

25th February, 1925

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
(Official Report)

SECOND SESSION

OF THE

SECOND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1925



SIMLA
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1925

CONTENTS—*contd.*

	PAGES.
Friday, 20th February, 1925—<i>contd.</i>	
Resolution <i>re</i> Appointment of two Members of the Assembly to the Governing Body of the Lady Hardinge Medical College, Delhi—Not moved	1307
The Obscene Publications Bill—Passed, as amended	1307-21
Monday, 23rd February, 1925—	
Questions and Answers	1323-31
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1331-35
Statements laid on the Table	1335-44
Bills passed by the Council of State laid on the Table	1344
Message from the Council of State	1344
The Cotton Ginning and Pressing Factories Bill—Report of the Select Committee presented	1344
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill (Age of Consent Bill)—Report of the Select Committee presented	1344
Railway Budget—General Discussion	1345-1406
Tuesday, 24th February, 1925—	
Election of Panels of Standing Committees	1407
Questions and Answers	1407-21
Ballot for Panels of Standing Committees	1414
Public Accounts Committee—Final Report laid on the Table	1421-23
The Prisons (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1423
The Cantonments (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1424
The Cantonments (House-Accommodation Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1424
The Indian Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill—Considered	1424-52
Resolution <i>re</i> Legislative Council for Ajmer-Merwara—Negatived	1452-79
Wednesday, 25th February, 1925—	
Members Sworn	1481
Questions and Answers	1481-82
Railway Budget—	
List of Demands—	
Demand No. 1—Railway Board. (Motion for omission of Demand—Negatived)	1482-1545
(i) Pay of Officers of the Railway Board	1515-33
(ii) Appointment of an Indian on the Railway Board	1533-45
Thursday, 26th February, 1925—	
Election of Panels of Standing Committees	1547-48
Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>contd.</i>	1549-1611
(iii) Appointment of a Rates Tribunal	1549-51
(iv) Reduction of Third Class Railway Fares	1551-65
(v) New Branch Line Policy	1565-86
(vi) Reduction of Coal Freights	1586-97
(vii) Attitude of the Railway Board with reference to the grievances of the general public	1598-1610

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 25th February, 1925.

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

MEMBER SWORN:

Mr. Clement Daniel Maggs Hindley, M.L.A. (Chief Commissioner, Railways.)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

WAITING ROOM AT CHANDRAKONA ROAD STATION ON THE BENGAL NAGPUR RAILWAY.

1025. ***Mr. S. C. Ghose:** (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the letter signed "One who knows" which appeared in the *Forward* of the 28th January last about the need of a waiting room at Chandrakona Road railway station on the Bengal Nagpur Railway?

(b) Are the Government prepared to bring the matter to the notice of the railway authorities concerned?

Mr. G. G. Sim: Government have seen the letter referred to. This is a matter to be dealt with by the Agent of the Railway and copies of the question and answer will be sent to him.

MEMORIALS OF THE FOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION OF INDIA.

1026. ***Mr. S. C. Ghose:** (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the letter "Foremen's Association of India" signed by one Charles Watney?

(b) Will the Government lay on the table a copy of the memorials submitted by the Foremen's Association of India to the Government of India and the Secretary of State for India?

Mr. E. Burdon: (a) The reply is in the negative.

(b) The two memorials are being considered, and orders will be passed in due course. Government do not propose to lay the memorials on the table in the meantime.

GRIEVANCES OF THE INDIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

1027. ***Mr. S. C. Ghose:** (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the news published in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of the 19th November 1924 about the grievances of the native Indian employees of the Eastern Bengal Railway?

(b) Will the Government state if it is a fact that the native Indian employees of the Eastern Bengal Railway at Paksey, numbering about 400, do not get good water even for drinking, while the European and Anglo-Indian employees numbering about 20 get sufficient good water not only for drinking but also for their swimming bath and the flushing of drains?

(c) Is it a fact that native Indian guards and drivers get no allowance for working on Sundays, while European and Anglo-Indian drivers and guards get allowances?

Mr. G. G. Sim: (a) Government have seen the article referred to.

(b) Government have no information but will send the Honourable Member's question to the Agent, Eastern Bengal Railway, for such action as he may consider necessary.

(c) The Honourable Member is referred to the replies given to similar questions Nos. 2151 and 857 on the 17th September, 1924, and 16th February, 1925, respectively.

INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION OF MODERN DECORATIVE AND INDUSTRIAL ART TO BE HELD IN PARIS.

1028. ***Mr. S. C. Ghose:** (a) Have the Government of India received any invitation from the Government of the Republic of France to participate in the International Exhibition of Modern Decorative and Industrial Art to be held in Paris this year?

(b) If the reply is in the affirmative, do the Government propose to consider the advisability of having an exhibit of Indian products in that Exhibition?

(c) Are the Government aware that the French Government have granted to the British Government a large amount of space free for exhibitors?

(d) Have the Government of India applied to the British Government for a portion of the free space for Indian exhibitors?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: (a) and (b). Yes, but after consultation with the Local Governments the Government of India decided not to participate officially in the Exhibition.

(c) The Government of India understand that space has been allotted to the United Kingdom but they do not know on what conditions.

(d) No.

CONSTRUCTION OF A HARBOUR AT VIZAGAPATAM.

1029. ***Mr. W. S. J. Willson:** Are the Government aware that the export trade of Vizagapatam Port is increasing and that transfer of goods from shore to steamers is carried on under great difficulties? Will Government please state whether the construction of a harbour at Vizagapatam will be undertaken this year?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Yes. The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the reply given to question No. 210 asked by Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan on the 26th January 1925.

THE RAILWAY BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS.

SECOND STAGE.

Expenditure from Revenue.

DEMAND NO. 1—RAILWAY BOARD.

Ruling as to the order in which motions should be considered.

Mr. President: The Assembly will now proceed to consideration of the Demands for Grants under Part I of the Budget. There are 28 motions for reduction on the paper under Demand No. 1. These motions fall under several different headings.

I shall take No. 6 standing in Pandit Motilal Nehru's name first as representing the largest reduction. It is a motion to omit.

As the second subject for discussion I shall take motions for reductions Nos. 1, 3 and 4 together, all of them dealing with questions of the pay of officers under the Railway Board.

As the third I shall take the motion for reduction by Rs. 100 in Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar's name, No. 9, raising the question of New Branch Line Policy, which will also include motion No. 28 in Mr. Willson's name.

As the fourth subject I propose to take together all those reductions which raise the question of the representation of various interests on the Railway Board, that is to say motions for reductions Nos. 10, 11, and I think 15, though I am not quite sure what Mr. Joshi means by the words in brackets after motion No. 15. Does he refer to the best method of securing representative control by the different interests on the Railway Board or in respect of individual railway administrations?

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated: Labour Interests): No, not on the Railway Board but in the whole management of the Railways, not representation on the Railway Board itself.

Mr. President: Does the Honourable Member mean Advisory Councils?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Yes I shall include Advisory Councils under that also.

Mr. President: Then it does not fall in the same category as any proposal to change the personnel of the Railway Board.

As No. 5, I propose to take the motion for reduction in the names of five members, Mr. Venkatapatiraju, Sardar V. N. Mutalik, Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar, Mr. K. C. Neogy and Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao, raising the question of the appointment of a Rates Tribunal. I imagine that will be a sufficient bill of fare for one day.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,86,000 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, 1926, in respect of the ‘Railway Board’.”

Pandit Motilal Nehru (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhamadan Urban): Sir, I rise to move:

“That the Demand under the Head 1, Railway Board, be omitted.”

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

The motion, as Honourable Members will have observed, is intended to draw attention to the general railway policy pursued in this country, and to condemn it in the strongest possible manner that is open to this House. I fully realise, Sir, the grave responsibility which rests upon me in adopting this course, but I do so with the confidence born of a deep-rooted conviction that it is the right course to follow. The motion is based upon grievances as old as the railway system itself in this country, and the persistent disregard by the authorities of the best interests of the people. I know, Sir, I am inviting a storm of opposition, not only from the Treasury Bench, but also from more friendly quarters. We are little perturbed by the rise and fall of the official barometer, but when the centre of disturbance is shifted to other parts of the House it does become a matter for serious consideration. Let me assure the House that we have given the matter our most anxious and most serious consideration and that nothing but a compelling sense of duty to the country could have induced us to take this extreme constitutional course. Sir, the grievances that I have spoken of have been accumulating for the past three-quarters of a century and they have now reached the stage at which nothing short of a complete refusal of supplies would meet the situation. We are not adopting the usual course of moving small cuts of Rs. 100 or so which is done with the intention of drawing attention to some matter of policy or to convey a mild censure for something which has been wrongly done or omitted to be done. We think that the matter is far too serious to be dealt with in that way and that the only proper way of dealing with it is to apply most strictly the principle, "grievances before supplies".

Now, Sir, it has been stated that railway matters are commercial matters and that railway policy should be discussed like any other commercial policy detached from political and constitutional considerations. I beg to dissent entirely from that view. I submit that Railways are the biggest political machine in this country and that railway policy has a very far-reaching effect upon not only the commercial and economic but also the political conditions prevailing in the country. The Railway Board has the statutory sanction of being a sort of *imperium in imperio* and has been aptly described as bearing the same relation to the Government of India as Provincial Governments do. The only difference is that while the Provincial Governments are outside that holy of holies the Government of India, the Railway Board is within it. They have within the *sanctum sanctorum* a member of the family, or shall I call my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes the *pater familias* of the Railway Board? Except perhaps for that difference the Railway Board is as self-contained as any Provincial Government and is master in its own house. That being so, the question is when the Railway Budget is put before this House and when there is a constitutional issue to be raised, how and when it is to be raised? Now, Sir, the very fact that railway finance has been separated from the general finance and the manner in which the demands made by the Department have been formulated and put before this House is to my mind a clear invitation to the House to treat the Railway Budget and the Department as it would treat the General Budget and the Government of India. There can be no doubt that it is the inherent right of this House to refuse supplies on a proper case being established, and when the matter relates to the Railway Administration I submit that the only proper occasion to raise the ques-

tion is on the first motion before us which asks for a grant to the Central Administrative authority for all railways in India. The only question therefore is whether in this instance a proper case has been made out. Now, Sir, I shall in one word show that it is fully established. It is well-known that the Railway Board is a wholly irresponsible body in the sense that it is not responsible to the Legislature. (*Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar*: "Why not?") I will explain. Because the members are not removable at the will of the Legislature, their salaries are not votable, and we cannot deal with them as we would deal with any authority which is responsible to us. My Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes in the course of his speech likened the presentation of the Railway Budget to a report made by the directors to the shareholders of a company. That I submit is a false analogy. The true relation is that of principal and agent. The Railway Board is the agent of the people of India whose money it deals with, whose money it takes and spends. But in this case it is not the principal, but the agent who is the real master. The principal is wholly powerless. The agent has not even given him the right to vote his salary. All that he comes before the master for is the charges for his maintenance and establishment. Now, Sir, what is, in these circumstances, the obvious right and the plain duty of the master? It is to obtain full control over the salaries of his own servants and make them responsible to himself. What is done here is that the master is asked simply to sanction the charges and expenditure necessary for the establishment of the agent to enable him to carry on his work. The master says, "No, I shall have nothing to do with it unless you, the agent, become responsible to me for everything that you do; and so long as that responsibility is not established you shall have nothing from me." Now, Sir, I ask, is there any way other than the one I have adopted of standing upon that right for the master, whose representatives we are in this House? (*Mr. K. Ahmed*: "By reducing the amount.") My Honourable friend, Mr. Kabeerud-Din Ahmed says 'by reducing the amount', and he shakes his head with the confidence that is born of ignorance. Reduction of a grant means that you approve of the remainder of the grant; reduction of the grant means that you are taking exception to some matter of policy to which you draw attention and that you do not mean to dismiss the servant. I stand here on behalf of those who have elected me to demand the instant dismissal of the servant who is not responsible to me. (*Mr. K. Ahmed*: "Can you manage without them?") I may or may not be able to manage, but that is my right and I am here to assert it. Sir, I cannot understand how any cut, however large, can take the place of the motion that I am putting before this House. What I say is give us a Railway Board with responsibility to the Legislature or no Railway Board at all. How that question can be raised in any but the form in which I have raised it, I fail to understand. As I have said we have given our most anxious consideration to this question and I confess my inability to think of any other way more proper, more correct, than the one which I have adopted.

Now, Sir, as I have said, the one ground, the one constitutional ground upon which I rest my case is that the Railway Board not being responsible to us we have the right to withhold supplies until that responsibility is established. But I may be allowed a few minutes to show very briefly without going into details what have so far been the results of this irresponsibility of the Railway administration. The real question is one of principle; however competent, however good the management may be, if

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

the manager is not responsible to me, I say that I will not look into what he has done or what he can do unless and until he admits his responsibility to me. But there are things which have not been done well and not only not done well but so grossly mismanaged that they afford strong reasons why this state of irresponsibility should not be allowed to continue. Sir, the first and foremost thing which strikes one is that there has not been found one Indian capable of being admitted in this august body, the Railway Board, throughout the length and breadth of the country. It is said that no Indian with the necessary qualification is forthcoming. Is it not a sad commentary on your railway administration that during three-quarters of a century you have not been able to train one single Indian who can occupy the place of a member of the Railway Board? But I deny the fact. I do not admit that there is no Indian who is capable of doing as well as any other member of this Board. You say special knowledge is necessary. There is my old friend and enemy, the Honourable Mr. Sim. We have worked together in the old Minto-Morley Councils and I have had the pleasure several times of measuring swords with him in those Councils. He is to-day the Blakett of the Railway Board. Now, I want to know what special railway training has he ever received? Is there no Indian who could have taken his place? Leave alone the traffic engineering and other technical departments though there undoubtedly are Indians who are fully competent to take charge of them. To name only one, Sir M. Visveswaraya, a gentleman whose high authority was admitted by the Acworth Committee. It would be invidious to name others, but I am perfectly certain that there is no lack of men.

Then, Sir, what is the next? Your highest officers are quite out of touch with Indians and how have you safe-guarded the interests of Indians? The whole railway policy from its very inception has been a policy of exploitation. It began with a system of guaranteed railways. The time at my disposal will not permit my going into that, but I would refer the House to the very valuable chapter in Mr. Dutt's "Economic History of India," the chapter on Irrigation and Railways. They will find a full account of the exploitation of the country, of the motives which guided early railway policy and of the actual service or disservice done to the people. The real service certainly was not rendered to the master but to the exporter from England. (Mr. V. J. Patel: "They are the masters.") They are the real masters, there is no doubt. Sir, millions of rupees, millions of lakhs of rupees, I may say, have been paid simply as interest during the past years to those guaranteed railway companies. No doubt there was also some service done to the public in carrying them and in carrying their goods, but that was necessary in order to maintain the system and to keep the Railways going. Among the great benefits conferred by the British rule on India are Railways, Posts and Telegraphs. Now, Sir, that they do confer some benefit, no reasonable man can deny. But how can you help it? Do they not benefit you more? Where would you be without them? They are really intended to keep you here, that is the primary object. Having been established with that object these things have to be kept going, and they cannot be kept going unless they serve the public also.

Then, Sir, I come to the treatment of Indian passengers. Who in this House has not seen cases of gross ill-treatment of passengers in railway trains and at railway stations? Sir, in my younger days, I was an athlete—

I hope I have not yet lost all my strength. My friends of those days know how many tussles I have had—I did not believe in non-violence then—at railway stations and in Railway carriages when I came in conflict with some overbearing Britisher travelling with me. I have seen Indian passengers travelling by third class packed in railway trucks and wagons, not even like cattle, but like sardines. (*A Voice*: "Without any oil added to them") On this point, I will only draw attention to one passage in the Acworth Committee's Report at pages 54 and 55. This is what they say:

"So long as the present shortage of funds persists serious hardship is unavoidable. But when it comes to overcrowding as a constant everyday affair, carried to the length that members of the committee have seen with their own eyes—passengers by regular trains perched in the luggage racks and in suburban services hanging on outside or squatting on the steps of the coaches, it is another matter. Serious measures must be taken to deal with it."

The report further on says:

"We were told by the Agent of the East Indian Railway that the Railway Board had recently disallowed any capital expenditure, even to provide such things as installation of additional water supplies or erection of waiting sheds, as they did not directly improve the movement of traffic. Whatever the shortage of funds, we cannot think that if an order so sweeping as this was given it was in the general interest."

This the committee were told by the Agent of the East Indian Railway. It is a compliment paid by one of their subordinates to the Railway Board. All that the Railway Board is concerned with is the movement of the traffic, the helping of the importer and the exporter by carrying his goods from the various important ports at the sacrifice of the personal comfort of Indian passengers and at the sacrifice of the internal trade of the country:

"Whatever the shortage of funds, we cannot think that if an order so sweeping as this was given it was in the general interest."

That is putting it very mildly as of course the Acworth Committee was bound to do.

Then, Sir, we come to the fares. There was an all round enhancement for the first time, as far as I have been able to ascertain, in 1917. That enhancement was called a temporary enhancement and it was promised to be withdrawn after the war by Sir George Barnes in the debate which took place in March 1918. It has not been withdrawn to this day. Now, Sir, what is the explanation that has been given by my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes? He says that there is such an increase in the travelling public of the third class that there will be a great loss if any reduction is made. He says in his speech at page 9:

"If there were no increase of passenger traffic, even a reduction of half a pie per mile in 3rd class fares would cost us $4\frac{1}{2}$ crores of rupees. Secondly, even assuming that there was a large increase in passenger traffic, it is certain that we should not have sufficient coaching stock to carry the increased traffic."

It comes to this, that the gates of the slaughter-house are wide open; the sheep run into it without any effort being made to catch them or bring them in, and as long as they keep running into it, nothing further need be done.

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

Then, Sir, we come to the manipulation of freight rates. That has been done in a manner to prejudice, as I have already said, the Indian trade. And here I will read only a few lines from the Report of the Fiscal Commission.

“ Paragraph 127. Broadly speaking, the charge is that the rates are so framed as to encourage traffic to and from the ports at the expense of internal traffic. This means an encouragement of raw materials and to the import of foreign manufactures to the detriment of industries, which often have to pay what are described as unfair rates both on their raw materials transported from other parts of India and on their manufactured articles despatched to the various markets.”

Now, Sir, this was denied by the Railway Board. As to this denial the Fiscal Commission say in their Report:

“ We cannot believe that these complaints are entirely without foundation. In spite therefore of the sympathetic attitude of the Railway Board and in spite of the fact that this question has already been dealt with by two important Commissions within the last four years, we think it necessary to refer to the matter briefly in the hope of emphasising points which appear to be accepted generally in theory, but do not always seem to be translated into practice.”

In fact, it was pointed out in the complaints that actual conditions were quite inconsistent with the policy enunciated in the Railway Board Circular. These complaints were made to the Railway Committee in 1921 and again to the Fiscal Commission in 1922. For further information I would refer the House to the speech made by Sir Vithaldas Thakersey in the debate which took place in the old Legislative Council in the year 1912.

Now, Sir, we have had Resolutions about the grievances of railway employees, we have had the sleepers scandal discussed, we have had the locomotive industry absolutely destroyed simply by an act of breach of faith on the part of the Railway Board. I would refer the House to page 173, paragraph 19 of the Tariff Board's Report on the protection of steel where they deal with the last mentioned matter. A company to manufacture locomotives came into existence on the assurance of the Railway Administration that a certain number of locomotives would be ordered every year but that undertaking was never kept though it was on the strength of that assurance, as the Tariff Board found, that this company was able to raise its capital.

Then, Sir, there is the stores purchase policy. I will not go into it at any length. I find an amendment by my friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas on the subject. But I shall tell the House the most recent thing that I have heard. It is that, after giving a bounty to the Tata's on rails, some Railways,—I think they are the East Indian Railway and the Bengal Nagpur Railway—are buying continental rails at prices somewhat lower than Tata's. Now, Sir, it is a matter of history that, whenever there was competition between English steel and continental steel, English steel was preferred although it was dearer than the continental steel. But when there is competition between continental steel and Indian steel, then the plea is put forward, we must go to the cheapest market. Is it not possible to adjust the prices in some way between the Railways and the manufacturers in India? But who cares?

Then, Sir, I come to the recommendations of the Lee Commission being adopted by the Railway Board in anticipation of Government sanction. My friend, Sir Charles Innes, says at page 4 of his speech:

"I should also mention that 26 lakhs have been provided in the Budget for the cost of extending to officers of Company Railways the Lee Commission concessions with effect from 1st April last. We have thought it prudent to make this provision in the Budget, but I must make it plain that it has not yet been decided whether these benefits should be conferred on the officers of Company Railways in whole or in part. It is a question which still has to be considered by the Government of India and the Secretary of State. If allowance be made for these additions to our expenditure, it will be seen that we hope to keep the direct cost of operation, if anything, below this year's figures."

Now, Sir, what does that come to? Here is our Agent in our commercial concern. He takes it upon himself to assume the rôle of the prudent manager and to assign no less a sum than 26 lakhs of rupees in order to make the recommendations of the Lee Commission applicable to company officers. Now, I ask the House whether it was possible for these officers ever to dream of claiming any such allowance from the companies which employed them? Is it prudent management by the agent on behalf of the principal to throw away the principal's money by giving advantages to the servants who neither under the terms of their employment nor under any code of justice, equity or good conscience are entitled to it?

Then, Sir, there is the age-old complaint of the Indianisation of the Services. There have been some steps taken, I know, but would not one expect, at this time of day when the Railway Administration has been working for the last three-quarters of a century, that the whole of the railway staff would be manned by Indians? You began too late. My friend, Sir Charles Innes, says that a new spirit is abroad now. I thank him for the new spirit, though I do not know whether to thank him or the spirit. But why did not that spirit come a long time ago instead of only just coming into existence? And even now we have only an assurance that it has come. I know that the time since September last has been short. The Resolution we passed in the September session about Indianisation has been treated in the speeches of my friend, Sir Charles Innes, and my friend the Chief Commissioner of Railways, whom I welcome on his re-entry in this House to-day, as being no part of the September convention as it is called. It was certainly as good a Resolution of the House as any other. You say, we have not had time to act upon that Resolution. Well, I ask when will the time come? Is there again a paucity of men? I do not overlook, Sir, what has been stated in the official speeches that I have just referred to about the new institutions that have recently been founded. But my case is that these institutions should by this time have become old institutions and should have turned out thousands of qualified men. Now, Sir, I will not go into any other matters specifically relating to the activities of the Railway Board. All I want to show is that the instances I have given are instances not of slight or carnal negligence but of culpable negligence and persistent disregard of the interests of the employer by the agent. Here we are in this House representing the principal. Here is the Agent, who does not admit any responsibility to the principal. These are the acts which have been done by the Agent, all to the detriment of the Indian tax-payer. What is the master to do with such an agent?

Sir, there are about 200 cuts on the various demands which have been proposed in the various motions before the House. They are really 200

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

arguments in support of the motion which I have the honour to move before you. I need not go into them in detail but, if Honourable Members who have proposed those cuts believe in them, if they believe that they are reasonable, I fail to see, Sir, how they can say that the motion I have now the honour to move is not reasonable. If the administration of the Railway Board has been such as to merit all the censure that these motions imply, I say that Railway Board must go and give place to a better and a more responsible one.

Sir, these are the reasons upon which I ask the House to vote with me upon this motion. I beg the House to consider very seriously the position which has arisen. What is the remedy? Do you approve the railway policy which is followed by the Railway Board or do you not? How can any Member of this House who does not endorse the policy of the Railway Board vote against my motion I for one fail to understand. Is it not true that an adverse vote on this motion means the approval of the general policy of the Railway Board? (*Cries of "No".*) I shall wait to hear the reason for that "no". How can you possibly have the effect given to your motion which my motion is intended to bring about by merely moving cuts. That is the old, old habit of a time when this Assembly and the provincial Councils had quite a different set of gentlemen to represent their constituencies. The time has gone by. If you are not going to do it now when are you going to do it? One objection that I have heard mentioned in the lobby is "Well, the General Budget is coming. This is a matter really upon which you have to censure the Government of India. Wait for the General Budget and then you can take such action as you think necessary." Now, Sir, I say that that is a wholly incorrect view of the procedure. If the Railway policy is not to be criticised on the Railway Budget, I submit that the time for criticising it will never come. The framers of the Demands have attached a note to those Demands and they indicate that any cut or criticism based upon the general railway policy is to be brought under Demand No. 1, the Railway Board. I want to know what is the measure of the cut which represents a mild censure, that which amounts to drawing attention to a minor matter of policy and that which draws attention to a major principle. Is everything to be done under Rs. 100 cuts? Does it not imply, I say again, that you do not object to the very principle upon which the Railway Board is exercising its irresponsible authority? However, Sir, it is a matter on which my friends are entitled to have their own opinions. I am entitled to have my own opinion.

Mr. K. Ahmed (Rajshahi Division: Muhammadan Rural): Whom would you trust and place in charge of the Railways?

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Mr. K. Ahmed.

Mr. K. Ahmed: I beg to decline. I would rather have faith in Government than trust the Swarajists who are an irresponsible body.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Now, Sir, before I sit down, let me make one more appeal to the Honourable Members of this House. So far as the Swaraj Party is concerned, I need make no appeal. The Swaraj Party has considered the matter. The Swaraj Party has definitely and deliberately approved of the motion that I have put before this House and the Swaraj Party will of course as one man vote in support of it. But I ask

Members, who are not members of the Swaraj Party, to consider very carefully whether it is or it is not the case that the railway policy followed by the Railway Board deserves the severest condemnation. If it does, then what action is possible, what action is conceivably adequate than the one I have taken? Remember, I say again, that every single vote cast against my motion is a vote of approval of the railway policy. (*Voices: "No."*) It is. My friends may laugh at it as something very ridiculous. I say that they appear to me to be most ridiculous when they say "No, no." But when you say "I will do the same thing by touching up the Railway Board with a feather; why do you take up this big stick?" I say, "Because the Railway Board deserves the stick and not the feather."

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Will you be able to smash it?

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Give it. Let me try.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: Quite so. Give it.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Now, Sir, I need not engage in this desultory conversation. I have had my say and of course Honourable Members will have their say. But I do ask them, and I seriously ask them, to consider and weigh carefully all the consequences which flow from an adverse vote upon my motion.

Mr. President: Motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Railway Board' be omitted."

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated: Labour Interests): May I rise to a point of order, Sir? My point of order is this. The Honourable Pandit has moved a motion as a censure on the Railway Board. Is it open to a Member to move an amendment to his motion reducing the grant by Re. 1 as a vote of censure?

Mr. President: The Honourable Member will observe that there are various motions for reduction on the paper. I must put them one by one.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: My point was that it will facilitate discussion. There are many people who want to condemn the whole policy of the Railway Board. But we do not approve of the method which the Honourable Pandit has adopted.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member (Pandit Motilal Nehru) has chosen to give the Assembly an opportunity of taking the extreme course of cutting out the whole of the Railway Board vote. If the Honourable Member approves of the Pandit's arguments he will vote with him.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes (Member for Commerce and Railways): Sir, we have been treated to a spectacle which has not been uncommon in this Session. That is a spectacle of the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru labouring heavily, the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru speaking against his own convictions. His speech, Sir, reminded me . . .

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I did not. My friend has no right to say that.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: That, Sir, was the impression that the Honourable Pandit's speech left on me.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: It is a wrong impression.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: His speech, Sir, reminded me . . .

Mr. Chaman Lall (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): May I ask, Sir, whether your ruling is not definite on this point that no Honourable Member of this House has any right whatsoever to question the *bona fides* of any other Member of this House?

Mr. President: I did not understand the Honourable Commerce Member to question the *bona fides* of the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru. I do not think so.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: As I was going to say, Sir, the Honourable Pandit's speech reminded me of two lines of a poem by Tennyson. The lines are as follows:

"The sounds had little meaning,
Though the words were strong."

Sir, I must confess that I received notice of this motion with a considerable sense of disappointment, because, it seems to me that this motion, if accepted by this House, will mean that the House is going to resile from the position which it took up in September last. If there was any meaning in the convention which the House agreed to in September last, it was this. In the first place, the House wanted the Railways to be treated more or less as a commercial proposition. In the second place, when we discussed this convention in September last, I think the House felt a very great responsibility to the people of this country for the Railway Budget. The House at that time recognised that the Railway Budget means expenditure of some 92 crores. One of the points on which Honourable Members during that debate in September last laid most stress was that this House should have more time for the consideration of the various Railway Demands for Grants. In pursuance of what we regarded as the express wish of the House we have done our very best to put up the Railway Budget in a form before this House which will facilitate discussion, and which will enable this House to raise every point on which they desire to criticise the administration of the Railway Board. What is the result? The first demand that we have put forward the Honourable Pandit proposes to reject altogether.

12 Noon. That is the demand for the Railway Board. The Honourable Pandit did not suggest for a moment, he did not pretend, that he did not require the Railway Board, for every one must admit that for the efficient management of our Indian railway system we must have what His Excellency the Viceroy called last year "a general staff up at headquarters." But the Honourable Pandit proposes to cut out the entire provision for the Railway Board. And why? He mentioned a certain number of what he called grievances. Well, Sir, what will be the effect if this motion is carried? Most of these grievances are dealt with in motions which are down on the paper in regard to Demand No. 1. The effect of this motion if carried is that the House will deprive itself of the opportunity of discussing in detail each and every one of those grievances. (*Cries of "No, no."*) That is to say, if the Honourable Pandit's motion is accepted, this House is going deliberately to gag itself (*Cries of "No."*) and I for one protest against a party, which I believe is numerically the strongest party, using its power to gag the House and deprive it of the liberty of speech. (*Interruptions by some Honourable Members.*) Why is he going to do it? He is going to do it, as he admitted himself, purely

for a political reason—that is, “grievances before supply.” (*Voices*: “No, no.”) Let me quote what the Honourable Pandit himself has said. He said:

“I will not look into what you have done or what you propose to do unless you admit your responsibility to us. (*Pandit Motilal Nehru*: ‘Quite right’.) I look at this fact that the Railway Board is an irresponsible body, not responsible to the Legislature and the salary of the Board is not votable.”

Is the Railway Board responsible for that? (*A Voice*: “Are we responsible for that?”) Why drag in politics into a purely railway question? Let us examine a little further this question of grievances before supply. Let the Honourable Pandit be at least consistent. He is going in for this principle of grievances before supply. Then let him throw out the whole of the Railway Budget. And let me go further. Every one of our Demands for Grants will have to be thrown out one by one, and then we on the Railway Board will be able to go back and do our job. I suggest that we should not make a farce of the discussion on the Railway Budget. (*Cries of* “No, no.”) And what does the Honourable Pandit wish to do? Let me go still further. What is the meaning of grievances before supply? If the Honourable Pandit were consistent he would refuse supplies in every Department of the Government of India. Then if he brought the administration to a standstill, his logical course would be for the Honourable Pandit to retire to Allahabad, collect his Swarajist hosts and then His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and the Honourable Pandit would have it out in the field of battle. But that is not what the Honourable Pandit means. He knows perfectly that we cannot get on without the Railway Board and he knows perfectly well . . .

Pandit Motilal Nehru: May I rise to a point of order . . .

Mr. President: I do not object to reasonable interruption, but it is perfectly obvious that no Member in this House can put forward his arguments properly in the face of a constant fire of interruption. The Honourable Pandit himself, being the leader of a great party in this House, ought to be the first to extend due tolerance to Members of Government.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: May I rise to a point of explanation? The Honourable Sir Charles Innes is hopelessly misrepresenting me in everything that he has said. He has said that I would do without a Railway Board. I never made any such suggestion; on the contrary I said that we can do without an irresponsible Railway Board and that we want a responsible Railway Board.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: As the Honourable Pandit himself has admitted, the only effect of this motion, if carried, would be that he will compel the Governor General in Council to restore the provision. He knows perfectly well that that will be the only result, and therefore the gesture is, I say, a perfectly meaningless one. We shall have to restore the grant and the only effect of this motion would be that the House will deprive itself of a legitimate and proper opportunity of criticising the details of our administration. (*A Voice*: “That is not so.”) There are numerous motions down on paper to-day, many of them motions of great importance. We on the Railway Board, whatever the House might think, welcome healthy and proper criticism and we welcome this opportunity of discussing these matters on the floor of this House. But here you have the Honourable Pandit proposing to deprive us and deprive the House

[Sir Charles Innes.]

of those opportunities for discussion. Sir, I am not going at this stage into any individual grievances to which the Honourable Pandit made allusion. It may be that some Honourable Members will get up and in support of the Pandit refer to those individual grievances. I say that the proper time to discuss those grievances is on the connected motions dealing with those grievances and that we cannot discuss them properly on a general motion of this kind. Therefore I wish to make one short appeal to the House. I say that those who believe in meaningless gestures of this kind, let them go with the Honourable Pandit into his lobby. But every Member of this House, who believes that this House is responsible to the people of India, who believes that this House exists for free discussion of points of administrative importance, and every Member who believes in the rights of minorities and liberty of speech will follow me into the Government lobby.

Mr. Chaman Lal (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, during the course of several months that I have had the honour of being a Member of this House I have not listened to a speech more provocative, more meaningless and more absurd than the speech that has just fallen from the lips of the Honourable the Commerce Member. The Honourable the Commerce Member, if he will pardon a very common expression, was talking through his hat when he said that the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru is depriving the House of an opportunity of discussing this question on the floor of this House by moving his amendment to omit the whole grant under Demand No. 1. Where does he get it from? Where does the Honourable the Commerce Member get this argument from? I would like to challenge him to prove this statement which he has made on the floor of this House that the Honourable Pandit is depriving us of the right to debate this question. What we have the right to debate is the policy pursued by the Railway Board and the Honourable Pandit by making his motion is giving us an opportunity to discuss this very question.

The Honourable the Commerce Member wants the Swaraj Party led by the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru to go to Allahabad, raise an army and fight it out with the British Government led by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief. Is this the view that you take of the fight that we are waging against you? Is this not an encouragement that you yourselves are giving to the revolutionaries in India? (*A Voice*: "They are breeding revolutionaries".) No. There they are on the Government benches—there sit the revolutionaries (pointing to the Government benches). What should be your business? It should be this, you should stand up and justify your policy. Are you or are you not an irresponsible body? Have you or have you not done the right thing by India? (*A Voice*: Has he denied it?) He does not deny it because he cannot deny it. He has no arguments with which to deny it. I have been told that the grievances with regard to the Railway Board can be discussed upon their individual merits. One very important question that the Honourable Pandit has raised is the question of Indianisation. What has the Honourable Member for Commerce to say about Indianisation? What did his colleague sitting there on his left say in another place about Indianisation? Here in this House the Government know that we are the representatives of the people and so the Honourable the Commerce Member gets up and puts in a whole paragraph in his speech about Indianisation. What does his colleague do in the other House? He knows that the Government have got

a clear majority in that House and not one word was said about Indianisation there. Have you justified your policy? I will take this one point of Indianisation. You have given us certain facts and figures in your speech. You say that 80 more Indians have been taken into your Department. I challenge your statement. It is mere eyewash, it is a misleading statement, it is a question of *suggestio falsi* and nothing more than that. If you take your own list—take the Railway Board itself; that body of financial priests and pandits, that body of commercial maulanas. What do you find? There are three Members, one Chief Commissioner, five Directors, 7 Deputy Directors, 9 Assistant Directors and one Secretary. How many of these gentlemen are Indians? Not one. There are two Assistant Deputy Directors who are Indians, but I believe both of them are holding merely officiating appointments, minor appointments. Every one of the other posts goes to the European. Let me take Government Inspectors. There are 8 Government Inspectors. How many of them are Indians? You are aiming at 75 per cent. Indianisation. Out of 8 Government Inspectors not a single Inspector is an Indian, and their salary ranges from Rs. 1,375 to Rs. 2,150. There are three Inspectors recruited from the Engineers and if you challenge me and say there are no competent Indians I say from this particular cadre you can get as many Indians as you like but you do not want to find them. I come to the question of the Agents' Department. Let me give the House a little quotation. A question was put in this House on the 6th September 1922 by Lala Girdharilal Agarwalla:

“How many Indians are members of the Railway Board. If none or very few, why are not Indians taken in as representatives on the Railway Board?”

The answer was given by Colonel Waghorn:

“As the Honourable Member is already aware none of the three members of the Railway Board are Indians because the Railway Board is recruited almost invariably from the Agents of the Railways and no Indian has ever risen to the post of a Railway Agent.”

Mr. President: The question of appointing Indians in the Railway Board comes up under another head.

Mr. Chaman Lal: Very well, Sir. I will defer my remarks as regards Indianisation to the other demands that will come up later on. I do want the Honourable the Commerce Member to realise that when we are asking you here on the floor of this House to refuse supplies we are utilising a weapon in our hands which is perfectly constitutional. I do not want to be taught my constitutional history either by the Honourable the Commerce Member or any other Member on the floor of this House. I know perfectly well that it is a legitimate weapon that we can employ. It is a weapon that is employed in every stage of political development in every country in the world. If you turn round and say, “No, you shall not. You are gagging us. You are stopping us from discussing this question”, simply because we raise this constitutional question, I say to you that you are merely begging the issue. All we are doing is to give you an opportunity to meet us, to ask you to come forward with your arguments as to why you should not be thrown bag and baggage out of this irresponsible position that you have taken up. We are demanding nothing more than this—that our rights should be given to us, that we should be made responsible in the governance of our own affairs. You are not doing that. You sit there and talk of war. You sit there and talk of revolution. We do not want war.

Mr. T. C. Goswami: They want it, they are crying for it.

Mr. Chaman Lal: We do not want a sanguinary revolution. We strive for a peaceful revolution. We do not want to be threatened with your armies. We do not want to be threatened by your Commander-in-Chief. I would ask you to realise that we, as representatives of the people of this country, are demanding certain rights which are our birthright and that we mean to have them.

Mr. T. E. Moir (Madras: Nominated Official): Sir, it had not been my intention to take part in this debate and I should not have risen to address the House if it had not been for what has been to me the entirely unexpected situation which has arisen.

Pandit Shamlal Nehru: Created by?

Mr. T. E. Moir: Further the Honourable Pandit has issued an invitation to all Members of this House to follow the attitude which he has adopted. I should like to give in a few words the reasons which would prevent me, even if I were as free and irresponsible as he is, from following his advice.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: My invitation was not meant for the Honourable Member.

Mr. T. E. Moir: The Honourable Pandit's speech divides itself into two parts. I propose to deal briefly with the second part in which he raised various grievances connected with the Railways. Now, when he did that, he was merely stealing other people's thunder and I do not propose to touch on any of these particular points. As regards that part of his speech I shall refer only to one point as an example of the manner in which the Honourable Pandit attempts to mislead the House. He said why is it that you have introduced Railways into this country, the Telegraphs and the Postal Department—in order that you may keep control over it. This Assembly itself is an answer to that suggestion. Here you have the Honourable Mr. Patel from Bombay, the Honourable Pandit himself from Allahabad, Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar from Madras. . . .

Pandit Shamlal Nehru: And Mr. Moir from England.

Mr. T. E. Moir: If it were not for the railways, we would not be able to watch the Honourable Mr. Patel cracking his whip and see the Honourable Pandit dance while Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar pipes. If it were not for the Telegraphs the Honourable Pandit would not be able to send out S. O. S. messages all over the country to gather his flock here to defeat the Government.

Pandit Shamlal Nehru: May I inform the Honourable Member that if the Government were reasonable the Honourable Pandit would not require telegrams to be sent at all.

Mr. T. E. Moir: If there were no post office the Honourable Pandit's speech will not be published and distributed in a few days from one end of the country to the other. And yet he accused the Government who have introduced all these unifying agencies of having done so with the express purpose of retaining their autocratic control over this country. The argument is too puerile. But it is not in that part of his speech that the Honourable Pandit has really spoken his mind. What he has really done is to ask us not to discuss railway grievances but to repeat this year the action which at his instigation was taken by this House last year

and thereby to produce a state of affairs which, if it were not for the existence of certain checks and counter-checks, would paralyse the administration. Now I think I have a right to ask the Honourable Pandit what purpose he thinks would be served by this action. He succeeded in inducing the House to adopt it last year. Who has benefited? Has India benefited? Has the cause of Swaraj benefited? Has any single matter in which this House is interested been advanced one little bit by the action which was taken last year? I say No. A cynical judge once remarked that marriage was a misfortune that might happen to any one, but that for bigamy there could be no excuse, and I would ask the Honourable Member and his party what advantage they think is going to accrue to any one by this dull, monotonous uninspired repetition of an action which entirely failed, when first performed, to have any effect. The Honourable Pandit is like a magician who fails to produce the egg from the chicken and says, "Give me another chicken and I will produce an egg". He is a magician with a broken wand, and I do not think the House will pay any further attention to his *mantrams*. But I should like the House seriously to consider one aspect of this question. We are now, I think I am right in saying, entering upon the discussion of the fifth Central Budget since the Reforms, and as the Honourable the Commerce Member has pointed out, the very first motion which is brought forward is in essence one: that the Budget should be thrown out, not merely the Railway Budget, but the whole Budget. That is to say the Honourable Pandit would throw out the whole Budget and wreck our whole financial proceedings if he can get a sufficient number of Members to vote with him. Last year, having only recently been at home, I ventured to place before the House some considerations which I thought it would be as well if they paid attention to as to the effect such action would have on opinion at home. Whatever Mr. Chaman Lall may say, you cannot afford to ignore that opinion. Circumstances took me home again last year and I found that my anticipations were more than justified, and I will say this, that I cannot conceive of anything more disastrous to a sympathetic consideration of any claims that India has than on such an occasion, at the very beginning of the fifth Budget to be introduced in this House since the Reforms, the House should still show that it can be swayed by those whose sole object is to wreck the administration. If the House does follow the Honourable Pandit's advice, it will reduce to despair the friends of reforms, both here and in England. I would ask them to refuse to follow the lead of these die-hards—it is the only word I can apply to them. They have only one idea; they are incapable of learning. They move about in blinkers in worlds not realised. Sir, I would hardly have taken the trouble to place before this Assembly warnings which have been given again and again to this House by others far more capable of doing so than myself, but I have one interest in this Railway Budget. Never yet since Railway Budgets of any kind were first introduced has such favourable consideration been shown to the claims of my own province in railway matters. I have found from bitter experience that, when this House adopts wrecking tactics, it is my province that has to pay the penalty (laughter) and for that reason alone I must protest against a motion such as that introduced by the Honourable Member. I must appeal to the House to allow the discussion of this Budget to proceed on normal lines and to refuse to follow what I regard as the pernicious and disastrous lead given to it by the Honourable Pandit from Allahabad.

Pandit Sham Lal Nehru: I move that the question be now put.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muham-
madan Urban): Sir, it was with a certain amount of surprise that I
listened to the speech of the Honourable the Commerce Member. I was
surprised because there was not his usual balance. He was thrown off
his balance apparently by Pandit Motilal Nehru's speech. But, Sir, when
the Commerce Member reminded the politicians in this House of the Com-
mander-in-Chief, of fighting the Swarajists with the Commander-in-Chief
at the head of the bureaucratic forces, I was reminded of the beginnings
of British rule in this country. Sir, the Englishmen came to this country
as traders. They went to other countries as "sea-dogs" and rovers.
They went to Egypt as money-lenders, and to our country they came as
shopkeepers! This "nation of shopkeepers," as Napoleon contemptuously
described the English opened their shops in this country and closed down
our own. Sir, they put an end to all the industrial and commercial activities
of this country by using the political weapon. I would ask the Honourable
the Commerce Member to read the history of India written by his own
countrymen. I would ask him to read the book written by Horace Wilson
in which he has clearly stated how the political weapon, the political arm
of injustice, was used to destroy the commercial and industrial activities of
our people. And now he comes to us and says, ignore political reasons,
put aside political considerations; the commercial question, the railway
question stands on its own legs. Sir, that is a policy which politicians in
this House cannot accept for a moment. You cannot divide politics from
railways; you cannot divide politics from commerce. The British politics,
the British administration, the British bureaucracy sits like a nightmare on
every department in the country. It sits like a nightmare also on the
railway administration; and therefore when you tell us, do not think of
political considerations I know that you are trying on us one of those
bureaucratic tricks. When you separated the Railway Budget from the
General Budget you knew that new forces have come to this Assembly.
Here I may remind the Honourable Member for Madras when he talks of
normal things and thinks of normal times that we are not living in normal
times, we are living in very abnormal times, because Indians have come to
realise that foreign rule, good or bad, cannot be so good as Indian rule and
we want to rule not only politically speaking but commercially speaking.
Sir, you have cut away our commercial arm when you introduced British
rule in India and unless we get back our commerce in our own hands,
unless we get back our industries in our own hands, unless we assume
charge of the administration of our railways and everything connected with
it, unless and until we do that, there can be no prosperity, there can be
no peace, there can be no contentment. The Honourable the official
Member from Madras and all those who think with him will do well to
bear in mind that Indians are prepared to come into their own and that
they are prepared to fight all the forces that stand in the way of their
rights and liberties. We take our stand, Sir, on our constitutional right,
on our natural right, our inalienable right, and a foreign people have no
business to deprive us of our right. We concentrate to-day on the Rail-
way Board, because it is from the Railway Board that the poison of racial
discrimination emanates. It is because of this poisonous policy of the
Railway Board that the domination of the Europeans still prevails. Go
through the Railway Budget anyone of you, go through the number of
railway employees in India occupying the higher posts, and you will find
that they are a European monopoly. The Railway Board certainly is a
European monopoly. The Indian voice, as I said the other day, is never

heard in the Railway Board. There are no Indians there. And when we present in this House the legitimate claims and grievances of our people you treat us like so many schoolboys. "The liberty of speech" to which the Honourable the Commerce Member alluded would only remind one of the Greek Chorus! Liberty of speech indeed! When our speeches are futile because you make them futile! You want us like so many babies to play at this speechifying and then to wait as so many mendicants screaming for alms at the doors of the Railway Board. That is what you want us to do; but, Sir, times have changed. (Turning to the Honourable Commerce Member). When you came to our country, when you came to Malabar,—which has not forgotten you, your old friends are proud of you, the high position you occupy to-day,—when you came to this country, the times were different. It was a quarter of a century ago. Indians have since risen from their sleep. Bureaucratic administration in the beginning managed to keep us quiet. Sir, we were then so many willing victims of autocratic rule; but owing to your own excesses as well as to your own education, English education I mean, imparted to our people, partly because of that and partly because of bureaucratic excesses, they have risen from their sleep. Times have changed; and therefore I would ask the Honourable the Commerce Member not to think that he is living in the nineteenth century. He is living at a time when people are prepared to take their stand on their rights and to fight for their rights. It is that stand we are taking to-day. I do not want to go into details, but I want to place on record, we the Swarajists want to place on record, that we do not propose to treat the Railway Department or any other department in charge of the Government in a manner different from the Home Department. I see the Honourable the Home Member shaking his head. I admit, Sir, it is the recognition of a fact that the Home Department and the Commerce Department are tarred with the same brush. There is no question here of hatred, Sir, no question of personal indignity offered to any Member on the other side, but here is certainly a question of taking our stand on our national rights and our national dignity and fighting for the national cause. The perpetuation of the present constitution of the Railway Board, the perpetuation of their irresponsibility, of that want of response to popular aspirations which permeates the Railway Board—that perpetuation, Sir, is a wrong to Indians, and if you want to take the Indian people with you, you must be prepared to concede to them what is due to them? If, on the other hand, you take your stand on the final appeal of all constitutions, of all Western constitutions, the appeal to force, then you can only remind us of the Commander-in-Chief. But the Honourable the Commerce Member shaking his hand towards me seems to suggest that he did not mean that. Am I right, Sir? Did you want to meet us with the Commander-in-Chief, face us with unconstitutional militarism?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: May I explain for the Honourable Member's benefit, Sir, that I was merely pointing out what should be the logical consequence of the doctrine, "grievances before supplies".

Mr. O. S. Ranga Iyer: I thank the Honourable the Commerce Member for his explanation, but his explanation requires another explanation. The doctrine of grievances before supplies must be known to every Englishman and also the manner in which it was pressed into service in America. They fought you because you did not listen to them. That same question was raised in America. They raised it in an unconstitutional manner.

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

They did not raise it in the Assembly of America. We are raising it here in a constitutional manner and I believe the Honourable the Commerce Member recognises it. We are not out to-day for a revolution if you do not force us to a revolution, if you do not goad us to a revolution. If the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru brings forward this motion to-day it is because he is anxious to save the country alike from the bureaucratic revolutionaries and the popular revolutionists. If you do not concede to us what is our right in this railway matter, if you go on fighting us in the bureaucratic style, what do you think will happen? You will only destroy the constitutional forces. You will only destroy the faith of the people in the Swarajists; then there can be only two parties in the country, with the Commander-in-Chief as the leader of one party and the Anarchist General of Bengal as the leader of the other party, and the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru will share the fate that Mr. Redmond had to bear in Ireland. I know the Honourable the Commerce Member does not want a crisis. I know the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru is anxious to avoid a crisis, and therefore the only proper attitude for the Government to take up is not to play into the hands of the irresponsible forces in the country but to consider the purpose, the principle, the fundamental right involved in the Swarajist attitude. Sir, I do not want to take up any more time of this House but I do want to appeal to my Independent friends not to make a party question of this. I am not using any language of threat, for we have got to live together, to fight together and to get on together. We have come down for the sake of the Independents from our great heights. We have met them half-way. (A voice: "Question?") An Independent questions me, but I am sure he knows the answer. He has not been absent from the Party meetings. But Sir, when we have met the Independents half-way and more than half-way, I will only ask them to consider whether it is proper for them to make this a party question against the Swarajists and to fight them in this matter. There is nothing in this against the Independents, there is everything in this making for the independence of the Railways from the iron hands of an alien bureaucracy. If the Independents want to give a longer lease of life to the present administration of the Railway Board, then I am afraid they will vote with the Honourable Commerce Member. If, on the other hand, they understand aright what we stand for and strive for and struggle for, then they will vote with us. (Pandit Shamlal Nehru: "Why don't you appeal to the Government Benches?") My friend, Pandit Shamlal Nehru, rather unwittingly says; "Why not appeal to the Government Benches also?" I would have appealed to the Government Benches, had I not listened to the speech of the Commerce Member and the speech of the official Member from Madras. I have yet to listen to the speech of Mr. Jinnah and Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas; if I had listened to their speeches, Sir, I might not have indulged in the luxury of an appeal.

Pandit Shamlal Nehru: Sir, I move that the question be now put.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, on this question I regret very much indeed that there is a difference of opinion between our Swarajist friends and ourselves. I have the greatest regard for Pandit Motilal Nehru and it is a pleasure always to work with him. But on this question we differ. I will place my reasons once more on the floor of this House before my Swarajist friends, including my friend the last

speaker, Mr. Ranga Iyer. Sir, let us examine this question carefully. My friend, Pandit Motilal Nehru put it on three grounds. First, he said, grievances before supply; secondly he went into the details of various grievances against the policy and the administration of the Railways. Thirdly, he said that the Railway Board was irresponsible. Now, we have given this question our most careful and anxious consideration. We have therefore to consider, are we going to apply the first principle, namely, grievances before supply? Let us examine that on its true constitutional basis. We felt, Sir, that in order to enforce that principle historically, constitutionally, logically, we should have to answer Sir Charles Innes' question, which he put to us. (*Pandit Motilal Nehru*: "Did you do that last year?") I will answer that question. Sir, I do not wish to impart the slightest heat into this discussion; I want this question to be discussed on the floor of this House and I shall be very glad to answer any question. My friend, Pandit Motilal Nehru says that we did that last year. Sir, his question is perfectly pertinent and my answer is this. Supposing we thought that we were wrong last time, are we going to commit the same mistake again? (Hear, hear and laughter.) I think we all make mistakes, including my friend, Pandit Motilal Nehru. I am humble enough to admit here and proclaim it that I make mistakes. (*Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta*: "This might be another.") This might be another; but Mr. Jamnadas Mehta has never made a mistake in his life-time and I think he ought to be exported to a higher place. (*Mr. Jamnadas Mehta*: "And you to a lower one.")

Sir, just imagine the excitement that is created in some quarters if one takes a different view. Should we not discuss this question dispassionately? We find that it would not be the proper course to refuse supplies, first of all on the ground that if we adopt this policy—I do not say that the people are not entitled to adopt that policy—we must carry that policy out to its logical conclusion; and I, Sir, standing here with all the responsibility that I have to face, say that we are not in a position at present to carry out that policy to its logical consequence. (*Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar*: "Were you last year?") You were not and therefore you made a mistake. If I may quote the words of no less a person than Mr. Patel who occupies a place only second, (*A Voice*: "if second") if second, to Pandit Motilal Nehru in the Swaraj Party. He said, "We will go out into the country and start a campaign of non-payment of taxes." That was one of the logical consequences. (*An Honourable Member*: "Did he say that?") Yes, he did say that; I standing here at present am unable to endorse this policy.

Then, Sir, I am told that we should leave our Party free to vote as they like, and an appeal was made to me by the Honourable Member there (*Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer*). I ask him this question. If we, with all the careful consideration that we have given to this question, have with regret to differ from him—it is with genuine regret that we have to differ from him—and if we have come to this decision and if we are to leave our Party free to vote as they like, I ask, shall we not be shirking our responsibility? Do you want us to stand here neutral?

Pandit Motilal Nehru: No, follow your conscience.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: We are following our conscience absolutely.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Follow your own conscience, not the party conscience.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Why are you making it a party question yourself?

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I offer to release my party from all obligation in this matter.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: That is only when it suits Pandit Motilal Nehru. But, Sir, I ask him, I do appeal to him and I am sure that he will agree with me—at least I hope he will agree with me—what is the good of a party unless, when the party has come to a decision, a clear decision, that we cannot agree, we are going to enforce that decision of ours and make it a party question? What is the good of a party at all? I do not want to enter into any further arguments on this question; but I do maintain that it was due to the dignity, to the self-respect and to the responsibility that this party owes to itself that if it came to a clear conclusion on a particular issue it must have the courage of its conviction and make it a party question and not shirk it. I maintain and I repeat that that is the only honourable course for any party to take

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: May I rise to a point of order? We are not discussing about party questions here; the Government Benches are not certainly anxious to know what are party questions.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member should have raised that point when Mr. Ranga Iyer was on his feet.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I think I have really answered that point and I have nothing more to say on that.

Now let us take the second proposition of my friend Pandit Motilal Nehru. He described the grievances of the passengers, the sins of omission and commission on the part of the railway management, the Railway Board, Indianization of the services, discomforts of passengers, and so on and so forth. Now, Sir, all these things are very true indeed. But if those are the only grounds, if they are the real grounds, then I can understand our adopting the proper procedure for that purpose

Pandit Motilal Nehru: May I rise to a point of explanation. I rested my case entirely on the constitutional ground, and then mentioned certain facts to show how irresponsibly the Railway Board had conducted itself all these years. I did not go into each of the grievances, but only referred to them as illustrations of irresponsibility.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I understand that the argument is that we must dismiss the officials because this Board is irresponsible. Now, let us examine, Sir, the constitution of this Board.

Mr. Chaman Lall: Examine it.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I want my Honourable friend to have a little patience. He knows the constitution better than perhaps anybody else.

Mr. Chaman Lall: I have read it.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I grant him the credit of having read it last perhaps. I admit, Sir, I read it a long time ago, but I have worked it. Well, now, let us examine the constitution of the Railway Board. The Railway Board is entirely subject to the Government. I think that cannot be denied by any one who has read the constitution of that Board. (*A Voice:* "So is a Provincial Government.") Yes. The Railway Board, therefore, are nothing else but a set of servants who are employed on certain salaries, and

these servants constitute themselves into a body. But they are entirely under the control and the orders of the Government of India. (*A Voice*: "And the Secretary of State.") and the Parliament if you like. Now, says my friend Pandit Motilal Nehru that because the Government of India who are responsible (*A Voice*: "To whom?") If Honourable Members will allow me to finish, I shall answer them. Now it is said because the Government of India are responsible for the policy, programme and administration of the Railway Board, because they in their turn are responsible to the Secretary of State, because we have got a large number of grievances, because they have not been either attended to or satisfied or complied with, therefore we should dismiss a certain number of subordinate servants who have formed themselves into a Board and who are under the orders of somebody else who is responsible, if at all, to this Legislature. I can understand my friend Pandit Motilal coming forward and raising a question of a constitutional character and saying, "Here is a department of the Government of India that is responsible for all this and I will reject the vote so far as that particular department is concerned". But in your anger, you hit not the Government of India who are responsible, you reject an item which is intended to pay Railway servants

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): Where is the harm in hitting hard those who are nearest and dearest to the Government of India.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: If you are going to vote, Sir, on the constitutional question that you shall reject a vote on the highest salary, I think I should have to consider whose salary I should reject. There is a clear fallacy in the argument of my friend Pandit Motilal Nehru.

I will only say one more thing on this point. If we are going to consider the various grievances and the various complaints, we have got various motions tabled before us for that purpose.

Then, lastly, I will point out this. We, this Assembly, were a party to a convention between the Government and ourselves. That was only last September. Under that convention—I do not wish to read those terms because they must be fresh in the minds of Honourable Members—but under that convention we brought the railway administration under an altogether different category. The railway administration was intended by that convention to be commercialised, and we with the consent of the Government adopted that convention in which all the points which we now complain of were embodied, namely, Indianisation, an Indian Member on the Railway Board; all these matters were discussed only as recently as September last. For the first time after a few months my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes comes here and presents his report as if he is the Chairman of the Board. I assure you that I am far from satisfied with it. I assure you that the Honourable Sir Charles Innes will have to do a great deal before I shall get up in this House and say to him or to his successor that I am now satisfied with your policy, with your programme and with your administration. I entirely agree that there are innumerable grievances, in fact the grievances have accumulated, as Pandit Motilal Nehru himself pointed out, they have accumulated for more than a quarter of a century. (*A Voice*: "For more than three quarters of a century.") Now, what is the good, Sir, of raking up that old history, bare as it is. Now, give the Honourable Sir Charles Innes or his successor a chance under this convention and then let us see, and then apply your spur (*A Voice*: "Mercilessly") as mercilessly as you can.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Grievances before supplies, apply the spur mercilessly before supplies.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Give Sir Charles Innes a chance, and then apply your spur mercilessly. If you can do that, I shall be with you. Please drop your phraseology "grievances before supplies." (*A Voice:* "Why?") Because you don't agree to give a chance under this convention, and that is why I don't agree with you.

Mr. Jammadas M. Mehta (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Have you no grievances?

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I admit we have grievances, innumerable grievances, but I am not in a position to stand up here and approve of the policy of refusing supplies.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: You are playing with words.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Yes, I am playing with words. You better consult your colleague Mr. Chaman Lal who is the latest authority on the constitution. Therefore, I say that it will not be right for us to refuse supplies. All that we want is this. We entirely agree that there are innumerable grievances. We hope that these grievances will be discussed one after another, and I shall endeavour my best on such points as I may be able to understand to join in applying that spur to the Railway Member mercilessly.

Mr. V. J. Patel (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I had no intention to take part in this debate to-day, had not the 1 P.M. speech of my friend, Mr. Jinnah prompted me to rise. He made a reference to my speech when the Demands for Grants were considered last year at this time. He happened to say that I then stated that I would go out to the country and ask the people to go in for a movement of non-payment of taxes. I wish he had read my speech before he made that statement. (*Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer:* "Hear, hear. Mr. Jinnah never reads.") I will read the very words that I used:

"But are you prepared for the next step? What is that next step? Mass movement: non-payment of taxes. I hope my friend the Honourable the Home Member has not forgotten the mass movement of 1921. The Honourable the Home Member says that the country is not ready and my Honourable friend Mr. Pal also thinks so. I do not agree. Therefore we want you either to accede to our demands or to drive us to the mass movement."

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: That is exactly what I said.

Mr. V. J. Patel: Will you kindly follow. Don't be in a hurry:

"The responsibility will be yours. We shall refuse supplies. The Government of the country then will have to be carried on by veto and by certification. We go to our people and we place the facts before them. Why? For the matter of that, when I stood for election the very first sentence in my manifesto was, 'I stand as a candidate for the Assembly, and, if I be elected, I shall endeavour to the best of my capacity to embarrass and to obstruct the bureaucracy by all peaceful means, by all legitimate means, unless and until the national demands are conceded to the satisfaction of the Indian National Congress.'"

These are the words I used. What I wanted to convey was that we were here to obstruct the bureaucracy at every stage and at every step. (*Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal:* "Have you done it?") It is our misfortune that we are not able to do all that we are here for because my friend Mr. Pal and my friend Mr. Jinnah are here. (*Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal:* "Are you

† member of the Railway Board Committee?') Yes, I am a Member of the Railway Board Committee. (*Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal*: "Is that co-operation or non-co-operation?") My friend Sir Charles Innes said that he was surprised at this motion coming before this House. As a matter of fact, he had no business to be surprised. I in the Railway Finance Committee took this point and intimated that I would move in the Assembly for the reduction of the Railway Board demand. He knew it for days past that this motion was coming. There is, therefore, no reason for surprise. But what I wanted to convey last year was, Sir, that we would obstruct the Government at every stage and at every step and, if we could help it, we would compel the Viceroy to certify everything that comes up before this Assembly, the Bills, the Resolutions, and everything also. We would compel the Government to carry on this administration not with our consent but merely by veto and certification and having done that, it would be our duty to go to our people and tell them, "Here we are, we have done what we can. It is now for you to go in for a non-payment of taxes campaign." But as things stand, we have got friends amongst us who would not see eye to eye with us in the programme that we have chalked out, in the programme that we wanted to carry out, but, on the contrary, they advise us not to go forward, not on the ground that people are not prepared, but on the ground that ours is not a proper programme. I cannot understand how it cannot be called a proper programme. It is a constitutional method. One clear duty of the representatives of the people is to refuse supplies when the grievances are not redressed and a case has been made out by my friend, Pandit Motilal Nehru, clearly that the grievances are there, they are long-standing, and it is the duty of the representatives of the people, if they really represent them, to refuse supplies to this Government.

Now, Sir, my friend, Mr. Jinnah tried to distinguish the railway Administration from the rest of the administration. I tried to follow him as far as I could but unfortunately I have not been able to understand what he really wanted to convey to this Assembly. I do not know how one can distinguish the railway administration from any other part of the administration of this country in connection with the question of refusal of supplies. As a matter of fact, if my friend, Sir Charles Innes, was the Minister of Railways, I should not have thought of supporting Pandit Motilal Nehru. All that Pandit Motilal Nehru wants is that Sir Charles Innes should be responsible to this House. Sir Charles Innes is not responsible to this House. He represents the Railway Board in this House. That Railway Board is not responsible to this House. As my friend, Mr. Chaman Lall very rightly pointed out, a number of high officials on the Railway Board, the Chief Commissioner, Directors and Deputy Directors, are all appointed by the Secretary of State. Then again, going further down, all the Agents on the different Railways are appointed by the Secretary of State. Where is the responsibility to this Legislature at all? My friend, Mr. Jinnah, hinted that the Railway Board was responsible ultimately to this Legislature. I join issue with him. (*Mr. M. A. Jinnah*: "I never said that.") Very well, I am glad you did not say that. Mr. Jinnah said nobody is responsible to the Legislature. (*Mr. M. A. Jinnah*: "Even you are not.") Certainly not, I am not responsible to you but I am responsible to my constituency. And they have sent me here for a particular purpose and with a mandate. You are independent, and so you are not responsible to anyone. My friend, when the Demands for Grants were discussed last year, joined us in throwing out

[Mr. V. J. Patel.]

"Customs." Where was the sense in it? He joined us in throwing out "Salt." He joined us in throwing out the "Income-tax" demand. He joined us in throwing out the "Opium" demand. And now he comes forward and says; "No, Railway must be treated separately." And yet he holds out some hope to us that the matter of the General Budget he might think of doing something and joining us. What is that something. I cannot understand. As a matter of fact, my friend, Mr. Jinnah does not know what he wants to do. He does not know his own mind. I am not at all surprised at his attitude. From the time this Nationalist Party was formed, he was against the obstruction policy, but some how or other he thought he was being taken to the slaughter-house. (Laughter.) These are not my words: they are words which Mr. Jinnah himself used at the time when the divisions for all those four grants were taken. He actually said in so many words that it went against his grain to vote against these demands but he was being taken to the slaughter-house; he had committed himself and he had no option, and therefore this time he quietly tries to escape from the situation. As a matter of fact the Nationalist Party, by the very constitution under which it came into being, is bound to a policy of obstruction, once it is found that the national demands are not conceded. There has not been sufficient response to the Resolution passed by the Assembly last year and the Nationalist Party is bound to join the Swaraj Party in obstructing the Government. I will just read the relevant portion of that constitution:

"If the Government do not make a satisfactory response to the Resolution demanding reforms within a reasonable time, the party will then be bound to a policy of obstruction and will put the policy into operation at the earliest period when the Demand for Grants is made by the Government by refusing supplies."

According to this rule the Nationalist Party after waiting for a reasonable time to see if there is any satisfactory response to the Resolution regarding Reforms, are bound to throw out the Demands for Grants when they come up to the Assembly. This was done last year. The rule holds good even to-day and if there was any case for throwing out the Budget, at any time, it is 10 times stronger to-day than it was last year, and there is absolutely no reason why any Nationalist who has subscribed to this constitution should keep out from the policy that the Swaraj Party is pursuing to-day. We are in all honour bound to throw out every demand for grant. We are told, "What is the good of throwing out one demand under the Railway Board? If we are consistent, we should throw out the whole Budget." Quite so. I entirely agree.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: May I rise to a point of explanation, Sir? It is not correct to say that. The latest rules which have been adopted by the Nationalist Party lay down that with regard to the policy of obstruction and with regard to the refusal of supplies the two groups, namely, the Independent group and the Swarajist Party are free to decide as they please unless there is agreement between them.

Mr. V. J. Patel: Quite right. I entirely agree with my friend Mr. Jinnah that they have passed a recent rule giving freedom to each party to decide for itself whether to go in for obstruction or not. But when they had pledged themselves to a policy of obstruction once, why and how could they go in for a change? Because they did not want to go in for obstruction this year they managed to have the rule altered. The Swaraj Party

has no power to compel the independents to stick to their promise and agreement. As a matter of fact, they are bound in honour to abide by the original agreement by which they pledged themselves to obstruct. They cannot get out of it so long as there has not been satisfactory response on the part of Government. They are pledged to a policy of obstruction till then and no one can get out of it and no one should attempt to get the rule changed and then take shelter under that change. Perhaps in the opinion of my friend Government have responded.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: There is the Ordinance.

Mr. V. J. Patel: I forgot about the Ordinance. Perhaps that is response according to Mr. Jinnah. I cannot understand how any Member from Bengal can with any conscience really help the Government in carrying on the administration of this country in face of Ordinances and Regulations.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: I will borrow your conscience.

Mr. V. J. Patel: Wait, I will just quote you, my friend. (Laughter.) My friend Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal, when we were discussing the Demands for Grants last year, gave the following advice to us. He said:

"I do not believe in that. Those who believe in it, let them vote for it. I do not believe in this petulant futility; and therefore I cannot vote for Pandit Motilal's proposition. Neither can I vote with the Government, because I see that, if there is extreme unreasonableness on one side, there is equally extreme unreasonableness on the other side also."

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: Not on the Railway Budget.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Give him the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. V. J. Patel:

"When two unreasons fight each other, the safest thing for those who believe in their own reason and conscience is to sit tight in their own seats."

This was the position of my Honourable friend Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal last year. His position was that the Government were unreasonable, but that Pandit Motilal Nehru and his party were equally unreasonable, and therefore, he as a man of conscience would sit tight in his seat. I ask him, "Are the Government more reasonable to-day—more reasonable than the Swarajists?" That is what I want to know from him. The fact is that his own kith and kin have been taken into custody, and God knows where they are kept, without any trial under the Bengal Ordinance and the Bengal Regulation. Has the position in any way improved? Has he any kindly eye towards those friends, those Bengali brethren of his, or is he prepared to say to-day, "No, Government have become more reasonable and we are going to oppose Pandit Motilal Nehru." I once again remind him that last year he did not vote either with us or with the Government. I admire my friend Mr. Jinnah because he says he made a mistake last year. But I cannot understand how he can ask us to distinguish between the Railway administration and the administration of other Departments of Government.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I rise to a point of explanation. I think my Honourable friend misunderstood me. I did not say I made a mistake in the sense that I deliberately blundered, but I said I made a mistake in joining a party which laid down the decision which I was bound in honour to obey. I surrendered my judgment when I joined the party.

Mr. V. J. Patel: He took a prominent part in making the rule. Now he belongs to the Independent Party without surrendering his judgment! If by joining one party one has to surrender his judgment, then he should not belong to any party, and yet, to-day my friend is the leader of a party and he wants every member of that party to surrender his judgment to that party.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I do not think so.

Mr. V. J. Patel: You have made it a party question. My friend Pandit Motilal Nehru said that he was prepared to leave every member of the Swaraj party to vote according to his conscience. You on the contrary were not prepared to do so. You said that it would weaken your party. You wanted others to surrender their judgment. To-day you come forward and say that last year you made a mistake in surrendering your judgment. To-day you would like others to surrender their judgments but you would not like yourself to surrender your judgment. That is the position.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: May I rise to a point of explanation. If this question is allowed to be gone into, I think it right for me to be plain. Mr. Patel knows perfectly well that the Independent Party cannot make any question a party question, unless there is the requisite majority for it and that requisite majority and more than the requisite majority was there.

Mr. V. J. Patel: All the same, the minority has to surrender its judgment, whether it was a 3/4th majority or a 2/3rd majority or a 5/6th majority on the other side. My friend Mr. Jinnah had to surrender his judgment last year and he said he made a mistake. This year he says he would not like to surrender his judgment and therefore he has got the rule changed. Very good of him. But why does he expect his other friends to surrender their judgment to him in the Independent Party? That is the question I put to him.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: He need not belong to the party.

Mr. V. J. Patel: You belong to the Nationalist Party all the same and it is your duty if you are really a member of the Nationalist Party, if you really believe in the constitution which you yourself were a party to last year, to go in for obstruction with the Swarajists. You cannot get out of it. I was very glad to hear my friend Mr. Jinnah only the other day telling the benches opposite that he had no faith in the *bona fides* of Government while talking on the Resolution of my Honourable friend Mr. Raju. To-day he comes forward and asks us to give a chance to Sir Charles Innes. Why give a chance to Sir Charles Innes? To work the convention. Then why not give a chance to the whole Government to work the Reform Act? I cannot understand the distinction. Here is a convention under which we are asked

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: I rise to a point of order. I have brought it to the notice of the Chair that these Honourable Members have had ample opportunities outside to fight with one another and if they want to explain to the public outside they have got a number of newspapers and the Associated Press. I do not know if the time of the House should be taken up on a discussion of the views of different parties, and I do not believe that the Government themselves are anxious to know the troubles amongst these parties.

Mr. V. J. Patel: I leave that question altogether and I come to the main question, namely, whether we are right in the attitude that we are

taking up to-day. Last year we passed a certain Resolution and we expected that something would be done, that Government would make some response. We waited and waited till the last Budget came on and then we threw out some demands and the Finance Bill. Subsequently, a Committee was appointed—what is known as the Jinnah Committee or Muddiman Committee. Only the other day we were discussing the question about the repeal of the Bengal Regulation and other Acts and in my speech, I gave a clear warning to my Honourable friend Sir Alexander Muddiman that they were not publishing the report of that Committee and that they were not telling us clearly whether they were going to give us a day for its discussion or not, that they were keeping everything back from us and the time for the Budget was coming and he did not know what it all meant to us. I do not know whether my Honourable friend took that warning but I gave him a clear hint of what we were going to do with regard to the Budget. During the course of the year since the last Budget sin upon sin has been heaped together, Government have been guilty of numerous acts of omission and commission and they have defied Resolution after Resolution of this Assembly. An integral part of this so-called convention Resolution of last year was that Indians shall be appointed on the Railway Board. Government have not cared to give effect to it. They have defied that Resolution. And we are asked to give a chance to Sir Charles Innes to work that convention as I have already said, if there was a case for throwing out the Demands for Grants last year, there is a ten times stronger case this year for throwing them out. I for one am prepared to say emphatically that, if it were possible for me to obstruct this Government, I would obstruct them at every stage and at every step. I do not make a secret of it, I have said that repeatedly, and I say it again that I would like to be consistent all along, throw out every Demand for Grant not only in respect of Railways but all other departments of Government, and finally throw out the Finance Bill. I would throw out all the Bills that Government introduce and I would throw out every Resolution that Government might introduce. I would compel them to resort to the veto and to certification at every step. Let us expose the pretence of this Government that they are governing this country or carrying on the administration of this country with the consent of the people of this country. That is one good that we are doing by remaining here. We are here to tell our people that the Government is being carried on not with the consent of the representatives of the people but against their will, against their vote. Let the whole world know that the administration of this country is being carried on, as in practice it is being carried on, by the bureaucracy according to its own sweet will and pleasure and against the vote of the representatives of the people of this country. That is one good which we the Swarajists are doing in this House. We are here to prevent the co-operation of people who gave an impression to the whole world that everything was all right and that the Reforms were working very well and that the Government was being carried on with the consent of the representatives of the people. We have not forgotten the days of repression when the policy of Government was being endorsed by this Assembly. Those days are gone. I do not want to go into that unhappy history. My Honourable friend, Diwan Bahadur Rangachariar, may not like it. Whether our people are prepared for non-payment of taxes to-day or not, one thing remains that this constant fight in the Assembly day after day and session after session will make them more ready for non-payment of taxes. I am quite convinced that this Government are not going to yield to reason. There is absolutely no doubt about it, that

[Mr. V. J. Patel.]

reason, justice, righteousness and argument are all on the side of the representatives of the people. But Government would not listen to that. They would listen only to direct action. That is the only way, so far as I can see, which will bring them round. (Mr. M. A. Jinnah: "What is the direct action that you propose?") This is one, and it must necessarily be followed, as my Honourable friend, Mr. Pal said the other day, by a mass movement. This is merely a preparation for mass movement. This is a step in that direction. (A Voice: "Mass movement to do what?") To go in for non-payment of taxes, to go in for civil disobedience. Will you go to Bardoli with me? I therefore say that these steps are a necessary part of the great struggle which is coming. Let my Honourable friend Mr. Jinnah think that we are not ready and therefore we should not go in for this extreme step. According to him we can justify this step only when the people are ready. He forgets that unless we take this step people will never be ready. This is a necessary step. People will at once realise that our representatives have done this, that and the other, and they will say, "What are we going to do?" They will feel the responsibility and I am sure in course of time they will be prepared to go in for a wholesale movement of non-payment of taxes and civil disobedience, unless in the meantime reason prevails on the Treasury Benches which I do not expect. With these few words I support the motion of my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadan Urban): I sincerely regret the turn that this debate has taken. I regret it for our own sake but I feel that the Government Benches must have been feeling exceedingly comfortable. Let us be honest because we are among friends. They will be feeling exceedingly comfortable to see this fight between one wing of the opposition and the other. I regret, Sir, that this irrelevant reference was made to party questions which have not been published and which, so far as I understand, are meant to be confidential. The agreement between the Swarajists and the Independents was a confidential agreement. (A Voice: "It was published in the papers.") If it has been published in the papers the responsibility lies with those who supplied the information to the papers and to the papers themselves. (A Voice: "Are you a member of the Nationalist Party?") I am a member of the Independent party. I had the correspondence between the Independents and the Swarajists before me. I might have been tempted as a journalist to take a copy of the whole correspondence and publish it throughout the whole of India this morning and India would have known who is responsible for the break-up of this Nationalist opposition in this House. Not we.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Publish it by all means.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: Thank you. I will publish it with your permission. Now, I do not want to be drawn away from the legitimate subject of this debate. I regret that this incident has arisen to divide us and to add somewhat also to the acerbity of the relations between this wing and the other wing of the Nationalist Party. We are anxious to work together. We know that we have a common goal, that we have a common enemy to fight. We are anxious to work together and we are anxious also to work in the light of our own reason and conscience and not to be dragged behind the chariot wheel of a powerful party which has got

more physical force than we have. Now, Sir, what is the issue? It has been said "grievances before supplies". I read in my school days a little of these constitutional matters. I read even now in the newspapers how these things are done in other countries. Now, if Mr. Hindley had been a responsible Minister of the Government of India I might have understood a motion to cut down his salary or to refuse his salary but in this Railway Board there is not a single member who is a responsible member of the Government. They are subordinate servants. I have yet to learn, Sir, that the salary of any member or of any group of members, say, in the Foreign Office, is asked to be refused on the ground that the Foreign Minister has managed his department wrong.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: Does the Honourable Member know that even now the salary of the Chief Commissioner and of the members of the Railway Board is not votable?

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: I always look for light upon constitutional questions from my friend Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar but I have got this paper before me and I have got my specks on my eyes also. I see that the members of the Railway Board have got their salary non-votable. Yes, that is a point that we have no right to vote on it.

Mr. V. J. Patel: We want to get that right.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: Yes, but this is not the way, according to our humble light, to get that right.

Now, Sir, there are many things which my friend Pandit Motilal Nehru has said with which we are in entire agreement. He has complained against the Railway Board as it is constituted. It is the complaint not only of the Swarajists either here or outside. It is the complaint of the whole country. We want more representation of Indian talent and Indian experience and Indian knowledge on the Railway Board. He has complained of other things also—the grievances of the railway passengers. That is a complaint that is common to every part of the country. We have all complained of all these things. We have complained of the way in which our complaints are treated by the authorities. This is not the special dispensation of the Swarajists here to claim that it is only they who have got a complaint in regard to these matters. But the issue here is quite different. The issue here is really whether we are going to have a Railway Board or not. You want to refuse the total Demand No. 1. What is this demand? The total demand is 9,86,000 voted and 5,06,000 non-voted which covers the salaries of the members of the Railway Board. The voted, which is within your right really to reject, covers the salary of 37 permanent assistants who draw pay from 180 to 500, head draftsman 350—500, clerks, draftsmen, etc., stenographers 16, servants 78, etc. You have got there Rs. 9,86,000 which will be paid to your men and suppose you do not pass this vote and accept this motion of my friend the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru and vote the whole demand down and if His Excellency the Viceroy is pleased to tell you, "You will have your own way. Now, gentlemen, I will close down all these salaries and I will not provide by certification or restoration for the salary of the permanent assistants, head draftsman or clerks, draftsmen and stenographers and others", what will be the position? Who will suffer? You say, "We want them to restore it". I dare say His Excellency the Viceroy will not be so unreasonable as to punish others for our sins. I know he

[Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal.]

will not be unreasonable but will restore the grant and it is on that assurance that my friend now brings forward this motion. Last year "Customs" were thrown out without considering the merits of the case. My friend Pandit Motilal got up in this House and proposed "Let us throw out the Customs". The "Customs" were thrown out and I remember, Sir, when he made that proposal he distinctly said, "We know that Government will restore this grant". Yes, you knew that Government would restore this grant. It is like setting fire to your house after having given notice to the Fire Brigade to come and put it out. This is just like that. And then what was the constitutional effect of it? If we are out for a revolution, if we are out to destroy the present bureaucracy by force of arms, I can understand this but we want to proceed constitutionally from precedent to precedent. We want to create conventions. Even my friend the Honourable Pandit Motilal helped in the creation of a convention in regard to the separation of railway finance from general finance. We want to create conventions and all the world over constitutional advance has been made through the creation of conventions and we want to create conventions if we can, that the Viceroy shall not ordinarily certify a rejected grant. When the Viceroy certified the rejected "Salt" Demand he did wrong and in the course of 12 months the Government had to confess that they were wrong and they had to return to what the Assembly wanted.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Will my friend point out one single instance in history where alien rulers established conventions between themselves and subject races?

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: I want to know of one instance in history where passive resistance has not been followed by active rebellion. (*An Honourable Member:* "Why not?" *Another Honourable Member:* "We are making history.") You are making history I know. Now, Sir, that is what I understand of constitutional practice. I want to make it as difficult as difficult it may be for His Excellency the Viceroy to restore any grant rejected by this House. I want to make it as difficult as difficult as it can be for the Viceroy to certify any Bill rejected by this House; and therefore I was opposed to the last year's motion of the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru, and for that reason I am opposed to this motion also.

An Honourable Member: Why did you sit tight then?

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: I have been asked why I did not vote the last time against my Swarajist friends on the question of Customs revenue. I will give out a secret. I was asked, "For goodness' sake, let us throw out one demand to show our anxiety to get Swaraj quickly".

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Where was your conscience then?

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: My conscience is in my keeping, Sir, morning, midday and at night also, in Delhi, in Calcutta and in Simla also. My conscience was in my keeping last time in Delhi, and it was in my keeping during the June session at Simla.

An Honourable Member: Where was it when you did not vote?

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: It was in my keeping during the June session and in September. Where was Mr. Patel's consistency when they made that bridge between the Swarajist obstruction and the Government to help the Tata Steel and Iron Industries Protection Bill? Where was his

consistency, Sir, when they passed the supplementary budget in the Simla session? Where was their consistency when they passed the other supplementary budget demands even in this very session?

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: May I say the Swaraj Party as such never voted for nor participated in any debate on any supplementary demands?

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: I never knew that the words "as such" like charity covered a multitude of sins. The Swaraj Party "as a party" did not refuse those supplies, but A, B, C, D, including A, the leader of the Swaraj Party, did all this.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: My friend is entirely mistaken and is completely misrepresenting the Swaraj Party. No member of the Swaraj Party, either as such or as anything else, ever took part in the voting of any supplementary demands or in the debate on such grant.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: Not even on the Tata Bill? Was not that a Finance Bill?

An Honourable Member: It was not a Finance Bill. You must read your history again.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: Was not the Tata's Bill a Finance Bill? The Honourable Member could not bring in a Bill like that. It was to pay money out of the public exchequer, and any Bill which means to pay money out of the public exchequer is a Finance Bill for all I know.

An Honourable Member: Do not dabble in law.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: No, Sir, I do not dabble in law; I dabble in politics, and in state craft and in journalism, and in literature. Now I will not introduce any more heat. We have had enough of it. The whole question is this. What shall we gain by throwing out this motion? It has been said, we shall embarrass the Government. I am prepared to embarrass the Government if the embarrassment of the Government will lead me to my goal, but this embarrassment, I am convinced, Sir, will not lead us to our goal, it will only embarrass us. It will not demoralise the Government; it will not weaken the position of the Government. It will only weaken our position. (*An Honourable Member:* "Why?") Let us agree to differ. If you did not think your position would be strengthened by this thing you would not have done it. I feel my position, as representing my constituency, as representing public opinion, as representing the increasing mistrust of the policy of obstruction in the whole country which is evidenced all over, as representing that view, I think, Sir, that the passing of this motion will not lead us to our goal but will weaken our position and strengthen the position of the Government. For these reasons, Sir, I oppose this motion of my friend Pandit Motilal Nehru.

An Honourable Member: I move that the question be now put.

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

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: The original question was:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,86,000 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, 1926, in respect of the Railway Board."

Since which an amendment has been moved:

"That the Demand under the head 'Railway Board' be omitted."

The question I have to put is that the Demand be omitted.

The Assembly divided:

AYES—41.

Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
 Acharya, Mr. M. K.
 Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.
 Aney, Mr. M. S.
 Belvi, Mr. D. V.
 Chaman Lall, Mr.
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
 Duni Chand, Lala.
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
 Goswami, Mr. T. C.
 Govind Das, Seth.
 Gulab Singh, Sardar.
 Hans Raj, Lala.
 Hari Prasad Lal, Rai.
 Ismail Khan, Mr.
 Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
 Jeelani, Haji S. A. K.
 Kazim Ali, Shaikh-e-Chatgam Maulvi
 Muhammad.
 Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
 Kidwai, Shaikh Mushir Hussain.
 Lohokare, Dr. K. G.

Mehta, Mr. Jannadas M.
 Misra, Pandit Shambhu Dayal.
 Misra, Pandit Harkavan Nath.
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi
 Sayad.
 Narain Dass, Mr.
 Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.
 Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
 Nehru, Pandit Shamlal.
 Patel, Mr. V. J.
 Piyare Lal, Lala.
 Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
 Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.
 Roy, Mr. Bhabendra Chandra.
 Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan
 Bahadur.
 Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.
 Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
 Sinha, Mr. Ambika Prasad.
 Sinha, Kumar Gangnanad.
 Syamacharan, Mr.

NOES—66.

Abdul Mumin, Khan Bahadur
 Muhammad.
 Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
 Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
 Ahmad Ali Khan, Mr.
 Ahmed, Mr. K.
 Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
 Ajab Khan, Captain.
 Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.
 Alimuzzaman Chowdhry, Mr.
 Ashworth, Mr. E. H.
 Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
 Bhore, Mr. J. W.
 Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
 Bray, Mr. Denys.
 Burdon, Mr. E.
 Calvert, Mr. H.
 Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
 Clow, Mr. A. G.
 Cocke, Mr. H. G.
 Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.
 Crawford, Colonel J. D.
 Fleming, Mr. E. G.
 Fraser, Sir Gordon.
 Ghose, Mr. S. C.
 Gour, Sir Hari Singh.
 Graham, Mr. L.
 Hindley, Mr. C. D. M.
 Hira Singh, Sardar Bahadur Captain.
 Hudson, Mr. W. F.
 Hussanally, Khan Bahadur W. M.
 Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.
 Jajodia, Baboo Runglal.
 Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.

Kasturbhai Lalbhai, Mr.
 Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.
 Makan, Mr. M. E.
 McCellum, Mr. J. L.
 Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra
 Nath.
 Moir, Mr. T. E.
 Muddiman, The Honourable Sir
 Alexander.
 Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur
 Saiyid.
 Mutalik, Sardar V. N.
 Naidu, Mr. M. C.
 Nambiyar, Mr. K. K.
 Pal, Mr. Bipin Chandra.
 Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
 Raj Narain, Rai Bahadur.
 Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.
 Rangachartar, Diwan Bahadur T.
 Reddi, Mr. K. Venkataramana.
 Rhodes, Sir Campbell.
 Rushbrook-Williams, Prof. L. F.
 Sarda, Rai Sahib M. Harbilas.
 Sastri, Diwan Bahadur C. V.
 Visvanatha.
 Shams-uz-Zoha, Khan Bahadur M.
 Sim, Mr. G. G.
 Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.
 Sykes, Mr. E. F.
 Tonkinson, Mr. H.
 Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
 Vishindas, Mr. Harchandrai.
 Webb, Mr. M.
 Willson, Mr. W. S. J.
 Wilson, Mr. R. A.
 Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.

The motion was negatived.

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

The Assembly reassembled after Lunch at Three of the Clock, Mr. President in the Chair.

PAY OF OFFICERS OF THE RAILWAY BOARD.

Mr. V. J. Patel: Sir, may I draw your attention to the fact that Motion No. 7 on the list in my name is similar to motion No. 1 and that my Honourable friend, Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, desires that I should move mine in place of his, with your permission?

Mr. President: I was taking Nos. 1, 8 and 4 together because they all raise the question of pay of officers under the Railway Board. Is that the point which the Honourable Member wishes to raise now?

Mr. V. J. Patel: Sir, I beg to move that the Demand under the head "Railway Board" (pages 1—2) be reduced by Rs. 77,000.

Members will see that this motion is a general one, while motion No. 1 is restricted to the Deputy Director's pay. I do not restrict my motion to the pay of any individual officer, but it extends to the pay of several officers. If you will compare the expenditure on the Railway Board last year with that of the budgeted amount, you will see that under the heading "voted" last year the revised estimates were 7,81 and the "non-voted" were 4,95, while the budgeted figures are 9,86 and 5,06 respectively. That means that last year the Railway Board spent Rs. 12 lakhs and odd, while this year we are called upon to sanction Rs. 14 lakhs and odd. I submit, Sir, that this is to say the least of it very extravagant. The Acworth Committee recommended that under the decentralisation which they had recommended, if it was carried out, most of the detailed work of the Railway Board would be lessened materially. I will invite the attention of my friend, the Honourable Sir Charles Innes, to paragraph 12 of the Annual Administration Report for 1923-24, which says:

"The ultimate object indicated by the Acworth Committee was a large measure of decentralisation to the railway administration, that is, to the Agents of the State-managed Railways and the Board of Directors of the Company-managed Railways."

As a result of this recommendation, 60 per cent. of the correspondence work of the Railway Board has been reduced. You will find this at page 9 of that report, paragraph 18 the last four lines:

"Considerable delegation was made to Agents in matters relating to establishment which has resulted in a reduction by 60 per cent. of the references previously made to the Railway Board."

You will thus see, Sir, that a large amount of work has been reduced as a result of the adoption of the recommendation of the Acworth Committee; and yet we find that we are asked to sanction Rs. 2 lakhs more this year.

Now, Members of the Assembly will perhaps be curious to know how I arrive at this figure of Rs. 77,000. I shall explain to you. Under the heading "Directors" the votable amount was 27 last year and this year it is 33, while the non-voted has been increased from 1,01 to 1,50. That means that Rs. 49,000 has been added to the non-votable amount. It is impossible for us—we have no power—to touch the non-votable amount; and the only course open to us is to reduce the votable amount, namely, Rs. 83,000; and I submit that this Assembly should not vote this Rs. 83,000. I understand that the Railway Board intends to have one additional

[Mr. V. J. Patel.]

Director this year; I do not know how far it is true, but that is why this additional provision appears to have been made, and I submit that you have got so many officers now that it is absolutely unnecessary that we should go on adding to the number of the existing high officials. You have got one Chief Commissioner and three Members; you have provided for five Directors—I say, have four only. Then you have got one Secretary, seven Deputy Directors, four Assistant Directors, and you have got so many Superintendents. I submit, Sir, that there is a superfluity of high officials and therefore the first cut that I propose is Rs. 33,000 in the votable amount proposed in regard to Directors.

The second cut that I propose is in the votable amount of Deputy Directors, which is 78. Last year it was Rs. 60,000, while this year it is Rs. 73,000. I therefore submit that as we cannot touch the non-votable amount the only course open to us is to ask the Government to reduce the votable amount, and I propose a cut of Rs. 18,000 there.

Then there is the amount of Rs. 51,000 votable under the heading "Assistant Directors". Last year it was Rs. 33,000; this year it is proposed to spend Rs. 51,000—perhaps they propose to add one more Assistant Director to the number already existing. So I propose a cut of Rs. 18,000 there.

Passing on to Superintendents, I find that Rs. 68,000 was provided last year in the revised estimates, while this year it is proposed to spend Rs. 73,000. I therefore propose a cut of Rs. 5,000 there. That makes in all Rs. 74,000; and as a consequential cut, I propose a cut of Rs. 3,000 in the allowances, which will make up Rs. 77,000. That is how I have made up Rs. 77,000.

I submit, Sir, that the whole of this large increase of Rs. 2 lakhs more should not be voted; I propose a small cut of Rs. 77,000 out of that Rs. 2 lakhs, and I trust the House will agree with me that this is reasonable. We have had a good fight over the main question, the wider question. Now we propose to fight the Government inch by inch. This morning we were defeated; we admit the defeat, but that is no reason why we should run away from the fight. We propose to fight inch by inch at every stage wherever we find that you can be attacked and censured, and we propose to stand by our Independent friends shoulder to shoulder in that fight.

Mr. President: Motion moved:

"That the Demand under the head 'Railway Board' be reduced by Rs. 77,000."

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao (Godavari *cum* Kistna: Non-Muhammadan Rural): *Sir, I have given notice of a similar motion for reducing the grant by Rs. 50,000 under this head. My reasons are not indifferently the same as those of my friend, Mr. Patel. In the first place my point is that under the head Directors Honourable Members will notice that there is a difference of nearly Rs. 50,000 between the estimates of 1924-25 and the proposed estimate for 1925-26. The number of officers shown under this head is 5. I do not know whether during the current year there were 4 or 5 officers. I think, Sir, in this connection I might suggest that in regard to new appointments they may be shown in the usual manner in the Budget, namely, that the figures for the current year

* Not corrected by the Honourable Member.

and the figures for the budget year may be shown separately, so that we may be able to follow easily the figures of establishments. That is the way in which the other Budget is prepared, and I believe, Sir, in the case of the Railway Budget also the figures of establishments should be shown separately both for the current year and also for the budget year, so that we may be in a position to follow them easily. My Honourable friend Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, who was in the Railway Finance Committee, says that this suggestion was made and agreed to, but, I am not now in a position to say whether 4 or 5 officers were employed during the current year and whether it is proposed to employ the same number of officers during the coming year. Anyway, I see a difference of Rs. 50,000 in the budget estimates. My reason for asking for this reduction is to get an explanation as to why the Government now wish to employ one more Director in the current year. I see from a statement somewhere in the papers that it is proposed to appoint a Director of Finance. We have already got a Financial Commissioner, and I should like to know what case has been made out for the appointment of another officer known as the Director of Finance at a cost of Rs. 30,000. That is the first point that I wish to raise in regard to this motion.

The second point that I should like to raise is whether the Government have come to any decision as to the officer to be appointed to this post. I am raising the question of the Indianization of the services in this connection, and I would suggest that, if it is necessary to appoint a Director of Finance, the Railway Board must comply with the general wishes expressed in this House so often, that new officers should, as far as possible, be Indians. Therefore, the first point is, is there any necessity to appoint a new officer known as the Director of Finance, and, if it is absolutely necessary and if we are satisfied that that officer should be employed, then my second suggestion is that he should be an Indian. The Financial Commissioner is a Member of the Indian Civil Service, and in regard to all future appointments my suggestion is that you should appoint Indians when the opportunity arises.

Sir, the Honourable Sir Charles Innes stated the other day in discussing the Railway Budget that we do not know the English temperament or the Scotch temperament, and that once the policy is adopted either by the Legislature or the Government, he, as a Member of the Government, was perfectly willing to carry out that policy. In this connection I would therefore suggest to him that the question of Indianization has been accepted by the Government, and there is no reason why, if a new officer is really required, the Railway Board should indent upon anybody else than an Indian. Then in regard to financial matters, we have already a very efficient department under my Honourable friend Sir Basil Blackett, and I believe it will be possible to indent upon the officers of the Finance Department if a new officer is required.

The third point is the general question of economy to which my friend Mr. Patel has referred. I think, Sir, that the establishment on the Railway Board is, in my opinion, somewhat extravagant. It is true that two new Railways are now coming under the control of the Government of India. Nevertheless, as has been pointed out by my friend, it has been stated that 60 per cent. of the references have been rendered unnecessary now in consequence of decentralisation to the Agents. The other day I raised a question as to the exact powers, financial and administrative,

[Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao.]

of these Agents, and I have had no reply to that question. If, as a matter of fact, these Agents are exercising larger administrative and financial powers, I should think, as has been admitted, that 60 per cent. of the references have disappeared, and it seems to me, Sir, that there is no necessity for such a large establishment as you have. I am aware of the exact constitution of the Railway Board. Nevertheless, it seems to me that if, as a matter of fact, decentralisation has been effected, it seems to be absolutely unnecessary to maintain the very large establishment that you have on the Railway Board.

For these reasons, Sir, I suggest that the cut that I propose should be adopted. If the Honourable Member in charge of the Department or Mr. Hindley justifies these appointments, it is quite a different matter; we shall hear them and see whether their proposals are justified.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I think the House ought without any hesitation to carry this cut. The reasons are these. The Railway Board, of all bodies, should not have forgotten the repeated admonitions of the Acworth Committee and the Inchoape Committee, and I am surprised to find that in the very place where an example should have been set, the expenditure is continuously increasing. In limited companies the infuriated shareholders throw out the whole of their Directors' report to show their indignation; we could have done the same by throwing out the whole Demand for the Railway Board grant but that the House has not done and the next best thing is now to show our disapprobation by suggesting cuts. Here we find that the Railway Board's expenditure has been increasing beyond any reasonable limit. For instance, we find, Sir, that in 1923-24 the superior officers cost Rs. 1,59,000 voted and Rs. 4,18,000 non-voted or the total was Rs. 5,72,000. In the current year we find the budget estimates are Rs. 6,05,000 for superior officers and the revised estimates Rs. 6,40,000. Proceeding further we find in the Budget that the total expenditure on the salaries and allowances of superior officers is Rs. 7,30,000. So that in the course of two years we have gone from Rs. 5,72,000 to Rs. 7,30,000 in a department where, we are told, as Mr. Patel has pointed out, that on account of decentralisation, a very appreciable amount of reduction in work has been effected, and references to the extent of about 60 per cent. have been reduced. Well, if 60 per cent. of the references have been reduced, then that reduction ought to be reflected at least somewhere in the cost of the establishment. Instead of that being reflected, we find the less the work the more the cost, which is very unsatisfactory. From Rs. 5,72,000 on the salaries and allowances of superior officers the cost has risen to Rs. 7,30,000 on the same establishment in two years and that when the references at the headquarters have been reduced to the extent of 60 per cent. This is progress, as Mr. Baptista would say, in the direction of the tail. It is not a progress in the right direction. Therefore, Government must justify to us this mounting up of the expenditure to the extent of nearly 40 per cent. in the course of two years.

Sir, the Acworth Committee in its reorganization scheme for the Railway Board recommended that the total number of officers should be 12; they recommended that one Member of the Executive Council should be responsible for Transport, Posts and Telegraph, Railways and Ports and in fact for all communications; when all these functions were to be centred in one Member, then the superior staff recommended was only 12 officers. That

recommendation has been not carried out to the full and Posts and Telegraph and Inland Navigation are still separate establishments. Therefore, instead of the 12 superior officers recommended by the Acworth Committee, the total number of superior officers in this budget should have been less than 12. Instead we find that 29 superior officers carrying salaries from Rs. 550 to Rs. 6,000 are being provided for in this budget, an unheard-of extravagance which I think this House should not at all tolerate. Then, Sir, on page 5 of the Railway Report for 1923-24, we are told that the work of the Department is divided among the Chief Commissioner, the Financial Commissioner, and two members of the Board, on the basis of financial, technical and general. I should have thought, Sir, that on the Railways we employed only technical men, particular officers, but now we find there is a general member. What is this general member doing? There should be nobody in general there, but everybody in particular, because there must be some definite work for him—no general appointments. I see my friend Mr. Parsons there smiling because he has explained to me what the general member was for. But I was not satisfied. On the whole, I cannot see any reason for appointments beyond technical and financial. Nevertheless we have financial, technical and general. And under them there were four Directors; now we are to have five. The Railway Board, as recommended by the Acworth Committee, should, really speaking, consist of only two—the Chief Commissioner and the Financial Commissioner. The other two members are not mentioned in the Acworth Committee's report. Of course Government have reorganised the Board on a different basis from that recommended by the Acworth Committee, I admit. But still there it is that on the whole the Acworth Committee having recommended not more than 12 superior officers, here is a reorganised scheme by Government making provision for 29 superior officers and for no reason whatever. (Mr. T. C. Gorwami: "How would you provide these people with jobs?") That, of course, is for Government to explain. But we should be on our guard when they provide for 29 superior officers, on salaries ranging from Rs. 550 to Rs. 6,000, when the Acworth Committee has only recommended 12, and that when there was to be one member for all communications.

Then, Sir, the other thing which perhaps is not very apposite here, is the question of Indianisation. But I am only fighting this question on the ground of cost. The other questions are there always. But this particular extravagance I am unable to understand or allow and the least that we could do therefore is that we should cut down as much as we can of the votable side as it is impossible to touch the items that are non-votable. It is one of the difficulties of dealing with a Budget like this that the people we want to get at we cannot get at. But still we can touch them, indirectly. It is clearly a case of extravagance that, even in spite of the recommendations of the Acworth Committee, which recommended 12 superior officers, the Board wants a provision for 29 officers without any explanation, and I hope the House will carry Mr. Patel's proposal.

Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan (Patna and Chota Nagpur *cum* Orissa: Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to support the motion made by my friend, Mr. Patel. As pointed out by Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, we protest against extravagance, and therefore our proposal is to reduce the demand by Rs. 77,000. There are two items under the heads "Deputy Directors and Assistant Directors" and the cost of this, as I have worked out, is

[Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan.]

Rs. 1,16,000 in 1923-24. And in the Budget estimate for 1924-25 the same comes up to Rs. 1,48,000. Now, in the revised estimates for 1924-25 the same again goes higher up to Rs. 1,75,000. Now, again in the Budget for 1925-26 we have the sum of Rs. 2 lakhs. Besides, I do not find sufficient reason why the figures should have risen so steadily. The Government have now taken charge of one railway, namely, the East Indian, and will soon be taking charge of the Great Indian Peninsula, and they have also reorganised it, as far as I understand, on a divisional basis, and the policy of Government is also to decentralise. Hence, when they are decentralising as well as reorganising on a divisional basis, I do not see any reason why there should be so much increase in the pay of officials at headquarters. Then I also think that, if more Indians had been taken,—as has already been pointed out that there are capable Indians who are available—salaries would not have risen so much. I may also say one thing more as an instance and that is how salaries have been increased at the time of the reorganisation. Last year, the Budget showed one post of Registrar in the grade Rs. 800—1,000. This post I do not find shown in this year's Budget. It appears that it is only the change of the name and the increase of the pay. If this is correct, it is simply increasing the pay of the post by changing the name, and so, when you increase without any sufficient reason, there is every justification for us to move for a cut of Rs. 77,000 with the object of drawing the attention of the Government to the fact. With these remarks, I support the motion of Mr. Patel.

Lala Duni Chand (Ambala Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I want to utilise this opportunity for a particular purpose which I think it is very necessary to place before this House. In so far as the grievances and the complaints of the travelling and the trading public against the Railway Administration are concerned, I charge the Railway Board with pursuing a policy of indifference, lukewarmness and condonation. I shall be personally happy if this policy of the Railway Board that has been followed for a long time is replaced by a policy of earnestness and determination to root out all the evils so far as the general public and the travelling public is concerned.

Mr. President: Order, order. The discussion on this motion for reduction is now confined to questions of pay of officers. We shall come to the discussion of grievances of passengers on a later motion for reduction.

Lala Duni Chand: Sir, so far as I understand my position, it will not be possible for me to move the motions that stand in my name. I can at once make myself clear on this point. My point is that I am not prepared to strengthen the position of the Railway Board in any way so long as Railway Board does not change its policy and therefore, so far as I see I am clearly in order in placing this aspect of the question before the House. I refuse to help the Railway Board in any way so long as the Railway Board does not adopt a different policy. Therefore I shall try to give prominence to a few grievances.

Mr. President: I must again remind the Honourable Member that these questions are not in order on the present motion. There will be other opportunities for ventilating these grievances on subsequent motions for

reduction. But at present the discussion is confined to the question of the pay of these officers.

Mr. G. G. Sim (Financial Commissioner: Railways): Sir, Mr. Ramachandra Rao has asked me for some details regarding the delegation of powers to Agents. Sir Campbell Rhodes only the other day expressed considerable scepticism as to whether there has been any delegation at all. The position as regards establishment matters, to which Mr. Jamnadas Mehta referred, is this, that we have given Agents full powers to appoint the subordinate staff subject to the maximum pay which the Railway Board have prescribed for particular posts. We have, for example, prescribed that not more than Rs. 600 may be paid to a station master or to the head of a workshop. Provided that the pay given by the Agent does not exceed the maximum fixed by the Railway Board an Agent is absolutely free to appoint the subordinate staff in such numbers and on such pay as he may consider necessary for the work. The Agent is of course limited by the budget provision. This delegation, as Mr. Jamnadas Mehta said, has resulted in a very considerable reduction of references of these questions to the Railway Board from Agents. He has asked why there has not been a corresponding reduction in the staff in the Establishment Branch of the Railway Board's office. The whole trouble regarding that particular branch of the Railway Board is that for the last three or four months they have been inundated with questions of detail regarding establishments. Only the other day Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal referred to the statistics which had been published by the Railway Board in regard to Indianisation and he wanted to know why the Government had proscribed a form of this sort and had apparently deliberately instigated racial discriminations. Now, Sir, this particular form was drawn up in consultation with Members of this House. The Railway Board had previously given, in reply to numerous questions, long statistics for each railway in India regarding almost every department. This list was drawn up in the fond hope that it would lead to a cessation of any further questions and that the material given in the return was sufficient to enable the House to deal with all questions regarding Indianisation. The statement shows, both as regards officers and as regards upper subordinates, the number of Europeans, Anglo-Indians, Moslems and non-Moslems in every department and for every railway in India. In spite of that, Sir, I have had to answer in the last few weeks masses of questions regarding the number of Anglo-Indians or Indians or Europeans, not under this broad classification, but as to what number have been appointed as Assistant Controllers of Stores, what number are employed as guards or drivers on particular trains, and several Members have carried this classification still further. I was asked only the other day to give a list of the number of Punjabis and Sindis in the workshops in Karachi and to explain how many of them were artisans and how many were labourers.

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally: Because you would not employ indigenous labour.

Mr. G. G. Sim: I do not know what the Honourable Member's object may be, but we fondly hoped that this list would satisfy all his curiosity. Another Member asked me why we had not a certain number of Oriyas as clerks or as station masters on particular stations.

Pandit Shamlal Nehru (Meerut Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): The safest thing is to employ all Europeans.

Mr. G. G. Sim: Then, Sir, another matter on which the Department is inundated with questions is regarding individual appointments, promotions and dismissals. I hoped the replies that I have been giving recently to such questions would tend to discourage a repetition of them, and I think it is the general sense of the House that the House should not interfere in matters of detail.

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally: Only if the Railway Board were responsible to this House.

Mr. G. G. Sim: If the House is prepared to support the Government in this attempt, and if the reply that we have been giving lately to these questions continues to be given, then, Sir, I think we can look for a reduction in the staff employed in the Establishment Branch of the Railway Board's Office. But it must be clearly understood that if the reduction is made, replies will not be given those matters of detail.

The next question I was asked was as to what new posts were going to be created in the Railway Board. Honourable Members who have read the report of the Standing Finance Committee will have seen that the only new post which it is proposed to create is that of Director of Finance. At present there is no head of the office under the Financial Commissioner and it has been impossible recently to carry on the work without having an officer on special duty. Members of the Standing Finance Committee know how great the work will be for the next year or two in changing our system and in changing the whole form of our accounts. It is essential that the Financial Commissioner, like other Members of the Railway Board, should tour as extensively as possible and settle questions locally, and it is necessary that if he should do so, he should be able to have somebody at headquarters who can dispose of all minor financial questions. But, Sir, I explained clearly to the Finance Committee that that proposal had not yet been sanctioned and that no steps would be taken to create any such post until the Standing Finance Committee had been consulted and their opinion obtained.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated: Labour Interests): May I ask, Sir, whether the Railway Board have appointed a Medical Officer?

Mr. G. G. Sim: I think there are separate motions regarding that particular appointment. Now, Sir, the reason for the increases referred to by Mr. Patel, apart from the proposal to create this additional post, is simply this. Most of the posts under the Railway Board were created only last year. Most of the other increases are simply due to the fact that the expenditure of the current year only includes the pay of these Directors and Assistant Directors for a few months. Take, for example, the Finance Branch. The Finance Branch consists of a number of men who were previously employed in the Accountant-General's office and they have been transferred to the Railway Board's office. But they were transferred only with effect from the 1st of October last. In the Finance Branch of the Railway Board's office, they were transferred only from the 1st of October. Therefore, the provision on account of these men for next year must be double the expenditure of the current year. There is no proposal at present to increase the staff under the Railway Board in any way whatsoever, except as regards the particular post of Director of Finance and that post, as I have said, will not be created until the matter has been placed before the Standing Finance Committee. I hope, therefore, that Mr. Patel will agree to drop this proposal.

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally: Will the Director of Finance be somebody over Mr. Sim or below him?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Below him.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas (Indian Merchants' Chamber: Indian Commerce): Sir, I wonder if you will mind my suggestion, that, as there are many amendments on the paper, it may perhaps lead to greater progress if the Honourable Member from the Government Benches rises to reply immediately after an amendment is moved. Then the House will be able to understand exactly what the position of Government on each question is. The reply from my friend Mr. Sim to the queries put by the various Members who have spoken before boils down, to my mind, to this, that, subject to the Assembly agreeing not to put too many questions, Government may agree to a reduction in the superior staff. I wonder if I have understood the Honourable Member aright.

Mr. G. G. Sim: Not to that particular cut. I said it should be possible to effect a reduction in the staff working in the establishment section of the Railway Board's office.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: We are discussing this particular amendment which amounts to some Rs. 77,000. The Honourable Member has suggested a certain reason which leads to more expenditure and I think it would help us if he could tell us what saving could be made on the condition he has named. Is it Rs. 10,000, or Rs. 20,000 or Rs. 30,000 that he expects to make a saving of?

Mr. G. G. Sim: It depends entirely upon the extent to which the curio- sity of this House is reduced. If I am asked to lay the proposals before the Standing Finance Committee I shall be prepared to do so.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: This House must decide this amendment before long this afternoon and I thought that the Honourable Member would give this House an approximate idea of the cut that he would be prepared to accept on behalf of the Railway Board on the understanding, if he liked it, that the Railway Board do not expect to have to answer too many questions of details specially when such details are available in printed reports. Any strict undertaking it would be impossible for this House either to give or even to be asked. I can understand your point where you print your detailed statistics in a report in ordinary course. But the Assembly Members would take time to get accustomed to those reports and a perusal of them. You have only lately started some of these reports and statistics and, there is nothing to be surprised at if Honourable Members of this Assembly have up to this time put to you many more questions than they should have otherwise done. Later on, when they become accustomed to the new tables and statistics that you are printing, I take it that, unless the Assembly wished to annoy the Department, the number of questions would be less, and I think that on that basis one could safely expect a cut being agreed to by the Railway Board.

The next point that the Honourable Member, Mr. Sim, raised was regarding the additional appointment which is neither made yet nor approved by Government but regarding which he said that he would take the Standing Finance Committee's consent before the appointment was made. It thus becomes a very simple question which can be solved now, namely, when the Standing Finance Committee agrees to that appointment, let the Railway

[Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas.]

Department put in a supplementary grant. At the moment cut it out and consult the Standing Finance Committee. If they agree, and even if they do not agree but Government want it, you can come in with a supplementary grant and justify your case before this House. I therefore feel that some other Member on the Government side may tell us what saving Government could make on the expectation that no more detailed questions would be coming into the Railway Board because the replies would be available in some of the printed statistics and tables. As far as the appointment is concerned, when the Standing Finance Committee approves of the appointment, the Government can put in a supplementary grant. I think, therefore, that the amount should be reduced to a figure up to which the money is actually required to run the Railway Board as at present constituted.

Mr. C. D. M. Hindley (Chief Commissioner of Railways): Sir, the debate has got itself down rather to details of one particular provision in the Demand while a number of Members who have spoken have mentioned several aspects of the case. My Honourable friend, Mr. Sim, has explained the actual position regarding the additional appointment of Director of Finance. We have, however, been seriously attacked by Honourable Members who have spoken about extravagance. Several protests were raised against this "unheard-of extravagance". Now, Sir, I am really surprised to hear that this House considers that the Railway Board are guilty of an "unheard of extravagance". I would like the House to consider for a moment what has been done during the last year and the year before. Will Honourable Members in their minds compare the position of the railway finances two years ago and now? (*A Voice*: "What about the increase of pay?") Will Honourable Members have the goodness, perhaps after this debate is over, to apply themselves in their leisure to some of the things that we have written in the Administration Report on last year's working? I hope in the course of the next few months we shall be able to produce another volume showing what has been achieved during the current year. Will any Honourable Member here stand up and say that to have achieved the change in the railway finances that we have achieved during the last two years can be described as "unheard of extravagance"? Honourable Members will perhaps remember that it is not so very long ago that the Government of India were faced with a potential loss of Rs. 9½ crores in one year on their railway property. The House has seen what the railway property has produced or will produce in the current year, from a loss of something like 9½ crores to a profit of something like Rs. 10 crores. Now, Sir, we have been accused of having an extravagant staff to deal with a problem like that. Did Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas believe in his mind, when he and his colleagues on the Acworth Committee and he and his other colleagues on the Inchcape Committee set us this task of renovating the Railways, of bringing about solvency and reintroducing efficiency—did Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas believe in his heart of hearts that we should be able to carry out that task with a reduced staff? Did not he and his colleagues fully anticipate that there would be of necessity an increase in the staff at headquarters? It is plainly stated in the report of the Acworth Committee. The recommendation is clear and distinct. From the summary I read paragraph 6:

"We recommend that the technical staff attached to the Commission shall be strengthened, especially on the traffic side."

They went on to recommend that the staff should be divided into six sections. Well, Sir, they recommended that the Railway Board should have, under them, six Directors. We have four. The Acworth Committee has specially refrained from making detailed recommendations regarding the lower supervising staff on the Railway Board. Nothing is said in their report about how those Directors were to carry on their work. But I am perfectly confident that, if they had had to take charge of the Railway Board themselves at that time they would have been faced with the necessity of having a junior technical staff as well as a senior technical staff. I do not think that the House has been sufficiently impressed with the magnitude of the operations which we control from the Railway Board. We get so used to talking about crores that Honourable Members are inclined to talk about lakhs as though they were pies, crores being rupees and lakhs being pies. Let us get away from that false sense of proportion which is apt to be induced by a study of the figures of our Budget. Will any one who is responsible for business management—and there are several Honourable Members in this House who know a great deal more about management of business concerns than I do—will any one of them tell me that a supervising staff, a head administration staff costing less than one-fourth of one per cent. of the total expenditure, is unheard of extravagance? That is the position, Sir. Are we really, as Honourable Members who have spoken would have the House believe, running our heads into unheard of extravagance? I do not understand how any one can imagine that while we have been strenuously applying the principles of economy and urging on railway administrations to reduce their working expenses and to reduce their expenses generally (and we have succeeded in doing so), we ourselves have been running into extravagance at headquarters. The simple proposition is how could that improvement and that process be brought to effect from headquarters unless we had the necessary technical staff to deal with these large problems. This is not a matter of dealing with a number of daily references that come in from the railway administrations as if we were so many clerks sitting down and writing our letters in reply to the letters received and sticking up the envelopes and posting them and going away home. This is not a case where we have to deal with correspondence like clerks. We have to deal with very much larger problems. We have to devise new methods and use our constructive imagination to see how economical measures could be introduced. It is no good my writing letters to Agents and saying to them, "Economise, cut down your staff". The man would turn round and say, "How am I going to do that?" Another man will say "How am I going to cut down my staff?" We have to advise our Agents and railway administrations on large changes in policy and large changes in methods, so that these economies will result. The Administration Report is crammed with illustrations of what we have been doing in that direction. I need only mention things like standardisation, matters connected with workshop improvements, matters connected with the improvements in design of marshalling yards, a whole body of matters connected with the change that we have made in statistics. These may seem very simple matters to the Honourable Members of this House. Perhaps some Honourable Members may think that I am such a genius as to be able to sit down by myself and get out of my head schemes of improvement of this kind. Neither I nor any one of my colleagues can by himself attempt such a task. This is a matter of team work and co-ordinated and properly organised headquarters administration. We have to deal with matters of a great many

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

different kinds. Mr. Jamnadas Mehta has questioned the necessity of our having a member of the Board who has been described as General, looking after general matters. Now, there are many ways of dividing up work in an office like ours. The plan we have adopted is to place on one side purely technical matters relating to engineering and on the other side matters relating to traffic working and Establishments. These have been put together in a group which we have called "General." I do not see why Mr. Jamnadas Mehta should make any particular play on that word "General". It is not a general officer who is looking round for work. He has definitely assigned to him certain important portions of the Railway Board work. Then, Sir, we have four Directors. We ought to have five—one for looking after the financial side of the office. Four Directors roughly deal with the four main portions of our work. For instance, we have a Director of Civil Engineering. Will any one say that I can have a technical officer who can deal with both civil engineering and mechanical engineering? Does any one here know of such a gentleman who could attend to the large problems both of civil engineering and mechanical engineering which we have to deal with? There are technical gentlemen in this House who will understand what I mean when I say that a man who could perform the duties of the Director of Civil Engineering and Mechanical Engineering would be an unheard of genius.

Pandit Shamlal Nehru: There is one in Ajmer.

Mr. C. D. M. Hindley: We have a Director of Traffic. The Acworth Committee recommended that we should have two. Somewhat against my better judgment, when I was revising this organisation, I economised to the extent of having one Director instead of two as recommended by the Acworth Committee. Is that unheard of extravagance? It has certain disabilities attached to it because traffic is now very distinctly divided into two main sections of work, operating and commercial. We have had for the sake of economy to combine those two sets of work in one officer and I have one Director of Traffic in the Railway Board. The other Director is the Director of Establishment. Mr. Sim has already given the House some indication of the extent of his work. And here I might mention that we have recently added to our responsibility enormously by taking over the management of one of the greatest, if not the largest, railway systems in India. In the course of a few months we have to take over another and I do not understand how the House will expect us to take over the management of two large railway systems of the size of those two without increasing our staff. I should have expected that it would have been necessary for us to increase our staff rather than reduce it. We hope to be able to carry on with our existing staff but it is a doubtful proposition and I am not prepared to say that it may be possible for all time. The addition to our work after taking over two large railways of that kind may not be necessarily in proportion to the size of the operations of those two railways but it must add to our work. We are taking the place to a certain extent of the Board of Directors of those railways. We have to deal with the Agent much in the same way as the Board dealt with him and it is inevitable that there should be some addition to our work. Now, Sir, the basis of the whole of our work during the transition period that we are going through is to decentralise as much as possible. The very fact that we have adopted this policy of decentralisation on the advice of the Acworth Committee and the Inchcape Committee has been used against

us in the course of this debate as an argument for reducing our staff. The difficulty that we have been in is that the very act of decentralisation means an immense amount of work in reorganisation and rearranging powers and rearranging work. Unless we have an organisation at headquarters which can efficiently watch the technical side and the financial side of railway work it is impossible for us to decentralise. We could go on in the old way of making the Agents refer to us everything and that will involve a very large body of clerks to deal with those references. What we hope to do when we get more accustomed to our work, when we have things running more smoothly, is to do much more of our work by local inspection and consultation with the Agents and with local authorities and the public. We have already made a beginning in that respect and members of the Railway Board have during the last year travelled extensively and visited practically every railway administration. We hope to be able to free our Directors also from their routine duties at headquarters, if Mr. Sim's advice to the House is accepted, and enable them to travel and to discuss with the Agents and their principal officers the details of the work they are carrying out. But, as I have said before, it is not possible for us to do without a minimum number of technical officers at headquarters, and I maintain that we have not got an extravagant number of officers at headquarters. Incidentally, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta made a misquotation in regard to the number of officers we have. The information I have before me is that the number of officers, including supervising officers, in the Railway Board is at present 23, and 7 of these gentlemen are Indians. That is the proportion we have reached at present.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Look up the Demands for Grants, No. 29.

Mr. C. D. M. Hindley: All I have to say with regard to that proportion is that there is no other department at the headquarters of the Government which has the same proportions of Indians of the department. I think, Sir, that, if I have not established the case to the satisfaction of all Members, I have established it to the satisfaction of those Members who know and appreciate something of the work which the Railway Board has to do and which it looks forward to doing in spite of this morning's attempt to induce us to pack our bags.

Mr. K. O. Neogy (Dacca Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, the Chief Commissioner has advised the non-official Members to read their papers during their leisure. I would advise my Honourable friend to read the Acworth Committee's Report once again. He seemed to make a great point of the fact that, while the Acworth Committee recommended the creation of six appointments of Directors, he did not propose to make more than five appointments. I should like to point out to my Honourable friend that the sixth appointment was intended to be of a Director of Ports, Inland Navigation and Road Transport, with which, I think he will agree with me, he has nothing to do. Sir, the Acworth Committee, as has been pointed out by my friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, recommended the creation of a portfolio of Communications which would include not only Railways, but also Posts and Telegraphs, Ports and Road Transport as well.

Now, Sir, coming to another small point, I find that in this demand provision is made for four appointments of Assistant Directors, and I think I am correct in saying that in 1923-24 there was only one Assistant Director in the Railway Board. I do not know whether my Honourable friend

[Mr. K. C. Neogy.]

would care to explain why it has been found necessary to increase the number by three. I have before me a chart which I think my Honourable friend will recognise as his own handiwork, and which I think was prepared by him just a year ago, and which contemplates only one "Assistant Director, Technical". My friend has referred to various considerations which ought to weigh with us in passing this Budget, and he has made a reference to the increasing work and the volume of work which is likely to be added by reason of the transfer of the East Indian Railway and the Great Indian Peninsula Railway to the State. Now, Sir, all these considerations I think were present last year, and if I am not wrong in assuming that these facts were before my Honourable friend last year, then may I ask why he provided for only one Assistant Director last year, and why he is asking us to appoint four this year? I am told that some of these Assistant Directors are Indians. I do not know whether some of these appointments were created and given to Indians in order that my Honourable friends might answer questions with regard to the Indianisation of the Railway Board with a little greater ease than at present. These are the points on which I would like to have some enlightenment.

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, there are two points involved in this motion. The first is a charge of general extravagance with which I do not propose to deal. The Honourable the Chief Commissioner has dealt with it, and I do not propose to repeat any such charge; but the point which troubles me is this. The cut proposed by Mr. Patel is a sum of Rs. 77,000 and if my Honourable friend Mr. Ramachandra Rao's motion is taken as an amendment to it, it will be a sum of Rs. 50,000. Now I call it loose budgeting to go and provide for an appointment which is not yet sanctioned. One specific post is proposed to be created which will cost Rs. 38,000 or a little under that, and the paraphernalia proposed may cost Rs. 4,000 extra, so that that appointment alone takes away Rs. 40,000. And my Honourable friend Mr. Sim told us that there was a chance of a reduction in the establishment. I suppose he means in the inferior establishment, or the upper subordinates who are employed to find the material for answers to these questions, if the number of questions diminishes. I do expect the number of questions will diminish for much information is now supplied in the shape of these monthly reports which we are now getting. We get a lot of information in these monthly extracts which are circulated to us. I therefore do trust and fully trust that there will be a reduction of work in that branch. I should like to know what is the harm done to the Budget if really this cut is made. I want the Honourable Member to realise that we are really providing for expenditure for next year. Is this expenditure needed or is it merely a speculative addition which I submit this House ought not to encourage? I therefore do submit the Government should agree to a cut of at least Rs. 50,000 in this. It will not do any harm. What is the good of issuing an estimate when you are not going to spend it? If you will permit me, I will move Mr. Ramachandra Rao's motion as an amendment to Mr. Patel's motion to substitute Rs. 50,000 for Rs. 77,000.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Sir, I just got up to answer a question put by Mr. Neogy. Mr. Neogy asked why it was that last year we provided for only one Assistant Director while this year we have provided for four. I think that Mr. Neogy was last year a member of the Standing Finance Committee. That is a point that I wish to bring to the notice of

this House, that these provisions, to which the House is now objecting as being so grossly extravagant, are proposals which have already received the approval of the Standing Finance Committee last year, and also the approval of this Assembly when they voted the Budget last year.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: I was not a Member of the Standing Finance Committee.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: We are not making provision for any more appointments, and the point which has puzzled Mr. Neogy about the number of Assistant Directors is merely accounted for by this fact. Formerly we had three Assistant Secretaries. We changed their names to Assistant Directors, and we asked for one more Assistant Director and got the sanction of the Standing Finance Committee to that appointment. I hope I have disabused Mr. Neogy of his misapprehension.

Then Mr. Rangachariar said it was loose budgeting for us to provide for the appointment of a Director of Finance before that appointment has been sanctioned. Now our Budget is just the best estimate that we can make of the expenditure which we are likely to incur in the coming year. The mere fact that we make budget provision for any particular post does not mean administrative sanction to that post, and that is why Mr. Sin has given a promise that this question of appointing a Director of Finance will be brought up before the Railway Finance Committee before the appointment is actually brought into existence.

There is another point I should like to bring out in this connection. The House is accusing us of gross extravagance. Here we are strengthening the finance branch of the office by a Director of Finance. The finance branch watches extravagance. We are merely carrying out a recommendation of the Acworth Committee. Is it wise for the House to cut out the provision for this purpose, especially when we have explained we are not going to bring the post into existence till we have discussed the whole matter with the Railway Finance Committee? I have pointed out that this provision for the Railway Board to which exception has been taken by Mr. Patel, has, except for this matter of the Director of Finance, been approved last year by your own elected Standing Finance Committee, and is a provision which was accepted by the House last year. There is little expenditure in the coming year because these new posts were only brought into existence at a late stage this year. There is no real increase of expenditure and I would just like to reinforce one more point since the point has already been made by Mr. Hindley. By this larger establishment, this larger technical staff which we have got on the Railway Board, we have been able in the past year to exercise the greatest possible economy. Every programme which comes up from an Agent now is examined with the utmost care. All indents for wagons, locomotives and everything else are examined by a technical officer. Just let me give one definite case. Only the other day we had an indent from a Railway Agent for a large number of locomotives. We were able through the technical branch of our office to show that instead of buying these new locomotives we were able to transfer to that railway the locomotives from what we considered to be excess stock on another railway. There was a clear saving of many lakhs of rupees there. We were able to do that by means of our new organisation and the new statistics that we keep up.

I do not admit there is extravagance in the Railway Board as at present constituted; but I do say this that we have not the slightest desire to

[Sir Charles Innes.]

have any greater establishment in the Railway Board than is necessary, and, if during the course of the coming year, whatever the cause may be, we find that our work is going down and that our staff is too big, you can take it from me we shall not hesitate for a moment to reduce that staff; but I hope the House will not make this cut because I do not think the House is really in a position to say that these posts are unnecessary. It will make no difference to the General Budget, this small cut of Rs. 77,000, and the whole difference in the position is that we on the railway side have just as much incentive to economy as the representatives of the tax-payer here, because any economy that we effect we get the benefit of it by getting more into our reserve. It seems to me that that makes the whole position different and you can rely on us to do everything possible in the direction of economy.

Mr. K. O. Neogy: Sir, on a point of personal explanation. I was not a member of the Standing Finance Committee last year and had nothing to do with the metamorphosis of Assistant Secretaries into Assistant Directors. The chart I was exhibiting to this House refers to the permanent new organisation of the Railway Board, and that provides only for one Assistant Director and one Assistant Secretary.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I apologize. I was quoting from the memorandum presented to the Standing Finance Committee. I thought that the Honourable Member was a member.

Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar (Madura and Ramnad *cum* Tinnevely: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, only one word. I feel I can testify to the large amount of work that has been done by the Department in connection with this reorganisation—I have read carefully through the reports and admit that a large amount of work has been done. But what I want to point out is this. Since the Budget of 1923-24 which only put this at 10.52 lakhs, it has been 11.6 according to the Budget of this year, and it has risen to 12.16 lakhs in the revised Budget, which means about Rs. 60,000 extra. What is proposed to be done is to add to the expenditure by another Rs. 72,000. Now, what I submit is that within the last two years considerable work has been done and it will probably be found that the Board is overstaffed if it carries on its work in future in the way it has been doing up to now. It is not likely that it will have to check more estimates than it has done in the past two years. All this extra new work will disappear—these statistics, preparation of forms, etc., will become almost routine work hereafter; and the checking of new estimates, the control of new estimates and new ideas to be originated will be the portion of the work that will have to be done by this establishment which has already exhausted the doing of some portion of it, which will as I say become more or less routine work. My submission is that it is not proper to budget for more now. On the contrary, it will have to be cut down. Whatever was wanted was then and there done by the Department and the revised Budget shows that all that was needed has been done.

I will only add one more word. Mr. Hindley referred to standardisation and other questions. I know there is provision for all this under General Administration "Miscellaneous" where you have got Rs. 1,11,00,000 provided. All those questions are connected with that head. I therefore

[Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar.]

submit that, in spite of the extra work done, this is the time you ought to cry halt and not go further simply to do as usual with this Government and add to establishment.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That the Demand under the head ‘Railway Board’ be reduced by Rs. 77,000.”

Further amendment moved:

“To substitute Rs. 50,000 for Rs. 77,000.”

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: I will not press that.

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

Mr. President: The original question was:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,86,000 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, 1926, in respect of the ‘Railway Board’.”

Since which it has been moved:

“That the Demand under the head ‘Railway Board’ be reduced by Rs. 77,000.”

The question I have to put is that the Demand under the head “Railway Board” be reduced by Rs. 77,000.

The Assembly divided:

AYES—59.

Abyankar, Mr. M. V.
Acharya, Mr. M. K.
Ahmad Ali Khan, Mr.
Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.
Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.
Aney, Mr. M. S.
Belvi, Mr. D. V.
Chaman Lall, Mr.
Chanda, Mr. Kamini Kumar.
Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
Duni Chand, Lala
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
Ghose, Mr. S. C.
Goswami, Mr. T. C.
Govind Das, Seth.
Gulab Singh, Sardar.
Hans Raj, Lala.
Hari Prasad Lal, Rai.
Hussanally, Khan Bahadur W. M.
Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
Jajodia, Baboo Runglal.
Jeelani, Haji S. A. K.
Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Kasurbhai Lalbhai, Mr.
Kazim Ali, Shaikh-e-Chatgam Maulvi
Muhammad.
Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
Kidwai, Shaikh Mushir Hcsain.
Lohokare, Dr. K. G.
Mehta, Mr. Jasnadas M.
Misra, Pandit Shamphu Dayal.

Misra, Pandit Harkaran Nath.
Murtaza, Suhit Bahadur, Maulvi
Sayad.
Mutalik, Sardar V. N.
Nambiyar, Mr. K. K.
Narsin Dass, Mr.
Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.
Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
Nehru, Pandit Shamlal.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Pal, Mr. Bipin Chandra.
Patel, Mr. V. J.
Piyare Lal, Lala.
Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur
M.
Rangachariar, Diwan Bahadur T.
Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
Roy, Mr. Bhabendra Chandra.
Sadiq Hasan, Mr. S.
Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.
Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan
Bahadur.
Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.
Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
Sinha, Mr. Ambika Prasad.
Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
Syamacharan, Mr.
Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
Vishindas, Mr. Harchandrai.
Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.

NOES—41.

Abdul Mumtin, Khan Bahadur
 Muhammad.
 Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
 Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
 Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
 Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.
 Ashworth, Mr. E. H.
 Razi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
 Bhoze, Mr. J. W.
 Bray, Mr. Denys.
 Burdon, Mr. E.
 Calvert, Mr. H.
 Clow, Mr. A. G.
 Cocke, Mr. H. G.
 Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.
 Crawford, Colonel J. D.
 Dalal, Sardar B. A.
 Fleming, Mr. E. G.
 Fraser, Sir Gordon.
 Graham, Mr. L.
 Hindley, Mr. C. D. M.
 Hudson, Mr. W. F.
 Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.

Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.
 Makan, Mr. M. E.
 McCallum, Mr. J. L.
 Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra
 Nath.
 Moir, Mr. T. E.
 Muddiman, The Honourable Sir
 Alexander.
 Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur
 Saiyid.
 Naidu, Mr. M. C.
 Raj Narain, Rai Bahadur.
 Rhodes, Sir Campbell.
 Rushbrook-Williams, Prof. L. F.
 Sastri, Diwan Bahadur C. V.
 Visvanatha.
 Sim, Mr. G. G.
 Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
 Sykes, Mr. E. F.
 Tonkinson, Mr. H.
 Webb, Mr. M.
 Willson, Mr. W. S. J.
 Wilson, Mr. R. A.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: Reduction No. 2, standing in Mr. Joshi's name does not arise on this—it arises on Demand No. 12 or on a later demand in any case; similarly Mr. Goswami's reduction No. 5 by Rs. 10,000 (Saloons for Officers) arises on a later demand.

Mr. T. C. Goswami: There is an item "Travelling Allowances" in this Demand. If you look at the Explanation (c) on page 1, there is an increased demand of Rs. 7,000 for travelling allowances. But if it is your wish that I should defer my remarks, I shall take another opportunity.

Mr. K. Rama Iyengar: May I point out that "saloons" come under the head "Carriage and Wagon Department".

Mr. President: I understood the Honourable Member to raise the point that he wishes the provision for saloons for officers to be reduced and he can raise that question when we come to the stage of the construction of rolling stock; otherwise it would be a question of putting it down under Travelling Allowances.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask, Sir, under which Demand my amendment comes?

Mr. President: If the Honourable Member studies the Demands, he will see.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: No statement of the officers is given and it is not possible for me to find it exactly.

Mr. President: If the Honourable Member himself acknowledges that the officer is not given, then he knows he is out of order. The Honourable Member will find it, I think, under No. 12—but I am not quite sure: no, it is No. 11.

I propose to take now, as suggested this morning, the amendment standing in the name of Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha and those of the five

Members following, as they all relate to the question of the appointment of an Indian or other changes in the personnel of the Railway Board.

APPOINTMENT OF AN INDIAN ON THE RAILWAY BOARD.

Sardar V. N. Mutalik (Gujarat and Deccan Sardars and Inamdars: Landholders): Sir, the amendment which stands in my name is that the Demand under the head "Railway Board" be reduced by Rs. 100, and the reason which is stated there is the appointment of an Indian on the Railway Board.

Sir, when the elder brother goes away the younger brother becomes the heir and he becomes the pet child. Now, when the first motion that stood on the agenda to-day was lost, this, I hope, will be the pet child of the House. In fact the difference between the first motion and this motion is very little. On the first motion the Honourable Pandit wanted to pass a vote of censure on the general management of the Railway Board; this motion is intended only to point out one grievance, namely, with regard to the appointment of an Indian on the Railway Board. It may be pointed out that, when we passed the separation of the railway finances from the general finances, a promise was made of more Indianisation; and the Honourable Member in charge gave us an assurance that Indians would find an increasing place in the management of Railways and on the Board. What that course should be is my main question, whether we should wait for Indians to rise from the bottom to the top or whether we should import an Indian fresh from outside. Unless an Indian is imported fresh and we have one Indian to start with, I do not think we should be satisfied; nor do I suppose it was the intention of the House that we should wait till a competent Indian rose from the lower ranks to the highest ranks and becomes eligible in due course to be appointed to a place on the Board.

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally: Imported from where?

Sardar V. N. Mutalik: My Honourable friend is very anxious to know from where an Indian is to come. Well, I do not want a man from England. There are already a sufficient number of men from England on the Railway Board, so I want a man from India. I want a competent man to be appointed on the Railway Board, though he may not happen to be in the railway service. I hope that answer will satisfy my Honourable friend.

Then, Sir, the Railway Board is entrusted with full powers. They have got a free hand, and the idea of giving a free hand to the Railway Board was really in the interests of the railway administration. Now the main question is, as the Railway Board has wide powers, why the House should not insist on having an Indian on the Board to express the Indian view. I do not want to go into details, but I want this question to be treated only on broad principles, namely, whether we should have the Indian voice on the Railway Board or not

Mr. Ohaman Lall (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): On a point of order, Sir. May I know, Sir, is it a question of appointing a representative of the workers on the Railway Board or an Indian on the Railway Board?

Mr. President: The Honourable Member, I understand, is moving his amendment in respect of an Indian on the Railway Board. I pointed out that it might be convenient to take all the amendments which propose changes in the personnel of the Railway Board together, but as the Honourable Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha in whose name the first amendment stands is not present, his amendment falls.

Sardar V. N. Mutalik: I can assure the Honourable Member that I should have no objection whatsoever to another representative of the workers being appointed on the Railway Board in addition to an Indian. The whole question, Sir, is whether Indians will have a voice or not in the management of the Railways. I trust that on this broad question the House will be unanimous. I am really sorry, Sir, that on the first motion this morning there was some sad scene which is not really quite in keeping with the dignity of this House, but I hope that the whole affair will be forgotten and that the Honourable Members on this side will join hands and pass this item in order to show their disapproval of the action of the Government in not appointing an Indian on the Railway Board.

Mr. G. Duraiswami Aiyangar (Madras ceded districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, the question that arises on this motion is as to how the Railway Board should be constituted so that a proper policy may be arrived at and carried on in this country. Sir, the question is not whether there should be one Indian on the Board, but the question really is whether there should be any non-Indian on the Board. Sir, in so far as the Railways which have to carry on their function in this country for the benefit of the people of this country, for the benefit of the trade and commerce of this country, are concerned, when the taxpayers' money of this country is involved in it, the question is who should have a strong hand in the management of this policy. If it is contended that the railway policy in this country is carried on not for the good of the people, not for the convenience of the people here, but for the sake of British interests, British manufacturers and British traders, then there is absolute justification that the entire Railway Board should consist of non-Indians and Europeans alone. Sir, if, on the other hand, you concede that in this country the policy must be so shaped as to bring about the convenience of Indian passengers, Indian traders and Indian merchants, then, Sir, the only logical conclusion that we can come to is to have the Board entirely constituted on Indian lines if possible, and to provide only for one non-Indian to represent the non-Indian interests in this country. That, Sir, ought to be the motion to be brought before this House, and it is a moderate motion which my Honourable friend Mr. Mutalik has made in asking for one Indian on the Board.

Sir, it seems to be pretty clear that in this country the railway policy is carried on in such a manner that the carrying of passengers is considered only as a subsidiary matter and the development of foreign trade as the principal matter, and that is why we find in this country commercial lines, strategic lines, luxury lines like the lines to Simla and the Nilgiris, but there is not a single line which suits the necessities of the people of this country. Sir, if you compare the statistics of passengers in this country with those in other countries, you will find that in a religious country like this, a larger number of passengers are going on pilgrimages, and if anything else you will find a large number going to law courts only to ruin themselves. This is the business for which most people are

travelling. Now, Sir, that accounts for the fact that, although there are 818 million people in this country, we have got only 37,000 odd miles, whereas in other countries like England we have 50,000 miles of railway for 43 million people, 34,600 miles for 60 million people in Germany, and 262,000 miles of railway for 118 million of people in the United States of America. Out of the entire 660,000 miles of railways in the world, what is it that India commands? Not even one per cent. That is because the development of railway communications in this country has not been so carried on as to promote the trading and other mercantile interests of this country, but it has been carried on to serve the foreign traders and foreign imports and exports.

Sir, my Honourable young friend, Mr. Rushbrook Williams, has correctly stated in his Moral and Material Progress Report—I am sure he will not be offended if I call him "young" friend, because he has stated in his Report somewhere that comparing the average age of the Members of this Assembly with the average age of the Members of the last Assembly the average is a low age in this Assembly and I believe it is he who has largely contributed to that and not I, and therefore I call him my young friend,—he has stated in his Report referring to the attitude of the people in this country:

"It is quite permissible to maintain that the deep lying religious sentiment which causes the vast majority of Indians to regard their present lives as relatively unimportant in the great fabric of past and future embodies something far nobler and more enduring than the material and the highly individualised ideals of the western world."

He puts down all our people as philosophical people, and therefore perhaps the Government need not, and certainly the railway authorities need not, minister to their material wants and it is enough if they minister only to their spiritual wants. But even that has not been done. What is it that you do to consult the convenience of the passengers who are of a philosophic or religious turn of mind? You have levied a pilgrim tax of one anna per head including children. This we have added

Mr. President: The Honourable Member cannot roam over the whole realm of railway administration on a reduction moved to draw attention to the need for an Indian Member on the Railway Board.

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: The principal reason for which I touched this question was to show that if the Board were constituted of Indian Members, they would have consulted these matters more readily than a Board consisting purely of foreigners. That, Sir, was my justification for touching on that matter. Now, Sir, the Railway policy will also be regulated if Indian members are on the Board more to suit the means of the people here, which will necessarily lead to their reduction of fares. But again I am not going to touch on the actual details of the reduction of fares on this occasion and I hope I will be able to catch the eye of the Chair on another occasion; but if there is any anxiety on my part to express everything now alone it is only for fear that I may not be able to catch the eye of the Chair on all occasions.

Now, Sir, with regard to the policy of the Railway Companies—I do not wish to go into details, as I have already assured you—one thing which the Railway Board is observing is racial distinctions, and that is consequent upon the fact that there is no Indian on the Board and that leads to the fact that not only in the services but in almost every department of Railways we find racial distinction is made. In the services it is largely made to the prejudice of my countrymen and the

[Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar.]

other day Mr. Neogy pointed out the distinction made in the reservation of compartments, and you find even on the station platforms boards bearing "native men" and "European gentlemen", "native women" and "European ladies". Sir, I believe that a strong Indian element in the Railway Board will not countenance differences like this being made. Sir, in the matter of the promotion of commerce also, you will observe a different policy if the Railway Board is manned by Indians. What is the kind of trade help which you are now getting? Coal which can be carried from Bengal to Bombay cannot compete with coal which is brought from South Africa to Bombay. Salt which is transported by railways in India cannot compete with ballast salt which is brought from abroad, from Liverpool and other places. How is it? Because you do not in any way give concessions either in freight or any other kind of concessions to the transport of Indian goods. These, Sir, are things which an Indian Board will certainly take into consideration and I do not therefore go into other details on this occasion but I support heartily my friend Mr. Mutalik's motion with this reservation that if possible I would like to have a Railway Board with one non-Indian and the rest Indians.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Sir, on page 5 of the Indian Railways Administration Report for 1923-24, Vol. I, we are given an idea of the responsibilities of the Government of India with regard to the Railways. The report says:

"The size of the work and responsibility which falls on the department is indicated by the various functions which Government has to fulfil in regard to railways in India as the direct owner of the large majority of mileage, the controlling authority of three large systems aggregating over 9,000 miles, the predominant partner in the Companies which manage the remainder of the trunk system and the guarantor of many of the smaller companies besides being the statutory authority over all railways in regard to public safety, services to the public and many other matters."

In such an important undertaking for 300 millions of people, not one Indian is associated and that too after Railways have been in existence since 1848 or even earlier. Sir, this Railway Board has developed from very small and modest beginnings. Government began to control the railways through a consulting engineer of guaranteed railways and then they went on changing the form of this control time after time; and I find from this Report, Appendix B of the Report, Vol. I, that this controlling authority was changed nearly fourteen or fifteen times until it has now become embodied in this Railway Commission. But during all these various transmigrations of this particular functionary no Indian has ever figured and it does not appear that he is likely to figure very soon. Can Government point out why it is so? Did it ever enter their minds that this was absolutely necessary; that responsible as Government were for the management of so much mileage, of communications and transport, that the people of the country should have at least one or two people on that Board? But unfortunately, as it appears, Government have never given any thought to that matter and the stock argument has always been that no fit Indian could be found. To this, Sir, Pandit Motilal Nehru, has this morning given an answer and he even went to the length of naming some individuals who could very well be appointed to the Railway Board if Government ever were willing to do so. (*Mr. W. M. Hussanally:* "He only named one.") Yes, but he indicated others. Many more could be named but it is invidious to name them and it is therefore

that I am not naming them, but if Government will cast their eyes about all over the country, they will find not only one but I am sure a hundred people who could be recognised as very fit and proper persons for being Members of the Railway Board. (*An Honourable Member: "Agents of Railways"?*) Pandit Motilal pointed out that the Financial Commissioner need not be a railway man. I do not indicate thereby that I have the slightest intention that Mr. Sim should be displaced because I value his services very much, but all I do is to lay down a principle, that Government could have appointed not one Indian but two Indians if they wanted to. That is our greatest complaint that at the head and source of Railway control there is no Indian to represent the Indian point of view. Even the Executive Council has got three Indians, good, bad or indifferent—it does not matter. But this Railway Board seems to be more sacrosanct than even the Executive Council. It seems to me that Government seem conscious that in the Executive Council things can be managed even if there is an Indian, but in the Railway Board, if an Indian got in, it would be difficult to control him in the manner they liked. That is the only implication or suggestion that one can read into their failure so far to appoint an Indian. Sir, I am very serious in pressing this amendment that in spite of these fourteen transmutations of the controlling authority, we have not been able to find a suitable Indian is a serious thing. Then turning to page 46 of the Acworth Committee's Report, I find that complaint was voiced in strong terms on page 46, paragraph 139. After stating their view that:

"So far we have dealt with the working of the administrative machinery. But this machine is at the present moment, and must, as we have said, continue to be for some years to come, worked mainly by non-Indian officers."

the Committee go on:

"Witness after witness representing Indian opinion has complained that the Indians have no voice in the management of their own railways. We think that no scheme of reform can attain its purpose of fitting the railways to the needs of the Indian public unless that public has an adequate voice in the matter."

Of course, this refers to all kinds of adequate representation, namely, through this Assembly, through the Standing Finance Committee, through the Railway Board, through the Advisory Committees. Everywhere, wherever the railway administration is concerned, Indian views and Indian sentiments and Indian interests must be frankly and adequately represented. That consummation I do not see even in the distant future because Sir Charles Innes in the last September session said that he did not see any Indian fit for the job. Further, Sir, this very humble amendment for a cut of Rs. 100 is not intended as a cut at all and it is merely to draw attention and, if passed, it would amount to a vote of censure. But, Sir, it is not going to teach anybody the much-needed lesson that the Indian must be recognised in a matter of such vital importance to his own country. But there is no other alternative now as the total omission cut has been defeated and as the House has ruled that we must be satisfied with smaller cuts. Therefore, I think the House will unanimously vote in favour of this modest proposition.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Sir, with regard to what the Honourable Member has just said, I should like to say that the Assembly from our point of view has never shown that it is more dangerous than when it is reasonable; and, when it moves a reduction of Rs. 100 in order to make

[Sir Charles Innes.]

a representation to Government on any particular point, we on the Government side attach just as much importance and respect to that recommendation as we should have done had the House cut out the whole of the Railway Board Budget this morning. (*The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett*: "More".) In fact, more, as the Honourable Sir Basil Blackett says. But I am sorry, Sir, this is a matter on which I must remain, I am afraid, at variance with the House. Mr. Patel this morning said that it was a definite part of the convention that there should be an Indian upon the Railway Board. I do not think that the Honourable Member ought to make that statement, for, Mr. Patel must know, or at any rate his memory must be short, that we discussed this particular point at great length when we discussed the separation in September. What I said was this. I said it in the hearing of the whole House.

"As regards the members of the Railway Board, I cannot bind myself to dates as it must take time before there are Indians of the requisite standing and experience in the Railway Department for appointments to the Railway Board. But as I pointed out the other day, the Railway Board is a technical body and does not control policy."

Mr. V. J. Patel: You allowed the Resolution to be passed unanimously. You did not oppose it. You did not challenge a division.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: In the convention there is no reference whatsoever to the question of Indians on the Railway Board.

Mr. V. J. Patel: But there is in the Resolution reference to members of the Railway Board also.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: What I said, Sir, was exactly the same as what the Acworth Committee said. I am obliged to Mr. Jamnadas Mehta for reading out the very passage which supports my point.

"The machine must, as we have said, continue to be for some years to come worked mainly by non-Indian officers."

(*Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta*: "Please read on".) And then they went on to say that it was important to bring Indian public opinion to bear upon railway administration, and that is what we have been doing. Have we not got these Advisory Councils? Has not the recommendation of the Acworth Committee been carried out by us? Have we not got the Central Advisory Council? Is there not this Legislature and is not Indian public opinion in all these ways being brought to bear upon the railway administration? The whole difficulty is this. The constitution of our Railway Board is a technical Board. It is a technical Board composed, with the exception of the Financial Commissioner, entirely of technical men. It is no use mentioning to me a distinguished Indian who may have engineering experience, but no experience at all in the technical railway work.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: With financial experience?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: It is no use mentioning men of that kind to me. We hold that for the Railway Board, as at present constituted, he must have an intimate acquaintance with railway work. As regards the Financial Commissioner, that is quite a different matter. Our principle in making the appointment of Financial Commissioner was to get the very best man we could. The officer whom we have was recommended

by Lord Incheape himself and I daresay that everybody in this House will agree with me that though he may have the misfortune of not being an Indian, at any rate he has the good fortune to be a real financial genius. I myself have thought about this matter quite a lot since the September session and one suggestion which I have had in my own mind is whether we could not attach one other man to the Railway Board, add to the strength of the Railway Board by one in order to provide for an Indian. I may say that as far as I am concerned, we would gladly pay Rs. 50,000 a year in order to avoid at any rate being harried upon this question in this Assembly. But, Sir, I am afraid that on principle I do not think we ought to adopt that expedient. It has been considered on more than one occasion. In fact, this suggestion was made to the Acworth Committee and the Acworth Committee did not recommend it to the Government of India. The difficulty is this. If we take on an extraneous man, an Indian or a commercial man, and put him in the Railway Board, we could not find work for him. Each member of the Railway Board has got his definite sphere of work. Mr. Sim deals with finance, Mr. Sheridan with traffic questions, Mr. Hadow with engineering and Mr. Hindley is the Chief Commissioner and head of them all. There is no definite sphere of work for an outsider who has got no railway experience. What will he do? If his business is to find files in which some question comes up about Indians, that would not do. I am perfectly certain that it would not add to what we look to most in the Railway Board, namely, efficiency and good management of railways. I have thought of this matter very deeply,—because I know it is one on which the House feels deeply—and I am afraid, Sir, that there is no solution but that of time. You have got to begin at the bottom in this matter. It may be that we were most slow in Indianising in the past. But you cannot hold that charge up against us now. In the last 3 years we have, I think I am correct in saying, filled 50 per cent. of the vacancies in State Railways with Indians. We have agreed to take 75 per cent. in the future, so that, in 15 or 20 years' time your Railways will practically be Indianised throughout. Mr. Jinnah the other day in talking about Indianisation of the Army, said he did not ask for it to-day or to-morrow or the next week or in 10 years. All he wanted was that we were working on a definite policy of Indianising the army. Sir, I wish to point out to the House that we are working on that definite policy in regard to Railways. You have got no complaint against us on that score. All I can say at present is that this matter of an Indian on the Railway Board is a matter which time alone can solve, and I must ask the House to have patience.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao: *Sir, the reply of Sir Charles Innes to this motion is very unsatisfactory. I wish to bring to the notice of Honourable Members that in September last, when this convention was entered into, I moved an amendment in the following terms:

“Apart from the above convention this Assembly further recommends that the railway services should be rapidly Indianised, and further that Indians should be appointed as members of the Railway Board as early as possible.”

So far as the House was concerned, at that time this Resolution was carried unanimously and even before this amendment was carried in the House, this matter of Indianisation of the railway services and the appointment of Indians on the Railway Board had formed the subject of very

* Not corrected by the Honourable Member.

[Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao.]

acute controversy and negotiation between the Honourable Member and several of us outside the House. Therefore, Sir, this question of Indianisation and of having one Indian at least in the controlling organ of railway administration was one on which, as my Honourable friend will see, we were very keen. A few days ago, in presenting the Railway Budget, the Honourable Member adverted to this question and spoke as follows:

"Honourable Members are apt to complain that few Indians have risen to high posts in the Railways and none to the Railway Board. That is true. But they must remember that it is only in recent years that Indians have joined the Gazetted ranks of railway offices in any number, and time must be allowed for them to find their way to the top."

In giving his answer to this motion to-day the Honourable Member has more or less repeated the same sentiments, namely, that Indians should rise in the ordinary manner before they could reach to the top, that they must enter one of the railway services, either the Engineering or the Traffic or the other branches either in State Railways or in Company-managed lines and that in that manner they must find their way into the Railway Board. I do not know, Sir, the exact field of recruitment for the Railway Board, but I imagine that it is mainly from the Agents of Railways and also from the senior Engineering officers of the State establishments. Sir, I have before me the classified list of these officers and it is undoubtedly true that there is absolutely no Indian at present on this list who could be promoted to this office. If my Honourable friend's argument is to be logically carried out, there could be none, I expect, for the next 35 years. (The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: "No.") 30 years? 25 years? 20 years? When will you be in a position to appoint either a Financial Commissioner or a member who will look after the mechanical engineering and civil engineering branch of the Railway Board's work?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The Financial Commissioner is not necessarily a technical railway man.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao: I therefore think that if we were to accept the argument of my Honourable friend and its logical implications it would come to this. Unless you have a man in the Traffic Department and he rises to the position to which he could be appointed in the Railway Board he cannot think of appointing any Indian to that office. Similarly, in the engineering side unless you have an Indian officer who would rise to the position of a Chief Engineer he would not think of appointing an Indian to the Railway Board. The same is the case with regard to the other technical branches of the Railway Board. In regard to the Financial Commissionership, Honourable Members know Mr. Sim very well. I have as much admiration for his ability and capacity for work as my Honourable friend has. But after all, he is a member of the Indian Civil Service. I know that members of that Service have a habit of moving from one superior post to another and I do expect to see Mr. Sim not necessarily in the very near future moved on to another post and probably to a higher post. In these circumstances the only way in which you could train an Indian to fit himself to discharge the functions of the Financial Commissioner is immediately to appoint an officer to work along with Mr. Sim and when the time comes for Mr. Sim to move on to a higher post, for that officer to take up that position and be appointed as the Financial Commissioner. So far as the financial administration is concerned, we

have a very large number of Indians in the Finance Department and without mentioning any name I am perfectly certain that Sir Basil Blackett can find a man who will certainly fulfil all the requirements of the office of Financial Commissioner. Therefore, so far as the question of the Financial Commissionership is concerned, I do not find the slightest justification for taking up the attitude which Sir Charles Innes has taken up to-day. If you immediately appoint an officer, he can certainly undergo a probation under Mr. Sim for some time and when Mr. Sim moves on to another post he can certainly be appointed as Financial Commissioner. Of course, I do not know that the Government, in proposing the new appointment of Director of Finance, had any of these considerations in view but I do not wish to press my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes to say what he intends to do in regard to this new appointment of Director of Finance. If Sir Charles Innes takes the line that I have suggested, there will be no difficulty in satisfying the almost unanimous wish of this House that an Indian should be appointed on the Railway Board. We are asking for this appointment for various reasons. One is the natural desire of Indians to occupy the most responsible posts in the railway administration. Another is that they want to shoulder the responsibility of this high administrative post. The Honourable Sir Charles Innes the other day talked with very considerable pride of his habit of shouldering responsibility. Does he not expect any of my countrymen to occupy an exactly similar place and be accustomed to shoulder responsibility? I must say that the reply which I have heard from Sir Charles Innes is very disappointing. It does not show that sympathy which I expected from him for our ideas in this matter. In these circumstances, Sir, it seems to me that we must press the motion to a division.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett (Finance Member): Sir, I hope that the House will think again about making this cut. In the course of this afternoon the House has made one cut the effect of which, if carried out, is to turn out two Indians from the Finance Branch of the Railways, and I think three Indians altogether. They have also declined to agree to the proposal to appoint a Director of Finance. The result of such action cannot be to hasten Indianisation. When the House are considering this new cut, I think they should not go away with the impression that Sir Charles Innes's last statement on the subject was so unsympathetic as Diwan Bahadur Ramachandra Rao seems to have thought. Sir Charles Innes was speaking of the difficulty of early action in regard to the addition of a technical railway man who is an Indian until such time as one had grown up in course of training. There are obvious difficulties, and the time, though it may be short as compared with the history of India, is long as compared with the history of this House. But as regards the special post of Financial Commissioner what Mr. Ramachandra Rao said just now is clearly quite reasonable. There is every prospect I hope that we shall enjoy the services of Mr. Sim as Financial Commissioner on the Railway Board for some time to come and I for one should be extremely regretful if I have to lose that particular watchdog of the Finance Department in the Railway Department. But we are all ephemeral and it is possible no doubt that even Mr. Sim's period as Financial Commissioner may come to an end. Then undoubtedly an opportunity will arise for considering very seriously the possibility of obtaining an Indian as a member of the Railway Board as the Financial Commissioner. Whether when the time comes the most suitable candidate will be an Indian or will not be an Indian is a matter on which it is quite impossible to prophesy, but I

[Sir Basil Blackett.]

would venture to say this that the scales would be weighted quite definitely in favour of the Indian candidate when the time comes. The action of the House in dealing with these demands for grants is one to which I think very great attention should be paid by the House. Diwan Bahadur Rangachariar, speaking the other day on a Bill of Mr. Patel, said that we are not considering a mere Resolution but that we are considering legislation and so we have to consider the consequences of our action. You are now considering the amount that is to be voted to carry on the railway services in the course of the year and the consequences of your action have to be considered very carefully. If you make a cut of a substantial amount as was made just now, you do not assist the process, with which I for one heartily agree, as described by Mr. Pal, of hastening the day when certification and restoration become so rare as to be regarded as really unconstitutional. That is the position we want to arrive at. Here the House has the opportunity of sharing a responsibility with Government in the management of our finances and in the expenditure of the country. If the House will think twice before it makes a cut, it must first consider whether it is a case where, whatever good reasons we may think we have for our grievances against Government, if we make this cut, restoration is inevitable. (A Voice: "Cut of Rs. 100?") I think the House should satisfy itself with making a demonstration and then withdrawing the motion. In the same way with the Rs. 100 cut. The Rs. 100 cut is meant to draw attention to certain grievances. An opportunity has been taken to draw attention to those grievances and if the House is satisfied, as I think it ought to be, that we are serious in this matter of Indianising and introducing an Indian into the Railway Board at the earliest possible moment, then, I think the House might consistently with its dignity and with great advantage to its system of control over the finances of the country withdraw the motion and let us go on to another subject.

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally: May I inquire if this amendment is carried whether it will not speed up the transfer of Mr. Sim to the Law Membership about to become vacant and make room for one of his subordinates, say, for instance, Mr. Aiyar of the Currency Department?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I hope it will not hasten Mr. Sim's retirement, but if it does, it will be a very strong argument against the House carrying the present motion.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas (Indian Merchants' Chamber: Indian Commerce): I wish to support the appeal made by the Honourable the Finance Member that these 100-rupee cuts should not be passed by this House lightly but I also wish to point out to him that in the course of the debate this afternoon this is the first time that we have heard any sympathetic speech from the Government Benches and that any Member from those Benches has tried to enter into the spirit of the attitude taken up by Members on this side of the House and has tried to reason with us. The Honourable the Finance Member reminded us that the result of the voting on the previous amendment, namely, the Rs. 77,000 cut, would be that the posts of two Indians would be scrapped. Every one of us here wants Indianisation but we certainly want less expenditure even though it may mean a sacrifice of Indian staff. In fact if you save Rs. 77,000 and not appoint Indians, I take it that I am voicing the feelings of this House when I say that we would like the saving. Therefore, there is nothing in that

argument and I hope that it will not be used. If the question is put, why was that cut insisted upon by this House with the solid majority of 59 against 41, the reply to my mind is simple and I would like to put before the Treasury Benches my view as to why the voting went as it did. The Honourable the Financial Commissioner (Mr. Sim) in his speech indicated that one appointment was not made and that regarding the other certain economies were likely. As an offer was made from this side by several Members, Government could have brought in their demand for this appointment later on as a supplementary demand and told us what amount they expected to be able to cut now. The Honourable the Chief Commissioner got up and preached a sermon as to what an important machine Railways are and how lightly, in his opinion, this House views the responsibilities and the great burdens of the offices carried by members of the Railway Board. I felt at that stage that we might have been spared all that. We were making a definite cut.

Mr. President: We are talking of a different cut now.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: I therefore feel, Sir, that if the Government Benches really want as few cuts of Rs. 100 as possible, which I understand are looked upon as votes of censure by the Government, they ought to make every genuine effort not only to take this House into their confidence but also to go further and meet their views as far as possible, and I submit that they could have done it on the last amendment.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): *When I listened to the speech of my friend Sir Charles Innes I must say I was disappointed. I had something to do with the convention in the Resolution that was passed and I think Sir Charles Innes remembers perfectly well what that Resolution was, as it was amended, and the Government did not oppose the amendment which was moved on our side. That amendment was as follows:

"That the railway service should be rapidly Indianised and further that Indians should be appointed as members of the Railway Board as early as possible."

Now, Sir, I recognise that even a cut of Rs. 100 or a motion to reduce the grant by Rs. 100 is a very serious matter. In one way I consider it is far more serious because it amounts directly to a vote of censure on the Government and if the Government were not irremovable, as is the case with the Treasury Benches, probably the Government might be defeated and they might for their own self-respect resign and dissolve this House, so that somebody else might take their places. I want the Members of the Treasury Benches to understand this that we fully recognise the gravity of this vote. It is a vote of censure. On the other hand, if a substantial cut is made, it may be that we do not agree with your estimates. It may be an over-estimate. Therefore I say that this is a much graver matter than the other one but it is not a case of restoring it. I do want Sir Charles Innes to make it once more clear to this House that you are going to appoint an Indian to the Railway Board as soon as possible, not merely in words but in real intentions and that you will assure this House that you will not allow any opportunity to pass, if you get one, of appointing an Indian when there is the next vacancy. I must get that assurance in view of the fact that, when we moved this amendment, you did not oppose it, and Sir Charles Innes will bear me out when I say that it was

* Not corrected by the Honourable Member.

[Mr. M. A. Jinnah.]

from our point of view a very important part of the convention and the convention was accepted by us on the understanding that the Government would not oppose this amendment of ours. To-day what do we find? We find that that date is slipping away, getting as distant as it ever was before. Now I expect a different answer, and I do appeal to Sir Charles Innes to assure this House without any ambiguity that it is the intention of the Honourable Member that he will carry it out without any delay.

Pandit Motilal Nehru (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhammadan Urban): In view of the last two speeches it is necessary that I should make the position of my party perfectly clear. Unfortunately for us official frowns and official smiles have absolutely no effect upon us. There is no doubt that my Honourable friend Sir Purshotandas has been considerably affected by what he called the sympathetic speech of my friend Sir Basil Blackett. But there is some doubt in the mind of my Honourable friend Mr. Jinnah and he wants it to be removed by a further assurance in the specific terms which he has stated from my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes. I may say once for all that neither the statement of my Honourable friend Sir Basil Blackett nor any statement that may be made by Sir Charles Innes will change our attitude in the least degree on this motion. It is a motion for a mild censure and as the bigger motion for severer censure has failed because we were in a minority we shall again risk a defeat but will not give our assent to the withdrawal of this motion.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I just wish to say one word in reply to what Mr. Jinnah said. Mr. Jinnah has asked me to give a definite assurance to the House that every effort will be made to appoint an Indian to the Railway Board

Sir Hari Singh Gour: To the next vacancy.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: To the next vacancy in the Railway Board. I think Mr. Jinnah will bear me out that in the first place what I might call the annex to the convention is no part of the convention, and in the second place that I made the position of the Government perfectly clear in that matter that in regard to the technical members of the Railway Board I said I could not bind myself to dates and I am afraid I must adhere to that position. I definitely did not refer myself to the Financial Commissioner for Railways because I regard that appointment as one which should be made by the Honourable the Finance Member. I make the recommendation myself to the Viceroy, but I always do so on the recommendation of the Honourable the Finance Member, and that is why I left the Honourable the Finance Member to deal with the question of the Financial Commissioner, and it seems to me the Honourable the Finance Member has gone just as far as any officer of Government could possibly have done. He told you that he hopes, and I hope, that Mr. Sim will remain Financial Commissioner for Railways as long as he can, but when the vacancy does come, he has given an assurance to this House that the claims of an Indian to that post will be considered; and I must ask the House to be content with that assurance.

Mr. President: The original question was:

"That a reduced sum not exceeding Rs. 9,09,000 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, 1926, in respect of the 'Railway Board'."

Since which an amendment has been moved :

“ That the demand under the head ‘ Railway Board ’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

The question is that that amendment be made.

The Assembly divided :

AYES—58.

Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
 Acharya, Mr. M. K.
 Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.
 Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.
 Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
 Alimuzzaman Chowdhry, Mr.
 Aney, Mr. M. S.
 Belvi, Mr. D. V.
 Chaman Lall, Mr.
 Chanda, Mr. Kamini Kumar.
 Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
 Duni Chand, Lala.
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
 Goswami, Mr. T. C.
 Gour, Sir Hari Singh.
 Govind Das, Seth.
 Gulab Singh, Sardar.
 Hans Raj, Lal.
 Hari Prasad Lal, Rai.
 Hussanally, Khan Bahadur W. M.
 Ismail Khan, Mr.
 Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
 Jajodia, Baboo Runglal.
 Jeelani, Haji S. A. K.
 Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.
 Kasturbhai Lalbhai, Mr.
 Kazim Ali, Shaikh-e-Chatgam Maulvi
 Muhammad.
 Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
 Kidwai, Shaikh Mushu Hosain.

Lohokare, Dr. K. G.
 Mehta, Mr. Jannadas M.
 Misra, Pandit Shambhu Dayal.
 Misra, Pandit Harkaran Nath.
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi
 Sayad.
 Mutalik, Sardar V. N.
 Narain Dass, Mr.
 Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.
 Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
 Nehru, Pandit Shamlal.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.
 Pal, Mr. Bipin Chandra.
 Patel, Mr. V. J.
 Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
 Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.
 Rangachariar, Diwan Bahadur T.
 Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
 Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.
 Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.
 Sarda, Rai Sahib M. Harbilas.
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan
 Bahadur.
 Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.
 Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
 Sinha, Mr. Ambika Prasad.
 Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
 Syamacharan, Mr.
 Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
 Vishindas, Mr. Harchandrai.

NOES—40.

Abdul Mumin, Khan Bahadur
 Muhammad.
 Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
 Ajab Khan, Captain.
 Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.
 Ashworth, Mr. E. H.
 Bhoire, Mr. J. W.
 Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
 Bray, Mr. Denys.
 Burdon, Mr. E.
 Calvert, Mr. H.
 Clow, Mr. A. G.
 Cocke, Mr. H. G.
 Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.
 Crawford, Colonel J. D.
 Fleming, Mr. E. G.
 Fraser, Sir Gordon.
 Graham, Mr. L.
 Hindley, Mr. C. D. M.
 Hira Singh, Sardar Bahadur Captain.
 Hudson, Mr. W. F.
 Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.
 Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.

McCallum, Mr. J. L.
 Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra
 Nath.
 Moir, Mr. T. E.
 Muddiman, The Honourable Sir
 Alexander.
 Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur
 Saiyid.
 Naidu, Mr. M. C.
 Raj Narain, Rai Bahadur.
 Rhodes, Sir Campbell.
 Rushbrook-Williams, Prof. L. F.
 Sastri, Diwan Bahadur C. V.
 Visvanatha.
 Sim, Mr. G. G.
 Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
 Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.
 Sykes, Mr. E. F.
 Tonkinson, Mr. H.
 Webb, Mr. M.
 Willson, Mr. W. S. J.
 Wilson, Mr. R. A.

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday,
 the 26th February, 1925.