

19th March, 1924

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
(Official Report)

FIRST SESSION
OF THE
SECOND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1924



SIMLA
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1924

1/2/24

CONTENTS.

VOLUME IV, PART III—13th March, 1924, to 25th March, 1924.

	PAGES.
Thursday, 13th March, 1924—	
Members Sworn	1607
Questions and Answers	1607-1622
Motion for Adjournment—Disallowed	1622-1628
Sketch of Course of Business during Discussion on Demands for Grants	1628
Statement of Business	1628
The Budget—List of Demands—contd.	1629-1701
Friday, 14th March, 1924—	
Questions and Answers	1703-1735
Alleged Pact between the Government and the Nationalist Party	1736-1737
Statement of Business	1737-1738
May Session in Simla	1738-1741
The Budget—List of Demands—contd.	1741-1807
Saturday, 15th March, 1924—	
Questions and Answers	1808-1816
Message from the Council of State	1816
The Budget—List of Demands—concl'd.	1817-1882
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill—Report of the Select Committee laid on the table	1850
Monday, 17th March, 1924—	
Member Sworn	1888
Statement laid on the Table	1883-1883
Questions and Answers	1889-1896
Discovery of a Bomb Factory at Maniktala	1896-1897
Rules under Section 67 of the Government of India Act	1897-1903
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1903-1907
Election of the Standing Finance Committee	1908
The Budget—The Indian Finance Bill—Motion for taking the Bill into consideration negatived	1908-1960
Tuesday, 18th March, 1924—	
Member Sworn	1963
Questions and Answers	1963-64
Accident on the Rohilkhund and Kumaon Railway	1964-65
Discovery of a Bomb Factory at Maniktala	1965
Unstarred Question and Answer	1965-66
Message from His Excellency the Governor General	1966
Governor General's Assent to Bills	1967

CONTENTS—*contd.*

PAGES.

Tuesday, 18th March, 1924—*contd.*

The Court-fees (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	...	1967
The Indian Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill—Motion for circulation adopted	...	1968-73
Amendment of Standing Orders—Adopted	...	1973-75
The Indian Finance Bill—Leave to introduce refused	...	1975-78

Wednesday, 19th March, 1924—

Member Sworn	...	1979
Questions and Answers	...	1979-82
Cost of the Simla Session of the Indian Legislature in 1923	...	1983
Personal Power of the Governor General	...	1982-87
Statement laid on the Table	...	1988
State Prisoners in Bengal	...	1988-89
Discovery of a Bomb Factory at Maniktala	...	1989
The Indian Coinage (Amendment) Bill—Amendment made by the Council of State agreed to	...	1989-90
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended	...	1990-91

Thursday, 20th March, 1924—

Questions and Answers	...	1993-2011
Unstarred Questions and Answers	...	2019-20
Resolution <i>re</i> Abolition of the Cotton Excise Duty—Debate adjourned	...	2020-43
Resolution <i>re</i> Repeal of Bengal Regulation III of 1818—Adopted as amended	...	2043-80

Monday, 24th March, 1924—

Members Sworn	...	2081
Questions and Answers	...	2081-2121
Unstarred Questions and Answers	...	2121-27
Further Constitutional Advance in India	...	2127
Holding of a Circuit Court in Delhi	...	2127-28
Franchise for Women	...	2128-29
Motion for Adjournment—Disallowed	...	2129-31
Statements laid on the Table	...	2132-36
The Indian Criminal Law Amendment Bill—Instructions given to Select Committee to present its report on or before the 26th March, 1924, withdrawn	...	2137
Governor General's Assent to the Amendment of Standing Orders	...	2137
The Imperial Bank of India (Amendment) Bill—Introduced, and motion for circulation adopted	...	2137-40
The Court-fees (Amendment) Bill—Referred to a Select Committee	...	2140-54
Election of the Standing Finance Committee	...	2154-55

Tuesday, 25th March, 1924—

Questions and Answers	...	2157-71
The Ramganga Railway Disaster	...	2171
Publication of the Tariff Board's Report on the Steel Industry	...	2171-74

CONTENTS—*contd.*

PAGES.

Tuesday, 25th March, 1924—*contd.*

Proposed Indian Delegations to Turkey, Persia and certain Arab States	2174-77
Motion for Adjournment	2177-78
Statements Laid on the Table	2178-83
Governor General's Assent to Bills	2183
Election of the Standing Finance Committee	2183
The Hindu Coparcener's Liability Bill—Referred to Select Committee	2184-2301
The Indian Stamp (Validating) Bill—Introduced and Referred to Select Committee	2301-04
The Indian Criminal Law Amendment (Repealing) Bill—Introduced	2304-10
The Indian Evidence (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	2311-12
Message from the Council of State	2312
Motion for Adjournment—Adopted	2312-30

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 19th March, 1924.

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

MEMBER SWORN:

Mr. Harry Tonkinson, C.I.E., M.L.A. (Home Department: Nominated Official).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

WORKS COMMITTEES IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESSES.

876. ***Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state whether the Works Committees appointed in the Government of India Presses at Calcutta, Delhi and Simla after the labour troubles in 1920 are still functioning and, if so, are any reports on the working of these Committees received by Government and what action is taken on them?

(b) Is it a fact that the Works Committee in the Delhi Press was dissolved soon after the present Deputy Superintendent took over charge, and that the said officer instead of trying to make the Committee a success exercised undue pressure on the workmen to dissolve the Committee?

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: The answer to both parts of the question is in the negative.

WORKING HOURS IN THE DELHI PRESS.

877. ***Haji Wajihuddin:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) The normal working hours of the foremen section-holders and head reader in the Delhi and Simla Presses.
- (b) Is it a fact that the above mentioned officials in the Delhi Press are forced to work from 7 A.M. to 6-30 P.M. even when morning overtime is not worked by men over whom they supervise?
- (c) How do the working hours of these officials compare with those of foremen and other heads of sections in other Government of India establishments worked under the **Factories Act?**

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: (a) The normal working hours are as follows:

In Delhi.

Mondays to Fridays—9 to 6-30 with two half-hour intervals.

Saturdays—9 to 3-30 with two half-hour intervals.

In Simla.

Mondays to Fridays—9 to 6-30 with an interval of an hour.

Saturdays—9-30 to 2-30.

But it should be added that during the current legislative session it has been the rule for all the workers in Delhi to work two hours overtime from 7 A.M. to 9 A.M.

(b) The answer to the second part of the question is No.

(c) The normal hours as given are approximately similar to those in other Government establishments. But with the added overtime which has been necessary lately in the Delhi Press the hours there are in excess of the average for Government of India factories. I may add that this overtime is necessitated by the work of the Legislature. At the same time they are within the limitations prescribed in the Indian Factories Act and much below the hours that used to be worked in Government presses three or four years ago.

CASUAL LEAVE AND HOLIDAYS OF THE STAFF OF THE DELHI PRESS.

878. ***Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state whether in October last certain orders were issued by them restricting casual leave and holidays in the Secretariat and if so, please lay a copy on the table?

(b) Is it a fact that the said orders have been made applicable to the Government Presses at Simla and Delhi, but not to the Calcutta Press, the Stationery Office and to the other Government factories? If so, why not?

(c) Is it a fact that under the said orders as applied to the Delhi Press a large number of Hindu and Muhammadan holidays have been abolished while all important Christian holidays are retained?

(d) Will the Government be pleased to state if the gazetted holidays *Fasant Panchmi* and *Sheoratri* were observed as holidays in most of the Secretariat offices?

(e) Is it a fact that in the Delhi Press the said holidays were treated as full working days and the concessions previously allowed to men when booked to attend on gazetted holidays were not allowed and an hour's early leave usually granted for the performance of *Puja* and prayers on such days was not given?

(f) Is it a fact that the usual working hours of the Delhi Press employes are from sunrise to sunset and even later up to 9 P.M. in winter, and if so, do the Government propose to continue the concessions previously allowed to them for performing *Puja* and prayers when they are called upon to attend on important festivals?

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: (a) Yes. Copies have been placed in the Library.

(b) Yes. The orders are intended to apply to Government of India offices at Delhi and Simla.

(c) No. The question of the allocation of holidays in the Press is still under consideration.

(d) Yes, so far as Hindus are concerned.

(e) Yes.

(f) The usual working hours have already been given to part (a) of the Honourable Member's previous question. Government hope that with the close of the Legislative session, some reduction will be effected in the hours worked, but the form which this reduction takes must depend on administrative convenience.

OVERTIME IN THE DELHI PRESS.

879. ***Haji Wajihuddin:** Is it a fact:

(a) That previously when men in the Delhi Press were booked to attend on holidays their special overtime was counted from an hour earlier than on full working days?

(b) That on the above noted concession being withdrawn the men petitioned the Manager, but instead of their petition being considered a number of signatories were called in and scolded by the Accountant and told that if they made such applications in future they would be brought under reduction?

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: (a) Yes.

(b) The answer is in the negative. One man was reprimanded for appending a false name to the petition.

PROVIDENT FUND FOR PRESS EMPLOYEES.

880. ***Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state if in their Resolution of July 1920 they promised the benefits of a Provident Fund to their Press employes? If so, how far has the scheme progressed and how many more years will it take to bring it into operation?

(b) Do the Government propose to pay the arrears of employes' share of the Fund to compensate them for the loss?

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: (a) Yes. The Government of India are in communication with the Secretary of State on the subject.

(b) This will be considered.

EXCLUSION OF PRESS WORKERS FROM THE BENEFITS OF THE CIVIL SERVICE REGULATIONS AND THE FUNDAMENTAL RULES.

881. ***Haji Wajihuddin:** Will the Government be pleased to state if it is proposed to exclude the press workers from the benefits of C. S. R. and Fundamental Rules? If so, in what manner will the employes be compensated for the serious change in the conditions of their service?

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: I presume the Honourable Member is referring to the leave rules which the Retrenchment Committee on page 255 of their Report considered unsuitable to the conditions of industrial labour. The question is being examined, but no proposals have yet been framed.

QUARTERS FOR PRESS EMPLOYEES.

882. ***Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Is it a fact that when a quarter allotted to a press employé is shared by another press employé owing to separate accommodation not being available full rent is recovered from both? If so, why and under what rules?

(b) Is it a fact that a large number of Secretariat staff share quarters and chum and mess together and that rent is deducted only from the man to whom the quarter is allotted? If so, why is a differential treatment accorded to the press employés?

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: (a) No. Press employés in Delhi pay rent subject to a maximum of 5 per cent. of salary. When this concession was sanctioned it was stipulated that if two or more press employés occupied the same accommodation the rent recoverable would be 5 per cent. of salary from each person, up to a limit of the assessed rent of the quarters.

(b) Government are not aware that a large number of the Secretariat staff share quarters. In their case the assessed rent is recovered from the person to whom the quarter is allotted. The stipulation referred to in the first part of my answer was not applied to them, as the concession rate of rent was not so applied.

COST OF THE SIMLA SESSION OF THE INDIAN LEGISLATURE IN 1923.

Mr. Darcy Lindsay (Bengal: European): Sir, I have given private notice of a question which, with your permission, I will put to the Honourable the Finance Member. Has the attention of Government been drawn to the statements appearing in the press to the effect that the Honourable Dr. Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi stated in the Council of State that the cost of a Simla session of four weeks' duration amounted to Rs. 1,28,00,000, of which 99 lakhs goes to the Assembly and 29 lakhs to the Council of State. What is the correct figure?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett (Finance Member): I am glad to have an opportunity of correcting an arithmetical error that has crept into the press. The statement that was made by the Honourable the Law Member in another place was that the cost of the Simla session of 1923, which lasted approximately four weeks, was Rs. 1,28,000. That has been copied in the press as Rs. 1,28,00,000.

PERSONAL POWER OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

Mr. K. O. Neogy (Dacca Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, with your permission, I will put a question of which I have given private notice.

(a) With reference to the answer given, on Monday the 17th March 1924, by the Honourable Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith, to my supplementary question regarding Rule 86A of the Indian Legislative Rules, will

the Honourable Member refer to the following statement made by the Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey, in the Legislative Assembly on the 26th January 1922:

"It is not the function of the Governor General in Council to make recommendations to the Governor General, in regard to the exercise of his personal power, nor can they in any way seek to sway his decision"—(*vide* Legislative Assembly Debates, 26th January 1922, page 1968)?

(b) Will the Honourable Member be pleased to state whether, in view of the above statement made by the Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey, an exception has been made in Legislative Rule 36A, in so far as it contemplates the Governor General being moved by the Governor General in Council, in regard to the exercise of his personal power under section 67B of the Government of India Act?

Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith (Secretary, Legislative Department): The intention of Rule 36A merely is to afford to the Governor General an opportunity for deciding whether he will exercise his power of recommendation under section 67B, and I quite admit that it would have been better had the rule been so worded. I must congratulate the Honourable Member on his detection of this somewhat unhappily worded phrase. I must also congratulate him on his excellent memory. There is no intention to depart from the principle laid down in the statement of the Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey to which Mr. Neogy has referred. He may rest assured that the Governor General in Council cannot, will not, and in fact, dare not, attempt to control or sway the Governor General's discretion as to the exercise of his personal statutory powers?

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhammadan Rural): May I ask, Sir, if it is open to the Governor General in Council to afford His Excellency the Governor General an opportunity of considering whether he shall exercise these statutory powers under section 67B, whether it will not be open to Members of this House also to move the Governor General in Council to afford in similar circumstances an opportunity to the Governor General to consider questions of certification and to consider the opinion of this House on such questions of certification?

Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith: I am not quite sure whether I understand the Honourable Member's question, Sir.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: I will put it categorically. I understood Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith to mean that this rule is only intended to afford the Governor General an opportunity of exercising his mind on the question whether he should exercise the powers under section 67B of the Government of India Act. If it is open to the Governor General in Council to do that in respect of the power vested in him, I ask whether it is not open to the House here to move the Governor General in Council so to give the Governor General the opportunity which this rule says the Governor General in Council is entitled to afford to His Excellency the Governor General. In other words, whether we in the Assembly can move the Governor General to take the action suggested.

Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith: The rule, as it stands, Sir, deals with a Government Bill. But I should imagine that, if any Member of this House dealing with a private Bill wished to approach the Governor General and

[Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith.]

ask him to consider whether he would not exercise his powers of recommendation in respect of that private Bill, there would be nothing to prevent the Honourable Member from so doing.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: I ask, Sir, whether it is open to this House to ask the Governor General to refrain from exercising the power. The question is, if he is to be afforded the opportunity of considering whether he should exercise the power or not, whether this House also may not move the Governor General in Council to ask the Governor General to refrain from exercising the power.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey (Home Member): Is the Honourable Member asking for an interpretation of any of our Rules or Standing Orders? They are as open to him as they are to us.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: I am asking, Sir, in view of the words used in this rule, namely, "that when the Member in charge of a Government Bill intimates to the Chamber that it is proposed to re-introduce the Bill and to move the Governor General to make a recommendation in respect thereof", when the Governor General in Council has got the opportunity or the right to move the Governor General to take action under section 67B, whether it is not open to this House to move the Governor General in Council to ask that the Governor General should not take the action suggested.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: The Honourable Member is taking advantage of words, which, my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith, has already stated, might have been somewhat differently phrased. If the Honourable Member desires that, in order to bring out the real meaning of the rule, it should be amended, we should be perfectly prepared to do so. The meaning is that the Governor General should have an opportunity of considering the case. If the rule is altered in that sense, then obviously the further implication which the Honourable Member wishes to attach to the rule would not arise and it would not carry the corollary that further powers should be given to this House.

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar (Madras ceded districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadian Rural): May I ask the Honourable the Home Member whether, in the contingency referred to by Mr. Iyengar, this Assembly cannot take steps under the Rules or Standing Orders relating to communications by means of an address to make a recommendation like that?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: The interpretation of those rules, Sir, is with the Honourable the President and not with us.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao (Godavari *cum* Kistna: Non-Muhammadian Rural): In view of the difficulties pointed out by Mr. Iyengar, may I ask whether the Honourable the Home Member will consent to have all the Rules referred to a committee of this House, though I understand that these Rules have to go before Parliament.

Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith: I explained the other day, Sir, that the rule-making power under section 129A or section 67 is a purely executive act. Moreover, section 129A itself, I think, makes that very clear.

(*Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao*: "I do not dispute that at all.")
It says:

"Rules shall be made by the Governor General in Council with the sanction of the Secretary of State in Council and shall not be subject to repeal or alteration by the Indian Legislature or by local Legislature."

I think that the enactment was so framed to make it perfectly clear that the making of rules is to be purely an executive act.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: May I ask, Sir, if, notwithstanding the fact that this rule-making power is vested in the executive Government, with which, we have been told, this Council is not concerned, the making of these rules was as a matter of fact undertaken by a committee on which Indian opinion was represented and it was laid in draft before both Houses of Parliament and finally approved, or if, in respect of rules of such a far-reaching character as these, the whole thing has been done behind the back of this House and of Indian opinion and without giving Parliament or this Assembly an opportunity of expressing their views?

Dr. H. S. Gour (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadian): May I also draw the attention of the Governor General in Council to the very rule referred to by Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith to the effect that the rules are to be made by the Governor General in Council?—in consequence of which, the Governor General in Council, being at least responsive to this House, though not at present responsible, it would have been wise for the Governor General in Council to have taken this House into confidence before formulating these rules, the legality of which is seriously in question in view of the provisions of section 67B which only provides that where either Chamber of the Indian Legislature refuses leave to introduce or fails to pass in a form recommended by the Governor General, then the Governor General may certify. It is only in that one short narrow contingency, that is where the Indian Legislature refuses leave to introduce or fails to pass in the manner laid down in the section, that the Governor General may certify. The rules now made leave a wider door open to the Governor General to exercise the power. It confers on the Governor General in Council a right of suspensory veto, as it were, to a provision of a Bill after its introduction which has not received the acceptance of this House. And I submit, in so far as it confers upon the Members of the Government the power to suspend the progress of the Bill till they have consulted the Governor General, the rules contravene the essential principle underlying section 67B of the Government of India Act.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: Is the Honourable Member asking a question?

Dr. H. S. Gour: I simply wanted to know whether this fact has been adverted to by the Governor General in Council in framing the rules.

Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith: I am not quite sure what the Honourable Member's fact is: he expresses an opinion that the rules are *ultra vires*. As I explained the day before yesterday the Governor General in Council is perfectly satisfied that these rules are not *ultra vires*. The Honourable Member seems to think that these rules are made under section 67B. They are not made under that section; they are made under

[Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith.]

section 67, which enables rules to be made for the conduct of business in both Chambers of the Indian Legislature. They do apply, practically all of them, to Bills dealt with by special procedure under section 67B. There is nothing whatever to prevent rules being made under section 67 to apply to any course of legislation in this Chamber or the other.

Dr. H. S. Gour: The question I asked the Honourable Member, Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith, was whether the rules made under the Government of India Act could be made so as to contravene the explicit provisions of a particular section, such as section 67B, which deals with one contingency and one contingency only, and whether, by the rules made under the general powers of section 129 of the Government of India Act, the narrow provisions of section 67B could be widened.

Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith: Does the Honourable Member ask whether it is open to make rules to contravene a provision of the Government of India Act? That, I understood, is his question, and, of course, the answer is, most certainly not. It is impossible to make rules that are repugnant to any provisions of that Act. If the rules are so made, they are to that extent void, as the Honourable Member will find by looking at his Government of India Act.

Mr. O. Duraiswami Aiyangar: May I suggest one or two things in this connection? In matters like these, when rules of considerable importance have to be framed instead of communicating these rules to the Honourable Members of this House by means of a notification in the Gazette, I think, Sir, it would be much better if His Excellency the Governor General chooses to communicate the same through the President to this House, and the Members of this House may be permitted on such an occasion to express their views upon the rules or communications so made by His Excellency the Governor General. I wish to state that in all matters of importance which are connected with the conduct of the business of this Assembly, whatever it may be, it will be better if His Excellency the Governor General sends such communications to this House direct through the President instead of making the Honourable Members of this House look into the Gazette for their information.

Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith: The method adopted for publishing these rules does not seem to have prevented the House from availing itself of opportunities to give their views at some length.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao: May I know, Sir, when that opportunity arose? Is it after the rules have been framed by the Governor General in Council and laid before the Houses of Parliament or before? May I suggest, Sir, that there is nothing in section 129A to prevent the Governor General in Council, if they were so minded, to have appointed a Committee before these rules were submitted to the Secretary of State in Council?

Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith: There is nothing to prevent it, Sir, but such a thing has never been done.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao: May I know, Sir, why it was not done? In view of the fact that these rules are to bind the House, may I know why such a course could not have been taken?

Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith: It binds the House no more than any other rule in the little blue book which the Honourable Member has in his hand.

Dr. H. S. Gour: The Honourable Member says that it has never been done. Had such rules been framed before this time?

Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith: The Honourable Member has had this little blue book in his hand for about three years. If he will look at it he will find that it contains a considerable number of rules. I am surprised that he was not aware of it till now.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: Is it a fact that, when the rules were originally framed, there was a Committee which sat upon it here in this country, and that Indian opinion was represented on it?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: There was what is known as the Reforms Advisory Committee, but, I am not sure how far they dealt with the Legislative rules. They dealt with a large number of subjects such as the Devolution Rules and the rules flowing from the Government of India Act generally. I cannot at the moment tax my memory as to whether they dealt with the Legislative rules or not. My recollection is that these rules were modelled with the necessary modifications, on the rules of the old Imperial Legislative Council.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: May I say, Sir, that so far as my memory goes, I have seen these draft rules in the hands of the non-official Members of the Advisory Committee that was set up to discuss them, and the discussion also is one of the many things we had before us. We discussed the rules when they were made.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I did not know that the matters referred to the Advisory Committee were communicated to others also; but I will ascertain the exact facts as to what questions were referred to them.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao: I may say that I was a member of an Advisory Committee in Madras and that the rules regarding business were discussed by that Advisory Committee.

Mr. Chaman Lal (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadian): Instead of raising a hornet's nest round the heads of the Executive by introducing these amendments, would it not have been better to have dissolved this Chamber?

Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha (Chota Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadian): With reference to section 67 of the Act which says that the rules regarding the course of business are to be framed in this country, are Government satisfied that these rules in question are only rules regulating the course of procedure and not infringing on the rights of the Legislature under section 65 of the Government of India Act?

Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith: We are quite satisfied, Sir, and so is the Secretary of State.

STATEMENT LAID ON THE TABLE.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey (Home Member): Sir, I lay on the table a statement promised in reply to Mr. Bhabendra Chandra Roy's question asked on the 1st March, 1924, regarding the total cost incurred on Committees and Commissions in 1923-24.

Statement of the cost so far as is known to central revenues of Committees and Commissions sitting during 1923-24.

Serial No.	Name of Committee or Commission.	Date on which appointed.	Cost.	REMARKS.
			Rs.	
1	Committee to make recommendations regarding the reorganization of the administrative methods of the Forest Department.	21-11-23	4,450	Approximate.
2	The Tariff Board	5-7-23	1,49,320	Estimated.
3	The Indian Mercantile Marine Committee.	12-2-23	1,24,500	Do.
4	Coal Dust Committee	12-11-23	7,560	Do.
5	Statute Law Revision Committee	24-9-23	1,147	Actual.
6	Indian Retrenchment Committee	8-11-23	21,000	Do.
7	Locomotive Standardisation Committee.	15-3-23	...	Unknown.
8	Royal Commission on Superior Civil Services in India.	6-11-23	8,00,000	Estimated.
9	Committee on Police Uniforms	26-9-23	1,500	Do.
10	Staff Selection Board Committee	25-7-23	Nil.	No expenditure was incurred.
11	Indian Bar Committee	23-11-23	1,12,000	Estimated.
12	Civil Justice Committee	4-2-24	50,000	Do.
	Total	...	7,71,477	

STATE PRISONERS IN BENGAL.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey (Home Member): If you will allow me, Sir, I will make a statement which I promised on the 25th February to give the House in connection with certain matters relating to the treatment of State prisoners in Bengal, that is, prisoners confined under Regulation III. Non-official visitors have been specially appointed by the Government of Bengal to visit the State prisoners confined in the various jails. I do not propose to publish the names of these visitors, but will communicate them privately to any Member of the House who wishes to know them. The dates on which they were appointed to the various jails are:

Midnapore Jail	26th Novr. 1923.
Dacca Jail	3rd Decr. 1923.
Presidency Jail	21st Decr. 1923.
Alipore Central Jail	21st Decr. 1923.

One of these visitors is allowed to visit and interview the State prisoners in the jail to which he has been appointed every month and to make any remarks or suggestions in the special book kept in charge of the Superintendent of the Jail. The Superintendent submits, with such remarks as he thinks necessary, a copy of these entries to the Local Government.

As regards newspapers and books, each State prisoner may be given one of three English papers and one Indian newspaper. The Indian paper he may select from a list of 16 papers. He may also be allowed to subscribe to any periodical or magazine published in Great Britain and to any of the papers mentioned in the list referred to. Books and magazines, both in the vernacular and in English, may also be allowed both from the jail library and from outside provided they are passed by the Superintendent of the Jail. It is considered desirable to encourage the perusal of suitable literature and so far as practicable facilities should be given for obtaining it.

DISCOVERY OF A BOMB FACTORY AT MANIKTALA.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Halley (Home Member): I promised yesterday in reply to Mr. Pilcher, that I will give any further information I had on the subject of the notice which appeared in the press relating to the discovery of bombs in Calcutta. He asked me whether that information was authentic. I have received a telegram from the Government of Bengal which shows that the information communicated to the press was in substance authentic. I do not think it advisable to read to the House the full details now sent to me, as they mention the names of several persons who must shortly be the subject of judicial proceedings. Suffice it to say there was a discovery of what appeared to be a manufactory of bombs, 5 highly efficient cast-iron bombs and one empty, as well as a quantity of caps and explosive chemicals such as picrate were found. A number of persons have been arrested in consequence of this discovery.

THE INDIAN COINAGE (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett (Finance Member): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the amendment made by the Council of State in the Bill further to amend the Indian Coinage Act, 1906, for certain purposes, be taken into consideration."

The amendment in question will be found at the very end of the Bill in the proviso to clause 3. That proviso as it left this House made arrangements for a period of six months between the notification of the withdrawal of the legal tender character of a coin and the date when it should cease to be legal tender at a Government treasury. In the Council of State that figure was altered from 6 to 12 after discussion. In the view of the Government, the period of six months is reasonably sufficient and it is possible that a period of twelve months may be inconvenient in certain cases. The matter, however, is one which is not of considerable importance, and I propose to move in due course that this House do agree with the Council of State in this matter.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: Amendment made:

"The word 'twelve' in the second last line of clause 3 has been substituted for the word 'six'."

The question I have to put is:

"That this House doth agree with the other Chamber in that amendment."

The motion was adopted.

THE INDIAN INCOME-TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett (Finance Member): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922, for certain purposes, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 and 3, as amended by the Select Committee, were added to the Bill.

Clauses 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 were added to the Bill.

Clauses 9 and 10, as amended by the Select Committee, were added to the Bill.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I beg to move:

"That in clause 11, for all the words after the words 'commencing on that date' the following be substituted, namely: 'and to be chargeable for the year commencing on the first day of April, 1924, at the rate or rates applicable for those years to the total income of an individual, in respect of the income, profits and gains and of the total income, respectively, of every association of individuals for which no rate of tax has been otherwise laid down by law'."

This amendment is moved purely as a matter of machinery. At the time when the Select Committee had the Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill before them they did not know whether this or the Bill which imposes income-tax for the year would have precedence, and if this Bill had been passed by the time that the other Bill came on, a clause to that effect would have been included in the other Bill. As things are now, it is desirable to include the clause in this Bill.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer (Madras: Nominated Non-Official): I should like to have some explanation with regard to the exact meaning of this amendment. It states:

"Income-tax and super-tax shall be chargeable for the year commencing on the first day of April, 1924, at the rate or rates applicable for those years . . ."

I suppose the words "rate or rates" are used because even in the same year there may be one rate with regard to income from one source and another rate with regard to income from another source. But I do not understand why the words "those years" are used. What is the antecedent of "those", and can a rate or rates applicable for two different years be applied in respect of the assessment of one year?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I think the Honourable Member has failed to read the clause as a whole. It would read thus :

"The amendments made in the said Act by sections 3, 7 and 8 shall have effect as if they had been made on the first day of April, 1923, and income-tax and super-tax shall be deemed to have been chargeable for the year commencing on that date and to be chargeable for the year commencing on the first day of April, 1924,"

that is, from 1923-24.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer: Your amendment is 1924.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: "The year commencing on that date" is already in the clause before the new amendment comes in. The years 1923 and 1924 are the two years which are in question.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer: You want to make an assessment for both the years?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Yes.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 11, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I move that the Bill, as amended, be passed.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922, for certain purposes, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 20th March, 1924.
