

24th February, 1926

THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report) .

Volume VII, Part II

(10th February to 1st March, 1926)

FOURTH SESSION

OF THE

SECOND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1926



DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1926

Legislative Assembly.

The President :

THE HONOURABLE MR. V. J. PATEL.

Deputy President :

DIWAN BAHADUR T. RANGACHARIAR, M.L.A.

Panel of Chairmen :

MR. K. C. NEOGY, M.L.A.

SIR DARCY LINDSAY, M.L.A.

LALA LAJPAT RAI, M.L.A., AND

MR. ABDUL HAYE, M.L.A.

Secretary :

MR. L. GRAHAM, C.I.E., M.L.A.

Assistants of the Secretary :

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

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

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

Marshal :

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

Committee on Public Petitions :

DIWAN BAHADUR T. RANGACHARIAR, M.L.A., *Chairman.*

DIWAN BAHADUR M. RAMACHANDRA RAO, M.L.A.

COLONEL J. D. CRAWFORD, M.L.A.

MR. JAMNADAS M. MEHTA, M.L.A.

MR. ABDUL HAYE, M.L.A.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME VII, PART II—10th February, 1926, to 1st March, 1926.

	PAGES.
Wednesday, 10th February, 1926—	
Questions and Answers	1011-20
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1020-22
The Hindu Religious and Charitable Trusts Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1022
Statement laid on the Table	1023
Elections of Panels for Standing Committees	1023-25
The Indian Naturalization Bill—Passed as amended	1026-40
The Insolvency (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1040-41
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Second Amendment) Bill— Motion to consider adopted... ..	1042-81
Friday, 12th February, 1926—	
Questions and Answers	1083-1101
Unstarred Question and Answer	1102
Statement of Business	1102-03
The Bengal State Prisoners Regulation (Repeal) Bill—Debate adjourned	1103-49
Monday, 15th February, 1926—	
Questions and Answers	1151-86
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1186-91
Messsages from H. E. the Governor-General	1191
Results of the Elections to the Panels for Standing Committees	1192
Death of Maulvi Muhammad Kazim Ali	1193-94
Comments in a Newspaper reflecting on the Impartiality of the Chair	1195
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Second Amendment) Bill— Passed	1196-1212
The Delhi Joint Water Board Bill—Introduced	1212
The Madras Civil Courts (Second Amendment) Bill—Intro- duced	1212
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Com- mittee	1212-19
Demands for Excess Grants	1219-34
Demands for Supplementary Grants	1234-60
Tuesday, 16th February, 1926—	
Questions and Answers	1261-64
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1264-68
Resolution <i>re</i> the Burma Expulsion of Offenders Act— Adopted	1269-96
Resolution <i>re</i> Extension of Reforms to the North-West Frontier Province—Debate adjourned	1296-1344
Wednesday, 17th February, 1926—	
Member Sworn	1345
Questions and Answers	1345-54
Appointment of the Committee on Public Petitions	1355
Messsages from the Council of State	1355

CONTENTS—*contd.*

	PAGES.
Wednesday, 17th February, 1926—<i>contd.</i>	
Statement regarding Negotiations with the Union Government of South Africa	1355-57
The Steel Industry (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1358-79
Resolution <i>re</i> Supplementary Protection to the Tinplate Industry—Adopted	1379-1406
Resolution <i>re</i> Continuation of the Customs Duty on Lac exported from British India—Adopted	1407-09
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	1409-28
Thursday, 18th February, 1926—	
Railway Budget for 1926-27—Presented	1429-40
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1441-55
The Legal Practitioners (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1456-68
The Promissory Notes (Stamp) Bill—Passed	1469
Resolution <i>re</i> Ratification of the Draft Convention regarding Workmen's Compensation for Occupational Diseases—Debate adjourned	1469-80
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Constitution of the Select Committee	1480
Friday, 19th February, 1926—	
Questions and Answers	1481-1503
Unstarred Question and Answer	1503
The Bengal State Prisoners Regulation (Repeal) Bill—Motion to consider negatived	1504-39
The Hindu Coparcener's Liability Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1539
The Indian Registration (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1540
The Hindu Religious and Charitable Trusts Bill—Motion to re-commit the Bill to a Select Committee negatived... ..	1541-60
Monday, 22nd February, 1926—	
Members Sworn	1561
Questions and Answers	1561-74
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1574-76
General Discussion of the Railway Budget	1577-1644
Tuesday, 23rd February, 1926—	
Questions and Answers	1645-49
Private Notice Questions and Answers	1649-52
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1652-54
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1654
The Railway Budget—	
List of Demands—	
Demand No. 1—Railway Board (Motion for omission of the Demand adopted)	1655-97
Demand No. 2—Inspection	1697-1713
(i) Extravagance and Defective Inspection	1698-1701
(ii) The Puttukottai Train Disaster	1701-08
(iii) Investigation into Accidents	1708-12
(iv) Railway Disaster at Halsa	1712-13

CONTENTS—*contd.*

	PAGES.
Tuesday, 23rd February, 1926—<i>contd.</i>	
The Railway Budget— <i>contd.</i>	
List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 3—Audit	1713-22
(i) Effect of changes in the Audit System...	1713-17
(ii) Powers of the Public Accounts Committee ...	1717-22
Wednesday, 24th February, 1926—	
Members Sworn	1723
Questions and Answers	1723-26
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1726-27
Messages from the Council of State	1727
The Railway Budget— <i>contd.</i>	
List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 3—Audit— <i>contd.</i>	1728-32
The Cost Accounting System	1728-32
Demand No. 4—Working Expenses: Administration— ...	1732-98
(i) Grant of the Lee Commission Concessions to Rail- way officers	1747-60
(ii) The Eastern Bengal Railway Administration ...	1761-64
(iii) Divisional System of Administration on the N.-W. Railway	1764-65
(iv) Unnecessary expenditure on the Superintendent of the Railway Training School at Chandausi ...	1765-70
(v) Arrangements for Food and Refreshments for Third Class Passengers	1770-80
(vi) Other Grievances of Third Class Passengers ...	1780-89
(vii) Indianization of the Railway Services ...	1789-98
Thursday, 25th February, 1926—	
Motion for Adjournment—	
Hunger Strike by the Bengal State Prisoners in the Mandalay Jail—Leave granted	1799
Statement of Business	1800
Deaths of Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar and Sir Muhammadbhai Hajibhai	1801-05
Election of a Panel for the Central Advisory Council for Rail- ways	1805
Election of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways ...	1805-06
The Railway Budget— <i>contd.</i>	
The List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 4—Working Expenses: Administration— <i>contd.</i>	1806-51
(i) Indianization of the Railway Services— <i>contd.</i> ...	1806-26
(ii) Provision of Electric Lights in Carriages in the Moradabad-Gajrola-Chandpur Branch of the East Indian Railway	1827-28
(iii) Unpunctuality of trains on the Central Sections of the Eastern Bengal Railway, etc.	1828-30
(iv) Reduction of Third Class Fares on Railways ...	1830-51
Motion for Adjournment—	
Hunger Strike by the Bengal State Prisoners in the Mandalay Jail—Adopted	1851-72

CONTENTS—*contd.*

	PAGES.
Friday, 25th February, 1926—	
Questions and Answers ...	1873-90
Unstarred Questions and Answers ...	1891-93
Messages from the Council of State ...	1894
The Railway Budget— <i>contd.</i>	
List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 4—Working Expenses: Administration— <i>contd.</i> ...	1894-1955
(i) Failure to deal adequately with the <i>mela</i> traffic ...	1896-99
(ii) Non-stoppage of mail trains at several important railway stations ...	1899-1902
(iii) Loss of articles while in charge of the Railway Administration ...	1902-09
(iv) Inefficiency and negligence of the Railway Police... ..	1902-09
(v) Fees paid by Indian Food Stall Vendors ...	1909-15
(vi) Heavy Demurrage and Wharfage charges at Nasik, Poona and other Stations ...	1915-16
(vii) Grievances of the Public against the Railway Administration ...	1916-19
(viii) Stores Purchase Policy and Management of the Stores Department, East Indian Railway ...	1919-29
(ix) Failure to redress the grievances of Railway subordinate employees ...	1930-55
Demand No. 5—Working Expenses: Repairs and Maintenance and Operation ...	1956
Demand No. 6—Companies' and Indian States' share of Surplus Profits and Net Earnings ...	1956
Demand No. 9—Appropriation to the Depreciation Fund... ..	1956
Demand No. 10—Appropriation from the Depreciation Fund ...	1956
Demand No. 11—Miscellaneous ...	1956
Demand No. 12—Appropriation to the Reserve Fund ...	1956
Demand No. 14—Strategic Lines ...	1957
<i>Expenditure charged to Capital.</i>	
Demand No. 7—New Construction ...	1957
Demand No. 8—Open Line Works ...	1957
Demand No. 15—Strategic Lines ...	1957
Monday, 1st March, 1926—	
Members Sworn ...	1959
Questions and Answers ...	1959-75
Unstarred Questions and Answers ...	1976-78
The Budget for 1926-27 ...	1979-2010
The Indian Finance Bill—Introduced ...	2011
Election of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways ...	2011
The Cotton Industry (Statistics) Bill—Introduced ...	2011
The Indian Divorce (Amendment) Bill—Introduced ...	2012-13
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Considered ...	2013,
	2018-46
Hunger Strike of the Bengal State Prisoners in the Mandalay and Insein Jails ...	2014-17
The Indian Factories (Amendment) Bill—Addition of the name of Mr. A. G. Clow, to the list of Members of the Select Committee ...	2018

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 24th February, 1926.

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

MEMBERS SWORN.

Mr. Gerard Mackworth Young, M.L.A. (Army Department: Nominated Official), and Mr. Ramrao Madhorao Deshmukh, M.L.A. (Berar Representative).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

REPAIR OF THE ROAD LEADING TO THE KOMARPUR RAILWAY STATION.

970. ***Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Is it a fact that the road to the Komarpur railway station on the Ahmadpur-Katwa Railway has sunk down near Komarpur proper and that inconvenience is caused to a great many passengers going to the station? If so, do the Government propose to have the portion of the road between Komarpur proper and the Komarpur railway station repaired at an early date?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: The Government of India have no information on the subject which would appear to be primarily the concern of the Local Government.

APPOINTMENT OF AN AGENT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA IN EAST AFRICA.

971. ***Sir Darcy Lindsay:** Have the Government considered or are they considering the question of appointing a Government Agent to be resident in East Africa with a view to guarding the interests of the considerable number of Indians resident and trading in Kenya Colony, Uganda Protectorate, Tanganyika Territory and the Zanzibar Dominions?

Sir Denys Bray (on behalf of Mr. J. W. Bhore): The Government of India have more than once considered the question of appointing an Agent in East Africa and in point of fact they did appoint an Indian Trade Commissioner in East Africa to watch over and promote Indian commercial interests during the post-war period.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Do not the Government think it advisable that a Government Agent should be appointed in East Africa to look after the interests of the Indian residents in that territory?

Sir Denys Bray: Government are prepared to reconsider the matter.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: Is the Trade Commissioner still there, or if not, why was he removed?

Sir Denys Bray: The Trade Commissioner is not still there. He was removed, I think, because his post-war duty was done.

INDIAN REPRESENTATION ON THE PROPOSED EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS OF ZANZIBAR.

972. ***Sir Darcy Lindsay:** (a) Are Government aware that a very recent issue of the Zanzibar Official Gazette contains the draft of an important decree to provide for the establishment and appointment of Executive and Legislative Councils for Zanzibar, and that the Legislative Council is to include unofficial members not exceeding six in number as H. H. the Sultan acting on the advice of the British Resident may appoint?

(b) If the answer is in the affirmative, have Government taken any steps to put forward the claims of the Indian community of Zanzibar to be suitably represented on the Councils?

*** Sir Denys Bray** (on behalf of Mr. J. W. Bhore): The answer to both parts of the question is in the affirmative.

EARLIER DEPARTURE OF THE MAIL STEAMER FROM BOMBAY TO MOMBASSA.

973. ***Sir Darcy Lindsay:** (a) Are Government aware that in regard to the fortnightly mail service from Bombay to Mombassa the steamer which proceeds alternative *via* the Seychelles is due to arrive on the Saturday morning one day after the departure of the train conveying the weekly mail to Uganda *via* Kisumu and the Lake Victoria steamer service to Entebbe, and as a consequence this causes intervals of three weeks and one week between the delivery of the mails from India?

(b) In view of the importance of the cotton and other trade between India and Uganda are Government prepared to consider the possibility of securing earlier departure of the mail steamer from Bombay in order to insure arrival at Mombassa on the Friday?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) Government have no information regarding the misconnection at Mombassa of the Indian mails for Uganda.

(b) An inquiry will be made and if the facts are as stated the question of an earlier departure of the mail steamer from Bombay will be taken up by the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs.

EXPORT OF LIZARD SKINS TO EUROPE.

974. ***Sir Darcy Lindsay:** (a) Are Government aware that apart from the local tanning industry a large trade has developed since 1922 in the

export of raw lizard skins (chiefly iguana) to Europe mainly from the Orissa Districts, the approximate figures being :

	Skins.
1922-23	8,000
1923-24	13,000
1924-25	76,000
April to November 1925	160,000

(b) Is it a fact that while in 1922-23 the skins frequently measured up to 18 inches the size during 1925 has become reduced to from 5 to 10 inches with very few even of the latter size available?

(c) Are Government prepared to consider the desirability of taking early action to protect the lizard from probable extermination by prohibiting the export of raw skins or at least by prohibiting killing during the breeding season from October to April?

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: (a) and (b). Government are not aware of the trade to which the Honourable Member has drawn attention.

(c) Though I have doubts about the practicability of imposing a close season for this class of reptile with whose habits I am imperfectly acquainted, I shall have a copy of this question and my reply forwarded to the Government of Bihar and Orissa which, I understand, is the Local Government immediately concerned.

MOVEMENT AGAINST THE PAYMENT OF CAPITATION TAX IN BURMA.

975. ***U. Tok Kyi:** (a) Have the Government ever received a report from the Local Government about the movement against the payment of Capitation Tax in Burma? If so, will the Government be pleased to lay it on the table?

(b) Will the Government be also pleased to state the number of persons who have been imprisoned or whose properties have been seized and sold by public auction as a result of their taking part in that movement?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: (a) I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the reply given by me to Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh's starred question No. 66 on the 23rd January, 1925.

(b) The Government of India do not possess complete information.

Lieutenant-Colonel F. C. Owens: May I ask the Honourable the Finance Member if the Government of India are aware that the movement referred to in the question just answered was fostered and encouraged by the political party in Burma, to which the Honourable Member who asked the question belongs, and also whether the Government of India are aware that in consequence of this non-payment movement a subordinate headman in the Henzada district was brutally murdered for merely doing his duty?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I think that the questioner knows more than the answerer.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: May I know, Sir, whether those countries where a poll-tax has been levied have been regarded as barbarous?

U. Tok Kyi: Is the Honourable the Finance Member aware that the statements contained in the question of the representative for the Government of Burma have no foundation whatsoever?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: In this case also I think the questioner knows more than the answerer.

PARAGRAPHS IN THE *FORWARD* OF THE 3RD JANUARY, 1926, REGARDING
CERTAIN STATEMENTS MADE BY THE MINISTER OF LABOUR OF THE
SOUTH AFRICAN UNION GOVERNMENT.

976. ***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the paragraphs published in the issue of the *Forward* of the 3rd January, 1926, page 5, under the headings "South African Minister in fighting mood" "Dominion Status"?

(b) If so, will they please state if Mr. Boydell, Minister of Labour, referred to therein did really make the statements contained therein?

(c) Do they propose to represent to the Secretary of State that an early opportunity be taken to state clearly what the Imperial Government's view is upon the "Dominion Status" for India, as suggested by the *Daily Telegraph*?

(d) If the answer to (c) be in the negative, will Government please give reasons?

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: (a) Yes.

(b) Government are unable to say whether the Minister of Labour of the Union Government did actually make the statement which is attributed to him.

(c) and (d). No.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

TOTAL RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE OF THE NORTH WEST-FRONTIER PROVINCE FOR THE YEARS 1922-23 TO 1925-26.

181. **Lala Lajpat Rai:** Will the Government be pleased to lay a statement on the table showing:

(a) the total receipts and expenditure of the North West Frontier Province, with deficits, if any, for 1922-23, 1923-24, 1924-25 and 1925-26; and

(b) what part of that expenditure was incurred in the 5 settled districts?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I regret I am not in a position to give any information which is not contained in the published Finance and Revenue Accounts, copies of which are, I believe, available in the Library of the House. Those accounts are not kept on the basis of districts.

APPOINTMENT OF GHULAM HUSSAIN, CLERK, LAHORE HEAD POST OFFICE TO THE SELECTION GRADE IN SUPERSESSION OF SENIOR MEN.

182. **Sardar Gulab Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that one Ghulam Hussain, clerk, Lahore Head Post Office, has been appointed to the special selection grade over the heads of 87 senior men? If so, will the Government please state if all the seniors have been tried and found unfit?

(b) Is it a fact that among Ghulam Hussain's seniors there are men who have worked for years together as head clerks or who have qualified for a head clerkship after passing the usual departmental test? If so, will the Government please state reasons why those men have not been tried?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: Government have no information. Superseded senior subordinates who consider that they have a grievance are at liberty to appeal in the usual manner.

MESSAGES FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATE.

Secretary of the Assembly: Sir, two Messages have been received from the Secretary of the Council of State. The first one is as follows:

"I am directed to inform you that the Bill further to amend the Madras Civil Courts Act, 1873, which was passed by the Legislative Assembly at its meeting held on the 1st February, 1926, was passed by the Council of State at its meeting on the 23rd February, 1926, with the following amendments:

In clause 2 in the new section 29 proposed to be inserted in the Madras Civil Courts Act, 1873:

(a) the words "or District Munsif" wherever they occur, and

(b) the proviso to the proposed sub-section (3)

were omitted.

2. The Council of State requests the concurrence of the Legislative Assembly in the amendments."

Sir, I lay on the table the Bill as amended by the Council of State.

The second Message is as follows:

"I am directed to inform you that the Council of State have, at their meeting held on the 23rd February, 1926, agreed without any amendments to the following Bills which were passed by the Legislative Assembly on the 10th, 15th, 17th and 18th February, 1926:

A Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to the naturalization in British India of aliens resident therein.

A Bill to amend the Presidency-towns Insolvency Act, 1909, and the Provincial Insolvency Act, 1920.

A Bill further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, for a certain purpose.

A Bill to amend the Steel Industry (Protection) Act, 1924, for the purpose of increasing the total amount payable by way of bounties under that Act, in respect of railway wagons and of providing for the grant of bounties in respect of underframes for railway passenger carriages.

A Bill further to amend the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908."

THE RAILWAY BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—*contd.*

SECOND STAGE—*contd.*

Expenditure from Revenue—contd.

DEMAND No. 3 —AUDIT—*contd.*

Mr. President: The motion before the House is:

“ That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,63,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of ‘ Audit ’.”

The Cost Accounting System.

Sardar V. N. Mutalik (Gujarat and Deccan Sardars and Inamdars: Landholders): Sir, I move:

“ That the Demand under the head ‘ Audit ’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

I am referring to the system of accounting, or to put it more correctly, the cost accounting system which, it appears from the Budget, is now proposed to be introduced in the Railways. It is more than three years since the Acworth Committee recommended that the accounts of the Railway Department should be commercialised. It is rather surprising to find that this recommendation, although it is of the greatest importance, was not properly taken into consideration for such a long time. I find from the Budget that this year Government propose to consider the whole question with the help of a firm of accountants specially trained in this branch, who are to be brought out from America, and it is a matter for congratulation that the attention of the Government has at last been drawn to that question. The system of accounts at present adopted is far from satisfactory, and in the speech of Sir Clement Hindley he has admitted the fact that it has at last been decided to have the accounts overhauled from top to bottom by a firm of accountants of world-wide repute who have great experience of railway accounting in Great Britain and Ireland. I want to know exactly what Government intend to do in this connection. The system has now been introduced in the Military Department. I recently came to be familiarised with it. I had occasion to study the whole system. I was so much charmed with it that it surprised me why Government introduced it in the Military Department instead of introducing it in the Railways. If there is any department in which this system ought to be worked it is the Railway Department. If this system had been introduced, I am quite sure my Honourable friend Mr. Rama Aiyangar would not have been obliged to write all those articles. He tried to come to certain conclusions exactly on the basis of this system. His conclusions may be right or wrong; I do not propose to pass any opinion on this. If this system had been followed, the replies to Mr. Rama Aiyangar would have been far more satisfactory than the arbitrary way in which his whole contention was disposed of. So far as administration is concerned, this system ought to help to prevent waste, to locate expenditure in the exact places and most of all to have comparisons of expenditure in different places. It is argued that this comparison is not possible because conditions on different sections differ, but I think it is not quite correct to say that comparisons are not useful in the Railway Department. In places where the Railway Department have tried to make comparisons they have effected considerable savings. I suppose the same process will go on under the new system. Per-

haps I shall not be here to see the whole system working but I hope the new system will introduce the system that is followed in commercial departments and in commercial companies. The present unsatisfactory state of affairs is due to the fact that the railway companies under company management had each followed its own system and there was no occasion for comparison, but the responsibility of accounting has always rested with Government and they would have done well if they had introduced the system in all Railways with the powers they had with them. I do not intend to press this motion to a division. I do not want a vote of the House on this question, but I want an explanation of the way in which this overhauling is intended to work, and I hope Government will enlighten me on the subject.

Mr. Syed Majid Baksh (Burdwan and Presidency Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): I move that in Demand No. 4 . . .

Mr. President: Order, order. We are now going on with Demand No. 3.

Mr. G. G. Sim (Financial Commissioner, Railways): I am not quite certain what exactly the Honourable Mover wishes me to say because he has himself described very correctly the objects which the Government have in view in proposing this expenditure. There is only one remark that I would make. He appears to be under the impression that the Company Railways work on different forms of accounts. That is not so. The Company Railways have to adopt exactly the same form of accounts that we have for State Railways.

Sardar V. N. Mutalik: I never meant that.

Mr. G. G. Sim: The expenditure proposed in the Budget is being undertaken on a suggestion made by the Standing Finance Committee. If the Honourable Member will refer to the proceedings of that Committee, dated the 29th June, 1925, he will find the following:

“Mr. Jamnadas Mehta recommended that effect should also be given to the proposal of the Acworth Committee that the present form of accounts should be examined and reported upon by experienced accountants conversant with modern practice in England and America of maintaining commercial forms of accounts, including, as was suggested by the Royal Commissioners in the Report on the Railways of New South Wales, the drawing up of a profit and loss account and a balance sheet.”

The proposal is that we should get the best expert advice possible and that the accountants employed should thoroughly overhaul all the forms of accounts including amongst other matters the question of cost accounting on Railways . . .

Sardar V. N. Mutalik: May I suggest, that comparative tables of expenditure should be compiled so that comparison between different sections will be available?

Mr. G. G. Sim: I have frequently dealt with this question before of the comparison of expenditure between one railway and another. We have at present as a matter of fact very complete statistics showing the amount of expenditure under different heads on different railways. I hope no Member of this House will again put forward motions similar to those made by Mr. Rama Aiyangar last year because these comparative figures are much more useful for comparing the working of a railway with itself over a series of years than for contrasting the expenditure of one

[Mr. G. G. Sim.]

railway with another. It is quite true that many of our statistics are of very great use in bringing to the knowledge of one particular railway system economies effected upon another. But that does not mean that you will ever be able to work out a scheme under which the cost per train mile or per passenger mile on any one system must be reproduced on another. All these questions will, however, be considered by the accountants who are being employed.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muham-madan Rural). Sir, I should also like to be enlightened as to exactly what the ideas of the Government are in regard to the overhauling of the accounts of the Railways on a commercial basis. Sir, as I referred to the position in my speech yesterday in this House, we are in the difficulty of having to frame estimates on the basis of Budgets that are sanctioned by means of grants voted by the Assembly. On the other side we have got to maintain Railways and to prepare estimates of expenditure to carry out expenditure upon the basis of what I may call business propositions. Therefore in dealing with the question of commercialization of accounts we have to see whether the requirements of the fundamental position, namely, that this House grants the money and that this House should possess the control over the grants that have been so made, is maintained intact. Sir, I do not know what the position would be in a commercial state of things, but I find that last year my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes put down a sum of 80 to 90 lakhs as expenditure which was to be incurred for the provision of automatic couplings. Sir, that sum was put down, I do not know on what basis, but it was nearly a crore of rupees and this House was not told why such a huge sum should be treated as revenue expenditure and not as capital expenditure.

Mr. G. G. Sim: It was fully argued, Sir, and the Honourable Member will remember that the motion to charge it to capital was rejected.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: Yes, I thank you for the correction. Therefore, I say, Sir, that the Government put down a sum of 80 lakhs in all for the purpose of providing automatic couplings from the railway earnings last year. What is the position this year? Nothing of that amount has been spent, but on the other hand I find in statement C of the Memorandum of the Railway Financial Commissioner that they are yet to carry out a preliminary investigation in connection with the conversion of existing buffers of rolling stock on Indian railways to automatic central buffer couplings. I find, Sir, that in the revised estimate it is put down that a sum of Rs. 36,000 will have been spent for this purpose during the current year, and a sum of Rs. 60,000 has been put down as likely to be spent in the coming budget year. Now I want to know when this is the state of progress of this scheme whether it was right or just for my Honourable friend Mr. Sim to come to this House and ask that we should provide 80 lakhs out of earnings and to make estimates of profits by taking as huge a sum as 80 lakhs out of the earning. The truth is that these schemes are put forward without an adequate examination and without preparation, while the Departments concerned use their powers of reappropriation, as I pointed out, quite freely, with the result that the control of this House is rendered wholly nugatory. I therefore want to know, Sir, whether in establishing a system of cost accounting—and I am one of those who believe in cost

accounting not merely in the Railways but in every Department of Government where it is feasible to introduce it—I want to know how along with the system of cost accounting this principle of budget control may be more strictly enforced than it is.

Mr. H. G. Cocke (Bombay: European): Sir, I am very glad to hear that the recommendation of the Acworth Committee is to be given effect to and that this inquiry is to be made by a firm of accountants with extensive railway experience. But, Sir, I should like to utter one word of warning to Mr. Sim and those who work under him. He will get a very nice report, beautifully typewritten, probably on superfine paper, and it will be read. It will recommend all sorts of alterations in forms, books and records, and that firm of accountants presumably will have left India when the report is in Mr. Sim's hands and action comes to be taken. Sir, it is one thing to read a report; it is a very different thing to get recommendations adopted. I speak, Sir, from some experience in this direction and I know the difficulty of modernising a system of accounts and getting recommendations given effect to. It is extraordinarily difficult and takes a very long time. The work of changing over has got to be supervised by people who are sympathetic to the changes and preferably by the people who put forward and comprehend the recommendations; and I hope therefore that every effort will be made to benefit by this report, because I am quite sure that any amount of opposition will be forthcoming from people who have kept their accounts in a certain way for the whole of their lives and who think the end of the world has come if they have to give up this book or that book. I therefore warn Government that they will find very great difficulty in carrying out extensive recommendations unless for altering existing systems of accounting they have a great deal of expert assistance from people who are sympathetic with the new scheme.

***Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao** (East Godavari and West Godavari *cum* Kistna: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I only wish to ask Mr. Sim whether the Standing Finance Committee for Railways will have an opportunity of acquainting itself with the general figures of any new system of accounts that may be introduced in consequence of the recommendations of the Committee. It seems to me that if any new system of accounts is to be introduced it is far better that it should be discussed in the Standing Finance Committee before it is adopted. I merely mention this because it may be that, as a new system is suggested, the Government of India and the Railway Board may proceed to adopt it without the Standing Finance Committee having any say in the matter. I suggest for the consideration of the Honourable Member that the report of the accountants when it is received, or the general features of it, should be put before the Standing Finance Committee and discussed thoroughly before it is introduced.

Mr. G. G. Sim: Sir, in regard to the remarks made by Mr. Cocke, I quite realize, and I have had painful experience myself of, the difficulty of introducing drastic changes in regard to accounts and finance. But, Sir, I have no doubt that if there is or appears to be any undue delay in giving effect to any beneficial recommendations for changes in accounts, Mr. Cocke and the other members of the Standing Finance Committee will keep whoever is in charge of the railway finances of the day up to

*Speech not corrected by the Honourable Member.

[Mr. G. G. Sim.]

the mark I also have no hesitation in giving Mr. Ramachandra Rao the assurance he wishes. The report of the Committee will undoubtedly be placed before the Standing Finance Committee, and also I presume before the Public Accounts Committee; I am not myself an authority as to where the jurisdiction of these two Committees begins and ends. As regards Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar's remarks, Sir, there is no intention whatsoever of asking the firm of accountants to draw up the budget forms at all. The accountants are concerned with the booking of expenditure, in order that we may ascertain as accurately as possible the exact cost of maintaining a particular department and as far as possible the cost of each operation of railway activity. But they have nothing whatever to do with the form in which the Budget is presented or the manner in which statements will be presented to this House in order to give the House information as to how far the money voted by the House has been devoted to the purposes for which it was intended. Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar, referred incidentally to the provision of automatic couplers and said I had induced the House to agree to a vote of 80 lakhs for this purpose and then proceeded to reappropriate it to some other purpose. I have done nothing of the sort. The whole of that money is saved and is lapsing. The saving under working expenses in the current year is far more than what was provided for automatic couplings. I was astonished to find that the Honourable Member objects to my having been a party to holding up a scheme in order that we might have more certain knowledge before we started on it. It is not the intention of this House, as far as I am aware, that every one of the schemes inserted in a Railway Budget must be inserted in an absolutely final form. Before they are started we must get accurate information in order to be certain that the expenditure contemplated is not going to be exceeded. And in this particular case, Sir, the experiments that were being carried out on the Railways were not complete. During the course of the year these investigations showed that there were further possibilities that had to be taken into consideration; and it was for that reason and in order to carry out these experiments more fully that we decided to postpone the expenditure during the current year.

Sardar V. N. Mutalik: I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

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

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,63,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of 'Audit'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 4—WORKING EXPENSES: ADMINISTRATION.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes (Member for Commerce and Railways): I beg to move:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,69,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of 'Working Expenses: Administration'."

Syed Majid Baksh: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be omitted."

This motion refers to the sum of Rs. 12 crores and 69 lakhs which is the Demand under this head. In moving this motion I am simply asking this House to carry to its logical length the proposition that it carried yesterday.

Mr. President: Where was the Honourable Member when Demands Nos. 2 and 3 were passed?

Syed Majid Baksh: That was in reference to the Railway Board.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I rise to a point of order. This grant has got nothing to do with the Railway Board.

Syed Majid Baksh: I have just heard that the Demand for working expenses has been moved and therefore I am moving my motion. If this is not the case, I will sit down.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is perfectly entitled to move his motion for the omission of this grant.

Syed Majid Baksh: I am moving for the omission of this grant. I have already moved that the Demand under the head "Working Expenses: Administration" be omitted. I was going to submit, Sir, that yesterday we carried a motion for the omission of the grant under the head Railway Board; and since we carried that motion, I think it will not be improper for me to carry it a little further and cut down altogether the Demand under the head Working Expenses for Agency, Audit and Accounts, Cash and Pay, Stores Department, etc. My reason for moving this motion is as follows: Firstly, Sir, this Demand includes, as the explanatory note points out, arrear payments in connection with the extension of the Lee concessions.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: May I point out that this particular Demand does not include any arrears of payment on account of the Lee concessions.

Syed Majid Baksh: The explanatory note says:

"The Demand of Rs. 12,69,00,000 is Rs. 9 lakhs more than the anticipated expenditure for the current financial year, but the excess involved is really 26 lakhs if allowance is made for the fact that the current year's payment includes 17 lakhs arrear payments in connection with the extension of Lee concessions to the East Indian, Great Indian Peninsula and the company worked railways . . ."

My point is this.

Mr. G. G. Sim: That is the Demand for the current year. The Honourable Member's motion refers to next year's Budget.

Syed Majid Baksh: My point is this. Because the Government persists in giving Lee concessions, this motion should be carried, whether it is included in next year's Budget or not. We have already made a cut of Rs. 37 lakhs only a few days ago and the Railway Member has led the Governor General in Council to restore the item. In this also, Sir, they persisted in including Lee concessions in all these Railway Demands. My

[Syed Majid Baksh.]

submission is that the Government persist in giving Lee concessions in spite of the fact that the Assembly has times out of number expressed its definite and considered opinion that they are not going to give any Lee concessions to railway employees. The Government, as is their wont, flout the opinion of this Assembly and impose upon this House their opinion that Lee concessions should be granted to railway employees, notwithstanding the fact that the Assembly has omitted like Demands before. This question has been before the Railway Member and the Railway Board that carry on the railway administration. If they go on flouting the opinion of this Assembly they ought not to be granted any Demands for Working Expenses. I should like to go further and say that this should also be the ground for refusing not only this Demand but every other Demand that is put before this Assembly. I would like to submit to you, Sir, that if we have suffered wrong in this matter as well as in other matters, if the Railway Board and the Railway people are the wrong doers, I shall use the same mode of expression that was used yesterday and say that, these people are the joint tort feasers. Therefore, if we refused that Demand we must also refuse this Demand as well.

Sir, the next ground upon which I would refuse this grant is this. In this year's budget statement made by the Commerce Member we find that he has made an allowance for the reduction of third class fares to the extent of Rs. 40 lakhs. That figure may sound very high to some of us, but when calculated, it is absolutely insignificant. Sir, I think I am stating the view correctly when I say that the gross earnings from all railways is a little over 99 or 100 crores, and if a reduction to the extent of Rs. 40 lakhs is only made, considering the gigantic figures, it will be very insignificant; and presumably if it is calculated it will be found to be .8 pie in the rupee. To give an idea what this is, I will give an example. If a passenger travels from Howrah to Delhi, his fare will be reduced by something like 1 anna; not more than that. That is the great reduction in third class fares that the Railway Board has made. Sir, they have squandered our money like water upon all these heads of Demands but they have only reduced one anna in the fare from Howrah to Delhi.

Mr. President: The question of third class fares will come up for consideration at a later stage and the Chair can not allow the Honourable Member to discuss that question on this amendment.

Syed Majid Baksh: The reason why I was mentioning third class fares is that under this head agency and other things come in. Therefore, in order to criticise this agency, I was mentioning third class fares as a reason to refuse the supply for the carrying out of the agency. I was going to submit, Sir, that very little attention has been paid to the reduction of third class fares. Then, Sir, we find that under every head there has been an increase over the previous years, but nowhere is there a decrease. The Government in the Railway Board are proving themselves traditionally extravagant, while the most important items concerning the convenience of the travelling public suffer. Then, Sir, I would like to criticise this agency in another respect. There is a certain section of the Eastern Bengal Railway where the trains are proverbially unpunctual. For this reason, I would like to give no amount of money to

this agency. Therefore, I am moving that the whole Demand under the head "Working Expenses" be omitted. The unpunctuality is so great

Mr. President: I am afraid I cannot allow the Honourable Member to go into all these details on this amendment. I thought that the Honourable Member wanted to reject the whole Demand on the constitutional issue. If he wants to go into details, there are other motions on the agenda paper which will come up for discussion in due course when the Honourable Member will have his opportunity.

Syed Majid Baksh: Then I will deal only with the constitutional issue. The constitutional issue was passed yesterday and the same remarks will hold good to-day, namely, that we must refuse supply so long as grievances exist. So far as other matters are concerned, I will be able to mention them under other motions.

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally (Sind: Muhammadan Rural): With your permission, Sir, may I ask one question from the Honourable Member who has just sat down. If the whole Demand is turned down, how are we to come to Delhi to obstruct the administration of Government—by bullock carts or camel carts?

Syed Majid Baksh: We are not so particular about coming to Delhi as some other gentlemen think it to be necessary. My ground is that as the whole Demand under the head "Railway Board" was thrown out on the motion of Mr. Jamnadas Mehta yesterday, the same thing should be done to-day and as the head was cut off by Mr. Mehta yesterday I wish to bury the trunk to-day.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be omitted."

The motion was negatived.

Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan (Patna and Chota Nagpur *cum* Orissa: Muhammadan): With your permission, Sir, I would like to reduce the figure in my motion* to Rs. 17 lakhs. The reason is that at the time when I gave notice of my motion I did not mention the reason which I have now mentioned, namely, the Lee Commission concessions.

Mr. President: The motion that stands in the name of the Honourable Member is for 1 crore and if he wants to bring down the figure to 17 lakhs, I can only say I am not prepared to allow it.

Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: Then, Sir, I do not move it.

Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar (Madura and Ramnad *cum* Tinnevely: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 20,00,000."

*That the Demand under the head "Working Expenses: Administration" be reduced by Rs. 1,00,00,000.

[Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar.]

Sir, I beg Honourable Members to bear with me when I deal with this Demand because I have already been told that I lull them to sleep when I mention these figures. (Laughter). I do want to impress upon Honourable Members that we have been here for the last three years and that it is our duty not to be out of our seats during the discussions of these Demands. They are the crux of our work here. The constitutional issue is important and we are all pledged to see that the constitution is advanced in the right direction. That point can be fought and is being fought but along with it we should also do our duty towards the discussions of these Demands both in the Railway Budget and the General Budget. So, I beg every Honourable Member to excuse me when I take them into a series of figures which are very important.

Sir, what I immediately wish to bring to the notice of the Assembly is that under the same Demand No. 4 I have given a series of cuts under motion 104 printed on this agenda paper in addition to the cut which I am now moving. It will be clear that I am bound to give an explanation. My object in moving the present motion is only to show that in the budgetting itself, according to the statements made by the Department and the Financial Commissioner in the several Memoranda placed before us during the last two or three years, 20 lakhs have been wrongly added. It was not necessary. The mistake, as I said before, often arises by not pursuing the actuals of the previous year closely in budgetting for the revised estimates of the next year. On the other hand, the revised estimates are prepared on the original estimates that have been prepared by the Department. The original estimates themselves are only prepared on the revised estimates of the previous year, so that the mistake is being carried on and in the end we find that a considerable amount of money is left which it is not possible to spend. It is under that head that I have asked for this cut of 20 lakhs. The other cuts that I have given under motion 104 relate to economies which I ask should be effected on the lines I have proposed and to the extent at least that I have mentioned. Honourable Members will therefore excuse me if, while dealing with the motion under discussion, I have to mention the figures of the previous years also. It will be seen from the previous year's account and Budget that the actuals of 1923-24 for Administration come to 11·96 crores, that is to say, 11 crores and 96 lakhs. Those are the actuals for 1923-24. Honourable Members will see on page 8 of the book, "Demands for Grants", that it gives for the year, actuals for 1924-25 12·32. As it is 12 crores, 32 lakhs and 70 thousand we may take it as 12 crores and 33 lakhs, which is the amount of actual expenditure for 1924-25. But what do we find? The budget estimate of 1925-26 was originally put at 12·40, and it has been by the revised estimate brought up to 13·03, putting 63 lakhs more as necessary for this administration expenditure under the Lee concessions and other items that are not important just now to know, so that it will be seen an explanation has been given on that page why 63 lakhs have been added in the revised estimate of the Budget. So far I do not propose to contest that position, as, though the provision may be a bit too much, it is only proper that the department that budgets should give a small margin so that actually they may not afterwards be wanting for funds. Thus this 63 lakhs which is added on to the 12·40 I allow without arguing the matter, but what I am going to prove is that besides that there is unnecessary money put in this year. As I said in 1923-24 the actuals remain

at 11.97 crores. In 1924-25 the actuals came to 12.32. About this, during the budget presentation last year, that is the revised budget of 1924-25 it explained at page 13 of the book which contained the whole of the Railway Budget presented last year. This page 13 is part of the explanatory memorandum that was furnished to the Assembly by the Department at that time regarding Administration. What was said was this:

“The anticipated increase of approximately 24½ lakhs in the cost of administration is due to a provision of about 4 lakhs for the Lee Commission proposals; to the reorganisation and strengthening of the watch and ward establishments of certain railways; to expenditure on the technical school at Jamalpur, and to payments of gratuities to the staff of the East Indian Railway retiring from the services on the termination of the contract.”

These are the various heads under which that year they provided 24½ lakhs extra. Out of this it will be seen that the extra gratuities that had been given to the East Indian Railway employees who were retiring and also the Great Indian Peninsula Railway employees, alone comes, if you examine the detailed budgets of those two railways, to 10 lakhs of rupees. The expenditure for renewal of debenture bonds that was non-recurring comes to another 3 lakhs, so that about 15 lakhs of this 24½ lakhs was non-recurring money needed for the particular year, owing to circumstances which arose in that year. This fact is also recognised by the Department. They say about 10 lakhs of this money is money which is not recurring and will disappear next year. Therefore when you take the actuals of 1924-25 you will leave out of this 12.32 crores, 15 lakhs for this non-recurring expenditure that occurred in the course of that year, so that you will have only 12.18 crores for the actuals of 1924-25. To that we have been asked to add the 63 lakhs about which I have said originally I shall not take any objection, because though it is a little too much it is necessary that the Budget must be made so that there will be no difficulty in finding funds later; so that the 12.18 crores *plus* the 63 lakhs will give you only 12.81 necessary for the revised Budget of 1925-26. There is therefore a balance of 33 lakhs there provided unnecessarily, not because it was needed but because it proceeded on the original budget estimate of 1924-25, without taking the actuals, so that 33 lakhs remains unnecessary and cannot be spent.

It will also be seen that the revised estimate of 1924-25 was given at 12.36 crores last year but the actuals came only to 4 lakhs less. Similarly the 63 lakhs that is sought to be added on now may leave some balance, but this 33 lakhs is money for which no necessity has been shown either in the memorandum attached to this or by the calculation that may be made in that matter.

Then we now come to the Budget of the coming year. The Budget of the coming year is dealt with on page 8 by the notes on the estimates of the year 1926-27. This estimate again does not need the 33 lakhs provision being made there because other circumstances being equal the previous year's revised estimate besides the additions that have to be made to it as per the explanatory note has provided, so that the 33 lakhs is unnecessary for that year as well as in the current year, because in the next year that same note shows that owing to 17 lakhs for the Lee concessions being unnecessary another 26 lakhs had to be provided. All the 26 lakhs are explained, 5 lakhs to cover cost of additional appointments, 9 lakhs for increases in the various departments on account of increments in the pay

[Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar.]

of the staff, 5 lakhs and 39 thousand for estimated increased contribution to the Provident Fund, and the remaining 6½ lakhs for meeting additional expenditure on account of additional mileage during 1926-27. I have no quarrel with that, though it might have been more than needed, as we have to provide a little more in case funds are wanted later. But leaving out that you will find that from this 13.03 you have to cut off 33 lakhs. It is 12.70. This 26 lakhs extra is included in this 12.70 crores. It leaves 33 lakhs to be cut out from the Budget. I have tried, Sir, to place it as clearly as possible and I suppose I have explained it fully. I will repeat it only for the purpose of making the position clear.

The actuals of 1923-24 and 1924-25 are now known to us. The Budget of 1925-26 was based on the revised estimate of 1924-25 and the revised estimate of 1925-26 is sought to be based not on the actuals of 1924-25 but on the Budget of 1925-26 which was wrongly estimated, so that when the actuals of 1924-25 are known and when we know that 15 lakhs of the actuals is money that is non-recurring and had only to be paid for that year, all the amounts they add for purposes mentioned in the department's memorandum I allow and when we allow that there is a balance of 33 lakhs, which is budgetted wrongly. I ask for a cut of 20 lakhs only because it may be that in my calculation of the 15 lakhs non-recurring

12 Noon. there may be some little difference, and it is possible that the whole of the 15 lakhs is non-recurring. Extra gratuities may have had to be given to people and may have come under that head. Making allowance for all that, I only ask for a cut of 20 lakhs. I submit it is necessary that it should be accepted by the House if we want to insist on good budgetting hereafter. In this connection I must place before the Assembly the actual difference between the revised Budget and the actuals during the last three years. Both on the receipt side and on the expenditure side there has been a large difference between the revised and the actuals

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Can you give the figures under this head for administration?

Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar: I have given the administration figure as 11.96 crores. I am giving it for the whole of the Railways. Between the revised estimate and the actuals—I am talking now only of the expenditure—there is a 5 crores difference in 1923-24. If you take the budget estimate, it will be much more because you find 1 crore less was estimated at the time of the revised estimate itself. I do not therefore take the budget estimate because the budget estimate proceeds on the assumption of normal conditions, and later conditions, which necessitate that either expenditure or receipts must be increased or decreased, will have to be taken into consideration later. So there is 5 crores difference between the revised estimates and the actuals. In 1924-25 you find we budgetted for 62 crores, but actually we spent 60.9 crores; in fact it is found that in both cases we have given credit to the customs duty that was returned, both in the revised estimate and the other estimate. But there is a difference of more than a crore. That being the position, it is proper that we should look into this very carefully and frame the Budget so that this mistake may not appear again. As I said it proceeds closely on the figures and I have allowed a margin for any extra amount that may be necessary. I commend the motion to the acceptance of the Assembly.

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Sir, I have got a few difficulties under this head which I wish to bring to the notice of the Member for any information he may offer. If the Honourable Member will take the Explanatory Memorandum for 1924-25, he will find under the head of Administration, Ordinary Expenses, General Administration, actuals 7.97 lakhs, and the revised estimates for 1923-24 are 7.94, and the Budget for 1924-25, 8.06. But if I turn to the Memorandum for the next year, that is 1925-26, at page 12 I find the Budget for 1924-25 is put down at 12.11 under this head, and I find, as my Honourable friend just now remarked, that the revised estimate for 1923-24 stood at 7.94, but the actuals come up to 11.96 under this head. Probably there has been some mixing up or addition of items under this head; otherwise I cannot account for the sudden jump of 7.94 to 11.96 between the revised and the actuals. We find however that, whereas the actual expenditure in 1922-23 was 7.97, it has now gone up to 13.10. That was the complaint I have made in my speech the other day and the Honourable Member explained that it might be that the excess of 5 crores was due to gratuities, pensions, provident fund and other things. It can hardly be that . . .

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I said, comparing like with like.

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: The difficulty is not ours because you go and change your accounts year after year. You must remember that you are dealing with laymen in this House. If really we are to have effective control over the Budget, if you change your accounts, it is your duty to give us explanatory notes as to what you have included and what you have excluded. We spend hours and hours trying to understand this, and we do want to be useful in this discussion. But I do find here this sudden jump. And again I find in presenting the Budget Demands last year, under Demand No. 4, page 9 it is stated:

"The Demand provides for very few new appointments, and a considerable number of superior appointments will disappear owing to the organisation of the North Western Railway on a divisional basis and to the amalgamation and organisation on a divisional basis of the East Indian and the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railways."

But I find that, during that year, with the consent of the Finance Committee, additional establishment costing 7 lakhs was taken, and I find in the new Budget of 1926-27 additional establishment is provided costing another 5 lakhs, although there has been this promise held out that there would be a reduction in establishment by reason of placing the organisation on a divisional basis, and I find in the course of 12 months new appointments costing 12 lakhs. Am I right? Because the Supplementary Demand includes 7 lakhs new appointments and this Demand for 1926-27 includes 5 lakhs for new appointments. so that within the space of 12 months we are adding 12 lakhs for establishment, whereas you promised a reduction. Therefore, my submission is that apparently there is an over-estimate under this head which is being taken advantage of and new appointments created. It is said that the Finance Committee has sanctioned most of the appointments. I have not been able to trace in the printed proceedings of the Finance Committee the sanction for these appointments, what those appointments were and whether they were examined and how they were sanctioned. I regret very much that my Honourable friend Mr. Rama Aiyangar was not present at the January meetings when these Demands were considered in detail. The remarks which he has just now made would have been of great use to the Committee. It was under this head that the Retrenchment Committee

[Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

recommended reductions and retrenchments and I see in last year's administration Report the Railway Board is taking credit for being very stringent in effecting economies in expenditure. And so I do think under this head some investigation is required. At any rate I want an explanation of these figures.

***Manvi Abul Kasem** (Bengal: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I do not want to go into the details of the motion moved by my Honourable friend Mr. Rama Aiyangar, but I have only to make this statement, that his criticisms were carefully and very patiently examined and considered by the Finance Committee and they were examined among others by my Honourable friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer and Mr. Aney, who, I am sorry to say, is no longer a member of that Committee. Of course I cannot myself take much credit for it but business men such as these with a lot of experience have examined not only his criticisms made in this House last year but also his criticisms made in the Press; and the Government gave a reply to all his criticisms, which was circulated to Members. Then again there came another communication from Mr. Rama Aiyangar which was also considered. And after having gone through all this I do not think it will serve any useful purpose to go over it again. If you do not think that the Finance Committee have examined these things and done their duty properly, I think it will be better not to have a Finance Committee at all rather than have a Finance Committee and, instead of reposing a certain amount of confidence in it, examine the details again in this House. At any rate I would advise my Honourable friend to withdraw his motion, and if he has got any grievances to place them again before the Committee and convince that Committee of the justice of his criticism, so that the Committee may take the necessary steps. A small Committee of this character is formed for the purpose of examining details and expressing their opinion upon them. Of course, I am sorry that Mr. Rama Aiyangar was not present at the January meeting of the Committee, but I may remind him that the dates were fixed in consultation with him and fixed later to suit his convenience; but, unfortunately, it was not possible for him to attend on account of certain private reasons. I hope, Sir, he will withdraw his motion.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I think the House will congratulate itself on the fact that Mr. Rama Aiyangar has now come down from crores to lakhs. That shows that the examination the Standing Finance Committee for Railways undertook on the working expenses last year has not been without its beneficial results. Although I am not disposed to agree with my Honourable friend Mr. Rama Aiyangar that a 20 lakhs cut under "Working Expenses: Administration" could be justified, I am willing to and I can justify a cut of 6 lakhs of rupees, which I hope, Sir, you will permit me to move as an amendment to the 20 lakhs moved by my Honourable friend Mr. Rama Aiyangar. I will justify it; these 6 lakhs can be proved to be an over-estimate and we should agree to this cut as a prevention of extravagance on the part of the various railway administrations. In this connection, Sir, the House will notice that I have got an amendment for a reduction of 2 lakhs on the North Western Railway (Divisional System), and I am including that here. If my present motion is carried I am not going to move

the cut of 2 lakhs for the purpose of reducing extravagance on the North Western Railway.

Sir, it was in June, 1924, that the divisional system of administration was sought to be introduced on the North Western Railway. It was said that the existing system was leading to overlapping, extravagance and waste; here I have got the Government of India, Railway Department, enclosure to despatch No. 12 (Railway) of 1924, Report by the Railway Board, and therein it is stated that there were three weaknesses in the system that existed before the divisional system was put into force; they are:

- (1) the division of work and responsibility in regard to the actual movement of traffic which leads to delays and inefficient use of equipment,
- (2) the lack of unified local control in matters to some extent subsidiary to the actual movement of traffic,
- (3) the difficulty of controlling executive operations from the headquarters of the railway.

These were given as grounds for going over to the divisional system of administration because it was contended that waste, overlapping and delay and consequent loss were incurred by the railways on account of the then existing system. It was further contended that this divisional system would lead to economies. On page 6 of this document, which is dated 24th June, 1924, and is signed by Sir Clement Hindley, Mr. Parsons, Mr. Sheridan and Mr. Hadow (the four gentlemen who then constituted the Railway Board), the financial effect of this was described as follows:

"The chief economy which we expect from the reorganisation will, as we have already explained, be derived from a reduction in working expenses to which at present no exact figure can be attached. It will also give us, as the appendix to this report shows, a direct saving of Rs. 7,539 per mensem in the cost of the superior establishment of the North Western Railway, and it will also enable us gradually to effect a reduction of clerical establishment as the reorganisation progresses, from which ultimately we should secure a further saving of not less than two lakhs per annum. Against these savings must be set the cost of additional audit staff which should not exceed Rs. 6,000 per mensem, and a certain amount of capital expenditure which will probably not exceed seven lakhs on buildings at divisional headquarters. As a whole, therefore, the reorganisation will give us a direct and immediate reduction in expenditure, apart from the far greater advantages to be obtained from improved working."

The authors of this document, which is dated the 24th June, 1924, thought the reforms recommended by them were so important and so necessary, so capable of giving reductions in expenses, that they recommended:

"If the Government of India agree to our following this course, we propose to instruct the Agent of the North Western Railway to proceed with the scheme with effect from the 1st of July, 1924."

So within a week of this document they wanted to put divisional system of administration into force; the figures of cost were worked out. In the appendix which is attached to this paper you are shown that the expenses then current were Rs. 2,20,173. The reduction is worked out to a rupee. The existing expenditure was Rs. 2,20,173 and the expenditure they expected would be Rs. 2,12,634,—a saving of Rs. 7,539. Every rupee has been calculated and this House was promised that as the result of going over to the divisional system of administration there would be a saving of 2 lakhs in addition to greater efficiency in working. Well, Sir, that was

[Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta.]

promised two years ago. Now, what do we find? No report has been made. The divisional system was introduced and it has been working for the last 18 months, but so far as any saving is concerned we have not been shown any. On the contrary the North Western Railway's book shows that the amount of expenditure which they had expected was less than what has actually been incurred. Here is their own admission. On page 2, Sir, of this book of the North Western Railway we find:

“ *Working Expenses* . . . Other increases occur under audit and accounts, 2 lakhs, due partly to the posting of more senior officers and partly to the underestimate of requirements of additional staff under the divisional audit scheme.”

That shows that instead of an economy of 2 lakhs here we have got an extra expenditure of 2 lakhs, which is a difference of 4 lakhs. Sir, in reporting on the results of the divisional system of administration on the 31st March, 1925, what are we told? At page 5 of the Report on Indian Railways for 1924-25, it is said:

“ The commercial side of the work is now entrusted to a Chief Commercial Manager and Mechanical Engineering subjects including the administration of workshops to a Chief Mechanical Engineer. The new system—namely, the divisional system—is working well and promises to effect a marked improvement in the general efficiency of the transportation arrangements of the line.”

No reference is made to the question of economy which was promised in the document which I first read, and this report is conveniently silent as to what retrenchments or economies or savings in expenditure have been rendered possible as a result of the divisional system of administration on which the Government embarked within seven days of their report. (*The Honourable Sir Charles Innes*: “ No, no.”) Yes; if the Government of India agreed they wanted to introduce it within seven days of their report; it is on record; if you took more time then so much the better. But even that better thought out scheme has proved to be wide of the mark by 4 lakhs on the wrong side. Therefore you must admit this cut.

There are other grounds, Sir, which I do not want to enter into. But I have now shown to this House that the divisional system of administration on the North Western Railway, has been more costly by four lakhs. It might similarly be more costly in the other places where the divisional system is being introduced: I think it is being introduced in the East Indian, Great Indian Peninsula and Oudh and Rohilkhand Railways. I do not know the figures of cost when they first introduced this system and the figures of the present working on these Railways, as a result of this divisional system; but here is the evidence in this one instance that they have gone wrong by four lakhs, and it is absolutely clear that similar miscalculations would have occurred on other Railways, and the total extra expenditure would be somewhere near ten lakhs or more on that account; and on that ground alone I would have been fully justified in agreeing with Mr. Rama Aiyangar to the extent of 10 lakhs; but, I am a moderate and sober man and I shall be contented with a smaller cut.

Then, Sir, this Demand is for Rs. 12,69 lakhs; Government are not much noted for efficient or correct budgetting. Sir Basil Blackett has introduced last year a method by which overbudgetting may be prevented. If we cut down as a matter of caution Rs. 25,000 for every Railway administration you get a figure of Rs. 2 lakhs and that will give us a saving of 6 lakhs

in all; this 6 lakhs cut is what Government should accept. I know my Honourable friend Mr. Sim in his heart of hearts does agree with me. If I could X-Ray him here and now I would find that he would agree to this 6 lakhs cut. I know that; he told me—but I shall not say what he told me because I should not say that; all that I need say is that I am sure he agrees with me.

With reference to my Honourable friend, Maulvi Abul Kasem, I do not know what he meant by saying that because we had agreed to these figures in the Standing Finance Committee we should treat them as so sacrosanct that not a single rupee should be touched. I do not agree with that point of view. The very fact that all the big cuts of lakhs and crores on this Demand have been given up by this side of the House shows that the very careful examination done in the Standing Railway Finance Committee has had its effect; but, Sir, this is a most moderate cut. As members of the Railway Committee we do our best; but when coming to the House if we find that we have gone wrong in any single item, we must not hesitate to admit that. And here I admit that the divisional system had not attracted my attention when I was considering the Budget. It was only after reading through all these books later on that I found out this 4 lakhs. Moreover, as I said before, there is the danger of over budgetting and I am sure the House will be fully justified in accepting this cut; the Government should remember that we are not going to move all the other cuts afterwards; if you carry this cut of six lakhs no other cut on the administration will be moved so far as some of us who have given notice are concerned, except of course the Lee Commission cut. That stands apart; it must stand apart; but I hope the House will carry this minute cut of 6 lakhs. unanimously.

Mr. A. M. Hayman (Railway Board: Nominated Official): Sir, when I heard my Honourable friend, Mr. Rama Aiyangar, speaking, I thought he was talking about the budget estimate and the Demands for the year 1922-23, and not for the year 1926-27. I first wish to take the Honourable Member's own words. He says that we do not take the actuals of the previous year in framing the revised and budget estimates under this head of General Administration. The amount we have allowed in our revised estimate is Rs. 1,303 lakhs. He makes a complaint, however, that that figure should not be trusted because if you go back about three or four years you will find that there are some non-recurring items of expenditure in the actuals of those three or four years, and therefore you must take it out of this revised estimate figure in order to make a proper budget estimate for the next year. Now, Sir, I wish to submit to the House that every year we get items of expenditure which are non-recurring and that we honestly allow for these items when we make our budget estimate. Even this revised estimate figure of Rs. 1,303 lakhs includes certain arrear payments and, if the Honourable Mr. Rama Aiyangar had read the note to the estimate carefully, he will find that we allowed for non-recurring items when we tried to justify our Demand for next year. We do not justify the actual arithmetical difference of 9 lakhs; we went into an explanation and justified 26 lakhs. That I say is the reply to Mr. Rama Aiyangar's criticisms that our Budgets are not carefully prepared and that we do not take into consideration items of a non-recurring nature.

[Mr. A. M. Hayman.]

But there is another point in his remarks that I should like to put before the House. Mr. Rama Aiyangar attempted to show to the House that we must try and frame the Budget, for 1926-27, more particularly with reference to the actuals of 1924-25. Sir, when Mr. Rama Aiyangar says "Let us frame our Budgets on actuals", I am one with him; and let me tell him, Sir, that although it kept us up days and nights, we got this year the actual expenditure from all Railways under this head of general administration right down to January 1926, before we placed this Budget before you. I do not think that we could have done better than that. You cannot make a comparison in the way in which my Honourable friend asks. Out of the 26 lakhs more for next year under this head of general administration, part of it is on account of establishments which have been sanctioned as necessary for the proper administration of our Railways by the Finance Committee; we are going to open new lines and we must have establishment to work those new lines. The proportion of establishment which we allow to our new lines must be much greater *pro rata* with reference to earnings than the old lines which are working and earning big profits. I think, Sir, that these two points will show the House that they should not follow Mr. Rama Aiyangar in the criticisms he has made.

I turn now to one or two remarks made by my Honourable friend, Diwan Bahadur Rangachariar. I admit at once that Honourable Members who do not know the technique of these Budgets must be confused a bit when they have presented before them figures which are based upon a different form of classification. But, Sir, you must remember that we are building up a new house, that after the scheme of separation we had to reclassify our expenditure, we did this first and foremost in order to place before you greater details. In the old days we placed before you one item of expenditure—Working Expenses. To-day we place at least details a hundred times as much. Now, we had to split those details up last year in the office here without the assistance of our railway administrations who could have told us how certain items of expenditure should be allocated. But during the course of the year we and the Accountant General for Railways, who is responsible for the actuals, have gone through this classification and he has given us a correct classification for the actuals of 1924-25, and I would ask my Honourable friend Diwan Bahadur Rangachariar to accept those actuals as correct as they have been prepared and verified again in this budget compilation by the Accountant General, Railways. We have based our Budget for next year on those actuals, so that the classification in 1924-25, as compared with the classification in the Demand that we put before the House is comparing like with like. If the Honourable Member desires it, I think I can take the permission of the Honourable Mr. Sim, and we shall place a short note before the Standing Finance Committee telling them what items were not included under this head in the year to which my friend refers, and what items we now include, and I am sure we shall be able to satisfy them on this point.

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: We should also be satisfied.

Mr. A. M. Hayman: I hope so.

I shall now, Sir, make a few remarks with reference to what my Honourable friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta said. I was present at the meetings of

the Standing Finance Committee, and I know that my Honourable friend was not satisfied with the figures relating to the North Western Railway. He pressed a demand that the working expenses of the North Western Railway should be reduced by 3 lakhs of rupees. My Honourable friend Mr. Sim after discussing the matter with him accepted that demand, and the Standing Finance Committee agreed with the Honourable Mr. Jamnadas Mehta. I thought that Mr. Jamnadas Mehta would be satisfied with that.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: No.

Mr. A. M. Hayman: I am very sorry to see, Sir, that he is not satisfied, but I will try to put the position clearly before the House. Mr. Jamnadas Mehta read out certain papers and said that when we put the divisional system before the Standing Finance Committee we said that there would be a saving of 2 lakhs of rupees. Now, Sir, that 2 lakhs of rupees saving is not under general administration only. It represents the total savings in establishment charges that we expect by the introduction of the divisional system. What I say is perfectly correct. Sir, we introduced this system on the 1st of October 1924. We introduced it on a railway system of about seven thousand miles. Now, when you change from one system of working to another on such a big organization,—I put it to the House,—you cannot get all the savings you anticipate in the course of a few months. But we have this matter absolutely in mind, and we are going to get the savings we say we expect by the change introduced. Now, Sir, if you will turn to the figures of the North Western Railway book from which the Honourable Member quoted, you will find, under general administration, that we expect to spend 2 crores and 5 lakhs of rupees this year. For next year we have cut down the estimate of the North Western Railway to 2 crores 3 lakhs. It may be said that it is a small saving, but I submit, Sir, you should look at the ratio at which you are going to work that Railway. The operating ratio for this year is 54·2, and next year it will be 53·8, so that we are doing better, and I would ask the House to trust us, and we will see that this system is properly worked and that we do get the savings that we told you in the memorandum we would get. Sir, for these reasons I oppose the amendment.

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: May I ask what these 12 lakhs additional establishment represents?

Mr. A. M. Hayman: I am sorry, Sir, I did not give the Honourable Member full information on that point. The 12 lakhs establishment represents not only the superior establishment but all the classes of establishment that are classified under the head "General Administration". Briefly put, you do not take the station staff and the running staff. All that establishment is needed primarily for the opening of new lines. We have a number of new lines on the Burma Railways,—I think the figures for the whole of our Railways are about 250 miles of railways already open and another 250 miles to be opened next year, so that for these 500 miles we have to get new establishments. The Honourable Member is also perhaps not aware of our more important proposals in this respect which were before the Standing Finance Committee. Now, Sir, let me quote one or two instances. On account of the Great

[Mr. A. M. Hayman.]

Indian Peninsula Railway taking over the Allahabad-Jubbulpore section, we had, for the purposes of economy, to constitute another division, and we had to get some establishment for that division. We put all those proposals before the Standing Finance Committee. We had also put before the Standing Finance Committee our proposals for the additional establishment that was required for the Burma Railways. I hope the Honourable Member will now be satisfied with the information I have just given.

Mr. President: The original question was :

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,69,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1927, in respect of 'Working Expenses: Administration'."

To which the following amendments have been moved :

1. "That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 20,00,000."

2. "That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 6,00,000."

The question I have to put is :

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 20,00,000."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. President: The question I have now to put is :

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 6,00,000."

The Assembly divided :

AYES—45.

Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
Acharya, Mr. M. K.
Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.
Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.
Ariff, Mr. Yacoob C.
Chaman Lall, Mr.
Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
Das, Mr. B.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
Deshamukh, Mr. R. M.
Duni Chand, Lala.
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Raja.
Goswami, Mr. T. C.
Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Kidwai, Shaikh Mushir Hosain.
Lajpat Rai, Lala.
Lohokare, Dr. K. G.
Mahmood Schamnad Sahib Bahadur,
Mr.
Majid Baksh, Syed.
Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.
Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.

Misra, Pandit Shambhu Dayal.
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.
Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.
Ranga Iyer, Mr. O. S.
Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.
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.
Talatuley, Mr. S. D.
Tok Kyi, U.
Venkatapattiraju, Mr. B.
Yusuf Imam, Mr. M.

NOES—52.

Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
 Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
 Ahmed, Mr. K.
 Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
 Bajpai, Mr. R. S.
 Bhoire, Mr. J. W.
 Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
 Bray, Sir Denys.
 Calvert, Mr. H.
 Cocke, Mr. H. G.
 Crawford, Colonel J. D.
 Donovan, Mr. J. T.
 Ghose, Mr. S. C.
 Ghulam Abbas, Sayyad.
 Ghulam Bari, Khan Bahadur.
 Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J.
 Gordon, Mr. R. G.
 Graham, Mr. L.
 Hayman, Mr. A. M.
 Hezlett, Mr. J.
 Hindley, Sir Clement.
 Hira Singh Brar, Sardar Bahadur Captain.
 Hudson, Mr. W. F.
 Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.
 Jatar, Mr. K. S.
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
 Makan, Khan Sahib M. E.

Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath.
 Muddiman, The Honourable Sir Alexander.
 Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur Sayid.
 Naidu, Rao Bahadur M. C.
 Neave, Mr. E. R.
 Owens, Lieut.-Col. F. C.
 Rahman, Khan Bahadur A.
 Raj Narain, Rai Bahadur.
 Rangachariar, Diwan Bahadur T.
 Reddi, Mr. K. Venkataramana.
 Roffey, Mr. E. S.
 Sarda, Rai Sahib M. Harbilas.
 Setalvad, Sir Chimanlal.
 Sim, Mr. G. G.
 Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
 Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.
 Sykes, Mr. E. F.
 Tonkinson, Mr. H.
 Vernon, Mr. H. A. B.
 Vijayaraghavacharyar, Sir T.
 Vishindas, Mr. Harchandrai.
 Wajihuddin, Haji.
 Willson, Mr. W. S. J.
 Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.
 Young, Mr. G. M.

The motion was negatived.

Grant of the Lee Commission Concessions to Railway Officers:

Mr. M. K. Acharya (South Arcot cum Chingleput: Non-Muhammadans Rural): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 20,00,000."

I wish, Sir, that some Member on the front Benches had moved this reduction, somebody who may be acknowledged to be an authority on railway finance had taken the responsibility for moving this. However, I have this consolation that this is an old story, not a twice or thrice but many times told tale, and it may not be out of place even for a back-bencher to move it. We all know, we at any rate on this side of the House, know the arguments that will be advanced on the other side. The concessions recommended by the Lee Commission, in spite of the vote of the House, rather in defiance of the vote of this House, were given to non-railway officials. Therefore, they say, they must be extended to railway officials. Then because they were given to State Railway officials, they must be given to Company Railway officials also. Now, I suppose they will say that these concessions were given last year in spite of or in defiance of the vote of this House, and therefore they must be given this year too. Well, I have only one small argument to advance against that. These concessions could only be continued in the light of good work. The Lee Commission, as has already been pointed out, more than once recommended not only certain concessions but they also suggested certain improvements. They laid certain duties on these officials, namely, that Indianisation should proceed on a certain scale and up to a certain

[Mr. M. K. Acharya.]

point, and it may be well worth asking before these concessions are granted whether the railway officials to whom these concessions were given have carried out the duties imposed on them as well as they ought to have done. I know that a separate item of discussion is put down with respect to Indianisation. It is enough to note now that the Lee Commission's recommendations proposed certain concessions and in turn imposed certain obligations. So these two go hand in hand. I will say just this one word on Indianisation. There has not been any appreciable Indianisation, to any reasonable extent so as to justify the concessions. I will come to this later. The Honourable Mr. Cocke gave us some figures with regard to the Indian employees given on page 62 of the last year's report. He said there were 700,000 and odd Indian employees. There were only some 300 and odd Indian officials employed in April 1925 on all these big railways, with an increase of 43 out of 1,931. There were 1,888 on the 1st April 1924 and 1,931 on the 1st April 1925. Some of the railways instead of increasing the number of Indians cut it down. I will not weary the House with this at this stage. I will now content myself by saying that the rate of Indianisation carried out was only 2 or 3 per cent. The Lee Commission recommended 75 per cent. as the ideal. Now, I ask, Sir, whether the duties imposed on these officials have been carried out as well as would justify us in granting to them these concessions. The concessions granted were wrong from the beginning. They were granted to some people for one year. This House has no right to continue those concessions unless it is proved that these officers have done their work so well as to justify the grant of these concessions. I know, Sir, that the Honourable Member will stand up and say that he is supremely satisfied with the work turned out by these men, that every white man is an absolute angel, infallible, and has conferred the maximum benefit on the railways. The Honourable Sir Charles Innes will get up and say that every white man has borne the white man's burden on his colossal shoulders in a magnificent manner. But it is for this House also to be satisfied, not only for the Honourable gentlemen who are there, who are always most satisfied with the work done by their own subordinates. But we are not satisfied with the recommendation; we are not satisfied that the concessions ought to be continued for all time to come, and I hope that this House will repeat the verdict it has already given, not once but twice, and have nothing to do with this very objectionable way of adding largely to the comforts of people who are probably already overpaid. I was surprised the other day when the Honourable Sir Clement Hindley said he did not know what was said in this House last year by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya to the effect that the Minister of Railways in Japan is paid only Rs. 1,000. The figures are there in some page of the debates of last year when Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya gave a lot of figures of salaries of officers in Japan, including railway officers, and I understand that the Minister for Railways there is being paid only Rs. 1,000; probably a fifth or a fourth of what Sir Clement Hindley is paid. We in India are paying very much more than probably any other country, and in any event no case remains for the continuation of the Lee concessions for all time to come. I therefore hope that, as this House has already given its verdict very definitely, my friends will on this occasion once more convey to the Government their determination that they will have no lot or part with these very objectionable Lee concessions.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Sir, I propose to follow the example of my Honourable friend Mr. Acharya and to be very brief indeed. The subject is one on which it is difficult to say anything new. That side of the House knows the point of view of this side and we know the point of view of the Honourable Members opposite. I am sorry that there is a difference and that there has always been a difference of opinion between the Government and the non-official Members of the House on this particular point. But I would remind Honourable Members opposite that as the result of many complaints from Government officers in India about the difficulties under which they were labouring the whole matter was referred to an independent impartial tribunal which was composed half of Indians. That independent tribunal made certain recommendations. It made those recommendations not only for the all-India services but also for the central services, that is to say, including the railway services, and it also made recommendations in regard to Indianization. The definite decision of the Government was that they would accept the report as a whole, that they would carry out one side as well as the other side of the report. That is the reason why we extended these concessions to our railway officers. I am sorry that the House do not like that decision, but I do put it to them that that is the decision and I hope that it will not be an annual feature of our budget debates that this decision is challenged and the Demand disallowed. Referring to what Mr. Acharya said about Indianization, I can only repeat the figures I gave yesterday. I have them here. In regard to superior officers on the three old State Railways, the Oudh and Rohilkhand, the Eastern Bengal and the North Western, in the last two years we have filled 57 of the central appointments by Indians: and if you exclude departments for which Indians were not available we filled 65 per cent. of the appointments by Indians. And, Sir, the Company Railways have definitely accepted the recommendation of the Lee Commission that facilities for training should be expedited so as to fill in India 75 per cent. of the vacancies, and you may take it from me that we shall make it our business to see that that promise is implemented. That, Sir, is all I need say. I oppose the motion.

Mr. H. G. Cocke: Sir, I think I heard my Honourable friend on the other side saying that the figures I gave the House the other day were wrong. I wish to point out to him that they were not. I spoke of the total staff of Railways, and I made a comparison between the year 1913-14 and the year 1924-25, and if he turns to page 62 of the Annual Report for 1924-25, he will find that the European staff decreased in that period by 1,700 approximately against an increase in the Indian staff of over 100,000.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated: Labour Interests): Sir, I wanted to put one question to the Honourable Member in charge of the Department of Railways. In my speech during the general discussion on Railways, I asked him the meaning of the phrase which he has used in the Annual Report for Railways as regards Indianisation, namely, that he would give effect to the recommendations of the Lee Commission "as soon as practicable". I wanted him to state very clearly what the meaning of that phrase was. He himself stated that the Lee Commission proposals were two-sided; one side of the proposal has been given effect to from the 1st April 1924. I want to know whether he is going to fill vacancies in the Railway Department on this basis that 75 per cent. of the vacancies since

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

1st April 1924 will be given to Indians. I want a definite answer on this point.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Sir, I wish to explain to my Honourable friend that when I made use of the phrase I did use I was merely quoting from the Lee Commission Report. The actual words of the Lee Commission were as follows:

"The extension of the existing training facilities (in India) should be pressed forward as expeditiously as possible in order that the recruitment of Indians may be advanced as soon as practicable up to 75 per cent. of the total number of vacancies in the Railway Department as a whole, the remaining 25 per cent. being recruited in England."

The difficulty in regard to this matter is that there are certain Departments, such as the Carriage and Wagon Department and the Locomotive Department, where at present we have not got facilities for training; we hope to have them in time: we have not got them at present. All we can do—and we are doing it on some Railways—is to take Indians and send them home for training with the object of getting them appointed here. As regards the Traffic Department for the last two years on State Railways we have filled up vacancies practically entirely by Indians. As regards the Engineering Department we have got to provide a certain number of Royal Engineers. Isn't that so? (*Sir Clement Hindley*: "Yes".) But there again we shall make it our aim in that Department to recruit at once up to the proposal of the Lee Commission, that is, 75 per cent. out here and 25 per cent. at home. My answer to the Honourable Member is that where facilities exist we shall at once recruit in the proportion of 75 and 25 per cent., 75 per cent. in India and 25 per cent. at home; but where we cannot recruit at present, what we shall do is to increase our training facilities as expeditiously as possible.

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally: May I inquire from the Honourable Member how much time Government would take to create those facilities which he says do not exist at the present moment?

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Sir, the Honourable the Commerce Member told us that both of us understand about this Lee Commission. I wish him to understand what the view we take of this matter is. The view we take of this matter, Sir, is this. After the creation of the new constitution the Secretary of State and the Government of India have flouted this constitution by forcing this Lee Commission on this country. Sir, the forcing of that Commission was an exhibition of distrust of this Legislature. Not only the forcing of the Commission but the very action taken by the British Government at home in putting through Parliament an enactment making these allowances and additions non-votable is an insult, Sir, to this country, to this Legislature. (Hear, hear.) Sir, that is the view we take of the situation. From every constitutional point of view I must time and again protest against any grant recommended by the Lee Commission. Sir, I am sorry my Honourable friends on this side have side-tracked this issue by asking what percentage of Indianization is going on. Sir, that is beside the point altogether. (Non-official cheers). If the whole staff were Indianized, I would not bargain my right for that Indianization. Sir, I take a strong view in this matter. I think the Government of India have acted most unwisely, most wrongly, in distrusting this Legislature. Sir, we have

been just to the Services and we propose to be just to the Services, and this matter is taken as an insult to this country. So, every year and every time when this proposal comes, if it is in our power, I think it is our duty to turn it down and force its certification.

Mr. K. C. Neogy (Dacca Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, when the question of the Lee concessions comes up in this House in connection with the Railway Department, I wonder whether we are in an auction room or in a Legislature, because the Honourable the Finance Member and the Honourable the Commerce Member come out with this argument: "If you want Indianization, you must agree to these concessions." That is the attitude of an auctioneer and not of a statesman.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett (Finance Member): That has never been said.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: I would remind the Honourable the Finance Member of his speech on the last occasion when this question came up in connection with Supplementary Demands for Railways. He then said that we have to enter into a bargain with the Companies and unless you agree to this we cannot make the Companies agree to the other part of the bargain. (*An Honourable Member*: "Companies!") Yes, Companies. This particular item refers to Companies as well as State lines. Sir, I find that although the Honourable the Commerce Member objects to importing politics into the discussions of the Railways, he himself, when this question comes up, asks us to decide it on political considerations. It is he who is introducing politics into the Railway Budget and not we. Sir, I wonder how the Honourable Members sitting opposite can dare raise this question here, and ask us to agree to these Lee concessions as a condition of further Indianization. It is preposterous to say that if you want more Indians to man your own Railways—Railways owned by the taxpayers of India—then you must agree to pay the European members, the non-Asiatic members, of the Services more, as a *quid pro quo*. Sir, we are in 1926; but as far back as 1870 Mr. (subsequently Sir) J. Danvers, the well known railway expert of the India Office, advocated Indianization as a matter of business proposition. He said that "the aim of all should be gradually to allow natives to take the place of highly paid Europeans and skilled workers", and recommended to the Secretary of State that definite steps should be taken for the Indianization of the railway services. More than half a century has since elapsed, and we are to-day discussing this question in the spirit of a bargain. Sir, I am very sorry that the Honourable Members opposite should be so much lost to a sense of propriety as to have brought forward such an argument.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: Sir, I do not think there is anything very much new that could be added to the arguments brought forward on this question. But surely, Sir, after my Honourable friend Sir Alexander Muddiman claimed that they were going to deal with the claims of Indians and Europeans purely on the basis of merit and not because a man was a European or an Indian, I have been very much surprised. My Honourable friend wholly forgot that the entire constitution of this country is based upon this racial discrimination. If you see Schedule II of the Government of India Act, Sir, you find that certain appointments have been wholly reserved for the members of the Indian Civil Service.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman (Home Member): Are they English only? Are there not Indian members of the Indian Civil Service?

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: I know there are very distinguished Indian members of the Indian Civil Service. But the point that I am at is that this ruling class has taken the precaution to hold its examinations in its own country to see that as we go there in as few numbers as possible, that very few of us get in.

Mr. President: That is not the question we are discussing. I have already pointed out to the Honourable Member that we are for the moment concerned with the recommendations of the Lee commission in regard to certain railway officials.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: I bow to your ruling, Sir. I was only answering the question put to me by the Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman.

What I am saying is that so far as the Lee concessions are concerned, they are deliberately based on the fact that foreigners are imported into this country and therefore we must pay more. We do not want the foreigners, and we do not want to pay more in the way of these concessions. That is the ground on which we have to vote down everyone of these Demands.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, yesterday evening when I gave my vote in favour of the throwing out the Demand for the Railway Board I did it on the ground of the injustice which the Government of India are doing to Indians, squandering Indian money in giving Lee concessions to Europeans without fulfilling their other part of the obligation. They talk of justice, justice. Why, there is no justice in the Government of India, and how can you expect justice in the Railway Board which is only meant to do anything that will keep Indians out of the Railways? There is no use in your bringing in a few Indians and putting them in the show case of the Government gallery to show us that there are a few Indians in the Railway Board. There are no Indians on the Railway Board. I do not want to argue those questions which the Honourable Mr. Ramadas Pantulu raised in a question in the Council of State where it was mentioned that out of 16 Secretaries in the Government of India there was only one Indian Secretary.

Mr. President: We are not considering the question of Indianization. The question under discussion is confined to the increased emoluments to certain railway officials under the recommendations of the Lee Commission.

Mr. B. Das: Sir, while opposing these Lee concessions during the Supplementary Demands for Railways I said if you fulfil the other part of the bargain that of 75 per cent. Indianisation I will raise no objection to giving the Lee concessions. We have not heard one word from the Honourable the Commerce Member that they are going to give us those numbers of Indians which ought to have been recruited in the proportion of 75 per cent. for the years 1924-25 and 1925-26. It is true. You did not know that the Lee concessions were coming. If you are willing to give us these numbers, if you are honest in your bargain of 75 per cent. of Indian recruits, why don't you stop your recruitment in England till you give us that proportion of Indians? The other day I mentioned that there were qualified Indians, engineers from England, who when they knocked at the doors of the different Railway Commissioners were simply shown

the door. There are gilded *chaprasis* at these doors who would not allow them access to the mighty Chief Commissioner and the mighty Financial Commissioner and other Commissioners.

Sir Clement Hindley (Chief Commissioner, Railways): May I ask the Honourable Member to raise his voice a little. I cannot quite hear the accusations he is making against me, but they sound very personal.

Mr. B. Das: I said that these Indians could not get access to the mighty Chief Commissioner of Indian Railways, his haughty highness Sir Clement Hindley. I am always saying that the different Commissioners are not accessible to the Indians. They are

Sir Clement Hindley: May I ask what this has got to do with the Lee Commission concessions?

Mr. B. Das: Sir, under the Statute Indians are entitled to fill 75 per cent. of the appointments in the Railways. Do you give us that? You talk of justice. Is this justice? Then you say you are employing more Indians. We have been fooled throughout in the Railway grants. I was told that it was foolish on our part to throw out the whole Demand of the Railway Board. We could easily have reduced by Rs. 100 to mark our displeasure. But we are quite justified in reducing the whole grant. A reduction of Rs. 100 or Rs. 200 would not work as you do not feel the sting of it at all. You do not feel the pinch of a cut of Rs. 100 or Rs. 200. It is like pinpricks to you. It is true if the grant is thrown out you may certify it, but the Viceroy will call a meeting of the Members of his Cabinet and will ask explanations and will want facts before he certifies. You will have to explain the attitude of this House to the Viceroy. You have shown also to the world that a great injustice is done by these vested interests that have been created, in the name of the Railway Board, which shut out every Indian; not only in the Railway Board itself, but in the small departments, and I would remind Sir Clement Hindley that last year we asked him to Indianise the Department and he told us how he takes an Indian coolie and trains him to be a nice mistry. Well, what solace was it to this House to hear

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Has this anything to do with the motion?

Mr. President: I must rule the Honourable Member out of order. These matters are not germane to the question now before the House.

Mr. B. Das: Sir, we are talking of the Lee Commission. (Laughter.) Every Indian who is true to his country, his motherland, cannot control himself; he must speak the truth, and naturally if I am a little irrelevant and go beyond the Railway Board and other points, you cannot blame me. I was mad yesterday (Laughter), because I feel on this point

Mr. President: I hope the Honourable Member is not mad to-day. (Renewed Laughter.)

Mr. B. Das: Sir, if you will permit me one minute. The Finance Department has produced great Indians. Here is my Honourable friend Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra, we are proud of him and we are proud of the Finance Department. But what have the Railway Board done? You do not take Indians

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Lee Commission.

Mr. B. Das: I am just referring to this matter. Sir Clement Hindley is a big engineer and he could have produced great Indian engineers. He could have produced great Indian engineers like Sir M. Visweswariah, Sir Gangaram as the Public Works Departments have produced. He would not: he has this policy of his which shuts out Indians from the Railways; you cannot appoint an Indian Agent, nor can you appoint an Indian as Deputy Agent. Sir, I thank you for permitting me to raise this issue. (Laughter.) I am quite willing to give the railway officers the Lee loot, but let us have the other side of the bargain. (*An Honourable Member:* "No bargain.") If we do not give them the Lee Commission's recommendations the Government will take them (Laughter), but I personally will give them the Lee Commission benefits, if they give me 75 per cent. Indianisation.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I do hope very much that, unless he is in the present tense mad, the last speaker will vote in the lobby, after he has listened to me, on my side. He asks that the Government should fulfil what he calls their side of the bargain, the Government are fulfilling to the full the recommendations of the Lee Commission in the matter of Indianisation

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: We are not agreeing to it.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I am not at the moment addressing my arguments to those, like Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, who are always irrelevant in their voting, but to the Honourable Member who has just spoken, who desires to vote for the merits of this question and who says we are squandering money without fulfilling our side of the bargain. I say that we are not squandering money and that we are fulfilling our side of the bargain.

We have accepted in full the recommendation of the Lee Commission that we should aim at a 75 per cent. recruitment of Indians at the earliest possible opportunity and we are expediting this opportunity; this is in answer to a question that was put in that quarter; and we are expediting that opportunity in every way we can.

Mr. B. Das: Do you mean you will take 75 per cent. every year of your recruitment for the superior service on the railways?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: That is not the recommendation of the Lee Commission. It is that we should work up to a total of 75 per cent. as soon as it is possible and where it is possible. We are recruiting up to 75 per cent. where it is possible.

Mr. Chaman Lall (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): How many centuries will it take?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Probably by the time that Mr. Chaman Lall has reached years of discretion he will find that it will have been amply fulfilled.

Mr. Chaman Lall: Why not when the Government have no discretion in the matter at all.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: That is as regards our side of the bargain. I will now turn to the other question. It is absolutely essential if you want your railways to work properly that you should have a contented staff.

Mr. B. Das: Who created the discontent?

Mr. Chaman Lall: What about the subordinate services? Are they contented?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I should like to know, Sir, who is addressing the House.

Mr. Chaman Lall: Why do you not look to the subordinate staff of the railways? Are they contented?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: The Honourable Member will no doubt have an opportunity when moving his cut

Mr. Chaman Lall: That is no answer.

Mr. President: Order, order.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: At the moment he is as usual irrelevant. It is absolutely essential that you should have a contented staff. Now the Government accepted the Lee Commission's proposals in full. They did not apply them to the Company Railways until they were sure that the Company Railways were willing to accept the recommendation of Now the Government accepted the Lee Commission's proposals in full, Companies having accepted that, the question simply was whether you should leave the employees of the Company Railways on a lower scale than the employees of the State Railways to whom the Lee Commission's proposals had already been extended by the decision of the Government. I maintain that it would have been an impossible thing not so to extend them. But let us go back to the question at issue. Now the motion is for a reduction of 20 lakhs, in order that the bargain already entered into, the contract that had already been made by the Government with these officials, should not be fulfilled. We are not really discussing whether or not the Lee Commission's proposals should be extended to the Company Railways. We are discussing whether the Government having made this bargain should keep it or not.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Did you consult the House before entering into the bargain?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: The question is simply whether we should now, if the House carries this motion with the intention that it should be accepted, whether we should now turn round to these employees with whom we have made a contract and say "We are not going to fulfil it". That is all that is before the House now. The last speaker spoke in feeling terms about justice and pin-pricks. He said a cut of Rs. 100 was a pin-prick, but a cut of this large sum was something that the Government would feel. I think that he is exactly wrong. A cut of Rs. 100 is not a pin-prick but something much more painful, which the

[Sir Basil Blackett.]

Government feel rather acutely. A cut of this large sum is a blow that entirely misses its aim. Do you suppose that there is anything to discuss, for the Governor General in Council to discuss, except to restore it, if this item is thrown out? Obviously there is nothing to discuss. The matter is

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: Automatic.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: The matter is automatic, of course, if Mr. Iyengar likes to make it automatic; that is his method of having a joke, but obviously it does not hurt anybody else except his own party and himself.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: It is so either way.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: It is simply non-co-operation.

Mr. M. V. Abhyankar (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): That is the only way left to us. Under the circumstances we have to go on obstructing you.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: If it is the view of some Honourable Members that the only way is to non-co-operate they might just as well do nothing, I admit. If that is their view let them have it; but there are other Members of this House who are not so obdurate

Mr. M. V. Abhyankar: Unreasonable? They are very sweet and reasonable.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I was not going to use the word "unreasonable"—I was going to use something more like "impervious to reasonable argument" (Laughter)—what the Americans would perhaps call bone-headed. If Honourable Members are prepared to consider this like the last speaker, on its merits, I would put it to him that he has a choice here between co-operation and non-co-operation, between voting whether the Government should keep their bargain or not, and that the test of the vote on this matter will not in the least indicate that he or anybody else has changed his opinion on the merits of the Lee Commission.

Lala Lajpat Rai (Jullundur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I just want to make one observation which has been suggested to me by the speech of my friend the Honourable the Finance Member. He has visualised to us the absolute unreality of the discussion in which we are engaged. He says it is all fruitless because the thing has already been decided and no amount of discussion can prevent the decision being acted upon. The whole of the administration is being run on lines that have been finally arranged. One party gives, the other party receives. We are here simply to record our disapproval of the present system of administration including the railway administration. We disapprove of the policy underlying the Lee Commission's Report; we also disapprove of the policy of accepting the Lee Commission's Report and meeting this extra expenditure from the revenues of the country. We also disapprove of extending the benefits of the Lee Commission report to the servants of the Railway Companies. That is all the function that we are here for; because we know that all the reasons we may advance and all the discussions that we may enter

into are perfectly useless. The thing has been arranged; it is going to be done from year to year; and that in spite of what we may say or what we may do, until we get the real power which will force the Government of India to listen to our voice, till then it will go on as it is. I am therefore very thankful to the Honourable the Finance Member for drawing once more our attention to the realities of the situation; and one of these realities is that all this discussion is of no practical value except to show to our electorates that we are doing our duty as fearlessly as we can possibly do in the circumstances, and that in fact all this discussion and all these debates are absolutely unreal and mean nothing.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: Sir, I had not intended to intervene in this debate at all, till my Honourable friend on the other side got up. But I must say a few words in regard to the point he has raised. My Honourable colleague, Sir Basil Blackett, did not say that these were cast-iron decisions. What he said was—(Mr. T. C. Goswami: "Do not apologise for him.")—I am not apologising for my Honourable colleague—I am explaining and I hope the Honourable Member will let me proceed. When I was interrupted I was about to observe that the Honourable Sir Basil Blackett pointed out perfectly clearly to this House that the reason for restoration is the decision that is being taken on the other side and not by us. If you go to the extent of reductions which would have the effect of stopping the administration you make a definite restoration necessary and that was his whole point. The gentleman who said that it was an automatic slot machine and who said—(Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: "The automatics are provided in the Government of India Act.") The power is provided in the Government of India Act, but who is forcing the Government of India to use it? My Honourable friend opposite, who said that he would desire to cut the salaries of all the Europeans. I understood him to say that and that is the reply, Sir, to the Honourable Diwan Bahadur Rangachariar's speech. That is the reason why it is impossible in the present state of affairs to submit these salaries to the vote of this House to be used in that way

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: If the salaries are taken for us in this way, they will be turned down. (Mr. Chaman Lal: "Robbery.") (Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: "Jobbery.")

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: I have heard the word "robbery" before; it is a very favourite word in this House. I shall probably hear the word "dakaiti" very soon. (An Honourable Member: "It is only another form of robbery.") I am not to be discouraged by interruptions of that kind from the point that I want to make. Do not charge us with breaking the constitution. It is you yourselves who are doing that. I will now leave my Honourable friends opposite. Sir, I hope there are still some Members in this House who desire to discuss the matter on its merits: I may say here that Mr. Acharya himself shows signs that he recognises there are advantages in some of the decisions of the Lee Commission. He says—"I do not like it—but it is a *chose jugée* and I will now do my best to see that you keep the part of it I do like". Now that is a reasonable proposition. That was also the proposition, as far as I followed him, of my other Honourable friend Mr. B. Das. He said also—and I recognise it—that we must keep our part of the bargain; but let me point out to him that if that line of argument is pursued it involves the conclusion that

[Sir Alexander Muddiman.]

there is a bargain. If my Honourable friend accepts that proposition then he will have to come into the lobby with me on the present motion and I trust he will.

Lala Lajpat Rai: There is no bargain.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: I am not appealing to my Honourable friend, for I do not suppose, he will support the Government. I am very hopeful, but I am not so hopeful as that. Therefore, on these two grounds, one constitutional, that you should not be a party to the corruption of the constitution, and secondly, as we have carried out our side of the bargain in regard to the question of Indianisation, I ask the House to vote with me.

An Honourable Member: Who has made the constitution?

Mr. Chaman Lall: Sir, I had no intention to take part to-day in this debate, but the speeches of the Honourable the Finance Member and the Honourable the Home Member prompt me to say a word or two. (*An Honourable Member:* "Provoke is the word.") Sir, provocation is not the word, but it should be something stronger than that. I should have thought that Honourable Members opposite would have come in sackcloth and ashes, but I find they have come to us entirely impenitent. Sir, they talk about reason, they talk about argument, they talk about co-operation, and they talk about corrupting the constitution. I say, Sir, that it is the Honourable Members over there who are responsible for corrupting the services. When I use the word "robbery", I use a very mild expression. I consider the Honourable Members opposite have been thoroughly dishonest in what they have done in taking all this money from the public exchequer without the consent of the public. I am surprised at the Honourable Member taking about reason, argument and bargains. Who made that bargain? Did we make that bargain? Why should you come to us now and ask our sanction for that bargain? (Hear, hear.) We are not going to give you the sanction, because we are not parties to that bargain. (Hear, hear.) You simply put your hand in your right hand pocket and get the money out and put it back again into your left hand pocket, and you call that a bargain and ask us to give you sanction for that procedure. Is that a contract; is that co-operation; is that fair dealing? Is it honest for Honourable Members over there to draw the money from the poor tax-payer of the country in order to pay fat salaries to their own kinsmen in this country without the consent and free will of the representatives of the people of this country? Is it honest, I ask? I say, Sir, it is not honest. And if you say there was a bargain, I say deliberately there was no bargain on our side at all.

I am very sorry, Sir, to have raised this issue, because I find that it is really a racial issue, and I am very loath to raise it. Honourable Members over there will sympathise with the attitude adopted by this side when I say that it is not on racial grounds that we are raising this issue, but that we are raising this question on constitutional grounds. That is the ground on which I intend to take up this issue. And if in raising that issue on constitutional grounds the racial issue is also brought in, then the blame is not on our side; the blame is on your side.

Sir, the question is a very simple one. Is it reasonable for the Honourable Member over there to use these false arguments, arguments which he knows perfectly well, have no validity, and come to us and say, "Oh, because the Government of India entered into a bargain with certain members of the services, therefore now you cannot go back on it and therefore, if you refuse, certification must become automatic?" Who is responsible for that certification? You come here and ask our sanction for the money without yourself co-operating with us. You pay no heed whatsoever to the opinion expressed on this side of the House. Did the Assembly give its assent to the Lee loot? And what did you do? You immediately went and got it certified. Who asked you to do that? We are not to blame for it. We placed all our arguments before you; we told you in plain language that we cannot afford this large sum, and yet you have drawn this large sum of money from the public exchequer in spite of the verdict of the country and of the representatives of the people. Whose fault is it? It is not our fault. Under these circumstances it is no good your coming to us hypocritically and talking about co-operation. The Honourable the Home Member talked about corrupting the constitution. I say, Sir, beware, in other countries at other times this sort of action on the part of an irresponsible executive has led to very serious consequences. It is no laughing matter. It is a matter to which I want to draw your very serious attention. Corrupting the constitution! *You* are corrupting your services, *You* are corrupting the constitution, and *you* are standing here shame-faced before the public bar of this country and demanding this sum of money from the public—not demanding it but taking it by force from the public purse. What are you taking that for? You are taking it away, Sir, to bolster up the pampered services of this country in order to give more money to those who have. When we talk about the subordinate services, the Honourable Members over there say, "We have no money."

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: Is the Honourable Member aware of what has been done for the subordinate services? There is something about it in the debate on the Lee Commission's Report I think.

Mr. Chaman Lal: Is the Honourable Member aware of what has not been done for the subordinate services? (*The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman:* "No.") (Laughter and prolonged Applause.) The Honourable Member will have an opportunity of hearing us as to what has not been done for the subordinate services during the course of this debate. All that I have to say now, Sir, is this, that you have no business to come here as honest men and claim honestly the opportunity and the privilege of placing what you wrongly call an honest demand before this House when you are guilty of this dishonest action. (Applause.)

(Several Honourable Members moved that the question be put.)

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

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 20,00,000."

The Assembly divided :

AYES—60.

Abdul Haye, Mr.
Abdul Karim, Khwaja.
Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
Acharya, Mr. M. K.
Ahmed, Mr. K.
Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.
Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.
Alimuzzaman Chowdhry, Khan
Bahadur.
Ariff, Mr. Yacoob C.
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
Chaman Lall, Mr.
Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
Das, Mr. B.
Das, Pandit Nīakantha.
Deshmukh, Mr. R. M.
Duni Chand, Lala.
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Raja.
Ghose, Mr. S. C.
Ghulam Abbas Sayyad.
Goswami, Mr. T. C.
Gour, Sir Hari Singh.
Hussanally, Khan Bahadur W. M.
Ismail Khan, Mr.
Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Kasturbhai Lalbhai, Mr.
Kidwai, Sha'kh Mushir Hosain.
Lajpat Rai, Lala.
Lohokare, Dr. K. G.

Mahmood Schamnad Sahib Bahadur,
Mr.
Majid Baksh, Syed.
Maaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.
Mehta, Mr. Jannadas M.
Misra, Pandit Shambhu Dayal.
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.
Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.
Rangachariar, Diwan Bahadur T.
Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.
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.
Talatuley, Mr. S. D.
Tok Kyi, U.
Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
Vishindas, Mr. Harchandrai.
Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.
Yusuf Imam, Mr. M.

NOES—46.

Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.
Bajpai, Mr. R. S.
Bhore, Mr. J. W.
Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
Bray, Sir Denys.
Calvert, Mr. H.
Carey, Sir Willoughby.
Cocke, Mr. H. G.
Crawford, Colonel J. D.
Donovan, Mr. J. T.
Ghulam Bari, Khan Bahadur
Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J.
Gordon, Mr. R. G.
Graham, Mr. L.
Hayman, Mr. A. M.
Hezlett, Mr. J.
Hindley, Sir Clement.
Hira Singh Brar, Sardar Bahadur
Captain.
Hudson, Mr. W. F.
Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.
Jatar, Mr. K. S.
Lindsay, Sir Darcy.

Macphail, The Rev. Dr. E. M.
Makan, Khan Sahib M. E.
Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra
Nath.
Muddiman, The Honourable Sir
Alexander.
Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur
Saiyid.
Naidu, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Neave, Mr. E. R.
Owens, Lieut.-Col. F. C.
Rahman, Khan Bahadur A.
Raj Narain, Rai Bahadur.
Reddi, Mr. K. Venkataramana.
Roffey, Mr. E. S.
Setalvad, Sir Chimanlal.
Sim, Mr. G. G.
Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.
Sykes, Mr. E. F.
Vernon, Mr. H. A. B.
Vijavaraghavacharyar, Sir T.
Wajihuddin, Haji.
Willson, Mr. W. S. J.
Young, Mr. G. M.

The motion was adopted.

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

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Twenty Minutes to Three of the Clock, Mr. President in the Chair.

The Eastern Bengal Railway Administration.

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar (Madras ceded districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I rise to move:

“That the Demand under the head ‘Working Expenses: Administration’ be reduced by Rs. 2,25,000.”

with special reference to Eastern Bengal Railway Administration.

Sir, at the outset I may state that it is not to be understood that by making a motion with reference to the Eastern Bengal Railway Administration I mean that the administration of other railways are more satisfactory or perfectly satisfactory. In the second place, I also want to make it clear that it is not that the Eastern Bengal Railway Administration is extravagant only to the extent of Rs. 2,25,000; it is much more extravagant. At the same time I confine my present motion to a reduction of Rs. 2,25,000 for reasons which I shall presently mention. Sir, it is often stated that we should not compare the administration of one railway company with the administration of another, because conditions may vary; the situation and the geographical position and other circumstances also necessitate a variation in the figures of expenditure. But I do not believe that, so far as the administration is concerned, it will make any difference, at any rate it will make much of an abnormal difference, between the conditions in one part of the country and the conditions of another portion of the country. Therefore, Sir, I think I am justified in comparing the administrative figures for at least some of the railway companies which are in very much the same position as the Eastern Bengal Railway Company. For that purpose I shall take four companies into consideration for purposes of comparison. The Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway, which has a mileage of 3,040 miles, has set apart Rs. 95,75,000 for its administration. The South Indian Railway, which has 1,878 miles, has set apart Rs. 64,35,000.

Mr. President: Order, order. I would ask the Honourable Member from Madras (Mr. M. K. Acharya) not to turn this Chamber into a reading room.

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: The Burma Railway Company with a mileage of 1,721, has set apart Rs. 61,25,000. The Eastern Bengal Railway, which has only 1,795 miles, sets apart for administrative expenditure Rs. 94 lakhs. Sir, I have selected these four companies with a special purpose, because you will find the mileage is approximately the same in the case of the South Indian Railway, the Burma Railway and the Eastern Bengal Railway, and I have taken the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway in this group because with an additional 1,000 miles and odd over and above the Eastern Bengal Railway the expenditure that has been allotted is very much the same as the Eastern Bengal Railway. For the Eastern Bengal Railway with 1,795 miles the budget expenditure is Rs. 94 lakhs, whereas for the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway with 3,040 miles the budget expenditure on the administration is only Rs. 95,75,000. Now, Sir, I want you to consider this from the point of view of the administration apart from any other question of working expenses about which

[Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar.]

there may be some variations here and there. For instance, if we take only three groups of expenditure, not to consider the rest, the expenditure under Agency, under Audit and Accounts, under Cash and Pay, you will find a difference between the South Indian Railway and the Burma Railways on the one hand and the Eastern Bengal Railway on the other hand of a sum of Rs. 5,50,000 and I have put down for my reduction only half of that, Rs. 2,25,000.

Now, Sir, I consider that there is every necessity for the Eastern Bengal Railway turning its attention to more of economy because, you know, the Eastern Bengal Railway has always been financially very bad. It is all the more necessary why that administration should take greater care about retrenchment of expenditure or economy of expenditure, whatever may be the term that is to be used, as I find there was once a quarrel about the terms between my friend Mr. Rama Aiyangar and Sir Purshotamdas Thakudas. Call it what you will, I say that the administration must necessarily pay attention to reduction of expenditure. Sir, by stating this I do not for one moment contend before you that the administrations of the South Indian Railway and the Burma Railways are perfectly satisfactory and that they should be taken as absolute standards because I find, when I go into the question of the staff, that the Burma Railways and the South Indian Railway are super-parsimonious, more niggardly than others. I do not want either the niggardliness of the South Indian Railway or the extravagance of the Eastern Bengal Railway Company. Therefore, it is necessary for us to consider how to improve the conditions of those Railways, at the same time making the expenditure of the Eastern Bengal Railway not disproportionately large and extravagant. Sir, in the case of the Eastern Bengal Railway under one branch, namely, the agency department, you will find an expenditure of Rs. 91,25, whereas for the South Indian Railway which has a greater extent of mileage, the expenditure is only Rs. 63,00 and for the Burma Railway it is Rs. 73,50. So the extravagance is there in the very first department of it and that will give us a saving of nearly Rs. 24,000, if so far as the administration is concerned, you are convinced that the administrative machinery which is employed for the other two companies will also be equally sufficient for the administration of the Eastern Bengal Railway. I therefore think, Sir, that it is absolutely necessary that we must pay special attention to the reduction of expenditure on this score. I feel also that it is due to this extravagance that the Eastern Bengal Railway Company has not been able to reduce the fares either of the first class, or second class or third class just as the other six railway companies have done. I am not going into the question of the reduction of railway fares under this heading but I take it as a necessary consequence of this extravagant expenditure under this heading that you have not been able to spare something for giving relief even to the third class passengers. If only you reduce this expenditure, you can certainly give relief to the third class passengers just as other railways have done. At one time the third class fare was only 2½ pies per mile but you have raised it to 3½ pies for ordinary trains and to 5 pies for mail trains. Yet you are not to-day able to reduce it. Why? Because the expenditure is very extravagant. Therefore, Sir, I move that the reduction be made to the extent of Rs. 2,25,000 which is certainly a very modest figure. If you compare, as I have already stated, the expenditure incurred under adminis-

tration by a Company with an equal mileage like the South Indian Railway Company, then you are spending 34 lakhs more than what that company is spending. Whatever may be the differences, whatever may be the variations in local conditions and whatever may be the differences in topographical conditions, you cannot say that, so far as the administration is concerned, such a highly disproportionate extravagance of 30 lakhs or 34 lakhs is necessary under administration. But I have not troubled the Honourable Members of the Railways to-day, notwithstanding all this extravagant expenditure, by moving a reduction of 30 lakhs, or 20 lakhs or even 10 lakhs. I have asked for a modest reduction of Rs. 2,25,000 which, if taken away, will not in any way diminish the efficiency of your administration in general or the efficiency of your agency department in particular. Sir, I move.

Mr. G. G. Sim: Sir, the speech just made by the Honourable Member illustrates the difficulties into which critics are likely to fall in comparing one railway with another. The Honourable Member has picked out the Eastern Bengal State Railway and has compared the cost of general administration on that railway with the Southern India and Burma Railways which he says are of equal mileage. I pointed out last year during the budget debate, and at great length in my reply to Mr. Rama Aiyangar's articles, which the Honourable Member does not appear to have read, that it is not only mileage you have to take into consideration in judging the working costs of a railway. You have to take into consideration, particularly in the case of the Eastern Bengal State Railway, the physical characteristics of the country through which the line passes. The Honourable Member has not perhaps travelled on that railway, but if he had he would have noticed particularly the special expenditure that has to be incurred in connection with the waterways of Bengal. Apart from that, if the Honourable Member had looked at one fact which is equally important, namely, the amount of the traffic handled, he would have found his comparison entirely wrong. If he will look at the gross receipts of the Eastern Bengal Railway he will find that it amounts to 44 crores a year. In the case of the Burma Railways it is 27 crores, and in that of the Southern Indian Railway it is only 25 crores. It is quite impossible therefore to contrast the railways in the way he proposes.

Now I went into the question of the financial position of the Eastern Bengal State Railway at considerable length with the Standing Finance Committee and that Committee not only dealt very faithfully with the matter but they had before them at the meeting at which they discussed the programme for this Railway the Agent of the Eastern Bengal State Railway. I pointed out that in the last three years we had been able to effect substantial improvements in the financial position of this line. The line used to be worked at a loss, and if the Honourable Member will refer to Volume 4 of the proceedings of the Committee at page 37 he will find a statement there of the drastic action taken by the Railway Board to cut down expenses on this line and to restrict further capital expenditure. The economies effected in 1924-25 were so great that the loss of 23 lakhs in the preceding year was converted into a profit of 16½ lakhs. This figure was arrived at after allowing for an increase in revenue expenditure of 30 lakhs due to the institution of a depreciation fund, and if you compare like with like you will find that the net improvement in the working of the Railway for that year amounted to the very large figure of

[Mr. G. G. Sim.]

70 lakhs. I hope I have said enough to show that the Railway Board is fully alive to the necessity for effecting economy on this particular railway and it has done so.

As regards this particular head I would like to point out that the increase under the head of General Administration on the Railway is very small. The gross receipts anticipated next year allow for an increase of 30 lakhs as compared with the figure for 1924-25, and the increase under this head amounts to only sixty thousand rupees, that is to say, while the increase in traffic and receipts is 6 per cent. the increase in expenditure under this head amounts to one-quarter of one per cent.

I hope in view of these figures the Honourable Member will agree that there was no justification for singling out this line for the reduction he has proposed.

I oppose the motion.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 2,25,000."

The motion was negatived.

Divisional System of Administration on the North Western Railway.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Sir, I move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 2,00,000."

Sir, on the original Demand on which I proposed a cut of 6 lakhs for general administration I had stated that if the House did not carry that Demand

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I rise to a point of order. Has not this very question been discussed in the Honourable Member's previous speech on the cut of 6 lakhs moved by him?

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is entitled to have the decision of this House without going into details of this question again.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Sir, I am not going into the details of the subject but only to point out my friend Mr. Hayman's inaccuracies. I showed, Sir, that Government had not carried out the economies which they said they would carry out if the divisional system of administration was introduced on the North Western Railway; and I showed from the books themselves that as a matter of fact there was an excess of expenditure instead of economy. Now, Sir, my Honourable friend Mr. Hayman, to whom I offer my congratulations on his beautiful maiden speech, said that, if I looked at the operating ratio of expenditure on this line, I would find that it was lower than last year. That was not the point; the point was that under Audit and Accounts you said the very fact that this divisional system was organised would result in a saving. You may have made other savings but you promised that the introduction of the divisional system would lead to savings of two lakhs. On the contrary, as I have pointed out, it has led to increased expenditure. You said you forgot to add senior officers; your figures have proved to be wrong, and, secondly,

you have incurred more capital expenditure than you thought you would. You admit that in this book of the North Western Railway, and I do not see how you can go back on the statements you have made and in your books. I was not urging my reduction on general grounds but on the very ground you took; on your own showing your estimate has not turned out to be as accurate as you promised. You have gone wrong by four lakhs and you should agree to my cut.

Mr. A. M. Hayman: I think, Sir, what I told the House was that the figure for General Administration for this year was Rs. 205 lakhs for the North Western Railway, and that we propose to spend next year only 203 lakhs. It is this proposed expenditure, Sir, which is now under discussion, and I ask my Honourable friend whether that is not a reduction. I went further and said that, having introduced the divisional system on the 1st October 1924, we have not had sufficient time to reap all the benefits from that system. We have made a beginning. Next year we shall spend two lakhs less than we spent this year, and in future years, as I said, I hope we shall spend less because of the advantages we expect from the divisional system. I do not think I have misled the House. The House heard what I said and voted against Mr. Jamnadas Mehta's amendment, and I am very sorry that he has brought it up again.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: In view of this explanation, I do not wish to press this.

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

Unnecessary Expenditure on the Superintendent of the Railway Training School at Chandausi.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 5,000."

Sir, this is a point of principle, although the amount involved is very small. This time last year when we were voting for the Budget, we were told that in order to have a training school at Chandausi certain appointments were necessary, among them the appointment of an Instructor. That appointment was made, and at that time the gentleman who was appointed was to get a salary of Rs. 1,300 per month which included Rs. 250 personal allowance. The post carried—I speak subject to correction—a salary of Rs. 550 to Rs. 1,350. The gentleman who got the appointment, did not start on the lowest rung of the ladder, he at once began with Rs. 1,300, a month.

Mr. A. M. Hayman: May I explain to the Honourable Member that that was the rate of pay the officer was drawing on an incremental scale on the railway and he was transferred from a post where he was drawing that pay to this post, and he carried his personal rate of pay with him.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Added to Rs. 250 further, free quarters and free electric light. That was when he was appointed Instructor
 3 P.M. from the place which he held. Well, within 6 or 7 months, we are told that this Instructor should be made Superintendent, and we are now asked that this very gentleman should get for a mere change of

[Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta.]

names—from Instructor to Superintendent—an additional allowance of Rs. 200 a month. Now, Sir, what are the duties of this Instructor as distinct from those of a Superintendent? We are told that the present Superintendent or Principal has got some other duties and the Instructor will have to look after those duties when the present Superintendent is absent;—nothing more. Even to-day he is a whole-time officer; his whole time is engaged by us for the salary which we gave him last year; he will not work one minute more next year than he has been working now. Still because the gentleman is to be called a Superintendent he will get an extra Rs. 200 per month although he will not work a minute more than he is doing now. Now, Sir, what is the increase in the qualifications of this man within twelve months that all at once you should give him a further increment of Rs. 200; the result will be that he will get in the course of a single year Rs. 450 more than what he was getting before his appointment *plus* free quarters and electric light, which would mean Rs. 200 more. Sir, in the course of a single year this individual will get Rs. 650 more than the Rs. 1,050 which he was originally getting. Now, Sir, Rs. 600 is a 60 per cent. increment in the course of a single year, and I think it is something extravagant and unjustifiable; I ask the House not to associate itself with this jobbery. I do not call it by any softer name, because I cannot think how any man can in the course of twelve months have qualified himself to deserve an increment of 60 per cent. That is really an absurd thing to say the least, and, if the Government wish to associate itself with this jobbery, the House should refuse to follow suit. The amount may be small but the principle is great. Several more schools of this character are being opened and very rightly; and the example of Chandausi may be followed elsewhere. I have nothing to say against the school; that is at least one way by which we may hope in 50 or 100 years the railway service will be Indianised. It is the same thing as training Indians at Sandhurst. Chandausi is the Railway Sandhurst. Whenever the Government cannot find any reasonable excuse for not employing Indians they start training us. That is one excuse for marking time. The real reason is this; having done wrong for 60 years they cannot do right at once; and in order to justify the delay they start these schools for training Indians. It used to be the same with primary education. When we demanded that it should be made free and compulsory there were not enough trained teachers and therefore free and compulsory primary education could not be proceeded with. The same excuse is always there for not doing the right thing, because they have not done the right thing since 1848. Now that they have begun to do the right thing, it must take time. The wrong will continue for some time yet: this exclusion of the sons of the soil will necessarily continue for some time because of the initial sin, the original sin as the Honourable the Railway Member said. But even in continuing this sin, there ought to be some limit. That a man who was getting Rs. 1,050 should get in the course of a single year, though he has not moved one inch from the place where he was posted, Rs. 600 more is an unheard of extravagance, and I request that the House should not associate itself with jobbery of this kind.

Sir Darcy Lindsay (Bengal: European): Sir, as a member of the Standing Finance Committee on Railways I would like to say that the question of this increase was fully explained to us. We dealt with the

matter first of all at a Bombay meeting; we required further information and that was fully accorded at a meeting held before this Session was opened. We had the advantage of a full explanation from Mr. S. D. Gupta, Director of Establishments of Railways; and so far as my recollection goes, we were fully satisfied with that explanation. (Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: "I was not.") I do not know why my Honourable friend should state so definitely that this official does not work longer hours than the hours set down for his regular employment. It seems to me that in Government service when officials take up duties in addition to their regular duties they frequently have to work overtime. I think it is for this reason that the official in question is thoroughly entitled to the extra pay that the Committee decided to pass. The memorandum gives the duties of this Chief Instructor and it states that in the absence of the Principal all his duties, some of which are detailed below, namely, general supervision and management of the school, all matters in connection with the feeding of students of various creeds and castes, sanitation, facilities for games, medical arrangements, upkeep of buildings and grounds will have to be carried out by the Chief Instructor in addition to his own duties. It goes on to say that the extra duties and responsibilities thrown on the Chief Instructor are not at all light and in consideration of these heavy extra duties and responsibilities the Board proposed the conversion of the appointment of Chief Instructor on a salary of Rs. 1,300 a month to that of Superintendent on Rs. 1,500 a month. In my opinion, Sir, there is no justification for any reduction in this allowance.

Mr. B. Das: Sir, I had no desire to speak on this motion, but I find that the debates on the motions before the House are becoming rather in the nature of compliments from my Honourable friend Mr. Sim to the members of the Standing Finance Committee and *vice versa* and at times cross-compliments are flying about amongst the members of Standing Finance Committee. If this House appointed the Standing Finance Committee to go into the merits of certain cases, that does not mean that the Committee's decision in every case should be the final decision. This House consisting of 130 Members besides the Standing Finance Committee has a right to go into the merits of things and we should not take every decision of the Standing Finance Committee for granted. (Sir Darcy Lindsay: "Who said you should?") My Honourable friend, Sir Darcy Lindsay, did not say that; but the insinuations and implications of my Honourable friend, Mr. Sim, and the way in which he quotes as his Bible from Mr. Jamnadas Mehta or Mr. Neogy (Mr. K. C. Neogy: "Never") prove this. Perhaps since Mr. Neogy is on this side of the House, Mr. Sim does not find time to quote Mr. Neogy.

But, Sir, coming to this question before the House, I did not pay any attention to this subject, in the way my Honourable friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta did; but the way my friend Sir Darcy Lindsay supported the increment of Rs. 250 to this official for the increment of stating that this official did a very large amount of extra work, that he looked after sanitation of the boys, attended to their board and lodging, looked into all their difficulties I feel tempted to ask the question which portion of his work this officer does for his huge salary? And who are these students? Ordinary traffic inspectors and traffic controllers who are to be trained. Personally I am of opinion that this School is doing no good work at all. It is a school for training a certain number of existing

[Mr. B. Das.]

railway subordinate officials and just to make them a little bit more efficient. That is all. It is not doing anything towards the Indianisation of Railways. If this gentleman is doing this much work for Rs. 250, then what is he doing for his full salary? If he is paid a salary, he must do all the work for that salary. For that reason alone, I support my Honourable friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer (Madras: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, as a member of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, I wish to say that the grant of a special pay, in cases where extra responsibilities are imposed upon an officer, is not a new principle in our administration. It has been often done, and in this case it was pointed out that there were special responsibilities imposed upon the Chief Instructor. Mr. Jamnadas Mehta himself did not raise any objection at the time when the question was discussed in the Standing Finance Committee. I see no dissenting minute

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I was not present at the time.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer: I see no dissenting minute appended

Mr. G. G. Sim: May I explain, Sir, that Mr. Jamnadas Mehta was not present in the room when the point was discussed.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer: This question of special pay has turned up in another case. At my request the Financial Commissioner has agreed to lay before the Railway Finance Committee a statement of the principles upon which special pay is granted, and I believe it will be done at an early date. In this case the decision of the Standing Finance Committee was justified on the ground that there were additional responsibilities imposed upon this official.

Sir Clement Hindley: Sir, I do not want to prolong the debate on this small point. I cannot help thinking, however, that the reason for Mr. Jamnadas Mehta making such an impassioned attack on this poor individual is perhaps that he was not present when the matter was discussed by the Committee and he did not like the decision being taken in his absence.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: May I say that I was present at the meeting of the Standing Finance Committee, but I was not present only when this item came up for discussion.

Sir Clement Hindley: That is a matter for Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, but I cannot understand why he has singled out this particular appointment and why he wants this House to reduce this man's emoluments.

Mr. Bhubananda Das was good enough to say that he did not believe that this School was doing any good. Well, Sir, Mr. Bhubanananda Das is a man for whom I ought to have great respect as he is an engineer and I suppose he has constituted himself the technical adviser to his Party. But I hope he has not been stuffing his Party with a lot of nonsense regarding the work of this School, because I am quite prepared to say that he does not know anything about it, and I do not believe that he has really taken any trouble to know anything about it either.

Mr. B. Das: I go by the result, Sir.

Sir Clement Hindley: I think, Sir, that very few Honourable Members of this House have perhaps had an opportunity of knowing what the School is doing.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: Is that a ground for disqualification for us?

Sir Clement Hindley: I did not intend to say anything derogatory to any Member of this House. I say they have not had the opportunity of knowing what the School is doing, and for one reason, the School itself has not been in existence for very long. It is in the nature of an experiment, and we are doing our best to make it a success. But I would like to enlighten Honourable Members who have not understood what the School is doing, and those Honourable Members

Mr. President: The Honourable Member cannot discuss the merits and demerits of this institution on this amendment. The whole question before the House is about the emoluments of the particular officer.

Sir Clement Hindley: Very good, Sir, but if I may just add one small remark, I was going to say that as soon as the new Central Advisory Council is appointed I hope to extend an invitation to Honourable Members of this House to pay a visit to the School and show them what it is doing.

Now, Sir, in regard to this particular appointment, I think we have, in the papers put before the House, amply justified the rate of pay which we propose to give this official. It is not really open to Mr. Jamnadas Mehta or to any one else to say what exactly this man is worth. In commercial undertakings, I understand, from my little knowledge of commercial undertakings, that you take a man and pay him what he is worth. This particular officer is really worth a great deal more as Superintendent of this School than he was when he was working in his own particular job as a Block Signal Engineer. He is a very experienced man in a particular line—a technical man—and he has a particular gift for imparting his knowledge to other people. He has always been known for it. He assisted in establishing a somewhat similar school which has been in existence for some years at Asansol and he made a great success of it. For that reason we sent him to Chandausi and there he had an extraordinarily difficult task in establishing the new institution under very great difficulties. He has succeeded under the orders of Mr. Daim, the former Principal, in getting this institution into extraordinarily good working order. I wish just to explain for one moment the reasons we have stated in these papers for giving him extra pay as Superintendent over and above what he had as Chief Instructor. We have in view, as the House well knows, a scheme for separating from this School the upper classes, the classes for the officers and probationer officers, from the classes for subordinates and lower subordinates, because the School is now not able to tackle all the staff who are being sent there. It is not big enough to take the staff that we want to put through it. So we have under examination a scheme for separating the upper classes, the officers and probationer classes, and forming a separate institution for dealing with those classes, and the Principal who has been in charge of the Chandausi School is working on that scheme and will eventually take charge of it, leaving this official we are talking about to remain in sole charge of Chandausi as an area school.

[Sir Clement Hindley.]

Mr. B. Das said that this School was doing nothing for Indianisation. With your permission, Sir, I will just lay stress on this point. This School at present takes charge of the Probationary and Assistant Probationary Superintendents who are the recruits under the recruiting scheme for the official grade. I wish to make that point quite clear, that this School is itself one of the training schemes which was mentioned by the Honourable the Railway Member this morning for furthering our policy of Indian recruitment. Mr. B. Das, I think, could not have known it, or he would not have said that it is doing nothing.

Mr. B. Das: I did not say that. I said it was doing very little.

Sir Clement Hindley: Two groups of the probationers who have been appointed have been under the charge of the Principal of this institution during their period of probation. They are under his charge for two years when they learn what is necessary to learn at the School and he also does general supervision work while they go out on practical duties of training on the Railways. This is part of the co-ordinated scheme for Indianisation and for Indian recruitment and training. In view of the fact that this School is doing very useful work and is assisting us to carry out our pledge with regard to Indianisation, I would ask that the House should not treat this particular official, who is doing extraordinarily good work, in a niggardly fashion by saying that he is getting too much pay. I would therefore ask Mr. Jamnadas Mehta to consider this point, because I am quite sure that had he been present at the meeting of the Standing Finance Committee, or if I had been present there, I should perhaps have been able to persuade him not to raise this cut here.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 5,000."

The motion was negatived.

Arrangements for Food and Refreshments for Third Class Passengers.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, I move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 1,000."

My object in bringing forward this motion

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: May I suggest that Nos. 74, 75, 84 and 87, may be grouped together for a single discussion because they all relate to the conveniences of third class passengers?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: My object in putting forward a separate motion was to emphasise this point. I think it is much better in the interests of third class passengers that some of their greatest necessities may be emphasised separately. My object in putting forward this motion is to bring to the attention of this House the indifference of the railway authorities to the needs of third class passengers, especially in the matter of giving them facilities for taking their food and refreshments while travelling. Sir, an English member of the Indian Civil Service in his book on India has stated that it took 50 years for the railway administration in India even to find out that third class passengers have to answer the calls

of nature. Sir, I do not know how many years the railway administration will take to note that even the third class passengers become hungry when they are travelling. Now, I do not say that there are no arrangements made at all whereby third class passengers can get some kind of food. But I feel that the arrangements made at present are not satisfactory. On the one hand you spend your money very lavishly in catering to the needs of the second class and first class passengers. There may be about a dozen second and first class passengers in a train and for their sake you carry a separate restaurant car. I do not know why you carry a separate carriage for the benefit of a dozen first and second class passengers and you do not attach a restaurant car for the benefit of the third class passengers. If you go by numbers, and I will always go by numbers in this matter, because every one is hungry equally, you should have at least two or three carriages for providing refreshments and food for third class passengers; but you do not provide even one carriage in a train where third class passengers can sit at ease and take their food. In some railways on some trains one small compartment is sometimes provided for the use of third class passengers. When you carry a whole carriage for the benefit of second and first class passengers, why do you have only one small compartment for third class passengers? (*An Honourable Member*: "It is for all Indians.") I therefore think that the railway authorities should make better provision in the trains for third class passengers. It may be said that third class passengers do not appreciate the facilities which the railways provide, but have the railways provided these facilities for a sufficiently long time? I know one company provided some sort of carriage for third class passengers, but instead of continuing the experiment sufficiently long, they stopped it saying that third class passengers did not appreciate it. I do not believe that third class passengers will not appreciate the benefit of fresh food. They appreciate fresh food as much as any other class of people appreciate their food. I know that on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway they provide a compartment where third class passengers can get their food and where both meat food and vegetable food is cooked in the same compartment. Personally I do not mind meat and vegetables being cooked in the same compartment, but at the same time you must remember that you are in India. There are a large number of people who do not take meat. Naturally they would like to have a separate arrangement for cooking meat food and vegetarian food.

Now, Sir, there is another point I want to put before this House. When the railway authorities run a separate carriage for providing food for a certain class of people, why do they not allow third class passengers to take advantage of the restaurant car? I have seen that third class passengers are refused admission to the restaurant car, and I want to know by what authority railway companies refuse admission to third class passengers if they can afford to pay the high rates charged in the restaurant car. Why should they not be allowed to go there?

Sir Darcy Lindsay: They do not pay the railway fare.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: They pay the railway fare as much as the second class and first class people pay the fare. The first or second class passenger does not pay double when he goes to the restaurant car.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: He pays his first class fare.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Yes, Sir, and he enjoys his comforts as charity from the third class passengers. I shall prove that when I come to that point. Sir, I do not know why these third class passengers are not allowed to go into the restaurant cars. Sir Darcy Lindsay says they do not pay, but I have seen in Europe that in the restaurant cars, first and second and third class passengers all go in.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: They have a separate refreshment car.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: They have a separate refreshment car and in India also we have a separate refreshment car. You do not take your food in the same car in which you sit and travel. I have seen in Europe that even third class passengers can go into the restaurant car and take their food. Why are they prevented from doing so in India if they so choose?

Then, Sir, take the platforms themselves. You have stations, some of them very small ones, where there may not be even half a dozen or a dozen first and second class passengers every day, and even at such stations you have second and first class refreshment rooms set apart on the platform. Why should there not be separate refreshment rooms for third class passengers? There are perhaps half a dozen stations in India where there are separate refreshment rooms for third class passengers. The waiting room is the refreshment room for the third class passenger. Why is this so? Does not the third class passenger pay his fare? If he pays his fare why treat him in this fashion? I could have understood your saying that you have not got the money; but where first or second class passengers are concerned, whether you have the money or not you will set apart great big rooms for catering to their needs. Go to any station and you will find two rooms set apart. One room for second class passengers and another room for first class passengers, and you will always see them empty. It is only some people from the town who make use of these refreshment rooms. (*An Honourable Member:* "For drinking.") I have seen refreshment rooms being used for that purpose. (*An Honourable Member:* "By Indians.") By outsiders, not by passengers; by people from the town. Sir, I also want the railway authorities to make arrangements to have a separate refreshment room on all stations for third class passengers. It is not right that you should expect them to take their food in the waiting rooms which are always overcrowded. I therefore thought, Sir, that I should bring forward a separate motion for bringing before this House the needs of third class passengers as regards the provision of refreshment rooms. I want to appeal to the House to pass my motion as a vote of censure upon the railway authorities who have neglected this matter for such a long time.

Dr. K. G. Lohokare (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I have here another motion, amendment No. 91. It covers nearly the same ground as my friend Mr. Joshi has been referring to. I had, immediately when I came down to this Assembly, put in a question

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: On a point of order, Sir, does not No. 91. disposal of Indian foodstall vendors' fees, raise rather a different question?

Mr. President: The Honourable Member must himself understand that his amendment raises altogether a different question. He might, if he likes, speak on Mr. Joshi's motion.

Dr. K. G. Lohokare: I will take my chance independently, Sir.

***Maulvi Abul Kasem** (Bengal: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I join hands with my friend Mr. Joshi in the question he has raised. Last year, Sir, while discussing the Demands I gave notice of a motion about the provisions of refreshment rooms for Indians and third class passengers. But I had to withdraw it, or rather I did not move it, because an assurance was given that steps were being taken to provide facilities for refreshments for Indian passengers and lower class passengers. But I regret to say that the promise that was made has not been carried out

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Question?

Maulvi Abul Kasem: And this House will have every justification in passing this motion against the railway administration. My friend Mr. Joshi has gone in detail into the lavish arrangements that are made for refreshments for higher class passengers, and, if I may say so, for the majority of the European passengers on our Railways. I would go one step further and say that these refreshment rooms in stations are not only used for drinking purposes by the outside public—Indians they may be or Europeans—but also they are used as provision stores in many towns. They have got a license for selling liquor and they do sell liquor and on premises for which they have to pay no rent. It has been said that on each platform at big and important stations there are two rooms set apart as European refreshment rooms and I can tell you, Sir, that there are many stations where there are four rooms on the up and two on the down platforms. Sir, these rooms are well made with marble floors, and the other passengers, and even Indian higher class passengers, are left uncared for. Sir, my friend Mr. Joshi said that third class passengers are left to have their meals or whatever refreshments they want in waiting rooms, but I may tell him that even that is not allowed in waiting rooms. They are reserved for higher class passengers. They have to take their food on the open platform of the station or in waiting halls for third class passengers which are also public places. Sir, I cannot understand what justification there is for not providing restaurant cars for through passengers especially on express trains. Sir, I hope and trust that this matter, to which attention has been drawn now and also previously, will receive the attention of Government and that it will not be our unfortunate duty when this House meets again to press this matter again on the Government for their consideration.

Mr. T. C. Goswami (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, Sir Darcy Lindsay told us the great truth that first class passengers pay first class fares. I think every student of railway economics will admit that it is the third class passengers that pay for a great deal of the first class passengers' comforts (Hear, hear); because the amount realised from first class fares never covers the expenses that are required for making the first class people comfortable.

Sir Clement Hindley: How do you know that?

*Speech not corrected by the Honourable Member.

Mr. T. C. Goswami: You ought to know it. It is the third class passengers and the goods that keep the railway as a going concern.

What I wish to say in supporting Mr. Joshi is this, that it is really scandalous that because certain people, certain members of the travelling public, are unable to pay higher fares, they should be deprived of facilities for cooking their food or for getting cooked food. This is really scandalous. I will mention one instance which I think comes within the scope of Mr. Joshi's speech. Once I was going to Shillong and there was some sort of an accident somewhere and the train had to be detained; and at a station where there was no provision for any kind of food the train was stopped for hours and hours. I went up to the station master and asked him on my authority to telegraph to the Agent or to anybody asking that the train should be moved to a station where food could be obtained. I then understood,—though this matter was later on contradicted, I know that the contradiction was of very little value—that some important officer (I forget his designation) had wired to the station master of that station asking whether any European passengers were travelling by that train. It so happened that in the first and second class compartments there were only myself and, I believe, another small party in the second class. That officer was duly informed that no European passengers were travelling; and I know that for the whole day the train was kept at a place where no kind of food was available.

Now, that is the attitude with which the railway administration approach this question. Now, Sir, I will make a statement which is the result of observation and if the Honourable the Railway Member or Sir Clement Hindley or any other Member chooses to deny it, he is at liberty to do so. My experience is that only a very small proportion of European passengers who of course, generally travel first class pay their own fares. Either their first class fares—or perhaps double first class fares—come as part of the liberal Government travelling allowance or allowance from companies or other institutions. This is a matter which I have observed. It is also a fact that the special facilities in the railway restaurant cars and in the railway refreshment rooms were originally designed to make the European passengers comfortable. I remember a time—it was not more than 7 or 8 years ago—when Indians in Indian clothes were not admitted into these restaurant cars, and were made distinctly uncomfortable in the refreshment rooms. Some of us—and they were a very few individuals, I remember, in our part of the country—made it a point to go to every restaurant car in Indian clothes and as aggressively Indian clothes as we could possibly secure for the occasions. Now, these special comforts were designed for the European travelling public, most of whom, as I have said and as I believe, do not travel at their own expense. Sir, I most heartily support the motion of Mr. Joshi.

Mr. Abdul Haye (East Punjab: Muhammadan): Sir, I want to join in this vote of censure on the Railway Department. But my reasons are somewhat different. The point to which I wish to draw the attention of this Honourable House is that the arrangements that have been made by the railway authorities for the issue of licences to the food venders are not satisfactory. Sir, in the last Simla Session I tabled a question to that effect. My point is that when a licence is to be issued to a person for the sale of food to a particular community, the licence must go to a member of that community. So long as we cannot sit at the same table and so long as there is a difference in food and "*chhut chhat*" observed, it is

highly objectionable that the licence for sale of food for Hindus should go to a Mussalman and *vice versa*. I find, Sir, that on the North Western Railway at Barogh and at Delhi this objectionable procedure has been adopted. I only want to draw the attention of the Member in charge of the Department to this aspect of the case so that he may do something in the matter.

Sir Darcy Lindsay (Bengal: European): Sir, I interrupted my Honourable friend Mr. Joshi on one or two points and I would like to take him up on those points. As regards the conveniences for third class passengers at railway stations, I am entirely in sympathy with Mr. Joshi. If it is possible to give the third class passengers such conveniences, I say they should have them. But when we come to the conveniences on the trains, the difficulties become somewhat great.

First of all we have no corridor trains in India.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: South India.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: In the majority of cases we have no corridor trains and were we to have corridor trains it would reduce the carrying capacity of such trains. We are always crying out for more and more accommodation and if we had corridor trains it would decrease the accommodation.

Then again there is the question of cars. That must be a very difficult question. Are we to have a refreshment car for different castes and communities? The train would then be all refreshment cars. Mr. Joshi made a point of these refreshment cars being put on the trains for the convenience of first class passengers. So far as I know, the refreshment cars were put on the trains very much to accelerate the speed of the journey, that is the period occupied over the journey. I have been a good many years in India and my recollection goes back a long way. In the earlier days there were refreshment rooms at all the stations *en route* where a train would stop for 25 minutes to half an hour. It was only at a comparatively recent date that refreshment cars have been put on the trains, and I maintain that those cars were put on to accelerate the journey and not particularly for the convenience of the first class or second class passengers.

Another point raised by Mr. Joshi was that having such refreshment cars on the trains why should third class passengers be debarred from entering the refreshment cars, and I think he stated that in Europe and in England the third class passenger had free access to such refreshment cars. There, Sir, I am in opposition to him because in England and on the Continent there are compartments in the refreshment car for first class only and compartments for third class only, and the ticket collectors are very keen to come along and examine your ticket when you are in that portion of the refreshment car reserved for first class passengers. The third class passengers pay for third class accommodation and I hold they are not entitled by the payment of the small fare that they do pay to enter accommodation for upper class passengers. If we follow all Mr. Joshi's arguments, then why should not the third class passenger, who pays third class fares, travel in a first class carriage.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Does the first class passenger pay for all this? You are evading that question.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: My Honourable friend, Mr. Goswami, who has presumably very considerable knowledge of travelling in India (*Mr. T. C. Goswami*: "Undoubtedly.") has stated that in his opinion—and he thinks that it is not to be contradicted—a very large majority of first class passengers do not pay their own fares.

Mr. T. C. Goswami: Of European first class passengers.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: And presumably some Indians attending the Assembly.

Mr. T. C. Goswami: I assure you it is a very very small part of my travelling expenses.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: I think that is a very wide statement to make, and the Honourable Member will be able to prove to Mr. Goswami that he is wrong in his information. With these few words, Sir, I am opposed to this cut of Mr. Joshi's.

Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar (Madura and Ramnad *cum* Tinnevely: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, I have to bring to the notice of the Assembly a portion of the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee in connection with this matter. I refer to page 48 of Volume IV.

"The committee agreed to a proposal of Mr. Rama Aiyangar that, while the facilities for third class passengers are better on the East Indian Railway than on most railways, the committee would be glad to recommend an increase in the expenditure under this head if the Agent could usefully spend the money. He further suggested that a similar recommendation should be made to the Agents of all railways."

Of course I do not think the Department is not going to allot the money for further suggestions that may be made. I submit, Sir, that most of the Agents are not inclined at all to take note of the grievances of third class passengers. Because from 1921-22 there was considerable pressure for money and they could not find much money for spending in these directions, the Agents do not send up proposals for providing further what they ought to. Some of the Agents have made inquiries. On the Great Indian Peninsula Railway they constituted a committee in 1921-22 and that committee went into certain grievances that could be remedied and that was put forward as a reason why further progress could not be made to inquire into further facilities that might be given. Of course on that matter there has been a difference of opinion in the Finance Committee. That inquiry was started at a time when there was little or no money to provide for conveniences. It is otherwise now. Another point I want to bring to the notice of the Assembly is that looking at the third class fares reduction table that has been furnished to Honourable Members by the Government, we find that practically the long distance passengers in the third class are very few. The average distance travelled is from 40 to 60 miles, and it is found that long distance passengers travelling more than 300 miles practically on all railways will contribute about 60 lakhs to the revenues. That is the amount which it is expected will be reduced by decreasing the fares only for 300 miles upwards. That will clearly show that it is possible to provide all sorts of conveniences for third class passengers and the suggestions made by the Honourable Mr. Joshi must be paid attention to at the earliest moment. There is no doubt that there is some little slackness in the Department and on the part of the Agents to proceed speedily with this matter. This cannot be said to be satisfactory. I really do not see why our friends Sir Darcy Lindsay and others should come into this and say that

there should be any obstruction, it is not possible to make provision for all these conveniences. In fact every long distance train that goes out should have third class carriages which provide all these amenities. If the rates are reduced and the number of passengers are as in the previous decade, it should be possible to provide every convenience, instead of putting so much money into other things. In fact the conveniences asked for should be given preference to others. I submit it should be possible to do this and I expect that Government will accept the Resolution without any hesitation.

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally: Sir, I rise to support the motion of my Honourable friend Mr. Joshi from more or less a selfish point of view. The grievances of third class passengers are not confined to them alone. But I may say that these grievances extend also to second and first class Indian passengers very largely. I will give an instance when I was travelling upon a branch line in Sind where there used to exist a refreshment room at one time

Mr. President: Order, order. The Honourable Member cannot on this amendment refer to the grievances of first and second class passengers. The motion relates only to third class passengers.

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally: But the subject matter is common to both.

Mr. President: That may be, but that is not the motion. The motion relates to third class passengers only.

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally: All right, Sir, I will confine myself to third class passengers only if that be your ruling. I look at it from a different point of view and for a different reason. The type of foodstuffs supplied to third class passengers at stations is most wretched, frequently stale and uneatable; and there is absolutely no supervision so far as this matter is concerned. As my friend behind me says the foodstuffs are full of flies, that is a fact.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: Who supplies it?

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussanally: The vendors employed by the railways and whom the railways fleece. Sir, these vendors are made to pay a sort of royalty to the railways, whereas the managers of restaurant cars pay no royalties. Besides paying these royalties to the railways these vendors are expected to pay some sort of blackmail to the station staff; therefore it is for the House to judge what kind of food they will be able to supply to passengers on the line. Sometime ago inspectors were appointed on the North Western Railway to inspect foodstuffs supplied to passengers, but those inspectors, although they did very little, have been taken off and there is absolutely no supervision of the food-stuffs these vendors sell to poor passengers on the line, frequently I have seen it myself and I have starved on account of the stuff sold on the line being uneatable; and for that reason I should very much like to see this proposition carried.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Sir, I wish first to contradict quite flatly a statement made by Mr. Rama Aiyangar, namely, that Agents of Railways take no notice of what was said by the Assembly or the Standing Finance Committee in regard to the provision of amenities of this kind. In order to prove my point I shall just take one extract from the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways. I find here, Sir, that the Agent of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway actually came before the

[Sir Charles Innes.]

Railway Standing Finance Committee. The members of the Standing Finance Committee were naturally very anxious to know what the various Agents—they met three personally—were doing in the way of amenities of this kind for third class passengers. The Agent of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway showed that he had appointed a sub-committee thoroughly to overhaul the requirements of third class passengers at every station in the system. In carrying out the recommendations of that report 9 lakhs were spent during last year and the current year, and all the recommendations have now been given effect to. My Honourable friend Mr. Rama Aiyangar suggested that Agents should be instructed to do certain things, but he could get no support at all in the Railway Standing Finance Committee. Now, Sir, I have merely given that instance because I do wish to suggest to my Honourable friend Mr. Joshi, who I regret to see is not present, and the other Members of this House that even when dealing with railway questions they might try to give the devil his due.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh (Tirhut Division: Non-Muhammadian): What about the Bengal Nagpur Railway Administration?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Because, Sir, this is one of the matters to which we have devoted a great deal of attention for the last few years.

Mr. Joshi complained of our indifference. Sir, as the House knows, there is nothing I dislike more than making long speeches, but that expression "indifference" on the part of my Honourable friend Mr. Joshi really tempts me to go into the history of this matter for several years back, and I am afraid I may detain the House for quite a long time. I have here a series of reports on facilities for third class passengers which are in the Library. I find many interesting things here relating to this very question of third class refreshment cars. It is not, as Mr. Joshi would seem to think, a new suggestion in India. It has been tried many times on many railways; and always or nearly always the result has been the same, namely, that where we ran refreshment cars for third class passengers we could not get those cars patronised. One obvious reason is that, taking the average third class passenger, he does not travel long distances and he does not want the facility of a refreshment car. The other reason is we all know that the third class passenger in this country, generally much to our inconvenience on the train, arrives with much luggage which he insists on taking into his compartment with him, because he is afraid to trust it to anybody else; and, Sir, having once deposited himself in his third class compartment with his luggage he is not going to be inveigled by anybody to leave that compartment to go to a third class car for refreshments. I think everybody in the House will agree with me when I say that. But, in spite of the experience of the past, we have been making attempts to introduce these third class refreshment cars. I find for instance that as a result of the Resolution moved by my friend, Mr. Joshi, the Agent of the North Western Railway discussed with his Advisory Council the question whether he should make further experiments with third class refreshment cars. He himself expressed an opinion against doing so; his Advisory Council, on the other hand, thought that an attempt might be made and I find—I have got here the information up to date—I find that the Agent of the North Western Railway is experimenting in this direction. I find that on two

trains between Lahore and Delhi bogie dining cars, marked—I regret to say, nobody regrets more than I do this racial discrimination—marked, I say, “for Indian passengers only” are provided. Again, I find on the Jodhpur Bikanir Railway Hindu refreshment cars—Hindu again this time—run on four different trains. On the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway I find two compartments, each for Hindus and Muhammadans set apart on various trains on the broad gauge; on the metre gauge I find dining cars for Hindus and Muhammadans are run on certain passenger trains. I find that on the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway refreshment cars are run on passenger and express trains between Madras and Bangalore City—that is, for Indian passengers, on passenger trains between Madras and Vizagapatam, on the mails between Bangalore City and Poona, and on passenger trains between Bangalore City and Poona. It is proposed to run a similar car between Guntakal and Bangalore City. On the South Indian Railway refreshment compartments of one type for all communities are run on trains between Madras and Rameshwaram and Dhanushkodi, between Madras and Shencottah on the Trivandrum express I find that on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway compartments were allotted on the Poona mail and express trains for vending tea, fruit and coffee and Indian sweetmeats.

So far I have confined myself solely to refreshment cars for Indian passengers. In addition, Sir, as I have been accused of not taking any trouble about arrangements for refreshments for third class passengers, I propose to read out some more dry extracts. I find that in the Bengal and North Western Railway, which will interest my friend Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh, Muhammadan and Hindu refreshment rooms have been provided at Sonapur and Gorakpur and were proposed at two other stations. That was two years ago, and probably they have been provided by this time. On the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, arrangements were introduced in 1923-24 for the catering of Hindu and Muhammadan passengers in certain trains between Bombay and Viramgam and Bombay and Delhi. On the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway fifteen Hindu and six Muhammadan refreshment rooms have, already been provided; they are managed by the Indian catering departments of the railways. This was two years ago, and four other station refreshment rooms were under consideration. Does the Honourable Member want any more? I can go on for the next half an hour with the recital

Mr. N. M. Joshi: You can count one by one for two hours.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: But, Sir, I do not think I need detain the House any more. I do think that I have shown to this House, and I ask them to believe it that we have been paying the very greatest attention to this question for the last two or three years. I do ask the House to recognise that and they can see it for themselves. I was particularly impressed myself when I went along the North Western Railway to which Mr. Hussanally referred that on almost every large railway station on that Railway you do find what I may
 4 P.M. call really up-to-date tea stalls. In every possible way, I claim that we have made in the last few years the greatest possible improvement in our arrangements for refreshments for Indian railway passengers. It is a question which is being constantly examined by Local

[Sir Charles Innes.]

Advisory Councils, and we have just issued a letter to all Agents of Railways asking them in their quinquennial programmes to give a description of the measures proposed during the coming year for improving the standard of comfort of the travelling public, particularly of the lower class of passengers. We have also asked them that they should take the opportunity of explaining to what extent they have been able to meet any of the suggestions made to them by their Advisory Councils or by the Standing Finance Committee in this respect. Sir, I think that the House should be fair in this matter, and that they should recognise that we have made and we are making great strides in this matter, and that if Mr. Joshi will not do the right thing and withdraw his motion, we should reject it.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 1,000."

The motion was negatived.

Other Grievances of Third Class Passengers.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 1,000."

Now, Sir, I have heard the speech of the Honourable Member in charge of this department. I am quite sure even when I place the other grievances of third class passengers before the House, he can take up at least half an hour of the time of this House by reading out some extracts from reports. The House knows very well that many of our officers spend their energy more in writing reports than in doing justice to the people. Sir, he can easily write reports and he can easily take hours together in reading them out in this House. That does not prove that you have done everything that you ought to have done.

Now, Sir, I am going to place before this House certain other grievances of the third class passengers, and I am quite sure that I shall get the strong support of this House. My first grievance is about overcrowding. You do not provide a sufficient number of seats for third class passengers. Now, Sir, when I talk of overcrowding, I should like to place before this House certain figures. I shall place before the House the percentage of passengers carried on Indian Railways.

First class passengers form .19 per cent. of the total number of passengers carried on railways.

Second class passengers form 1.69 per cent. of the total number of passengers carried on railways.

Intermediate class passengers form 2.12 per cent. of the passengers carried on railways.

Third class passengers form 96 per cent. of the passengers carried on railways.

Now, Sir, as regards the seats provided on Indian Railways, I shall give certain figures. First class seats available on Indian Railways is 3.02 per cent., that is about 15 times more than the percentage of the

number of passengers. The percentage of second class seats provided is 5·05, that is about 4 times larger. In the intermediate class the percentage of seats provided is 5·63, that is about twice the number of the percentage of the total number of passengers. As regards the third class, the total number of seats provided is 86·3 per cent. Here you will see at once that the percentage of first class passengers is ·19, and out of the total number of seats provided on the Railways they get 3·2 per cent., or at least 15 times more. The same is the case as regards the other upper classes also. It is only where the third class passengers are concerned that you get the smallest percentage of seats provided. If the Honourable Member has any doubts as regards these figures, I am quite willing to place in his hands my paper and he can also find out the page of the report from which these figures are taken. This one fact proves that this Government only exist for the rich people, and they are absolutely indifferent as regards the poor people. If the percentage of first class passengers is ·19, when you are providing seats on your Railways, why don't you provide the same percentage for the first class passengers? When the percentage of third class passengers is 96, and if you have got 100 seats, you ought to give 96 seats to third class passengers. If you have got 100 seats, you give 3 to the first class, 5 to the second class, 5 to the intermediate class and 86 to the third class. I want to know, Sir, why you give 3 per cent. of the seats to first class passengers who form only ·19 of the total number of passengers. This shows why the first class is not crowded and why the third class is crowded. You have provided more seats for the first class, you have not provided a sufficient number of seats for the third class. (*An Honourable Member*: "There are some third class carriages provided for in the Budget?") I am coming to what is provided for in the Budget. It is said that some third class carriages are provided for in the Budget. I will give you the figures. The Budget provides in the case of upper class additions 84, renewals 62, total 146. This is for broad gauge railways. For metre gauge railways in the case of the upper class, additions 40, renewals 31, total 71. For lower classes, the additions and renewals are 397, and 295, total 692; in the case of the broad gauge railways and for the metre gauge railways the figures are 150 and 135, total 285. Now, look at the percentage of first and third class passengers. Out of 100 you have got only ·19 first class passengers, while you have got 96 third class passengers. You have 1·69 second class passengers out of 100. The total of first and second class is 2 out of 100. But when you provide carriages, you provide 146 for the first class and 692 for the third class.

That gives you a percentage of about 25. You have got more than 25 per cent. of carriages provided for the first class while the percentage of the passengers for the first and second class is only 2. As a matter of fact you have already provided for first and second class passengers more than their share. If you look to the number of seats provided you will find that you have already provided three times the number of seats that you should provide for the first class and also twice the number that you should provide for the second class. Why are you building new first class and second class coaches? Prove by figures how there is a need. I do not say that first class passengers do not want more room. Surely they want more room. There is some times overcrowding even there. But there is greater overcrowding in the third class. You must show that you look to the interest of the third class passengers. Then as regards the provision of seats on the railways. This overcrowding is also caused because on trains you

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

attach more first and second class carriages than are necessary and you do not attach a sufficient number of third class carriages. In some long distance trains you have no third class carriages at all, but I have not yet seen any train in which there are no first and second class carriages. I want to know why this difference is made. If by some trains you want only first and second class passengers to go, then let them go but I shall be pleased if there are some trains in which there are no first and second class passengers. (*Honourable Members*: "There are some such trains.") I am quite ready to get the figures.

Then, Sir, there is the question of waiting rooms. I want the Members to look at the waiting rooms which are provided for third class passengers and the waiting rooms which are provided for first and second class passengers. I would especially like some members to go to Poona and see the new station and the waiting rooms there for first and second class passengers and the waiting rooms for third class passengers. They will see that the Government are absolutely indifferent to third class passengers. I repeat that charge. The station is a big palace. I do not know where the Railway Board found the money for that big palace, but look at the provision made for third class passengers in that station. (*An Honourable Member*: "Do you want sofas for third class passengers.") Sir, this is the way the Government are treating third class passengers. In the waiting rooms you will not even find benches, let alone chairs. People have to squat. If you go to the first class waiting room you will find easy chairs, tables and all sorts of things provided. I want to know why this distinction is made.

Then there is the same difficulty as regards the issuing of tickets. The second and first class passenger may get his ticket at any time but the third class passenger can get it only at a particular time and there must be overcrowding. (*An Honourable Member*: "Not at all stations.") I am making certain general statements. I am quite ready to have definite statements made by Government. Let us have the facts. If you have facts certainly speak out. If you take a list of the stations and find out the time when the tickets are issued, you will find that my statement will be found to be generally correct. There may be stations at which first and second class passengers do not get their tickets at all hours, but that does not prove the general rule. As I said, the third class passenger is not properly treated as regard facilities for the issue of tickets. The same may be said about other grievances but I do not wish to go into that question.

Sir, I should like to say one word as to what my Honourable friend Sir Darcy Lindsay has said. He said Government give facilities to first class passengers and do not give facilities to third class passengers because the first class passenger pays more than the third class passenger. Sir, I am quite willing to have an inquiry made as to whether the first class passenger pays the full cost of what he receives from the railway company and whether the third class passenger gets the full value of what he pays. Some years ago the Government of India used to give figures of the receipts from and the expenditure on third class passengers and what was the profit or loss made. And those figures clearly showed that every year it was the third class passenger who paid a part of the cost of the comforts which were enjoyed by the first class passenger. Let Sir Darcy Lindsay go into those

figures and he will be convinced that he has been receiving charity from the third class passenger. Sir, I do not wish to speak on this question longer. I hope the House will carry the motion I have moved.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Sir, I rise to support the motion of my Honourable friend Mr. Joshi. The difficulties of third class passengers are many and varied. The first is the difficulty of obtaining their tickets. I asked a lot of questions as to the hours during which booking offices were open for the issue of tickets, and I was told that at most of the stations the booking offices are opened sufficiently early before the arrival of trains, and at other important stations the booking offices are supposed to be open for 24 hours. But my experience is otherwise. When I was coming to Delhi I had to travel to some other places also, and I had some of my people with me for whom I wanted to purchase third class tickets. On the morning of the 6th January at Cawnpore, on the 7th afternoon at Agra Fort, on the 8th evening at Muttra Junction, and again on the 31st January at Delhi when I was sending my people back—at none of these places did I find the third class booking offices open in time. I had to go to the station authorities at each of those places, and then I was very well accommodated by them and I got my tickets. (*An Honourable Member:* "Did you say you were a Member of the Assembly?") I said so, Sir. (Laughter.) I am glad to say the station authorities were none of them Indians, so I have no racial feeling in the matter, and I do not mention this by way of complaint. With regard to this point, Sir, I have two suggestions to make: one that the opening hours of booking offices should be notified on posters in front of third class booking offices in the vernacular. That might help the passengers to understand when the booking offices are open, and that might serve as a reminder to the booking clerks to keep their offices open at proper times. Another suggestion of mine is that the station masters should be definitely instructed to see regularly that the booking offices are open at the right hours, and complaints in this respect should be swiftly dealt with. Then, Sir, there are other difficulties which third class passengers have to suffer from, and they have been detailed in the Report of the Acworth Committee at page 54. I find this:

"The Government of India can hardly be aware of the amount of ill-feeling . . ."

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: May I point out, Sir, that that is five years old.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Yes, Sir, I know that, but my point is that the complaints still continue. My Honourable friend gets the report of his Department all right; and he is brandishing that report in my face. (Laughter.) What I beg to submit is, has he ever travelled in any third class carriage on any railway during his whole official career? I will then be satisfied with the result of his own experience. I have travelled some times in the third class, but not when coming here as a Member of the Assembly. (Laughter.) Now, Sir, I was going to say that some of the inconveniences are detailed here in the Report:

"Overcrowding to the extent that at times double or even more than double the approved carrying capacity; inaccessibility and insanitary condition of third class carriages for long distance journeys; dirty condition of third class carriages; inadequate water supply on platforms; inadequate food supply arrangements; inadequate waiting sheds or waiting rooms; insufficient booking office facilities; uncivil treatment of railway staff."

I will not dilate, Sir, at length on these points.

[Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh.]

There is another inconvenience and that is specially very serious in my part of the country. During occasions of fairs, festivals and *melas* third class passengers are carried like cattle in wagons by the Bengal and North Western Railway. (*An Honourable Member*: "On all railways?") I have no experience of other railways on such occasions. So far as the Bengal and North Western Railway is concerned, which last year I called the beggarly niggardly-working Railway, complaints are still numerous. Early in 1922 Government issued instructions to Railway Administrations that steps should be taken as far as practicable to put a stop to the practice of conveying passengers in goods vehicles. But this expression of Government's opinion still remains in the realm of a pious wish only. It has not been translated into practice. I am aware that some improvements have been made even with regard to the Bengal and North Western Railway in some matters, and waiting sheds at a few stations have been built; but the improvements are not at all commensurate with the needs of the situation. With these few words, I support the motion.

Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: Sir, I rise to support this motion wholeheartedly. My friend Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh said that he had travelled on one or two occasions in the third class. Let me also say that once, simply with a view to have personal experience of third class travelling, I travelled from Bombay right up to Patna in the third class, sleeping of course in the night in the first class. So I have personal experience of the inconveniences and discomforts of the passengers in the third class. I need not dwell on this matter very much as much has been said with regard to it by other speakers. I do not wish to take up any more time of the House. With my personal experience of travelling a long distance from Bombay right up to Patna I know what the troubles of the third class passengers are. Unless a person travels a long distance in the third class he cannot realise and visualise the inconveniences of third class passengers. I therefore wholeheartedly support the motion.

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: Sir, I thank my friend Mr. Joshi for having called me to order, because I committed a mistake in putting under motion No. 87 the phrase—I do not know myself where I borrowed it from or where I learnt it—"amenities of third class passengers". When they are starving for necessities for me to have used the phrase "amenities" is a blunder, and I therefore thank Mr. Joshi for having put it under the proper heading, namely, grievances of third class passengers. Sir, I would at once give a catalogue of the headings under which this question of the grievances of third class passengers must be considered. The question of the overcrowding of pilgrim traffic, waiting rooms at stations, booking office facilities, through traffic without breaks, water and refreshments, lavatory with pipes in the trains, want of platforms, luggage and ticket inspectors' troubles on the way, thefts in trains, these are the various items under which we must look to the convenience of third class passengers. Sir, so far as overcrowding of pilgrim traffic is concerned—and I specially put it as pilgrim traffic, because on all festival occasions wherever there is any *jatra* or *mela* in Northern India or Southern India the matter is the same for the railway companies—they huddle together numbers of passengers in either third class compartments or sometimes in horse wagons. Some years ago I remember—I have only a hazy recollection at present—of having seen the figures put outside the wagon—8 horses, 8 mules and 80 pilgrims. That, Sir, I remember to have seen very many years ago before the Pilgrim Committee

came on tour and I remember that I drew their attention also to this. Now, Sir, the Honourable Sir Charles Innes says that many of these things are five years old. They are five years old so far as the reports are concerned, but so far as practical experience is concerned they are quite as brand new as they were some years ago. I do not say that the railway companies have not been taking any steps at all for improving facilities of third class passengers. Of course, they have been doing it to some extent. The Administration Report of 1924-25 also gives several instances of shuttle trains having been opened, some new designed carriages being built and so many other things. I am particularly thankful, Sir, because one of the shuttle trains that is referred to in that Administration Report is the shuttle train to which I am also obliged because it runs from Tirupati to Renigunta Junction. That is a short distance of 6 miles. This shuttle train was at one time in existence but was taken away and it has now been restored and it looms large in this Administration Report as a great facility for passengers of the lower class. In fact, the shuttle is as useful to the passengers of the first and second classes as it is to the passengers of the third class. That has also been put as a great act of benediction under the heading "Facilities given to third class passengers or lower class passengers."

Sir, so far as the waiting rooms at stations are concerned, I brought this question to the notice of the House last year and have also agitated in the newspapers when I was not a member of this Assembly that at pilgrim centres, a number of which I have myself witnessed, there is absolutely no accommodation for third class passengers. They come in large numbers with children and babies. They are made to sleep all night in the station yard where they are exposed to cold, exposed to sun, rain and to every kind of thing because they have to wait for a number of hours in order to catch their trains. If they come exactly to the hour of the train from somewhere else just like first class passengers who simply step in, they are sure to miss the train for another 24 hours. So, to guard against that contingency, they sometimes come four or five hours earlier than the train hour. But what is the good of their coming? The booking office is not open to them. The booking office is open to them only about half an hour or 15 minutes before the train arrives, when all these people have to rush together to the booking office which has got a small window with the booking clerk placed on the other side, there being a small hole through which mutual faces can be seen. It is very rarely that all these passengers can have their tickets from the booking clerk with the result that very often—I am saying this from my own personal knowledge—many of these third class passengers have to depend upon the mercies of the railway police constable there who, for some remuneration given to him, is prepared to get them tickets. Sir, I would ask whether it is not necessary that strict orders should be issued that at all pilgrim centres and centres where there is a large crowd of passengers there must be a number of booking offices not only at the station yard but even inside the town so that people may go and purchase tickets at their convenience throughout the whole day for any trains which they may need to catch. I consider, Sir, that that kind of improvement must necessarily be made for the benefit of these passengers.

Then, Sir, with reference to the through traffic. I have often complained about that matter also that when they command a railway from Villuppuram to Gudur, why should you break it into two halves? The line is one straight line from beginning to end. You give one half of it

[Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar.]

to the South Indian Railway and the other half to the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Company for management, and then what is the result? All passengers who come by one train have to get down at Katpade for this reason that the Companies are different. The first company will not arrange a through train, with the result that passengers have to wait on the platform for hours together in order to get another train and proceed on the same line. Between Villupuram and Gudur there are half a dozen centres of pilgrimages to which a large number of pilgrims go. Supposing a man wanted to come from Madras to Delhi, he has to change at Manmad and Dhond, thereby making two changes. On the other hand if you provided through trains

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: May I interrupt the Honourable Member and ask him how many third class passengers come from Madras to Delhi?

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: I wanted to ask that question myself of the Honourable Sir Charles Innes in reference to the reduction in the passenger rate for distances of 300 miles and over. How many passengers travel over 300 miles? But now supposing persons starting from Raichur, wanted to go to some station between Dhond and Manmad, or Delhi—such passengers are numerous—what I would ask you to do is, to attach one through carriage as an experiment as in the case of first and second class passengers. How many passengers have to travel between Hardwar and Delhi and have to change at Saharanpore, whereas first and second class passengers can be conveniently attached and detached. These are matters also which I would place before the authorities, that some remedy must be given to third class passengers.

Now about water and refreshments. I do not want to say much on this subject as it has already been fully threshed out, all except one fact. Sir, formerly the food and refreshment arrangements at certain stations were let out on contract

Mr. President: We have already disposed of the question of refreshments only a little while ago.

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: That was dealt with under the head of want of food. This is the amenity of food.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is very ingenious, but he is out of order.

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: There is many a slip twixt the cup and the lip.

Then coming to the platforms. There are several stations where no platforms are made for passengers to get down from trains, though the Administration Report says that they are gradually putting up high level platforms, they have put them up at ten stations, next year five stations, and afterwards there will be some lull until there is another agitation. Is not the railway company bound whenever they establish stations to first put up high level platforms? The Honourable Sir Charles Innes shakes his head and says "no". But if only the Privy Council had decided properly that Bombay case of damages when a passenger got down and broke his knees or if the railway companies were sued for damages day

after day when children and women fall down from trains, then the Honourable Sir Charles Innes would come to me, a lawyer, rather than to Sir Clement Hindley who is only a Chief Commissioner, and I would first give him the advice to build platforms. Don't let passengers get down on dark nights with children, baggage, luggage. What occurs to several trains even when there is a platform. If two trains pass at a particular station, what is done is one occupies a platform and the other is placed on the other side and people get down between the two trains, and it is no wonder that accidents frequently happen. We do blame you in all these matters. You cannot say you are gradually and slowly doing it. You may slowly and gradually carry out Indianization, but at least this convenience of passengers should not be so slow. Let it be a speedy affair, therefore I request you to attend to these things. Then passengers are troubled by ticket inspectors on the way. How many passengers are turned out at roadside stations by ticket inspectors. All at once the ticket inspector comes and says: "Did you purchase a ticket for this child at the starting station?" At the starting station the child is let off; the station master sees it and the ticket examiner sees it and they are satisfied that it is a baby of two years; but by the time it has reached a junction station, the baby grows into a child of four years! The man is taken hold of and he is asked to get down from the train while his other relatives must proceed. He is detained there and he has to buy a penal ticket for the sake of the baby. Such troubles should not exist. If he is let off at the first station he ought not to be interrupted at a station on the way, but at his destination, and if he has been let off improperly you had better charge the man who lets him off there. The child did not creep in the crowd, the man has it on his hand or the mother has it; the station master sees it and the ticket examiner sees it. Then why are these people put to trouble on the way? These are other kinds of difficulties that the third class passengers have to put up with.

An Honourable Member: You are encouraging cheating in this way.

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: I do not very often see ticket examiners approaching first and second class passengers, so it is convenient if they have not tickets.

Now, Sir, I have stated that thefts occur on the trains. Last year Lala Duni Chand made some mention about it, but he mentioned it in such a way and perhaps exaggerated to some extent, that he made Sir Charles Innes and Sir Clement Hindley very angry; but all the same he was not wrong. He was quite right in bringing it to the notice of this Assembly. But I shall tell you another instance which occurred at this very Delhi station last August when we were travelling up to Simla for the September Session. Two Honourable Members of this House were robbed of their property

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: May I point out that we are dealing with the grievances of third class passengers. I should like to know whether these two Honourable Members were travelling third class.

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: I was only giving an illustration

Mr. President: The Honourable Members were perhaps travelling third class. There is nothing wrong in it.

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: Let us assume that they were travelling third class; I was not, but assuming for the sake of argument that I was, is it not an *a fortiori* argument that if even the property of first and second class passengers is not safe, how much less safe is the property of third class passengers, and how do you expect the third class passenger to make a complaint

Mr. President: Will the Honourable Member allow the House to reach more important motions?

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: Is there anything more important than the safety of property?

Mr. President: If the Honourable Member thinks that so much time of the House should be occupied on this motion, I am not sure that the House will agree with him.

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: I shall not say anything more.

(Several Honourable Members moved that the question be put.)

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

The motion was adopted.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Sir, I do not propose to say very much in reply to the various speeches made. In particular it is beyond my finite intelligence to follow the string of complaints of the Honourable Member who has just spoken, but I can assure the Honourable Member that I shall read his speech when I get it in print with great interest, and as I always do with these debates, when I look through these debates I shall see what action we can take on the various suggestions made. I hope Honourable Members will accept that as my way of dealing with the various speeches made. The only question I wish to take up is this question of overcrowding. I do wish to show that we have made a great impression in the last three years

Maulvi Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): That is the only genuine grievance, the overcrowding of third class passengers.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I wish to show we have made a very real impression upon what two or three years ago was, I admit, a serious evil. I will first give you some statistics. During the last three years, that is from 1922-23 to 1924-25, the increase in the number of our third class passengers was 22 millions. In the same period we increased our third class seating accommodation by roughly 100,000 seats. If you make the very moderate assumption that 20 people occupy one seat during a week you will see we have increased our capacity for carrying third class passengers by something like 100 million passengers in these 3 years, and the actual increase was merely 22 millions. I merely give those figures to show that the position is much better than it was 3 years ago. Then again, in addition to that, this year—and here I am afraid that we must incur the ire of my Honourable friend Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar—without waiting for the assent of the House, knowing the deep interest the House does take in this question of overcrowding of third class passengers, I am afraid that we went so far as to order 22 complete steel rakes.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: I hope you will multiply such instances of incurring my ire and wrath hereafter!

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I merely wish to show that in advance, anticipating the approval of this House, we took that action this year in order that we might make a further attack upon this evil. We ordered those rakes; and that will increase our capacity for carrying third class passengers very much indeed. This year, as the House will see from the budget memorandum, we are providing for a gross expenditure of 1½ crores; that includes some of the money required for those 22 rakes which we hope will be delivered this year; 1½ crores for amenities specially for third class passengers. In these circumstances I hope my Honourable friend will recognize that we are making considerable advances and will withdraw his motion.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: What about the opening of booking offices?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I promised the Honourable Member I would look through the debate and study all the suggestions that have been made.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 1,000."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. President: Does the Honourable Mr. Schamnad Sahib Bahadur wish to move his motion, motion No. 1 in the Supplementary List?

Mr. Mahmood Schamnad Sahib Bahadur (West Coast and Nilgiris: Muhammadan): Yes, Sir.

Mr. Muhammad Yakub: Sir, there is a motion in my name No. 77 on page 6.

Mr. President: Yes, that will be taken up later.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: May I know what Mr. Schamnad's motion is because I have received no notice of it.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member will find it in the supplementary list.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I am sorry; I had not seen it.

Indianization of the Railway Services.

Mr. Mahmood Schamnad Sahib Bahadur: Sir, my motion is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 1,000."

Sir, in making this motion I admit that something has been done in the direction of Indianization, but very little, much remains to be done. I wish to bring to the notice of the House the tendency which exists on certain Railways to go back on this principle and I cannot do better than read something from the *Bombay Chronicle* of Monday last. It says:

"There is a proposal on the part of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway to ask the Indian ticket inspectors working in the Bombay-Poona mails and expresses to revert to their old posts to make room for European inspectors. The new men are to receive salaries ranging from Rs. 400 to Rs. 500 a month, while the Indian inspectors did the work on the niggardly salary of Rs. 110 a month."

Mr. A. M. Hayman: I rise to a point of order, Sir. If the Honourable Member is referring to ticket collectors, it does not come under this Demand; he must wait till Demand No. 5 is taken.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member has raised the general question of Indianisation of railway services.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: He is talking about ticket inspectors who do not come under this Demand.

Mr. Mahmood Schamnad Sahib Bahadur: Sir, on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, Indians were asked to leave and make room for European inspectors. There, Sir, instead of Indianisation we have Europeanisation. There the European Inspectors are paid from Rs. 400 to Rs. 500, whereas the Indian inspectors get only Rs. 110 a month. There are several other invidious distinctions also that are made there, but I do not think it necessary to refer to them.

I want to bring to the notice of this House one other thing and that is that the claims of Muhammadans have been studiously ignored in the Railway Department. Last year I put some questions as to how many Muhammadans were sent back owing to the reduction of posts and Mr. Sim gave very evasive answers. I hope, Sir, that Indianisation will steadily increase with proper representation of the different communities of India. With these words, Sir, I move.

Mr. M. K. Acharya: Sir, the question of Indianisation has again been brought up and I propose to make a few remarks if I may with your permission. We have had, Sir, these two days more than one reference to this question of Indianisation. We had it yesterday in connection with the Railway Board, and to-day we are having it in connection with the general railway administration. And an assurance was given or rather very very loud protest was made on the other side that Indianisation was being carried out at an enormously rapid rate and that a very great deal is being done in respect of this matter. I have been looking into some of these statistics also. We were told yesterday—and of course we are thankful for small mercies—that there were two Indian Directors appointed under the Railway Board; and I am very glad about it that the Director of Finance who is here is not only a very capable Director of Finance but also a very good debater in this House. And I have no doubt that judging from the capacity of the two Directors that have now been appointed that old complaint that qualified Indians are not obtainable in larger numbers will not be so often trotted out on the other side of the House, as it has been. However, as I say, I am concerned now with what may be called the general administration. Here in Chapter V of the Report of the Railway Board for 1924-25 which deals with the staff, we have got some facts and figures; and I suppose it was to this that my Honourable friend, Mr. Cocke, referred a little while ago in the course of the day. Sir, I have got these facts and figures before me quite plainly. What are they? If we compare 1913-14 and 1924-25, the latter year is supposed to show some increase. On page 63 again we have got the figures for the last two years, and I have tried to analyse them. What is the story we find? In some railways there have been reductions or decreases in the number of European officers, and a slight increase in the number of Indian officers also. The analysis comes to this: the number of European officers has been decreased, and obviously the interpretation is that the older European officers must have retired in the ordinary course; and in their places possibly either Indians have been

brought in, or perhaps in some posts no officers have been appointed at all and they have been retrenched. Now my own impression is this. I have long thought,—I believe many other Members have thought so too,—that the number of European officers on many railways is very much larger than it need be. Hence the decreases. Thus, for instance, in the North Western Railway in 1924, I think there was a decrease of 10 European officers and an increase of 7 Indian officers; in the East Indian Railway there was a decrease of 5 European officers and an increase of 4 Indian officers; in the Great Indian Peninsula Railway there was a decrease of 10 European officers and an increase of one Indian officer; and so on. According to this table it appears that there has been an increase of 43 Indian officers in the total number of officers. It appears that there are 30 European officers who have gone away and 14 Indian officers also have left. Taking into account all non-Europeans, that is Anglo-Indians, Muslims, and non-Muslims, 30 European officers and 14 Indian officers left after April 1924, and 36 European officers and 51 Indian officers were appointed. Now, Sir, it was said on the other side of the House that during the past three years or even five years there has been steady Indianisation going on. The appointment of 51 Indian officers against 36 Europeans does not show that there has really been any formidable increase in this direction. Out of 87 new places, 51 or 59 per cent. have been given to Indians and 36 or 41 per cent. of the posts have been given to Europeans. Does it show that the Indians have been taken into the higher services on any very very large scale? This is the question which I want to put to the other side. They have been contending that in all the new appointments that are being made a very large number 75 per cent. of Indians are being appointed. Statistics which are supplied by the Railway Department do not show to me how there is any very large increase of Indians. I believe some statistics have been given showing the number of officials in the various Railways. In Appendix C, page 170 of Volume II, we have the number of European employees in the various railways. I find, Sir, here the total number is given as 6,479. I find, for instance, in some railways a very large, a disproportionately large, number of European officers. The East Indian Railway comes at the very top with 1,461 Europeans in 1923-24 and 1,473 Europeans in 1924-25. I take it, Sir, that the number of European officers given here are not menials drawing Rs. 15, Rs. 25 or Rs. 30 at all.

Sir Clement Hindley: They are not officers. They are total figures of the European staff.

Mr. M. K. Acharya: I know that is the total number. Taking the total number of 1,461, a very large number of them ought to be people drawing fairly fat salaries of Rs. 500 and more. They may be technically in the gazetted ranks or not in the gazetted ranks. They may be technically in this group or in that group or in yet another group. But I want to know whether any European as distinguished from Anglo-Indians and Indians ever comes to India to occupy a place on Rs. 30, Rs. 40 or Rs. 100 even. There are on the East Indian Railway I repeat altogether 1,461 European officials, and the number of subordinates drawing Rs. 250 and over is 857. The number of gazetted superior officers on the East Indian Railway, as I said a little while ago, in 1924 was 189 and in 1925, 184, and there were 857 subordinates. But altogether, as I said, the total European staff was 1,461. And surely, one has a right to ask whether such a huge high-paid European staff is properly and rightly employed

[Mr. M. K. Acharya.]

with reference to the true needs of the Railway, and whether that staff might not be reduced. In the South Indian Railway, with which I am well acquainted, there are only 164 Europeans altogether. The total mileage of the South Indian Railway is 1,876 and that of the East Indian Railway is 2,796, only one and half times that of the South Indian Railway.

Sir Clement Hindley: What are the earnings?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Does the Honourable Member know the earnings of the East Indian Railway?

Mr. M. K. Acharya: That is exactly my contention. Where you have got more earnings, you squander them in paying these people who are not required. In another railway, because there is less earned, they are able to do with less number of Europeans. That is exactly my point. Wherever you find ample money from the hard working third class men,—for, where after all does the earning come from?—it comes largely from the poor men of this country—wherever you get more money, all that money is squandered on the employment of a staff which is absolutely unnecessary. Take your own statistics. Where one railway can work with 170 or 200 Europeans, on another you have such a fabulously large number. Laughing will not do. It will not explain away the difficulty. Take another Railway, the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. You have 1,125 men. It earns more than the South Indian Railway, quite right. When all the money earned by these Railways is wanted badly for the amenities of third class passengers and for the reduction of third class fares, why do you throw it all away? Is it this European staff that earns this money?

Sir Clement Hindley: Yes.

Mr. M. K. Acharya: Sir, this is an absolute scandal, this is worse than a lie. If these 1,461 officers were reduced to 461 to-morrow, I give my word that the East Indian Railway will earn and earn more, and what is more, the amount of the pay of these officers will be thrown into the coffers of the Railway Department. It is absurd to say that while the South Indian Railway can run with 164 Europeans, the East Indian Railway cannot run with less than 1,400 or the Great Indian Peninsula Railway with less than 1,125 Europeans. There are 164 Europeans on the South Indian Railway and 84 only on the Nizam's Guaranteed Railway. The Nizam's Guaranteed Railway has a mileage of 962, about one-third that of the East Indian Railway, but the East Indian Railway has sixteen times the number of officers on the Nizam's Guaranteed Railway. And in broad daylight, in the year of the Lord 1926, it is advanced that these officers earn this money. Sir, such a ridiculous, futile statement cannot stand scrutiny even for a moment. I am surprised what clever and ingenious arguments are advanced on the other side. I thought, Sir, that there would be some better case for the other side to-day. I do not think I need take up the time of the House in refuting so futile an argument as that. Is that indeed an argument? It is an old scandal. It is a historic scandal that has been going on for a long time. I daresay Sir Clement Hindley will have his turn. He can then juggle with the figures much more cleverly than I can do. Here are the facts. There is a very large number of Europeans. What is the percentage? In 1914, 80 old men went away. Is that any

advantage to the Indians? 30 men went away and 36 men were appointed. Is that reducing the European staff. On the 1st April, 1924, there were 1,510 European officers on all the State Railways. On the 1st April, 1925, there were 1,516 European officers. Is that any reduction? We want the European staff to be reduced; and it was put up on the other side that they are being gradually reduced. If the old men go away, why do you bring in more new men? Why don't you employ Indians in the places of all those who went away? Is this asking for the moon? Is this asking for anything too large? If this is the rate of Indianisation—43 every year out of 1,931—how much time shall we take to reach our 75 per cent., to get 1,500 Indian officers out of 2,000? 30 years and more I daresay. Does that mean that Indianisation goes on at a very rapid rate and we shall have our 75 per cent. as early as possible? It will be 30 years hence, when Sir Clement Hindley and I will no longer be in the land of the living. They say that Indianisation is going on rapidly, immensely, at an extraordinary rate. If this is to be the rate of Indianisation, the plea put forward by the other side that Indianisation is being carried on on a very large scale falls to pieces. Now, I come to Company Railways. On the Bengal Nagpur Railway last year there were 9 new Europeans employed and only 4 Indians. On the Bengal and North Western Railway there were 4 new Europeans and no Indians. On the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway there were 7 Europeans and 2 Indians. On the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway, four Europeans more and one Indian less, not more; and on the South Indian Railway 11 new Europeans and four new Indians. These facts are quite clear. These Company-managed Railways are actually adding to the European staff; they have not given a fair chance to the Indians. I think I need not labour the point. My contention is this. Indians wherever they have been tried, whether on salaries of Rs. 250, Rs. 500 or Rs. 1,000 or Rs. 5,000, in any office opened to them have given a good account of themselves; and they have even proved better men than their European colleagues. Therefore to say that no fit Indians are found is a lie. The figures show that they have not been given the opportunities which the other side says have given. Then, about the training at Chandausi. I believe all Honourable Members have got the printed communication showing that in the East Indian Railway the same training is given to the superior officers and inferior men, and that one Indian headed the list in the recent examination. He is still a low-paid clerk. There was a printed circular to that effect which I received by post, and I trust that every Honourable Member received that also. Is that the way you proceed with Indianisation? It has been repeatedly said that there are 700,000 Indian staff. That refers to men on Rs. 15, 20, 30, 40 and so on, who can never rise beyond a couple of hundreds. That is not what we are concerned with here. We are concerned with the higher officers, men who draw Rs. 250 and over. The facts, Sir, are quite clear. It is a scandal that on almost every railway during the past two years, wherever there have been new opportunities, more Europeans have been taken and less Indians than should have been. Is this giving to Indian 75 per cent. of all the new vacancies arising? Is that the story given to us by the facts and figures of 1924-25? And yet, Sir, that is almost the very brave answer given on that side. They say Indianisation is going on, that pledges are being very very strictly fulfilled, that every Agent has been impressed strongly with the necessity of giving more places to Indians,

[Mr. M. K. Acharya.]

and so on and so forth. I hope, Sir, that a careful study of the facts and figures will show that Indianisation is not going on in as rapid, in as intensive a degree as it ought to be going on; and it is no use coming to this House and saying that "as early as possible" in the long long time to come, that is in the Greek Kalends, we shall have the requisite number! I therefore say that this House will be doing its bare duty if it lays down emphatically by means of its vote its opinion that the present rate of Indianisation is very meagre. Of course something is being done; something always is being done; even we here are supposed to be making some impression on the Government of India. But I contend as much as should be done is not being done and as much as we rightly expect is not being done, and as much is not likely to be done for some years to come as we demand should be done. Therefore, Sir, for these reasons I hope that this House will give a very emphatic opinion on this very important question of Indianisation of the superior services of the Railways.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, I should like to make one suggestion to the Honourable Member in charge of the Department as regards Indianisation. He said that there is a bargain according to the proposals of the Lee Commission by which 75 per cent. of the vacancies should be filled by Indians as soon as practicable. He said also that he is trying to give 75 per cent. of the vacancies in those departments in which it is possible for him to do so, but he does not do it in some departments in which it is not possible for him to do so. Now, Sir, you can work out the percentage of 75 in either taking 75 per cent. of the vacancies in each department separately or 75 per cent. of the vacancies in the Department as a whole. If you want to make it 75 per cent. of the Department as a whole you can give 100 per cent. in certain departments and then you can give a lesser percentage in other departments. I want to know, Sir, what the meaning is of the phrase "75 per cent. of the vacancies for the Department"? Does it mean 75 per cent. in each department separately or in the Department as a whole? If it is for the Department as a whole then certainly he can work up to that percentage by giving all the vacancies in some departments in which it is possible to fill them by Indians and a smaller percentage in other departments in which you say it is not possible to fill the posts by Indians. Then, Sir, I would also like to make another suggestion to the Honourable Member, and it is this. The Members of this House are very much interested in this question of Indianisation, and he could therefore give the total number of vacancies that occur every year. and he could also tell us in a separate note in his annual report if he likes how these vacancies are filled in. From the figures given along with last year's report we are not quite sure how many vacancies there were during the year, and we do not know how those vacancies were filled up. If the Honourable Member will give us in his annual report the number of vacancies occurring every year and will also state how many have been filled by Indians and how many by Englishmen, the House will have some information which they desire.

Dr. K. G. Lohokare: Sir, on the first day of the Railway Budget discussion the Honourable Member in charge gave an illustration of the district which he served. He said in his files he found a document 50 years old and therein he found a description of the past condition of the district, while after 50 years he could find out how many improvements there were. He applies the simile to Indianisation here and expects us to wait and watch

saying there are difficulties in the way, trained men have to be obtained, and we should wait for some years and then see the result. That is what his statement means. I would just present to him, to meet his plea of not being able to find trained Indians to fill the vacancies, a list of the staff of the Mysore Railways. Here the Railways are under State management and we find only one name which is not an Indian, while in all other cases there are Indians with English and Indian University qualifications; in Railway Engineering, in Railway Traffic and in the Locomotive Department, in all these branches almost all the officers are Indians. Had there been a really honest desire to find Indians it would have been surely possible to find Indians whenever there was a vacancy. This excuse of "wait and see" does not therefore stand to reason. Moreover, one feature has been noticed by me in these lists. Whenever a vacancy occurs a junior scale post is often given to an old retiring man. That is not the Indianisation we want. We expect young officers to be put in who can be trusted to take advantage of the experience and be useful to the country afterwards. Many of these appointments are being given to old hands who have worked as foremen, Superintendents or head clerks in these branches. That is not the desire of this House in the matter of Indianisation. Sir, I should like to ask the Honourable Member if the efforts which he referred to are taking a definite honest shape. He may say that he has one school started here and is about to have another there. Does he think this a genuine beginning? I would like to inquire whether the Railway Board or the Government of India have made inquiries of the Engineering profession and the Indian Universities to find out if it is possible to start Railway Engineering and such other Faculties. There are in England and in America Faculties providing education in Railway Engineering and Railway Economics. We have here Railways with not less than six hundred crores of capital. What is the amount of training provided for in India? Why should there not be full provision for training of these officials? By putting up a small school somewhere in a nook or corner for training upper subordinates, does the Honourable Member mean to satisfy our demand for Indianisation and the provision of proper education for Indians in the administration of Railways? Is this the attempt, is this really the honest attempt that the Honourable Member is thinking or rather making much of? That is my question to the Honourable Member. Sir, I would ask how many appointments in the Medical Department, either in the Company Railways or in the State Railways are now being given to Indians? The vacancies really speaking should have been filled wholly by Indians. You cannot have any complaint of not being able to get qualified persons. We have in India Indian and British qualified persons of the same standard and capacity as you can produce. Why then do these Railways entertain Europeans on larger salaries and set aside Indians? When there is a vacancy in the Medical Department if you take an Indian you pay him less and put him in as a third grade officer, whereas if you recruit a fresh European boy, you put him in the senior job and create him a District Surgeon immediately. Is this the spirit of Indianisation, Sir? That is my question. Since that spirit is followed I should demand of the Government of India an honest effort to provide for advanced railway education in this country and immediately to create Faculties for training in railway subjects in the Indian Universities. Give them grants, make arrangements for training, and thus give them scope. Our mechanical engineering degree holders, our electrical degree holders and our civil engineering degree holders have never been thought of by the railway administration. My Honourable friend from Bombay belonging to the

[Dr. K. G. Lohokare.]

Engineering Association tells me that there are many Indians who have qualified themselves in England, who have qualified themselves in Glasgow and have not yet been able to get appointments in the Railway Engineering Departments. The Honourable Member in charge complains that we do not get sufficiently qualified candidates. The engineers in charge of Locomotive Departments in the Baroda and Mysore State railways are persons qualified from the Association of Engineers in England. They are all Indians, Sir. When there is a demand, the supply is automatically created. But when the supply is to be treated in the way it is being treated, naturally every body doubts the sincerety of your statements. You do not entertain qualified Indians and yet you say that there are no Indians available. I am sorry, Sir, I do not find any explanation for this argument. Sir, I support the motion moved.

Mr. E. K. Shanmukham Ohetty: I move, Sir, that the House be now adjourned.

***Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** Sir, I should like to make one or two observations on this very vexed question of Indianisation. It has appeared in our debates during the last two or three years and I do not think we have yet got an idea of the exact position of the Government in this matter. I have brought to the notice of Honourable Members on previous occasions that the Royal Commission on Public Services of 1912 made definite recommendations that educational facilities should be extended in this country for the purpose of the recruitment of the technical services that are employed by the Government. Their recommendations cover all branches of technical services, such as, the Engineering Service, the Medical Service, the Wagon and Locomotive Department. In fact, every department of the public services came under their scrutiny, and their recommendation was that the time had come when there were no questions of policy why European recruitment in regard to the technical services should be continued and they recommended that, as a preparation, educational facilities should be extended in this country. Sir, that was in 1912. When I went round in 1921 in connection with the Lytton Committee to England I found a large number of Indians studying for all branches of the technical services and made inquiries at the India Office whether the recommendations of the Commission as regards the provision of educational facilities had been attended to. The answer was that there was no information available at the India Office. Well, Sir, the next Royal Commission has also drawn attention to this question of providing educational facilities in this country. Honourable Members will see that in regard to State Railway Engineers and superior revenue establishments, the Lee Commission state:

"The present scheme has been designed with a view to secure as soon as possible a cadre of which out of every 100 officers 50 shall be recruited in India and 50 in Europe. The date on which this cadre can be reached is dependent on the provision of adequate training facilities in India. Measures with that end in view were advocated by the Islington Commission and we are informed that facilities have already been provided to a limited extent. We are strongly of opinion that the extension of the existing facilities should be pressed forward as expeditiously as possible in order that recruitment may be advanced as soon as practicable up to 75 per cent. of the total number of vacancies in the Railway Department as a whole, the remaining 25 per cent. being recruited in England."

Sir, Honourable Members will, therefore, see that when the Lee Commission reported the position as regards training facilities was practically

the same as when the previous Royal Commission reported. Sir, this is the aspect of the case on which I should like to have a clear answer from my Honourable friend opposite. What are the existing facilities that are available now and what steps have been taken for the purpose of enabling recruitment to take place from those who have received their education in this country? We find the Lee Commission saying that these facilities have been provided to a very limited extent, and they themselves recommended that these facilities should be expanded in this country.

As regards this question, it is quite clear that so far as at least two services are concerned, namely, the Medical and Engineering Services, we have a certain number of colleges in this country and bodies like the Industries Commission and the Calcutta University Committee have recommended the expansion of the engineering college with a view to provide the requirements of all Government departments in this country. May I ask the Honourable Member what steps have been taken in regard to this matter?

Mr. G. G. Sim: What matter?

***Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** In regard to engineering. There are different departments of engineering for which facilities are required, and if as a matter of fact our existing colleges have already received any additions I should like to know the scheme of recruitment which is thrown open to these colleges. Are there any exact number of vacancies thrown open to any of the existing colleges, or is there any other method by which you propose to recruit our railway engineers? If existing facilities for education are not necessary, will my Honourable friend be prepared to tackle that problem at once and to put in if he likes any additions to expand the college? And will he be willing to provide all facilities for mechanical or electrical engineering? This is one of those subjects which we have so often urged in this country that any further delay would really mean that while the Honourable Member says he is willing to recruit as far as possible 75 per cent. of Indians, its application would end perhaps in the result that no Indians are available.

In regard to other services we have the fact that a number of covenanted mechanics are ordinarily recruited in England. May I ask the Honourable Member what steps he proposes to take to train Indians for the Locomotive and Carriage and Wagon Departments of State Railways? These are the problems to which we invite attention.

Then as regards the Medical Services. You have a large number of excellent medical colleges which will be very suitable ground for recruitment for this branch of the service. May I ask the Honourable Member what are the exact proposals he has in view to Indianise this part of the railway services?

Sir, a good deal has been said that Company-managed Railways have given an undertaking that they would recruit 75 per cent. of Indians in their services as compensation for the concessions which have been extended to them. May I ask exactly what this undertaking or understanding with the companies is, because the recommendations of the Lee Commission are to the effect that as soon as practicable this standard should be raised? Are companies willing to come into the general scheme for recruitment of all the railway services according to the same system as that adopted by State Railways, or are they free to recruit as they like under regulations framed by them? I should like to know what exactly is the state of things

[Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao.]

in this matter. There were contracts hitherto and if there is to be a variation in those contracts I take it that the Honourable Member will see that Companies will have no loophole to urge that what they agreed to was entirely different from what we think they agreed to. I would like to have a clear and unequivocal statement of the arrangements with the companies at which the Government of India have arrived.

I do not wish to trouble the House with any more remarks. I am conscious of the difficulty of fitting in a new system with services which have already been organised, but I will give the Honourable Member this warning that if there is any deviation from the intentions of this House and if any excuses are put forward that Indianisation cannot be proceeded with, they will be charged with breach of faith. Already there has been one instance which has produced considerable dissatisfaction in this House. I wish the Honourable Member to realise that if an honest undertaking is come to, they will faithfully and honestly carry out that undertaking. I am not suggesting that he has no intention of doing it. But the whole difficulty arises in this, that once Government have made up their minds to concede the principle and adopt a scheme of Indianising the services up to a particular proportion, there should be no excuse thereafter, and we in this House expect the Government to show us their *bonâ fides* by taking all steps to see that this Indianisation is carried on both in the letter and the spirit in which it is put forward. Therefore, Sir, I hope the Honourable Member will see that our position is fully understood. Yesterday we had a good deal of discussion with reference to the appointment of an Indian. Sir Basil Blackett made a statement which gave us the impression that at the time when he made this statement there were Indians available for appointment to the Railway Board, for he used the words, that "when the next vacancy arises the scales will be distinctly weighted in favour of an Indian." Therefore he gave us that undertaking in a way that implied there would be competent Indians who would naturally succeed Mr. Sim when there was a vacancy; but a different construction was put upon those words, and we find the Honourable Sir Charles Innes said: "We chose the best man available, and that was Mr. Parsons." He may be right in thinking that Mr. Parsons was the best man, but what we want is that there should be a faithful carrying out of the principle which has been accepted. I hope the Honourable Member will therefore make a complete statement on all the points raised.

Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas (Sind: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I move that the House stand adjourned till to-morrow.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member from Bombay must know that the power of adjourning the House is vested entirely in the Chair, and no Member can submit any such motion for the decision of the House.

Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas: I bow to the ruling.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member may make a request to the Chair if he wishes.

Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas: Sir, I make a request that you will kindly adjourn.

Mr. President: The House stands adjourned till to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 25th February, 1926.