Fort, it is not the historical part of the building that is occupied by the military authorities, but modern structures.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: What is the answer to part (b) of the question?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I have answered parts (a) and (b) together. I have asked for information and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: It is a declaration of policy and no information is required to be called for.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: My Honourable friend will agree that Government cannot enunciate a policy *in vacuo*.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Is it not a fact that the military authorities were thinking of evacuating the Delhi Fort at any rate some time ago?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I am not aware of that.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: Sir, I must get an answer to part (b) of my question.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member says that he is in communication with the authorities and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: At least with regard to the Delhi and Agra Forts, which are now occupied by the military authorities, will Government ask them to vacate these buildings and allow them to be used as national museums?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: My Honourable friend's question is that buildings of historical importance which may be occupied by the military authorities and which are under the protection of the Archæological Department may be evacuated. As I have submitted for the information of the House, the buildings which are occupied in the Delhi Fort are not historical buildings, but modern structures. If my Honourable friend's suggestion is that even these modern structures should be evacuated, then I am quite prepared to take up the matter with the military authorities, but I cannot give any assurance as to what the outcome of the consultations will be.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government see that these modern structures are not such eye-sores as they are now, and will Government at least reconstruct them so as to be in consonance with the historical structures all round there?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I am sure, the House does not desire that these modern structures should be pulled down and other structures put up in order to harmonise them with the older buildings.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: If they are an eye-sore, they should be pulled down.

King's Commissioned Officers seconded for the Military Dairies and Grass Farms.

1096. ***Mr. M. Ghiasuddin:** (a) Will Government please state how many King's Commissioned officers are seconded for the Military Dairies and Grass Farms?

(b) How many of them are Indians? If there are none, is there any rule against having Indian King's Commissioned officers for these posts? If so, are Government prepared to consider the removal of this rule?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) 17.

(b) None, but there is no rule against their serving in these appointments.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know why the King's Commissioned Officers, who evidently possess high military qualifications, should be put on duty at the military dairies and military grass farms? Do they require any military genius or military training for this purpose?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: The policy is now tending in the direction of employing civilians to an increasing extent in place of soldiers, and we have seven or eight Indian civilians who are occupying appointments which previously were held by Commissioned Officers.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: Will Government consider the appointment of persons holding Commissions in the Army in India Reserve of Officers to these posts in military dairies and grass farms?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: No, Sir, I do not think it is at all necessary.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: Even if these persons are qualified diploma holders in agriculture, Government will not appoint them?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: If they have got the qualifications, they might be appointed as people who possess qualifications, but not as people who belong to the Army in India Reserve of Officers.

PURCHASE OF MATERIALS FOR THE ARMY.

1097. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** (a) Will Government state whether all things required by the army are purchased through the Indian Stores Department? If not, why not?

(b) What percentage of Army stores are purchased by the Indian Stores Department, London, and the Indian Stores Department in India?

(c) What percentage of the purchases made in India, of the Army stores, is Indian made and what percentage foreign?

(d) What percentage of the total purchases of the Army stores in India and outside is Indian and what percentage is foreign?

(e) Are any articles available in India and made in India, purchased in foreign countries or of foreign manufacture? If so, what are the articles, and for what reasons are they purchased in foreign countries or of foreign manufacture?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) No. Because it is considered desirable to maintain a Directorate of Contracts at Army Headquarters to make certain purchases for the Army particularly of food grains

(b) I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reports of the India Stores Department, London, and the Indian Stores Department, India, copies of which are in the Library.

(c) and (d) I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the reply I gave to Mr. Asaf Ali's starred question No. 119. It is impossible to say within the percentage there quoted what the proportion is between Indian-made and foreign-made.

(e) I don't think I need say more than that the Government Stores Purchase Rules are followed in making purchases for the Army.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Except food grains, are other purchases made through the Indian Stores Department?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I have tried to explain the position before. Practically all our requirements for the army are purchased or manufactured in India. About 89 per cent. of our requirements for the army are purchased in India or manufactured by firms in India or by our own Ordnance Factories. We purchase a certain amount of stuff through the Indian Stores Department in this country and we purchase a certain amount of stuff through the India Stores Department in London, but the majority of our requirements such as foodstuffs and lethal stores are either bought by our own Contracts Directorate or manufactured by our own Ordnance Factories.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thinks the Honourable Member explained this fully the other day.

Sardar Mangal Singh: Do Government try to manufacture. . . ..

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Next question.

INCREASE OF THE SPEED OF TRAINS AND REDUCTION OF FARES ON THE MADRAS AND SOUTHERN MAHRATTA RAILWAY.

1098. ***Mr. S. K. Hosmani:** (a) Are Government aware that the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway's 'Frontier Mail' train takes only 24 hours to run from Bombay to Delhi, a distance of 861 miles?

(b) Are Government aware that the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway mail train takes 33 hours and 45 minutes to run from Bangalore to Poona, a distance of 626 miles?

(c) Are Government aware that the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway third class rates for the mail train are $4\frac{20}{163}$ pies per mile?

(d) Are Government aware that the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway third class rates for the mail train are $5\frac{1}{4}$ pies per mile?

(e) Are Government prepared to ask the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Company to reduce the fares? If not, why not?

(f) Are Government prepared to ask the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Company to increase the speed of their trains? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Yes.

(b) The time taken is approximately 32 hours and 45 minutes.

(c) I am not aware how my Honourable friend has arrived at this average. The basis of the third class fares by mail over the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway is as follows:

Miles.	Pies.
First 50	$4\frac{1}{2}$
Plus 51-200	4
Plus 201-300	$3\frac{1}{2}$
Plus over 300	3

(d) This figure seems unquestionably wrong, even as an average, since it is higher than the maximum rate charged. The basis of the third class fares by mail over the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway is as follows:

Miles.	Pies.
First 50	$4\frac{1}{2}$
Plus 51-250	4
Plus over 250	$3\frac{1}{2}$

(e) I am forwarding this suggestion to the Agent for consideration.

(f) It is not always either possible or desirable to provide uniformity in the speed of mail trains on different railways. Varying conditions have to be taken into account in deciding on the speed at which a train should be run, such as the volume and nature of the traffic to be carried, the grade of the track, convenient times for the departure from the originating station and for the arrival at the terminal station, connections with other

trains at junction stations *en route* and the additional expenditure which would be necessary to accelerate the service. If my Honourable friend has any definite suggestions to make, I shall be glad to forward them to the Agent, for consideration.

MILEAGE OR RUNNING ALLOWANCE PAID TO THE STAFF ON STATE RAILWAYS.

1099. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** Will Government please state whether mileage or running allowance paid to the staff on State Railways in India is within the provisions of sub-clause (*iii*) of clause (*a*) of Rule 9 and Rules 15 and 23 of the Fundamental Rules, made under section 96-B of the Government of India Act? If not, by what rule or direction is it governed?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Mileage or running allowance does not fall within the provisions of the rules referred to by the Honourable Member. Running or mileage allowance is governed by paragraph 359 of State Railway Open Line Code, Volume II. I have placed a copy of this paragraph in the Library.

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali: Under what sub-clause of rule 359 does it fall?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Under-sub-clause (*d*) of paragraph 359 which governs running or mileage allowances.

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali: I do not find the word "pay" at all in this sub-clause. May I suggest that this would more appropriately come under "other emoluments"?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I do not follow my Honourable friend.

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali: I will read sub-clause (*d*) of paragraph 359. It runs:

"Mileage allowance is admissible to Guards and Brakesmen at a rate per 100 miles run with a train and is granted on the condition that they shall provide at their own cost uniform in accordance with such patterns as may be approved."

The word "pay" is not at all mentioned here. So am I right in assuming that it will fall under any other emoluments clause?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The reference is to mileage allowance and I do not follow why the word "pay" should come in the definition of mileage allowance.

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali: The other day I put a question, No. 866, which reads as follows:

"Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the old Travelling ticket Inspectors of the Accounts Department on the East Indian Railway were paid mileage allowance which unlike all other forms of travelling allowances was treated as pay for all practical purposes."

Here I mentioned specifically the word "pay" and said that the emoluments were treated as pay for all practical purposes The reply was:

"Yes, up to the end of May 1931. These allowances up to a limit of 75 per cent of pay proper were treated as pay for the purpose of leave salary provident fund and gratuity."

Therefore, I say the word "pay" is not found in this sub-clause.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member cannot discuss a question of interpretation now.

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali: It is a question that if it does not fall within that clause, will it not be. . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is a question of interpretation.

RESTORATION OF SUBSTANTIVE OLD GRADES OF PAY ON STATE RAILWAYS.

1100. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** Will Government please state whether the restoration of substantive old grades of pay *ipso facto* means a claim towards advancement to next higher stages in the old scales of pay of that class of employee on State Railways? If not, under what rule or direction?

Mr. P. R. Rau: A decision on the point must depend on the merits of each case. I am unable to give a categorical reply applicable to all hypothetical cases that may arise.

CERTAIN RETRENCHED EMPLOYEES ON EAST INDIAN RAILWAY RE-EMPLOYED AND BROUGHT UNDER THE REVISED SCALES OF PAY.

1101. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** Will Government please state:

(a) whether it is a fact that in 1931 certain employees on the East Indian Railway working in the Crew System, both temporary and permanent, were discharged from service due to reduction in establishment;

(b) whether it is a fact that this reduction of establishment was analogous to the retrenchment of the staff for administrative purposes;

(c) whether it is a fact that some of such retrenched employees were taken back or re-engaged and offered the same rate of pay which they were drawing at the time of discharge and were fixed in the newly sanctioned grades of the Moody-Ward system;

(d) whether they were given any warning at the time of their re-engagement or re-appointment that their scale of pay will be subject to a revision, if and when introduced;

(e) whether it is a fact that now they are brought under the new (revised) scales of pay, which are much less remunerative; and

(f) whether this is not a contradiction of the orders on the subject and a repeal of the rights and privileges enjoyed so far?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Yes.

(b) So far as temporary staff are concerned, these reductions bear a greater analogy to discharges of staff engaged for a temporary purpose who in cessation of the work for which they were employed are discharged.

(c) to (f). Government have no definite information on these points, but have issued general orders on the applicability of the new rates of pay to employees in service before their discharge and borne on a waiting list. The staff concerned will be dealt with under these rules.

PROMOTION OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1102. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** Will Government please state:

(a) whether promotions from grade II, Travelling Ticket Examiners on East Indian Railway to grade I are made according to seniority or on some other factors;

(b) whether uniform rules on the subject are in force on all Divisions of the East Indian Railway;

(c) whether these posts are time-scale or selection grade posts; and

(d) whether the duties of Travelling Ticket Examiners grade I and grade II are same or different; if different, in what respects?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government have no information. These promotions are governed by rules laid down by the railway administrations to whom full powers have been delegated.

SENIORITY LIST OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS AND TICKET COLLECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1103. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** (a) Will Government please state whether it is a fact that the seniority list of the Travelling Ticket Examiners and Ticket Collectors has been communicated in some of the Divisions on the East Indian Railway Administration and is kept confidential in others?

(b) Will Government please state why the staff should not know their position in respect of seniority?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government have no information, but are making enquiries, and I will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

RATE OF PAY ADMISSIBLE TO A TICKET COLLECTOR WORKING AS TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINER ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1104. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** Will Government please state the rate of pay admissible to a Ticket Collector, grade III, when ordered to work as Travelling Ticket Examiner grade II on the East Indian Railway Administration?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The actual rate of pay will be determined in each case by the Accounts Officer at the time having regard to all the circumstances. The scales of pay are as follows:

	Rs.
Ticket Collectors, grade III	37—3—52
Travelling Ticket Examiners, grade II . . .	55—3—64

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali: Are the allowances referred to in clauses (c) to (e) of paragraph 359 to be determined at the time the person is engaged and are final in each and every respect during the term of service in that class?

Mr. P. R. Rau: It is quite impossible for me, by way of an answer to supplementary question, to interrupt every Article of the State Railway Code.

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali: It is a simple question and my friend himself referred to paragraph 359. I am asking whether this is to be determined at the time the person is engaged and are final in each and every respect during the term of service in that class.

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have not referred to paragraph 359 in reply to this question. My Honourable friend's supplementary question might be relevant on another question, but not on this.

†1105*—1109*.

PRODUCE OF THE LAND OF THE ISTIMRARI AREA OF SATHANA, AJMER-MERWARA.

1110. ***Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur:** Will Government please place on the table of this House a comparative statement showing the rate of rent payable (a) by the tenants of the *Khalsa* area of Ajmer-Merwara, and (b) by the tenants of Daulatpura in the Istimrari area of Sathana (Ajmer-Merwara) in respect of (i) per *bigha* of *chahi* land and (ii) per *bigha* of *Barani* land?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: With your permission, Sir, I shall answer questions Nos. 1110 and 1111 together. The information is being collected, and a reply will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is there any legislation to regulate the relations between the Istimrardars and their tenants in this particular area?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: There is no legislation at present.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do Government propose to bring forward any legislative proposal before this House to regulate those relations?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: My Honourable friend had better wait for the next question where this point has been raised.

PRODUCE OF THE LAND OF THE ISTIMRARI AREA OF SATHANA, AJMER-MERWARA.

‡1111. ***Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur:** Will Government please enquire and state what proportion of the earning of the tenants from the land is realised as rent (i) in the *Khalsa* area (Ajmer-Merwara) and (ii) in the village Daulatpura, in the Istimrari area of Sathana (Ajmer-Merwara)?

---

†These questions were disallowed by the Honourable the President.

‡For answer to this question, *see* answer to question No. 1110.

ENQUIRY ABOUT THE CONDITION OF THE TENANTS OF THE ISTIMRARDARS OF AJMER-MERWARA.

1112. *Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: (a) Is it a fact that a committee of enquiry was appointed in Ajmer-Merwara to enquire into the condition of the tenants of the Istimrardars of Ajmer-Merwara?

(b) Is it a fact that one of the members of the said committee of enquiry was Rai Sahib Mithan Lal who has been, for many years, the legal adviser and counsel of the Raja Sahib of Pisangan and other Istimrardars of Ajmer-Merwara?

(c) Is it a fact that Rai Sahib Kishan Lal, the then Extra Assistant Commissioner, Merwara, was also a member of the said committee of enquiry?

(d) Is it a fact that after the completion of the work of the said committee of enquiry the said Rai Sahib Kishen Lal was appointed as Kamdar of the Rao Sahib of Masuda, a prominent Istimrardar of Ajmer-Merwara?

(e) Is it a fact that Diwan Bahadur Har Bilas Sarda was also a member of the said committee of enquiry?

(f) Are Government aware that the Istimrardars of Ajmer-Merwara have a well-established and consolidated organisation, whereas the tenants of the Istimrari area of Ajmer-Merwara have no such organisation?

(g) Is it a fact that while the proceedings of the said committee of enquiry were going on, ordinances were made applicable to several Istimrari areas of Ajmer-Merwara?

(h) Is it a fact that the tenants were not allowed to engage any lawyer except the two named by the Local Administration in connection with the proceedings of the said committee of enquiry?

(i) Is it a fact that the said committee of enquiry completed its work more than one year ago?

(j) Is it a fact that the said committee of enquiry has not yet published the results of its enquiry?

(k) If what are stated at parts (a) to (j) above are facts, what steps do Government propose to take in the matter?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) A committee was appointed to enquire into the question of the relationship between the Istimrardars and their tenants.

(b) Rai Sahib Mithan Lal was a member of the Committee. He is not, however, legal adviser to any particular Istimrardar, though he may, on occasion, be briefed by Istimrardars as by other clients.

(c) Yes.

(d) Yes.

(e) No, Sir.

(f) There is a recently formed organisation called the Istimrardars' Association.

(g) No, Sir.

(h) No lawyers were allowed to appear for either party in a professional capacity. Two local lawyers were examined as witnesses by reason of their knowledge of the subject.

(i) and (j). Yes.

(k) The question of how best to place the relations between Istimrardars and their tenants on a satisfactory basis is receiving the attention of Government.

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: May I know if the Committee appointed by Government has submitted its report?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The Committee to which my Honourable friend has referred in the question submitted its report in 1933.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Has any action been taken on that report?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: No, Sir; no action has been taken on that report, because, on a consideration of it, both the Chief Commissioner and the Government of India came to the conclusion that it does not satisfactorily solve the problem.

ENQUIRY ABOUT THE CONDITION OF THE TENANTS OF THE ISTIMRARDARS OF AJMER-MERWARA.

1113. ***Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur:** Do Government propose to appoint a committee of enquiry with Members selected from the Legislative Assembly, to enquire into the condition and grievances of the tenants of the Istimrari area of Ajmer-Merwara and to suggest the ways and means of improving their condition?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer I have given to part (k) of question No. 1112 just now.

CESSES REALISED IN THE ISTIMRARI AREAS OF AJMER-MERWARA BYTHE ISTIMRARDES.

1114. ***Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur:** (a) Will Government please enquire and state what the names and descriptions of the cesses realised from the tenants and other residents in the various Istimrari areas of Ajmer-Merwara by the Istimrardars are?

(b) Is it a fact that in the *Khalsa* areas in Ajmer-Merwara tenants and other residents are not required to pay any cesses? If it is not a fact, will Government please state what cesses the tenants and other residents of the said *Khalsa* areas are required to pay?

(c) Is it a fact that in the Istimrari areas of Ajmer-Merwara, the police, educational institutions, hospitals, and other institutions of public welfare are maintained by Government at Government expense?

(d) If the reply to the question in part (c) above be in the affirmative, will Government please state why the Istimrardars are allowed to realise cesses?

(e) What steps do Government propose to take in the matter?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) Complete information in reply to this part of this question is not readily available. The matter is one of great complexity, and I have asked for certain further information. A reply will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

(b) The answer to the first part is in the negative. Tenants in the Khalsa areas are required to pay cesses like the Veterinary, Dispensary, *Chowkidari* and District Fund cesses

(c) As in the case of the other residents of the district, the Istimrardars make no special contribution towards the cost of the regular police force of the district, but they pay their own *Chowkidars* or rural police. District Board cesses are paid by all Istimrardars into the District Board Fund and, from this fund, expenditure on schools, dispensaries and other institutions is met. In addition to these, special and voluntary contributions have been made by certain Istimrardars, namely for a school and hospital in Bhinai and for two dispensaries and schools in Masuda

(d) Does not arise.

(e) I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer to part (k) of question No. 1112.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Who manages these hospitals and schools for which cesses are paid by tenants through these Istimrardars?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I presume they are managed by the District Board.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is the Honourable Member aware of the fact that in other areas of this country these cesses are paid directly by the tenants to the Government concerned and not through Istimrardars or any other intermediary?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: My Honourable friend is imparting information, but I am dealing with Ajmer-Merwara.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE RULERS OF INDIAN STATES.

1115. ***Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if any negotiations are being carried on with the Rulers of Indian States? If so, what is the nature of the negotiations?

(b) Do these negotiations consist of allocation of customs revenue or any such financial commitments?

(c) Having regard to the large interests of British Indians involved in such negotiations, do Government propose to consult this Assembly or any non-official Indians or at least to appraise this House with the progress of the negotiations?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) and (b). I have presumed that the Honourable Member's question relates to financial negotiations with States in connection with the Federation On that assumption the answer is in the negative.

(c) Does not arise.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Is it not a fact that the Government of India have come to some arrangement with the State of Baroda with regard to the customs revenue?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Has the Honourable Member's question nothing to do with financial negotiations in connection with the Federation, but is an independent question?

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Independent of the Federation.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: In giving the answer "No", I presumed that the Honourable Member's question related to financial negotiations with the States in connection with the Federation.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: At any rate I did not say so.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Perhaps I can clear up the position. There have been negotiations with Baroda in relation to their customs right, but they have no relation whatever with Federation.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: My question does not relate to the Federation at all

Mr President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has got the answer that negotiations have been going on with regard to their customs rates.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: May I know what is the nature of the negotiations going on?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: If the Honourable Member will put down a question, I will see that he gets as full an answer as it is possible to give.

Rates for the Supply of Materials to Provincial Governments, Railways, etc., by the Indian Stores Department.

1116. ***Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if the Indian Stores Department supply materials to Provincial Governments or local authorities, Railways or contractors of any of these authorities at the same rate at which the department purchases these materials? If not, does the department sell these materials at higher rates? If so, how are these rates fixed?

(b) Is it a fact that contractors are bound to take material from the Indian Stores Department, even though the rates charged by the department are considerably higher than those available in the open market?

(c) Is it a fact that contractors are asked to calculate for their tenders at the rates at which the department sell these materials to them?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The Indian Stores Department does not hold any stocks, but arranges for the supply of stores to Provincial Governments, local bodies and Railways, on receipt of indents, for which the indenting authorities are required to pay the actual cost *plus* a fee of one per cent. for purchase and one per cent. for inspection (if the stores are also inspected) for the services of the Department. The

Indian Stores Department is not authorised to make purchases on behalf of contractors

(b) and (c). The supply of materials to contractors is regulated by the terms of the contracts entered into by them with the authorities placing the contracts. As already explained, the Indian Stores Department does not sell any materials to contractors, nor is that Department concerned with the fixation of rates for materials issued to contractors from the stores of the departments concerned with the projects.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Does not the Department charge local bodies higher rate of charges than those at which those materials can be supplied by the customers?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: If a local body asks the Indian Stores Department to make its purchases for it, all it is required to pay in addition to the actual cost is, as I have stated, the charge of one per cent. for purchase and one per cent. for inspection. If the local body gets its stores from somewhere else, I obviously cannot say what it is charged for them. I am only dealing with the Indian Stores Department.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is it true that sometimes these local bodies can get these goods cheaper directly themselves than through the Indian Stores Department?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: They are not bound to use the services of the Indian Stores Department. They are not compelled to purchase through the Indian Stores Department. They can get their stores wherever they like. If they use the services of the Indian Stores Department, it is obviously because they consider that a satisfactory way of making their purchases.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Does the Stores Department require the railways to purchase only through them?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The Stores Department cannot require any Department of Government to purchase only through them. That is a matter for Government, not for the Stores Department to decide.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: If any Department wants to purchase through the Stores Department, does the Stores Department issue tenders for them or give orders to some particular firms?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Obviously, if the Stores Department is asked to make a purchase, it must issue tenders.

EMPLOYMENT OF LABOUR THROUGH INTERMEDIARIES IN BURMA.

1117. *Prof. N. G. Ranga: (a) Are Government aware that shipping agents in Burma permit their cooly maistries to employ, dismiss and pay labour engaged in loading and unloading work of ocean-going steamers?

(b) Has the Royal Commission on Labour said in its remarks on employment through intermediaries that there is no part of India where responsibility for labour is delegated to the extent prevailing in Burma and that so long as the worker is dependent for the reward of his labour on a subordinate agent of an employer, there is little security against abuse?

(c) Are Government aware that in the dock labour of Rangoon, most of the subordinate agents of employers, namely, cooly maistries, take compulsory wage contributions, make reductions in wages, under-employ men in gangs and dismiss any labourer who protests against these practices?

(d) Are Government aware that in shipping labour at Rangoon only 50 per cent. of the work is given to Indian labourers, that the maistry system tends to keep more men, a labourer hardly gets at present more than four days' work in the month, that the maistry takes two days' wages from every four days' work a labourer gets, and with the heavy reductions made in wages by the maistry, it is becoming very difficult for a labourer to subsist?

(e) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the resolution adopted at the Burma Provincial Labour Conference held in Rangoon on January 11th and 12th of this year and presided over by Mr. N. M. Joshi, M.L.A., protesting against the evils of the maistry system?

(f) Has the attention of Government been drawn to a book called "Contract Labour in Burma" by Mr A. Narayana Rao, formerly a member of the Burma Legislative Council, in which the facsimile of a document written by a cooly maistry and attested by two witnesses showing his sources of income from compulsory contributions, under-employment of men and reductions in wages, is reproduced?

(g) Will Government be pleased to state whether they are prepared to call for a report from the Government of Burma on contract labour in docks with special reference to (i) compulsory contributions, (ii) reductions made in wages, (iii) under-employment of men, (iv) arrears in wages, and (v) the period of wage payment?

(h) Will Government please lay on the table a statement showing figures for the years 1932, 1933 and 1934, month by month, for the port of Rangoon in regard to:

(i) the loading and unloading work in ships given to Burman and Indian labourers;

(ii) the number of Burman and Indian labourers employed; and

(iii) the amount of wages paid to Burman and Indian workmen, respectively?

(i) Have the Government of Burma taken any action against the abuses in contract labour? If so, in what manner?

(j) Have the Government of Burma carried out any recommendations of the Royal Commission on Labour? If so, in what respect?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a), (c) and (d). Welfare of Labour is primarily the concern of the Local Government and the Government of India have no information beyond that contained in the Report of the Royal Commission on Labour in India.

(b) Yes.

(e) Yes: the actual dates were January 12th and 13th.

(f) Yes.

(g) The matter is primarily the concern of the Local Government.

(h) The information is not available and Government are of opinion that the time and labour which would be spent on collecting it would not be justified by the results to be obtained.

(i) and (j). Yes. The Honourable Member is referred to the Third Report recently supplied to him on the action taken on the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Labour.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Are Government prepared to call for a report upon the social ameliorative steps taken by the Government of Burma in answer to parts (a) and (c)?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I understand that, in regard to this matter, my Honourable colleague, the Industries Member, recently received a deputation when this question was placed before him, and I understand further that the matter is receiving the consideration of my Honourable colleague.

STATION MASTERS AND ASSISTANT STATION MASTERS FAILING IN NIGHT VISION TEST ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

1118. ***Mr. H. M. Abdullah:** (a) Will Government please state how Station Masters and Assistant Station Masters, who fail in night-vision test, are dealt with on the North Western Railway?

(b) Is it a fact that one Shahabuddin, Assistant Station Master, New Delhi, who failed in night-vision test, was not provided in any other capacity, whereas one Raghbir Das, Station Master, Sampla, of the same grade, who also failed in night-vision test has been provided in a higher grade and if so, why?

(c) How do Government justify their action with their present policy of encouraging the recruitment of more Muslims on the North Western Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) The instructions are that staff who have failed in the eyesight test should be offered suitable employment as far as possible.

(b) Government have no information.

(c) Government cannot see that the case referred to in part (b) of the question has any bearing on the general policy of representation of Muslims in the railway services.

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi: Are Government aware that many promising young Muslims have been discharged on this very ground without being offered any other jobs?

Mr. P. R. Rau: If my Honourable friend has any specific instances to show that this is the general practice in any particular railway, I shall consider the matter.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA DEPARTMENTS WITH STORES PURCHASING AGENCIES.

1119. *Mr S. Satyamurti: Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) what the Departments of the Government of India are which have got stores purchasing agencies, apart from the Indian Stores Department,

(b) the reasons why they are so having them; and

(c) whether there are any proposals for amalgamating them?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Regular stores purchasing agencies, besides the Indian Stores Department, exist under the following Departments and officers:

(1) Army Department

(2) Railway Department.

(3) Controller of Printing and Stationery in India.

(4) Surveyor-General of India.

(5) Director-General, Indian Medical Service.

(b) Separate purchasing agencies are needed to deal with stores which are excluded from the scope of the activities of the Indian Stores Department, such as food-stuffs, medical supplies, stationery articles and locomotives.

(c) Does not arise.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know by whom these categories are excluded from the scope of activities of the Indian Stores Department?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Because they are specialised articles, and the Departments concerned consider it preferable that their own expert officers should deal with them.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have Government considered the question, from the point of view of the tax-payer, as to whether purchasing these articles independent of the Indian Stores Department may not entail a larger cost?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Yes; that aspect of the question has been considered and I may mention that in recent years the Railway Department has entrusted more and more work to the Indian Stores Department.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know if there are any proposals for amalgamating or rather abolishing these, and instituting a central purchasing department for all Departments of the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: There is no question of the abolition of these departments: as regards the one of which I have special knowledge—the Department of the Controller of Stationery and Printing —that Department does not employ any additional officers to deal with its purchases: that is done as part of the ordinary work of the office. That is the position there.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Why should the Army Department have a separate purchasing department?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think we have discussed that question already at great length in answer to supplementary questions: it has been referred to only this morning.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know the reasons why Government do not propose to amalgamate all these departments? Is it based on the consideration of cost?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) That is really discussing the policy.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is it not desirable, in the interests of economy and cheap purchase that all the requirements of the Government should be purchased through one department?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is again discussing policy

INDIANISATION OF THE ARMY.

1120. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** (a) Will Government state their policy with regard to the Indianisation of the Army?

(b) In view of the recommendations of the Expert Committee after the Round Table Conference, has the Government policy with regard to the pace of the Indianisation changed?

(c) Are Government aware of the recommendations of the Skeen and Rawlinson Committees which contemplate the complete Indianisation of the Army within 30 years?

(d) Is the present pace of Indianisation in consonence with Skeen and Rawlinson Committees? If not, why not?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: In reply to the Honourable Member's question, I do not think there is anything I can add to the information I gave the House in reply to Mr. Satyamurti's Short Notice Question on the 5th March and in my speech on the motion to reduce the Army Department grant on the 12th March, 1935.

APPLICATIONS FOR SALT CONCESSIONS UNDER THE GANDHI-IRWIN PACT.

1121. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** (a) Will Government state in view of the Finance Member's reply to starred question No. 543 on the 26th February, 1935, who the local officer is to whom the applications for salt concessions under the Gandhi-Irwin Pact should be sent?

(b) What are the considerations which are taken into account to decide this matter?

(c) In case he makes an adverse order, who are the people to whom an appeal lies against that order?

(d) Is there a final appeal to the Government of India against the decision of the local officer?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) to (d) In areas from which the concession has not been withdrawn, there is no need for any applications; but if any villagers are in doubt as to the extent of their privileges under the concession, their enquiries would readily be answered by the local officers of the Salt Department or the Revenue Department.

As regards the restoration of the concession in areas from which it has been withdrawn, I have already stated in this House that applications are to be dealt with by the local officers in consultation with the Local Government but I do not know what arrangements, the Government of Madras have actually made in the matter The Government of India have no intention of circumscribing the discretion of the Madras Government in this matter, either as regards the arrangements for dealing with applications or as regards their decision upon them and, in these circumstances, the question of an appeal to the Government of India against a decision of the local authorities does not arise.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is the Honourable Member aware of the fact that even in those districts, where this particular concession is extended, the local police are threatening the masses and preventing them from manufacturing salt?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I am not aware of that, Sir. As I said, this is a matter which is left to the Local Government.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will he ascertain and see whether what I have just stated is a fact or not?

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What is the answer to clause (b)? What are the considerations which are taken into account?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The considerations which the Local Government decide to take into consideration.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will he ascertain whether what I said is a fact or not?

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What are those considerations?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I cannot answer two supplementary questions at the same time.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question, please.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: Sir, I have been authorised by Mr. Chattopadhyaya to put the questions standing in his name.

Position of the Indian Museum regarding certain Particulars after the Repeal of the Indian Museum Acts, 1876 and 1887.

1122. ***Dr. P. N. Banerjea** (on behalf of Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya): (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether section 17 of Act X of 1910, which repealed the Indian Museum Acts, XXII of 1876 and IV of 1887, also repealed the Preamble to Act XXII of 1876?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government please lay on the table the express and definite sections of Act X of 1910 regarding (i) provision for the cost of repair of the Museum buildings, (ii) provision for the payment of the salaries, allowances and pensions of the officers and servants of the Trustees of the Indian Museum, (iii) all other expenses of the Indian Museum; and (iv) the change in the status of the officers and servants of the Trustees of the Indian Museum consequent on the repeal of the Preamble?

(c) Is it a fact that that section of Act X of 1910 was repealed by Act X of 1914 (II Schedule)? If so, why and with what effect?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) Yes.

(b) The Act is available in the Library for the perusal of the Honourable Member, who will be in a position to form his own opinion as to the presence or otherwise therein of provisions of the nature which he has in mind. Government do not share the Honourable Member's view that the Act introduced any change in the status of the officers and servants of the trustees.

(c) Yes. The section was repealed in pursuance of the established practice whereby repealing provisions are themselves repealed, when a suitable opportunity presents itself, with a view to the removal from the Statute-book of provisions which have accomplished their effect. By virtue of section 6 of the General Clauses Act the repeal of a repealing provision does not operate to revive the enactment repealed by the earlier repealing provision or otherwise to affect the law in force immediately before the enactment of the second repealing provision

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: When does the Honourable Member expect to repeal this Act?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: No occasion has arisen to repeal the present Act

COST OF ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TRUSTEES OF THE INDIAN MUSEUM.

1123. ***Dr. P. N. Banerjea** (on behalf of Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya): (a) Is it a fact that the officers and servants of the Trustees of the Indian Museum ceased to be Government servants from 1910, and if so, why was it decided in 1916 that the charge on account of the cost of establishment of the Trustees of the Indian Museum falls on the Government of India and not on the Trustees of the Indian Museum [as admitted by Government in reply to starred question No. 474 (b), dated the 5th March, 1930] ?

(b) Will Government please lay on the table a copy of (i) the exact section of any Statute by which the charge on account of the cost of establishment of a private body like the Trustees of the Indian Museum falls on the Government; (ii) the exact section of any Statute by which the officers and servants of a private body can be deemed to be *public* servants; and (iii) the section under which a private body like the Trustees of the Indian Museum are exempted from contributing anything towards the upkeep of their Institution?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) It is not a fact that the officers and servants of the trustees ceased to be Government servants from 1910. They never were Government servants; nor is it the case that the charge on account of the cost of establishment of the trustees falls on the Government of India and not on the trustees. It falls on the trustees and is defrayed from the revenues of the trustees, which include an annual grant from Central revenues.

(b) In view of the answer to part (a), the remainder of the question does not arise.

†1124* and 1125*.

REFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO CERTAIN CANDIDATES TO APPEAR AT THE INDIAN AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS SERVICE EXAMINATION OF 1934.

1126. ***Dr. P. N. Banerjea** (on behalf of Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya): (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact:

(i) that about 85 per cent. of the candidates who applied for admission to the Indian Audit and Accounts Service Examination of 1934, were refused permission to sit for the examination; and

(ii) that the candidates were informed whether they had been selected or not, when there were barely 12 days left for the examination?

(b) If so, will Government please state the main considerations which weighed with them in selecting candidates for the examination?

(c) Are Government aware that this belated intimation was responsible for causing too much worry and wastage of energy in the case of those candidates who were not selected for the examination?

(d) Why did not the Public Service Commission issue an intimation to the candidates at least two months before the date of the examination? Is it a fact that the applications for admission to the examination had to be submitted by the candidates prior to 21st July, 1934? If so, why?

(e) Are Government prepared to consider whether candidates should not be informed at least two months before the examination, so far as future examinations are concerned with a view to avoid undue hardship?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) to (d). I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply given to parts (a) to (f) of question No. 320 asked by Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar on the 18th of February, 1935.

(e) The circumstances of last year's examination were abnormal, and longer notice will, if possible, be given on future occasions. The Public Service Commission do not, however, consider that it will be practicable to give as much as two months' notice.

---

†These questions were withdrawn by the questioner.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Will the Honourable Member consider the advisability of giving a longer notice than 12 days to intending candidates? There is serious inconvenience.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That is the question which I have answered. Yes, the Public Service Commission will, if possible, give longer notice on future occasions. They don't think they can give two full months' notice asked in the question.

GRADUATES BELONGING TO THE DEPRESSED AND MINORITY COMMUNITIES APPOINTED ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1127. ***Dr. P. N. Banerjea** (on behalf of Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya). (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact:

(i) that the graduates belonging to the depressed and minority communities who were appointed on the basis of 24 hours' notice on the East Indian Railway, were started on a pay of Rs. 60 per mensem;

(ii) that almost all the graduates appointed on the result of the Appendix 'B' examination and of far superior educational attainments were started on the minimum pay of the grade, *viz.*, Rs. 32 per mensem; and

(iii) that in 1931, in reply to certain representations on the subject, Mr. T. R. V. Sarma, the then Deputy Chief Accounts Officer, East Indian Railway stated that the lower pay in the case of Appendix 'B' passed graduates was due to their stability of service?

(b) Is it a fact that these graduates of the minority communities have also been confirmed and they have been allowed to retain the benefit of about double the starting pay as compared with Appendix 'B' passed graduates?

(c) Has it been decided that competing in a All-India competitive examination like the Appendix 'B' examination is a disqualification for the purpose of determining the eligibility for higher starting pay?

(d) Do Government propose to review the matter and refix the pay of the graduates appointed on the result of the Appendix 'B' examinations held in April, 1929 and October, 1929 by allowing the same starting pay as compared with graduates of the minority communities? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) (i). In the Railway Accounts Department it used to be the practice to grant at the discretion of the Chief Accounts Officer, higher initial pay than the minimum, according to educational qualifications, to all temporary clerks recruited as a purely temporary measure otherwise than through the competitive examination; such initial pay did not depend on the community to which the clerks belong.

(ii) The initial pay of clerks recruited through the Appendix B Examination is fixed at varying rates according to the marks obtained by each candidate.

(iii) Government have no information.

(b) Certain temporary clerks, who had originally been recruited on higher rates of initial pay and had survived the retrenchment campaign and been declared as fit for permanent retention in service after examination of their work and capabilities, have as a special case, been allowed to retain the higher initial pay originally granted to them.

(c) No; higher starting pay was granted in all cases in which it was due under the terms on which the examination was held.

(d) No; for the reasons explained in reply to part (c) of the question.

STAFF OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT BROUGHT UNDER NEW LEAVE RULES.

1128. ***Dr. P. N. Banerjea** (on behalf of Mr Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya): (a) Is it a fact that the staff appointed in the East Indian Railway Accounts Department after the 1st September, 1928, but prior to the 1st April, 1930, were not given any warning at the time of their appointment that they would be brought under the new leave rules on their introduction, and that they have been compulsorily brought under the same rules?

(b) Is it also a fact:

(i) that even permanent employees appointed prior to the 1st April, 1930 and recruited on the result of the Appendix 'B' Examination as prescribed in the Financial Commissioner of Railways' memorandum No 5565-F., dated the 31st July, 1929, have been compulsorily brought under the new State Railway Leave Rules, although the 'letter of appointment' issued to them by the Controller of Railway Accounts did not contain any such stipulation; and

(ii) that the employees appointed in the office of the Controller of Railway Accounts have been permitted to remain under the old set of leave rules in similar circumstances?

(c) Is it not a fact that in accordance with the provisions of letter No. 270/CRA-E/33, dated the 17th August, 1934 from the Director of Finance, Railway Board to the Controller of Railway Accounts, the employees mentioned in parts (a) and (b) above can remain under the old set of leave rules?

(d) If so, do Government propose to issue a letter elucidating the whole position and granting the concession to the employees cited above?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) and (b). Employees belonging to offices or organisations where the intention to apply the new leave rules to future recruits had been made known generally were brought on the new leave rules if they were appointed after the 1st September, 1928. They have not been allowed to take advantage of accidental omissions on the part of their official superiors to take formal declarations from them that they would be governed by the new leave rules The Railway Board understand that on the East Indian Railway it was quite well-known to the staff that persons appointed after 1st September, 1928, would be governed by the

new leave rules; on the other hand the relevant orders of the Railway Board had not even been communicated to the Controller of Railway Accounts, the staff in whose office had, therefore, no similar warning.

(c) No.

(d) No.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDIAN MERCANTILE MARINE AND PARTICIPATION OF INDIAN SHIPPING IN THE COASTAL AND OVERSEAS TRADE OF INDIA.

1129 *Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether in face of the provisions set forth in paragraph 353 of the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report as under:

"We think that separate provision should be made for the case of ships and shipping; and it should be enacted that ships registered in U. K. are not to be subjected by law in British India to any discrimination whatsoever, as regards the ships, officers or crew, or her passengers or cargo, to which ships registered in British India would not be subjected in U. K."

(i) it will be possible for Government to develop national shipping by the method recognised in all maritime countries of the world and approved by the Indian Mercantile Marine Committee of reserving the coastal trade to national shipping, and

(ii) whether it will be possible for Government to enact a measure on the lines recommended by the Indian Mercantile Marine Committee, whereby the steamers plying in the coastal waters will have to employ at least 50 per cent. of their officers and engineers from among the cadets coming out of the Training Ship "Dufferin" and obtaining their certificates of competency?

(b) If the reply to part (a) (i) be in the negative, will Government be pleased to state what effective steps they propose to take to develop Indian Mercantile Marine and to carry out their oft-repeated policy of arranging for an adequate participation of Indian shipping in the coastal and overseas trade of the country?

(c) If the answer to part (a) (ii) be in the negative, will Government be pleased to state if it is not a fact that the *ex*-cadets of the Training Ship "Dufferin", who have obtained their certificates of competency, have not been employed by the British shipping companies plying on the coast in a number in consonance with the number of their steamers plying in the Indian coastal waters?

(d) If the reply to part (c) be in the affirmative, are Government aware that in the absence of the employment of such officers by the British shipping companies in such a number as may be in consonance with the number of the steamers plying in these waters, the *ex*-cadets of the Training Ship "Dufferin", obtaining their certificates of competency, either as executive officers or marine engineers, are likely to remain without employment and the building up of an Indian sea personnel is likely to receive a serious set back?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) The reply is, I think, in the negative.

(b) Reference is invited to the answers given on the 27th February, 1935, to question No. 632 by Mr. N. V. Gadgil and the supplementary questions thereto.

(c) and (d). All the *ex*-Dufferin cadets, who had obtained certificates of competency as second mates up to the end of last year, have been employed either by shipping companies or in the Bengal Pilot Service or by Port Trusts. In this connection the Government of India will take steps to impress on all shipping companies, whether British or Indian, engaged in the coastal trade, the importance of employing duly qualified Indian officers in adequate numbers.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Will the Honourable Member be good enough to read out the answers which were given previously?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I do not know what my Honourable friend is referring to.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: The Honourable Member in his answer referred to the replies given by him to Mr. Gadgil's questions and to the supplementary questions. Have you got those answers there? If so, will you please read them out?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): They were answered only the other day.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: May I know if Government are aware of the fact that the Shipping Ministry in England has given several millions by way of subsidy for the development of shipping in England?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I believe, Sir, that an announcement on those lines was made some time ago.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Is it a fact that several countries today have restricted their coastal trade to their own nationals?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: That also, I think, is correct.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Is it a fact that the shipping industry in India is in an infant and backward state as compared with the tremendous advance that England has made in this matter?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Indian shipping is developing every day.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Yes, I hope so, but in spite of that, is it a fact that the development that has taken place so far does not entitle it to come within even a hundred miles of the progress that the shipping industry has made in England?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: That is perfectly true, but shipping in England began long before India made a start.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Is it a fact in the circumstances that Indian shipping, except with the help and protection that may be extended to it by Government, will not be in a position to compete with British shipping?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: My Honourable friend is, I understand, a non-violent co-operator, no one would accuse him of being a violent co-operator, and I do not see why he should prefer militant methods when I think we can reach the same objective by other means to which I have already referred in this House.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I ask the Honourable Member what are those other steps which he has in mind and the Government have in mind, by which they will be able to protect and develop the Indian coastal shipping?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Amicable settlement between the parties concerned in the coastal trade of India.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: That is to say, only if the British shipping companies agreed?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: So far as my own experience is concerned, I have not found it an impossible task to get the British shipping companies to agree to a reasonable arrangement.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: In view of the provision in the report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee, will it be possible for Government to exercise any pressure on British shipping companies if they do not agree to their suggestion for an amicable settlement?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: My Honourable friend is still thinking in terms of pressure. I am prepared to think in other terms as I have already said.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Does the Honourable Member depend and rely on their piety?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: No. I depend and rely upon their good sense.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: And pray for it, as the Honourable the Finance Member will pray for industrial development?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: My Honourable friend is at liberty to do so.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know what they have achieved till now by amicable settlement in the way of preserving the coastal trade?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That does not arise. That is too general a question.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: May I draw attention to pages 236 and 574 of the Sea-Borne Trade of India where it is said that India exports rice to Ceylon and Ceylon exports rice to India . . . .

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I do not see what it has got to do with shipping.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: It is in connection with a certain wrong statement made by the Commerce Member.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: When did I make a wrong statement?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is it in connection with this question?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: No.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim). Then the Chair does not think it can be allowed.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Will the Honourable the Commerce Member secure for Indian shipping by means of an amicable settlement a share in the coastal trade of Great Britain in the United Kingdom?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: There is nothing to prevent their trying to enter into that trade.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Will the Honourable the Commerce Member make an effort to secure by means of an amicable settlement a certain portion of that trade reserved for Indian shipping.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: My Honourable friend is comparing things which are not alike. So far as the coastal trade of India is concerned, British shipping is already established here and has been established for a long number of years. Up to the present, so far as I know, no Indian shipping has taken any part in the British coastal trade.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Exactly because Indian shipping is not established in England and we expect reciprocity from England and to work wonders through amicable settlement, I was putting the question, which I repeat, will the Honourable the Commerce Member, therefore, try to secure a share in English coastal shipping for the Indian shipping which has not yet had any opportunity of making a start there?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I have already given my reply, and that is, that the two cases are not on all fours.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: But, Oh, we are slaves and they are free!

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): No. 1130.

GARHWALI PRISONERS CONVICTED FOR PESHAWAR OCCURRENCES OF 1930 STILL IN JAIL.

1130. *Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: (a) How many of the Garhwali prisoners convicted for Peshawar occurrences of 1930 are still in jail?

(b) When were they convicted?

(c) Were they tried by a civil or military tribunal?

(d) What was the sentence in each case?

(e) Do Government propose to release them?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) Four.

(b) On the 6th June, 1930.

(c) By court martial.

(d) One was sentenced for life, one for 15 years and two for 10 years each.

(e) Not at present, but His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief reviews their sentences every year.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: What were these people convicted of?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Mutiny.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Is it a fact that they were convicted for failure to fire on an unarmed crowd at Peshawar?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: No.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: What was the exact nature of the mutiny?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Refusal to obey certain orders.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: What were the orders that they disobeyed?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I should require notice of that question. I cannot quote the exact orders, but they were in connection with the disturbances in Peshawar.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Have not the Garhwali battalions acted most gallantly in the various theatres of war during the Great War?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Yes, Sir.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Did some of the Garhwalis at least secure the Victoria Cross?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I should require notice of that. Very possibly.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Is it a fact that Garhwal provides a large number of recruits for the army?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Yes.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Are they not entitled to sympathetic consideration—the case of these people?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Yes, the Garhwalis are entitled to it and they get it.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Is it a fact that some of the other Garhwali soldiers who had been convicted and sentenced for similar offences have been released before their term?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: There were altogether 17 soldiers who were convicted in this case and sentenced to varying terms of imprisonment. Of those 17, 13 have already been released before their sentences had fully expired and there are four left. These four were the ringleaders in this case and they received the longest sentences. I think the Honourable Member will realise the gravity of their offence and the impossibility of releasing at this stage people who were sentenced to life terms of imprisonment or long periods of 15 years, when the incident only happened five years ago.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Is it a fact that these soldiers have already undergone five years' imprisonment for a technical offence?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: It was not a technical offence. It was mutiny, which is a very serious offence.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Did they use their arms against anybody? What sort of mutiny did they commit?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thinks the Honourable Member has asked for notice of that question.

Glass Bangle Industry.

1131. ***Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** (a) Are Government aware that the glass bangle industry is being hard hit by the Japanese competition and that it stands in need of expert scientific advice?

(b) What are the measures which Government have already taken to give it expert advice?

(c) What further measures do Government propose to take to help the industry and give expert advice?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a), (b) and (c). The Government of India have received no recent representation from this industry and I am unable to confirm the Honourable Member's opinion that Japanese competition is particularly severe at the present time. The question of giving technical advice to the industry is one for the Local Government to consider.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Is it a fact that the import of bangles is increasing?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No. My information is to the contrary.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: What is the present extent of the import?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The figures I have shown that the imports of Japanese bangles for 1932-33 were to the value of Rs. 22 lakhs, for 1933-34, Rs. 13 lakhs. We have no information later than that.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Is it a fact that the amount has gone up during the last financial year?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have given the figures for the last financial year.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: In 1934-35.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: That is the current financial year. Unfortunately I have not been able to get the figures for that year. They are not yet available.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Will the Honourable Member be able to look into the figures for the last calendar year then?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have given the figures for the last financial year. We have not got further information for the current year, but I will make an effort to get it as soon as possible.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I speak of the calendar year and not the financial year.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No. Unfortunately the figures are for the financial year and not for the calendar year.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Really unfortunate in this case!

CONDITION OF WORKING IN THE MIXING PROCESS OF THE GLASS BANGLE INDUSTRY.

1132. ***Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** (a) Are Government aware that the bangle mixing process of the industry entails constant hazards, *e.g.*, inhalation of poisons and lead poisons?

(b) Are Government aware that the conditions of work in those factories, *i.e.*, intense heat, smoke gases and glare, badly tell upon the health of the workers employed in the process?

(c) Are Government aware that the conditions of work can be improved if the employers are made to supply suitable appliances to the workers, *e g.*, respirators and protection goggles, and if they pay proper attention to the ventilation of the rooms and proper arrangement of the furnaces?

(d) Are Government prepared to invite expert opinion to improve the condition of working in the bangle mixing process, and consider the question of enabling the employers to furnish the factories with a gas at Firozabad?

(e) Have Government taken any measures regarding parts (a), (b) and (c) above?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Government are aware that glass manufacture may entail certain hazards to the workers. I have no detailed information as to the extent of the hazards involved by the bangle mixing process.

(b) Government are aware that in 1931 the Government of the United Provinces regarded the labour conditions in the glass and bangle industry at Firozabad, to which I think the Honourable Member is referring, as unsatisfactory.

(c) and (d). Rules under section 33 (4) of the Factories Act, 1934, are about to be made with a view to the protection of workers employed on hazardous operations, and I shall be glad to consult Local Governments, and particularly the Government of the United Provinces, as to the need for special protection to the glass industry when their opinion is invited on the draft rules.

(e) I understand that the Government of the United Provinces have taken steps to ensure that those of the Firozabad factories which come under the Factories Act are properly regulated under that Act. For other factories the Municipal Board made certain bye-laws in 1931

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will the workers concerned here also be consulted?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Will the proposals of the Government be published in the draft stage before they are finally adopted?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think so. I think, in all probability, these draft rules will be published

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I know what the Honourable Member said as regards factories which do not come under the Factories Act?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I said that for other factories, which do not come under the Act, the Municipal Board made certain bye-laws.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. The Chair understands the Leader of the House wishes to make a statement.

12 NOON.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): With your permission, I want to make a statement with respect to an answer which I gave the House yesterday. There was a question and there were some supplementary questions too, about re-printing the documents relating to the statements made by Ministers of Ruling Princes, and so on. I proceeded on the assumption that they were printed in newspapers, and the supplementary questions proceeded also on that footing. I have been informed by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, that that is not the fact and that only portions have been printed in the newspapers and also some Members would very much like an authenticated reprint of the documents relating to this matter. I have no objection to undertake to print it as soon as possible, so that it may be available to the Honourable Members.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I know whether Government will distribute copies free to Members of the Legislature, instead of making it merely available?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: We shall supply it free to Honourable Members of this House, but not to the public.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: All right.

STATEMENT *RE* TRIBUNAL FOR INDO-BURMA FINANCIAL SETTLEMENT.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): I am very grateful to you, Mr President, for allowing me to make a statement in regard to the debate that we had two days ago. (*Some Honourable Members*: "We cannot hear you".) I think it is due to the House that in two respects I should supplement and in one respect correct the information I have to the House during the debate on the Indo-Burma Financial settlement. In the first place, I ought to have informed the House that the tribunal was actually constituted in the middle of December last and has been in session since about the 21st of that month. Secondly, when the debate took place, I was unaware that later information had been received in the Secretariat by telegram to the effect that the tribunal had actually signed their report. I am not yet in a position to say when the report will be published, but I can definitely say now that an opportunity of debating it will be afforded to this House before the Secretary of State submits his final conclusions upon it to Parliament. I must apologize to the House fully and sincerely for having misled it. I ask Honourable Members to believe that this was absolutely unintentional.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Has the Honourable Member seen the article in the *Statesman*—Between the Devil and the Deep—and understood the implications?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That does not arise.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): With reference to the statement which has just been made by the Honourable the Finance Member, he has only furnished one proof, which we would otherwise have been unable to find out, of the manner in which the description he gave of the bloated service to which he belongs is justified. This is the kind of efficiency shown by this service, with all the expenditure that is devoted to it from year to year. We began with three statements, each of them was wrong. On the 21st of February, we were told that this Committee or tribunal or whatever it was would take a long time, and hence it was not advisable or perhaps not feasible that Members of this House could be associated with it in any way. Then came the answer in reply to Mr. Satyamurti, that probably it will take three days. Then we came to the discussion when the three days became three weeks and today we are informed that the report had already been signed. It is a matter of sincere regret that matters of this kind should escape the attention of those who are in charge of the Government of India here, but also their own principals in their own country, whose business it is to carry on with efficiency, being paid for fully and sufficiently for the purpose.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Does the Honourable Member mean to say that this tribunal was appointed by the middle of December without the knowledge of the Government of India?

Thhe Honourable Sir James Grigg: No, Sir. I ought to have given that information to the House during the debate, and I neglected it.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Some time before the debate took place, the Honourable Member had opportunities of answering supplementary questions when there was not the slightest inkling given to the House that this tribunal had been appointed so long ago as the middle of December without the knowledge of anybody in India, except perhaps, as now stated by the Honourable Member, the Government of India themselves. Does the Honourable Member realise that the tribunal was appointed against the recommendation of the Round Table Conference? Now, we understand to our great surprise that this tribunal was appointed so long ago as the middle of December. We are now at the end of March, and we were kept in complete ignorance of the constitution of this tribunal or that it was even taking evidence. Does my Honourable friend realise the implications of the statement he has made just now?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): May I say a few words on this? It seems to me that it is no use flogging a dead horse.

An Honourable Member: We want to see that the horse does not die like this hereafter.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: In spite of the further information which is contained in the statement, the position still remains this. The Government will contradict me if I am wrong. I still understand that the Government of India were not consulted before this tribunal was appointed. If they were consulted, they must have made some proposals or suggestions of their own. That is still not before us. It seems that the Government of India were not kept in touch by the Secretary of State as to whether this report was concluded or not. The only satisfaction—and I want to be quite fair—that we obtain from this statement is that it is now definitely stated that no decision will be taken by the Secretary of State for India without this House being given an opportunity of discussing the subject.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That is so.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: That is a very very poor satisfaction indeed. I am sure, when we come to discuss this question, we shall be told that here is the recommendation of a responsible committee, ...

An Honourable Member: It will be flogging a buried horse.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: . . . after due deliberation sitting from the middle of December till the end of March, considering various points and discussing them and finally arriving at this conclusion. Is that to be lightly treated? We shall be told that the Government of India were represented and the Government of Burma were represented. I am quite sure that the Honourable the Finance Member will agree with me that that is not the way to treat this House. That is not the way to treat this country, and that is not the way to dispose of such vital interest of Burma and India.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Does the Honourable Member realise the significance of the statement he has made just now? The significance is that the Committee was appointed behind the back of India. The Committee was appointed, not in consonance with the recommendation of the Round Table Conference, but in defiance of those recommendations to which the Secretary of State was a party. Does the Honourable Member realise the significance of the statement he has made?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Yes, Sir.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Has he got any defence for the statement? Who is responsible for this state of affairs? Is it the Government of India or the Secretary of State?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable Member wants any information, let the Finance Member say anything he wants to.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I cannot give any more information than I have already given

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): I should like to put one question specifically to the Honourable the Finance Member.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member says he cannot give any more information.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Let alone the past The Honourable the Finance Member made a statement today that the Secretary of State will not submit his conclusions to Parliament, before this report is discussed by this House. I want to know whether that statement is made with the authority and with the knowledge of the Secretary of State, or only on his own responsibility.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: With the knowledge of the Secretary of State.

An Honourable Member: And authority?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: It comes to the same thing

MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT.

WORKING OF THE NEW CONSTITUTION BY INDIANS DESPITE DISCLAIMERS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): A notice for the adjournment of the House was given yesterday by Mr. Asaf Ali. The notice is to this effect,—that the Honourable Member proposes to ask for the leave of the House:

"to move an adjournment of the business of the Assembly for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance on the ground that:

(1) in spite of the adverse opinion of the Assembly, the Provincial Legislatures, and nearly all political organizations of the country, the Government have reached the misleading conclusion that 'despite disclaimers every body will come and work the Constitution', and

(2) inasmuch as the Government of India Bill is now before the British Parliament the communication of such an opinion by the Government of India to the Secretary of State will do incalculable harm and encourage defiance of Indian opinion."

The Chair would like the Honourable Member to satisfy it that this is a specific matter of recent occurrence and urgent, in the sense of the Standing Order.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali (Delhi: General): Sir, I hope you will permit me to preface my remarks by a few observations.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair simply wants the Honourable Member to state his points.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: I shall state my point, Sir, but I simply want to make it perfectly clear at the outset that I do not seek to revive the discussion of any matter which has been debated in this House. Nothing is further from my object. I propose to eliminate as rigorously as possible any reference either to the framework or to the contents of the Government of India Bill which is now before the British Parliament. So far as the point of recent occurrence is concerned, Sir, I do not suppose for a moment that even the Government will question that—because I am basing this adjournment motion on the reply which the Honourable the Leader of the House gave to my question No. 1033 only the day before yesterday. In a way, we are indebted to him for revealing a part of the confidential communication which has taken place between the Government of India and the Secretary of State, but inasmuch as he has made a definite assertion that the Government of India have reached a conclusion with regard to the attitude of India towards the coming Reforms, I think the matter becomes one of urgent public importance . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order The difficulty the Chair is feeling is this—that the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report was debated on the 4th, 6th and 7th February. Then, on the 13th also, some statements were made as regards the conclusions reached by the Government of India.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: This conclusion was never made known to us before but only the day before yesterday. It was only the day before yesterday that the Government of India definitely made it known to us and to the world that, in spite of all that had been said in this Legislature and in all the other Legislatures of the country and by all the responsible political organisations throughout the country, they had reached the decision that everybody—mark you, Sir, everybody—would come and work the Constitution. Now, this is nothing but the grossest misrepresentation of facts.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair simply wanted to know the Honourable Member's point. Sir Nripendra Sircar.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): Sir, I really would not have pressed my objection but that we are all now pressed for time, and this motion is hopelessly out of order. My Honourable friend is not right in saying that only day before yesterday he came to know that the conclusion of the Government—whether that is right or wrong is not the question now—was that, in spite of these resolutions passed by the Provincial Councils and other resolutions, they were of the opinion that the constitution would be worked. I will read, Sir, from page 558 of the Legislative Assembly Debates of Thursday, the 7th February, 1935, and I shall read other portions also. I hope to be as brief as possible. Now, this is part of my speech. I would remind the Honourable House that, before this, at least two Members had drawn attention to the fact

[Sir Nripendra Sircar.]

that this Constitution had been rejected by the Liberal Federation and had been rejected by other bodies, and so on. That should be finally borne in mind. This is what I said:

"If you had the courage to say that, if this is passed, we are not going to work the Constitution, because it is not consistent with self-respect to come within 500 miles of a Constitution, which is so derogatory to us, insulting and so humiliating, then, surely, to be consistent, you should say—'we cannot work this Constitution'.

It may be asked why I am assuming that this Constitution is going to be worked by the people who want now to repel it because it is inconsistent with self-respect? My reason is that throughout these speeches, I have not heard even a suggestion made by anybody that they are not going to work the Constitution if the Bill passes through the Houses of Parliament. I don't hear any contradiction even now, and I ask Honourable Members to consider what is the object of passing a futile Resolution when we know that this really means nothing. These are blank shots which create noise. I daresay they raise some amount of smoke but they do not hit anybody. If it had been followed up by a Resolution stating that it is not consistent with our self-respect to work it, I would have understood that there was something concrete in it. But this is nothing * * * *

I again ask,—what is the good of this heroic language of rejection, inconsistent with our self-respect, and so on, when we know perfectly well that this Constitution is going to be worked?"

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What was the date of that?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: The 7th of February last. And, Sir, every bit of this sort of reasoning may be wrong—we are not concerned with that.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): It is wrong. The reasoning is quite wrong. (Interruptions.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better go on.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Sir, in spite of what my friend says, I am sure, I am perfectly correct The House was informed on the 7th February that that is the opinion of the Government of India, namely, that the Constitution is going to be worked.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): That is the Law Member's opinion—not that of the Government of India.

(Interruptions.)

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I think, Sir, at least four of my Honourable friends are anxious to interrupt, and I do not want to deprive them of that pleasure.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better go on.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Now, Sir, on the 13th, certain supplementaries were put by my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, and I am now going to read from page 740 of the Debates, dated the 13th. This is part of my answer to my Honourable friend:

"Since the presentation of the report of the Joint Select Committee they (*that is, the Government of India*) have informed the Secretary of State that, in their opinion the scheme presented in the Report provided a basis for a Bill which they believed would be workable. Before expressing that opinion, the Government of India did not consult persons belonging to political parties in India."

Now, Sir, I would draw your attention to the supplementaries.

"*Mr. S. Satyamurti*: May I know, in view of the answer to clause (a) of this question being 'No', whether the Government of India's attention has been drawn to the Secretary of State's statement and that of Mr Stanley Baldwin in this morning's papers that they had been assured by Governments in India that the reforms would be worked? May I know if that answer is based on any formal information sent by the Government of India, or is it merely an impression produced on their minds?"

That is where the question stops. My answer was:

"The answer to the last portion is 'No', and I do not accept the first portion as correct, because I have got here a brief report of what Sir Samuel Hoare is reported to have said: This is what Sir Samuel Hoare said:

'Critics in India must not be taken to mean that Indians would obstruct the reforms. On the contrary, the Viceroy and all Governors had told him that India would work the reforms'."

Mr. Satyamurti follows up by another supplementary:

"May I know if the Government of India never informed the Secretary of State that in their opinion there will be people found in this country to work the reforms?".

My answer was:

"I think that follows from the answer to the first part, but, if necessary, I again say, 'Yes'."

"*Mr. S. Satyamurti*: Then, may I know when the Government of India, according to the Law Member's reply, informally, as a result of correspondence, gave the impression to the authorities in England that the reforms would be workable, whether they were giving expression to their own opinion, or whether it was arrived at in consultation with any representative Indians, persons or parties?"

In realising the answers given to the next three questions I would ask the House and you, Sir, to remember that Mr. Satyamurti was proceeding on the assumption that the Secretary of State had been informed informally though not by means of a formal document that the constitution would be worked and his whole point is why was not public opinion consulted. The answer given was this:

"They had drawn their own inference from facts before them."

"*Mr. S. Satyamurti*: So, may I know that they did not consult any Indian belonging to any school of political thought before giving this opinion or impression to the Government in England?"

My reply was:

"I have answered once and I give the same answer, and that is, they did not consult."

"*Mr. S. Satyamurti*: May I know the reason why the Government chose not to consult any Indian, and yet informed the British Government that the reforms would be workable?"

[Sir Nripendra Sircar.]

I answered

"Because the Government had hundreds of opinions as expressed in speeches, resolutions and writings"

"*Mr. S Satyamurti*: May I know whether those speeches and writings were not available to the Government in England? May I know where the Government of India come in?"

I replied.

"That is a question which ought to be put to the Government in England."

Then, Sir, I would give you one more reference, because I do not wish to argue at any length. The point that everyone had rejected the proposed Constitution was brought out by several speakers, but I will give only one reference and that of Mr Asaf Ali, because he is moving this motion for adjournment. On page 174, he said:

"Those who attended the Round Table Conference have one and all rejected it as a monstrosity, a constitutional monstrosity, which no one on earth would be prepared to nurse. Then, in so far as the question of the opinion in the country is concerned, was there any doubt in the minds of any one, including His Majesty's Government, that the whole of this country had condemned it right and left from the moment the proposal emerged in any form whatsoever?"

The next point that I wish to take is the question of urgency. My submission is that they are well aware that on the 5th and 13th we had definitely come to the conclusion that this constitution would be worked on all sides. I want also to draw your attention to the Legislative Rules. If you will kindly turn to page 85 you will find that rule 12 (m) runs thus:

"The motion must not revive discussion on a matter which has been discussed in the same session"

The point is so obvious that my Honourable friend cannot say: "Oh, no, no, I am not going to refer to the Joint Parliamentary Committee". But whether he does it or not, if this question is debated I have to go over the same ground again.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has not the least doubt that this motion is out of order. The whole question was debated on the motion for the consideration of the Joint Parliamentary Committee's Report and the point of discussion was whether the recommendations of the Joint Parliamentary Committee were acceptable to Indian public opinion as represented in different sections of the House. That was the occasion on which opinions were expected to be expressed as to whether the Constitution proposed would be worked in India or not. Now, it would be open to the Government as well as to any Honourable Member of this House to draw any conclusion he could from the debate on the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report, whether the Constitution, such as is proposed, would be accepted or rather would be worked by different classes of politicians representing Indian public opinion. If the Government of India formed the conclusion that such a Constitution would be worked, that opinion might be right or wrong, but it was a conclusion which it was open to them to come to. The question was debated also in replies to questions put by several Honourable Members of this House. Therefore, the Chair does think that the motion is out of order.

CONFIDENTIAL REPORT MADE ON MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There is another notice of a motion for adjournment in the name of Mr. Fazlul Huq. The Honourable Member proposes to ask for leave to make a motion for the adjournment of the business of the House today for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance as follows:

"The situation created by the admission made by Government yesterday that Members of the Legislative Assembly are being confidentially reported upon to the Government of India, and that such reports are not open to inspection even by the Members affected."

Is there any objection to this motion?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik (Home Member): Sir, a motion for the adjournment of the House has to satisfy three standards It has to relate to a recent matter, a specific matter and a matter of urgent public importance. As regards the recentness of this matter, I find that it has always been the practice to ask Local Governments to supply us with a statement giving, for all newly elected candidates, a brief account of their position and political antecedents and showing the party to which they belonged. That has been the practice ever since this Assembly was started in the year 1921. There is nothing, therefore, recent about this. It is true that apparently the practice was unknown to Honourable Members. I may say it was unknown to me till a few days ago. But even assuming that its recentness is admitted, even assuming that it is quite a definite matter, does the House or do you, Sir, consider that one can lay one's hand on one's heart and say definitely that this is a matter of urgent public importance?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is it done in the course of ordinary administration?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, Sir. I would urge that it is desirable in these matters to preserve a certain sense of proportion. We have had numerous motions for adjournment lately on matters which can be considered of urgent public importance, such as the position of Indians in Kenya, the Indo-Burman financial relations, the Karachi firing and other matters in which no doubt the public are deeply interested. But is the public really deeply interested in this particular matter? Would I not be equally in order or possibly even more in order in asking that this House should now adjourn in order that Members might have for once an opportunity of getting a little fresh air and exercise?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair wishes to know from the Honourable the Home Member whether this report was specially in respect of the Honourable Members of the Congress or the Nationalist Party?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It refers to all newly elected Members of the Assembly, that is to say, Members who were not Members of the last Assembly.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is it a report by the C. I. D.?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It is a report by the Local Governments

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Give copies of this report for our obituary notices!

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra (Presidency Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Will the Honourable the Home Member say if the President is reported on by the C. I. D.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq (Bakarganj *cum* Faridpur: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, there is a Persian proverb . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not want any discussion The Chair wants the Honourable Member's statement.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: I will only refer to that Persian proverb and come to the point That Persian proverb says:

"Ozre gunah badtar az gunah".

It means that sometimes the excuse for a crime is worse than the crime itself. (Hear, hear.) If the Honourable the Home Member had only taken the trouble to read the wording of my motion, I do not think he would have given the answer which he has given to the House today. My point is that a situation has arisen which is a definite matter of urgent public importance. I emphasize the word 'situation' I do not care what the Government of India or the Governments in India have been doing in the past.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has only to state his point.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: I have got to satisfy you, Sir, that it is a definite matter

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is not a question of argument The Honourable Member will simply state his point.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: You will please permit me, Sir, to develop the argument in my own way.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is not to argue, but he has to state his points.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: I am arguing to this extent that it is a definite matter of public importance which can be discussed in this House. The new situation is what I want to discuss. It may be that the Government has been doing it for a long time, but it is inconsequence of the answers given the day before yesterday that I personally and many of us came to know that we are under an espionage whether by the police or by the Government I do not know. That has created a situation and I submit,

Sir, that the knowledge that we are being reported upon confidentially and that the reports are to be kept away from us interferes with the free exercise of our right as Members of this House. (Hear, hear.) (Applause.) I submit there are many Members who feel that their freedom is being interfered with in this way, that they are under the impression that a vote given against the Government would be recorded against them and that such a vote will ruin their future career. In this way this interferes with the free exercise of the rights of Members of this House. Therefore the situation that has arisen is after the statement has been made and that arose the day before yesterday and I could not have brought forward this motion earlier. I submit, therefore, that this is a definite matter and it is of public importance. As regards urgency my submission is that this situation affects our work in this House from moment to moment (Hear, hear) and it was not that it arose sometimes ago and then ceased to exist. Every moment of our life in this House is being affected by the situation that has been created (Laughter), and, therefore, it is of extreme urgency and it has to be discussed. I already submitted that it is a definite matter.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, it is admitted by the Honourable the Home Member that it is specific, that it is urgent, and that it is recent. The only point which he takes is whether it is of public importance urgent enough to be taken now I submit, Sir, it is *prima facie* for you to say, but if afterwards you rule it in order, and if, in spite of the objection of the Honourable the Home Member, 25 Members stand up in support of it, it shows to the House that a section of the House wants the motion to be discussed. The only other matter that I want to submit is this. I am not on the merits, Sir, but you put a very pertinent question as to whether the C. I. D. report on the position and political antecedents of the Members. My Honourable friend, the Home Member, does not know He says simply that the Local Government report . . .

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I beg the Honourable Member's pardon. I said, "No; the C. I. D. do not report". It is only the Local Governments that report. If the Honourable Member wants to quote me he must do so correctly and not incorrectly

Mr. S. Satyamurti: My point is this. How do Local Governments get their report? How do they collect information? My Honourable friend does not know.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I do know. In fact, I have done it myself.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: That will be going into the merits of the question. I think it is unusual in any deliberative House of the world, where Parliaments with full powers or even Parliaments with limited powers like us sit, that one section of the House must have a confidential report about the other section of the House, and, at the same time, they refuse to show these reports to them. I consider this very unusual in any part of the world. I also consider that this is an urgent matter and of public importance to be discussed in the House.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: May I just point out that, so far as I understand, the position is this. The Honourable the Home Member stated that when a Member is elected to this House, the Local Governments are asked to send a brief biography of that gentleman, a short history . . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Has the Honourable Member got the answer of the Home Member before him?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I said "A brief account of their position and political antecedents and showing the party to which they belong".

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: If that is usual when each Member becomes a Member of this House for the first time, then it is a part of the administrative routine. It is nothing urgent. I contend that it is not important and that it will be a waste of time of the House to discuss this motion.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thinks there is a good deal of misconception which has arisen on this. Apparently the Honourable Member, who gave notice of this motion, did not perhaps consider carefully the answer which was given by the Honourable the Home Member in reply to the question of Mr. Satyamurti. The answer is:

"As has been done on the occasion of previous general elections, the Government of India asked the Local Governments, and not C. I. D. officers, to supply them with a statement giving for all newly elected candidates a brief account of their position and political antecedents and showing the party to which they belong."

It is not espionage on any Honourable Member at all. The Chair does not see how an ordinary departmental matter like this could be the subject of a motion for adjournment. The Chair, therefore, rules the motion out of order.

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS—*contd.*

TRANSFER TO THE FUND FOR THE TRANSFER OF THE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE FROM PUSA TO DELHI—*contd.*

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House will now resume discussion on Demands for Supplementary Grants.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): It is a dull transition from the subjects that we have been discussing just now to the question of transfer of Pusa, but I can assure my Honourable friends opposite that I shall curtail the agony as much as possible. Sir, I was stating yesterday why it was that the Agricultural Institute was located at Pusa in the first instance, and I think I explained that point satisfactorily. The next point that I would take up is in regard to the crop experiments and the work on crops which has been done at Pusa. My Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, quite rightly paid a tribute to the very good botanical work which has been done at Pusa in evolving a new strains of seeds. May I remind him of what I said in the House the other day in answer to a question, namely

that it is not the intention of Government to disturb the botanical work which is being done at Pusa. In other words the work of evolving new strains of seeds and crops will continue and the sub-station will be maintained. The botanical sub-station will be maintained at Pusa so that the work that is being done at present will not be interfered with by reason of the transfer. My Honourable friend also referred to the work which has been done on sugar-cane. May I remind him that the main work of the Imperial Institute of Agricultural Research on sugar-cane has been done at Coimbatore, that the policy of extending the scope of field experiments has been applied also to Bihar and Orissa and that as a result of grants made by the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research, the agricultural research work on sugar-cane is not being done now at Pusa, but at a separate farm in Mushari, Muzaffarpur district.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): May I say that I did not make any statement to that effect I only read out the passage from the Encyclopedia Brittanica.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: That is perfectly true. But my Honourable friend implied by that quotation that as a result of the transfer, this valuable work might cease, and I think I am perfectly justified in pointing out to the House that this valuable work will not cease but that it will be continued.

I now go on from this to the main change which has taken place since the Institute was established at Pusa. The scope of field work has extended all over India by reason of the realisation of the fact that the work of conducting enquiries on effect of soil and climate on crops must not be done in one central place but is to be done in regions peculiarly representative of special conditions.

The second point which one has to remember is that in 1904 there were no provincial departments of agriculture of any value or importance. Since then colleges have come into being in the different provinces; for example, the college at Lyallpur the college at Cawnpore, the college at Coimbatore, etc., and these are doing research work themselves. Now, as a result of the emergence of these two classes of experimental work by the provinces, experimental work of very high importance, *viz.*, field work as also laboratory work, the question of contact between Pusa and the provinces has become much more of a live issue than it was when Pusa was the only institution carrying on agricultural research in India And, on this point, I should like to quote to the House what I quoted before in Simla, namely, the opinion of the Royal Commissions on Agricuture. It said, in paragraph 40 at page 45:

"The evidence we received showed that the reverse (*i.e., reverse of contact between the provinces and Pusa*) is unfortunately the case and that the thread of connection between Pusa and the provinces is becoming more and more attenuated."

That, Sir, is the position. It is not that the officials of the Government of India in Delhi want to be in nearer touch with the Institute, although that may have a certain importance from the point of view of supervision and control, but the important thing is that contact between Pusa by reason of its isolation and the research work which is being done in the provinces and which is being done in the universities does not exist; at least it does not exist to the extent that is desired. That, Sir,

[Mr. G. S. Bajpai.]

is the position. My Honourable friend also said something about cultural contacts and he seemed to be of the opinion that Delhi really has no pretensions either to culture or to the provision of cultural contacts. I can pursue that point but it seems to me that it is not essentially germane to this discussion. In any case I would ask my Honourable friend to turn to a greater authority than myself on the cultural position and traditions of this place, to the Chief Whip of his party Mr. Asaf Ali, who will be able to give him ample enlightenment as to what part Delhi has played in the cultural development and evolution of India. Sir, he also said that if Pusa were transferred to Delhi the University of Delhi will be thrown in the shade. The University of Delhi, as everybody knows, is an extremely small and limited concern. I have yet to hear that any university is thrown in the shade by reason of the fact that its scientific activities are supplemented by the creation in its very neighbourhood of a first-class institution. I do not think that that is a point which really has much validity.

Now, Sir, I go on to another point of my Honourable friend's and that was the question of the adequacy of financial return as a result of the transfer. Sir, there are two kinds of savings; one is an immediate saving of expenditure, and the other and the more important kind of saving is the greater and the added benefit that you derive by reason of the change that you make. I informed the House last Session in Simla that it was, on a conservative estimate the opinion of experts, that if you do remove Pusa to a central location the value of the work which is being done there will be at least doubled. We spend on the maintenance of Pusa seven lakhs of rupees a year. I do not attach much importance to purely arithmetical calculations in a matter of this kind because the advantages of research are really imponderable. But at any rate if one has to proceed on that basis, I should say that seven times two is 14 lakhs; in other words, by spending seven lakhs we should be deriving a benefit which should be equivalent to seven lakhs extra. And I think on a simple calculation it will be clear that in 3½ years or four years the additional expenditure of moving Pusa from where it is to Delhi will be completely wiped out, and, after that, we will continue to derive this additional benefit.

Now, Sir, I do not think I have very much more to say in regard to the points raised by my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, but I will turn to one remark made by my Honourable friend, Maulana Shafi Daudi. He said that he had visited the site where the new Institute is to be built and he found it a desert and he thought that really it was a great wrong to this country that we should move the Institute from the fertile neighbourhood of Pusa to the desert neighbourhood of Delhi. Well, Sir, my Honourable friend is, I am sure, familiar with the history of canal irrigation in this country as also abroad. What was the position of Lyallpur, as my Honourable friend reminds me, before it was subjected to intensive irrigation and the application of the results of scientific reseach? What exactly was the position of the Soudan? They were deserts before; they have blossomed as the rose today. I think my Honourable friend ought to do us the justice of conceding, that when this place is treated as Pusa has been treated, there is no reason why it should not be as fertile and as suited for agricultural research as Pusa.

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi (Tirhut Division: Muhammadan): The soil is rocky.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I am coming to that later on.

Now my Honourable friend may not be satisfied with a purely *a priori* argument. He may say that this is just dialectics pure and simple and and there is nothing scientific behind this. My answer to my Honourable friend there is this. We have not come to this conclusion merely on the analogy of what irrigation and research have done for the Soudan or for Lyallpur. We took the very natural precaution of consulting every agricultural chemist of any consequence or importance in this country. We consulted Mr. Mackenzie Taylor who is the Irrigation Chemist to the Government of the Punjab; we consulted Rao Bahadur Viswanathan who is the Imperial Agricultural Chemist to the Government of India; we consulted Dr. Shaw who is the head of the Institute at Pusa and who, if the Institute is transferred to Delhi, will be here and who is an eminent botanist. They all said that the soil of the land, which we have chosen for this Institute, is in every way adequate for the work which this Institute is required to do. I do not think that it is necessary for me to continue that particular point further.

Now, Sir, I come to one last question. I am sorry that my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, is not here. He wanted to know whether we had consulted the provincial Departments of Agriculture in this matter before we came to a decision. Sir, it so happened that,—I think it was in January, 1934.—soon after the earthquake, we held a meeting of the Scientific Advisory Board of the Imperial Agricultural Research Council here. The Vice-Chairman of the Council definitely put this question to the Directors of Agriculture. The Director of Bihar and Orissa unfortunately was not present. Even if he had been present I do not think that provincial feelings being what they are he would have expressed his own opinion. But all the other heads of the Departments of Agriculture present were unanimously of the view that the neighbourhood of Delhi would be better from the point of view of co-ordination and contact in the field of research than Pusa. That was the opinion of the Directors of Agriculture. Then let me pursue the point. In August, 1934, there was a meeting of the Scientific Advisory Board, which includes representatives of the Departments of Agriculture, which includes representatives of universities, in fact of every one engaged in agricultural research. They made it clear, in the course of their discussion, that as a result of the transfer, they felt that we had made a step forward in the direction of the co-ordination of agricultural research, and, what is more, that we would be economising by this in different ways.

I will mention one instance of that. For example, the question of the investigation of certain pests of sugar-cane had been engaging the attention of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research. They felt they could not proceed with the investigation which had been proposed to them because of the cost involved. The non-recurring cost was estimated at about a lakh and a half and the recurring cost was estimated at Rs. 44,000 a year. As a result of the change that we are proposing the non-recurring cost has fallen to about Rs. 30,000 and the recurring cost only to Rs. 19,000. This is to be spread over five years. It is open to Honourable Members to calculate for themselves what the saving on this one individual scheme is. I think that I have said all that I had to say, but I would only repeat . . . . .

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): Before the Honourable Member resumes his seat, I would like him to answer one question for my information: I do not know whether my question is an intelligent one; but after the transfer of this Institute from Pusa to Delhi, what would be the position of the Institute in Pusa?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: After the transfer of the Institute from Pusa to Delhi, the laboratory work which has, up to the present, been done in Pusa, laboratory work on entomology, mycology, agricultural chemistry and botany, will be done in the laboratories that are to be constructed in Delhi. The practical agricultural or experimental work on crops peculiar to that tract and to which that tract lends itself will continue to be done at Pusa because the botanical sub-station is to be maintained there . . . . .

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: One more question: what about the damage done by the earthquake? To what extent was that damage and to what extent does it make it necessary to reconstruct the buildings and what will be the cost of such reconstruction?

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi: Before that question is answered, I say 36 lakhs or even double that amount is justifiable for such reconstruction.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I cannot answer two questions simultaneously. My Honourable friend's question was what is the extent of the damage done at Pusa. The main work of the laboratory was done in the buildings known as the Phipps Laboratory: that laboratory has been completely destroyed. The position is that at the present moment practically no research work is being done at Pusa: it is in cold storage. Our engineers said that it would be two years before they could say definitely on what particular site of the area included in the Institute you could reconstruct at all, because they were not sure of the effects of subterranean subsidences that had taken place. At any rate there is this additional consideration for my Honourable friend's reflection, namely, that if you build here you can build immediately, but if you want to rebuild in Pusa you have to wait for another two years . . . .

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi: That fear has vanished now.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Yes, but the work has also progressed. There is only one further point that I wish to submit for the consideration of this House. Last July, the matter was considered at very great length at two meetings of the Standing Finance Committee. With the exception of two Honourable Members from Bihar and Orissa—and I have no quarrel with them for that—the Committee was unanimously of the opinion that the Institute should be transferred. We had a two days' debate in the Legislative Assembly. There again our Supplementary Demand for expenditure, which we expected might reach up to Rs. 7 lakhs by the end of the year, was voted by the House without a division. I submit that since then no new fact, no new consideration has come to light. My Honourable friend's eloquence is undoubtedly a new factor: it moves the House; but I do beg the House not to be swayed by eloquence pure and simple but to reflect upon what has happened and then decide for itself whether in view of the fact that no new fact has come to light, it would be justified in reversing a considered and a careful decision.

Some Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

Mr. G. Morgan (Bengal. European): I only want to ask you, Sir, for your ruling about this vote on which there has been rather a mixed up debate. The motion moved by the Honourable the Finance Member is the transfer of a part of the revenue surplus to a fund on account of the Research Institute. The amendment moved by my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, is to reduce this amount of 36 lakhs to one rupee. What I want to know from you is: if one is to vote in favour of the amendment, does that mean the reversal of the decision of the Assembly for the transfer of the Institute from Pusa to Delhi? Because our view and our vote in the Assembly before was in favour of that transfer Now this is a different question: this is the transfer from a surplus of revenue to meet that expenditure. We are not in favour of the transfer of the money from the surplus which the Honourable the Finance Member has got in the budget, and we would rather stick to the old arrangement by which it was charged against capital. But if the voting in favour of the amendment means that we are against the transfer of the Institute from Pusa to Delhi, then we cannot vote in favour of the amendment. I should like your ruling as to what the actual meaning and result of the vote would be.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) So far as the Chair can understand the wording of the motion, the result will be that the transfer from surplus revenue will not take place and things will remain as they are. The question is . . . . .

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Have I no right of reply, Sir?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair did not know that the Honourable Member wanted to reply.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: May I point out that the point raised by Mr. Morgan is one of considerable importance in order to enable us to vote? I am also one of those who feel that expenditure of this sort should come from capital. That point was never really discussed in this debate. I am one of those who agree with the transfer of the Institute from Pusa to Delhi. If this vote means that Government are to have no money to carry on with during the next year in order to carry out the scheme of this transfer, then I would vote against the amendment. But if you hold that the passing of this amendment will have the effect of not allowing Government to use money out of capital I would change my mind. I would like an authoritative statement on this point from Government as to what their position is and what is the real consequence of this vote. I should like to hear the views of the Honourable the Finance Member.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): It seems to me that the matter is in inextricable confusion. Supposing this vote is rejected, the Government have got to make up their mind whether the motive of the House in rejecting it is because it disapproves of any further expenditure upon the transfer of the Institute from Pusa to Delhi or whether it merely objects to the method of paying for it out of the revenue surplus that is expected to accrue in the present year.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What is the Honourable Member's interpretation of the wording of the motion? As the motion is worded, what will be the effect so far as the Government are concerned?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I cannot say: it is impossible to say that: the Honourable the Mover of the motion may be able to throw some light upon it; but as I heard his speech . . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's demand for grant is in the same language. What is the Honourable Member's interpretation of his own demand?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The motion for the grant is to meet it out of the revenue surplus It is then open to the Government to decide, if it is rejected, whether it can come back to the House and ask for a capital grant or whether these proceedings should be taken to mean that the House is rejecting the motion on its merits. It is quite impossible to say what the Government will do until they have considered the matter in the light of the debate in all its bearings.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): At any rate, they cannot transfer the money from the surplus revenue?

The Honouarble Sir James Grigg: If this is rejected, it means that the House is unwilling that it should be paid for out of the surplus revenue.

Mr. G. Morgan: That is all.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Is that all it means?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That is certainly the meaning of it.

Mr. F. E. James (Madras: European): Before my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, speaks, may I have it clear from you, Sir, what the position is? I understood that when Mr. Morgan asked your advice on the matter you said that the effect of the success of the vote which is in the name of Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant would be that the Government would be precluded from taking this particular amount out of the surplus revenues which accrue this year. If that, therefore, is the only effect, then surely that is an authoritative interpretation of the meaning of this vote if it is carried.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: May I just elaborate the point, Sir, because it is quite clear that the Honourable the Mover of the amendment objects very strongly to the transfer of the Institute from Pusa to Delhi, and he wishes that the whole work on the transfer should be put an end to That was quite clear from his speech, and if the only question before the House is about the method of charge, then most of the discussion which has taken place is completely irrelevant

1 P. M.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: May I just say one word, Sir?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I really think, Sir, that the Government do not realise their position. It is not a question of ruling at all. The words are perfectly clear, because the Honourable the Finance Member has moved the motion which stands in his name, and he has asked us to vote the grant, and it is specifically stated there that it will be from the surplus revenue. That is quite clear There is no question of ruling at all from the Chair. The question is this. Do the Government stand by this, and do they want our vote on this? If we vote in favour of this grant, then it means the transfer of the fund from the surplus revenue. If you say that that is your intention, and it is quite clear to me, then the vote of the House can only be recorded on that point It is not a question whether the House is in favour of the transfer of Pusa Institute to Delhi or not. If you want the vote of the House on that question, you must make your position clear.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The only question I wish to submit to the House is whether it should be charged to capital or to surplus revenue. If the charge to surplus revenue is rejected, the position then is that there are no funds. The provision of funds for any further work upon Pusa by the House has not yet been approved. The question then will be whether the Government will bring forward a proposal to finance it out of capital, but all I say is that, in deciding whether they will bring forward such a proposal, the Government might or might not take into account the fact that the Honourable the Mover of the amendment made it quite clear that he wished the vote, as far as he was concerned, to be recorded on the project as a whole.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: That is not Mr. Jinnah's point.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I think the House could very well give me an opportunity to explain what I mean by my motion. So far as I am concerned, I have not concealed my opinion on the merits of the question of transfer. But, so far as the present motion before the House is concerned, it certainly can be restricted to one point, namely, whether payment for this purpose should be made out of the surplus revenue or not. It does not prevent the Government from coming to the House again with a proposal for supplies out of capital. It will be open to the House then to discuss the question from the viewpoint whether or not they are prepared to find the money out of capital for the transfer of the Institute, and it is not impossible that I may myself change my mind (Hear, hear), for it is one of the factors which does weigh with me. Therefore, I hold, Sir, that the present issue is restricted exclusively to the point whether funds should or should not be provided out of the surplus. And the main reason why I have made this motion is this.—I want to have the surplus revenue for the relief of taxation. I think it is a breach of the ordinary canons of finance that any surplus revenue, which is not unoften kept back intentionally by Members in charge of Finance is dealt with by them at the end of the year as they choose. I make it quite clear that my motion will not debar the Government from bringing forward another motion before this House to ascertain its opinion on the merits of the question. What I will think of it later on, it is left for me to decide, but one of the reasons, which certainly weighs with me and weighs with me to a very considerable extent, is this, that I am opposed to the

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

transfer from the surplus revenue for purposes of this Institute. So, Sir, I will not argue the other points. I have got much to say, and I had intended to say a good deal, but, on this occasion. I restrict my motion to this, that no transfer shall be made from surplus revenue for this purpose or for any other purpose, and, therefore, I would request my friends to concentrate on this point.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: May I make the position clear, Sir? If the object of the Honourable the Mover of the amendment is to intercept this non-recurring and practically accrued surplus for the purposes of reduction of taxation in the next financial year, I should like to make it quite clear that that is quite illegitimate, and the Government have no intention of proposing any such thing. But the effect of this motion, if it is passed by the House, will be simply this, that instead of using the accrued surplus, *pro tanto* it will go automatically to the reduction or avoidance of debt, and, therefore, will reduce the capital debt. Then the House will next vote precisely similar sums over the next two or three years which will increase the debt to the original figure. I submit that if that is the sole purpose, then the House will be stultifying itself.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: The House knows that it has 36 lakhs at its disposal Undoubtedly, our Finance Bill is passed, adopted and modified every year in accordance with the exigencies of the financial situation . . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: It will automatically on the 31st of March go to the avoidance of debt.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I want to know for our guidance one thing. Do I understand my friend, Mr. Pant, to say that he is putting it on the ground that the transfer from the surplus revenue should not take place?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Yes, Sir: that is the main ground.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: And no other ground?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: No other ground

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: It has nothing to do with the question whether the Pusa Institute should be transferred to Delhi or not?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: No.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Then, Sir, it is not a question of a cut. If I hold that Pusa Institute ought to be transferred to Delhi, then I would be entitled to vote against the cut, and when the grant is put to the vote again, I shall refuse that grant on the ground that I refuse to be a party to its transfer from the surplus revenue. Therefore, Sir, I would ask you to put the cut motion first, which is, whether the Pusa Institute should be transferred to Delhi or not. If the House is of the opinion that it should be transferred. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is exactly what the Chair was going to do.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I am much obliged to you, Sir.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The position appears to be quite clear. The Chair need not repeat what it said as to the effect of this motion. It only means that there shall be no transfer from the surplus revenue for this purpose. What action Government will take afterwards, the Chair is not concerned with at present. The question is:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 36 00,000 in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Transfer of the Agricultural Research Institute from Pusa to Delhi' be reduced to one rupee."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs 36,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Transfer of the Agricultural Research Institute from Pusa to Delhi'."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—52.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian
Abdullah, Mr. H. M.
Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab
Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan Bahadur Nawab Malik.
Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A A Venkatarama.
Bajpai, Mr. G. S.
Bewoor, Mr. G. V.
Bhagchand Soni, Rai Bahadur Seth.
Bhore, The Honourable Sir Joseph.
Buss, Mr. L. C.
Chatarji, Mr. J. M.
Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.
Dalal, Dr R D
DeSouza, Dr. F X.
Drake, Mr. D. H. C
Fazl-i-Haq Piracha Khan Sahib Shaikh.
Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya Ananda.
Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.
Graham, Sir Lancelot
Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.
Hockenhull, Mr. F W
Hudson, Sir Leslie.
James Mr. F. E.
Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir.
Kirpalani, Mr. Hiranand Khushiram.
Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri.
Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
Margal Singh, Sardar.
Mehr Shah, Nawab Sahibzada Sir Sayad Muhammad.
Metcalfe, Mr. H. A. F.
Milligan, Mr J. A.
Monteath, Mr. J.
Mukerje, Mr. N R.
Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya Charan
Nayar, Mr. C Govindan.
Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank
Owen, Mr. L.
Parma Nand, Bhai.
Rajah, Raja Sir Vasudeva.
Rajah, Rao Bahadur M C
Rau, Mr. P. R.
Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
Sarma, Mr. R. S.
Scott, Mr. W L.
Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain Sardar.
Singh, Mr. Pradyumna Prashad.
Sircar, The Honourable Sir Nripendra.
Sloan, Mr. T.
Swithinbank, Mr. B. W.
Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F

NOES—72.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel
Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.
Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.
Ba Si, U
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
Bajoria, Babu Baijnath.
Banerjea, Dr. P. N.
Baqui, Mr. M. A.
Bardaloi, Srijut N. C.
Bhagavan Das, Dr.
Chattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra Nath
Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam
Chetty, Mr. Sami Vencatachelam.
Das, Mr. B.
Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha
Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.
Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer, Mr. Ahmed.
Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.
Fakir Chand, Mr.
Fuzlul Huq, Mr. A. K.
Gadgil, Mr. N. V.
Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.
Giri, Mr. V. V.
Govind Das, Seth
Gupta, Mr. Ghanshiam Singh.
Hidayatallah, Sir Ghulam Hussain
Hosamani, Mr. S. K.
Jedhe, Mr. K. M.
Jehangir, Sir Cowasji.
Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
Khan Sahib, Dr.
Khare, Dr. N. B.
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
Muhammad Nauman, Mr.
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Syed.
Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.
Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta.
Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.
Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.
Rajan, Dr. T. S. S.
Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.
Ranga, Prof. N. G.
Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
Sant Singh, Sardar
Satyamurti, Mr. S.
Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
Shafi Daudi, Maulvi Muhammad.
Sham Lal, Mr.
Shaukat Ali, Maulana.
Sheodass Daga, Seth.
Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib Nawab.
Singh, Mr. Deep Narayan
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Shri Krishna.
Sinha, Raja Bahadur Harihar Prasad Narayan.
Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.
Sri Prakasa, Mr.
Thein Maung, Dr.
Thein Maung, U
Umar Aly Shah, Mr.
Varma, Mr. B. B.
Vissanji, Mr. Mathuradas.

The motion was negatived.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Half Past Two of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH DEPARTMENT.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 5,33,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 5,33,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department'."

There are two motions in the name of Professor Ranga. Both of them are token cuts and are out of order. There is another in the name of Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta. That is also a token cut, and out of order. Pandit Nilakantha Das has another motion. That is also out of order.

Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I only want certain information. May I know if anything substantial has been done at the Research Institute for rice? Everybody knows that rice is the principal food-crop of India. Out of a total net crop of 229 million acres, 80 million of acres are sowed with rice. Now, if I am not wrong, my information is that, except for a small experiment on the isolation of paddy, nothing has been done May I know if something substantial has been done for rice?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Sir, my Honourable friend is labouring under some confusion He is talking about the Imperial Institute of Research. This is not a demand for the Agricultural Research Institute but for the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research. However, I will give my Honourable friend the information that I have in my possession. The Imperial Council of Agricultural Research has already sanctioned expenditure to the limit of Rs. 11 lakhs for provincial research in Bihar, Burma and other Provinces on this question of rice and paddy.

Prof. N. G. Ranga (Guntur *cum* Nellore: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I wish to make some suggestions. I find that only two Members of this House are represented on the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department. This is a Department in the progress of which this House has been evincing a very great deal of interest from the very beginning, and, as such, I suggest that the number of Members of this House on this Imperial Council ought to be increased at least to six

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Sir, as you are aware, I am always anxious to give all the information I can to Honourable Members opposite. But I do feel that this is raising a question of policy as to what the constitution of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research should be.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In that case, I wish to oppose this demand.

Pandit Nilakantha Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I wish to point out that this is practically a "new grant". At any rate, Rs. 5 lakhs of this demand for agricultural research is so. This money is being given year after year in this way by means of a supplementary grant. In 1932-33, for want of money, this grant was not given in the Budget. It was retrenched, so to say. But, towards the end of the year, it was given as a supplementary grant. The same thing was done in 1933-34, and, in the current year, the same thing is being done. Of course, nobody would think of stopping a grant of five lakhs for agricultural research. My idea is that more should be spent on it. But I should like to suggest one thing. New crops are being investigated in the research. Old crops are being more useful by selection of varieties. Rice crop. I mean, paddy, is the staple crop in most parts of this country. The whole of Coastal, Eastern and Himalayan India is paddy-growing But many parts of this paddy-growing areas are affected by floods, as, for example, North Bengal and the

[Pandit Nilakantha Das.]

East Coast tracts, especially Orissa. Vast tracts of land in these regions are flooded year after year, especially the lands on the East Coast. Now, I have noticed that lands are flooded especially when the plants are young, and if floods come at that time, then, in that year, there is no paddy. So, if some rice crop could be found out or selected by means of research which could stand the flood water even when the plants are young, then it would prove to be of a great benefit in those flooded parts of the country. So, I should like to suggest that some part of this research money should be allotted for the investigation of the problem of the paddy crop in the flooded areas.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Sir, the money that we are asking for now has, in all probability, already been allocated to schemes that have been submitted by the Advisory Council and approved by the Governing Body, but I can assure my Honourable friend that the suggestion which he has made as regards the investigation of possibilities of the paddy crop in permanently-flooded areas will be brought to the notice of the Advisory Board.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I really want to raise two questions—concerning the financial procedure as apart from the merits of the question. Sir, it has become almost a practice with the Treasury Benches, because they have been allowed to do just what they like, to do like this. Look at this—it is a note in the book of proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee, Vol. XIV, No. 9, at page 382, Sir, you will find there this opinion of the Government:

"The annual research grant of five lakhs of the Council under Demand No. 60 was suspended for the year 1932-33 on account of financial stringency, but subsequently on the recommendation of the Committee, the Legislative Assembly voted a supplementary grant of 5 lakhs during that year"—*that is 1932-33.*

The same procedure was adopted in 1933-34. Again in 1934-35, a supplementary demand of 5 lakhs was asked for and granted. Now, I really want to know from the Finance Member, if he has followed me, whether it is right that, for three successive years, the same supplementary demand for the same service should be made. Can it be said to be a new service which was not contemplated? And, if it was suspended three years ago, I suggest that the Honourable the Finance Member or his Department should have examined the question of its need, the last time, when the Budget was introduced.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Are you objecting to the grant of the five lakhs on the ground that it is unnecessary because they have been able to do without it for one or two years and that they can do without it for ever?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: On the other hand, I want this Council to get the five lakhs, if they can find the money. I am pointing out this it is not right to bring, in year after year, for three years, a supplementary demand for five lakhs, for the same purpose.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is it exactly the same sum?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes, and for the same service. The proposal is that the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research may be provided with a supplemental grant of 5 lakhs for research.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The amount asked for is Rs. 5,33,000.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: That is a separate grant. It is mentioned in the Standing Finance Committee proceedings Vol XIV, No. 10, dated the 2nd March, with regard to the earthquake grant. For these three years continuously, the exact sum of 5 lakhs has been asked as a supplemental grant for the same subject.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is not the demand under discussion now?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: We are now asked to vote Rs. 5,33,000 for two items. Five lakhs are required under this head, and Rs 33,000 are required for the reclamation of land in a place called Mushari in Bihar and Orissa. You will find the details in Vol. XIV, No. 10, dated the 2nd March, 1935. The details are given on page 466:

	Rs.
"Reclamation of land	10,000
Installation of new tube wells	3,000
Construction of temporary residential quarters for the entire staff	20,000"

That is a separate item. But the point I am raising for the consideration of the Finance Member is that this department has been coming up with a supplemental demand of five lakhs for the same service year after year. That, I submit, is a financial irregularity. They must satisfy his department in time, and the department should say whether they can spare the money or not. The other is an entirely new service. I will refer you to page 456 where it is said:

"Owing to the urgency of the matter and in order to reduce the dislocation of the research work to the minimum, the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research has already authorised expenditure on items (i) and (ii) in anticipation of the approval of the Standing Finance Committee."

I want to know where exactly we are. Who is the sanctioning authority for expenditure beyond the budget sanction? Where does the Council come in? I am simply asking for information. The note simply says that the Imperial Council sanctions the amount. I want to know what is the financial procedure which sanctions extra expenditure in anticipation. Those are the two points on which I should like to have information.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: As regards the bringing forward of a supplementary grant at the end of each year, I understand that what was in my predecessor's mind was that the budget balance was very precarious during the last three years and although he had great benevolence towards the work of the Imperial Council of Research he was not quite certain whether he could find five lakhs out of the budget. So he waited till it became clear that he could spare five lakhs and then he brought a supplementary

[Sir James Grigg.]

grant. I am quite ready to consider and I think there is a good deal in what the Honourable Member says—that it is rather concealing a material fact, although I do not think it is a very vital fact, from the Assembly if the expenditure is not definitely submitted to it at the beginning of the year. I quite agree with that. His principle in the matter is unexceptionable. I am afraid that the same course has been taken this year but I will certainly consider whether a more orthodox procedure cannot be accepted in the future years. His other point was: Who is the body which is responsible for anticipating the approval of this House? That cannot be done by the Imperial Council of Research on its own, it must have the approval of the Finance Department.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 5,33,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department'."

The motion was adopted.

SCHEME FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING IN INDIA.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs 57,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Scheme for the Improvement of Agricultural Marketing in India'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved.

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 57,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Scheme for the Improvement of Agricultural Marketing in India'."

There are motions standing in the names of Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena, Prof. Ranga, Pandit Nilakantha Das, and Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant all of which apparently raise questions of principle by motions of cuts. They are out of order.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena (Lucknow Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I propose to move my motion.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has already ruled that out of order.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: May I submit a few words about this demand because it is a new service and new appointments are going to be made. I think the House should get an opportunity to express its views on this subject.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can raise those questions, not by means of a token cut, but he can speak on the substantive motion.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: Sir, I had given notice of this motion with two objects in view. Firstly, I wanted to draw the attention of the House to the high salaries of the officers that are provided under this scheme. Secondly, I wanted to warn the House against raising any false hopes from the scheme so far as improving the lot of the unfortunate agriculturist is concerned. But, before I proceed further, with your permission, I want to say a few words to remove the wrong impression that has gone abroad that there is some dissatisfaction amongst us, the back benchers, for not getting more frequent opportunities of speaking because, much of the time of the House is taken up by our friends who sit on the front benches. I think I am voicing the views of friends here when I say that this is not so. Sir, so far as I am concerned, I am not ashamed of having to play the roll of a dummy and allowing my hand to be played by those who are sitting on the front benches.

Mr. Ahmed Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer (Bombay Central Division: Muhammadan Rural): But you are an interrupter.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: You can interrupt me all right. I know, Sir, that my Honourable friends, who occupy the front benches, are experienced hands at the game that we are playing here and I have full confidence in their sagacity, judgment and resourcefulness. Moreover, our experience has shown that it is our discipline, more than our speeches, which has proved embarrassing to the benches on the opposite. But still there are occasions when even we, back benchers, have to speak, either with a view to giving expression to some local grievance or to putting certain first-hand information in the possession of the House or again with a view to indulging in a little more plain-speaking.

Sir, now coming to this demand which has been moved by the Honourable the Finance Member, we find that in the note on supplementary estimates on page 25, we find details of pay of officers. Central marketing officer, Rs. 2,500 rising by Rs. 125 to Rs. 2,750. Senior marketing officers Rs. 900 rising up to Rs. 1,200 and then Marketing officers Rs. 600 rising up to Rs. 900 and Assistant Marketing officers rising from Rs. 200 to Rs. 500. Now, Sir, you are aware, that there is a Marketing Board in England and, if we compare the salaries of the officers there, we find firstly the Minister of Agriculture is getting only £1,700 a year. The pay was formerly £2,000 and now owing to retrenchment the pay is reduced to £1,700. On the other hand here in India the Central marketing officer is going to get Rs. 2,500 rising to Rs. 2,750 a month which is much more than the pay drawn by the Minister there. Then, if we see the civil estimates for 1934, we find on page 94, that there are investigation officers and their salary is only £400 rising to £500 per year which would come to less than Rs. 500 or Rs. 600 a month. Well, Sir, here these Senior Marketing officers are going to be paid Rs. 900 rising to Rs. 1,200 per month. Again, we have got Assistant Marketing officers and in England they are given only £200 rising to £400. I now confine my remarks only to the salaries of officials engaged in similar work. I am not going to raise the general question of salaries in India and in other countries. We find that an authority in economics, on whom the Honourable the Finance Member relied, that is Lionel Robins, the Assistant Professor of Economics in London School of Economics, is not drawing more than £800 a year and I should like to be corrected if I am wrong.

[Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena.]

That means that Lionel Robins, whom the Honourable the Finance Member claims to be one of the greatest economists of the day or at least by whom he swears, does not get even that much salary which is proposed to be paid to these Marketing officers here. If we refer to the book "Wisdom and Waste", written by Mr. Darling, who is supposed to be an expert, so far as the rural problems are concerned, he writes on page 336 that:

"it is the peasants' financial interests that require special protection and in regard to these, three propositions may be laid down, firstly that the Government should be carried on as economically as possible."

That is the first condition that Mr. Darling has laid down. Then there are other conditions, but in regard to this first condition he says further on:

"If, therefore, it, *i.e., democratic government* is to be introduced into a poor country like India it is the bounden duty of all concerned to reduce the cost wherever possible and the comparatively few who are fortunate enough to hold all the public posts whether high or low should be content with the market wage for their services and in return to give full measure of their service. The idea of service for the common good is as much an Indian as an English ideal."

My submission is that the salaries that are being offered to these officers are not the market wage as suggested by Mr Darling. Then, we must bear in mind that this scheme is being inaugurated and these officials are being appointed with a view to serve the rural interests and to ameliorate the lot of the unfortunate agriculturists and certainly it does not become this department that so highly paid officers should be appointed in it. In India it is a well-known fact that high salaries have a history behind them. We know that the officials who came from England were given higher salary, not because they compared, in any way, unfavourably with those given to them in England, but because they wanted that the officers who come to India should not be exposed to the temptation of bribery and corruption. So, in a way, these high salaries were fixed by way of a consolidated bribery. In other words, for not taking bribery direct from the people, the officers were given bribery in the shape of high salaries. These circumstances do not exist today. Moreover, the difficulties and the experiences which persons coming from England had to suffer do not exist any more. My submission is that a time has come when there should be a general revision in salaries, and, at least in the case of new appointments, we must see, as the custodians of the interests of the poor, that these high salaries are not allowed so far as these new appointments are concerned. The other day, the Honourable Sir James Grigg said that we, the Congressmen, want that this poor country should be made rich over-night or even in a year and that that was not possible. I submit that no one but a congenital idiot could have made that suggestion or understood it as such. What we have been protesting against is the process of impoverishment that commenced about 150 years ago in India and is still continuing. That process must be stopped and the principal factor in that process is the high salaries. We know what Mr. Burke said 150 years ago holds good even today. He said that one rupee that goes out of India is lost to India for ever. The large amount of money that is going out of India, in the shape of salaries and

pensions and other remittances, is a complete loss to India. But we are painfully aware that we cannot touch their salaries. It is not within our power. We know that their salaries were not only enhanced but additional allowances were given on the recommendation of the Lee Commission, against the decisions and views of the Legislatures both Central and Provincial. I had given notice of a token cut, but, as I cannot move it under your ruling, Sir—I would ask the House to reject this demand *in toto*, unless the salaries of these officials are fixed according to the market wage of these incumbents who are going to be appointed. So far as we, the Members of the Congress, are concerned, you know, Sir, that there is a resolution of the Congress laying down that no public servant should be allowed, except specialist, more than one thousand rupees a month. If Honourable Members on the other side have any real regard any genuine regard for improving the lot of the agriculturists, they should come forward with proposals, so far as salaries are concerned, which are commensurate with the poverty and with the income of the people who have to contribute money towards these salaries.

Then, Sir, coming to the other point as to whether this scheme is going to prove beneficial to agricultural interests, I do not want to go into it in detail. I would only say that the scheme may be very good but how long will it take to materialise? How much money will be needed to finance it. It is no use having a motor without motive power and without a battery. We know marketing boards have been working in other countries like America and England. These marketing boards and marketing schemes require large sums of money to finance the crops. They have large sums of money to advance by way of loans to the agriculturists in need. It will serve no useful purpose to set up this machinery, to have these persons to investigate, to survey, and to plan, without knowing what is needed. What is the trouble with the agriculturist today? We find that his income has been considerably reduced.

3 P.M.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member cannot go into those general considerations. He should confine his remarks to the item before the House.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: I was submitting that the expenditure on this scheme is not going to help the agriculturist very much. It is just like that Persian proverb which means:

"Till the specific is received from Mesopotamia, the person who has been bitten by snake will die."

So the whole point is this, that the agricultural situation requires a radical treatment here and now; it does not admit of waiting. At the most, these schemes will be palliatives; they will not be the remedy that the situation requires. We know it for a fact, that so far as foreign markets are concerned, Indian agricultural products cannot compete there. Even in India itself we have to impose import duties on wheat and rice in order that they may not come and compete with us in these markets. So, it is no use appointing commission agents or marketing officers; we cannot make others purchase what they can get cheaper from other countries. Ultimately we shall have to fall back on the markets in India, and in India, we know that the sale is poor because the purchasing capacity of the people has been considerably diminished. How is that capacity to

[Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena.]

be restored,—that is the problem; and, I think it is up to all sections of the House to apply their minds to find out a remedy which will solve this one problem. And I raise this discussion simply to draw the attention of the House to the difficulties of the agriculturists and to tell them that the remedy which has been approved by the conference, which met some time ago in 1934, is not going to solve the problem. With these few words, I oppose the demand.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty (Madras: Indian Commerce): Sir, I propose to make a few observations on this demand. The details of the scheme presented to us in respect of this demand are no doubt very imposing; most of them are such as it would be impossible for any person representing the Indian peasant to object to. But the point is that most of these duties could be done and should be done by the existing departments of the respective provinces. It is a pity that, whenever we want certain improvements to be made in any particular line of the Government's administration, we are very often met with a strong denial, and, when that is not the case, we are met with a costly establishment. Unfortunately this proposal containing the appointment of marketing officers on high salaries and a senior marketing officer and assistant marketing officers on proportionately high salaries seems to me an unnecessary burden. If only there was a will on the part of the provincial Governments and also of the Central Government to keep up the respective departments of the provinces, they could have certainly done all that is intended to be done under the scheme. However, I do not wish to grudge the grant of this amount only on that ground, but I would, in this connection, warn Government against the inevitability of these marketing officers being entirely out of touch with the conditions in this country.

It would appear that in the view of Government any person who is appointed by Government is competent to do any work on the face of this earth. He may be a lawyer but he can easily be made to do the work of a tradesman, in the view of Government. It is with that view that whenever there is an appointment vacant or a fresh appointment is created, the only officer who in the view of Government is competent enough to do that work, however technical it may be, however important it may be, and however special it may be, is the I. C. S officer In many places where Industries Departments were created under the provincial Governments, all the provincial Councils demanded that this department should be manned by persons who are competent to know anything about the industries and they should be at the head of this department. We are always told that it would be wrong and difficult to choose one industrialist as against another, and so the best way of keeping impartiality is to put a person who is thoroughly ignorant of either one industry or the other. I daresay, the same kind of policy is going to be adopted even in respect of this senior marketing officer; and I know in respect of other minor appointments the provincial Governments are given the power of appointment.

What usually happens in the provincial Governments is this. Either a deputy tahsildar or, this subject being in charge of the ministry, some unemployed and unemployable favourites of the Ministers will be pitchforked into these places. They do not know absolutely anything, either the trade conditions or marketing conditions or the agricultural conditions

that exist in the country. They would begin to learn from the day of the appointment and by the time they have picked up a few things the offices might expire or the ministry may come to an end and the new ministry will want new favourites. That is going to be the position. I am afraid it is going to be a costly burden on the agriculturists and an unnecessary interference with the general trend of trade and commerce in this country. I am glad, however, that despite the very strong opinion of the Finance Member against any planned economy, there is a suggestion that one of the duties which this marketing establishment will be asked to do is to plan the production on the basis of quality and demand. That is really no doubt a very desirable move, but the whole question is whether in the determination of these things, whether in coming to decisions as to what crop and to what extent that crop will survive in particular areas, we will have the co-operation of the local traders and cultivators primarily or whether they are going to be merely guided by the figures that may be contained in the blue-book; and moreover, whether those decisions will have the force of law in the matter of being observed by the cultivators. I do not yet see that there is on the part of Government any inclination to make it compulsorily observable by the cultivators. But without it it will be a hopeless task; without compulsion to be enforced subsequently it will be impossible for any plan to proceed successfully. I do not know if Government's view is that after the collection of information Government propose to take legislative power to enforce the programme of cultivation, the extent of cultivation of the zone of the crops that they want this country to produce. I would suggest that instead of these appointments being left to the Provincial Governments, the Central Government itself must directly collect statistics: the subject of marketing is so closely connected with the central subject of commerce that the administration of this whole thing should be in the hands of the Central Government; otherwise, it would only mean adding one more section to the agricultural section of each province: they will be sending up their comments without reference to the conditions existing elsewhere in the country; and it will be necessary for the Central Government to collaborate all those needs, seemingly conflicting and seemingly irreconcilable. It would be merely a redundant task to collect information from Provincial Governments on the one hand and for the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research or some other central establishment again to consider how far they are capable of reconciliation with each other I would like that in this matter both the cultivators and those who are engaged in commerce in this country should be consulted without having too much of bureaucratic opinion, and information collected by marketing officers, who may be appointed either by the Central Government or by the Provincial Governments.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, I find, as my friend, Mr. Saksena, has already said, that the marketing officer is to be paid a salary which is very much more than what is paid to the Minister in England in charge of the Board of Trade and also the expert who is engaged to advise him, and I find also that one of the officers who are already appointed in this direction is somehow or other related to one of the ex-Members of the Executive Council . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair will not allow that sort of reflections to be made.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Anyhow, to propose to pay such an enormous salary to the marketing officer and also such enormous salaries to his assistants at the very outset is nothing short of trying to rob the peasants who are supposed to be helped by this new Department of Marketing.

Then, this Department or this particular officer with his assistants is expected to collect information regarding producers and consumers both in India and abroad. It is something like putting the cart before the horse. How can they get information about the prospects for agricultural produce of India in other countries when the Government of India does not have any of their Trade Commissioners in most of the countries in the world? The other day, when I put a question to the Honourable the Commerce Member, whether he proposed to appoint any more Trade Commissioners either in the United States of America or Japan or any other country, he said that there was no such provision in this year's budget, and, therefore, he did not see any chance of appointing any more Trade Commissioners. Without having any Trade Commissioners in any of those countries, it would be impossible for this marketing officer and his assistants to get the necessary information about the conditions prevailing in other countries.

I come next to the point that is mentioned in the items that are going to be laid stress upon, that are going to be taken up by this particular marketing officer,—the appointment of special committees for staple crops. I do not know how many committees they propose to appoint, but they state here that they would like to have committees for the most important staple products in this country. If these committees are to be appointed, who are going to be represented on them? Are these committees going to be constituted in the same manner in which these other committees under the aegis of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research have been constituted or are they to be constituted in such a manner that the agriculturists, who really are to be benefited by the activities of these marketing officers and their subordinates, are going to be represented on these committees? I do not know what the Government propose to do in this particular connection.

Then, who is to appoint these committees? The marketing officer himself or the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research? If it is the Council which is to appoint these committees, then what is the sanction behind the Council? Anyhow, in the last two or three years, the Imperial Council has not come on any special occasion for any grant, but, instead of that, it has only come here for—its needs and affairs have been placed before us in the form of—a supplementary grant for the last three occasions, and, therefore, this House has not had any occasion at all to discuss the policy underlying the work of this Imperial Council or the manner in which it has been appointing these several committees. There are a number of committees, as many as 16 committees, and on none of these committees are the peasants represented at all. We are now to have some more committees appointed and these are expected to help the marketing officer, and if the peasants are not going to be represented on these committees as well as on other committees, I do not know really how this marketing officer can be expected to do his job satisfactorily.

The next question is of marketing surveys. These surveys when completed will set out in detail the present system of marketing the commodities concerned not only in each province separately but in respect of inter-provincial, inter-state and foreign trade, so as to provide an all-India picture of existing conditions and a common basis for future purposes. But I find that we do not at present have any useful information at all, any relevant information at all, about the inter-state as well as the inter-provincial trade that is going on in this country. This information has not been collected: they made a sort of abortive attempt to collect information about the rail-borne trade in this country, and, after that, they stopped publishing these reports in 1922: and took it up two or three years ago; but if you look into those figures, you will find that there is no general review or attempt to explain the facts that are presented in the report nor is there any account of the total amount of different agricultural commodities that are being carried by rail in this country. Apart from that there is the river-borne trade and here is the coastal trade, and the trade between different towns. Even if we have, with the help of this marketing officer and his assistants, some sort of survey about these conditions for one particular year, it will not be enough. We must have annual reports published about the inter-state and inter-provincial trade that is being carried on in agricultural commodities. But are these people competent to carry out this task? Are these the people really who can be expected to do this work? They themselves admit, they are not enough, they want some more assistance, and it is for that purpose that they expect and hope that the Provincial Governments will appoint their own Provincial Marketing officers; and in order to enable the Provincial Governments to appoint their own marketing officers, they propose to make certain grants to the Provincial Governments, and, in that connection, my friend, Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty, has already pointed out that the Provincial Governments are just as capable of appointing people in whom they are interested as the Central Government itself has behaved in this connection. If such officers are going to be appointed, more because of favouritism on the part of Ministers than because of their real ability, then, I say, this is going to be a farce rather than a real constructive proposal.

Then, Sir, are these provincial marketing officers going to be given a free hand in making their inquiries, in carrying on their work, and are the Provincial Governments going to be given free hand in running the whole of this department, or are they going to be subject to the direct control of the central office? I cannot very well agree with my friend, Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty, when he said that all these provincial officers should be appointed by the Central Government and should be controlled by the Central Government and directed by the Central Government. But, at the same time, I do agree with him in this essential principle that the Provincial Governments ought not to be given complete autonomy as to the manner in which they are to conduct these economic surveys and these marketing arrangements and to establish other facilities for the peasants. I found the same thing had happened in connection with the handloom weaving industry. It is the Government of India which raises the money and which distributes it to the provinces, but the Government of India allow these Provincial Governments to have their own way in regard to spending that money. Sir, I do not like that the same

[Prof. N. G. Ranga.]

thing should happen in regard to this matter. If the Government of India is to make any grants at all for the maintenance of these Provincial Marketing officers, then certainly the Government of India should insist upon a uniform policy being followed all over India, and they should also see that these Marketing officers carry on their work in a manner which will be satisfactory both to this House as well as to the Government of India.

Next, Sir, I come to the question of publication work, and the order in which these officers should carry on their work Last comes the most important thing. It is said that a marketing officer is going to be appointed by the Government of India. As has been observed by my friend, Mr. Satyamurti, already, the Government has come to this House with a supplementary demand,—in fact it is not a supplementary demand, really it is a new demand,—and yet, the Government has already appointed a marketing officer, in fact they have not only appointed a marketing officer, but they have appointed several assistant marketing officers, clerks and so on, it is a *fait accompli.* The next thing is the appointment of provincial marketing officers. I do not know if in any of the provinces, marketing officers have been appointed so far. I have a vague idea that in Madras they have already appointed a marketing officer, but whether that appointment has been made with or without the subsidy from the Government of India, I do not know.

Then the third thing is the question of the inauguration of marketing surveys. We are going to have a number of surveys, I do want all those surveys, but at the same time, my point is, how is it that the Government of India have taken such a long time to create this service? The only reason that I can assign for it is that the Government of India really did not wish to create these surveys at all, because the Honourable the Finance Member has already said that he has absolutely no faith in statistics, he has no use for surveys, and the Government have not had any need for statistics at all about the marketing position in this country.

And, now, they propose to have all these too-highly paid officers for marketing service. But what will they do? They will work on grade standards, just the one aspect of the work on which Great Britain and Ireland have been laying much stress. In Great Britain much useful work has been done in this matter. They have stated here that National Mark Schemes are now in operation for beef, strawberries, apples, cucumbers, canned fruits, vegetables, cidar . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is it necessary to read out the whole list of vegetables?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Now, Sir, all this work has been carried on in England, and now our marketing officers come forward and say that they are going to carry on the same kind of work here in India, but only in regard to three or four commodities, and lastly comes this their programme of work in their scheme. If this is the kind of work, which the newly appointed officers are going to do, then the sooner we abolish this service the better. On the other hand, if the Government of India gives us an assurance that they mean business, that they will provide for us an annual review of trade conditions for agricultural commodities

in this country as well as in other countries, and, if they will assure us that they will appoint part-time correspondents in different countries with a view to supply us periodically with information about marketing facilities and conditions prevailing in other countries in regard to Indian agricultural commodities, then we can reconsider the position in respect of this particular grant and see if we cannot help the Government in passing this particular demand.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Sir, this is practically a new service, and in creating a new service I should like to make it clear that we should, in the first place, look to the question of Indianisation both in regard to pay as well as personnel—spirit as well as form. It is a fact that we have been paying very heavily to all our services, but I am not going into the matter now, but I may tell my friends at once that in a service like this which is being created for the first time, it should be Indianised not only in personnel but in spirit. The pay and conditions of service should be adapted to the conditions of living in this country. That is Indianisation in spirit Now, Sir, it is proposed to create this service according to the recommendations made by a Commission like the Agricultural Commission, endorsed by the Banking Committee some six on seven years ago, and Government had enough time to send at least one man, if not more, to foreign countries for necessary training as a marketing officer or expert. Instead of that, Government say now that they have secured the services of one marketing expert, and I presume his services have been secured from England. It may not be very palatable to some, but I say that so long as we look to England for our experts or for the control of all our services, especially new services, we shall never be able to build up our nation. I have no objection to your recruiting experts from foreign countries—even from England, if there is a real national need for it. But, if you want a real expert, our selection should not be confined to England alone, we must pick out from any country the best man available, and we may pay him for a particular period of time, but one of the conditions of his service should be that he should train our youngmen. I presume this marketing officer's services have been secured on a contract basis for a particular period, and so I would suggest that after the period of his contract is over, Government should give us an assurance that his contract will not be renewed and that an Indian will be appointed in his place

As to the spirit of Indianisation, it will not be possible to carry out the spirit if the outlook does not change in regard to new services. First of all, look to the pay of the Central marketing officers and that of the provincial marketing officers,—we find a good deal of difference. They begin with Rs. 200 in Provinces whereas these marketing officers in the Centre begin with Rs. 600, for provincial marketing officers, it is said, will be of the grade of assistant marketing officers.

Then, again, as has been remarked by some of our friends, this service, in course of time, may prove a heavy burden on the taxpayer I may mention here something by way of an analogy as to what happened to co-operative research in Bihar and Orissa. When co-operative credit societies had not even been fully established, when people had not even understood the utility of these societies, a proposal was made that all those

[Pandit Nilakantha Das.]

poor societies of the Province should contribute something towards the construction of a big house in a central place to accommodate one or two experts to be indented for from abroad so that they might study and advise how best the co-operative movement could be promoted and developed in this country. I now find that the entire co-operative movement there is in a moribund condition. Many co-operative societies are in process of liquidation and banks too.

There is again, in this new programme, another thin end of the wedge for fresh taxation. I find that many committees like the Oilseeds Committee are going to be established, and in this connection it is intended that there will be levied a cess in each case to meet the expenditure for the committees In the case of the Oilseeds Committee it is already under investigation to levy a cess to meet the expenditure of this Committee. Similarly, in the case of other Committees also, a cess is contemplated and the Oilseeds Committee is actually considering detailed proposals for the same. Of course, if under this marketing department there was some storehouse or sales depot, and some articles were to be sold through this department and some commission was charged for the sale etc., that might be a separate proposition, but, if there is going to be a cess which would act like a land cess, like our road cess, then it will be a fresh taxation and I would appeal to the Honourable Member that he should not meet the expenditure on the Committees by levying a cess on the produce of the soil, for our agriculturists are being taxed already very much and Government might well afford to give some money for their relief.

Last of all, there is an item in which I am somewhat personally interested—rather, my constituency is directly interested. Aids are given to ten provinces. I should like to suggest that this is going to be done for three years, and, as in the meantime, new provinces are coming into being, I earnestly appeal to the Honourable Member to treat the new provinces, especially the province of Orissa, as a separate entity, for I have no desire now to describe the condition of Orissa—its miseries, mainly due to long neglect, and exploitation in neglect. This is a province where there are no industries and our agriculture is in a very bad state on account of floods which are generally followed by famines. So, it should be considered as a separate entity and some special provision should be made for the province of Orissa so far as the marketing organisation is concerned.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Mr. President, I think that my intervention at this stage might help to shorten the debate, because the points which, in my opinion, could be raised on the demand have already been raised and raised in elaborate form. There are four main questions, as I see it, that have been raised The first is, is it worth while to undertake the work which is to be entrusted to the marketing officers and their associates? My Honourable friend, Mr. Mohanlal Saksena, was doubtful, in fact, he thought that it would be money wasted. On the other hand, my Honourable friend, Mr. Sami Venkatachelam Chetty, was not so sceptical; on the contrary, if I heard him correctly, he said that nobody representing agricultural interests could minimise the importance of the objects for which this investigation was to be undertaken. I submit that the task of persuading my Honourable friend, Mr. Mohanlal Saksena, in regard to this

matter had better be left to Mr. Sami Venkatachelam Chetty. He will be able to do it much more persuasively and much more effectively than I, because I do not happen, fortunately or unfortunately, to be a member of that political organisation.

The second point which was raised was regarding the level of salaries. It was stated that we had pitched the rates of pay too high, not merely for the principal Agricultural Officer, but for the other members of the hierarchy. I would like to deal first with the principal Agricultural Officer. There seems to be an impression that this appointment has only recently been made. No. It was made last year; it was made after reference to the Standing Finance Committee; it was made after an advertisement issued by the High Commissioner for India in England who invited applications from suitable candidates And we chose the best officer in the circumstances, because it was felt that, in view of the highly specialised work of marketing organisation and investigation, it was desirable that we should have somebody with practical experience of this kind of work. But the point to bear in mind is that the appointment was made only for a period of three years and it was made with the definite object that this officer would train up officers in India to take his place and to continue the work which might be initiated as a result of the organisation that might be started. That is all I need say on the subject of the principal marketing officer. And I would like to take this opportunity of repudiating the suggestion that this appointment was made in any spirit of nepotism, because, as I have already stated, it has been made as the result of advertisement and on the recommendation of the High Commissioner for India who happens to be not only an Indian, but was in the past a very distinguished and a very respected Member both of the Government and of this House. Now, we go on to the other members of the hierarchy and the staff of the marketing officer. My Honourable friend, Mr. Mohanlal Saksena, and I think very rightly, said: you should fix the rates of pay having regard to the market value of the people that you get. Now, in so far as the staff of the Central Marketing Office is concerned, that has been recruited, not by the Governor General in Council, but by the Public Service Commission. That, I hope, will dispose of any suggestion that there has been any nepotism or any other backdoor influence at work. The Public Service Commission advertised, they scrutinised the applications—I think more than 300 applications were received,—they interviewed the candidates, and then they chose the best people they could. I come to the point of salaries. As you would have observed . . .

Pandit Nilakantha Das: May I know if there were applications from other countries than England and India?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I am not at the present moment talking about the principal marketing officer. I am talking about the other members of the hierarchy, the marketing officers, the assistant marketing officers and the senior marketing officers, who have been recruited by the Public Service Commission in this country. My Honourable friend is, and he said so, a staunch friend of Indianisation. He will agree that in regard to appointments which could be made in this country and about which we were confident that there is a suitable field in this country, there would have been no justification for inviting applications from abroad. That was the reason why the Public Service Commission were asked to confine their

[Mr. G. S. Bajpai.]

attention to the field of recruitment in this country. Now, to come back to the salaries, I think my Honourable friend, Mr. Mohanlal Saksena, enunciated a very excellent principle, namely, that the salary shall be related to the market value of the people whom you get. Let me now give you the salary of the first principal marketing officer. This gentleman was in receipt of a salary of Rs 700 per mensem in Mysore. He is being asked to take up an appointment which is not a permanent one but a temporary one, because the appointment is only for a period of five years. I think my Honourable friend will agree that in the circumstances we had to offer him a slightly higher salary than the salary which he was getting in Mysore, otherwise it would not be worth while practically jeopardising a permanent appointment in Mysore for the purpose of doing temporary work. I submit that in the circumstances our fixing his initial salary at Rs. 900 per mensem is by no means an act of extravagance. Similarly, in the case of the second marketing officer, also from Mysore. He was already in receipt of a salary of Rs. 1,000 per mensem. I may state that if we had fixed his salary at a rigid figure of Rs 900 or 950, we should have had to go without this officer I can go on multiplying instances, because I have got the names of all the officers selected by the Public Service Commission, but, I hope, in the light of the explanation I have given, my Honourable friend will agree that the decision of Government was a decision caculated to meet the requirements of economy as well as the requirements of efficiency, because it is no use, in fact, it is uneconomical to go and appoint people cheap and people inefficient That disposes of the second question, namely, the scale of salaries.

Now, I come to the question of functions. My Honourable friend, Prof. Ranga, said that while he was in favour of leaving a great deal of latitude to the Provincial Governments, he felt that this investigation shall be co-ordinated, so that there shall be some systematic method both of investigation and of presentation of the facts. That exactly is the principle upon which this whole plan has been worked out. Our staff of principal marketing officers, senior and junior, has been recruited on this assumption that, inasmuch as the principal crops with which they may be dealing are grown in more than one province, inasmuch as the commodities of which the marketing they may be investigating interest more than one province, the particular plan of investigation must be laid down by the Central Government; the particular lines of investigation must be supervised by the Central Government but the actual investigation must be done locally by such a staff as the Local Government may appoint. That, Sir, is the principle on which we have acted. We have provided money for the central staff with the approval of the Standing Finance Committee, and, after furnishing to them every information that was likely to be needed. So far as the provinces are concerned, the only thing that we could do was to ask the Standing Finance Committee and this House to agree to a lump grant being given. The maximum of that is 2 lakhs. It will not be consistent either with the spirit of the Constitution, nor I submit would it be generous to the provinces to assume that a sum of two lakhs distributed over nine or ten Governors' provinces cannot be judiciously spent by the Ministers in the provinces and the Governor—by the Ministers who, I am sure, are responsive in these matters to public opinion and to the opinion of leaders of parties as they sit in the Provincial Legislatures.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What about the recommendation of Committees?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is interfering too much.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The fourth or last point which I want to deal with is the subject of commercial intelligence. My Honourable friend Prof. Ranga, was responsible for raising that also. He said what on earth is the good of all these investigations. We do not want merely to collect statistics in India. We want to know what the outlet for our products abroad is. You will really have a picture of these requirements only when there is a proper commercial intelligence organisation abroad. Now, my Honourable friend will agree that the staple products which are to be investigated by these officers and committees are primary products, that is agricultural products. Now, what is the position in regard to that. We have a Trade Commissioner in Hamburg, we have a Trade Commissioner in Milan. We have a Trade Commissioner in London and also a Deputy Trade Commissioner. In other words, with the possible exception of the United States of America—and the Honourable the Commerce Member announced the other day that the question of appointing a Trade Commissioner there is under consideration—every principal consuming country of our primary products has already a Trade Commissioner. I submit, it cannot, in the circumstances, be contended that we are undertaking something which would be lopsided. That is all, Sir, I need say in regard to the various points that have been raised.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: What about a grant to Orissa?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: My friend has asked me about Orissa. At the present moment, my friend is perfectly aware that Orissa is part of the province of Bihar and Orissa. We can, for purposes of this distribution, recognise only the province of Bihar and Orissa. When Orissa becomes a separate province, the question will be reconsidered.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 57,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Scheme for the Improvement of Agricultural Marketing in India'."

The motion was adopted.

INDUSTRIES.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): Sir, I move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 1,69,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Industries'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 1,69,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Industries'."

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, this is the first time . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does the Honourable Member want to oppose this motion?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Yes. This is the first time that this demand for money for the handloom industry is brought before this Assembly. The policy underlying this grant of money has not been discussed before in this Assembly.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): This is not a new service, and the Chair cannot allow any question of policy to be debated.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I find that this money is to be distributed between the different provinces in the manner which is accepted and proposed by the Industrial Conference held once a year in Simla. I find that according to the figures supplied to this House by the Honourable Member for Industries, only very small sums are to be granted to each one of the provinces. I find that, in 1934-35, it is proposed to distribute one lakh and 76 thousand between all these provinces in this country for the improvement of handloom weaving industry and in 1935-36 only 4 lakhs 74 thousand is proposed to be distributed but if you look at the proceedings of the Industrial Conference held in Simla on the 9th, 10th and 11th July 1934, we find the proposals placed before that conference by various Local Governments and according to the estimates that they have made for their schemes of improving the handloom weaving industry that as much as 12 lakhs of rupees per annum will be needed if all those schemes are to be properly financed at all but it was thought since the Government of India was having only about 5 lakhs of rupees or a little more, it would not be possible for them to accept all their schemes and therefore a compromise was arrived at and a particular scheme was adopted according to which this money was to be distributed between all these different provinces. The principle according to which this money is to be distributed is stated as follows:

"It was agreed that the distribution of half the grant in proportion to the consumption of yarn and half in proportion to the expenditure incurred should hold for the first year only and that the matter should be reconsidered at the next Conference in the light of experience, and it was also agreed that 15 per cent of the grant should be retained for contingencies and grants to Minor Administrations and especially to increase the grants of those provinces which for special reasons received unfavourable allotments under the agreed basis of allocation."

But I find no provision made for establishing a Central Emporium for hand-woven goods either at Delhi or at any other centrally-situated place in India, and I find also that several provinces, especially the United Provinces and the Central Provinces Governments were suggesting the establishment of such a Central Emporium, if necessary, to be under the direct supervision and control of the Honourable Member for Industries and Labour. Sir, this Central Emporium will serve a very useful purpose in that people from different parts of the world and India who will be thronging to Delhi can resort to it. And it is for that reason that it is proposed to shift the Pusa Institute to Delhi. It is, however, for a very much more sensible and plausible reason that I suggest that such a Central Emporium should be established in Delhi and money should be provided for it, but no provision at all has been made.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can make his suggestions without repeating himself.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Secondly, Sir, according to the proposals placed before the Government of India and accepted by the Government of India, it is learnt that the various provinces are to appoint their provincial marketing officers and they are to have their provincial committees also. In Bombay they are to have industrial committees in different districts and so on, and they are to establish these marketing societies in various parts of their province. Yet no mention is made about the manner in which these weavers should be taken into the consultation and confidence of these Provincial Governments on the allocation, distribution and expenditure of these sums proposed to be granted by the Government of India It is only one province and one Government and that is the United Provinces Government which has come forward with this proposal that it will supplement the money that will be granted to it by the Government of India with its own funds and thus finance this marketing programme, but other provinces have not come forward with any such programme at all, and I do not know what the Government of India propose to do in order to see that the money which they are granting will be properly utilised and will not be a sort of drop of water in a world of desert but, on the other hand, will be a useful source of inspiration and progress. Then, Sir, I suggested the other day to the Honourable the Member for Industries and Labour that the handloom weavers should really, if they are to be benefited, taken into the confidence of and ought to be given representation on, all the committees to be established in all these provinces, but he gave me the answer that he was not prepared to make any such suggestion to the Provincial Governments, that he was not prepared to interfere with the manner in which the Provincial Governments propose to spend these sums that are granted by the Government of India, and that he will not even see the advisability of making or even placing that suggestion before them. Unless the handloom weavers who are sought to be benefited are to be given a higher constitutional place on all the institutions that are to be established in all these provinces with the money that is to be granted by the Government of India, I cannot feel sure that the handloom weavers will be benefited at all.

And, then, there is the question of the salaries. I find from the proposals placed here that the Madras Government propose to pay as much as Rs. 700 for its marketing officer, while the Punjab Government propose to pay only Rs. 250 for its officer. Now I would like that there should be some sort of uniformity in the salaries to be paid to the various marketing officers out of the funds to be granted by the Government of India, and that is why I again maintain that the Government of India should try to put its foot down and then say to these Provincial Governments that if they are to get any money from the Government of India, they should certainly try to abide by the decisions of the Government of India; and in coming to its own decision, the Government of India should develop a uniform policy about the manner in which this money should be spent in the way of grants to handloom societies, in the way of the supply of capital at a low rate of interest to the handloom weavers the co-operative societies, the industrial societies, the sales societies, and also by way of salaries to the officers to be appointed to carry on the marketing of handloom goods.

Next, Sir, I want to suggest that the Government of India should try to persuade the Provincial Governments to pay more attention to the marketing of handloom-woven goods and in that way improve the get-up and

[Prof. N. G. Ranga.]

efficiency of the clothes used by handloom weavers and they should also pay attention to the collection of facts in regard to the number of handlooms there are in different provinces, the number of handloom weavers employed in that particular industry, and also the standard of living that is possible for those workers. And I want the Government of India also to investigate the possibility of establishing Trade Boards in order to improve the conditions of the handloom weavers who are employed by an increasing number of employers. It is usually believed that the handloom weaving industry, being a cottage one, is full of only independent weavers, who are not at all employed by anybody, but it is a wrong belief, Sir. I find, as a result of an extensive inquiry carried on in the Madras Presidency in various districts, that more than 75 per cent of the handloom weavers are employed today as wage-earners either in groups of five or groups of ten or twenty by various employers belonging to either their own caste or some other caste or even race and are thus being exploited by these employers, and these weavers should be protected from the ravages of these employers, and that ought to be undertaken also if there are funds available for that. Lastly, Sir, I find that these five lakhs will not be enough at all. The Government of India should certainly try—if they do wish to help these handloom weavers at all—to convince the millowners and persuade them to agree to an increase in this direction to the extent of at least five lakhs raised per annum so that these handloom weavers may really be helped . . .

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Where are the millowners going to get the money from?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: They even tried to oppose it here on the floor of this House when the additional income from the tariff was being granted.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: What authority have you for that?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: That is my memory.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Oh, memory!

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I am speaking subject to correction. I say, when this money is being distributed by the Government of India they should have a sufficient amount of control over the manner in which it is being spent by the Provincial Governments, and I do not want the Honourable Member for Industries and Labour to come here and say: "I cannot make any suggestions to the Provincial Governments. I cannot control their activities, I cannot have anything to do with it at all—I will simply make over the money that the Assembly grants to the Government of India to the provinces to be distributed, and then I simply wash my hands of all this."

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce (Member for Industries and Labour): Sir, my Honourable friend, Professor Ranga, stated at the outset of his speech, that this question had not been discussed before in this Assembly. I think, Sir, that is hardly correct. The grant we are discussing is the outcome of a statement made by the Honourable the Commerce Member

last year in the course of a discussion on the Indian Tariff (Textile Protection) Amendment Bill. It was then that he told the House that the Government of India had—

"Decided that they would invite Local Governments and Local Administrations to place before them suitable schemes for developing co-operative buying and selling on behalf of the handloom weaver, and, generally, for the better organization and improvement of the industry. They propose to make grants-in-aid of such schemes as may appear suitable to them, the grants-in-aid per annum not to exceed, in the aggregate, an amount equal to the amount of the proceeds of an import duty of a quarter anna per pound on yarns up to fifties imported into the country, and to last so long as the protective measures in this Bill are in force. We calculate that we shall have something like Rs. 3½ lakhs per annum to distribute for this purpose."

4 P. M. The position is that the House had ample opportunities, during the discussion on the Bill, to discuss the principle of the grant. My recollection on the subject is not very clear, but, so far as I know, no objection was raised. In fact, the proposal was generally welcomed, as it was felt that as the Government were doing so much for the cotton mill industry, they ought to do a little for the handloom industry. My Honourable friend's next contention is that the amount is too small. There I have considerable sympathy with his point of view. But one has to cut one's coat according to one's cloth. If we find that this expenditure is really producing a useful effect, I should have no hesitation in going to my Honourable colleague on my right and asking him whether he cannot give us a little more money.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: He has got 35 lakhs now.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would ask the Honourable Member not to go on interrupting. He must exercise some self-restraint.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Now, Sir, I come to my Honourable friend's main contention with which I find myself in complete disagreement. He wishes us to keep the very strictest control over the expenditure of this amount by Local Governments. He wants us to put Local Governments on a Procrustean bed and to have absolute uniformity throughout the whole of India, whatever the differences may be between the local conditions of the different provinces. He wants us to give the marketing officer in Madras Rs. 250 or Rs. 300 or whatever the figure he mentioned because the Punjab Government happen to have fixed that salary for their marketing officer irrespective entirely of the amount of work the marketing officer or the officer in charge of these schemes in Madras has to do and irrespective entirely of the number of handlooms in that province and of the consumption of yarn. I decline to be a party to any proposal of that kind. I cannot understand the distrust of Local Governments which prevails in some sections of this House. The Madras Government administers a budget of about 16 crores. We are giving them about Rs. 60,000 for 1935-36 to spend on the handloom industry, and, forsooth, we are to tell them that they can only spend the money in one way and one way alone. Sir, it is really too much to expect us to tie the Local Governments down this way especially when we are on the eve of Provincial Autonomy when they will be entirely independent in matters of this kind. It is absurd that we should expect them to come to us for our approval if they want to make changes in their schemes and if they

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

want to spend another Rs. 100 here or another Rs. 100 there. I think that we have done our duty to this House in the way of seeing that the money which is voted by it is properly spent when we have asked the Local Governments to submit schemes to us for general approval. The schemes they submitted were carefully examined by the sub-committee of the Industries Conference and it criticised them in various ways. I should like to express my appreciation of the way in which the Local Governments gave effect to the points which were made in the course of the discussion at the Industries Conference last year. We are proposing that the schemes should be reviewed annually at the Industries Conferences not merely to provide us with information on the progress made but also with a view to enable all the provinces to exchange ideas and experiences. I feel, Sir, that in these ways we have provided sufficient guarantee that the money we are giving the Provinces should not be wasted. I do not think there is any other point in my Honourable friend Professor Ranga's speech which calls for comment except that I am a little doubtful whether the idea of a Central Emporium is worth following up. India is a vast country with 350 million people and I should have thought that Provincial Emporiums were all that is required. I cannot see myself what useful purpose would be served by having a Central Emporium in addition. I should like to express my agreement with him in regard to the last point he raised, which is that special attention should be paid to marketing. That, after all, is the most important part of the various schemes which have been submitted to us. He also said that special attention ought to be paid to the finish. There I am in entire agreement with him. If you want to sell your goods, they must be finished properly and he is perfectly right in urging that special attention should be paid to the finish of the articles produced. I would only once more say in conclusion that I feel that Local Governments may be trusted in this matter, that the administration of the grant must be left to them and that it must be for them to decide whose advice they should take in regard to the expenditure. They are far better judges of local conditions than we are and any undue interference on our part beyond the limits that I have mentioned would be both unnecessary and uncalled for.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 1,69,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Industries'."

The motion was adopted.

TRANSFER TO THE FUND FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL AVIATION.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 92,57,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Development of Civil Aviation'."

Perhaps I may be allowed to make a few preliminary remarks of explanation. Except in one particular, this grant is on all fours with the grant for the transfer of the Pusa Institute to Delhi. The scheme was approved by the Standing Finance Committee of the last Assembly, but it was not approved in principle by the Assembly itself. It was proposed to meet the expenditure out of capital, and it is now proposed to utilise the revenue surplus for that purpose. The principle behind that change from capital to a revenue surplus is that whatever may be said about the return on the money spent, it will not yield an immediate and correspondingly measureable return to the exchequer, so that it is not a remunerative scheme of the kind which it is normally justifiable to charge to capital. That is why, when money became available, we decided to meet the expenditure out of a revenue surplus. And perhaps as a certain amount of misapprehension exists about what it is and what it is not legitimate to spend revenue and accrued revenue surplus on, I may say that even if the money from the surplus which it was proposed to spend on this subject is released by a restoration of the former decision to charge it to capital, it is not available for the reduction of taxes in the forthcoming year. On the 31st March, it will automatically go to debt reduction and avoidance. In other words, it will go towards reducing the capital debt. Therefore, if we decide now to increase the capital debt by precisely the same amount, the net effect on Government finances will be nil. But it certainly is not legitimate to bring forward an accrued surplus from year I to assist the revenue of year II and to utilise the money for the reduction of taxes which involves a recurring reduction of the resources of the Government. With these few words of explanation, I move the motion standing in my name.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 92,57,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Development of Civil Aviation'."

The first motion is in the name of Pandit Nilakantha Das that the demand be omitted. That, being a direct negative, is out of order.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: I do not move my amendment*

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, I must apologise to you for again rising to a point of order. But I may assure you, Sir, that I do so only after the most careful consideration that I am capable of. I submit to you, with some confidence, Sir, that this supplementary demand is not covered by our Rules. My submission to you is this. It is admitted, Mr. President, that it does not come under Rule 50(1)(i) of the Indian Legislative Rules, because the amount voted in the Budget is not found to be insufficient for the purpose of the current year. Rule 50(1))(i) says:

"An estimate shall be presented to the Assembly for a supplementary or additional grant when :

(i) the amount voted in the Budget of a grant is found to be insufficient for the purposes of the current year.

(ii) a need arises during the current year for expenditure for which the vote of the Assembly is necessary upon some new service not contemplated in the Budget for that year."

*"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 92,57,000, in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Development of Civil Aviation' be reduced to one rupee."

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

I lay some emphasis on the words 'not contemplated in the Budget for that year'. If you will kindly turn to the big Volume which has been circulated to us along with the Demands for Grants for this year, you will find at page 393, Demand No. 63, Aviation and the sub-heads under which this grant will be accounted for on behalf of the Department of Industries and Labour (Civil Aviation). Therefore, I believe there was last year, I speak subject to correction, this Demand No. 63 including Aviation and Civil Aviation, and it was a service contemplated in the budget for the year 1934-35. This Civil Aviation was a specific service, for which the House was asked to vote money, and the House voted money for this very specific purpose. I should like to know, Mr. President, what is the new service for the expenditure upon which this money is wanted, which was not contemplated in the budget for that year. As far as I can see, this demand comes under neither sub-rule (i) nor sub-rule (ii).

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What about Rule 49.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: It is not admittedly an excess grant, because it has not been spent.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then, what does the Honourable Member say is the nature of the demand?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: It is more than I can say. The Honourable the Finance Member says that it is a supplementary demand. I say it is not covered by any Rule I know of. You will concede at once that, so long as the demand cannot come under Rule 49 or Rule 50, no demand can come before the House.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is a technical question. The House can, if it so chooses, reject the demand.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: On that matter, I submit one thing. When these demands are asked for, we are given a big Volume stating the specific items of expenditure. It is not as if this House votes block grants for Civil Aviation. This House votes for a grant to be spent in the manner specified in the Volume given to us. So far as this is concerned, you will notice only a reference at the bottom and it says.

"This is in accordance with the proposal explained in paragraphs 28 and 33 of the speech of the Honourable the Finance Member."

If you will kindly turn to the speech of the Honourable the Finance Member, you will find in paragraph 28 there is nothing mentioned specifically about this. In paragraph 33, the Honourable the Finance Member simply says:

"After these special grants have been made there should remain a balance of Rs. 2,04 lakhs. A large part of this sum I propose to put aside for two schemes which it was provisionally decided to finance from capital. These are the civil aviation programme, which is expected to cost Rs. 93 lakhs, and the transfer of the Pusa Institute to Delhi which will cost about Rs. 36 lakhs. I was not myself very happy about the decision to charge to capital these two schemes, which are certainly not in any strict sense of the word remunerative. And now that we have an accrued revenue surplus it seems to me sound policy to use part of it for these purposes and to avoid the creation of what might have become an awkward precedent."

My point on the merits is this. We are asked to vote away 93 lakhs without a single datum, as to how it is to be spent. I submit this is a very vital point. We are asked to vote away 93 lakhs block grant. Nobody tells us details about this.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then, this cannot be brought up as a supplementary grant.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: My substantial point is that there are no details forthcoming as to how this money will be spent, and so this demand cannot be taken up.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: May I say a few words as to what the position is. It is as follows: This matter was discussed by the Standing Finance Committee before whom a note was placed. The Finance Committee was the Committee of 1934. They considered the whole question and approved of this expenditure of 92 lakhs odd from capital. The suggestion of the Government originally was that money should come out of capital and that was in the note. The note was considered by the Finance Committee, but it was never placed before the House (Hear, hear), nor was there any Resolution before this House such as in the case of Pusa. It evidently turns out now that the Honourable the Finance Member did not think that this expenditure should be financed from capital and he wanted it to be financed from revenue. He got a windfall from the surplus of the last two years and he wanted to use that surplus for this purpose. Finding no other way of bringing it before the House the Honourable the Finance Member struck upon the brilliant idea of a supplementary demand. It ought to have been shown under capital expenditure in the next year's budget. That is how it ought to have appeared before the House and then it would have been open for discussion on its merits. As a matter of fact, my Honourable friends have not got the report of the Standing Finance Committee of that year, because they were not Members of this House. I suggest it might be distributed to all the Members.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I understand it has been distributed.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: It was distributed to us before, to us old Members.

Mr. K. Sanjiva Row (Government of India: Nominated Official): It was distributed to all the Members here along with the budget papers.

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): I have also got it. It is dated 27th August, Proceedings of the Finance Committee, Vol. XIV, No. 4.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Then, I apologise, if that is so. I was given to understand that my Honourable friends did not get it. Then, the scheme is now before the House. I withdraw the statement that it is not before the House. My Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, was then wrong in saying that he did not know the whole question. He ought to have seen the papers distributed to him. He made a mistake. We all sometimes make mistakes. But, however, the point of order raised remains

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

that this demand ought to have been included in the budget and that also out of capital expenditure. The Honourable the Finance Member desiring to provide this money out of revenue, but not being able to afford to pay out of the revenue of the current year, has taken advantage of the surplus of the last two years and has further taken advantage of the medium of supplementary demands to bring it before this House. I contend that this is capital expenditure as originally suggested by Government themselves and that the Finance Member ought to find ways and means of granting this money to the department through capital. I agree that there is a great deal in the point of order raised.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The only thing, Sir, that I need say is that if this is an illegitimate use of a supplementary demand, it is precisely the same procedure as was adopted in the utilisation of the surplus of last year for special expenditure on the Bihar earthquake. It is a special programme of expenditure outside the ordinary annual programme of civil aviation and it is a special programme to overtake arrears of development.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): With regard to the Bihar earthquake, was any point of order raised at the time?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I understand not.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Sir, may I point out to the Finance Member that the Bihar earthquake took Government by surprise? It was a sudden call upon their resources, and it, therefore, falls within the two rules read out by my Honourable friend about supplementary demands. This was not a sudden call upon Government.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: There is nothing here about a sudden call. The language is, "a need arises not contemplated in the budget of that year". The need in this case is to overtake the arrears of development of civil aviation.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Yes, but it was contemplated.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: No, it was not. The provision made was for the bare minimum which we thought could be financed within the budget of that year.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: The whole demand was placed before the Finance Committee and sanctioned by the Finance Committee. It was contemplated; the Bihar earthquake took Government by surprise.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: It was not contemplated in the budget; it was contemplated at a later stage.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is it a new service?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: It is a new service which was approved by the last Standing Finance Committee, but was not submitted for the vote of the Assembly.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): But civil aviation is not a new service?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The special programme to overtake the arrears of development is a new service.

Sardar Sant Singh: Sir, in the proceedings of the meeting of the Standing Finance Committee held on 27th August, 1934, the question was if the proposal was in respect of a new service, and the answer is, "No." It is in vol. XIV, No. 4, page 138.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The question of new service does not arise in connection with capital charges. "New service" has a special technical significance in relation to the budget and to the charges to be defrayed out of revenue.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The point of order raised is that this supplementary demand about the transfer of the fund for the development of civil aviation is not in order and is not covered by rule 50. It is clearly not covered by clause (i) of sub-rule (1), and it is also contended that clause (ii) of sub-rule (1) does not apply because it is not a new service. This question, the Chair admits, is not free from difficulty as to what will be considered a "new service" so far as financial provisions are concerned. Aviation itself is not a new service because provision has been made in the last budget. But what is suggested is that it is a new service so far as the programme as sought to be financed by this scheme is concerned. And also a precedent has been cited in the case of the grant that was made for relief of suffering caused by the Bihar earthquake. This is a technical question, but one of importance. On the materials that are available at present, the Chair is not prepared to rule that the demand is out of order, but it does not want this to be taken as a precedent for guidance in future

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Sir, I move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum of Rs. 22,57,000 in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Development of Civil Aviation' be reduced to one rupee."

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta).]

Sir, though you have been pleased to hold that, in the special circumstances of the case, you are not prepared to hold that the demand is not out of order, the fact remains that the demand does not fully answer the conditions that are provided in the rule governing supplementary demands and is certainly not in consonance with the spirit of it. This is a factor which must weigh with the House in determining their attitude towards the demand. Sir, we have to see what will be the consequence of our approval of this proposal. The financial year for which these supplementary demands are being presented is almost at its close. Within a few days it will have come to an end. Admittedly no part of this money has been spent so far. So far as one can foresee. . . .

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I am sorry to have to disabuse my Honourable friend, but some of this money has been spent.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Under whose orders?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: How much?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: My Honourable friend, the Finance Member, explained the position in that respect this morning. He explained that the Finance Department can authorise money in anticipation of a supplementary demand.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: How much has been spent?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: That, I am sorry, Sir, I cannot say, but it is not a very great amount.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Well, then, I have no objection if a rupee has been spent out of it; I am prepared to concede that a rupee has been spent. That does not affect the position so long as we are not told what is the amount that has been actually spent. It is no answer to say that at least a part has been spent. I know that there is a provision of about 16 lakhs for civil aviation in the budget for the next year and one for about 12 or 13 lakhs in the budget for the current year. So, it is just possible that money may have been spent out of the provision that had been made in the budget for the current year; and, if anything has been spent in excess of that amount, then the proper course for Government would be to bring a supplementary demand for that excess amount and not to press for such a huge amount with a view to covering that small expenditure. Here the proposal is for the transfer of a sum of about a crore to a fund. So long as no transfer has been made to that fund, it is inconceivable that any money could have been spent out of a fund to which nothing has yet been transferred. So I cannot possibly conceive how anything could have been spent out of the funds that we are now being asked to transfer to the contemplated or proposed fund which has not yet come into existence. I should very much like to know from the Honourable the Finance Member how he would justify such expenditure out of a fund which has not yet come into existence, whether it would be a regular expenditure, and whether it would be in accordance with the elementary rules of financial disbursement or adjustment or expenditure. But it is not merely a technical question: the question is of greater importance than that. When we are asked to transfer money to a fund, it is open to the Government to spend it in one year—it is open to the Government to spend it in 10 years. If any supplementary demands are brought before the House, they must be strictly restricted to the sums that are needed for immediate and urgent expenses; for any transfer of funds to a consolidated account which will remain in operation for an indefinite length of time would be highly objectionable, as the Government can always in this manner ask the House to transfer sums to a fund with a view to securing a blank cheque and a full licence to spend it away in any manner they choose, at any time they choose, for any purpose they choose . . . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: May I ask the Honourable Member whether he himself did not, on an earlier occasion in this House, propose that all revenue surpluses be carried automatically to a special fund for the development of rural areas?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I did. There, I did not leave it open to the Government to spend away the money for any purpose they chose. On the contrary, I made it clear that the main reason why I made that proposal was to prevent Government from keeping money up their sleeve at the time of framing the budget and then springing upon us demands like these with a view to obtaining arbitrary latitude for wasting away sums which they often managed to secure as surplus revenues through these devious and dubious means and contrivances. That was my argument then, and that argument stands today. The rule by which surpluses are automatically transferable to a particular fund is certainly distinguishable from a proposal for transferring money to a fund and leaving it there to be used by the Government in any manner they chose. What would be the effect of my proposal? The result would be this: that no appropriation could be made out of that fund without sanction to the various schemes being accorded by the House itself. It would be a consolidated fund and various schemes would require sanction before it could be drawn upon. But here we are asked to sanction this amount and leave it at the disposal of the Honourable the Finance Member to be spent by him at his sweet will. That is not only opposed to all principles, but on merits too it is highly detrimental to the proper regulation of expenditure as it would practically divest the House of whatever control it possesses over the expenditure of public money. The Honourable the Finance Member told us that this provision is different from that made for the transfer of the Pusa Institute only in one respect. He said that it stood exactly on a par with that in all other respects and in so far as it can be distinguished from that I think it will induce the House to throw it out still more than in the former case: for he said that while in the case of the transfer from Pusa to Delhi the House had accepted the principle of transfer, so far as this particular demand is concerned, the House had never considered it: it has not in any way examined the policy underlying it, and it has not yet committed itself to the policy underlying or governing it. So, when the House felt that it was necessary and proper that the expenditure should not be met out of surplus revenue for the transfer of the agricultural institute from Pusa to Delhi, in spite of the fact that the House stood committed to the principle of transfer, I think we stand on much stronger ground in urging upon the House the necessity, the wisdom, the advisability, the justice and the propriety of opposing such expenditure out of surplus revenue for a purpose of which even the principle has not yet been independently approved or accepted by the House. On the financial ground alone, therefore, this demand should be thrown out; and if there is occasion for any expenditure it should be met out of some other sources with which we will deal when the occasion arises.

As to the statement made by the Honourable the Finance Member that the money would not be available for the relief of taxation, as it would be automatically transferred to the debt redemption fund, I am not aware of the rule on which he bases that statement; and I would very much like to know the exact rule which lays down that every pie that is left in hand at the end of the year will be automatically transferred to the debt redemption fund or will be devoted to the redemption of debts. Is it the contention of the Honourable the Finance Member that on the 1st of April or rather at 12 o'clock on the night of the 31st March, the Government of India have not a shell left in their balances in any bank or treasury or currency office? That they can have not a shell at the end of the year

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

as, whatever they then possess automatically goes over to the redemption of debt? That seems to me a preposterous position, and I cannot possibly accept it. Undoubtedly the House is asked to make provision year by year for the reduction of debt, and in the budget which we have just passed—or rather which has been passed in spite of us to be more precise—there is a provision of 50 crores for the redemption of debt in the next financial year. Is it open to the Government to apply a larger amount to the redemption of debt than they have provided for? Would it be consistent with the provision that has been made by the House by its vote? Then, this vote is sheer mockery and has no meaning. I submit it is not open to the Finance Department to apply more than Rs. 50 crores to the redemption of debt in the coming financial year; and it has to be applied out of the sums to be raised in the manner indicated and provided in the budget itself. So, the argument that it will automatically go over to the redemption of debt is, I submit, fallacious and wrong.

But assuming for a moment it might be so, it would not affect the substance, it would not affect the real financial position as it is. We would still have reduced the debt liability by a further sum of 92 lakhs and so we would be free to add to our debts in the course of the next financial year to the extent of 92 lakhs: and assuming, as I said, that it is not open to the Government to apply more than 50 crores to the redemption of debt without a vote of this House, we would still save 92 lakhs out of that provision of 50 crores, without in any way making the debt position worse than what it would otherwise be on the 31st March, 1936. I submit that it would be certainly a relevant argument to be taken into account by this House when we reach the Finance Bill: I would be entitled to argue that we have in our hand a sum of 92 lakhs which had been set apart for the purpose of civil aviation and which had not been voted or granted by the House for that purpose. Whether this will or will not be granted out of capital account, I am not concerned with at present. It is enough for me that it should not be granted out of surplus revenue, and I hope it will help us in reducing the price of postcards, the rates of income-tax, and, if possible, some other taxes. So far as the Members of the European Group are concerned, they have a mandate, I believe, from their constituency not to submit to any expenditure out of surpluses until and unless the surcharges have been removed. So their duty is clear enough. They have, out of regard for the mandate of their constituency, to join hands with us in throwing out this proposal for spending this money out of surplus revenue. . .

Mr. F. E. James: May I ask my friend,—I do not wish to interrupt him in his speech,—but may I ask him on what authority he states that we have the mandate from our constituencies in the terms which he has described.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Well Sir, if they have not that mandate in those terms, my friend can let me know in what terms they have that mandate.

Mr. F. E. James: I will.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: And I will stand corrected to that extent, but the readiness with which they supported our objection to the transfer of Pusa on the ground that the amount provided for that purpose should not be voted out of surplus revenue further confirmed the impression I had about their mandate. If they acted contrary to their mandate, I have no quarrel, only I want them to do likewise in this case, and I hope they will act according to the precedent which their Group has set.

I submit, Sir, that the allotment for the transfer of the Agricultural Institute from Pusa to Delhi was less objectionable than this proposal for spending no less an amount than 92 lakhs out of surplus revenue on aviation. The surplus revenue, Sir, is the result of the sacrifices of the poorest of the poor in this country; it has been paid by the agriculturist at a time when he is getting less than a rupee for the stuff for which he used to receive Rs. 2 two or three years ago. The Finance Member said that we cannot make a country rich by calling a penny a tuppence, but I may tell him that we can make a country poor by calling the worth of a penny a half penny, and that is what he and his Government have been doing, and that is how they have managed to secure this surplus revenue. There is no justification for making any alteration in Government's original proposals for meeting expenditure out of capital account. The surplus should be devoted to the relief of the taxpayer. In every country today, from one end of the world to the other, wherever there are surpluses, they are devoted to the relief of the taxpayer, because he had to pay very heavy taxes during the economic crisis. In fact, the burden of the taxes, even if the amount were constant, would be twice as heavy and burdensome as it was two or three years ago. In these circumstances, Sir, I press my motion that this amount be reduced to Re. 1 on the ground mainly that it is not payabale out of surplus revenues for the year.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Amendment moved:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum of Rs. 92,57,000 in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Development of Civil Aviation' be reduced to one rupee."

Sardar Sant Singh: Sir, I rise to support the motion of my friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant. Sir, civil aviation has been in existence since the year 1920. During the past 15 years, the development of aviation has been very rapid in all parts of the world, but in India we find that we are still in an infant stage. Sir, aviation has great potentialities in the various departments of human life, and I know too that, at this particular time, France, Italy, Germany and England herself are affected with aerial malaria and they are strengthening their aerial arm for the defence of their country. At the same time, it is somewhat significant that we find the Government of India too want to spend a huge sum of money for the development of civil aviation and this coincidence is remarkable in the extreme. However the fact is there that we are asked to vote a huge sum of money for the purpose of further development of civil aviation in India. The question was considered in the Standing Finance Committee, and the considerations urged in justification of the scheme proposed are given at page 136 of the proceedings. There two reasons are given. The first is that the inadequacy of the sums placed at the disposal of the civil aviation directorate in recent years has resulted in hand to mouth uneconomical expenditure. Further on, in part (b), it is stated that apart from the

[Sardar Sant Singh.]

considerations that further expenditure is being forced upon the Government of India by humanitarian considerations and by their international commitments, there is good reason to believe that the expenditure now proposed will be remunerative, though not so directly as in the case of Railway or Irrigation projects. The principal points to be marked in the so-called justification for incurring this huge expenditure are that this expenditure has not been undertaken by the Government of India because they feel that the money is required to be spent but because it has been forced upon them,—by whom it is not clear. It is stated that it has been forced upon them by humanitarian considerations and by their international commitments What the two expressions mean it is not very easy to guess. If they mean, as I will show later on, that it is desired to benefit the foreign companies by providing more facilities for them, that is not a consideration to which this House will be a party. Again, at page 157, we are given a very illuminating essay on the benefits of aviation which are likely to accrue to India if India utilises the opportunity of capturing some of the markets by which aviation promises to bring a good return to this country. But one thing which is conspicuous by its absence in this whole description is what is the policy the Government of India have been pursuing in the past in developing civil aviation in this country, I mean, in India alone.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: That question comes very curiously from an old Member of this House. I could have understood if it had been raised by one of the new Members My Honourable friend was a Member of the last Assembly, and the whole question of the Government of India's policy in regard to civil aviation was debated at length in that Assembly on the 29th September, 1933.

Sardar Sant Singh: I am coming to that point later. I am putting two issues clearly before the House, so that I may examine them carefully in the course of my speech. The first issue is, what is the policy to which the Government of India is committed to develop civil aviation in this country, and the second is, what is the policy that the Government propose to follow in future. This policy is printed in Appendices 1 and 2 in the volume of the proceedings in my hand. Similarly, I may point out that in the year 1927 when a similar motion for a supplementary grant to civil aviation was made before this House, a certain policy was enunciated by the Government before this House. Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra, in his long speech, declared in very forcible language one important point, and that was,—I should like to state it in his own words:

"The fact of the matter is that if we do not ourselves adopt a steady line of development of our internal air transport, however cautious and slow it may be, there is a distinct danger of our internal air routes being exploited by, and falling into the hands of, foreign capitalists."

This was one line of argument adopted by him. Then, again, later on, he said:

"The Government of India consider that 'India should obtain her proper share of the business of aerial transportation at this stage in order to ensure that she shall have an effective voice in the conditions on which contracts are given for services touching her shores and that opportunities are afforded for the investment of Indian capital and for the training and employment of Indian pilots and personnel'."

This was the policy adopted in the year 1927. Again, the then Member for Industries and Labour went on to examine what methods the Government proposed to give effect to this policy. He said:

"I should like also to state that the reports which I have so far studied make it clear that a school for the teaching of the science and art of civil aviation in all its details is not a practical proposition. So far as I can make out the conclusion which has been arrived at in some of the more important countries of the world on the basis of recent experience is that the training of the personnel required in connection with the air transport services can be best managed through subsidised companies; and this is precisely what the Government of India propose to do at present."

Then, he went on to discuss how training was to be given to the aerial engineers, artisans and mechanics for the purpose of employment in this department, and he declared in no unmistakable terms:

"Should, however, this become impossible and Government has to take over the establishment and management of the internal air services, Government will also have to make direct arrangement for the final training of Indian youths at aerodromes and air works."

Then, he held out a promise to the House:

"It is our intention to foster the training of Indians as pilots, etc., and as soon as we get our Director of Civil Aviation, one of his functions will be to prepare a paper showing the steps taken in the other principal countries of the world in regard to training in the various subjects connected with civil aviation, and the action to be taken in India in that direction."

5 P. M. Let us, after eight years, examine what steps have been taken in this direction by the Government of India. Two points, which were later made clear by Sir Basil Blackett were, one, that the Government of India would encourage the promotion of a company with rupee capital and a majority of Indian directors on its board, and secondly, they would see that Indians were trained in this branch of science. Government have circulated this memorandum and we find what steps have been taken since 1927 towards the fulfilment of this promise. The first question I will ask of the Honourable Member in charge would be as regards the promotion or encouraging the promotion of a company with rupee capital and a majority of Indian directors on its board—whether it was done at all during the last eight years, and, if so, what subsidy was paid by the Government. The second would be, how many Indians have been trained during these eight years to take over charge of this department. At page 160 of this book, details are given of the training imparted to Indians during these eight years, and I find that Indian aerodrome officers have been trained to the number of six, and aircraft inspectors two. Four have been disqualified during the course of the training, one, on account of disobedience of orders, another, on account of ill health, the third, for not making satisfactory progress in flying, and in the case of the fourth, scholarship terminated from 30th June 1930 on his being declared medically unfit. This is the total which has been trained during these years. Besides this, seven more persons have been trained not for the purpose of employment in the Government of India department but for commercial purposes, as it is stated. I do not want to prolong my speech on this point but I certainly want information on this point. Is this sufficient progress during the last eight years? If we were to compare the training imparted to the nationals of other countries in other countries, will it compare in any way with the training imparted in India? It is now stated that certain staff is to be

[Sardar Sant Singh.]

recruited and that staff is to be recruited for the purpose of employment in the civil aviation department. Another departure is made in this respect and that was that when originally civil aviation staff was recruited, they were recruited on a contract basis of five years' contract and the object was that after the termination of that period the department automatically goes to the Indians who would have been trained during this period but now we find that the same staff is being made permanent. This is a very great departure from the principle which was accepted in the first instance. Now, it is stated on page 143 that, for the future of civil aviation in India, it is essential that the very best material should be recruited. Nobody can take objection to this, but, further on the Government state that the field of recruitment for the present is restricted to the United Kingdom. Why, Sir, do you think that India has not been able to furnish and is not likely to furnish the suitable material for being trained in this branch of service. Why in the last 15 years steps were not taken to qualify persons for this department? It has been our experience that the Government always fall back to the United Kingdom for recruitment of experts in all technical subjects. Why it is so, and why it should be so? It is a thing which no Indian should voluntarily or willingly tolerate. It is an insult to our self-respect. With a population of 350 millions, we are told that India cannot furnish the material for manning such departments. I will say that the real reason behind this is not that the material is not available in India, but because there is no will to obtain that material. So long as the Government are not prepared to really effect improvement in the technical service in India by training and then recruiting Indians to these jobs, they cannot expect us to be a party to give any more money, so that it may go to the pockets of aliens from this country. Sir, there is no doubt that aviation is an important subject and the world will see more of it in the future, but we are not willing to have any more even the benefits of scientific improvements so long as the Government are not willing to make it possible for the youth of this country to be employed in these departments. In foreign countries, whenever new enterprises are undertaken, they open up new avenues to the youths of such countries, but, in India, the conditions are just the reverse. The new openings offer fresh fields for further exploitation of India by alien nationals and alien capital. Therefore, it is our painful duty in such matters to oppose Government, even in the matter of the improvements coming in the world of science in other countries. Therefore, I will oppose this motion until and unless suitable arrangements are made for training Indians in this branch of service.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official): I intervene in this debate for one or two reasons. I listened very attentively to the speech of the Mover and that of the last speaker, but as I listened to the reasons adduced by Mr. Sant Singh, which were nothing else but a mirror of the reasons of the Mover, Pandit Pant, I was reminded of a story of a dear old lady who had a beautiful female dog which she had carefully looked after in every way. One morning, she came down and to her surprise, she found five or six puppies around this dog who was proudly and cozily looking up at her mistress. The lady naturally was very surprised and shocked at what she saw and sternly addressed the dog, saying: "Fluffiken's darling: I see you have again allowed your heart to get the better of your head". When I heard my friend, Mr. Sant Singh, adducing his reasons as to why he opposed this demand, I felt sure, he

had allowed his heart to get the better of his head. I have no doubt that neither the Mover nor Mr. Sant Singh will deny that we should do our utmost to improve India's position so far as her air services are concerned. Whether we get the money from the surplus or from the general revenues does not concern me so much. You may, as did the Mover, talk of the poorest of the poor as being affected if we pass this demand, but you should have included the richest of the rich who also pay their taxes. There is no doubt that if we reject this demand and it is used in remission of taxes, any benefit, even to the poorest of the poor, would be very very small indeed. What do we find? Here we have Government trying their utmost to satisfy the needs of India and the demands of this House to improve our nation building services. Here is a matter—aviation—in which India is lamentably and disgracefully lagging. There are many other smaller countries who spend eight to ten times the amount that India spends on her civil aviation. Indeed, at present, we are merely playing at aviation. This must be stopped.

An Honourable Member: What is their income?

Sardar Sant Singh: That is the real point. You are missing that.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Sir, I did not interrupt Sardar Sant Singh when he spoke. Would he mind keeping quiet now? But I see he has a *point*. I am glad. I hope it has a sharp point. My advice to him is to sit on his point, and, when he does, I hope he will appreciate the truth of the saying "Thrice blessed is he who sitteth on a point for he shall rise again". And when he does rise with his point, of course, in him, this House will be able to see his point, already felt by him and which we cannot see now.

Sir, what has been the expenditure in the past in regard to civil aviation in India. In 1930-31, it was 16½ lakhs; in 1931-32, 16½ lakhs; in 1932-33, 9 lakhs; in 1933-34, it was about 12 lakhs.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) resumed the Chair.]

And what has been the income derived from this expenditure? In 1932-33, the income from this expenditure of nine lakhs was two lakhs and, in 1933-34, from an expenditure of 11 lakhs, it has been three lakhs. None can deny that money which has brought this income is not a revenue producing investment. Moreover, India is peculiarly well situated from a geographical point of view, and if civil aviation were developed to the extent that the needs of the country demand, any investment on civil aviation will be money well spent; for it will add to our national revenues. Remember, India lies on the best route between Europe and North Africa on the one hand, and China, Japan, Java, Malaya and Phillipines, Indo-China, Australia and New Zealand on the other but the traffic to the southern countries of this group could be diverted along the sea-plane route *via* Colombo and traffic to the northern countries along a land route north of the Himalayas which is already engaging the attention of the Russians and the Germans.

Sir, we in this House are continually crying out that our country lags behind all others in the British Empire, because we have not got self-government and because we have not got responsibility in the Centre and the control of our own affairs. But when Government ask for nearly a

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

crore of rupees for such a laudable purpose, you refuse it and you want to starve one of its vital nation-building services. Sir, when money is asked for this, you say: "I shall refuse it and reduce it to one rupee". Surely Sir, with the Opposition, their hearts have got the better of their heads. (Hear, hear.)

Sardar Sant Singh: That is not a nation-building service?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: It certainly is. Apart from that, with this money, which I believe will be spent, judiciously, and as the cadre of Indians today undergoing training shows that Indianisation is absolutely the order of the day in this department, how can this House—when the Government are anxious to improve civil aviation in India and to develop it in uniformity with and parallel to other countries—refuse this demand and vote its reduction to one rupee? Let me refer to another way in which revenue *will* be obtained by the expenditure of this demand. We know that India is now getting bi-weekly services, that the Dutch Service flying between Karachi and Rangoon are planning to use Fokker Fxxxvi machines of a more modern type, which consumes 110 gallons of petrol an hour as compared with 75 gallons today; this will mean "revenue" to this country: and, surely, it must be only the purblind man and the prejudiced politician who will say that this money that is going to be used is without any corresponding revenue brought in. I submit that this money will be used with every prospect and every promise of there being, beyond doubt, a good return, and it is foolish to reject this demand and to seek to reduce the demand to one rupee! I quite agree with my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh, that the time has come when India should manufacture her own aeroplanes. I go further and say that I think it has been the studied policy of the British Government for obvious reasons to exclude this country from being properly trained in these highly technical services, but that time has gone, and I think England is now just as alive to the necessity of India building her own aeroplanes and supplies as India is, and this demand for improving our civil aviation is a beginning of this policy. Regarding Indianisation: You have only to look at the cadre of officers who are in the Civil Aviation Department to see that every one is an Indian, except just a few of the heads who are administering the department. I have before me a list of aerodrome officers, assistant aircraft inspectors, pilots, instructors, etc., and every name I see is that of an Indian. Sir, when Government are desirous of improving India's civil aviation and keeping in step with other countries, when Government show their anxiety to help us to develop our own aircraft in this country, when the Government of India show their concern in their desire to help us to build up or rather to improve a nation-building department, I think it is very unwise indeed to seek to reject or reduce the demand—I would go further and say that we should spend more money on civil aviation. Sir, when I was a member of the Indian Military Academy Committee and we were discussing the subject of the India's Miltiary Air Force, I insisted that we should start the whole thing in India and not depend for our training on England or Egypt. And here is a scheme that in my opinion will be the nucleus of our future air force and I personally know other schemes, *e.g.*, aeronautical academy, etc., will follow and will provide India with everything aerial she wants. Sir,

this is a very necessary and a very desirable beginning, and I do think that it will be to the interest of this country if this House realises that the money that is being asked of this House is meant for a useful purpose intended entirely for the benefit of India. I repeat, it is meant entirely for the benefit of India, and I, therefore, support the demand and oppose the motion before the House. (Applause.)

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, in the realm of finance, as in the realm of morals, one error leads inevitably to another. (Laughter.) Sir, I would point out to this House that a financial acrobatic feat has been performed. It is not alone a supplementary grant, but a new category of demands has been created. I do not want, Sir, your ruling on this point. If Honourable Members will kindly look at the bulky volume. . . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has already given its ruling.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am going on another point now, Sir. Your ruling did not cover the creation of a new department. Your ruling, Sir, certainly cannot be questioned on the floor of this House, but I am now bringing to the attention of the House the fact that among the original Demands for Grants there is another new Demand No. 63-A. It used to be "Demand No. 63", "Demand No. 64", but who the financial and constitutional genius of the Government of India is who suggested to them that, under a supplementary demand, you can create a new demand beats my head. Rule 44, at page 96 of the Legislative Assembly Manual, says that:

"A separate demand shall ordinarily be made in respect of the grant proposed for each Department of the Government, provided that the Finance Member may in his discretion include in one demand grants proposed for two or more Departments, or make a demand in respect of expenditure which cannot readily be classified under particular Departments."

It seems there is a demand already—the demand for civil aviation, that is Demand No. 63. Now this Demand 63-A is for civil aviation again. I am not raising a point of order; I am merely pointing out to the House that an opportunity is being used to create a new category of departments altogether, called Demand No. 63-A, which is not in the detailed estimates and demands for grants presented to this House; and I submit that it is not covered by the Rule, which says:

"Or make a demand in respect of expenditure which cannot readily be classified under particular Departments."

This can readily be classified under the head "Civil Aviation". Therefore, Sir, I object to this outrage on financial propriety and ask the House to vote for its rejection on that among other grounds. Then, Sir, we are told—my Honourable friend, the Baronet from Bombay, referred to it—and I apologise to you, Sir, and to this House for not having read this note early enough, but having read it, Mr. President, I want to draw the attention of the House to two or three important points. The first point is this. At page 136 of this Volume XIV, No. 4, of the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee, we are told very seriously this:

"The Government of India have been forced to the conclusion that the development of ground organisation should be accelerated, and in view of the difficulty that funds are not yet available from revenue in sufficient amounts, have obtained the agreement of the Secretary of State to provide funds for the purpose from capital."

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

This was on the 27th August, 1934, when the Chairman of the Standing Finance Committee was the present occupant of the office of the Finance Member of the Government of India. Therefore, this statement was made to the Standing Finance Committee on his responsibility that they had got the sanction of the Secretary of State for this purpose. The matter does not stop there In paragraph (b) Honourable Members will find the following statement of the Government of India:

"(b) Apart from the considerations that further expenditure is being forced upon the Government of India by humanitarian considerations and by their international commitments, there is good reason to believe that the expenditure now proposed will be remunerative, though not so directly as in the case of railway or irrigation projects."

Details are given later on as to how, according to the Government, this will be remunerative and various estimates are given, and we are assured that they will be remunerative Coming now to the Honourable the Finance Member's speech, he says.

"I was not myself very happy about the decision to charge to capital those two schemes which are certainly not in any strict sense of the word remunerative."

I quite agree. He has used the words—"not in any strict sense of the word", and, therefore, protected himself from a formal contradiction of the previous system. At the same time, it seems to me that a change in the personnel of the financial officers of the Government of India or a change in his own opinion ought not to commit the Government, or at all events this House, to change an accepted financial principle, and say that this expenditure, which was originally agreed to be financed from capital, ought now to be charged to the revenue surplus.

Then, Sir, I want to draw the attention of the House to another matter. At page 137 (roughly about the middle of the page) they will find that the first category contains projects which are now urgently required on existing air routes They amount roughly to 53 lakhs and a half. It is proposed to put these works into execution at once The second category contains works which, though not actually required at present, may become very urgently required, if certain developments now strongly indicated should occur. The cost of this amounts to about 39 lakhs. Various schemes set out in the Schedule have not in all cases been worked in detail, and some of them may have to be modified or amplified before they are finally sanctioned, but, as has already been stated, the Schedule shows a total expenditure of 53½ lakhs which is proposed to incur at once, and a further possible expenditure of about 39 lakhs which may be required urgently within the next three years. Now, Sir, I want Honourable Members to notice this fact that even with regard to this 53½ lakhs there are schemes which are not completely worked out and which will have to be revised, modified or amplified. With regard to the 39 lakhs, it is only for a further possible expenditure during the next three years. I put it to you, Sir, and to this Honourable House, whether it is right that the machinery of a supplementary demand, which is intended for an unforeseen expenditure in the year, should be allowed to be utilised for the purpose of financing schemes, some of which are still not final, and a good portion of which are still in the realm of possibility. I do put it to the House that it will be certainly violating all elementary canons of financial propriety and budget control, if the House is asked to vote 92½ lakhs for these contingent expenses.

The last point I want to make is as regards the threat, for I cannot conceive of it in any other manner, which the Honourable the Finance

Member gave, that unless we earmark this 3½ crores of surplus somehow or other and sanction it by our votes before the end of the year, it will automatically go towards the reduction of the debt. I join with my friend, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in asking the Honourable the Finance Member to state what is the financial authority or rule or practice, which requires that automatically all the surplus should go to the reduction or avoidance of debt. I am ignorant on the matter, and I shall be obliged for enlightenment. But, Sir, I do feel that this House as representing the taxpayers many of whom are the poorest in the country, should be loath to allow money to be spent on projects which may otherwise be very desirable, but which we have to consider in relation to the other demands on our purse. These demands are the absolute need for relief of the taxpayer, the absolute need for lowering the postage rates, the absolute need for exempting the lower incomes from income-tax All these are matters on which most sections of the House feel strongly. It seems to me, therefore, that the House will be ill-advised in following the advice of Colonel Sir Henry Gidney who seemed to think that a vote for my friend's motion will mean that this House is against civil aviation. That is not the case It is a case of asserting its financial control. Indeed, your ruling, Sir, was so carefully and guardedly worded, if I may say so respectfully, that this House, I think, would be upholding its prestige and its control over the Finance Department and on the manner of spending this money, if we vote for this motion and refuse to give them this money. I want to warn the House that, apart from the question of utilising the surplus for this purpose, and apart from the fact that most of these schemes are in the realm of future, they are not complete schemes, they are not detailed schemes, they are not even approved schemes,—apart from all this, I think this House ought to tell the Finance Department that they cannot go on trifling with the finances of this country, and bring forward a demand for 92½ lakhs with unbaked details, and without telling the House how this money is to be spent and creating a new demand called No. 63-A. I, therefore, beg this House most respectfully to vote for this motion.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Mr. President, I think it is most unfortunate that a very important subject like this should have been presented to this Honourable House in the way it has been. Here is the question of the future of civil aviation in this country. There are proposals for an expenditure of no less than 92 lakhs of rupees, and the first time it comes before this House for consideration is by a supplementary demand. Surely, this House has a right to demand from Government greater facilities for considering and discussing schemes of this importance which involve an expenditure of nearly a crore of rupees and to protest at these having been brought up by means of a supplementary demand. We were hoping that these supplementary demands would have been dealt with by this House within a day or so but I am not at all surprised that we have taken the time that we are taking since these demands involve wide principles and involve a scheme which is concerned with the future policy of civil aviation in this country. Therefore, Sir, I greatly regret that this important question should have been brought before this House in the manner it has. Secondly, I regret that there should be a discussion as to how this scheme should be financed, namely, whether it should be financed from capital or from revenue. There can be no doubt that originally Government intended that this scheme should be financed from capital, but my Honourable friend, the Finance Mem-

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

ber, said that he had some doubts whether this scheme was remunerative enough to justify him in sanctioning capital expenditure. Well, Sir, my Honourable friend may have his doubts and as the watch-dog of our purse he has justification perhaps in thinking that the scheme, as placed before the House, does not justify expenditure from capital. On the whole it rather relieves me to think that the Finance Member of the Government of India should be so strict. It is his business to be strict and I do complement him on that strictness. But, Sir, let us see where he gets this money from that he proposes to hand over to his Honourable colleague on his left. It is the surplus money from the budgets of the last two or three years and that surplus accrued from the taxation which we paid.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: It is one year's surplus.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: All right it represents one year's surplus. Having got that surplus and instead of using it for purposes that would meet with the approval of this side of the House, he quietly hands it over to his Honourable colleague and says: "Take this crore. I had my doubts about raising a loan for this purpose, but here I have got this amount. Take it, and we will put it before the Assembly in a supplementary demand." ("Hear, hear" from Congress Party Benches.) I think that has prejudiced the case. It has prejudiced the Government case because of the method they have adopted. It has diverted the attention of this House from the merits of the case.

The proper method of dealing with such important matters is by way of a Resolution. Get the House to adopt your scheme and then ask the House to make financial provision. Instead of that, as I have already explained, another method has been adopted and therefore I will repeat that I honestly feel that the merits of the case are not being properly considered due to the faulty method in which the case has been presented by the Government. Sir, this morning we expressed our opinion fairly definitely as to how this surplus ought not to be used. (Hear, hear.) There has been considerable criticism already all over the country about how this surplus is proposed to be utilised by the Honourable the Finance Member I have great sympathy with that criticism. Sir, do not let us mix up the issues. Fortunately or unfortunately a very important scheme is placed before us for our consideration at this most awkward time during this Session. Is this scheme a good one? Does it deserve encouragement? That is the first issue. Having decided that issue, the second issue is, should we allow this money to be handed over to the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce's department for this scheme? Now, on the first issue, I am inclined to think that the scheme is a good one on its merits. We want civil aviation in this country. We want to encourage civil aviation as far as it possibly lies in our power. We desire to vote all adequate sums of money for the encouragement of civil aviation. That is the broad principle. Secondly, if the scheme is remunerative,—I am not going into the comparative merits of remunerative schemes,—if it can be called remunerative by Government, if that is the word used in the report. "remunerative", then I contend that the money should come from capital. (Hear, hear.) If now the Honourable the Finance Member will conclusively prove that the scheme is not remunerative, that the report that was placed before the Standing Finance Committee was not quite accurate, that the sanction of the Finance Com-

mittee was obtained to this scheme on facts and figures which are not quite correct, he will have to stand corrected on behalf of the Government. But so long as this report is before this House, which report goes to show that the schemes are expected to be remunerative, in the same breath the Government cannot come and ask us to sanction money for this scheme out of revenue and not out of capital. Now, Sir, the two issues I have placed before the House, I have answered to the best of my ability.

The next point that was raised by the Honourable the Finance Member was that if we did not agree to this scheme, the money would go to the reduction of debt, and that we would not be able to make any use of it. He said that there was a rule by which at the end of this month all money automatically would go for the redemption of debt I am not going to contest the position he has taken up in theory, but in practice I respectfully beg to point out to him that he is not quite right. Suppose that it does go for the redemption of debt and suppose after the end of this month, we come to the conclusion that more money ought to be spent for some useful purpose or that further relief should be given to the taxpayer, we will have a justification for demanding from the Honourable the Finance Member that he should budget for a deficit budget, because we have merely through an accident enabled him to reduce the debt. (Hear, hear.) Having reduced the debt today on the one hand, we can demand on the other that he draw upon loans to a greater extent than he intended to do. Therefore, in practice, Mr. President, I do not think very much of his argument. (Hear, hear.) He may carry this surplus to debt redemption, but we can also, on our side, if we have the strength of voting power, nullify the ultimate result. He has finally the power of certification. We can insist upon his having a deficit budget to the extent of the money that we allow him to carry to debt redemption, but he has the final power of certification. That is the constitutional position. I do not think he will contend that I am wrong. This has happened all through the Finance Member's desiring suddenly to finance these schemes out of revenue. We disagree with him. We think they ought to be financed out of capital and if insisting upon our point of view being carried out results in a deficit budget, it is a deficit budget not really in practice but merely in theory. Therefore, Sir, I would respectfully suggest that this House do what it did this morning (Hear, hear) and approve of this scheme, but refuse it to be allowed to be financed out of revenue. I am not going to tell the Honourable the Finance Member how I am going to vote or what I am going to do in immediate future with regard to his other proposals. I am not going to say that I will insist upon the reduction of the salt tax, I am not going to say whether I am going to insist upon a further reduction in our income-tax surcharge, nor am I going to suggest just now what should be done with regard to the postal budget. We will consider these questions on their merits, keeping in mind, that we have reduced the debt of this country to the extent of about 36 lakhs this morning and I trust about 93 lakhs this afternoon. (Hear, hear.) Keeping those two points in view, we shall deal with the budget in the future, but I do not commit myself personally as my Honourable friends have done with regard to one side of the budget or the other. I would again very respectfully suggest that we carry out this morning's programme and not condemn a good scheme merely because it happens to be placed in an unfortunate manner before this House. While following the very good principle, Mr. President, that schemes which are remunerative or that involve large expenditure on permanent measures such as building research institutes

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

should be financed from capital. I am sure that the Honourable the Finance Member will watch our interests to see that the departments do not carry this too far and ask him for monies from loans which ought to be met out of revenues. A laxity on our part might lead in the future to moneys being spent out of loans which justifiably ought to be credited to revenue. I have known that happen before, and I feel sure that this side of the House will be alive to that danger just as the Honourable the Finance Member is sure to be on his side of the House.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Sir, it is, to say the least, very unfortunate from my point of view that this debate should have taken the turn it has. It seems quite evident that a very large section of the House is not willing to consider the proposal before it on its merits but wishes to side-track it on a technicality. Now, Sir, I am not a financial expert and I do not propose to make any contribution to the discussion regarding the canons of financial propriety, except to point out that in the memorandum we submitted to the Standing Finance Committee we said that we (that is, the Government of India):

"Have been forced to the conclusion that the development of ground organisation should be accelerated and in view of the difficulty that funds are not yet available from revenue in sufficient amounts, have obtained the agreement of the Secretary of State to provide funds for the purpose from capital"

It is, therefore, evident that our feeling at the outset was that this money ought to be provided from revenue and we are now reverting to the position which we felt we ought to have taken up in the first instance but which we were not able to take up owing to financial conditions. My Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, also read out a passage which he considered proved the point that this expenditure should be debited to capital. "There is good reason to believe that the expenditure now proposed will be remunerative". But, Sir, as has happened once or twice before in this House, he did not go on to complete the sentence. The sentence goes on:

"though not so directly as in the case of railway or irrigation projects"

and the memorandum proceeded to point out that a good deal of the return would be indirect. In the circumstances, Sir, it is not necessary for me to enter at length into the merits of this case. I am very sorry not to have an opportunity of doing so for I should have liked to attempt to convince the House,—I might not have been successful,—of the merits of the proposals placed before it. I should have liked to point out to my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, that this was a case of economic planning and that we were endeavouring to think ahead within our resources. I should also have endeavoured to point out the prospect that schemes like this, new activities like this, new careers that those activities open, hold out of doing a little,—they cannot do much at present but they have great potentialities—to help to solve the problem of unemployment. Now, Sir, I am debarred from doing that by the fact that the House, I gather, is not prepared to deal with this proposal except on the narrow point of financial propriety; and therefore I shall confine myself to making a few comments on the speech of my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh. I cannot allow that to pass without a challenge for a more unfair presentation of a case I have seldom listened to in this House. My Honourable friend dug up certain debates of 1927

and 1928. I can assure him that as far as civil aviation is concerned, 1927 and 1928 are as dead as the dodo. I would ask him, what about the discussions of 1933 in the Simla Session of the Assembly? I do not remember whether he was present or not.

Mr. F. E. James: He was; I can never forget Sardar Sant Singh.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I am sorry I have not got Mr. James's memory, but if he was present in the Simla Session of the Assembly, why has he not referred to the discussions then? Why does he ask us now what we have done to create an Indian company with rupee capital? Sir, I explained at great length on that occasion to the House that that was exactly what we had done. I explained the rather complicated arrangement for the transit of mails across India. I explained the relationship between the Indian Trans-Continental Airways, a company with rupee capital and with a majority of Indian directors in which the Government of India have invested, I think, Rs. 24 lakhs—I explained the relationship between that company and Indian National Airways, another Indian company with rupee capital and with a majority of Indian directors, on the one hand, and with Imperial Airways on the other. My Honourable friend has taken absolutely no notice of that most important development which took place only the year before last. He has not referred to the fact that there is another important company operating services in India which is a purely Indian company and, I imagine, with entirely Indian capital; and that is Messrs. Tata's service from Karachi to Madras, which we hope shortly to see extended to Colombo. I would ask whether that is not more than a sufficient fulfilment of the promise made in this House in 1927 and 1928 which my Honourable friend quoted. And then, Sir, he referred to the training of Indians and asked what we were doing in that direction. There, again, I think the figures show that we have done and are doing our best. My Honourable friend seems to demand that Indians without training or with a modicum of training should be at once put at the head of affairs. I cannot think that this House will support that demand. Let us take the "Dufferin" cadets for example. They are excellent material, and I should like to add my tribute to the many which have been paid to the excellence of the "Dufferin" cadets; but nobody in his senses would demand that those cadets only a year or two after they leave the "Dufferin" should be placed in charge of a battleship or a big merchant ship. And that is exactly the position here. We are training Indians up to be able to pilot the big air liners but you cannot put them in charge of those air liners at once. The toll of air accidents every week shows the extent to which experience is necessary before you can do that. I think it is worth telling the House that we have spent nearly half a lakh on the training of Indians in England to fill various posts in connection with air transport. We have subsidised Flying Clubs in this country at considerable expense and they have trained something like 450 pilots from amongst whom the big companies, Indian Trans-Continental Airways, Tata's and Indian National Airways, select their personnel. Indian Trans-Continental Airways are employing 60 Indians in the higher posts now. They have two probationary first officers, two licensed engineers, 30 other skilled engineers and 26 unskilled engineers. Tata's have four Indian pilots, one Indian engineer and eight Indian mechanics. Indian National Airways have two Indian pilots, 24 Indian ground engineers, fitters, etc., and one Indian Aerodrome Officer. This

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

question of Indianisation has occupied the attention of my department very closely, and it will continue to do so. We have made agreements with the operating companies that they should do their best to help us in training Indian personnel and in employing them. I submit, Sir, that my Honourable friend's charge against the department on this account is absolutely without foundation.

As I have said, I could have wished for a better opportunity of trying to convince the House of the merits of this scheme, and of trying to show the extent to which we are endeavouring to conform to our requirements and obligations. My Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh, was at a loss to know what the humanitarian and international considerations were. The point there is that, under the International Air Convention, a country has a right to give or refuse permission to the operation of air services across its territorial limits. We have that right to give or refuse to foreign air services permission to cross our territorial limits; but most countries in the world, at any rate all the prominent civilised countries—and I maintain that India is a prominent civilised country, a contention against which, I am sure, there will be no argument—have given permission and we have followed their example. It was in accordance with the terms of the Air Convention that we have given the Dutch and French services permission to operate across India. . . .

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Would the Honourable Member tell me why the Government did not, by way of a Resolution, put the matter before this House instead of coming up with a supplementary demand? I would like to know what the difficulty was.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: That is a question which, I think, my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, has already answered. (Laughter.) The House may not be satisfied with his reply, but, at any rate, he has replied, and I may point out in this connection that the last important debate we had on this subject was on a supplementary demand: the one in Simla was on a supplementary demand. A different line was taken on that occasion from the line that has been taken today. But to refer to what I was saying, the point is that under our international obligations we have to keep up at least a minimum standard in the matter of aerodromes and other arrangements, and it is in order to make up for the loss of ground during the last nine or ten years that we are asking for this 93 lakhs.

I think that is all that I can say, and I can only express my deep regret that my arguments will not in all probability prove very effective.

Some Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Sir, the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce seems to have renounced himself to the helplessness of the situation. In the circumstances, it is not necessary for me to deal with the merits of the proposals that find place in the report of the Finance Committee. He tried, however, to controvert some of the statements made by Sardar Sant Singh. It is unfortunately my duty to state before the House some facts as I know them. He said the Trans-Continental Airways satisfied the conditions that had been imposed for the flotation of an Indian company with rupee capital. In name, it does; in reality and in spirit, it does not. In fact, in the Trans-Continental Airways, 51 per cent. of the capital is held by the Imperial Airways, London, so that. . . .

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I did not deny that for a moment: I did not say there was a majority of Indian capital invested: I said that it was an Indian company with a majority of Indian directors. The other two companies have a majority of Indian capital and I explained—again I wish my Honourable friend opposite had read the previous discussions on the subject—I explained very carefully in the course of the discussions in Simla in 1933 the reason why Imperial Airways held 51 per cent. of the capital of Indian Trans-Continental Airways, and the advantages to India which accrued from the arrangement as a whole.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: On the whole, to me it is not in any way a position of profit, of self-respect or of advantage to this country that the majority of the capital in the company should be held by foreigners, with the right certainly of returning a majority of directors. It does not matter whether they are Europeans or Indians. The fact that has to be considered is who is the controlling authority, who nominates and who appoints these directors; and under the constitution of the Trans-Continental Airways, four out of the seven directors are to be appointed by the Imperial Airways, London, so that the majority of directors will always be nominated by foreigners and the control of the company will always vest in the hands of foreigners. That is obviously not a position over which we can congratulate ourselves or for which we can thank those who seem to be perfectly satisfied with the constitution of that company. I will not say anything about the Indian National Airways nor will I refer to the circumstances in which this company was formed and the manner in which it was constituted. It was floated by a gentleman who had been responsible for the Clive Engineering Company, which went into liquidation with a loss of Indian capital to the extent of over Rs. 20 lakhs. The Government have given a monopoly to this company and they have undertaken that no other company will have any subsidy or will be allowed to carry the mails in the branch lines so long as this company is there. There are various other features, but, at this late hour in the day, I will not refer to them. In these companies to which reference has been made by the Honourable the Industries Member, the Europeans are receiving double the pay of Indians for the same services, for performing identically the same work; and the majority of workers in higher grades, by far the majority consists of non-Indians. I would like to know whether there is any single Indian under training in this company at present. There are many questions relevant and highly useful which would have thrown considerable light on this department and its activities; but I refrain from addressing myself to them at this late hour in the day. As even the Government Member in charge has accepted the inevitable position, I think it is unnecessary for me to say more in this connection. I hope that my motion will be accepted unanimously by all the non-official Members in this House. I beg leave, Sir, to withdraw my motion, and request Honourable Members to throw out the original motion.

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 92,57,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Development of Civil Aviation'."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—57.

Abdoola Haroon, Seth Haji.
Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.
Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.
Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan Bahadur Nawab Malik.
Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A. A. Venkatarama.
Bajpai, Mr. G. S.
Bewoor, Mr. G. V.
Bhagchand Soni, Rai Bahadur Seth.
Buss, Mr. L. C.
Chatarji, Mr. J. M.
Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.
Dalal, Dr. R. D.
DeSouza, Dr. F. X.
Drake, Mr. D. H. C.
Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer, Mr. Ahmed.
Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya Ananda.
Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.
Gidney, Lieut. Colonel Sir Henry.
Graham, Sir Lancelot.
Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.
Hidayatallah, Sir Ghulam Hussain.
Hockenhull, Mr. F. W.
Hudson, Sir Leslie.
James, Mr. F. E.
Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir.
Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
Joshi, Mr N. M.
Kirpalani, Mr. Hiranand Khushiram.
Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri.
Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
Metcalfe, Mr. H. A. F.
Milligan, Mr. J. A.
Mody, Mr. H. P.
Monteath, Mr. J.
Morgan, Mr. G.
Muhammad Nauman, Mr.
Mukerje, Mr. N. R.
Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya Charan.
Nayar, Mr. C. Govindan.
Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
Owen, Mr. L.
Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Rau, Mr P. R.
Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
Sarma, Mr. R. S.
Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
Scott, Mr W. L.
Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain Sardar.
Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib Nawab.
Singh, Mr Pradyumna Prashad.
Sircar, The Honourable Sir Nripendra.
Sloan, Mr. T
Swithinbank, Mr. B. W.
Tottenham, Mr. G. R F.

NOES—57.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.
Aney, Mr. M. S
Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
Ayyangar, Mr M. Ananthasayanam.
Azhar Ali, Mr Muhammad.
Bajoria, Babu Baijnath.
Banerjea, Dr. P. N.
Baqui, Mr. M A.
Bardaloi, Srijut N. C.
Bhagavan Das, Dr.
Chhattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra Nath.
Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.
Chetty, Mr. Sami Vencatachelam.
Das, Mr. B
Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.
Fakir Chand, Mr.
Gadgil, Mr N V.
Giri, Mr. V. V.
Govind Das, Seth.
Gupta, Mr. Ghanshiam Singh.
Hosmani, Mr. S. K.
Jedhe, Mr. K. M.
Jehangir, Sir Cowasji.
Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
Khare, Dr. N. B.
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
Mangal Singh, Sardar.
Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Syed.
Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.
Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta.
Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.
Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.
Rajan Dr. T. S. S.
Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.
Ranga, Prof. N. G.
Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
Sant Singh, Sardar.
Satyamurti, Mr. S.
Shafi Daudi, Maulvi Muhammad.
Sham Lal, Mr.
Sheodass Daga, Seth.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Shri Krishna.
Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.
Sri Prakasa, Mr.
Thein Maung, U
Varma, Mr. B. B.
Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The "Ayes" are 57, and the "Noes" are 57. I vote for the "Ayes".

The motion was adopted.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I understand that all Parties in the House are prepared, with your permission, to take a division without speeches on the next motion relating to Broadcasting, where precisely similar considerations arise. I have consulted the Leaders of Opposition Parties.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair will only say this, that it hopes Honourable Members will see that these motions for supplementary demands are concluded on the next official day.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 29th March, 1935.

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी, पुस्तकालय
Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, Library
मसूरी
MUSSOORIE.

यह पुस्तक निम्नांकित तारीख तक वापिस करनी है।
This book is to be returned on the date last stamped.

दिनांक Date	उधारकर्ता की संख्या Borrower's No.	दिनांक Date	उधारकर्ता की संख्या Borrower's No.

119650

अवाप्ति संख्या
Acc No. 592

वर्ग संख्या 328.5402 Ind
Class No. 1935

पुस्तक संख्या
Book No.

लेखक
Author

शीर्षक
Title Legislative Assembly. Debates. V.3

328.5402
Ind-1935 LIBRARY 592
V.3. LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI
National Academy of Administration
MUSSOORIE

Accession No. 119650

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
5. An overdue charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request at the discretion of the Librarian.
5. Periodicals, Rare and Reference books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced or its double price shall be paid by the borrower.

Help to keep this book fresh, clean & moving