

14th March, 1923

**THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES**

(Official Report)

VOL. III.

(21st February, 1923 to 14th March, 1923.)

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1923.



**SIMLA
GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS
1923.**

Legislative Assembly.

The President :

THE HONOURABLE SIR FREDERICK WHYTE, KT.

Deputy President :

SIR JAMSETJEE JEEJEEBHAY, BART., K.C.S.I., M.L.A.

Panel of Chairmen :

RAO BAHADUR TIRUVENKATA RANGACHARIAR, M.L.A.

MAULVI ABUL KASEM, M.L.A.

SIR CAMPBELL RHODES, KT., C.B.E., M.L.A.

SARDAR BAHADUR GAJJAN SINGH, M.L.A.

Secretary :

SIR HENRY MONCRIEFF SMITH, KT., C.I.E., M.L.A., I.C.S.

Assistants of the Secretary :

MR. W. T. M. WRIGHT, I.C.S.

MR. L. GRAHAM, I.C.S.

MR. S. C. GUPTA, BAR.-AT-LAW.

MR. G. H. SPENCE, I.C.S.

Marshal :

CAPTAIN SURAJ SINGH, BAHADUR, I.O.M.

CONTENTS.

	PAGES.
WEDNESDAY, 21ST FEBRUARY, 1923—	
Member Sworn	2601
Statement laid on the Table	2601—2608
Message from the Council of State	2609
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill	2609—2649
The Cantonments (House-Accommodation) Bill	2649—2650
The Indian Cotton Cess Bill	2650—2662
THURSDAY, 22ND FEBRUARY, 1923—	
Questions and Answers	2663—2671
Unstarred Question and Answer	2671
Statement of Business	2672
Report of Committee on Arms Act Rules	2672
N.-W. Frontier Committee's Report	2672
Discussion of Resolutions raising the same question	2673
Resolution <i>re</i> Hypothecation of Revenues	2673—2699
Statement of Business	2699—2700
Messages from the Council of State	2700—2701
Resolution <i>re</i> Status of Indian Settlers in Kenya	2701—2715
Resolution <i>re</i> Secretary of State's Despatch on Indian Autonomy	2715—2736
SATURDAY, 24TH FEBRUARY, 1923—	
Members Sworn	2737
Questions and Answers	2737—2747
The Workmen's Compensation Bill	2747
The Indian Income-Tax (Amendment) Bill	2747
The Indian Cotton Cess Bill	2748—2754
The Indian Official Secrets Bill	2754—2784
The Exclusion from Inheritance Bill and the Hindu Law of Inheritance (Amendment) Bill	2784
MONDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1923—	
Member Sworn	2785
Questions and Answers	2785—2788
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill	2788—2802
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill—(Amendment of Sections 362 and 366)	2802—2828
The Indian Stamp (Amendment) Bill	2829—2838
The Government Savings Banks (Amendment) Bill	2838—2842
TUESDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 1923—	
Questions and Answers	2843—2846
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2846—2852
The Workmen's Compensation Bill	2853—2859
The Indian Income-Tax (Amendment) Bill	2859—2861

TUESDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 1923—*contd.*

Resolution <i>re</i> State Management of Railways in India	2861—2881
Message from the Council of State	2881
Resolution <i>re</i> State Management of Railways in India	2881—2903
The Mussalman Waqfs Registration Bill	2903

WEDNESDAY, 28TH FEBRUARY, 1923—

The Prisoners (Amendment) Bill	2905
Statement laid on the Table	2905—2913
Resolution <i>re</i> Separation of the Railway from General Finance	2914—2923
Conference <i>re</i> Regulations under the Electoral Rules	2923
Meetings of Legislative Assembly	2923

THURSDAY, 1ST MARCH, 1923—

Question and Answer	2925
Budget for 1923-24	2926—2945
The Indian Finance Bill	2945

MONDAY, 5TH MARCH, 1923—

Member Sworn	2947
Questions and Answers	2947—2961
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2961—2965
Incheape Committee's Report	2965
Message from the Council of State	2965
General Discussion on the Budget—(First Stage)	2966—3018

TUESDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1923—

Questions and Answers	3019—3025
Unstarred Questions and Answers	3026—3027
Governor General's Assent to Bills	3027
Message from the Council of State	3028
General Discussion on the Budget—(First Stage)	3028—3093

THURSDAY, 8TH MARCH, 1923—

Draft Notification <i>re</i> Emigration of Unskilled Labour to Mauritius	3095—3096
Questions and Answers	3096—3108
The Prisoners (Amendment) Bill	3108
Election of Members to Public Accounts Committee	3109
Demands for Supplementary Grants	3109—3110

FRIDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1923—

Member Sworn	3111
Questions and Answers	3111—3129
Unstarred Question and Answer	3130
Particulars <i>re</i> Lump Retrenchment Figures	3130
Messages from the Council of State	3131
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill	3131—3133
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill	3133—3138
Resolution <i>re</i> Emigration of Unskilled Labour to Mauritius	3138—3168

SATURDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1923--

Questions and Answers	3169—3171
Unstarred Questions and Answers	3172—3173
Resolution <i>re</i> reserved Railway Compartments	3173—3191
Resolution <i>re</i> Selection to Appointments under Government of India	3192—3227

MONDAY, 12TH MARCH, 1923—

Questions and Answers	3229—3237
Unstarred Questions and Answers	3238—3239
The Budget—List of Demands	3239—3297

TUESDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1923—

Date of Future Sessions of the Legislative Assembly	3299
The Budget—List of Demands	3299—3361

WEDNESDAY, 14TH MARCH, 1923—

Statement of Business	3363
Indianization of Eight Units of the Indian Army	3363—3372
The Exclusion from Inheritance Bill	3372
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of Section 4	3372
The Budget—List of Demands	3372—3435
The Hindu Law of Inheritance (Amendment) Bill	3436
The Special Marriage Bill	3436

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 14th March, 1923.

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

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

Mr. W. M. Hussanally (Sind: Muhammadan Rural): May I, Sir, with your permission, inquire of the Honourable the Leader of the House if we are going to get any further day for non-official Resolutions this Session?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey (Home Member): I am afraid I shall have to consider that in the light of the progress we make with the voting on Demands for Grants and the Finance Bill. I shall hope to be able to give a definite answer to the Honourable Member about the middle of next week.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadan Urban): May I ask a similar question with regard to the Incheape Committee's Report, the discussion of which has now become imperatively necessary, apart from the Budget.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: Does the Honourable Member wish that we should delay the further progress in voting on Demands for Grants in order that we may discuss the Incheape Committee's Report? I see at present no other way of doing it than that.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: The Honourable the Leader of the House must know that I did not mean that.

INDIANISATION OF EIGHT UNITS OF THE INDIAN ARMY.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar (Madras: Nominated Non-Official): May I ask the Honourable the Army Secretary a question of which I have given him private notice? Will he be pleased to lay before the House and to explain to the House, the scheme regarding the Indianisation of the 8 Units which was promised sometime ago?

Mr. E. Burdon (Army Secretary): Sir, I have been asked to furnish the House with a statement giving full details, and explaining the implications, of the scheme for the Indianization of 8 units of the Indian Army, which was recently announced to this Assembly by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief. I have accordingly had a statement prepared, which, with your permission, I propose to lay on the table. It shows exactly how the scheme will be put into operation and the conditions which govern the matter. For the convenience of Honourable Members, and in order to enable the whole question to be readily understood, I have embodied in the statement a brief account of the system of organization of an infantry

[Mr. E. Burdon.]

Battalion and a cavalry regiment of the Indian Army, in so far as their establishment of King's commissioned officers is concerned; and also a brief account of the system which governs the promotion of King's commissioned officers of the Indian Army up to and including the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel.

STATEMENT EXPLANATORY OF THE SCHEME FOR THE INDIANIZATION OF 8 UNITS OF THE INDIAN ARMY.

1. The units selected for Indianization are—

Cavalry.

7th Light Cavalry, late 28th Light Cavalry, Madras.
16th Light Cavalry, late 27th Light Cavalry, Madras.

Infantry.

2-1st Madras Pioneers, late 64th Pioneers.
4-19th Hyderabad Regiment, late 98th Infantry, Hyderabad.
5th Royal Battalion, 5th Mahratta Light Infantry, late 117th Royal Mahrattas.
1-7th Rajput Regiment (Q. V. O. L. I.), late 2nd Q. V. O. Rajputs.
1-14th Punjab Regiment, late 19th Punjabis.
2-1st Punjab Regiment, late 66th Punjabis.

2. An Indian Infantry battalion has the following establishment of King's commissioned officers :—

Appointment.	Rank.	Number.
Commandant	Lieutenant-Colonel or Colonel	1
Second in Command	Lieutenant-Colonel or Major	1
Company Commander	Captain or Major	4
„ Officers	Lieutenant or Captain	4
Adjutant	Ditto	1
Quartermaster	Ditto	1
		12

The posts of Adjutant and Quartermaster are filled by selection from officers of the unit. Generally speaking, the most efficient of the senior subalterns fill these posts. The establishment of King's commissioned officers of a cavalry regiment is on lines closely similar to the above. The designation of certain of the appointments is different; for example, a Squadron Commander and a Squadron Officer in a cavalry regiment correspond to the Company Commander and the Company Officer of an infantry battalion.

3. King's commissioned officers in the Indian Army receive promotion up to and including the rank of the Lieutenant-Colonel according to a time-scale, subject, in the case of each step, to certain prescribed examinations being passed. A King's commissioned officer should normally enter the Indian Army in the rank of Lieutenant at the age of 20 years. He receives promotion to Captain after 9 years' service, to Major after 18 years' service, and to Lieutenant-Colonel after 26 years' service. Details of the retention and promotion examinations which have to be passed are given in Appendix A to this statement. In addition to the prescribed tests and qualifications exacted from each individual officer, there are certain other subjects, included in the training of the soldier, in which a proportion of officers of every regiment must be specially trained; for example, physical training, including athletics, gymnastics and mental development; machine gun fighting; signalling, including the use of electrical appliances, etc. Further, in order to qualify for the post of Adjutant, a special certificate in musketry has to be obtained; and while, as has been shown, promotion to Lieutenant-Colonel is obtained by length of service and after passing certain qualifying examinations, the command of a unit is only given to those Lieutenant-Colonels who are selected *ad hoc* by the Selection Board. The Commandant of an infantry battalion is required to vacate his command on attaining the age of 52 years; and the Commandant of a cavalry regiment is similarly required to vacate his command on attaining the age of 50 years.

4. A list of Indian officers who already hold King's commissions in the Indian Army is given in Appendix B to this statement. These officers have been classified as follows:—

Table A.—Indore students who received their first commissions when over 26 years of age.

Table B.—Direct commissioned officers who received their first commissions when over 20 years of age.

Table C.—Previously commissioned officers who received their first commissions when over 26 years of age.

Table D.—Indore students who received their first commissions at the age of 26 years and under.

Table E.—Sandhurst cadets and others who received their first commissions at approximately the same age at which a British officer enters the army.

The tables show also the dates on which each officer would qualify for promotion to Captain, Company Commander, and Major, according to the time-scale and the normal course of promotion; and, in each case, the age of the officer on these dates. It will be seen that many of these officers, having received their first commission at an age much greater than the normal age, cannot hope for a normal career in the Indian Army. To indicate an extreme case, there is one officer who would be over 57 years of age before he could qualify for the command of a Company in the rank of Major, according to the prescribed tests applicable to all British officers. As previously stated, an officer is required to vacate the command of an infantry battalion on attaining the age of 52 years. It follows therefore that, for the purpose of officering, with Indian officers holding the King's commissions, the 8 Indianizing units, it will be desirable to rely mainly on those Indian officers who have obtained their first commission at approximately the same age as a British officer and can therefore hope to reach the highest posts within the age limits laid down. Of this class there are already 21 in the army.

5. It has accordingly been decided that 8 of the Indian officers of suitable age will be transferred at once as Company or Squadron Officers, one to each of the 8 units destined for Indianization, replacing in each unit a British Company or Squadron Officer who will be transferred elsewhere. In 1924, another batch of 8 Indian officers will be similarly transferred, replacing an equal number of British officers. In 1925, the same process will be repeated. But in that year the officers already available will be completely absorbed, and the numbers will in fact have to be made up by young Indian officers who have in the meantime qualified at Sandhurst. According to the process stated, at the beginning of 1927, all Squadron or Company officers of the Indianizing units will be Indians; the senior of these will be about 29 years of age and will have about 6 years' service. At this stage the situation will arise that any further postings in accordance with the process laid down would entail the appointment of the senior amongst these Indian officers to the command of Squadrons or Companies. These will be, in comparison with the officers of non-Indianizing units, young and relatively inexperienced. The nature of the further step will necessarily depend upon the development which have taken place in the interval.

6. Indian officers at present serving in the Indian Army who, for the reasons stated above, are not posted to Indianizing units, would ordinarily be passed to the non-effective list in the usual manner. A proposal is under consideration that their services should be utilized by appointing them thereafter to the Territorial Force, a course which might be of distinct benefit to the State.

7. The earliest date by which the 3 units could be completely officered by Indian officers, holding the same qualifications as are laid down in respect of British officers and having had the same advantages of training and experience as British officers, would be approximately 22 to 23 years from the present time. It might be possible to shorten this period to some extent if Indian officers of outstanding capacity come to the front during the process of development. Exceptional promotion could conceivably be given to such officers, since unusually rapid promotion has actually to be given in war time to specially good officers and men who are required to replace casualties. But the expedient could not be relied upon as a normal procedure: it would never be relied upon as a normal procedure in the case of British officers. The question would be not merely one of studying the pace of Indianization; the first obligation of the Government would be to study the safety and efficiency of the units under Indianization; and from this point of view, it would not be right, and it would not be prudent, to impose on an Indianizing unit a system which would never normally be imposed upon a British unit or a non-Indianizing unit of the Indian Army. Finally, there is the consideration that it might not be regarded as fair to place upon the first generation of Indian officers of the Indianizing army a burden of responsibility which normally a British officer of corresponding age and experience would never be asked to shoulder. Essentially, special promotion, such as has here been indicated, could only

[Mr. E. Burdon.]

be given on the merits of individual cases. It is patently impracticable to attempt to regulate the matter by any *a priori* formula.

A question has been asked whether the experiment is to be fully tried before the next step is taken, that is to say, in dealing with the other units of the Indian Army. The point is one on which Government are not in a position to make a statement. It would obviously be premature to do so. The first measure of Indianization has only now been embarked upon, and the developments to which it may lead cannot be foreseen or foretold.

APPENDIX A.

EXAMINATIONS WHICH KING'S COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE INDIAN ARMY ARE REQUIRED TO PASS FOR RETENTION IN THE INDIAN ARMY AND FOR PROMOTION.

I.—*Examination for retention in the Indian Army.* (To be passed within 3 years of appointment).

1. Preliminary test in Urdu (equivalent to the old Higher Standard Hindustani).
2. (a) Drilling a regiment of cavalry or battalion of infantry.
(b) Regimental duties, including matters relating to discipline, interior economy, pay and pensions, double company accounts and books, arms, ammunition, and equipment, supply of clothing and necessaries, the classes of which the corps is composed and recruited, and, for cavalry officers, the supply of horses and saddlery.
(c) Indian military law and musketry if not in possession of an officer's musketry certificate.
(d) (For cavalry officers.) Veterinary treatment and shoeing, footing of saddlery.

II.—*Examination for promotion from Lieutenant to Captain.*—

- (a) Practical examination in the field without troops to test a candidate's knowledge of Cavalry, Artillery and Infantry.

Field Service Regulations, Map reading and Field Engineering, Military Hygiene.

- (b) Written examination 4 papers.
 - (i) Military Organisation and administration;
Administration of Military discipline and Law.
 - (ii) Imperial Military Geography.
 - (iii) Military History.
 - (iv) Tactics, Map reading and Field Engineering.

COURSES.

Qualify at an Army School of Education.

(In addition to the above certain technical examinations have to be passed by Artillery, Medical and other technical services.)

III.—*Examination for promotion from Captain to Major.*—

- (c) Practical examination. Tactical exercise in the field without troops embodying the employment of a mixed force of all arms, to be of such a nature to test the candidate's capabilities of appreciating a situation.
- (d) Written examination 5 papers.
 - (i) Military organisation, Military administration, administration of discipline and military law.
 - (ii) Government of the British Empire and Imperial Military Geography.
 - (iii) Military History.
 - (iv) Educational Training.
 - (v) A short essay on a military subject.

COURSES.

Small Arms School (Rifle, Automatic, Grenade, Light Mortar).

(In addition to the above certain other examinations have to be passed by officers of technical services.)

IV.—*Test for promotion from Major to Lieutenant-Colonel.*—

Pass a Course of Instruction at the Senior Officers' School, comprising:—

(Practical and Theoretical.)

- (i) The organisation of all units within a division.
- (ii) The tactical employment of the various arms.
- (iii) The principles of training and system to be adopted.
- (iv) Co-operation between the staff and troops.

APPENDIX B.

List of Indian Officers who already hold King's Commissions in the Indian Army.

TABLE "A".

Indore students who received their first Commissions when over 28 years of age.

No.	Rank.	Name.	Where serving.	DATES.				AGES.				
				1st Commission.	Captain.	Company Commander.	Major.	On 1st Commission.	At present.	On Captaincy.	On becoming Company Commander.	On Majority.
1	Lieutenant	Bakshi Chand	56th Rifles	17th July 1920.	17th July 1929.	1st Jan'y. 1935.	17th July 1938.	38½	38	45½	50½	54½
2	"	Anter Singh	22-25th Cavalry	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	38½	35½	42½	48	51½
3	"	Sher Mohammad Khan.	18-19th Lancers	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	32½	34½	41½	47½	50½
4	"	Mohammad Ayab Khan.	22-25th Cavalry	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	30½	32½	39½	45½	48½
5	"	Jai Singh	45th Sikhs	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	27½	29	36½	42½	45½
6	"	Partab Singh	5-8th Cavalry	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	26½	28½	35½	41½	44½
7	"	Sajjan Singh	11th Rajputs	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	26½	28½	35½	41	44½
8	"	Sabyabrata-Singh Roy.	2nd Rajputs	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	26½	28½	35½	40½	44½

TABLE "B".
Direct commissioned Officers who received their first Commissions when over 26 years of age.

No.	Rank.	Name.	Where serving.	DATES.				AGES.				
				1st Commission.	Captain.	Company Commander.	Major.	On 1st Commission.	At present.	On Captaincy.	On becoming Company Commander.	On Majority.
1	Lieutenant	Laohman Singh	16th Sikhs	7th Oct. 1919.	7th Oct. 1928.	7th April 1934.	7th Oct. 1937.	41½	44½	50½	53½	59½
2	"	Bhimasing Thapa	3rd Gurkha Rifles	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	39½	42½	48½	54½	57½
3	"	Hissam-ud-din	21-23rd Cavalry	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	37½	40½	46½	52½	55½
4	"	Janda Singh	72nd Punjabis	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	37½	39½	46½	51½	55½
5	"	Thakur Singh	47th Sikhs	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	36½	39½	45½	51½	54½
6	"	Suedar Singh	41st Dogras	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	36½	39½	45½	51½	54½
7	"	Amar Singh	33rd Punjabis	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	35½	38½	44½	50½	53½
8	2nd-Lieut.	Inder Singh	31st Lancers	14th Jan. 1922	14th Jan. 1931.	14th July 1933.	14th Jan. 1940.	30½	36½	45½	50½	54½
9	Lieutenant	Mit Singh	47th Sikhs	7th Oct. 1919.	7th Oct. 1928.	7th April 1934.	7th Oct. 1937.	31½	33½	40½	45½	49½
10	"	Khan Mohammed Khan.	35-36th Cavalry	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	27½	30½	36½	42½	45½
11	2nd-Lieut.	Najibullah Khan.	46th Punjabis	14th Jan. 1922.	14th Jan. 1931.	14th July 1936.	14th Jan. 1940.	} Details not available.				
12	"	Nur Ahmed Khan	9-10th Horse	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto					
13	"	Kasimah Dalir	116th Mahrattas	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto					
14	"	Awunt Rao M-hite	108rd Mahrattas	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto					

TABLE "C".
Previously Commissioned Officers who received their first Commissions when over 26 years of age.

No.	Rank.	Name.	Where serving.	DATES.				AGES.				
				1st Commission.	Captain.	Company Commander.	Major.	On 1st Commission.	At present.	On Captaincy.	On becoming Company Commander.	On Majority.
1	Captain	Kanwar Amar Singh.	2-4th Cavalry	25th Augt. 1917.	25th Augt. 1921.	25th Feb. 1932.	25th Augt. 1936.	39 $\frac{1}{2}$	43 $\frac{1}{2}$	43 $\frac{1}{2}$	35 $\frac{1}{2}$	57 $\frac{1}{2}$
2	"	Zorwar Singh	1-3rd Horse	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	34 $\frac{1}{2}$	39 $\frac{1}{2}$	38 $\frac{1}{2}$	48 $\frac{1}{2}$	52 $\frac{1}{2}$
3	"	Abdal Saunad Shah.	31st Lancers	15th Dec. 1919.	...	16th June 1934.	16th Dec. 1937.	36 $\frac{1}{2}$	38 $\frac{1}{2}$...	50 $\frac{1}{2}$	54 $\frac{1}{2}$
4	"	Aga Cassim Shah.	104th Rifles	25th Augt. 1917.	25th Augt. 1921.	25th Feb. 1932.	25th Augt. 1935.	33 $\frac{1}{2}$	38 $\frac{1}{2}$	37 $\frac{1}{2}$	48 $\frac{1}{2}$	51 $\frac{1}{2}$
5	"	Bala Sahib Daphle.	16th Rajputs	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	33 $\frac{1}{2}$	38 $\frac{1}{2}$	37 $\frac{1}{2}$	48 $\frac{1}{2}$	51 $\frac{1}{2}$
6	"	Mhd. Akhbar Khan.	1st Brahmans	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	32 $\frac{1}{2}$	37 $\frac{1}{2}$	36 $\frac{1}{2}$	47	50 $\frac{1}{2}$
7	"	Pirithi Singh	5-8th Cavalry	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	32 $\frac{1}{2}$	37 $\frac{1}{2}$	36 $\frac{1}{2}$	46 $\frac{1}{2}$	50 $\frac{1}{2}$
8	"	Rana Jodha Jank	28rd Pioneers	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	27 $\frac{1}{2}$	32 $\frac{1}{2}$	31 $\frac{1}{2}$	42	45 $\frac{1}{2}$

TABLE "D".
Indore students who received their first Commissions at the age of 23 years and under.

No.	Rank.	Name.	Where serving.	DATES.				AGRS.				
				1st Commission.	Captain.	Company Commander.	Major.	On 1st Commission.	At present.	On Captaincy.	On becoming Company Commander.	On Majority.
1	Lieutenant	Mohammad Masir Khan	18-19th Lancers.	17th July 1920.	17th July 1929.	1st January 1935.	17th July 1935.	26	27 1/2	35	40 1/2	44
2	ditto	Maung Ba Hpn	1-70th Barmans	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	26 1/2	27 1/2	35 1/2	40 1/2	44 1/2
3	ditto	C. B. Ponappa	11th Mairattas	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	26 1/2	27 1/2	36 1/2	41 1/2	44 1/2
4	ditto	Chitar Singh	2nd Rajputs	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	25 1/2	27 1/2	34 1/2	40 1/2	43 1/2
5	ditto	Daulat Sen	86th Sikhs	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	25 1/2	27 1/2	34 1/2	40 1/2	43 1/2
6	ditto	C. Poonooe	75th Carnatic	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	25 1/2	27 1/2	34 1/2	40 1/2	43 1/2
7	ditto	Maung Aye	1-70th Barmans	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	25 1/2	27 1/2	34 1/2	40 1/2	43 1/2
8	ditto	J. B. Cama	69th Punjabis	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	24 1/2	27 1/2	33 1/2	39 1/2	42 1/2
9	ditto	Digvijay Sinhji	1-125th Rifles	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	24 1/2	26 1/2	33 1/2	39 1/2	42 1/2
10	ditto	Ajab Singh	22-25th Cavalry.	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	24 1/2	26 1/2	33 1/2	39 1/2	42 1/2
11	ditto	Pritam Singh Bakhahi	38-39th Horse	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	24 1/2	25 1/2	33 1/2	38 1/2	41 1/2
12	ditto	Hamidullah Khan	124th Baluchis	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	23 1/2	25 1/2	32 1/2	38 1/2	41 1/2
13	ditto	Aji Amil Kudra	28th Punjabis	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	23 1/2	25 1/2	32 1/2	37 1/2	41 1/2
14	ditto	Mahand Hayat Khan	67th Punjabis	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	23 1/2	25 1/2	32 1/2	37 1/2	41 1/2
15	ditto	Mohammad Akhbar Khan	1-12th Cavalry	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	23 1/2	25 1/2	32 1/2	37 1/2	41 1/2
16	ditto	Mohammad Abdullah Khan	29th Punjabis	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	23 1/2	25 1/2	32 1/2	37 1/2	41 1/2
17	ditto	Mir Haider	92nd Punjabis	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	23 1/2	24 1/2	33 1/2	37 1/2	41 1/2
18	ditto	Gul Sher Khan	16-19th Lancers	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	22 1/2	24 1/2	31 1/2	37 1/2	40 1/2
19	ditto	Mohammed Ali Khan	9-10th Horse	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	22 1/2	24 1/2	31 1/2	37 1/2	40 1/2
20	ditto	Veshashar Nath Singh	20-29th Cavalry.	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	22 1/2	24 1/2	31 1/2	37 1/2	40 1/2
21	ditto	Maung Kin Maung	1-70th Barmans	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	21 1/2	24 1/2	31 1/2	37 1/2	40 1/2
22	ditto	Abdul Rabim Khan	Guides	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	21 1/2	23 1/2	30 1/2	36 1/2	39 1/2
23	ditto	Arial	123rd Rifles	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	20 1/2	22 1/2	29 1/2	36 1/2	38 1/2
24	ditto	K. M. Carappa	2-125th Rifles	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	20 1/2	22 1/2	29 1/2	34 1/2	38 1/2

TABLE "E."

Sandhurst cadets and others who received their first commissions at approximately the same age at which a British Officer enters the Army.

No.	Rank.	Name.	Where serving.	DATES.					AGES.			
				1st Commission.	Captain.	Company Commander.	Major.	On 1st Commission.	At present.	On Captaincy.	(In becoming Company Commander.	On Majority.
1	2nd-Lieutenant	Bedi Daya Singh.	16th Lancers	14th July 1921.	14th July 1930.	14th January 1936.	14th July 1939.	22½	23½	31½	37	40½
2	Ditto	K. S. Rajendra Singh.	3rd K. R. R. C.	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	22½	22½	31½	36½	40½
3	Lieutenant	Sikandar Ali Mirza.	33-34th Horse	16th July 1920.	16th July 1929.	16th January 1936.	16th July 1938.	20½	22½	29½	35½	38½
4	2nd-Lieutenant	Faiz Mohd. Khan.	Green Howards.	14th July 1921.	14th July 1930.	14th January 1936.	14th July 1939.	20½	21½	29½	35½	38½
5	Ditto	Mohd. Nawaz Khan.	7th Hussars.	23rd December 1921.	23rd December 1930.	23rd June 1936.	23rd December 1939.	20½	20½	29½	34½	38½
6	Ditto	E. Yusuf Khan.	2nd Warwickes	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto	20	20½	29	34½	38
7	Ditto (N.B.—In addition there are 4 other officers newly joined from Sandhurst.)	Sarwar Ali Khan.	1st Worcesters	14th July 1921.	14th July 1930.	14th January 1936.	14th July 1939.	19½	20½	28½	34½	37½
8	Lieutenant	Manng Kin Maung.	1-70th Burmans.	7th October 1919.	7th October 1928.	7th April 1934.	7th October 1937.	20½	23½	29½	35½	38½
9	Ditto	K. S. Himat Singh.	4th Bajpouts	23rd March 1918.	23rd March 1927.	23rd September 1932.	23rd March 1936.	20½	24½	29½	35	38½
10	Ditto	K. S. Madeo Singh.	8-39th Garhwalis.	24th October 1918.	24th October 1927.	24th April 1933.	24th October 1936.	20½	23½	29½	34½	38½

* Direct commission.

† Previously held Temporary Commission.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: Sir, may I know what period, the longest period, within which the Indianisation of these 8 Units is expected to take?

Mr. E. Burdon: The matter is one which requires to be stated with a considerable degree of precision. It has been explained very fully in the body of the statement, and I think it will be more satisfactory to my Honourable friend if he will wait till he reads the statement.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Sir, may I ask if it is a fact that it will take 23 years before these 8 Units become Indianised.

Mr. President: I think the Honourable Member had better wait till he has the opportunity of looking at the paper and then he can put any questions.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: What is the total number of Indian officers in these 8 Units?

Mr. E. Burdon: The establishment of King's commissioned officers in an Indian Infantry Battalion is 12, and in a Cavalry Regiment 13.

THE EXCLUSION FROM INHERITANCE BILL.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: Sir, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to amend the Hindu Law relating to the exclusion from inheritance of certain classes of heirs and to remove certain doubts.

THE CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) BILL.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4.

Mr. Abul Kasem (Dacca Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, amendment of section 4.

THE BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS.

SECOND STAGE—*contd.*

DEMAND No. 8.—RAILWAYS—*contd.*

POINT OF ORDER—NOMINAL CUT ON VOTABLE EXPENDITURE.

Range of Discussion on Non-votable Expenditure.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey (Home Member): Sir, there was a discussion in the House yesterday, during part of which I was unfortunately absent, on a point of order. Briefly, it referred to the extent to which on a proposal for what we have come to know as a nominal cut on votable expenditure, questions might be raised and discussion might range over questions relating to non-votable expenditure. I appreciate the fact that you have given your ruling on the subject, but for my own part, and I may perhaps be blamed for not having raised the point last year, I am conscious of the fact that in previous discussion on the Demands for Grants, opportunities were taken by the House for raising questions ranging over non-votable expenditure in the course of discussing cuts of a nominal nature

on votable expenditure. I am not, it may be well understood, desirous of arguing against your ruling; I am equally desirous to avoid putting forward any proposal which might embarrass the Honourable the Finance Member. I am far from either intention, but may I suggest, in view of the terms in which the Governor General's Order regarding discussion of non-voted items is couched; in view also of our previous procedure, that without in any way altering your previous decision, and without prejudice to any final decision that you may come to on the subject, it would be possible for you, during the next few days to allow the House, as an interim arrangement purely and without prejudice to the future, to discuss on nominal cuts relating to non-votable expenditure general questions relating to votable expenditure. I put that request forward, because I feel that the House would perhaps, during the general discussion, have taken a fuller opportunity of discussing non-votable expenditure had they been aware that it would not be possible for them to discuss these questions on motions placed on the paper in regard to votable expenditure. I of course wish to be precise on one point only, and that is that such motions should be actually of cuts of a nominal character. It is quite clear, Sir, that I could not put forward or support any proposal for a reduction in votable expenditure of such a nature that it was really intended to affect non-votable expenditure. My suggestion relates entirely of course to motions for nominal reductions.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I am sure we appreciate this concession to the weakness of the House, if I may put it so, its faults and defects to which they have got accustomed and which for a short spell might be permitted to continue. Sir, we have often been told that within the powers reserved to us larger conventions might grow up, and that is exactly what the House has been trying to do in this matter, and they have been allowed to do that. It is not as if there had been lapses which have to be condoned and need be now further condoned. I purposely refrained from taking part in yesterday's discussion for an obvious reason, and that is that these are matters that had best be allowed to grow their own way. And if they are not allowed to grow as they ought to grow, as conventions, then any concessions from the Government such as has been hinted at to-day would be valueless. Take for instance, what Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas referred to yesterday. He relied on the convention that sprang up last year. Unfortunately there were slight elements of inaccuracy owing to the exact proceedings not being before us. Mr. Jamnadas referred to what had been allowed before and this is exactly what the House has been trying to follow up. This proposed concession comes in another shape and I do not know whether it will serve any useful purpose or whether we had not better go on in the way we are doing. We do claim that by effecting cuts on votable items it is not only intended to raise a discussion but there is a desire to force the hands of the Government with regard to votable, that that is the clear object with which these cuts are proposed; and if this power is to be taken away, I do not much appreciate the value of the concession that has been announced to-day.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I did not understand you yesterday to rule that all discussion outside the particular item as irrelevant. You can, on a motion for a substantial reduction of a votable item, support your position by showing other ways in which that amount can be found. It is not an actual vote-

[Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

on a particular item; in the argument in support of the motion I refer to various items which might have been done by Government, and thereby they need not ask for so much vote from the Assembly. In that way I do not understand that you ruled out such discussions as out of order. If you did, Sir, because the matter was discussed at very short notice and without any previous preparation for it, I would ask you to reconsider it. We do not want any concessions; we want to stand on our rights such as they are and if we have not got those rights we must agitate for getting those rights. By all means let us cultivate the habit of making conventions, but not against law. I do not think, Sir, there is anything in the rules or in the Act preventing us from supporting our motions for reduction of particular grants, whether it be a nominal sum or a substantial sum. I do not want to take this recommendation which the Honourable Leader of the House has suggested that it must be a nominal sum. It might be a substantial sum, but in asking my substantial sum reduction I may be able to show there are other ways in which the Government could have found this money and therefore I need not grant it. I am asked to grant a particular sum and I tell the Government "You can find that sum elsewhere." Sir, it is a perfectly legitimate argument to adopt, and I do not think you will rule such an argument out as irrelevant.

Mr. N. M. Samarth (Bombay: Nominated Non-Official): I support what Mr. Rangachariar has said, Sir. Take for instance, what we had last year. We made a certain cut of a lump sum in certain grants and left the Government to adjust it in any way they liked between non-votable and votable as they chose. Here is the list supplied to us—the statement of the expenditure that is appropriated and that is reduced. Take for instance, the North-West Frontier Province. We asked and we carried a vote for a reduction of Rs. 12 lakhs and 90 thousand. How have the Government adjusted it? In that sheet, on page 10, it will be found that the original amount which was non-voted was Rs. 1,38,08,000 and the net grant voted by the Assembly was Rs. 1,11,22,000. How did the Government adjust it? They reduced the non-voted item from Rs. 1,38,08,000 to Rs. 92,99,000 and reduced the voted item to Rs. 14,79,000. It is for the Government to cut out according as they choose. It is for us to say "We are not going to grant anything more than this; you had better adjust yourself in any way you like between voted and non-voted as you did last year."

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I rise only to remove a misapprehension that might have been created by what my Honourable and esteemed friend Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary said. Yesterday evening I had no time to urge the point that I was laying emphasis on. All the time, Sir, I was trying to prove that the discussion had been allowed last year in the course of discussions on demands for grants on items which it is urged this year are of a non-votable character; and in doing so I referred to the motion which was on paper in my name but which I refrained from moving only because before moving that I wanted to obtain some information from the Honourable the Finance Member. The Honourable Finance Member in replying never raised the point and I am still prepared to maintain that he had not the slightest idea of raising the point of order if that motion had been moved; and if he denies it I am prepared to accept his statement. But the Honourable the Finance Member in dealing with that point treated me

very fairly and answered all the arguments that were urged by me in speaking on my intention to move the motion. That alone prevented me from technically moving the motion; all the arguments were urged and in the course of discussion on Sir Vithaldas' motion for all practical purposes. I urged also the possibility of my moving the motion if the Honourable the Finance Member's explanation was not satisfactory. I do not think, Sir, that I was inaccurate; besides, all that I was trying to prove yesterday was—and that I think has been proved beyond doubt—that last year in the course of the discussion on demands for grants, those items which are considered non-votable to-day were allowed to be discussed. Apart from that, the reason of the non-votable items being too heavy was allowed to be urged by Members as a reason for cutting down the expenditure on votable items. That was all that I wanted to urge and I do not think that I am guilty of inaccuracy.

Mr. President: The point in its essence is simple; but before I approach the main point put to me by the Honourable the Home Member I want the Assembly to clear up its mind of the confusion which arose owing to the fact that a certain item which appeared in last year's estimates as votable appears in this year's estimates as non-votable; therefore, though Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas' words were applicable to that point, they are not applicable to the main question.

The Home Member has put to me a point which is not only of great importance for this House but of great constitutional importance. As the Assembly is aware, I have endeavoured always to interpret the spirit rather than the letter of the 'Rules and Standing Orders. I have no intention of enforcing in a hard and fast sense the ruling given yesterday and I am prepared to acknowledge that the interpretation which I placed on the Governor General's order is open to argument. Therefore I may say that I am glad that the Honourable Home Member has taken this point in order that the further proceedings on the demands for grants may be put properly in order.

Mr. Rangachariar has suggested that if a large reduction is moved on the votable portion and carried then the Government must find means either in the votable or the non-votable portion of carrying that into effect. But I may point out to him that we should be establishing a very unfortunate precedent if I were to accept that without reservation; and the reservation which I must put to the Assembly in this: the non-votable portion in certain parts of the budget is much larger than the votable; and if I were to allow him to move a reduction on the votable item larger than the votable item itself, then obviously I should be allowing him to do a thing which is not permitted by the rules.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: I did not mean that.

Mr. President: But the Honourable Member meant it in essence though not in form. What the Honourable Member is asking me is to allow him to proceed not exactly on that line, but with that object and effect in view. Therefore, I think, for the purposes of the remaining discussion, I must adopt the more restricted procedure suggested by the Honourable the Home Member on the assumption that the Government itself is not impervious to argument and that where a reduction of a nominal amount is carried by the Assembly, the arguments used will carry their due weight with the Government. I may say in general that I am glad that the Honourable the Home Member has taken a liberal view of the constitution.

Dr. H. S. Gour (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, after what has fallen from the Chair, my perplexity has become greater. I understood, Sir, ever since the commencement of this Assembly that we were always at liberty to use pressure upon the Government to economise upon non-votable items by making corresponding cuts in the votable items and that we were not restricted to any nominal amount in our cuts on the votable items. I now find, Sir, that the practice of the last two years will have to be modified, and if I wish to make a cut of a lakh of rupees in the non-votable item, I shall not be entitled to make that cut in a votable item and use it as a lever upon the Government to transfer it to the non-votable item. All that the Honourable the Home Member has suggested is that a nominal cut should be made in the votable item and leave the Government to make such cuts as they desire to make in the non-votable items. That, Sir, would be reversing the practice and procedure which has been followed during the last two years and which we, Sir, have followed even during the last two days. I, therefore, submit that that is a practice which has developed into a convention of this House, and we shall be going back upon a convention, the validity of which was never challenged by the Honourable the Home Member when he was in charge of the finances of the country. I therefore submit that we must not break upon a rule which, at any rate, has been established and become established during the last two years.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blakett (Finance Member): Sir, in making the motion yesterday and in asking you to give a ruling that the discussion on sinking funds on a motion for a reduction in the Railway Demand was out of order, I was following the practice which was in entire accordance with the practice in the House of Commons. A consolidated fund charge is not a charge which on any occasion in connection with the voting of the Demands or estimates in Great Britain the House of Commons can use as an argument for cutting down voted expenditure. The difference of course between the position in England and the position here is that, there are other things besides the consolidated fund charges which are non-votable. So far as the consolidated fund charges are concerned, the ruling that you have given, gives this House probably rather more liberty of voting, of expressing its view by voting on a consolidated fund charge than is granted to the House of Commons.

I would just like to refer to one other argument used by Mr. Samarth. He said that if this House were to reduce a votable item, it was open to the Government to spread that reduction over the votable and the non-votable portion of the vote. That is not so. The Government can only spend on voted expenditure such sums as are voted by this House, and if this House reduces a vote of 10 crores by one crore to 9 crores and there is a non-voted portion of one crore in addition to that sum voted, it is perfectly true that as a matter of money, the result at the end of the year might be that the Government had spent only 10 crores, by saving one crore on the non-votable instead of on the votable. But we should have to come back to the House and obtain its authority for that additional one crore on a supplementary vote. This Government can only spend on votable expenditure what the House votes. If this House reduces a voted item by a crore, the Government has either to reduce its voted expenditure by a crore or come back to the House for a supplementary grant. So that it is not true to say that the Government has liberty to adjust a cut in a votable portion of the vote by non-expenditure under a non-votable portion.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar (Madras: Nominated Non-Official): May I ask the Honourable the Finance Member a question. Supposing out of a sum which is regarded as non-votable there is an amount which is not spent, you can adjust the unspent amount of the non-votable portion and use it for votable items. Of course, it will come by way of a supplementary grant, but when you ask for a supplementary grant and when the House finds that there is money in the non-votable item which can be transferred to the votable portion, there will be no difficulty in giving you a grant. That will be the position.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: That may be the position, but the technical position is that on a votable expenditure Government can only spend money that is voted. If you cut a Demand by a crore, the question whether there is money unspent has nothing to do with the case. It is simply a question that this House has the right to determine by vote what sums shall be voted for the Government to spend on certain services. The Government cannot spend a rupee more on these services without getting further money voted by the House.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: It was an old saying that the Greeks feared their enemies even when they brought them gifts. I thought that I was endeavouring to get over a difficulty that was raised yesterday and was asking your assistance to surmount it. The difficulty as I saw it and as I put it, arose purely out of one matter, namely, whether you could discuss non-votable questions on a motion relating to a nominal cut on a votable item. That I understand was the exact point on which you gave your ruling. I find, however, that my well-intentioned efforts have been misconstrued into an attempt,—I am sure I am right in using the word 'misconstrued' because that is the practical effect of what Mr. Gour said,—to curtail a convention of another nature at which the House is said to have arrived. Nothing was further from my thoughts; nor would that result be involved in the permission which I asked you to give. As for the alleged convention, Dr. Gour said that last year the House was in the habit—whether it was a good habit or bad habit I leave the outside world to judge,—of making large cuts from votable items on the suggestion that it would leave it to us to distribute those as we liked between non-votable and votable. It is true that the House took that course, but it is a process against the correctness of which we argued both on practical and constitutional grounds. As the Honourable Sir Basil Blackett said, the House by doing so could not alter the constitutional position; if we could not effect reductions on the non-voted section then the total budget provision under the head was insufficient; and even if we did so, the matter had to be regulated subsequently by a supplementary grant within the voted head. When I proposed this morning that when nominal cuts were proposed on voted items the House should be able to discuss non-voted heads of expenditure, I did not, of course, in any way suggest that the House should not be at liberty to vote reduced supply on voted items when it could indicate that such reductions could be met by a feasible reduction in the scale of voted expenditure. Nor could I suggest that the President should go behind the motives of the House in making such cuts. We well know that last year large cuts on votable expenditure were moved and were supported on arguments which really had nothing whatever to do with the subject matter in hand. That is to say, the House, while fully acknowledging that we could not earn our Customs revenue without a

[Sir Malcolm Hailey.]

full establishment, nevertheless decided that 4 lakhs should go out of it. They argued it on grounds which they themselves will now admit had very little to do with the question whether a reduction in establishment was really possible. In other words, admitting that we still needed the establishment, they nevertheless voted reduced supply on this head and suggested we might make it up out of the army or elsewhere. We cannot go into the motives of the House in making these cuts on votable expenditure. I say nothing now as to the propriety or reasonableness of this procedure, nor do I suggest that it could or should profitably be followed again. I am not on that point—I only suggest that on motions for reduction of votable expenditure purposely placed on the list with the view of raising discussion or eliciting information you might allow the discussion to range over non-votable items.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhamadan Rural): Sir, the question which was raised before this House yesterday involved two principles of great constitutional importance. One has been discussed and is being discussed to-day before this House. With regard to that, I would remind the Honourable the Home Member that his predecessor gave an assurance, when we made lump cuts last year, that, if the cuts could not be made from the votable items, the non-votable items would be reduced.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: Would the Honourable Member kindly say who gave that assurance?

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: Sir William Vincent. He gave an assurance that, although we cut down votable items, if the reduction could not be made from votable items without making administration impossible, he would make some reductions in the non-votable items.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: The Honourable Member will, I am sure, excuse me if I interrupt him to put him right on facts. It was suggested that a total reduction might be made under the head "General Administration." Sir William Vincent accepted that—that cut was not made by the House—he accepted that and said at the same time: "I am sure the House will not bind me to make it purely in one direction, but I shall spread it over the entire head, votable and non-votable." That, the Honourable Member will admit, is entirely different to what we are discussing now.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: I quite admit that. My point is that that is a mode of bringing indirect pressure on the Government.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: No pressure was needed in that case.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: I do not question for a moment that, so long as this distinction between votable and non-votable exists, of course we cannot effect a reduction in the non-votable items. But in that respect, what the Honourable the Home Member has said is a concession. The non-votable items are not a permanent fixture and the scheme of the Act is that they will gradually be made votable. Now, the other question of principle that was raised yesterday on the merits, I have looked into the Government of India Act, and there can be no question that annuities are non-votable under the existing arrangement. But I would point out that

a question of principle as regards the privileges of this House that was raised was this. My learned Leader, Sir Sivaswamy Ayyar, raised the question that under section 67A, whenever a votable item is transferred to a non-votable head then the question should arise in this House. It would have been regular if, when this change was made, the matter was brought before the House and the change was effected in a regular way. That would have been a compliance with the requirements of section 67A to which Sir Sivaswamy Ayyar referred.

As on the merits, my friend Mr. Rangachariar referred to section 20, which says:

“All expenses, debts, liabilities, contracted and incurred on account of the Government of India should be a charge on the Revenue.”

That is clause 20 (c). Now, if we refer to section 28, there is no doubt with regard to the question under the Government of India Act. These railways were acquired by the Secretary of State under powers therein referred to.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is now arguing a question of merit, which is somewhat remote from the real point of order raised by the Home Member. I must ask him to bring his remarks to a close.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: So I say on the merits of this question, the annuities are non-votable, but the other question that is indirectly involved is a constitutional question, and a question of the privileges of this House. Supposing next year a certain item is transferred from under the head of votable to non-votable without reference to us, that will be an encroachment on the privileges of this House and that will be an unconstitutional course.

Mr. President: That question has not yet arisen.

Sir Montagu Webb (Bombay: European): I beg to move, Sir, that the House do now proceed with the further consideration of the Demands for Grants.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: That is indirectly involved and that is why I say I must enter my protest on constitutional grounds and on the ground of its being an encroachment on the privileges of the House.

Mr. President: I think I cannot allow the Honourable Member to raise a large issue like that. As far as I am able to understand, this is really a book-keeping entry.

The Honourable the Finance Member: Yes.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: If any Member of this House does not appreciate the point, perhaps the Honourable the Finance Member will.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member has just said that he is satisfied that this particular item is non-votable.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, the item in question is an annuity payable to the shareholders of the East Indian Railway Company. It is a sterling sum. Last year, owing to the way in which our accounts were drawn up, the sterling sum was shown in rupees with the equivalent of two shillings to the rupee. That left a gap of a very considerable sum between the amount of rupees required and the amount of rupees shown

[Sir Basil Blackett.]

at 2 shillings to the rupee. Under another head "Exchange", the additional sum was included. That was under a general item for Exchange, but was treated as votable, obviously quite wrongly, purely by mistake. This year the exchange being shown at 1s. 4d. the rupee sum which is the equivalent of the sterling sum is shown entirely under one head as non-votable. The amount that has been transferred from votable to non-votable is simply the exchange difference between the rupee at 1s. 4d. and the rupee at 2s. on a sum something over three million pounds representing the shilling annuity. I think there is a certain amount of misapprehension as to what the House is doing when it is voting demands for grants. What it is doing is appropriating a certain sum of money for expenditure by the Government on certain items. It votes that a crore be spent on such and such a department, on the voted portion. It is not framing a budget; it is not providing money, it is simply appropriating a given sum for a given expenditure. If it appropriates a reduced sum or if it reduces that expenditure by half, that is at that moment a direction to the Government to spend half that sum on these particular items of the voted expenditure. But there is a good deal of confusion of thought, I think, on what it is doing. It is simply voting certain sums for certain purposes and if it reduces the sums voted, that is a direct reduction of the sums available to the Government for those purposes and has no other effect.

Detailed Discussion.

Mr. President: The House will now resume the discussion on Demand No. 8 under the head "Railways."

Munshi Iswar Saran (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhammadan Urban): With your permission, Sir, I shall say only one brief word about all these three items.*

Mr. President: Do they come under the head Working Expenses? •

Munshi Iswar Saran: Yes. According to the ruling given by you yesterday, I understood that all these proposals for reduction of smaller sums were included in the proposals for the reduction of larger sums and when the vote on the bigger issue was given, then the smaller ones went out. If that was your ruling, then, Sir, I cannot move these three items for the obvious reason that they are included in the head Working Expenses. But if, on the other hand, you are now pleased to hold that in view of the discussion that has taken place it may perhaps be more useful that these smaller reductions, which are really made to raise questions of principle and discussion on various matters should be allowed, then I shall, with your permission, make a few observations. It is a matter entirely for your decision, Sir.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member must not take the ruling regarding the discussion of a particular item in this case as applying to all cases. The ruling which I gave in the case of one of Mr. Joshi's amendments was not on the point of votable or non-votable but on the point that the matter had been fully discussed under Working Expenses and that

* "144. That the provision for Engineering Department, Appendix B (page 4) be reduced by Re. 1.

145. That the provision for Locomotive Department, Appendix B (page 4) be reduced by Re. 1.

146. That the provision for Carriage and Wagon Department Appendix B (page 4) be reduced by Re. 1."

it was the duty of the Chair to avoid as far as possible the repetition of discussion under successive motions for reduction. As the Honourable Member will remember, there was a long debate on Working Expenses and I think the Chair was entitled to assume that those who wished to discuss matters arising under Working Expenses would do so on the larger demand even though they themselves had put down smaller demands. The Honourable Member must not understand as regards the general application of the ruling that where a larger demand has been moved and voted upon, therefore *ipso facto* it rules out of order smaller demands, because that is not so. But in this case, from the point of view of orderly procedure, it would be improper to allow successive discussions of all smaller motions which come under Working Expenses in view of the fact that Working Expenses was fully discussed yesterday morning.

Munshi Iswar Saran: Perhaps it is my fault, but if you will be pleased to turn to amendment 132A, on page 10, you will find the following:—

“ That the provision for Working Expenses under the head Railways (page 29) be reduced by Re. 1.”

After the discussion on the larger question you passed over this and similar other items. Perhaps it may be my mistake, but I understood that all these smaller items were ruled out simply because the discussion had taken place on the larger item. Your ruling would necessitate that in the discussion on the larger item, all those people who had given notice of amendments for smaller reduction will, as a matter of right, be entitled to speak. Otherwise, there will be this obvious difficulty. Assume, Sir, for the moment, that twenty of us have given notice for reduction of a particular demand by Re. 1, Rs. 2 and so on, and there is a discussion about the reduction of the same demand by Rs. 1 lakh. Further assume that a discussion of the larger reduction takes place and the question is decided. Now, if it is to be held that all the people who have given notice of smaller reductions are ruled out, then it appears to me, Sir, perfectly reasonable that all these people should have the right of expressing their views in the discussion on the larger reduction.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: The President has not said “ No ” to it.

Munshi Iswar Saran: I do not say that the President has said “ No ”. I am only pointing out that this would be the inevitable consequence of that position.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member means that a Member in whose name a motion for reduction stands, which is less than the amount in the motion under discussion, ought to have the right to be called by the Chair. Is that what he means?

Munshi Iswar Saran: As you have been pleased to put the question I must answer it. Yesterday after the discussion on the larger reduction was over, you called on other men. I did not like to jump up to be told that I was out of order. This is exactly what happened yesterday. As soon as that was passed, you passed over this item and went down to some other item and called upon some other Member of the House. If you mean that each Member is to get up, then I suppose you will be pleased to allow us to have a little breathing time, because, you announced the vote and then you passed on and called upon another man. It is really impossible for a man to stand up in the interval between the announcement and the calling up of another man. That is the difficulty. As regards this particular item

Mr. President: If the Honourable Member thinks that he still had the right to move the reduction of Re. 1 after we carried Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary's reduction of Rs. 50 lakhs, we carried out his intention.

Munshi Iswar Saran: The reason is this. When there is a proposal for the reduction of a large amount that may be guided by considerations of a very different nature and it may not be necessary in the discussion of that large item to bring forward those matters which a man who proposes a reduction of, say, Re. 1, wishes the House to consider. I mean it is perfectly obvious.

Mr. President: I just called upon the Honourable Member to move 144. If he means that it is simply a vote reducing the Working Expenses, then it is out of order. But if he wishes to raise a particular point, then he is in order. I fail to understand his grievance regarding his motion for reduction of Re. 1.

Munshi Iswar Saran: As regards the reduction of Re. 1 it has nothing to do with the reason why that reduction of Rs. 45 lakhs or Rs. 50 lakhs should take place. I shall now come to this question* of 144, 145 and 146. I may take all these together. It is not necessary for me to make a long speech about it. I only put them down in order to draw the attention of the Honourable Mr. Innes and the Chief Commissioner to the grievance that there exists about the employment of Indians in these various Departments.

Mr. President: We have already had that discussion.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: Are you not satisfied? (*A Voice:* "Withdraw.")

Munshi Iswar Saran: That is perfectly so and I was therefore not going to move it. But you were pleased to call upon me. Take, for instance, the Carriage and Wagon Department. Not a word was said yesterday about it. If these are included technically under the head Working Expenses, then that goes. But if it is not, then I submit that I would be perfectly justified in moving my amendment No. 146, for not a word was said about it yesterday. But before I proceed, I shall beg you to consider that according to this view the right of a Member to move a particular amendment will depend to a large extent on the observations that have been made by the speakers in the discussion of the larger amount.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member will remember that the Commerce Member in replying said that he was replying
12 Noon. to no less than fourteen points under this vote and one of those was the very point of Indianisation. It is not the duty of the Chair to protect the right of any individual Member to raise a question at its proper point. He must realise that though it was somewhat disorderly the question of Indianisation was raised on two votes, Working Expenses and the Railway Board. The Assembly will appreciate the difficulty of preventing a repetition of discussions; but it is the duty of the Chair as far as possible to do so, because otherwise the same question would be raised on nearly every one of the votes. When once the question has been thoroughly discussed the Chair must protect the right of other Members of the House to raise other questions on other

* *Vide* page 3380 of these Debates.

votes. (Hear, hear.) If the Honourable Member proposes to raise the question of Indianisation I am afraid he is not in order.

(Cries of 'Withdraw', 'withdraw'.)

Munshi Iswar Saran: The only word I wish to say to those who shout 'withdraw', is that I am withdrawing this motion not in response to that shout but in compliance with your ruling.

Corruption on Railways—Pilferage of Fruits, etc.

Dr. Nand Lal (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I shall not make reference to those points which were adverted to yesterday and day before yesterday. I shall confine my remarks to one point alone which was not brought within the scope of discussion during these two days. That point is this. Two years back on the floor of this House I had the privilege of raising my voice and addressing the Railway Department that some of the stationmasters do not give a free supply of wagons to traders and merchants.

Mr. President: Order, order. That was thoroughly discussed on Working Expenses.

Dr. Nand Lal: With due deference, Sir, I remained present in this House during the last two days and so far as my recollection goes none of the Honourable Members of this House made any reference to the point which I am urging now. The point which I am referring to is this that the merchants and tradesmen . . .

Mr. President: The Honourable Member must have forgotten certain passages in the Debate in which under Renewals this question was very carefully gone into both by the non-official Members and by Members of the Government. If the Honourable Member has some other question to raise, I shall allow him to proceed.

Dr. Nand Lal: I am not referring to the question of renewals or the question of the number of carriages or the question of the difficulties of third class passengers. I am now referring to the conduct of certain stationmasters towards the merchants and tradesmen, that is, corruption. That point was never brought within the scope of any discussion during the last two days, and if I go beyond that point, then I may be asked to resume my seat. Since I am in favour of discipline I wish to ask your permission to proceed. May I proceed to that point?

Mr. President: The Honourable Member did not make it clear to me that he was going to discuss the question of the conduct of stationmasters.

Dr. Nand Lal: I thank the Chair for the permission granted to me. Sir, I shall not repeat the preliminary point which I had raised. It happens in many cases that a merchant applies to the stationmaster for the supply of wagons and the stationmaster tries to pretend that he has not got sufficient supply of those wagons which are required by the merchant or the tradesman as the case may be. But if that merchant or trader gives something to the stationmaster the wagons crop up in no time. The House is intelligent enough to understand what that thing is and I need not mention it. I address the Railway Department that the country will feel very much indebted to that Department if they will take effective measures so that the corruption, in any case, may be reduced, if it cannot

[Dr. Nand Lal.]

be eradicated. It is impossible for any Department to eradicate it, because, unfortunately, this evil habit has got its existence in the whole world. Therefore, I will not ask the Railway Department to do that which is impossible, but I am fully justified in asking that they will do their level best to see that this evil is minimised. Perhaps it may be urged on behalf of the Department "This criticism is merely destructive. Have you got any constructive suggestions to make?" Here I may add it is my duty, as a Member of this House, to offer those suggestions. The suggestion is that a register may be kept, at every railway station, so that if any merchant or any tradesman wants to have the supply of one wagon or two wagons, he may put down in that register "I want one wagon or two wagons on a certain day", and that register may be subscribed to or signed, in the way of authentication, by the officer in charge of that station, it may be the Superintendent of the station, so far as the bigger towns are concerned, or the stationmaster, as far as the smaller stations concerned. This will, in a way, meet the requirement and there will be, in any case, less chance for that stationmaster to get his palms greased. Another point in connection with the Traffic Department which was not urged before is—most of us are quite alive to this fact and I think the Railway Department too—that if you send a parcel containing oranges or mangoes from one place to another, your consignee will not be fortunate enough to get the whole of the consignment, but he will find something less, in some cases half, and in some other cases one-third. May I invite the attention of the Traffic Department to this evil which exists on a very large scale. I think even some of the official Members may have felt very deeply the loss of fruits which they might have sent for from a certain place. I think this is a point, in which we are very much concerned, and an honest effort must be put forth to see that this evil is reduced. Sir, the purity and honesty of the Department are essential factors, which go to give a good name to that Department and if the Railway Department will do something in the direction I have suggested most of the criticism which is levelled against it will have been removed at once. I move:

"That the provision for Traffic Department under sub-head Ordinary Expenses (b) (i) (4)—Appendix B be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. R. A. Spence (Bombay: European): I think there is a good deal in what Dr. Nand Lal has said especially in regard to fruits. I well remember trying to discover what had happened to a basket of mangoes and at last when I traced my complaint and got into the clerk's office, I discovered the empty basket under the clerk's table. Dr. Nand Lal made a constructive criticism and offered a suggestion to the Honourable Member in charge of Commerce and Railways in regard to a register of wagons. May I ask him to carry the suggestion a little further? It is a difficult problem. Perhaps the railway people might get assistance if they referred this matter to one of the Secretaries of the Gymkhanas who have great difficulty in arranging a register for tennis courts. If it is a difficult matter to arrange a register for tennis courts I am sure it would be a very much more difficult matter to arrange a register for wagons.

Mr. W. M. Hussanally (Sind: Muhammadan Rural): The point that has been brought forward by Dr. Nand Lal is a very important point indeed. Corruption among railway station staff is a very common thing all over India. Not only does corruption exist in regard to the supply of wagons and pilferage of fruit, but corruption exists in almost everything connected

with the railway station working. For instance even the foodstuff vendors pay annuities to the station staff and I have tabled a question upon this point of annuities of this kind to which I expect an answer in a few days more. The question I admit is a very difficult one for solution for one reason and that is that whatever is earned by this corruption is divided not only amongst the whole station staff, but also amongst the underlings and subordinates in the offices of the District Traffic Superintendents and others, with the result that these station masters are emboldened in their attempts to fleece the public. It has occurred within my own knowledge and experience that a station master drawing only about Rs. 50 or 60 a month has been kept at a particular station and only that station for years together, sometimes 15 or 20 years. At the time of transfer he carries a fortune of over two or three lakhs. In one instance I remember that a particular station master who was working on the Sind section carried a fortune of 2 lakhs at retirement and he had no son or daughter, and I do not know what he did with that money. Similarly with regard to foodstuff vendors, they have to pay regular annuities and even commissions to the station staff or the staff of higher offices, for securing a licence for the purpose of vending these foodstuffs. The result is that the travelling public is mulcted. They get very inferior stuff. No body cares to look at what is being sold to them what the public are given to eat and at what rates. The suggestion made by Dr. Nand Lal with regard to keeping a register in regard to the supply of wagons will hardly do. There are ways and ways of doing things and evading the supply. I consider this matter is so important that I have suggested the appointment of a committee to go into this matter regularly and make a thorough inquiry and find out how far this evil exists and what should be the remedies for stopping the same. The thefts are not confined entirely to parcels of fruits but to much more valuable articles, such as ghee, liquor and things of that kind. These are freely robbed while in transit. A tin of ghee or kerosine is tampered with and the contents removed. In some instances the public have complained that instead of ghee they found stones when these tins are received by them. Thefts of mangoes and fruits are common complaints on all railways and the fact that superior officers of the Railway Department have not paid any consideration to the complaints which are by no means new or tried to stop the nuisance has led the public to believe, though wrongly, that the railway officers themselves encourage their subordinates. I say that these things will never stop unless a regular committee is appointed and the matter is thoroughly gone into and some strong measures adopted for stopping this scandal. I would therefore draw the attention of the Chief Commissioner to this point very particularly.

Sardar B. A. Dalal (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I rise to support and voice the grievance of Dr. Nand Lal. I represent the Northern Division and I have received a telegram a few days ago from the timber merchants of Godra that they applied to the Station Master and the Traffic Inspector to supply them wagons but unfortunately their request was not conceded. The same telegram was addressed to your goodself and to Mr. Jamnadas also. These grievances ought to be remedied. They have been waiting for so many months and still they have not been supplied with wagons. Consequently they were put to a loss of some lakhs. Some remedy must be found for this grievance and I suggest to the Railway Board to do their best in this matter, to make enquiries whether what I have said is a fact or not. It is a fact, because I have got a telegram a few days ago.

Mr. K. G. Bagde (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): The evil which is now under discussion was brought to the notice of the Acworth Committee and in their report they have made the following remarks. I am reading at page 53, paragraph 165:

“It is not too much to say that petty payments for wagons have now grown into a system of organised blackmail. The Railway Board and the railway officials, though they hesitate to admit that the evil is as serious and widespread as the traders claim, do not attempt to deny its existence. They deplore it, but are disinclined to accept responsibility. The practice, they say, can only be stamped out by convicting and punishing the bribe taker. This has been done in some cases, but not with sufficient frequency or certainty to stop the practice. If conviction of the bribe taker in a law court were the only means of stopping the practice, it would evidently continue indefinitely. For normally the only witness against the bribe taker is the bribe giver and as he is *particeps criminis* and equally liable to punishment, he can hardly be expected to come forward to give evidence. The practice must be stopped, not by conviction of offenders, but by prevention of the offence. And this we are convinced can be done as soon as the authorities are sufficiently in earnest about the matter. We feel that the evil would not have grown so serious if the Railway Board has appreciated its magnitude, and after a thorough investigation had grappled with it as a general question affecting all India and had insisted on reforms of the methods of wagon distribution.”

The report is signed 22nd August 1921. It is more than a year and a half since the report was published and I would like to know from the Honourable Member concerned what steps have been taken in this direction.

Mr. J. P. Cotelingam (Nominated: Indian Christians): With reference to the point raised by Dr. Nand Lal as also by Mr. Spence and Mr. Hussanally, I believe a Committee was appointed last year to go into the whole question of the revision of railway risk notes. That Committee went round the country, took evidence and dealt also with the question of pilfering referred to by the Honourable Member and we have received copies of that report. I do not know what action has been taken in the matter by the Railway Board.

Mr. C. D. M. Hindley (Chief Commissioner, Railways): Although this discussion when started by Dr. Nand Lal was perhaps received by the House with a certain amount of levity, I can assure Honourable Members that this matter of corruption and pilferage is a serious one, on which the Railway Board feel very acutely and we feel that definite steps must be taken to eradicate these abuses. In regard to the general question of the distribution of wagons between stations, I must again mention that this depends to some extent on the total number of wagons available. Individual stations in various parts of the country undoubtedly feel the pinch when the number of wagons which are available or the number of wagons which can be moved are in deficit of the number required for the total traffic. This symptom, which Honourable Members know from their own experience, of wagons not being easily available at stations does hang on the general question of the provision of facilities and the renewals of stock on the railways. That is the general aspect of it.

In regard to actual distribution, various railways have different methods of ensuring that the goods brought to each different station are carried away in turn. Acting on the suggestion of the Acworth Committee, very shortly after we received their Report, this matter was brought prominently to the notice of all railways, but the suggestions which have been made by Dr. Nand Lal and Mr. Spence are, if I may say so without disrespect, of a somewhat amateur nature compared with what we are actually doing and

have been going for some considerable time. It is not at all comparable to the difficulties of the Secretary of a Gymkhana Club, if I may say so. Each railway has its own special system of registers. When goods are brought to a station for consignment, they are entered in a register in rotation and on many railways—I am not prepared to say that it is the case on every railway—those registers are periodically submitted to and certified by the district officers. The penalties for changing the order of those consignments as registered are very severe indeed. I may say from my own experience on the East Indian Railway that no less than six station masters were dismissed for altering the order of consignments in registers without authority. I know from my own experience that this is a matter which is looked into very carefully by district officers. I say that their measures may not always be effective in every direction, and, in so far as they are not effective, we shall endeavour to tighten them up; but the measures are there and the machinery is there. (*A Voice*: “Perhaps that machinery is never used.”) I think if Honourable Members have occasion to send consignments, if they make inquiries at their own stations, they will find out exactly what the practice is.

In regard to corruption, I must again mention what was mentioned to the Acworth Committee, namely, that both sides to the transaction are to blame, and I do deprecate putting the whole blame upon the receiver of a bribe in a matter of this sort and not on the people who offer it. (*A Voice*: “Shame.”) I wish to clear to some extent these attacks that have been made upon a very hard-working body of people. There are black sheep in every flock, and we cannot expect every one to be absolutely honest, but I do not believe that they are as a class essentially dishonest. I should like to say here publicly that they are men with whom I have worked myself from the time I joined the railway; I have had many friends among them and I know, as a whole, that the station masters and men of that class, who have dealings with this class of business, are honest. There are dishonest ones among them no doubt, but it is the duty of any Honourable Member who wishes to traverse this statement, if he has individual cases within his own knowledge, to bring them forward. (*Mr. Darcy Lindsay*: “Is it always the station master?”) I was referring to those who have to deal with the registration of goods. Mr. Hussanally, I think, went further and said some of the bribes which are collected or alleged to be collected in these cases are divided amongst some other members of the staff. Well, I say any case of this sort which is brought to notice will be and shall be properly investigated. I do not think it is quite fair to make general statements on some individual cases or upon hearsay. (*Sardar Bahadur Gajjan Singh*: “There are no parties in the case of mangoes and any other fruit.”) I have not come to pilferage yet, Sir. I want to say on the general question that it is not a matter over which we are sleeping. We have had it under discussion and we are pressing on the railways at every possible opportunity to improve their methods of registration of goods and distribution of wagons. On certain sections of the North-Western Railway it may interest Honourable Members to know that we have been developing a system whereby by means of telephone instruments and what we call “train control,” adapting it for another purpose, we have been getting gradually a system into force whereby the district officers themselves can be put in touch every day with the consignments which are waiting at the stations and the position of the requirements of wagons. This is a very definite step forward, and I believe myself that it will effect a great reduction of these complaints about inequality of treatment of consignments..

[Mr. C. D. M. Hindley.]

There we bring the small station directly under the district officer and the whole position can be reviewed. That is a matter we cannot go on very rapidly with, because the House is not giving me sufficient funds with which to carry on these improvements. These are the improvements I want to make, and, of course, we shall be stumped in some directions.

I must say with regard to pilferage that this is another matter which is causing us very great concern. We hear about fruit, apples and mangoes, being stolen and, looking at the matter from a very light point of view, I am afraid those are things that touch individual Members of this House; but the railways know full well and I agree quite definitely that pilferage on the railways has become a very serious evil and it is a matter which we are taking up on very definite lines. We have had the matter investigated, as perhaps Honourable Members will recall, in connection with the Railway Police Inquiry Committee, which sat either last year or the year before, and the steps which that Committee recommended us to take we are taking to the best of our ability. The re-organization of our watch and ward staff is one of the most important matters which we are taking up. It is a matter which varies in its different aspects in different parts of the country. Every province of the country has different aspects of this most important question owing to the different kinds of people who commit pilferage and the different classes to be dealt with. For that reason it has been taken up individually on the different railways. Some railways have already made a step in advance and appointed a special police officer to re-organise the watch and ward, for we are satisfied that it is only by making better security methods for the goods while in our care as carriers that we can hope to reduce to some extent this pilferage which has grown to such very large dimensions; and I hope that this House, the country and the public generally will realise that this is a somewhat slow matter and will take time. It is a matter of organization and of gradually countering the evil by suitable means wherever we can do so. I think, Sir, those are the main points.

There is one other point which I forgot to mention regarding vendors on the North-Western Railway. I am sorry I have not here with me the exact terms under which these vendors are allowed to be given licenses, but I believe I am right in saying that on the North-Western Railway these vendors do not pay anything for their licenses. On some railways they are made to pay a certain fee for licences, and it is possible that Mr. Hussanally may have mixed these two things up. I believe it is a fact on the North-Western Railway. There is no definite fee for licence, and of course I quite admit that it may be within his knowledge that certain of these vendors have paid money for their licences to sell food; but that I may say is not within the knowledge of the responsible officers of the railway or they would have taken action at once. It is not a recognised practice.

With regard to the statement that no one cares what food they sell or what prices they charge, I believe it is a fact that they have a definite schedule of food which they sell at each station, and that the prices are fixed and reviewed from time to time.

I think, Sir, those are all the points that were raised on this amendment.

Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas (and other Honourable Members): I move that the question be now put.

Mr. President: The question is that the question be put.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the provision for Traffic Department under sub-head Ordinary Expenses (b) (i) (4)—Appendix B (page 29) be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. B. S. Kamat (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, as I think since yesterday morning, Government has already come in for a great amount of ragging, and as we have only three and a half days left for the other Demands, I shall not move this amendment:

"That the provision for Government Supervision under the head Railways, be reduced by Rs. 5.

Mr. B. Venkatapuraju (Ganjam cum Vizagapatam: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I propose to take only a few minutes.

Mr. K. C. Neogy (Dacca Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I have not had a chance of moving my amendment No. 150 yet.

Mr. President: I called on the Honourable Member just now. The Honourable Member must realise that is one of the subjects which we have discussed. What point does he wish to raise?

Mr. K. C. Neogy: I want to raise a specific point with regard to one particular railway. I beg to move, Sir:

"That the provision for Programme Revenue Expenditure—Assam Bengal Railway, Appendix B (page 8) be reduced by Rs. 100."

If Honourable Members will turn to page 8 of Appendix B, they will notice that the provision for Programme Revenue Expenditure is shown as Rs. 6,99,000 in the actuals of 1921-22. This year the figure stands at Rs. 14,61,000—that is to say, more than double. I will remind the House that the Assam Bengal Railway has cost the tax-payer 18 crores in capital cost and 9 crores in interest charges already, and that the line involves an annual net loss of about 40 lakhs to the tax-payer. Now, Sir, if Honourable Members will turn to page 63 of the Inchcape Committee's Report, they will find that they strongly recommend that that expenditure on unremunerative lines must wait until the financial position improves. I want to know from the Honourable Member in charge as to how he proposes to effect any cut in this amount of Rs. 14,61,000 and whether he has borne in mind the recommendations of the Inchcape Committee in sanctioning this Programme Revenue Expenditure for the Assam Bengal Railway.

Mr. C. D. M. Hindley: Sir, in the revision of the Programme Revenue figures which was made in the cuts as a result of the Retrenchment Committee's recommendations, we have, as I mentioned to the House before, made a cut of 2½ crores of Programme Revenue on our total figure as put before the House in the Budget. We had already made a cut of 1 crore and therefore the total amount which we budgeted, 12½ crores, will be reduced by 3½ crores. These figures in Appendix B relating to the Assam Bengal Railway were included in the original total figure, and we have not yet had time to distribute that total amount of cut over the different railways. It is a matter which requires very great care because there are certain railways which require more renewals perhaps than others; but I can assure the Honourable Member that in the case of the Assam Bengal

[Mr. C. D. M. Hindley.]

Railway we shall give full effect as far as we possibly can, having regard to commitments and liabilities, to the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee. I am not in a position to make an announcement as to the exact figure to which the provision for the Assam Bengal Railway will be reduced.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: Sir, I beg to withdraw my amendment.

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Catering and Advertising Department—B.-N. Railway.

Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju: Sir, I move:

“That the provision for Catering and Advertising Department under the head Bengal-Nagpur Railway Company, Appendix B (page 13), be reduced by Rs. 100.”

Sir, it must be admitted that reasonable facilities should be provided in India as in other places for passengers who are travelling; but unfortunately in India the railways do not compete for the travelling public and therefore they do not care for the comfort of the passengers. Of course it is true they provide refreshment rooms and dining cars

Mr. President: Order, order. I assumed the Honourable Member was going to raise some particular point in connection with the Bengal Nagpur Railway.

Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju: I am coming to that, Sir.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member has been embarking on a general discussion, which is not in order.

Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju: I want to show, Sir, that there are European refreshment rooms, not only for Europeans but for those who take European food, and in order to give additional facilities the Bengal-Nagpur Railway have established a Catering and Advertising Department. So far advertisements are concerned we find in the carriages whisky is advertised, and wherever we turn our eyes we have advertisements of whisky before us. But leave that alone. Unfortunately the Department which has been set up to provide comforts, so far as I am aware in our part of the country, is causing much inconvenience and discomfort to the passengers. It is in this way. Before Waltair station was taken up by the Bengal-Nagpur Railway it was under the Southern Mahratta Railway, when there was no complaint. The rooms were leased for Rs. 15 by the Southern Mahratta Railway to the Indian refreshment room contractor. Subsequently from the Southern Mahratta Railway the Bengal-Nagpur Railway took charge of that, and now instead of giving it to some respectable person on contract, they have given it to some Friends and Company, friends of somebody, who in their turn have given it to somebody else, and instead of realising Rs. 15, per mensem they wanted to take Rs. 300 the first month, then Rs. 400 and then Rs. 500. Out of sheer despair the party refused to pay and he refused to vacate. Things were at a standstill and then the public met twice or thrice and sent telegrams to the Agent concerned and he said he would not interfere because the arrangement had been made by the Catering Superintendent. What were we to do, if they wanted to charge Rs. 500. For better accommodation they do not charge for the European refreshment room anything. Therefore this amount must come out of the pockets of Indian passengers. Is it not the intention of the Railway Department

in making these arrangements to provide facilities for passengers and not that certain people should make profits out of the poor unfortunate passengers who travel several hours a day in the train. Therefore, Sir, this matter is one which the Government should take serious notice of. They should not allow any one to sublet it to anybody else, who in their turn sublet it to somebody else, so that the last man might fleece the passengers by charging unconscionable rates for dirty food supplied to these unfortunate third class passengers. Therefore, Sir, I invite the attention of the Chief Commissioner to this point. As my friend points out this is the only refreshment room for passengers that you have on the line; you do not find it at other stations, except what we call *kutch*a food—*puris* and the like which are sold by vendors. Most of the southern people do not take these *puris* and *kutch*a food; they want rice and other things and that cannot be had unless provision is made for refreshment rooms. In this matter, Sir, though help was wanted, it was not actually given; when they have appointed three officers drawing Rs. 1,000, Rs. 800 and Rs. 700 per mensem to look after these small things, can they not provide better facilities for the poor passengers?

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated: Labour Interests): I want to make one remark, Sir, before Mr. Hindley replies. In reply to one of my questions on this point the Honourable Mr. Innes stated that the Bengal-Nagpur Railway spends Rs. 33,289 on its Indian branch of the Catering Department and Rs. 2,79,700 on the European Branch, or nearly ten times as much. While spending Rs. 33,289 it makes a profit of Rs. 28,000 on the Indian branch; that explains the *kutch*a food mentioned by Mr. Venkatapati-raju. On the European branch they spend Rs. 2,79,000 and make a profit of only Rs. 20,000. I think, Sir, this is evident partiality and the Chief Commissioner will perhaps be able to explain this.

Mr. C. D. M. Hindley: Sir, with regard to the complaint of my friend, I found it a little difficult to understand exactly what his specific complaint was. He seemed to give rather scant recognition to the efforts that have been made by the Bengal-Nagpur Railway to put their catering arrangements on a proper footing. They have taken a great deal of trouble about it and I believe that the public generally who use the Bengal-Nagpur Railway are satisfied with the arrangements that have been made. (*Cries of 'Not at all.'*) I stand corrected; I have not been on the Bengal-Nagpur Railway myself very much, but I have heard a great deal of praise of the arrangements made. In regard to Waltair I am afraid my knowledge does not extend to the details of the arrangements made at that particular station, but I will ask the Agent of the Bengal-Nagpur Railway to give attention to the complaint that has been made.

Regarding Mr. Joshi's figures—I beg the Honourable Member's pardon—they are my figures, I think the explanation of these figures is that the European branch as it is called was started first by the catering department because it was considered then that that was the department which wanted organising. The vendors and others on the stations at that time apparently met the requirements of passengers, but there had been subsequently complaints from the members of the Indian public about this, and the catering department therefore took over the Indian side of it as well. That possibly is the explanation of the figures for the Indian branch being considerably less than the European branch

Mr. N. M. Joshi: What about the profit on the Indian branch?

Mr. C. D. M. Hindley: Another explanation is that the European branch does not only the catering in the refreshment rooms but also supplies stores and provisions to the staff along the line. I am not in a position to explain the reasons for the profit on either side, but I must point out that in either case there was a small profit made and I do not think that the railway itself is looking to making a large profit on either branch. I am quite satisfied from the reports that I have seen that they are taking the matter quite seriously and not using it as a means of obtaining a heavy profit from the public, and I am quite certain that Sir Godfrey, the Agent of that Railway, would be the very last to attempt to make a profit out of food supplied to Indian passengers.

I will bring the matter of Waltair station to his notice at the first opportunity.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: I only want to add one word, Sir, because I have been travelling by this Bengal-Nagpur Railway. They may take a lesson from the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway and the South Indian Railway in the matter of food supplied to Indian passengers; and if the Honourable the Chief Commissioner will travel in the south of India he would recognise what public opinion there has effected; there we make ourselves felt on the railway administration and we have had these arrangements improved. When I passed Waltair I had to suffer a lot; in fact I had to break the railway rules by having the food cooked in my own compartment; and you will find that there is a lot of trouble felt by the Indian passengers. You get unwholesome food vended on the railway platforms; you have no room to go to and all these things require to be looked into; it is not only the Waltair station, but all along the line you have these difficulties.

Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju: Hoping that the Chief Commissioner will attend to these difficulties I do not press my amendment.

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju: The next motion is:

"That the provision for Engineer-in-Chief for Vizagapatam Harbour under the head 'Bengal-Nagpur Railway Company' be reduced by Rs. 5."

His pay is Rs. 3,000 and I propose by this reduction to raise the question. I have no complaint against the officer; he is a very able and sympathetic and energetic officer doing his level best; but my complaint is against the Government because they have taken money and purchased land to the value of Rs. 8 to 20 lakhs; they have kept that officer really without any work to do; they have demolished several buildings in the town of Vizagapatam and they have made the town congested, and now that they have got 38 crores for expenditure they have not provided a single pie for the extension of the Harbour there. What is their object in keeping the Engineer on Rs. 3,000 if they have not made up their mind and prepared to proceed in the matter? They have acquired hundreds of acres of land to the utter inconvenience of the people. When they started this project, did they not have estimates before them? Did they not have a clear understanding whether it was a profitable concern or not? If it is a profitable concern, when they have at present ample funds before them, about 38 crores, why should they not proceed and provide funds for it? If they think, on the other hand, that it will not pay, then why should they have acquired the land at all? Probably they might have seen several

articles that appeared in the *Statesman* wherein it was shown that if proper facilities were provided the return would be not merely 5½ per cent. but more, because it would facilitate trade and bring foreign goods at less cost by steamer *via* Vizagapatam to Calcutta, and it would save a lot of money in traffic. I had a discussion with several officers and they at least made me understand that they are quite satisfied with the programme and that it will be a profitable concern. Under these circumstances I do not see what change of policy has come upon the Government of India. The other day when I asked a question they said they were considering—in the year 1921. I am told that the Bengal Nagpur Railway offered to do the work if certain facilities are offered to them, and when I asked a question the Government replied that they did not know whether any specific suggestion was made, but they were considering. How long are they going to consider it? Why do you keep an officer on such a salary without utilising him? Is it not a waste of public money? Therefore I appeal to the Honourable Mr. Innes to see that when there are ample funds available and when they have seen that it is an absolutely paying concern, they should launch it especially when they have spent some amount on it already for that purpose, instead of keeping an officer waiting in expectation of doing something from year's end to year's end.

The Honourable Mr. C. A. Innes (Commerce and Industries Member): Sir, I must admit that this project for a harbour at Vizagapatam has been hanging fire for some time. The original intention was that we should have a railway port at Vizagapatam. That was agreed to, and the intention was to go ahead. Then the financial difficulties arose, and when we did arrive at a solution of those financial difficulties by the large amount of money granted to us for capital expenditure, the House will remember that in accordance with the definite recommendation of the Acworth Committee, it was decided that that money should be devoted to the rehabilitation of Railways and not to new projects of development. That is the reason why we were unable to provide last year from this capital programme money for the development of the Vizagapatam harbour. Naturally we have been endeavouring to find out other methods of financing the scheme, and we have been in negotiation with certain financiers connected with the Bengal Nagpur Railway, and they are on the point, I understand, of putting up definite proposals for financing this project of constructing a harbour at Vizagapatam. We expect those proposals shortly and then we should be able to come to a decision whether to accept those proposals or to follow the suggestion which has been thrown out by the Incheape Committee, namely that instead of spending all this money upon the rehabilitation of Railways we should go in for new developments; but I must ask my friend to be patient for a little time longer.

Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju: Sir, in view of the observations made by the Honourable Member in charge, I do not wish to press my motion.

The motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

General Superintendence.

Dr. Nand Lal: My motion is that the provision of Rs. 12,638 for General Superintendence, Appendix B, (page 49) be reduced by Rs. 500. I shall not take more than three minutes. There is only one point, Sir, to which I should like to invite the attention of the House, and when the House hears me, I am sure it will appreciate my arguments, barring, of course, a few members, who have no mind to do their duty. Sir, if the

[Dr. Nand Lal.]

Chief Commissioner of Railways will give me some sort of undertaking, then I shall withdraw my motion at once. The point which I wish to bring to the notice of the House is this. That sometimes, not only I, but, other Members of this House also, must have seen women and children walking about at the railway station platforms being unable to get suitable accommodation. The train has arrived, and there is no Railway official to look after them; to see whether they are properly accommodated or not. Adult passengers are able to look after themselves if they are put to any discomfort or inconvenience. But old women and little children without their parents find it very difficult to find accommodation. Sometimes the children have their parents with them, but they are too old to find suitable accommodation. In such cases I think it is incumbent upon the Railway Department, which is the carrier, to see that their customers are properly accommodated in the carriages. If a passenger goes to the station master, he asks him to go to the platform inspector. If he goes to the platform inspector, he asks him to go to the ticket collector, and the poor passenger does not know how to steer himself. He has paid you the money and he claims that he should be given a proper seat, and it is incumbent on the railway authorities to discharge their obligation. If the Chief Commissioner of Railways will give me some sort of undertaking, that he will do something effective in this direction, I shall withdraw my motion at once.

Mr. C. D. M. Hindley: Sir, there are two points which occur to me in regard to this suggestion. One is that I do not think that, when a passenger takes a ticket, the Railway Administration is necessarily responsible for guiding his erring footsteps from the point where he steps on to the station premises up to the place where he gets into the carriage. We assume that the ordinary passenger has a certain amount of intelligence and he can get the information if he wants to as to where his train is and how he has to get into it. But the larger problem which I know Dr. Nand Lal is referring to is a difficult one, especially at large stations, and in the hurly-burly of getting into the train I appreciate the fact that it is very difficult for inexperienced people to find their way about. On larger stations, therefore, we have appointed on certain railways a class of Passenger Superintendents as is known to many Members of this House. These have proved very useful in some cases, in other cases they have not come up to the requirements altogether. I think that is a matter which the Railway Administrations will see to.

Now the other point that I want to come to is this. You are asking me to cut down expenditure on staff. At the same time questions are fired at me as to why more staff is not employed for looking after passengers, why more staff is not put on to stop pilfering and to stop corruption. Now, Sir, I am not able to do impossibilities. I will do my best, and certainly every Railway Administration will do its best under the very great difficulties which are being imposed upon them now owing to retrenchments. But we cannot have luxuries in the matter of passengers travelling if we are going to cut our working expenses down to the very lowest limit. I will take note of what Dr. Nand Lal has said on the wider aspect of the question with regard to larger stations, and I am quite sure that the Railway Administrations will do what they can in the matter.

Dr. Nand Lal : Since an understanding has been given, and I believe that it is a very sincere one, I beg to withdraw my motion.

Railway Board.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: Sir, my motion is as follows:

“That the provision for establishment of the Railway Board under sub-head 12—Miscellaneous Railway Expenditure India under the Head B—Railway Revenue Account (page 78) Appendix B, be reduced by Rs. 100.”

This is a motion for a nominal reduction of the establishment of the Railway Board. My object was to elicit some information from the Honourable Mr. Innes. I understood that the Railway Board was in a state of flux and he has given us some answer to it already and he further mentioned that the matter is under the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General in Council. If he can give us any further information I shall be very happy. We have cast upon him a very great responsibility by passing our Resolution with regard to such an important Railway as the East Indian Railway being taken over by the State. In order that the State may take it over and carry on the business efficiently, it is essential that the reorganization should take place as early as possible, and the Honourable the Member in charge ought to be in a position to enlighten us on it during the Simla Session. So I will not press that point.

But I would draw the attention of the Honourable the Chief Commissioner to a fact, that the Inchcape Committee has mentioned. This Report is indeed very valuable in many ways. But in certain respects it seems to be a little hasty. One of the items that the Inch-

1 P.M.

cape Committee mention is that the Railways showing the worst results relatively from 1913-14 are the North-Western, the Eastern Bengal State Railway and the Oudh and Rohilkhand. I have looked into the history of Railways and I find the Eastern Bengal State Railway is not at all a losing concern. I do not wish to refer in detail to the fact that it has raised its capital in recent years. I will put it generally to the Chief Commissioner that its capital has been raised to the extent of nearly 13 or 14 crores or more. If was, 10 years ago, only 27 crores, now it is 41 crores or more.

Mr. President: We cannot discuss railway finance now.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: What I say is that this Railway is not getting the advantage of the additional capital, for this reason. Sara Bridge has been put up at a cost of 3½ crores, and the broad-gauge has been extended for about 50 miles beyond. That entailed an enormous outlay of capital. But as the Honourable Mr. Innes said the other day, its profits depend on the traffic in jute,—that is, from the jute area from Jalpaiguri down to Sara Bridge. And one of the reasons for the building of the Sara Bridge and the broad-gauge line was to obviate the necessity of transhipment. But now that we have spent this capital of about 13 or 14 crores, still we are precisely in the same position as before.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member should raise this point over the vote to the Eastern Bengal State Railway itself.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: I do not raise it here, Sir. I just draw attention to it and will finish soon. I would not like to take up the time of the House again. But I say that if this line is to reap the full advantage of that capital, the broad gauge line should be pushed up to Jalpaiguri if not to Siliguri; to curtail the capital expenditure now will result in a loss. So these are matters

Mr. President: The Honourable Member must pay attention to what I said to him just now. This should be raised on the Eastern Bengal State Railway. I cannot go back on my decision.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: I hope the matter will be gone into by the Chief Commissioner and the Honourable Mr. Innes, so I withdraw this motion.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: Before the Honourable Member is allowed to withdraw, Sir, may I ask the attention of the House to a definite question of importance under Miscellaneous Railway Expenditure in Exhibit B and that is with regard to audit and control. There was a question I asked some time ago as to whether it was intended in any way to relax the audit with regard to railway accounts. Some people are under the belief that there is a move in that direction. If that is so, it will be extremely unfortunate. Railway audit such as it is is good, but Government audit should on no account be relaxed. Then, Sir, on page 79 there is a reference to the Indian Railway Accounts Committee about which there is no allotment. I do not know quite what that means. If it is a question of the Railway Advisory Board in some way, I want to ask as to whether means could be found for making the deliberations of all Railway Committees accessible at least to the Members of this Assembly.

Mr. C. D. M. Hindley: There is only one point there, Sir, that I think I need refer to. I presume the Honourable Member is referring to page 79 of Appendix B—he said Exhibit B. The Indian Railway Accounts Committee was a departmental Committee appointed for a definite object, to look into certain matters in regard to accounts—I see that it is mentioned in the Report of the Retrenchment Committee. As far as I remember,—I am not quite acquainted with the facts,—but, as far as I remember, it completed its work in 1921-22 and therefore there is no provision for it in the current year's budget. With regard to the relaxation of audit on railway accounts, I do not think, Sir, there is any such proposal and I do not think the Government will entertain any proposal to relax in any way whatever the audit over railway accounts.

Mr. S. C. Shahani (Sind Jagirdars and Zamindars: Landholders): Sir, I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Railways’ be reduced by Rs. 5 crores.”

Since this appears to be a large amount, with your permission, Sir, I would reduce it to one crore and a half. There has been apparent to me a feeling in the House, nay a conviction, that the expenditure under this head has not been cut to the last limit. So far as I have been able to understand the opinion of my Honourable friends, I feel that this proposal of mine will find favour with them. (*Mr. R. A. Spence*: “No, no.”) I have already spoken on this subject and I therefore do not propose to inflict another speech on the House. I merely formally move it.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: I wish to move my amendment to this amendment of Mr. Shahani's, Sir,—my amendment No. 177.

Mr. President: You had better take the Honourable Member's instead. It is almost the same thing.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Mine is for 1 crore and 14 lakhs, Sir. 40 is a mistake.

Mr. President (to Mr. Shahani): Will the Honourable Member withdraw in favour of Mr. Rangachariar's amendment?

Mr. S. C. Shahani: Very well, Sir, I withdraw.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Railways' be reduced by Rs. 1,14,00,000."

Sir, my object in reducing this general demand by 1 crore and 14 lakhs

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: In addition to the 50 lakhs?

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Yes, that is already carried. My object is not to cut down the actual expenditure under the various heads which Honourable Members will find on page 29 of the Demands. They may make reductions here and there under Miscellaneous or they may find funds otherwise. I point out to the Government a ready method which it is perfectly open to them to adopt and I hope they will adopt it and if they adopt it they need not cut down the expenses under these heads. I am quite aware that against the 4 crores and 59 lakhs recommended by the Inchcape Committee they have already accepted a reduction of more than 4 crores and 59 lakhs, so that we have no complaint to make against the Railway Department that they have not carried out the recommendations of the Inchcape Committee, although these recommendations are still indefinite and hazy to me. But I take it, this is not the time to quarrel about it and I dare say we will soon understand it. I said, Sir, it is easy for the Government to find this money without in any way impairing the efficiency of the work next year. If Honourable Members will turn to page 7 of the Railway Memorandum circulated to us, there is a very handy entry of 1 crore and 21 lakhs which, by providing for interest for one year, reduces itself to 1 crore and 14 lakhs, which is readily available in the hands of the Government. And that is why I say, without in any way impairing the efficiency of the working, Government will find a method of recouping this expenditure. It is only a pen transfer which can be done in a second and without any effort they can find this money. I commend this motion for the acceptance of this House.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala (Burma: Non-European): Sir, I support generally the vote for reduction but I am afraid I cannot accept the reason that my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar, has given for the acceptance of his motion. It is the worst way of financing that I can think of. If this method is sound, why not finance the whole of your Budget for borrowing money in this way to pay off an annuity which is nothing more than payment of a sinking fund *plus* interest. There are various other items here of this nature. It will be the easiest thing in the world for us to go and borrow money and reduce our deficit. I am surprised, Sir, that even such a distinguished authority as my Honourable friend, Sir Montagu Webb, is in favour of this financial method. It will be much more straightforward of us either to leave this deficit uncovered or to say that the deficit should be financed directly out of loan. But you are camouflaging your argument. You are like the ostrich hiding your head in the sand, and just because you cannot see anything, you imagine that nobody notices anything. That, I submit, is no ground whatsoever for making this reduction. But I put

[Mr. P. P. Ginwala.]

it on the general ground. I am not so satisfied as my friend, Mr. Rangachariar, seems to be that the Government has given full effect to the Inchcape Committee's recommendations. What the Government has done is simply this. They have no doubt, as I said yesterday, reduced the Budget by Rs. 4,50,00,000 as compared with the budget estimate of 1922-23. But this is how they have done it. They have deducted Rs. 3,00,00,000 which in ordinary circumstances is in the nature of capital expenditure—from the revenue programme. The other economies consist merely of economy in fuel added to Rs. 50 lakhs already saved by the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. That is how I account for these Rs. 4½ crores. If this is what the Inchcape Committee intended to do, I submit, that the Inchcape Committee has not done anything whatsoever, for practical purposes and it is no good our talking about the recommendations for economy that have been made by the Inchcape Committee. The plain truth of the matter is that the Honourable Members on the Government Benches could themselves have effected these economies without the Inchcape Committee ever sitting, if that was really all that the Inchcape Committee intended to do. There is no economy in the general administration of Railways, if this is the method in which they want to give effect to their recommendations—I ask the House, to examine the way in which Government say they have given effect to the Inchcape Committee's recommendations. There is no element of permanency in this method. The Rs. 3 crores which they have deducted from programme revenue only applies to this year. It means that in the next year they will come forward and say "These Rs. 3 crores were deducted last year, because the Inchcape Committee said so. Let us have them back. As for the rest we have already saved one crore on fuel, and the Great Indian Peninsula has already saved Rs. 50 lakhs." I submit, Sir, that this is not treating the Inchcape Committee with respect. That is not what they could possibly have intended. That is what the Railway Administrations ought to have done themselves without the help of the Inchcape Committee, and I maintain, that there is a further Rs. 3 or 4 crores which can be deducted if the Inchcape Committee is treated with that respect which it deserves. This is camouflaging the figures to put it plainly. This deduction does not come from the general administration of Railways at all. It is merely postponing the evil day to the extent of 3 or 3½ crores. If that is what the House understands by economy, I have nothing to say. But if the House insists upon permanent economy in the administration of Railways, then it must ask for the further reduction, if not of 4 crores, as I asked for, to the limited extent proposed by my friend, Mr. Rangachariar, not for the reasons given by him but for the reasons I have given now. I have given them in a straightforward fashion. I do not wish to blind myself to the fact that if you accept the amendment for the reason that my Honourable friend has given, you will be simply throwing dust into your own eyes, but if you look at the position in a plain business like fashion, you must insist upon a further cut being made in the general expenditure on Railways. I support this amendment.

Captain E. V. Sassoon (Bombay Millowners' Association: Indian Commerce): Sir, after the discussion yesterday Mr. Ginwala pointed out to me that he was not satisfied that the cuts that have been made really bore out the recommendations of the Inchcape Committee and at some little trouble, with the help of a Member of Government who had studied them,

i went through these accounts and I quite agree up to a point with Mr. Ginwala that the final recommendations of the Inchcape Committee do not actually carry out the detailed recommendations paragraph by paragraph. I take it that what happened is this. In the paragraphs, the Inchcape Committee recommend a cut on the 1922-23 Budget in the programme of revenue expenditure of Rs. 2½ crores, another cut of 1 crore on coal and Rs. 50 lakhs already cut by the Great Indian Peninsula on salaries and wages and an additional crore which the Committee thought could be cut by other Railways. Besides these, I see on page 70 an item of Rs. 23 lakhs, the difference between Rs. 81 lakhs and Rs. 104 lakhs which they consider could be made up by general tightening up of control. That is to say, we have a total recommendation of Rs. 5,23 lakhs, against which, on page 77 they advise Rs. 4½ crores, a difference of Rs. 73 lakhs. Now, Sir, I take it that after consideration and probably protests made by railway officials they decided to recommend Rs. 4½ crores, adding as you will notice a rider that they consider that other savings could be made. Well, Sir, one of my reasons for suggesting yesterday that the extra Rs. ½ crore should be made in spite of the Government provision for lag was because of these additional cuts. So, what we have really done is this. We have suggested a total cut of Rs. 4½ crores allowing this Rs. 73 lakhs as lag. If the Railway Administration is able during the year to catch up all that Rs. 73 lakhs, that will, in my opinion, enable them to give us the full Rs. 4½ crores. If we look at the lag, instead of having Rs. 50 lakhs they now have Rs. 73 lakhs. I think it is that Rs. 73 lakhs, which is the real amount recommended in the pages of the report and not in the summary which Mr. Ginwala has noticed but has not been able to calculate correctly. On the main motion which we are now discussing, we are asked to reduce the grant by Rs. 114 lakhs. Mr. Rangachariar's point is a sound one, because, Sir, the total amount of the grant is Rs. 67,47,00,000 less Rs. 3 crores, that is Rs. 64,47,00,000 less the Rs. 50 lakhs, which, roughly speaking, gives Rs. 64 crores. We have now got to the point of cutting the grant down to Rs. 64 crores. We agree that under the Inchcape Committee's recommendations we should give Rs. 64 crores for Working Expenses and for surplus profits. Therefore Mr. Rangachariar is quite correct in opposing the reduction of Rs. 64 crores by another Rs. 1,14,00,000. What Mr. Rangachariar is really doing—he has approached it in an indirect way—he is logically pursuing the course that was initiated this morning, of suggesting to the Government that they should consider seriously the motion that was raised by Sir Montagu Webb yesterday and which was ruled out of order. The suggestion of Mr. Rangachariar is that they should consider that suggestion and that that would be a method by which the Government could get money to pay for this cut of Rs. 114 lakhs. I personally would have preferred to have followed the advice which you gave us this morning. I would have preferred to have made the cut by the nominal amount of one rupee so as to use that as moral pressure on the Government to seriously consider the advice of capitalising these annuities. Still, there is no reason, as the Leader of the House mentioned this morning, why we should not make a cut of the total amount instead of a nominal amount. I think the feeling on this side of the House is strongly towards capitalising these annuities. I think if it had not been for that feeling we should not have had this motion before us to-day. Mr. Ginwala has argued probably from the point of view of Sir Basil Blackett on the disadvantages of capitalising these annuities. Some of us take the point of view that if you purchase an article, whether it is a railway or a mill, and if you decide to pay a certain amount in cash and a certain

[Captain E. V. Sassoon.]

amount is spread over a period this amount could have been capitalised and borrowed, and for that reason, as the State cannot make both ends meet, we suggest capitalising some of these liabilities which are on the border line of capital and revenue,—we say put these over to capital. Let us spread the paying of that capital amount over a further period,—that is what we should be doing by borrowing—so as to give temporary relief I am not saying I like it. I am not saying that I would not have much preferred to put as much as possible to revenue, but we are looking forward to the Finance Bill when we shall have to supply the money for the paying of these grants. We see before us the proposal of the Finance Member in respect of salt. We do not like that. We find no other, at any rate, feasible suggestion put forward to replace that demand. We are therefore trying to cut our coats according to our cloth, and although I agree it is to a certain extent juggling, by a mere book entry, I think if we are even straining the point a little so as to balance our budget without having to refuse to pass a very unpopular measure we should do so. Therefore, I hope that the Finance Member may help us if not by taking this amount and putting it into capital, by showing some other means of getting at the same result.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, after the speech that we have just heard I think it is quite unnecessary for me to argue the details of the thing behind the thing. This is one of those cases where as the Irishman said it is not the thing that is the thing but it is the thing that is behind the thing that is the thing. The last speaker said "We cannot balance our budget, we do not know how to make the budget balance and therefore let us fake it." That is what is being proposed. It is perfectly absurd to say that there is any real difference between charging to capital a sum which on certain arguments may or may not be on the border line and saying we are budgeting for a deficit. To pretend one thing when you are doing another is absurd. One of the objects we had in view in aiming at a balanced budget was to improve our credit. You will do much more damage to your credit if you fake a balance than if you budget for a deficit. This particular question about the capital portion of an annuity can be argued up and down, other things can be argued up and down. The Railway accounts by common consent are not in as good a condition as they might be. We ought to have undoubtedly a provision for reserve fund. We ought to have probably a depreciation fund. The only provision in these accounts which is of that nature is this small annuity and a small sinking fund in addition. It is the same in regard to our general accounts. We have totally insufficient sinking funds. Outside our general accounts we have—I have referred to it already—we can see no reasonable ground for not charging to revenue an amount which is charged against capital. Bastable has been quoted against me. I am not sure he has not been misquoted but I should like to say I entirely disagree with Bastable if he said anything of the sort. I should be very sorry if Bastable wrote anything of the kind. I should also like to draw the attention of the House to another technical point. This is a motion to reduce the voted portion of the Railway demand—the only portion with which this House is directly concerned—by Rs. 114 lakhs. If you carry that motion, that is a direction to Government to spend Rs. 114 lakhs less on the voted portion. I was rather shocked to hear it suggested that the Government can do it by underspending somewhere else, that is to say, that the Government has

a right to spend more money than the House votes for it. Is that what you really mean? That it is a perfectly decent thing that we should be gaily spending more than the House has appropriated, on the expectation (*A Voice*: "Adjust or re-adjust?") that you can come back later on and ask for a supplementary vote? (*A Voice*: "Under-spend the non-voted.") If you under-spend the non-voted you are appropriating a certain amount to voted expenditure. If you invite me to over-spend what you have already given me you are inviting me to over-spend subject to under-spending the non-voted portion. Then you are inviting me to misappropriate (*A Voice*: "We sanction it by a general Resolution") in the hope that after the event I will get your sanction. I am taking this technical point because if the House is going to assert its authority to control the expenditure of Government it must insist on this golden rule that the Government shall not spend money above what the House has appropriated if it can possibly avoid doing so, in advance of the appropriation of that money by the House. And to suggest gaily at this stage that we should go ahead and by saving on non-voted portion misappropriate money (*A Voice*: "No, no")—that is what you are suggesting, I submit, Sir, that it is what is being suggested

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: If I may explain, keep it there and come to us and say "Here is the money and please allow us to spend it."

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I am perfectly content to accept Mr. Rangachariar's definition of misappropriation. I should like to add this one remark. Government cannot accept the suggestion that any portion of these annuities should be transferred to capital. If a cut is made on that ground it will not be a cut which will have any influence on the total of the deficit as viewed by the Government.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: I do not know whether the House really is asking the Finance Member to fake up the accounts in order to produce a balanced budget, because if the House is doing that, when it suggests that the annuities should be charged to capital it is in very good company. I may for the information of the Finance Member quote here certain passages from Government documents themselves. I just want to point out to the Honourable the Finance Member that during all these years this point was not raised. From 1900 to 1920 except 1908-09 I think when we had a deficit we had years of fat surpluses. And when you have a year of surplus you do not mind its being chargeable to revenue, but on many occasions it has been pointed out

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: May I rise on a point of personal explanation? I think it will help to shorten the discussion. As I said, you can argue this question up and down but whatever we do about this particular point it will not alter the general fact that in my view we shall be attempting to fake instead of make a budget balance. You can take one single item by itself and say that it should not be chargeable to revenue, and you can argue on a dozen other items that they should not be chargeable to capital. As regards the statement that this question was not raised till 1920, I would point out that it was actually raised in 1906, as the correspondence which was circulated last year will explain. It arises now in a deficit year, because you are attempting to fake a balance when you have not got a balance.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: If you read the General Administration Report of 1910 you will find it there stated in paragraph 4 of the Report that the financial result of the working of State railways was a net gain of Rs. 298·75 lakhs. This result, however, and I want the Finance Member to notice this particularly, is arrived at after inclusion in the charges against revenue of a sum of Rs. 13·108 lakhs representing the portion of annuity payments and redemption of capital. Omitting this item which is not properly a revenue charge, the result is a net gain of 430 lakhs, but I do not merely stop here. You take the Financial Statement introduced by Sir William Meyer in the year 1914-15. There again he says: "Admitting that annuity payments are really of a capital nature amounting as they do to the discharge of debt." So there again Sir William Meyer himself admits that while in a surplus year you can make them chargeable to revenue, there is justification in making it chargeable to capital. So after all the House is not demanding anything like faked accounts. All that we are demanding is that these annuities should be chargeable to capital. I can quote paragraphs from report after report to strengthen the argument that we have advanced here. I do not know wherefrom my Honourable friend, Mr. Ginwala, brings his knowledge of finance, but in very many countries this practice is prevalent and the annuities are chargeable to capital. The late Finance Member, Sir William Meyer, has himself admitted it. Your own reports have admitted it that these are really a charge on capital. I will be very glad if the Government can cut down at the instance of my friend, Mr. Ginwala, a sum of one crore and 14 lakhs from the voted item. No one would be more pleased than myself but in order to secure a balanced budget, I think you would be perfectly justified in doing what your own past Finance Members and your own Administration reports have recommended should be done.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: If it is a question of direct vote whether annuities should be charged to capital account I would have no hesitation in agreeing respectfully with the Finance Member and disagreeing with my friends on this side of the House. But, Sir, I am going to give my vote to my Honourable friends, although I do not agree with them as regards their contentions. As was pointed out by the Honourable the Finance Member yesterday, the practice in England has been since 1906, since I believe Mr. Asquith became Chancellor of the Exchequer, not to charge annuities to the capital account. What would be the effect of charging annuities to the capital account? The result would be that you go to the world's market and say that as we are not able to pay from the revenues what we have been paying as annuities, we want to borrow; and what would be the state of your credit? Certainly you will have no credit in the world's market if you tell them that you are not able to pay from the revenue account what you have been paying hitherto: it would be mischievous and it would bring down the credit of this country if we say we are not able to do what we have been doing hitherto, namely, to charge to revenue these annuities which have been paid for a long time; but I am in agreement with my friends that this amount can come from the general accounts and therefore I shall vote for the proposition that has been put forward by Mr. Rangachariar.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: Reference has been made to the correspondence in 1906, which was circulated last year. Unfortunately I have not got a copy of the correspondence before me and I must make very guarded reference to it, but my recollection is that it was made abundantly clear that what was asked by the Government of India at that

time was considered as the correct mode of keeping accounts and that could not be followed because of what was considered to be the law on the subject. There is some doubt whether the law is to that effect or not. But if that is the law, there would be no difficulty in changing the law. Fake and misappropriation are strong terms, even though they may be lightly used and I am sure neither this House nor the other House where the term was first used are going to be party to anything of that kind. If we vote for it, as I hope we shall, it will not be by way of being a party to fake. Supposing the whole of the amount that has been devoted to annuities had to be paid in the year in which the rights in the railways were taken over by the Government, what would you have done? Would you not have raised a loan? Instead of doing that you have been spreading over that loan on a number of annuities. In the ordinary course of things and if annuities were not then in vogue, you would have raised a loan and will have been paying the interest all these years. I admit that what goes by the term annuities may be divided into two parts, namely, capital portion payable during the year and interest portion. There may be differentiation with regard to that; but it cannot be soundly and legitimately urged that the whole of that is chargeable to revenue. Well, the Honourable the Finance Member has shuddered at the idea of professors becoming Financial Members. It is not a new thing in the world for Professors to have risen to higher posts than that. One of the corridor aphorisms, if I may so call it, is that when a civilian financier has bungled the finances of the Government of India expert financiers have come in and there is a variant of that aphorism also, *viz.*, where experts have bungled, it is the civilians that have got the matters straight. There is room for legitimate difference of opinion and I do not think that the application of strong terms will be justifiable if the House decides that what ought to have been paid out of loan, on which interest is paid, has really been spread over a number of payments in the shape of annuities consisting of portions of capital and also of interest. That being the state of things, I do not think that the House would be wrong (if it is permissible to do so under the ruling proposed this morning), in voting for the reduction that has been proposed by Mr. Rangachariar. I should be free to vote for it, in spite of what I said yesterday. My observations yesterday were confined to working expenses and I did not believe in crippling the railway administration so far as the working expenses are concerned, after imposing fresh burdens upon it. But if there are other ways open to us, which we may legitimately fall back upon by way of reducing the deficit, we are entirely justified in resorting to them.

Sir Montagu Webb: Sir, there is one point on which I should like to say a few words. I trust that this House will not be misled by the expression "fake". With all respects to the Honourable the Finance Member, I think we can take it that the payment of capital liabilities out of loan money is not "faking" the accounts.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I do not think that was what I said. What I said was that this question could be argued up and down on its merits and that it was part of a very much bigger question. With regard to this question whether annuities should be charged to capital or not, what I did say was that it was impossible, in the circumstances of this year, having regard to the other condition of our Budget, having regard to the absence of reserve funds and other things and the presence of the Delhi capital expenditure and other things quite

[Sir Basil Blackett.]

illegitimate, to pretend to have a balanced budget by saying this item should be charged to capital.

Sir Montagu Webb: It is a very common device in the discussion of matters of account, when you are making an amendment or attempting to make an amendment of which perhaps your own adversaries do not approve, for your opponents to say that you are "tinkering" with the accounts or "doctoring" the accounts. We were told to-day that, if we put capital expenditure to loan on this particular occasion, we shall be "faking" the accounts. Well, I submit, Sir, I have dealt with accounts—private and public—for 30 years and I know far too much about accounts to be affected by the suggestion that any particular course of this kind would be "faking" the accounts.

I would like to recall to the House what are the facts of this case. I think it was about 1880, that Government first exercised its option of purchasing one of the Indian railways under the option in its contract. In those days to have had to pay for this railway out and out would have involved the raising of a loan of 26 millions sterling, possibly over 30 millions sterling if we take the premium on the value of the shares. Now, 30 or 40 years ago the idea of the Government of India raising a loan of 30 millions sterling was unthinkable. Why, only six or seven years ago, when I ventured to suggest that the Government of India should raise a loan of twenty millions sterling towards the war, the suggestion was received with universal ridicule and I was called the "wild man of finance" or something of that kind. Now, during the latter half of the last century there was a great vogue in favour of annuities. People at large, professors in colleges, financiers and others, all commenced to talk about annuities. People began to discover what a splendid thing it would be if you could pay off the whole of the National Debt by way of annuities. They said "Why should we go on paying interest on our National Debt year after year and, having paid interest for 40 or 50 years, or more, find that the debt remains at the end of that period just the same? Let us turn all our national liabilities into annuities." It was at this time that the Secretary of State for India had somehow or other to make a *bandabast* for purchasing the East Indian Railway. It is not unnatural that the idea of settling this difficult problem by way of annuities received favour, and the East Indian Railway was purchased by way of annuities. Unfortunately, the conclusion of the public was such that nobody liked annuities and, as the years went on, the idea of turning our debts into annuities completely failed because, however suitable they are from the point of view of the State, the public do not like annuities, because each payment that the public receives in the form of an annuity means that they are receiving not only their interest but also a little bit of their capital back. Of course, you ought to re-invest that little bit of capital if you are a wise person, but people who receive an annuity are liable to spend it all and not re-invest that little bit of their capital as they should do. The consequence was that annuities for the repayment of Public Debt have never been popular. But the fact remains that in its essence an annuity is the repayment of a portion of the capital and the interest. Now, in this particular case we are paying annually some five crores under the heading of Railway annuities; of that 5 crores about one quarter is capital and the rest is interest. Now, Sir, if our finances are in a thoroughly sound condition and we have a handsome surplus, there could be nothing wiser than to repay ~~out~~ that capital

out of that surplus; but this coming year we shall not have any surplus; yet we are still invited to make a capital payment from revenue in spite of our deficit. I do not think that this House can be surprised that, in the circumstances, the suggestion has been put forward that we should, at least for one year, make this capital payment out of loan money, rather than out of revenue, which we have not got. That is the simple matter of the case and I naturally rise to say, Sir, that such a financial transaction appears to me, with some 30 years' financial experience behind me, to be a thoroughly sound proposition. I repudiate the suggestion that the House would be "faking" the accounts, if they made such an amendment.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I must apologise for rising at this moment, when the House is suffering from the fact that the memory of its breakfast is long past, and its hopes of lunch seem infinitely dim; but I think we ought to get our minds a little clearer on the two avenues of thought which have been moving the House for the last half hour. We do not any of us want to base a vote either for or against a motion on matters of verbiage or expression. We want to get to the substance and we also want to be quite honest with ourselves. Now, here you have a motion which calls for a reduction of over a crore of rupees on the voted expenditure. It is supported on two grounds. First of all, there are certain advocates for it who say that we can reduce our railway working expenses by that amount, and they will vote that reduction on that account. There are others who believe that we have made all the reduction possible in our working expenses, but nevertheless they are going to vote for this motion on an entirely different ground which I need not now describe to the House. I say this is a matter on which the House needs to be honest with itself. I do not think it is possible that these two schools of thought can either honestly or logically unite on the same platform. The process savours too distinctly of a desire to refuse supply at any cost, in spite of any argument and indeed without reason. Now let us assume that the amendment is passed. Yet, what I take to be the larger part of the House agrees that we cannot really cut our working expenses any lower and that it would be dangerous to do so. (*Several cries of dissent.*) Yes, I hear murmurs to the contrary, but I have heard also speeches in the sense I am now voicing. There are undoubtedly—and I merely quote what has been said here this morning—a large number of the Members of this House, and some Members who are not lacking in business experience, who hold that we have already reduced our working expenses to the lowest possible figure. Then we have got to make this money up from elsewhere, or we shall not earn our full railway revenue. Here comes in the second school of thought. They say "You have your non-voted section, transfer a certain sum from that section to capital or loan, and you will be able to find the money." We can only do that if we are honestly convinced that this would be the proper course to take, and if, after being convinced that that is the proper course to take, we could come back to the House with confidence that after we had effected that operation, the House would vote the necessary crore and a quarter to replace this cut in our working expenses. For, after all, the working expenses must be met. I say that we need, first of all, the conviction that we can properly effect this transfer and, secondly, a certain guarantee that, if we come back to the House, they would supply us with the requisite crore and a quarter to replace working expenses. Now, can we with honesty to ourselves, work on that conviction? Sir Basil Blackett has

[Sir Malcolm Hailey.]

admitted that the proposed transfer is one of those questions which you can argue up and down. That is perfectly obvious. It has been argued up and it has been argued down in the past; and argued both ways again to-day. The point on which we lay stress is this,—that whatever the rights of the case may be, though it is true that in the past the expenditure has at times been described as of a capital nature; though it is equally true, on the other hand, that there are many of us who believe that railway annuities being in the nature of a sinking fund should properly be a revenue charge; but balancing those two arguments or putting them both aside, if you like, we lay greatest stress on this, that this expenditure has been charged for a large number of years on revenue, and on what appeared at the time to be on reasonable grounds.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: In surplus years.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: Not entirely last year, if I may point out to the Honourable Mr. Dwarkadas, it was paid in a deficit year. He himself raised the point that it should not be paid in a deficit year and when I pointed out that it was after all in the nature of a Sinking Fund he very handsomely withdrew his objection.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: Sir, I rise to make an explanation. Last year the Honourable Member said the point would be considered, whether in a deficit year it should be charged to revenue, and on that I did not move the motion.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: At any rate, the result of it was that whether through lack of pressure on the part of Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas or for some other reason, it was paid in a deficit year, and it has been paid in previous deficit years in the same way.

We are applying continually to the outside world for money. An important item on which we must lay stress is our financial credit. We do not wish to present to the outside world the fact that for a number of years we have charged this considerable item against revenue but now, finding ourselves in a difficulty, we propose to pay it from our loan accounts. We do not consider that that would redound to our credit. Financial critics might say—"That is all very well in itself. It may be that there are arguments on both sides. It may be that from a book-keeping point of view or from a commercial point of view, this may not be an entirely incorrect transaction." As I said, there is something to be said on both sides; but they might say—"Why have you never adjusted the whole of your accounts on this basis? Why is it you take this particular item and charge it to loan account? Why do you not re-adjust the whole of your accounts in order to bring properly against your revenue account the many items which you are now spending from your loan account and which, on a more strict commercial basis, you should charge to revenue?" The question is awkward and inconvenient. We cannot deny that there is a certain number of items of no inconsiderable amount, which we are now incurring from loan accounts. Our justification for maintaining them in the present circumstances is—firstly, that we have done it in the past and that is a kind of justification in itself—that is, it at least keeps our accounts consistent in the eyes of the outside world; it knows exactly where they are in relation to the past. Secondly, we shall not be able, until we have re-cast our whole commercial and other

transactions on a book-keeping basis, to effect the transfer. That is our case. Do not let us go into minute arguments as to whether this particular item can or cannot be charged to loan account. Let us bear in mind only what effect this transfer might have on the outside world from which we have to raise our money. They will say—“Are your finances in such a sound condition after all, if when you are temporarily pinched you have to take what has always been an item of the revenue account, and purely for purposes of convenience now charge it to loan account?” My own impression is that if one of the commercial institutions to which Sir Montagu Webb has referred, and with which he himself has been honourably connected in the past, if it were to do the same, then I do not say that it would be charged with any kind of misconduct, but I do say that its financial reputation, when they came to raise fresh money, might be impugned in the money market.

Mr. N. M. Samarth: I am sorry, Sir, to detain the House at this late hour, but as reference has been made to the subject as to what is to be done when the State is in such a state of financial stringency that it must keep its accounts in a particular way, I will again read another passage, a short passage, from Bastable on “Public Finance”, who is my great authority. If I had to take my lessons in Public Finance from Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar or Mr. Ginwala, I would have to burn up all my text-books on the subject.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: But from the Honourable the Finance Minister?

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: There is a great deal of difference between you and the Finance Minister.

Mr. N. M. Samarth: Now, Sir, the substance of that passage—I will give the reference, it is in Book 5, Chapter 5,—the substance of those two parts of paragraph 2, is that the State is in a different position from a private individual in the case of loans and borrowings, and the passage says that in the case of the State there are some special features of public economy that give a peculiar colour to its borrowing, more particularly in the case of the Central Government. The sources of individual wealth reside in property or person or capacity to earn. It is from them that all private income comes; but the State's revenue is mainly derivative. It can compel the tax-payer to supply funds. Now comes the passage to which I refer:

“The method of borrowing is therefore naturally suggested, where heavy taxation is for the moment undesirable and is further encouraged by the fact that public credit has the advantage of resting on a broader and more enduring basis. So far as a public domain is in existence, loans may be regarded as virtually mortgages raised on its security, as many of the early loans were in form as well as in fact.”

He again proceeds:

“A second peculiarity of public economy is the difficulty of sudden retrenchment in its case.”

And, consequently, he says:

“when under any given state of things, a deficit is imminent and new taxes are not for the moment available, borrowing is necessarily prescribed.”

Well, I again say. I prefer to have my lessons in Public Finance from Bastable than from Mr. Ginwala or Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar. The question is specifically dealt with by him. Here we are faced with this necessity.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: Sir, I rise to make a personal explanation. What I said was that if you said you were going to borrow in order to cover your deficit, I should have no objection for it would be a more straightforward course. What I was objecting to was the method.

Mr. N. M. Samarth: Again I say that Mr. Ginwala has some curious notions of public finance. When we say it is to be transferred into capital account, it means that it comes out of borrowing. Sir, this is not the only item that we ask to be transferred. There are several amendments of which notice has been given by me of the same character. I made the matter clear in my speech on the Budget. I am going to insist on the thing being done. It is not faking accounts but keeping accounts properly. It is improper book-keeping against which this Professor has protested, and he has said that if you ask any Department to make retrenchments you may take it that that Department will not make the retrenchments. If it is a complicated undertaking which the State undertakes, it is liable to resort to a bad or defective system of book-keeping. I can read you another passage to that effect. But there is no need to do so. I insist upon purity of book-keeping in the Government of India; it is not faked, it is proper book-keeping I insist upon and I trust that the House will carry it.

2 P.M.

The motion that the demand be further reduced by Rs. 1,14,00,000 was put and the Assembly divided:

AYES—67.

Abdul Majid, Sheikh.
 Abdul Qadir, Maulvi.
 Abdul Rahman, Munshi.
 Abdulla, Mr. S. M.
 Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
 Agarwala, Lala Girdharilal.
 Ahmed, Mr. K.
 Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
 Asjad-ul-lah, Maulvi Miyan.
 Ayyangar, Mr. M. G. M.
 Ayyar, Mr. T. V. Seshagiri.
 Bagde, Mr. K. G.
 Barodawalla, Mr. S. K.
 Barua, Mr. D. C.
 Basu, Mr. J. N.
 Bhargava, Pandit J. L.
 Bishambhar Nath, Mr.
 Chaudhuri, Mr. J.
 Clark, Mr. G. S.
 Dalal, Sardar B. A.
 Das, Babu B. S.
 Gajjan Singh, Sardar Bahadur.
 Ghose, Mr. S. C.
 Ginwala, Mr. P. P.
 Girdhardas, Mr. N.
 Gour, Dr. H. S.
 Gulab Singh, Sardar.
 Hussanally, Mr. W. M.
 Ikramullah Khan, Raja Mohd.
 Iswar Saran, Munshi.
 Jamall, Mr. A. O.
 Jamnadas Dwarkadas, Mr.
 Jatkari, Mr. B. H. R.
 Jejeebhoy, Sir Jamsetjee.

Joshi, Mr. N. M.
 Kamat, Mr. B. S.
 Lakshmi Narayan Lal, Mr.
 Lathe, Mr. A. B.
 Mahadeo Prasad, Munshi.
 Man Singh, Bhai.
 Misra, Mr. B. N.
 Mudaliar, Mr. S.
 Mukherjee, Mr. J. N.
 Mukherjee, Mr. T. P.
 Nag, Mr. G. C.
 Nand Lal, Dr.
 Nayar, Mr. K. M.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.
 Pyari Lal, Mr.
 Ramayya Pantulu, Mr. J.
 Ramji, Mr. Manmohandas.
 Rangachariar, Mr. T.
 Reddi, Mr. M. K.
 Samarth, Mr. N. M.
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Mr.
 Sarvadhikary, Sir Deva Prasad.
 Sassoon, Capt. E. V.
 Schammad, Mr. Mahmood.
 Shahani, Mr. S. C.
 Singh, Babu B. P.
 Sinha, Babu Ambica Prasad.
 Sinha, Babu L. P.
 Srinivasa Rao, Mr. P. V.
 Subrahmanayam, Mr. C. S.
 Ujagar Singh, Baba Bedi.
 Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
 Vishindas, Mr. H.

NOES—37.

Abdur Rahim Khan, Mr.	Hailey, the Honourable Sir Malcolm.
Achariyar, Rao Bahadur P. T.	Hindley, Mr. C. D. M.
Srinivasa.	Holme, Mr. H. E.
Ahsan Khan, Mr. M.	Hullah, Mr. J.
Aiyar, Mr. A. V. V.	Innes, the Honourable Mr. C. A.
Allen, Mr. B. C.	Ley, Mr. A. H.
Amjad Ali, Maulvi.	Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.
Blackett, Sir Basil.	Mitter, Mr. K. N.
Bradley-Birt, Mr. F. B.	Moir, Mr. T. E.
Bray, Mr. Denys.	Muhammad Hussain, Mr. T.
Brayne, Mr. A. F. L.	Muhammad Ismail, Mr. S.
Bridge, Mr. G.	Percival, Mr. P. E.
Burdon, Mr. E.	Rhodes, Sir Campbell.
Cabell, Mr. W. H. L.	Sams, Mr. H. A.
Chatterjee, Mr. A. C.	Shahab-ud-Din, Chaudhri.
Crookshank, Sir Sydney.	Singh, Mr. S. N.
Faridoonji, Mr. R.	Spence, Mr. R. A.
Gidney, Lieut.-Col. H. A. J.	Townsend, Mr. C. A. H.
Haigh, Mr. P. B.	Webb, Sir Montagu.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 62,83,79,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1924, in respect of ‘Railways’.”

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Ten Minutes Past Three of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Ten Minutes Past Three of the Clock. Mr. President was in the Chair.

DEMAND NO. 3—SALT.

Mr. A. H. Ley (Industries Secretary): Sir, I beg to move:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,13,84,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1924, on account of ‘Salt’.”

I only wish to say, Sir, that in making this motion, it involves, as the House will see, a reduction of Rs. 84,000 on the demand originally presented to the House, and that in effecting this reduction Government have proposed to accept in full the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,13,84,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1924, in respect of ‘Salt’.”

It will probably save the time of the House if we have a general discussion on the administration of this department, and then take each motion for reduction, thus strictly limiting the subsequent debate to the issues raised.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: There may be no motions.

Dr. Nand Lal: Sir, if the Honourable the Commerce Member will give me an understanding that the present system of issuing licences, in favour of a few merchants, which, to all intents and purposes amounts to a salt monopoly, will be abolished, then in the interests of economy of time I shall not move my motion.

The Honourable Mr. C. A. Innes (Commerce and Industries Member): Sir, if the Honourable Member wishes an undertaking from Government regarding the agency system, may I explain to him that we have already abolished to all intents and purposes the agency system in respect of certain Punjab sources, and that we have under consideration the question whether we should or we should not abolish the system altogether in respect of the Rajputana sources.

Dr. Nand Lal: I accept the explanation given, and therefore, I shall not press my motion, Sir.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: Sir, motions Nos. 83, 84, 86, 87 and 88 standing in my name on the paper seek to make a larger reduction than a lakh of rupees. Since the revised figures came to my hands, I sent in a revised motion asking for reduction of one lakh of rupees on the total demand, and I think it will be convenient if I take all the different items and indicate as to how that lakh of rupees can be made up without serious detriment to the working of the department

Mr. President: I understand the Honourable Member is moving a reduction on the whole vote?

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: If I may, Sir, with your permission.

Mr. President: Then I think I must go through the others first.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: As you please.

Dr. Nand Lal: I do not propose to move mine in the interests of the economy of time.

Mr. President: That proposes a specific amendment on a particular point. Am I to understand that the motion which Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary rose to move is to be taken as covering the large reductions upon the total vote?

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: That is a bigger demand for cut, Sir.

Mr. President: Mr. Braja Sundar Das is not in his place.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: Sir, I base my request, I shall not call it a demand for further economy without attacking the department itself, the working strength of the department, establishment and such other things, which cannot be attacked on short notice. The second thing that I want to avoid is, demanding anything that may not be within the limitations of the retrenchment recommendations of the Incheape Committee. If we save a lakh of rupees under this grant in other directions, it will enable us to get what we are trying hard to get, namely, a substantial reduction in the general expenditure. From that point of view, I am limiting myself strictly to expenses such as I have indicated in items Nos. 83, 84, 86, 87 and 88 which relate in all cases to allowances, honoraria, contingencies and such like things. In passing, I desire to acknowledge, Sir, that it has been pointed out to me that honoraria is not necessarily honoraria. That is I have been told only an account head called

' Allowance and Honoraria '. There may be no actual honorarium involved in that item. So when I speak of honoraria, I speak of the general account head ' Allowances and Honoraria. ' I know, Sir, that in asking for a reduction in expenses under the heading ' Salt ' we are somewhat in the position of a person in whose house hemp or rope was not mentioned because a forbear was hanged in some previous period of time; it is hanging in prospect which we are trying to avoid. But it is not from that point of view that I am trying to recommend this reduction. Whether the increased salt tax comes or not will not be much of a matter so far as these expenses are concerned. Taking for example the first item of allowance and honoraria under the Northern India Salt Department, we have a provision for about Rs. 1,21,000 including house-rent, compensation for dearness of food, and travelling allowances. I do not say that there should be no compensation for food or no house rents or no travelling allowances, but it is a big item and we want a reduction. Then going on to the next item of contingencies, we have the provision of Rs. 7,87,000 all over the place are strewn provisions for contingencies, travelling allowances, giving up some of which will not hurt efficiency but may bring us relief.

Then we come to the thick-lettered new items providing for Assistant Commissioner's bungalow, quarters for drivers and fitters, and various other new items of expenditure, some at least of which may stand over, and as I am cutting down my own demand for reduction to a lakh of rupees it ought to be possible for the authorities to distribute further cuts, so that a lakh of rupees may be saved. I do not want to touch the absolutely imperative items of expenditure such as godowns which may be required for the better working of the department, but providing quarters may in this year of financial stringency should stand over. About Rs. 40,000 could be saved under one item. I need not indicate the various other small items of allowances, honoraria and contingencies that are spread all over the budget. On the whole what I desire—and I hope the House will be with me in carrying out the suggestion—is that a small deduction of a lakh of rupees should be made. Incidentally we may take steps to see, if possible that the importation of salt should be brought down to a minimum and further facilities should be provided in this country for manufacturing a better class of salt. That can be done in some of the Bengal fields and other fields. But I shall probably be told that that will involve further expenditure. Not necessarily. It could be done by better organisation. At all events this small reduction of a lakh of rupees ought not to be impossible.

Mr. A. H. Ley: Sir, I am obliged to my Honourable friend, Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary, for stating that in the first instance he does not propose in this motion of his to suggest a reduction of staff or establishment. I understand him to say that he proposes to effect this reduction by small items scattered over various portions of this budget and one of the main points that he raised was the provision for new works and quarters for the staff. I quite realise that he does not wish to cut down items which are obviously required for preserving the output of salt. But he did suggest actually that we should cut out the Assistant Commissioner's bungalow at Khewra and I think he was aiming at quarters for clerks and such items. Well, Sir, I only wish to point out with regard to these items that these are absolutely essential items if we are to retain our staff at Khewra at all. As the Honourable Member, I am sure, is aware, we adopted the policy

[Mr. A. H. Ley.]

of extending the works at the Khewra mines with the object of increasing the output of salt. This led in the first place to the appointment of an Extra Assistant Commissioner at Khewra, and the appointment of extra clerks, and it is absolutely essential to provide quarters for them for the simple reason that there are no quarters there at all. Khewra is a little settlement in the salt range. There are no houses there—the only people who go there are Government servants—so quarters have got to be provided. If you don't provide the houses you cannot send anybody there. At present, the quarters for clerks there are hovels—they can only be called hovels at the present moment. We have had trouble with our clerical staff at Khewra for the simple reason that we have not provided adequate quarters so far, and I am afraid that, if we refuse to adopt this grant, the only result will be that we shall not be able to post the staff which we require to Khewra. And the same remark applies to the other items with regard to quarters. I may say that these proposals for new quarters have all been considered in detail. They are absolutely essential proposals which we consider necessary to keep up the manufacture of salt. They have been consented to by the Standing Finance Committee and I do hope the House will support us in pressing that these quarters should be built. Perhaps I should say that, with regard to allowances and honoraria, which my Honourable friend referred to, we are proposing a total cut of Rs. 84,000. We are proposing, here again, following the Retrenchment Committee's Report, a cut of Rs. 26,000 in these particular items. The other items are essential. To take this particular item of travelling allowances—there is a small reduction here on last year as will be observed, in spite of the increase in railway fares. And we consider that this is essential, because the staff obviously has got to undertake frequent visits of inspection to see not only that the manufacture of salt is maintained but also to visit the salt sources, for instance in the Native States, in order to see that no illicit practices go on. We cannot possibly cut down the travelling allowances further, unless we agree to reduce those activities of the department, which, I venture to think, would obviously have very undesirable results. And again in supplies and services, we propose to cut that down by Rs. 15,000, following the Incheape Committee's Report, Rs. 5,000 in contingencies, and here again, following the Retrenchment Committee's Report, over Rs. 10,000 in petty construction and repairs. This is suggested by the Retrenchment Committee, although I feel that the Commissioner of Salt Revenue, Northern India, will experience great difficulty in giving effect to this recommendation, for the same reason as I have suggested in regard to quarters. I only wish to emphasise the fact that these proposals for new quarters and for new works, are all part of the general scheme which has been adopted for some years past in the Northern India Salt Revenue Department, and in Bombay and Madras to a certain extent, for developing our salt sources and increasing the supplies of salt. That is the main object to increase the supplies of salt, for three obvious reasons. They are, firstly, we want to make ourselves self-supporting. We don't want to rely more than we can help on supplies of imported salt. I think all Honourable Members will remember the difficulty which we experienced in 1918, for instance, when the imports of salt were curtailed during the war, and it was really then that this forward policy of developing our salt sources was started. Then secondly, as a corollary of that, it is felt, and I think all Honourable Members will realise, that this policy of the development of the salt sources in order to increase the supplies of salt is the one

satisfactory, obvious, economical way of keeping down, as far as we can keep down, the price of salt, which is, I think, an object which everyone of us has at heart. And, finally, of course, the third reason is that if the amount of salt is increased, we get something like five or six times the amount of expenditure back in the shape of revenue. So that is the basis of all these proposals for developing the salt sources, building works and quarters for the staff, and I do trust that the House will take this into consideration and will not support a motion for any further reduction.

Dr. H. S. Gour: Sir, there is one point in connection with my friend, Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary's amendment to which I should like to invite the attention of the House. The budget estimates for Salt appear to have been framed on the assumption that the enhanced duty on salt will be sanctioned by the House and increase the general revenue by 4½ crores of rupees. Honourable Members will find, if they turn to page 300 of this Book of Demands, that our revenue from Salt is 7½ crores per annum, and the Government expect to raise this revenue by 4½ crores by the doubling of the salt duty. The estimate of expenditure under this head is therefore framed on that assumption. At any rate, it is perfectly clear that, if this House votes the additional duty on salt, the Government are not going to revise their figures and the figures which they have set out under demand No. 3 will be the expenditure incurred for raising salt worth 11½ crores of rupees. That is a fact from which the Government cannot get away. I, therefore, ask, Sir, that, if suppose this House refuses the enhanced duty on salt, we shall be making only the estimated sum of 7½ crores. (*The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: "Why?"*) Now, then I ask another question. Is expenditure of Rs. 1,14,00,000 odd justifiable for raising a revenue of Rs. 7½ crores which works out to something like 15 to 20 per cent. of the gross revenue? I submit that there is ample room in this Budget for further curtailment of expenditure under this head. The Honourable the Mover of the amendment has drawn the attention of the House to various items appearing in black letters. Honourable Members will find that besides the construction of quarters for the Assistant Commissioner and the rest we have also on page 19 a very large sum earmarked for the revision of the pay of the establishment and so on. Now, I ask, Sir, is not this revision of the pay of the establishment contemplated in view of the additional revenue which the Government expect to make from this head of revenue?

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee (Education Member): No, certainly not.

Dr. H. S. Gour: And I further ask, what urgent necessity is there for this revision of pay of the establishment in this year of straitened finance? As regards the building of quarters, Sir, if we have got no money, we do not erect new houses, but the Government seem to think otherwise. When they have no money in hand they complain that it would be an unwise policy to borrow money, and yet they ask the vote of this House for the construction of quarters upon which the return would be negligible. I therefore submit that so far as the construction of quarters is concerned, no case has been made out why this House should vote the additional sum demanded from it for the construction of quarters; and as regards pay and allowances, our best justification for refusing an enhanced grant is that we ourselves are passing through a severe financial crisis, and as the whole country suffers, our staff on the salt works must wait for another 12 months. On these grounds, Sir, I support the amendment.

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: Sir, the Honourable Dr. Gour has tried to confuse the issues and mislead the House. The proposal to enhance the salt duty has nothing whatever to do with this demand for a grant for the manufacture of salt and for the establishment of a preventive staff. It has nothing whatever to do with it. I think the Honourable Dr. Gour ought to have known that. He has been in this House for the last three years. This demand has been debated on year after year. It has been discussed before the Standing Finance Committee in detail and the Honourable Dr. Gour has been furnished with the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee. Sir, I am pained and surprised to hear the line of argument which has been adopted by the Honourable Dr. Gour. The whole object of Government, Sir, as has been explained more than once, has been

Dr. H. S. Gour: True economy.

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: to develop a Swadeshi industry. We expected that this House would support Government in that enterprise. Instead of that, Dr. Gour comes and crabs us. He has taken exception to the revision. So far as I can judge, the only material point he has raised is with regard to the provision of quarters and the revision of the pay of the establishment. With regard to the provision of quarters, Sir, I should like Dr. Gour to go and live in Khewra and then he will know what it is like. I paid my first visit to Khewra last October. I was, I must confess, rather reluctant to be any party to the construction of a large number of quarters without knowing what was really required. So I paid a visit to Khewra. I came to the conclusion that I should not like to live there even if the most luxurious quarters were provided for me there. It is the bleakest spot I believe in India. It is right in the heart of the salt range. There are no villages and no habitations anywhere near there. These people have to go and live right down in the heart of that mountain without any shelter from rain or from sun, and it is only right when Government is a large employer and when Government is making any profits out of a particular industry that it should provide quarters for its labour. I think, Sir, it is inhuman to contemplate that we should employ people there, whether they are Assistant Commissioners or whether they are labourers and should allow them to suffer from the inclemencies of the weather in a most desolate spot such as Khewra is. I would most earnestly request the House not to cut down this provision for quarters. With regard to the pay of the establishment, that comes mostly in Bombay and Sind. The fact is that when salaries were raised all round two or three years ago, these people were not given the enhancements that were due to them. This was kept back for two years for scrutiny by the Bombay Government and by the Government of India. The most elaborate scrutiny was applied to these proposals and I may say, that after the Government of India had come to the conclusion that these increases should be allowed, the proposals were most elaborately scrutinised again by the Standing Finance Committee and any Member of the Finance Committee here will bear testimony to the fact that the proposals were most moderate and by no means generous. I think, Sir, it would be extremely unfair on the part of this House to cut out this provision for a revision of the pay of the establishment in the case of men who have been waiting for this revision for the last three years. I do not think, Sir, I have anything further to say. I hope, Sir, that now this demand will be passed by the House.

Mr. Pyari Lal (Meerut Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, the proposition before the House is what I would call a commonsense proposition. We are passing through very stringent times and our duty is to manage our house as best we can while we are tiding over these bad times. The position is, we are faced with a deficit of Rs. 4½ crores and we are trying to set our house in order. We feel that we can do, as we have done in the past for so many years, without these quarters for Assistant Commissioners.

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: No.

Mr. Pyari Lal: There is no reason why we should not do without them for another year.

The Honourable Mr. C. A. Innes: Who is to do without them?

Mr. Pyari Lal: In the same way, the provision for the revision of the salaries of these clerks and other establishment could wait for another year as they have waited for so many years. Dr. Sarvadhikary originally proposed a cut of nearly 5 lakhs but now he has come down to a very proper figure of 1 lakh. This is a very modest sum especially when you cut 1 lakh out of a total expenditure of 1 crore and some lakhs, and this sum can be very easily met. The Department should consider that they are so hard up and should not incur any unnecessary and avoidable unpopularity in the country by imposing a salt tax. We want to avoid that, and the best way is to cut down our expenditure as best we can and act as a prudent householder. What would an ordinary householder do when he is confronted with a difficulty of that sort? He will cut down his expenditure in every direction and absolutely avoid all expenditure of a new character. The Government of India ought to do the same and it is in that sense that this reduction is proposed. Dr. Gour said that the Government of India or the Finance Member is contemplating an increase in the salt revenue by 4½ crores or 5 crores and that is why he has thought fit to indulge in the luxury of granting additional pay or additional houses or additional quarters. From that he drew the inference "because this provision is entered in the budget therefore I say that he wants this additional income," not that he said that it is expressly provided in the Budget and in that sense I think the Honourable Mr. Chatterjee wrongly understood him.

Mr. C. A. H. Townsend (Punjab: Nominated Official): I know Khewra well and that is my only excuse for taking up the time of the House. I have been more unlucky than the Honourable Mr. Chatterjee in that that place is in a sub-division in which I was stationed in the earlier part of my life in India. Strange to say, I was very happy there: it may, however, have been because I had a house there. I entirely agree with every thing that has fallen from Mr. Ley as to the necessity of providing quarters at Khewra. I can add nothing to what he and Mr. Chatterjee said as to the impossibility of finding any quarters for the new staff they are proposing to send there, to a village which entirely depends for its life on the salt industry. As regards the general remarks that have fallen from the last speaker and from Dr. Gour as to the advisability of postponing this expenditure till times improve, I would draw the attention of the House to the footnote (a) at page 17 of the Demand for Grants:

"Provision made for improvement of salt sources and development of mines which will yield increased revenue."

[Mr. C. A. H. Townsend.]

That point was made by Mr. Ley also, but I wish to draw the attention of the House to it. I was, as Director of Civil Supplies in the Punjab during the concluding years of the war, acquainted with the problems that confronted Government owing to the cessation of import of salt by sea into India and with the great trouble that people in the whole of north India were put to owing to the consequent very great rise in the price of salt. The Government of India is entirely right in trying to overcome these difficulties and to develop the salt industry in India and thereby help an indigenous industry. I earnestly ask the House to reject this amendment.

Mr. N. M. Samarth: I am afraid my Honourable friends who have raised the question of retrenching the expenditure of this Department are labouring under some misapprehension. If they refer to the statement, Revised Schedule of Demands, at page 3 they will find that the Retrenchment Committee recommended a reduction of Rs. 19,15,000 and they will find in the last column that the whole of the reduction has been given effect to. Unless Dr. Gour means that somehow or other the Members of the Retrenchment Committee were taken into the confidence of the Government of India and told that they were going to raise the salt tax by doubling it, I do not know how the Retrenchment Committee recommended only Rs. 19,15,000. It is unreasonable to suppose that they knew anything about it and the Department has given effect to the full cut recommended by the Inchope Committee. Besides, as a Member of the Standing Finance Committee these proposals of the Salt Department came to us and we scrutinised the proposals of this Department very carefully and we sanctioned in some cases extra expenditure, say, at Tuticorin because we knew that the expenses incurred there for housing and other things, the construction of works and so on, would bring in more salt and practically, if I may say so, reduce the importation of European salt at Calcutta. If that is so, it is an indigenous industry and everything that is necessary to see that that industry thrives should be done, and I trust that the House will not accept any curtailment.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: I do not believe in a house divided against itself, and certainly not in section of the House divided into subsections. Therefore I ask your leave to withdraw my amendment after Mr. Samarth's rebuke.

The amendment was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Babu Braja Sundar Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): I move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Salt' be reduced by Rs. 14,78,000."

Sir, there is nothing in the budget to show what sum is spent on the production of salt and what sum on the prevention of the illicit manufacture of salt. From the figures that we have in the budget we cannot understand that. That puts us in a very bad position to make up our minds regarding the demands. The Honourable Mr. Chatterjee has just narrated that it is a growing Swadeshi concern and therefore no cut should be made under this head. I would refer to page 224 of the Indian Retrenchment Committee Report where you will find that the province of Bengal depends entirely on imported salt. So does the province of Bihar and Orissa to a certain extent. Nay, Orissa with a large seaboard entirely depends on the imported (either provincial or external) salt, and India

with a vast seaboard of thousands of miles is depending on imported salt. On the 5th March 1921 I asked a question of the Government and there it was stated that about one-fourth of the salt consumed in India was imported from outside. So, I fail to understand how the Swadeshi concern helps us in getting all our needs from the country itself. In 1918 we in the Bihar and Orissa Legislative Council moved a Resolution for the manufacture of salt on the Orissa coast, but I think it was negatived by the Government of India. Therefore I think that the Swadeshi concern in respect of salt which is said to be a growing concern is not making much headway and hence I move my amendment that this amount be deducted from the expenditure that is incurred on the prevention of illicit manufacture of salt.

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,15,84,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1924, in respect of ‘Salt’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 4—OPIUM.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blckett: Sir, I beg to move:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,85,53,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1924, in respect of ‘Opium’.”

Dr. Nand Lal: The opinion on this side of the House is that no amendments may be moved.

Mr. President: The question is that that demand be granted.

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 14—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I beg to move:

“That a sum not exceeding 74 lakhs be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1924, in respect of ‘General Administration’.”

Honourable Members will see that the sum originally placed in the Demands for Grants was 81,58,000. The reduction now proposed as the result of the report of the Incheape Commission is 7,58,000, making a net demand of 74 lakhs. If Members wish to compare the progressive reduction of expenditure under this head they will find the figures at the bottom on page 36 of the Demands for Grants. In 1921-22 the actual expenditure was 1,25,06,489. In 1922-23 our estimate was 1,03,32,000, exclusive of exchange. The revised estimate for 1922-23 was 1,32,05,000 inclusive of exchange, exchange accounting for 26½ lakhs. Our budget estimate is 1,20,20,000 inclusive of exchange which will now be reduced, owing to the reduction of 7,58,000, by a further 12 lakhs, of which 7½ lakhs are voted. It will, therefore, be 1,08,20,000.

Hill Journey Allowances of the Governor General.

Munshi Iswar Saran: With your permission, Sir, I should like to modify my amendment and move it in the revised form:

“That the provision of Hill Journey Allowance under sub-head ‘Staff and Household of the Governor General’ be reduced by one rupee and also that the provision for Hill journey allowance and Hill journey charges wherever they occur be reduced by one rupee.”

[Munshi Iswar Saran.]

It will be in the recollection of the House that there was a debate in 1921 when the House had an opportunity of considering this question and I must say that the opinion of the majority then was that the present system of the move to Simla should be kept intact. But, in spite of that vote of the House this question will continue to come before us till it is finally settled in the way in which the country wants it to be settled. We have it in the report of the Retrenchment Committee that the cost of this move was about 3,87,000, in 1921-22, and it strengthens our position to find that the Incheape Committee itself has recommended a substantial reduction in the staff of officers that go to the hills as well as the amount of establishment and so on. I say, that is a vindication of the position that was taken by those of us who were against the Simla exodus in 1921. I venture to think that the position taken up by Government on that occasion was that the matter rested entirely with us. The question was left in our own hands and Government said distinctly that they were not going to take any part or express any opinion either way. That shows, I think, that the Government itself has now begun to see the wisdom of the step that is being advocated and which at the present moment I have the honour to advocate. This question, Sir, can be looked at from two points of view. One is financial and the other is the general point of view. Now, we all know that in the old Imperial Legislative Council there were many Members who raised their voice against this exodus to Simla. We also know that the National Congress, other political bodies, provincial as well as local, have expressed themselves clearly and emphatically against this exodus. It is true that the financial aspect

4 P.M. of it may not be very serious and I do not wish to exaggerate it. For the last two or three days we have been hearing only of crores. Where crores are spent in this fashion, after all it does not really so much matter that a few lakhs of rupees are spent over the move to Simla; but I do venture to think that there are other considerations which make it imperative to express our opinion decidedly against it, and the reasons are these. No Government can successfully administer a country if it is not in close, intimate and daily touch with the people. (Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: "How about Delhi"?) My Honourable friend, Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary, seems to imagine that outside Calcutta there is no place a contact with which would be of any help to Government. That is not so. As regards Delhi, this is a closed question now, but if we were free to discuss it, I think my Honourable friend himself would admit that a great deal could be said in favour of Delhi as well as in favour of Calcutta. (Voices: "More so in favour of Bombay.") Now, Sir, there is no doubt that this proposition cannot be got over that for successful administration it is absolutely necessary that you should be in touch with the people. Sir, I venture to think, and I hope at least some of my friends will at least agree with me that, if Government had been in close touch with the people during recent times, some of the unhappiest and most unfortunate events that have taken place would perhaps have not occurred. Sir, I dare not prophesy, but, if I could, I would say that the historian of the future, when he begins to write the history of India, will feel amazed that a Government from the hilltops used to administer for about half the year this vast and great country. You cannot govern and administer a country from the clouds; that is perfectly obvious (Mr. R. A. Spence: "What about keeping your head cool"?). (Dr. Nand Lal: "That is exactly the point.") Now, Sir, reference has been made to

climate and there is no doubt about it that in April, and May, and in the hot weather generally some parts of India and, I must say most frankly Delhi also are hot. (*A Voice*: "And Allahabad.") Yes, Allahabad is hot. (*A Voice*: "Very hot.") Yes, but if you got a fee you would not mind going there. (*Dr. Nand Lal*: "You have got your home there.") Sir, let us look at the question seriously. The climate of Delhi is hot, but, if you undertake the responsibility of governing and administering a hot country, you cannot run away from the heat, you have got to put up with it. That is the first question and the fundamental question which you have got to face. Sir, as regards the principle underlying my amendment is concerned, I venture to hope that there will be no serious disagreement with me, but where the disagreement comes in is when you come to look into practical difficulties and personal considerations, and I wish to refer very briefly to those. It is said it is very comfortable and very pleasant to go up to the hills in the hot weather. Well, Sir, I cannot say that it is not so, but there are so many things which are convenient and comfortable, but which for good and valid reasons we dare not have. Sir, who is there, if he had the money, would not drive in a Rolls Royce? Who is there who would not live in the hills? Who is there who would not like to have all the comforts and even luxuries of life? But the financial and other considerations prevent a man from having them. Now, what I tell you is this. Here, in India, you have millions of people living and working in the plains in the heat. Do they all go up to the hill-tops? Do people go up to Simla and Naini Tal, I am speaking of my own province. How many do? Very few. (*Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney*: "Many.") My Honourable friend, Colonel Gidney, is so displeased with my remark yesterday that I should not say that by this interjection of his he betrays his colossal ignorance of the real Indian community.

Now, Sir, it may be true that you work better on the hills; it is more comfortable; but, Sir, I ask, is it impossible to work in the plains? I shall run very hurriedly over all these arguments which have been repeated so many times. Do not Judges work hard here? I am only talking now of the case of Europeans. (*Cries of "No, no."*) My Honourable friend, Sir Malcolm Hailey, used to work in the plains, but, since his translation to the Executive Council, I suppose he has lost this capacity of working in the plains during the hot weather.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I hope the Honourable Member does not suggest that I do not work now.

Munshi Iswar Saran: Now, Sir, you have a number of barristers, a number of big merchant princes; they all work on the plains. (*Sir Campbell Rhodes*: "Hear, hear.") My friend, Sir Campbell Rhodes, says, "Hear, hear," because he has got to work in Calcutta; he cannot leave his work and go up to the hills and do all his business from there. Occasionally he goes to the hills, but not like you from April to September, I think. (*Dr. H. S. Gour*: "Till the end of October.") Till the end of October. Sir, if you look at this question from the purely personal point of view, there is a great deal to be said in favour of this move to Simla and I would certainly vote myself in favour of this exodus to Simla if that was the real standpoint of looking at the problem, but if, as representatives of the people, it is our business to take into consideration these grave and serious questions of principle, then, I say it is our clear duty to say that the Government ought not to go up to the hills and that we ourselves should not hold our

[Munshi Iswar Saran.]

meetings in Simla. The Government, on the last occasion when this question was discussed, left the matter in our hands, but I am very sorry to say that by our own action we did not take advantage of the position taken by Government. I do sincerely hope that on the present occasion we shall give a better proof of our long-sightedness and of our patriotism by accepting this amendment.

Sir, there is one question I would like to ask. I have never been to England but I am told that in winter it is very cold. That is what some of my friends who have been to England have told me. If that is so—I have no information about it myself—will some of the Honourable gentlemen occupying the Front Benches tell me if the Members of Government run away from England during the cold weather (*A Voice*: “They do.”) in order to avoid climatic conditions. (*A Voice*: “They do.”) I should like to ask my Honourable friend where the Parliament sits in winter. Let my Honourable friends name the place where for 4 or 6 months in the year British Government permanently resides away from London. That is the point; not that individual members go for short periods. It is no good, I submit, Sir, looking at this question in this light-hearted fashion. Do it if you like, but take it from me that in the next Council or in the Council after the next this question is bound to be settled and settled in the only way in which it ought to be settled—that is, the exodus will have to be stopped. (*Several Honourable Members*: “Certainly not.”) Some of my Honourable friends who are opposed to it say “Certainly not.” What is the good of saying it, when they know that the better mind of the country is almost practically unanimous on this point, that there should be no exodus to the hills. They have exposed the harmfulness and the wastefulness of this migration to the hills times out of number, and it is for us, if we feel for the country and represent its interests to say emphatically that this exodus to the hills is harmful, and to vote to-day in favour of the amendment.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Sir, I rise to a point of order. I want to move a more substantial amendment. I do not want to play with the subject, but to be serious about it.

My amendment is No. 330.

Mr. President: I will put the first:

“That the provision for Hill Journey Allowance under sub-head ‘Staff and Household of the Governor General’ be reduced by Re. 1.”

It must be understood that if I allow the discussion to proceed on Munshi Iswar Saran’s amendment for the reduction by Re. 1 of the provision for Hill Journey Allowance under sub-head ‘Staff and Household of the Governor General’, the House cannot open the question again after it has decided that—open the question, that is to say, of the move to the Hills.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Then, Sir, I will have to move my amendment about Hill Journey Allowances. No. 330.

Dr. H. S. Gour: I have also a question to ask. I have a series of amendments, not directed against the move to the hills but against the long stay of the Government and the Members in Simla, as I want to cut down the expenditure to a minimum.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: May I make a suggestion in regard to this matter? I have also two amendments at page 24, and my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar, has one, No. 330. Would it be possible to have a general discussion, and then take votes upon the various motions? That would be the best thing. There are two amendments of mine, one of Mr. Rangachariar, and one of Munshi Iswar Saran.

Mr. President: All I was pointing out was that we cannot have the discussion twice. As far as the Chair is concerned, there is no objection for taking the discussion under any of these heads.

Dr. H. S. Gour: Sir, I think all the amendments can be boiled down to three points: that there should be no move, that the move should be for a shorter period, and that in any case the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State should not hold their Sessions in Simla. These are the three points upon which all these amendments converge, and if you, Sir, would direct the House upon these three points, it will help us.

Mr. President: It is obvious that the question of the sitting of the Legislature in Simla is a separate one to the move of the Government to the hills. These can therefore be taken as separate amendments. The other relates to the time which the Government of India spends actually in the hills, and I am afraid it is a little difficult to see on what amendment it can be taken. If that is the point which Mr. Rangachariar wishes to raise

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Yes, Sir.

Move of the Government to the Hills.

Mr. President: We had better proceed with the issue in its largest form raised by Munshi Iswar Saran. The House will be restricted to the argument that there should be no move to the hills at all.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: That would not shut out observations on the cutting down of the demand under General Administration—say, for instance, in connection with my amendment No. 336; I gather from what has fallen from you, Sir, that reference to Hill charges would not be allowable later on when the question of detailed demand referring to Hill charges under General Administration comes on.

Mr. President: The motion for reduction made by the Honourable Member from Allahabad raises the issue in its naked form, that there should be no move to the hills. When we dispose of that question, I shall tell Honourable Members what is in order and what is not.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: We have an amiable habit in this House of discussing for nearly three quarters of the day what we shall talk about for the rest of the day; but I understand that we are now to discuss only the question whether the Government of India should move to the hills at all, and, by implication, I assume, also whether the Legislature . . .

Dr. H. S. Gour: No, no. You have distinctly ruled, Sir, that the question of the Legislature will be the subject of separate discussion.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member from Allahabad, in the way he has put his question, has raised the question of the move of the Government of India to the hills, and those who wish to discuss that question will discuss it in this debate. Those who desire to speak on the

[Mr. President.]

subject of the Legislature sitting in Simla will presumably reserve their remarks till we come to the other amendment.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I see I should have said nine-tenths of its time instead of three-quarters! Well, Sir, this proposition has not now been put forward nor is it being debated, for the first time. As Munshi Iswar Saran says, it was debated in 1920 first of all in the old Council. We then had thirteen capitals indicated to us, each with its own claims. It was debated again in some form in 1921, but in a form that did not allow of a definite decision as to whether the Government of India should go to the hills or not. There of course the motion was that the Assembly recommend that a Committee should be appointed to go into the possibility of establishing a permanent capital of India in a place possessing a salubrious and temperate climate throughout the year. The preliminary discussion whether such an attempt was necessary occupied most of an afternoon. It began at 3.10, I notice. At 4 o'clock, we had exhausted the claims of Nagpur, or it might have been perhaps Pachmarhi. We proceeded shortly afterwards to discuss other alternatives, and we got thoroughly tired of the question towards evening and took no vote on the matter. Now I hate to spoil sport. There I see sitting my Honourable friend, Sir Basil Blackett. He has before him some tiring days which may involve the cutting down of some of his demands for grants. If I did my duty by him, I should incite the House to prolong consideration of this engaging topic, hoping to occupy some considerable part of the remaining few days before the guillotine comes down and saves the remainder of his demands. But I suggest, Sir, that after all, if you move a nominal reduction in order to call forth an expression of the opinion of the Legislature, it should be in a matter which can have effect on the current Budget. It would be valuable no doubt if we could get from this Assembly an opinion as to what we should do in the summer, but whatever that opinion may be it would be impossible that we should give effect to it in the present year—that is to say, that if it were decided that we should go to one of the many capitals which have been recommended to us, it is of course clear that we could not do so for many years to come; and if the decision were that we should stay down here in the hot weather, even so it is well known that we have not as yet and will not have for a couple of years the buildings which will enable us to do so. Our Secretariat is not ready, our houses are not ready. Therefore, putting it on that ground only I think that the House would hardly be justified in proceeding to a discussion to settle this question under the impression that a decision could have any effect on the budget of the present year. There will come a time of course when the question will possess more relevance, that is to say, when New Delhi is complete and the House itself has some experience of what a hot weather in Delhi means. I speak of it myself without any apprehensions at all for two excellent reasons: it is probable that I shall not be at the time in India, and in the second place having spent six hot weathers here I shall not mind spending another. I can therefore be perfectly impartial when speaking on the subject, but I claim it is only a House with experience of our summer arrangements in Delhi and of the capacity of the New Council Chamber that can give a final decision whether it would recommend to the Government of India to stay here or go to the hills. I would suggest that the House refuse to enter into a discussion on this topic to-day or to decide the question so much in advance of a period when we can give effect to it. I would only note one thing, Sir, it is curious that we are now only in the

middle of March, in an exceptionally cold season, and yet at the very moment that Munshi Iswar Saran began to suggest that we should not go to the hills, somebody demanded that the fans should be put on!

(Cries of: "Withdraw, withdraw.")

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Sir, much to the dissatisfaction of my Honourable friends who cry "withdraw", "withdraw", I am sorry to say it is impossible for us who take this view to agree to such a course. It was very well to say in the first year "Have experience." We have had experience of Delhi; we have had experience of Simla. Sir, the move of the Government of India to the hills, to delightful Mashobra and other sweet spots there, which I have myself enjoyed, is too attractive indeed. We are all human, no doubt. But at the same time we have to consider the year we are passing through, the financial crisis the country has been passing through, the burden of taxation which we have been putting upon the country year after year; and, Sir, to say "withdraw, withdraw" a serious motion like this, I really cannot understand. Sir, I will have my say notwithstanding the cries. Sir, I beg to suggest that a beginning should be made in this direction. It is not too soon to begin. If the House affirms its opinion that the move to the hills is undesirable, I think it is by means of a vote like this that we should express our opinion. I agree the time is not yet that you can abandon the whole move to the hills next year; that is not the suggestion of this motion. But this House, having had three years' experience of the way in which the Government of the country is run, having had intimate and close acquaintance with the way in which the Government of India is transacting its business, it is up to us to record our emphatic opinion that it is no longer desirable that this practice should continue. Here you are all elected representatives of the people who sent you here to watch their interests. Are we really advancing their interests when you say "By all means, go on, govern the country from the hills"? Why, Sir, London has become a very short journey just now. Why not govern the country from London? If the Assembly moved to London and held its summer Sessions there, probably we may be able to influence the administration much more effectively than we are doing here. The Noble Lords, Lord Peel and Lord Winterton might perhaps condescend to grace this Assembly with their presence more often to watch the debates in this House, before talking of this young and inexperienced and enthusiastic Assembly who have committed errors now and then. Sir, why not we move to London? Why not? It is as practical, as useful, perhaps as I said more useful than moving to the hills and trying to govern the country from the heights of Simla. What happens? It is said they go there for six months. But really work is put out of gear for say a fortnight before and a fortnight after. Look at the move of the whole Secretariat including the army of clerks, peons, bearers and records; and look at the extraordinary move which takes place in April and again in November. You have to see the train loads of people and goods and other things which pass between Delhi and Simla. Look at the enormous waste of expenditure. When are you going to begin to put a stop to this? I may be told that nobody can tell when New Delhi is going to be finished. Can anybody tell? Probably we will have to ask an astrologer to say when that day will come. Are there not houses enough here? Is it necessary that the whole of the Secretariat, including this army of clerks, should go there? Cannot business be transacted if His Excellency the Viceroy and the Members of the Executive Council stay there with their important Secretaries and

[Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

Under Secretaries, the other people, poor mortals like myself, staying here and doing the work? Why should all these people be taken there? I have no doubt they are tempted by the Simla allowance, house allowance, local allowance and all those things. But look at the torture these people are put to. Look at the depths they have to go down every day and come up. Has any Honourable Member gone down to those places where the Indian clerks have to live and seen how after a heavy breakfast they have to walk up? I mean it is all very well for us to talk of joys for those of us who live in big palaces and all that on level roads and go about in rickshaws or ride. What about these poor people who have to go down and mount up immediately after a heavy breakfast, mount up perhaps a thousand feet? I do think, Sir, the time has come when this representative House should express its opinion. Even the unrepresentative House time after time recorded its opinion by its non-official votes. No doubt the official majority were able to defeat motions which were brought then. Now, Sir, with an elected majority of representatives of the people in this House, if this motion should be defeated, I do not think it will redound to our credit or add to our colours. It is quite true that it is not a practical proposition now as the Honourable the Home Member said; but they can cut short the stay there. Why should they stay there for six months all round? Could not Honourable Members stay there for three months? Have not the Provincial Governments set an example in this matter? I know Sir, that the Madras Government moved up to Ooty for six months, following the vicious example of the Central Government, and now they have come down; only the Governor and the Members go there and they stay there for only three months or four months; the Secretaries go and come and the whole of the Government is carried on at Madras. Madras is quite a hot place; in fact the weather there can only be classified into hot, hotter and hottest; you have no cold weather there at all. Therefore, when Madras has set an example, and other provinces have set an example, why should we, why should this Central Legislature set a vicious example to other Provincial Governments to follow? They have already set a good example. You have to recognise the financial limits, the financial resources of the country. Can we afford to have this costly move up and down year after year? We are all accustomed to be brought up in luxury, especially magnates from Bombay, and our Punjab friends are anxious for hill stations. (*A Voice*: "Supposing Bombay magnates are not in favour of going to the hills.") Then that shows they are not here sitting as magnates. I am proud of that. We are here for the toiling millions who cannot get even one full meal a day and from whom we wring and we propose to wring the salt tax, why? In order to meet this costly administration. And are we going to allow this costly administration? I am told "withdraw, withdraw" on a plain matter of this sort on which the country has been agitating year after year; Congress after Congress has been agitating over this question of exodus to the hills and the country has been crying hoarse for the last so many years. I do not know, Sir, if this was not the first question which every politician took up and was agitating time after time. In a matter of this sort when we have had enough experience an expression of opinion on our part will greatly add to the weight of the opinion of the country, and I do hope, Sir, this House will carry the vote which is clearly its pious expression of opinion in order that it may be given effect to in later years when Delhi is really fit for habitation to such Honourable Members who think that Delhi is not fit for habitation. What about the 2 lakhs of people who live here all the year round?

Are we better than those human beings? Are they not human beings like ourselves. It is said that Delhi is unfit for habitation. I ask, do these 2 lakhs of people flee away from Delhi? Sir, it was not without a purpose that I called for a fan. I called for it deliberately because of the coming motion. I wanted to remind Honourable Members that Delhi is not what it was years ago. Thanks to our engineers, thanks for the other comforts which have been added time after time. You can make a cold room warm, and you can make a hot room cold. That is exactly the reason why I called for fans in order to remind Honourable Members of the existence of these fans. Therefore, I say, Sir, with all these modern conveniences, living in such open spaces as Raisina where you have got all the conveniences

Mr. P. P. Ginwala: No, no.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: It is all very well for Mr. Ginwala to say no, no, but I do enjoy this place, and if we really hold a Session in the hot weather, there is nothing to be afraid of. No doubt we have hot winds. You may have hot winds, but where have you not got them? Let us remember that we are born in this country. That is why I told my friend Sir Basil Blackett on the Budget speech 'love the heat of this country'. It was not without a purpose I mentioned that to him. If you love the heat of this country, then only you will love the people of this country, and therefore I say let us not flee from the heat of this country. Sir, I strongly support this motion.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: Sir, I desire to give this motion my very strong and hearty support, but I do not propose to walk into the trap and take up much of the time required to be devoted to other grants. I do not suggest that the trap has been laid by the Leader of the House, on the other hand he has frankly warned us against it. But before we get away from the confusion of issues I think this House owes an initial duty. As we are discussing the question of the staff of the household of the Governor General, I think it is up to us to acknowledge and appreciate what His Excellency has been pleased to do himself not only in graciously accepting, but in suggesting cuts in his own household, an example which might well be imitated by others

Mr. President: The House is now discussing the move to the Hills of the Government of India.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: Exactly, Sir. When we know and appreciate what the Governor General himself has done in effecting cuts in his own household, and as we know that the vote will come to His Excellency, he will surely be helpful in giving effect to the desires of this House in this concern if they are unanimously expressed, so far as the non-official portion of the House is concerned. That is the bearing of my reference to what His Excellency has done. The move from Calcutta did one good and 'the only good; in reducing the hill charges,' and it is up to us now to further reduce them. We want to do that and take the first step this year by accepting some motion later on for cutting down the hill charges. We do recognise that we cannot do the whole thing this year, and it will have to be done year by year; but the first step has to be taken this year. From that point of view and as a recognition of principle, I think this House should take the initial step of carrying this motion so that when the items relating to hill charges come up we may give effect to the principles we lay down and reduce the expenditure as far as possible.

Mr. President: The original question was :

“ That a sum not exceeding Rs. 74,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1924, in respect of ‘ General Administration ’.”

Since which an amendment has been moved :

“ That the provision for the Hill Journey Allowance under sub-head ‘ Staff and Household of the Governor General ’ be reduced by one rupee.”

The question I have to put is that that reduction be made.

The Assembly divided :

AYES—50.

Abdul Majid, Sheikh.
Abdulla, Mr. S. M.
Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
Agarwala, Lala Girdharilal.
Ahmed, Mr. K.
Asjad-ul-lah, Maufvi Miyan.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. G. M.
Ayyar, Mr. T. V. Seshagiri.
Barodawalla, Mr. S. K.
Basu, Mr. J. N.
Bhanja Deo, Raja R. N.
Bhargava, Pandit J. L.
Bishambhar Nath, Mr.
Chaudhuri, Mr. J.
Das, Babu B. S.
Faiyaz Khan, Mr. M.
Girdhardas, Mr. N.
Gour, Dr. H. S.
Gulab Singh, Sardar.
Hussanally, Mr. W. M.
Iswar Saran, Munshi.
Jamall, Mr. A. O.
Jamnadas Dwarkadas, Mr.
Jatkar, Mr. B. H. E.
Jejeebhoy, Sir Jamsetjee.

Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Kamat, Mr. B. S.
Lalshmi Narayan Lal, Mr.
Mahadeo Prasad, Munshi.
Misra, Mr. B. N.
Mudaliar, Mr. S.
Mukherjee, Mr. J. N.
Mukherjee, Mr. T. P.
Nag, Mr. G. C.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Ramji, Mr. Manmohandas.
Rangachariar, Mr. T.
Rhodes, Sir Campbell.
Samarth, Mr. N. M.
Sarvadhikary, Sir Deva Prasad.
Sassoon, Capt. E. V.
Shahani, Mr. S. C.
Singh, Babu B. P.
Sinha, Babu Ambica Prasad.
Sinha, Beobar Raghbir.
Srinivasa Rao, Mr. P. V.
Subrahmanayam, Mr. C. S.
Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
Vishindas, Mr. H.
Willson, Mr. W. S. J.

NOES—53.

Abdul Quadir, Maulvi.
Abdur Rahim Khan, Mr.
Abdul Rahman, Munshi.
Achariyar, Rao Bahadur P. T.
Srinivasa.
Ahsan Khan, Mr. M.
Aiyar, Mr. A. V. V.
Aiyar, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.
Allen, Mr. B. C.
Amjad Ali, Maulvi.
Bagde, Mr. K. G.
Barua, Mr. D. C.
Blackett, Sir Basil.
Bradley-Birt, Mr. F. B.
Bray, Mr. Denys.
Brayne, Mr. A. F. L.
Bridge, Mr. G.
Burdon, Mr. E.
Cabell, Mr. W. H. L.
Chatterjee, Mr. A. C.
Clark, Mr. G. S.
Cotelingam, Mr. J. P.
Crookshank, Sir Sydney.
Faridoonji, Mr. R.
Gidney, Lieut.-Col. H. A. J.
Ginwala, Mr. P. P.

Haigh, Mr. P. B.
Hailey, the Honourable Sir Malcolm.
Hindley, Mr. C. D. M.
Holme, Mr. H. E.
Hullah, Mr. J.
Ikramullah, Khan, Raja Mohd.
Innes, the Honourable Mr. C. A.
Ley, Mr. A. H.
Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.
Man Singh, Bhai.
Mitter, Mr. K. N.
Moir, Mr. T. E.
Muhammad Hussain, Mr. T.
Muhammad Ismail, Mr. S.
Nand Lal, Dr.
Nayar, Mr. K. M.
Percival, Mr. P. E.
Pyari Lal, Mr.
Sams, Mr. H. A.
Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Mr.
Schamnad, Mr. Mahmood.
Shahab-ud-Din, Chaudhri.
Singh, Mr. S. N.
Sinha, Babu L. P.
Spence, Mr. R. A.
Townsend, Mr. C. A. H.
Webb, Sir Montagu.

The motion was negatived.

Move of the Legislature to the Hills.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: Sir, now that the Government have carried the day and as it has now been, so far as this House is concerned, established that the Executive Council should go to the Hills, my proposition reduces itself to this, that the Legislature should not move to the Hills.

Sir, something may be said in favour of the proposition that the Government which is largely manned by gentlemen from England who are accustomed to a cold climate should not be asked to remain in a hot place, but there can be no excuse, so far as Indians are concerned, for claiming that they should have the same privileges as are enjoyed by the Executive Government. We are born in this country and most of our lives have been spent in hot places and it seems to be unpardonable that we should claim the right to go to the Hills at the expense of the poor people of this country. Some of us, no doubt, Sir, do like to go to the hill station in order to recoup our health. If this has to be done, we must do it at our own expense and not at the expense of the people of this country. That is a point which I hope my friends will remember in speaking on this proposition and in voting upon this proposition. Sir, when I had an opportunity on the very first occasion some years ago of moving in this House this proposition, I asked the question: Is there any other country in which there are two different Legislatures, one at a place wherein the Legislature sits for six months, and another at a place where the Legislature sits for another six months? I do not think there is any parallel for what we have in this country.

Sir Montagu Webb: Sir, on a point of order, may I ask to which motion the Honourable Member is speaking?

Mr. President: He is moving the second part of Munshi Iswar Saran's motion.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: Sir, this is without any precedent and without any parallel. I think, Sir, as has been pointed out by my friend, Mr. Rangachariar, the country as a whole wants that we should not follow the bad example which has been set by the Executive Government by moving to the Hills. And I think we must show some sacrifice by refusing to go to the Hills and by consenting to work in the plains and that, Sir, will show to the country that we are really looking to the interests of the people and not looking after our own interests. I do not think, Sir, it is necessary to say much because a great deal has been said already. I move the motion standing in the name of Munshi Iswar Saran, namely:

"That the provision for Hill Journey charges wherever they occur be reduced by one rupee."

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Halley: This is another of those herrings which, if I consulted only the immediate interests of my friend, Sir Basil Blackett, I should like to see trailed across the course of the discussion of the demands for grants—the question whether, if the Government of India goes to the Hills, the Assembly should not do so. May I hope that my friend, Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar, will not again advance the argument which he just used, that it is necessary for the Government of India to go to the Hills because it is so largely the concern of Englishmen. Believe me, I think there are very few Englishmen here who would claim that exceptional privilege purely on that ground. Certainly I should never

[Sir Malcolm Hailey.]

think of doing so. It is quite obvious that there are a large number of Indian Members of this House also who consider that a move to the Hills is in present circumstances advisable. But taking the question whether, even if the Government of India goes to the Hills, the Legislature should not go there, may I point out to Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar that what he has put forward is not a proposition that would lead to the reduction of expenditure but one which would lead at present to some increase. For if the Government of India goes to the Hills and stays there, and the Legislature comes here, then it is clear that the Government of India—or a large part of it—would have to move down here at a considerable expense and the expenditure on the whole would probably be increased over the extra expenditure involved in the Legislature going up to Simla instead of meeting in Delhi.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: What about the cost of the permanent buildings?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: The House on a previous occasion decided against Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar by voting 67 to 21 that the permanent buildings in New Delhi should go forward, and I take it that that, therefore, is a matter which has been settled.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: I am speaking of the permanent buildings in Simla.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: The permanent buildings are already in Simla, and I say it would cost very little more for this House to go to Simla to meet the Government of India, whereas, on the other hand, we should certainly be involved in a great deal of extra expenditure if the Government of India or a large part of it were to come down to meet the Legislature here. For I suppose that the Legislature would hardly like to come here and for the Government of India not even to pay them the compliment of appearing on the Benches. Then again, there would of course be very considerable expenditure in other directions connected with their visit. I would again repeat, that this, for the present moment, is not really a practical proposition. Let us wait until our Legislative Chambers in New Delhi are built. They are being completed, as I have said before, under a deliberate decision of this Assembly. A vote which has been repeated not once but twice, a vote which involved full discussion, much consideration and an expression of very decided opinion on behalf of certain members. Am I wrong, Sir, is my recollection betraying me, that Mr. Rangachariar himself told us in the course of one of our discussions that there was an occasion when in the hot weather he swooned on the platform of the Delhi Railway station? I can only congratulate him, on the fact that he has now found it possible to face with greater equanimity the rigours of our Northern summer and I congratulate my friend Sir Sydney Crookshank on the efforts he has made to make Mr. Rangachariar comfortable in Raisina.

Dr. Nand Lal: Sir, I am afraid most of us are becoming sentimentalists. We ought to show to the world outside the House that we are practical Legislators. In the name of economy arguments have been advanced and those arguments have been based on the ground that our countrymen are living in the hot places and why should we as Legislators go to Simla and enjoy the salubrious climate of that place? If it were not

the question of real economy against the motion according to my way of thinking, I would have shared the view of the author of this amendment. But I am afraid he had not sufficient time to look into the items and to come to the right conclusion as good arithmetician, in order to see whether the arguments, which have been advanced by the Mover in favour of savings, are good and acceptable or not. Let us take the economic phase of the question. Have we got houses built in Simla? And if these Legislators live in Simla will there be additional expense? I think the whole House would have to admit that there will be no additional expense at all. We have got houses here in Delhi at Raisina, similarly we have got houses there at Simla. If we cease to go to Simla, if the exodus to Simla is not accepted, then those houses there will remain vacant. Who will be responsible for the cost of repairs? What answer have you got for that? Do you mean to say that after we have spent lakhs and lakhs of rupees in building those houses, those houses should remain vacant or that we should invite tenants to go and occupy them? Are you really serious? Now, let us take the question of travelling allowance. I think none of us can advance this argument that this Assembly should hold its sittings for 12 months. You shall have to admit that there must be some interval. If this Assembly will sit for three months in the winter at Delhi, there must be a summer session also, because we have to discuss the most important questions which may crop up in that season. If it is admitted that there will be no additional expense in our going to Simla, then naturally there will be no harm if we sit there and discuss these important questions at Simla. Another point which might have troubled my learned friends from Madras is that it is a very cold country. That is the only argument which was advanced a year before and which is for all intents and purposes advanced this time, too. Well, I say that if you are afraid of winter, then Delhi is as cold for you in winter as Simla will be in summer. It does not make any difference. On that score also, I may say, that your argument has not got much force. There is another point which supports my argument in opposition to this amendment, and that is this. The quality of work depends on mentality. I ask the gentlemen who are the authors of this amendment whether they will be able to apply their minds to the important work here at Delhi in summer or there at Simla? Once upon a time I took a note of the amount of work which we had done at Simla in the summer and then I tried to find out the amount of work which we had done here at Delhi and the result which I arrived at was that despatch of work at Simla was much more and better in quality than that in Delhi. Is there any Member of this Assembly to question the correctness of this result? If there is any I shall welcome him. Then, Sir, do you want to perform your duty efficiently and properly or not? If you simply want to say, purely on sentimental grounds, that, "If our countrymen are living in the plains why should we live in Simla?" my answer to it would be "Do not take your motor cars here. Do not drive in them. Do not charge any allowance at all, if you want to make a sacrifice, if you have got real sympathy with the people. There is no sympathy at all if you say, "We do not want to go to Simla, we shall sit here and charge the allowance all the same." There is no practical sympathy in it. Here, my learned friend Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas changed his clothes the other day. I asked him, "Hullo! summer has arrived?" He says "I cannot stand the heat". My learned friend has summer clothes just now on and that is a testimony which I can rely on. If this Legislature will not have the exodus to Simla, I am afraid the House will be very thin. Some of you fall sick and your doctor's bill will be

[Dr. Mand Lal.]

very heavy. I wish you may have an experience of stopping here in summer in Delhi; then you will come to know. I am sure that none of you will then have the courage nor desire to move any motion or any amendment in regard to this matter. Then, Sir, to discuss the question of so-called touch or contact, I may say, it does not make any difference. You will remain in contact with your country at Simla. You will be in contact with your people at Simla.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Who are they?

Dr. Mand Lal: There are the newspapers. Do you mean to say that the Post Office will be stopped if you go to Simla? There will be no such thing at all. At Simla you will have the same channels of information which you could have in Delhi. There is therefore no force in this argument that we shall not be in close touch with the people if we are there. We shall be able to read from the newspapers what the conditions of the country are and what the views of the people are. That we do always. Does any of you go personally to your constituents individually to inquire how they feel and what their opinion is? Do they come to you at Delhi? You collect your information, you gather your information from the papers. Sometimes you receive letters. Therefore, this argument that we shall be far away from our countrymen has got no force. Allow me to point out that Simla is within your country. Simla is not separate from your country. Those who are living in Madras or Bombay may now be very well-informed that Simla is within British India and it is a part of our country. It is as good
 5 P.M. a part as our Delhi. Now, the argument has been advanced that this Provincial Council and that Provincial Council decided in this way, and in that way. I may inform my learned friends, who pose to be well-informed,—and I am afraid they have betrayed their ignorance of what is going on in the country—that the Punjab Provincial Council some time back has passed a resolution in favour of the exodus to Simla, and here my Honourable friend on the right has very rightly informed me that a great majority of that House decided in favour of going to Simla and I am told that one of the reasons, which were assigned there, was that we would be able to put forward intelligent work at Simla. Bombay and Madras members have got little justification to be in support of this amendment. (*A Voice:* "Bombay is not.") They did not take part in the debate but so far as the voting goes they, if my information is correct, sided with the other side. They are near the sea coast, as you know. They have, in summer, certainly a better breeze, which we may call technically sea breeze. They do not want any sort of change and they think that if the Council will sit here at Delhi it will not make any difference to them. Instead of attending this Assembly regularly and punctually and its full session they, in any case some of them, may not come here, for some days when it is very hot in Delhi and very nice at their sea coast. The correctness of my view on the point will be verified, if once, at least, as an experiment, this Assembly sits here in Delhi in the summer. I think the result of that will go to corroborate my argument which I am placing now before the House. I do not wish to make it a question of sentiment. We should try and assist this House by our views which can stand the test of practicability. On these grounds, Sir, I oppose this amendment which I am sure will be thrown out as its predecessor was thrown out.

Colonel Sir Sydney Crookshank (Public Works Department Secretary): Sir, as Honourable Members appear to be looking forward with great keenness to the day when they will be able to sit in Delhi in Session year in and year out, if I have the permission of the Chair to digress for a moment I will inform them how soon their expectations in this direction will be fulfilled. In 1924 electric light and power, irrigation, sanitation, miscellaneous, and railway diversion works in connection with the construction of the New Capital will be completed; the year 1925 will see the completion of the Secretariats and other buildings, that is to say, residential and such like buildings, the communications, and miscellaneous public improvements; lastly towards the end of 1926 Government House and the Legislative Chambers will, it is hoped, be complete and ready for occupation.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: I rise to give my support to the amendment moved by my Honourable friend Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar and I want the House to consider the question on its own merits. I do not want the House to be led astray by the remarks that have been made by my Honourable friend, Dr. Nand Lal, that it is only from a sentimental point of view that we from Bombay and Madras look upon the exodus to Simla as in itself undesirable. Now, the Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey replying to the arguments of Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar said that so far as the question of expenditure was concerned it would not only make no reduction in expenditure but that it would increase by reason of the Legislature not going up to Simla and the Government of India having to move to and fro from Simla to Delhi. We have lost the first amendment moved by my Honourable friend, Munshi Iswar Saran. What remains now for us to do is to pass this amendment so that we can compel indirectly the hands of the Government of India to suspend their intention of going to Simla. I know that if the Legislature is prepared to undergo this self-sacrifice of not going to Simla and is prepared to sit and legislate in Delhi the Government of India cannot with any sense of reason afford to go and spend their days in Simla. I want the House also to take another thing into consideration. It is not merely, after all when you come to look at it—not merely the financial aspect of the question that ought to weigh with this Legislature. I for one have absolutely no doubt that it would pay, that it would be a financially lesser burden on the country if we decide to remain for all time in Delhi, but there is another aspect of the question. I want every Honourable Member of this House to put this question seriously to himself. Is it possible for us for all time altogether to legislate for the country sitting in Simla? Are we really in touch with public opinion when we are far away in the clouds of the Himalayas? Are we really in a mood to legislate in the proper way for the country sitting in that far distant places where we have to take a few days before we acclimatize ourselves to the weather and secondly the weather conditions are such that they are not suitable to the exigencies of the modern way of living? I want the House also to consider the question from this point of view. At present we sit in the year about 2½ months here and about a month or less than a month in Simla. This is not going to be the case for all time to come. I was informed that the Parliament in England has to sit for 9 or 10 months in the year. I look forward to a time and I hope that time will come very soon, when people will take seriously to the service of the country and we shall have to sit not merely 2½ months here and one month in Simla, but for 9 or 10 months continually. (*Cries of: "No, no."*) There can be no royal road to the service of a vast country like India, and if there are

[Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas.]

people who will come out to serve the country by entering Legislatures they must put aside ideas of comfort. The most predominant idea should be to serve the country best at the least cost to the country and at the maximum sacrifice of everyone who is called upon to render service to the country. If you have that conception of service and if you place side by side with that conception the idea of having a comfortable time in Simla and legislating sitting in that Chamber,—they are more to suit the convenience of the powers that be rather than to suit the convenience of the country—well, I can only say this that there are other people besides ourselves in this country who whatever may be our differences with them are prepared to bear the exigencies of the climate and all the sacrifices that they may have to undergo for the purpose of rendering the best service to the country. I wonder if the House decides in favour of going and legislating in Simla whether it is really carrying out the wishes of the country in this matter. As has been pointed out, it is for years now that this cry against the exodus to Simla has been raised. The powers that be are out of touch with public opinion. Look at what is happening in India for the last three years. Perhaps that argument had less force in it a number of years ago than it has to-day. Before 1912 and 1913 perhaps public opinion had not been so developed in this country. Perhaps political consciousness had not reached the stage which it has reached to-day. Is it safe, I ask the Members of this House, and the powers that be in the interests of this country that while eventful things are happening every day in this country, when the political consciousness is so raised that you have got to be in touch with everything that is going on in all parts of the country that you should go and legislate at a place which seems to me the most distant place for being informed of what is happening in the country. We have to take a very serious view of our duties. I am afraid I must inform the House that in dealing with this question you cannot afford to take a light view. You cannot afford to treat the question from the point of view of your comfort or from the point of view of your convenience. What does your convenience matter compared with the convenience and comfort of the country, compared to the duties which you are taking upon yourself for doing your best to serve the country. I say it to the Government that it is no longer safe that they should remain away from touch with the public opinion of the country for such a long time as seven or eight months. I know myself when we discussed this question in 1921 we were told "Oh, you are all new. You wait here and spend a year or two and then you will find the advantages of Simla". Well, Sir, we have had sufficient time at our disposal to compare the respective merits of legislating in Simla and of legislating in Delhi. As regards the argument that my Honourable friend has advanced that in Simla we have done the work with more despatch, the record of the Legislative Assembly will speak for itself. I do hold in spite of what my Honourable friend has said that we have done far more important work in Delhi than we have done in Simla. That is an argument that does not arise. If my Honourable friend will not understand it, I cannot help it. I said that that argument is outside the question. The question is this. As a body representing public opinion in this country, entrusted to serve this country by means of our Membership of the Legislative Assembly, we cannot afford to be out of touch with public opinion. We cannot afford to allow the powers that be to go right away from public opinion. We must bring them into the centre of things. We must see that we locate ourselves in the centre of things, so that we may

know what is going on outside the country and what is going on outside may affect our doings, as it is intended that it should affect in the Legislature. You cannot treat this question lightly. I think the effect of your going to Simla will be, I may be pardoned for saying so, that you take a very light view of our duties towards those who have sent us to legislate for them. Both from the financial point of view and also from the patriotic point of view of doing our duty to the country, it seems to me that we are approaching the time when we shall have to work far more and for a longer number of months than we are doing now. I believe it is necessary that we should consider the question from the proper standpoint and decide to remain in Delhi at whatever cost we may have to do it. I heartily support the motion and I hope Honourable Members will voice the public opinion of the country held for a long number of years if they support this motion. Only one more point. In 1920 we were told that the point was raised by the Imperial Council. If I remember rightly, one of the Members of the Government, my Honourable friend Mr. Sarma was a strong advocate, if I am not mistaken, of the policy of remaining in Delhi and not going to Simla. I do not know whether it was in 1920 that my Honourable friend held that view.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma (Revenue and Agriculture Member): I never expressed that view.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: If I am not mistaken in 1921 when he was a Member of the Government he took a different view. I do not also know this, and my Honourable friend Mr. Rangachariar referred to it in the course of the discussion in 1921, that my Honourable friend, Mr. Sarma, took the other view at one time.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma: Mr. Rangachariar was mistaken. I never expressed an opinion on the question of the exodus to Simla.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: How did you vote?

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma: I may inform Honourable Members that I was absent from Delhi when the Honourable Mr. Srinivasa Sastri raised the question. So there was no question of voting.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: That gives me one more argument to strengthen my case. I wonder how I forgot all about that argument. The Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri can be said to have more experience than any one of us of the sitting both here in Delhi and in Simla. The Right Honourable gentleman has certainly a better idea of his duties to the country than many people have and I believe that his opinion at any rate ought to count but

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I was present in connection with that debate. The Honourable Mr. Srinivasa Sastri complained greatly of Delhi and said that it was impossible to open your mouth without getting a fly down into it. I wish merely to mention that point.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: I hope my Honourable friend will not try to win me away from my support of Delhi. I believe the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri complained of Delhi, because it was probably in his mind

[Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas.]

to suggest some better capital like Poona instead of Delhi. About that I do not know. I can only say this. It has been decided that Delhi shall be your capital. I do not want to lure you away to Bombay or Poona, although these places have great advantages. What is a settled fact must remain a settled fact. What matters is this. Even if there is a place worse than Delhi, I say that if we have a serious regard for our duties then we ought to make up our minds to stick to one place in order that we may do our duties better. I support the amendment.

Dr. H. S. Gour: I should like to say a few words before this question is put to the vote. Honourable Members will remember that the motion of the Honourable Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar is a very short one and one need not hark back to the general question of the exodus to the hills. We are concerned now with a very short and limited motion that the Legislature should not meet in Simla. Now, if Honourable Members will advert to that short question what will they find? During the last two years the Session of the Legislature in Simla was in the month of September and if the precedents of the last two years is followed, another session of the Legislature this year would be either in September or in its neighbourhood. Now, Sir, I ask the Members of this House this single question. If we vetoed our exodus to Simla what would be the result? It is perfectly obvious that the work that can be done in September can be done equally well in October. Consequently, if this House records its deliberate vote in favour of the amendment, it will hasten the pace of the Government of India who will come down to Delhi in the month of October and meet the Legislature which will hold its session here. The question therefore is this. What will be the expense and what will be the nature of the climate of Delhi in the month of October? The Honourable the Home Member cannot deny the fact that Delhi in October is as pleasant as it is in the cold weather. After the rains the climate of Delhi is not only tolerable but pleasant. Surely, Sir, this is the short question that you have to decide for yourself. We need not go into the general question as to whether the exodus of the Government of India to Simla is justified or not. That question has been settled by you by your vote. And remember that, if the division list is analysed, you will find that the bulk of the non-official vote is solidly in favour of non-exodus. No doubt some of the Members, official and non-official, introduced personal considerations into the question; and so they defeated the vote of this House, but their votes do not count for the moment on this important question. I suggest, therefore, that the short question you have to deal with is shall you or shall you not meet in Delhi in October (*A Voice*: "No") and will it entail any additional cost to the Government of India? That raises the question which the Honourable the Home Member has raised. He said if there is a session of the Indian Legislature in Delhi the Government of India will have to move down to Delhi and thus it will entail additional cost. I think, Sir, I have already answered that question by implication. If the Government of India, instead of moving down to Delhi towards the end of October as they generally do, move down to this place towards the commencement of October, it will shorten their stay in Simla and thus partially carry out the wishes of the non-official Members of this House by curtailing their exodus to Simla and at the same time entail no additional cost by reason of the holding of the session here.

One more point, Sir, and I have done. It has been said that, so far as Simla is concerned, the climate is good and salubrious while the buildings in Delhi are not yet complete. But I say to Honourable Members that we are not here concerned with the remote future. The vote of this House will be for this year or for next year. What is the position of this Assembly? Supposing it meets here next October or, for the matter of that, after the outbreak of the rains, say in the month of July or August. I can vouch for the salubrity of the climate of Delhi in the month of July or August. (*A Voice*: "Would you come here then?") I lived here, Sir, a part of the hot weather last year and, though I must confess that the climate of Delhi is trying in the months of May and June, it was certainly not unpleasant after the rains burst, and I am quite sure that, if the session of the Legislature is timed to be held here after the rains burst, the additional expenditure which the Honourable Member suggests will not be incurred, provided the session is timed to be held in October. The condition this year is somewhat exceptional. This is the last session of the Assembly and it may be that Members would be anxious to spend October and November amongst their constituents; but I am not speaking of this year. I am speaking generally, not only of this year but of the next year, because the vote of the House will indicate the direction in which the Members of this House desire the Members of the Government to shape their action. I therefore hold, Sir, that, without committing themselves to the larger question involved, this House should by its solid vote support the amendment in favour of holding the autumn session of the Indian Legislature in Delhi and not in Simla.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: Much of the time of the Government Members on this Bench seems to be taken up in trying to lead the House back to the point after Dr. Gour has elaborately led it forth into by-ways of his own. The one question before the House is the Budget for the present year and the one question which has been put by Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar is this, whether that Budget shall be reduced during the present year in order that the Assembly and the Council of State may sit in Delhi during the present summer instead of going to Simla. That can be the only question before the House and none other. This is the Budget of the present year and we are discussing the present year only. (*A Voice*: "That is not so.") Are you discussing the Budget of the next year? (*Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar*: "We are discussing the principle.") We are discussing the Budget of the present year.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: The Honourable the Leader of the House knows it is the principle we are discussing.

Dr. H. S. Gour: He knows what we are discussing; he is dissembling.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: We are discussing here a question connected with our financial arrangements for the present year. It is not a general Resolution on the subject of the move to Simla, though from some of the digressions one might think it was; it is a discussion on the Budget; and any questions of principle which we discuss ought to have some relation to the Budget. The question involved in this vote is a simple one, namely, are you going to sit in Simla or in Delhi next July, and in my opinion there is really no other question before the House.

Mr. President: The question is, that the provision for Hill journey charges wherever they occur be reduced by one rupee.

The motion was negatived.

THE HINDU LAW OF INHERITANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar: Sir, I present the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to amend the Hindu Law of Inheritance in certain particulars.

THE SPECIAL MARRIAGE BILL.

Dr. H. S. Gour: I also beg to present the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to amend Act III of 1872.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 15th March, 1928.
