

16th March 1929

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
(Official Report)

Volume III

21st March to 12th April, 1929

FOURTH SESSION
OF THE
THIRD LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1929



DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1929

CONTENTS—*concl'd.*

	PAGE.
Saturday, 16th March, 1929—	
Short Notice Question and Answer	1985
The Trade Disputes Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1986
The Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended	1986-87
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Motion to re- circulate, as reported by the Select Committee, adopted	1987-88
The Presidency-towns Insolvency (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1988
Demands for Supplementary Grants in respect of Railways— Inspection	1989-95
Working Expenses—Administration	1989
Repairs and Maintenance and Operation	1989
Appropriation to the Depreciation Fund	1989
Appropriation from the Depreciation Fund	1989-91
Strategic Lines—Working Expenses and Miscellaneous	1991-92
Commercial Lines—New Construction	1992-94
Open Line Works	1994
Strategic Lines—New Construction and Open Line Works	1994
Appendix III	1995-97
Monday, 18th March, 1929—	
Questions and Answers	1999-2020
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2020-37
Statement laid on the Table—Rules regarding the grant of scholarships to Indians for training in Civil Aviation	2037-43
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to con- sider adjourned	2044-86
Tuesday, 19th March, 1929—	
Questions and Answers	2087-94
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the Motion to con- sider adjourned	2099-2149
Wednesday, 20th March, 1929—	
Questions and Answers	2151-61
Short Notice Question and Answer	2161-64
Message from the Council of State	2164
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the Motion to con- sider adjourned	2165-2264

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Saturday, 16th March, 1929.

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

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION AND ANSWER.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDIAN ROADS DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

Kumar Ganganand Sinha: Sir, I put the question of which I have given short notice. (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether or not they propose to give effect to the recommendations of the Indian Roads Development Committee, regarding the formation of a Standing Committee of the Indian Legislature, and the approval by the Assembly of the general principles in accordance with which the grant should be spent?

(b) If so, when?

(c) Will or will not any portion of the fund for road development be spent before the recommendations referred to in (a) have been given effect to?

(d) How will provincial opinion be ascertained in regard to the recommendations of the Committee and, when?

(e) Have Government considered the question of the advisability of the participation of the Standing Committee of the Indian Legislature in their conference with Provincial Governments? If so, will Government be pleased to state what they propose to do?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) Yes.

(b) If the Government proposals contained in the Finance Bill are accepted, it is proposed to make a motion in both Houses for the appointment of a Standing Committee of the Legislature, as recommended by the Roads Development Committee.

(c) No.

(d) It is proposed to invite representation of the provinces to a conference on the subject during the summer.

(e) Yes. It is Government's intention to invite the Standing Committee of the Legislature to take part in the proposed conference.

Kumar Ganganand Sinha: So, will the Government be pleased to state whether the Conference with the Provincial Governments will take place only after the appointment of the Standing Committee and not before that?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: Obviously after, Sir.

THE TRADE DISPUTES BILL.

PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra (Member for Industries and Labour): Sir, I present the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to make provision for the investigation and settlement of trade disputes, and for certain other purposes.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1923, for certain purposes, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

It will be seen from the Report of the Select Committee that that body has made certain alterations in the Bill, as originally introduced in this House. These alterations fall broadly into two classes, firstly those directed to a more precise definition of the categories of individuals to whom it is now proposed to extend the benefits of the Workmen's Compensation Act, and secondly, those directed to protecting the interests of workmen in the matter of receipt of compensation under the Act. It is not necessary for me, Sir, to add anything to supplement the Report of the Select Committee. Sir, I move the motion.

***Diwan Chaman Lall** (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to point out that I have appended a minute of dissent to the Report of the Select Committee to make my position perfectly clear. I have signed this Report, subject to the clear understanding that a comprehensive revision of this measure is going to take place very shortly, and I believe the Honourable Member in charge will have no objection to state on the floor of the House what his intention is with regard to this matter. I take it that the Government are willing to undertake a comprehensive revision of the Act, and if they are willing to do so, I have personally no objection to giving my whole-hearted support to this measure, because it is merely a drafting amendment of the Bill, Government having realised that certain difficulties had cropped up in the administration of the Act and created certain hardships to certain individuals, namely, to give wages to workmen who have been in employ for less than a month and in whose case it has been difficult to compute their wages, and secondly the question of the Railway Contractor has been brought in now under this Bill. Certain other matters have also been dealt with in the Bill, but as I said, I want to make one point quite clear, and it is this, that the Government should give us, on the floor of the House, an undertaking that they do intend to undertake an early and comprehensive revision of the Act.

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: I think, Sir, I dealt with the point raised by my Honourable friend, Diwan Chaman Lall, on an earlier occasion, and I have nothing to add to what I said on that occasion. The Government of India have already addressed the Local Governments in the matter. At the same time, it is quite possible that

*Speech not corrected by the Honourable Member.

an important matter like this might come within the purview of the Whitley Commission. Whether it will so come or not I am not in a position to say definitely. That being so, I cannot give any undertaking as to the precise time when a comprehensive revision of the Workmen's Compensation Act will be undertaken by Government.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1923, for certain purposes, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 8 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

The Title and Preamble were added to the Bill.

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: Sir, I move that the Bill, as amended, be passed.

The motion was adopted.

THE INDIAN INCOME-TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster (Finance Member): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922, for certain purposes, as reported by the Select Committee, be re-circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinions thereon."

Sir, the reasons why the Select Committee has recommended re-circulation are very clearly explained in the Report. I think I need only deal with one or two principal points. The alterations suggested by the Select Committee are numerous, but they only affect questions of detail and not its general principles. Nevertheless, the details are of such importance that the Committee thought it was desirable that the Bill should be re-circulated for opinion. The main alteration is possibly that contained in clause 4, where it has been sought to arrive at definitions of companies or firms subject to the provisions of this Act, which would cover substantially those companies or firms which are formed for the purpose of evasion of tax, and not to rely so much on mere technical distinctions, as had been done in the Bill as originally drafted. As regards companies, for example, certain conditions had been attached in the original Bill, which, on consideration, the Select Committee thought would not prove effective for getting at those companies which the Act was originally designed to deal with. The Committee has adopted the definition used in the corresponding English law for deciding what is a company, which is, in effect, a company in which the public are genuinely interested, as distinguished from a company in which perhaps one or two men only are interested, and which has been formed really for the purpose of evasion of tax. I think that the definitions now adopted will prove more satisfactory in practice.

The Bill has further been altered in another important respect, in that it substitutes Boards of Referees as the Court of Appeal for the High Court. The High Courts objected to the amount of work which would be involved in the original provisions, and it was the opinion of the Select Committee that Boards of Referees, as provided in the amended Bill, would meet the needs of the case more satisfactorily.

[Sir George Schuster.]

I do not think that it is necessary for me to say any more on this subject, for, as I have already said, the reasons for all the amendments are very clearly stated in the Report of the Select Committee.

The motion was adopted.

THE PRESIDENCY-TOWNS INSOLVENCY (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter (Law Member): I beg to move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Presidency-towns Insolvency Act, 1909, for a certain purpose, as passed by the Council of State, be taken into consideration."

This is a very simple measure, which provides for the extension of the period six months to one year for the purpose of the declaration of the first dividend by the Official Assignee. Sir, I may mention, for the information of non-lawyer Members of this House, that the Presidency-towns Insolvency Act applies to the towns of Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Karachi and Rangoon; it does not apply to any other place. Under the existing law it is provided that, within six months after the adjudication of the insolvent, the Official Assignee has to declare the first dividend. In practice it has been found that this period of six months is much too short. The Government of Madras proposed to have legislation in the Provincial Legislative Council for the purpose of extending the six months to a year. But it was found that the difficulty which was felt in Madras was common to all the other towns to which this Act applied, and that is why legislation has been undertaken in the Central Legislature.

Sir, the sole amendment is to sub-section (2) of section 69 of the Act. The existing section is this :

"The first dividend (if any) shall be declared and be distributed within six months after the adjudication, unless the Official Assignee satisfies the Court that there is sufficient reason for postponing the declaration to a later date."

No doubt, it may be said that the Official Assignee can always go to Court and ask for extension. But, Sir, in practice it has been found that this is a needless formality. The Official Assignee goes to Court, makes an *ex parte* application, and time is extended. It means costs and unnecessary labour to the Official Assignee. The period of one year, which was suggested by the Madras High Court, and which has been approved by all the other High Courts, has been adopted in this Bill.

Sir, I move.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

The Title and Preamble were added to the Bill.

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: Sir, I move that the Bill, as passed by the Council of State, be passed.

The motion was adopted.

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS IN RESPECT OF RAILWAYS.

A.—Expenditure from Revenue.

INSPECTION.

Mr. P. B. Rau (Financial Commissioner, Railways): I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 8,000 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, 1929, in respect of 'Inspection'."

The motion was adopted.

WORKING EXPENSES—ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. P. B. Rau: I beg to move.

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 71,00,000 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, 1929, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Administration'."

The motion was adopted.

REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION.

Mr. P. B. Rau: I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,21,50,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Repairs and Maintenance and Operation'."

The motion was adopted.

APPROPRIATION TO THE DEPRECIATION FUND.

Mr. P. B. Rau: I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 5,00,000 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, 1929, in respect of 'Appropriation to the Depreciation Fund'."

The motion was adopted.

APPROPRIATION FROM THE DEPRECIATION FUND.

Mr. P. B. Rau: I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 50,00,000 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, 1929, in respect of 'Appropriation from the Depreciation Fund'."

Pandit Nilakantha Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): This is only a demand consequential on the capital expenditure which we have got on the list today. During the last Railway Budget, we have, I hope, sufficiently discussed this particular question, which also relates to our stores purchase and the development of Indian industries. Though we have got to pass these as two items, I take it that the whole expenditure is one, which has been incurred in excess of the grant of last year.

Mr. President: Is that the position? I thought the Railway Board were going to spend this amount in the next few days. If they have already spent the amount, they cannot make a motion in this form.

Mr. P. R. Rau: It is expected that the total amount of expenditure will exceed the amount granted by the Assembly last March by this amount.

Mr. President: I am very sorry the position was not made clear earlier. I thought the amount was going to be spent during the course of the next few days. The Honourable Member is, I think, not entitled to come before this House and make motions in this form for monies already spent. These are really excess grants. Perhaps Sir George Rainy will explain the position.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy (Member for Commerce and Railways): I think that the procedure in past years has undoubtedly been that, after the approval of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways has been obtained, the expenditure has proceeded in anticipation of the approval of this House. I understand that that has been, in fact, the procedure and undoubtedly much the greater part of this sum of Rs. 50 lakhs represents expenditure already incurred.

Mr. President: I think the Honourable Member will agree with me when I say that if money has been spent already in excess of the grant voted by this Assembly, the Government can only come by way of a motion for excess grant. That is, as I understand, the right Parliamentary procedure. However, as the Honourable Member points out that this practice has been in vogue for the last few years, I do not wish to raise any objection at this stage, but will see that the procedure is regularised in future.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: This is exactly what I was going to say. This comes for the vote of the House after the money has been spent. We have only a very few days left of this year. As that point has already been made clear, I am not going to expatiate upon that particular point of technical objection, but the thing remains that this money has been already spent in excess. The whole grant of capital expenditure has a history which has been sufficiently discussed. It was first contemplated that 30 crores every year, for five years, would be spent. The House would not have sanctioned money had it not been under the impression that our Indian industries would get sufficient development by that means. We have seen that some of the Indian industries were first encouraged in order to elicit the grant from this House, but that process has been discontinued and purchases have gone to England more and more. Besides, company-managed railways are not at all controlled by our Railway Board in matters of purchase.

Mr. President: Order, order. The Honourable Member is not in order in discussing questions of policy on this supplementary demand for grant.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I was simply going to say that this amount should be taken from the grant we have already passed for the coming year. This amount should be appropriated from that, and after a full scrutiny of the situation, we shall see if we are in a position to grant anything in excess next year. That is my position.

Mr. K. Ahmed (Rajshahi Division: Muhammadan Rural): This is for inspection only.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: This is not for inspection only. This is from the Depreciation Fund, I believe. My point is that this is a consequential Demand arising out of capital expenditure, and should, with all other similar excess demands of today, be appropriated from next year's grants, and we shall see if we can give excess money in next year's capital expenditure, consistently with the spirit and meaning of our programme on that head.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, as has already been explained by the Honourable Member for Railways, this amount, at least the greater part of it, has already been spent. I do not know whether the Honourable Member is asking the House to reduce the amounts that have already been granted for expenditure next year, but if he does, I believe, Sir, you will rule him out of order.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 50,00,000 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, 1929, in respect of 'Appropriation from the Depreciation Fund'."

The motion was adopted.

STRATEGIC LINES—WORKING EXPENSES AND MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. P. R. Rau: I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 11,80,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Strategic Lines—Working Expenses and Miscellaneous'."

Mr. M. S. Sessa Ayyangar (Madura and Ramnad *cum* Tinnevely: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I wanted to take this opportunity for making a suggestion to the Committee sitting on the question of the separation of Railway from General Finance. Last year, during the general discussion of the Railway Budget, I drew the attention of the House to the position that these strategic railways occupy in the Railway Budget. I stated that these lines, being military fortifications, should find a place in the Army Budget and not in the Railway Budget. I know that, in 1922, a Resolution was moved in the Council of State, which was divided into three parts. First the Resolution wanted the separation of the account of the strategic railways from that of the general railways; secondly they wanted that the profits and losses of strategic lines should be credited or debited to the Army estimates, and that the capital outlay relating to strategic lines should certainly find a place in the Army Budget. The first portion of the Resolution was accepted by the Government, but parts two and three were negatived. Now, as the Committee is sitting on the question of the separation of General from Railway Finance, I think it legitimate to bring prominently before the House now that this Committee ought also to consider this question, because, as I submitted last year, this is a double wrong. . . .

Mr. President: The Honourable Member cannot do that on this motion.

Mr. M. S. Sessa Ayyangar: I only make a suggestion.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member has made the suggestion and he should go no further.

The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 11,80,000 be granted to the Governor-General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Strategic Lines—Working Expenses and Miscellaneous'."

The motion was adopted.

B.—Expenditure charged to Capital.

COMMERCIAL LINES—NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 32,00,000 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 1929, in respect of 'New Construction'."

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): Sir, I want to bring one point to the notice of the House. This, virtually, is an excess grant, which comes before us in the form of a supplementary grant, and is the result of extra expenditure incurred in excess of the budget grant chiefly by the two lines, the North Western Railway and the Bengal Nagpur Railway. Now, in connection with this, I want to bring prominently to the notice of the House the fact that, in the Report of the Public Accounts Committee for 1926-27, the Committee pointedly drew the attention of the Railway Board to the fact that there had been a considerable amount of bad budgeting with regard to the North Western Railway. The tendency of that Railway to run in excess of the grant allotted reacts prejudicially upon the carrying out of the programme by other railways. This year we find that, on account of the North Western Railway having exceeded its expenditure, the Great Indian Peninsula Railway was compelled to stop its work, with a view to keep the total expenditure within the limits of the total grant, as far as possible. The zeal of one railway reacts upon the working capacity of another railway; the mistakes or miscalculations of one result in inflicting a loss upon the others. This is what has taken place. The Honourable the Finance Member, the other day referred to the fact that, immediately after he took charge, he put on a brake; and I find that the work of new construction on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway was suddenly arrested, I think in the month of August. The staff and the labour were suddenly withdrawn, but whether exclusively as the result of the Finance Member's brake or not I can not definitely say.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster (Finance Member): I did not take over my duties until the middle of November, so I could hardly have put on the brake in the month of August!

Mr. M. S. Aney: I don't precisely know in what month exactly the brake was put on. But the result is this, that certain new construction

programmes, which were being carried on by the Great Indian Peninsula Railway in Berar were stopped. I don't know if and when they will again begin this year. This was done, I presume, with a view to keep the total expenditure, as far as possible, within the budget grant for the year. In spite of that we have now a demand for this excess grant. Mr. Parsons was cross-examined on this point by my friends in the Public Accounts Committee, and he admitted the fact that there was an inveterate or almost incurable tendency on the part of certain railways to spend more than the budget grant, and the excuse they give is that they have a greater spending capacity on account of better organisation. When it was pointed out to him that it was necessary for the railways to run according to the budget estimate, he replied that he had already appointed an officer with the view to find out the defects in the budgeting system of railways. I want to know what the officer has done, if he has made any suggestions to the Railway Board and whether his suggestions, if any, have been availed of in preparing the budget for 1929-30.

So far as the Railway Standing Finance Committee is concerned, they know nothing of the report of that officer, even if he has made any. I also wish to bring to the notice of the House one fact, and that is that the Members of the Standing Finance Committee have to go through the Public Accounts Committee's Report generally some time before the budget is placed before the House. But they get the Report of the Public Accounts Committee very late and there is little time for studying it. The greatest difficulty is that they are never supplied with copies of the Audit Report of railway appropriations for the year, so that it is a case of reading a commentary without the text. It would be better if the Members of the Railway Finance Committee were supplied with the Report of the Auditor on railway appropriations, and the Public Accounts Committee's Report in time, so that they would be in a better position to know what items they should pay particular attention to. That is another suggestion that I wanted to make. I want to have some explanation from my Honourable friend Mr. Rau on these two points.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I am not rising just now to defend the railway administrations against the charge of wrong budgeting that has been levelled by Mr. Aney, against them. If Mr. Aney will refer to Demand No. 7 in the Demands for Grants for 1929-30, he will find that the mistake—if it can be called a mistake—is as much ours as that of the railway administrations, if not more. The point is that, for the last four or five years, since larger amounts were placed at the disposal of the railway administration for spending, we have had to adopt a system by which we allotted to railway administrations more money than they expected they would spend. In 1928-29 also what happened was that we distributed among the different railway administrations 10½ crores, hoping from our previous experience, that their total expenditure would be only 8½ crores. Our guess turned out to be not quite accurate. The increased spending organisation now at the disposal of railways did enable them to go ahead much faster than we imagined they would, and while, as a matter of fact, in hardly any individual railway is there an increase in the present estimate of expenditure over the original grant, the total amount for all the railways together is larger than the amount we asked the House to grant last March, on account of the fact that the cut we made was far too much.

[Mr. P. R. Rau.]

This was explained by Mr. Parsons before the Public Accounts Committee, and in the Honourable Sir George Rainy's speech on the Budget, it was stated that our present system had probably outlived its usefulness. I am afraid, therefore, that, in these particular grants, where the lump sums were made by the Railway Board, in the expectation that the total expenditure would be less than the amount actually asked for by each railway administration, the blame for it lies partly on the Railway Board.

The other point raised by Mr. Aney was about the circulation of copies of the appropriation accounts of railways in India, with the report of the Accountant General, Railways, thereon to the Members of the Standing Finance Committee. I shall certainly be very glad to have copies circulated to them in the future when they are received by us.

A further question that was raised by Mr. Aney was the question of changes in the budget procedure, which was referred to by Mr. Parsons before the Public Accounts Committee. I am sorry to say that we have not yet received the report of the officer who went round some time ago to all the administrations to collect materials and examine their procedure in preparing their budget. Unfortunately, as it happened, the officer was taken away from this special duty to other duties, and thereafter was partly on foreign service, and then he had to go on leave for some time. I am told that his report is now almost ready and will be in our hands in a very short time. I shall then consider in what form to place the report, or the substance of it, before the Standing Finance Committee for Railways at one of their meetings this year.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 32,00,000 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, 1929, in respect of 'New Construction'."

The motion was adopted.

OPEN LINE WORKS.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,67,30,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Open Line Works'."

The motion was adopted.

STRATEGIC LINES—NEW CONSTRUCTION AND OPEN LINE WORKS.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,00,000 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, 1929, in respect of 'Strategic Lines—New Construction and Open Line Works'."

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 18th March, 1929.

Khan Bahadur Makhdum Syed Rajan Bakhsh Shah (South-West Punjab: Muhāmmādan): A very interesting discussion has been in progress on the General Budget since yesterday. Every Honourable Member is anxiously marshalling out his views to advance the interests of the public. Indeed the erudition and labour with which the new Finance Member has prepared the Budget deserves our commendation. I am sure that the Honourable the Finance Member has left no stone unturned in the preparation of this Budget, yet the objections raised against it are apparently right. The Indian Members of the Assembly are, obviously, more informed of the internal and external conditions of India than what can be expected from a non-Indian. However it is desirable to offer some encouragement to the new Finance Member in his toils, in order that he may be able to apply himself with a better heart to his next year's task, and be able to pay due attention to the Indian aspirations, and incidentally save himself from the criticism of the Indian Members.

I feel particularly impelled to draw the attention of Government to the zemindars of the Punjab. This community of the Punjab pays a very substantial amount, annually, in the form of revenue; and the Government always appear to be anxious to maintain its rights. Under the circumstances am I to believe that the Government are ignorant of their sad plight, to which they have been reduced by the tyranny of the Irrigation Department?

Their lands have grown heavily burdened, and there are only very few big zemindars, who can just make both ends meet. If this state of affairs is allowed to continue for some time, the consequences may well be imagined. I have every confidence that the Government will be gracious enough to take immediate steps to relieve this community from the tyranny of the Irrigation Department, particularly when, during a war, the assistance afforded by this community of the Punjab is the greatest in India. Will not His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief give his support in removing these difficulties of the Punjab?

The Educational Grant for the year 1929-30 is simply amazing. In spite of the fact that enlightened persons like the Honourable Sir Muhammad Habibullah and Mr. Bajpai are the Member-in-Charge and the Secretary for Education, yet the rights of the Muslims are being trampled upon.

The Hindu University of Benares secures a grant of Rs. 1,25,000, and an additional grant of Rs. 4,75,000; while the Muslim University of Aligarh obtains only Rs. 1,25,000, and so far as additional grant is concerned it gets a cypher. This does not mean that the grant allowed to the Benares Hindu University is in any way grudged by us, rather, "It pleases our heart, and brightens our eyes", and I would go so far as to say that the grant should yet be greater. However when we see the Aligarh University deprived of this additional grant "Our heart grows sad, and our eyes grow red". Will it not be called gravely unjust and unfair, especially when the Standing Finance Committee contains such great personages as Sir Abdul Qaiyum, the Deputy President of the Muslim Party, Mian Mohammad Shah Nawaz, Haji Chaudhury Mohammad Ismail Khan, and Nawab Mohammad Ismail. I think they should be ashamed of themselves.

*Vide page 1536 of these Debates.

Mian Mohammad Shah Nawaz: I was away in Madras, and took no part in the proceedings of the Committee.

Khan Bahadur Makhdum Syed Rajan Bakhsh Shah: It is your fault, you ought to have been present. The other members of the Committee, Sardar Gulab Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh, Mr. Sarathai Nemchand Haji, Rai Sahib Harbilas Sarada, etc., deserve to be congratulated, along with Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: I was not a member of that Committee.

Khan Bahadur Makhdum Syed Rajan Bakhsh Shah: Yes, I know you were not, but would you mind being a little patient? The Honourable Member, by remaining outside the above Committee, is procuring due advantages for the Benares University; and in this Assembly, according to his conscience, always opposes the Government with great violence. Because the non-Muslim gentlemen are ever-ready to slash the Government policy, Government are always frightened, and allow them an unfair share, even in the superior services, etc. For them the present Government fall only just a little short of Swaraj, and yet they are very loud in their cry for Swaraj. "May your courage be praised".

Just face to face to this we find the Muslim Party, which, by offering a steady support to Government in all its important issues, leads it to success; and in recognition of these devoted services, the just rights of their community in the superior services of all the departments, as well as in clerical establishments are being absolutely ignored, as has been very briefly illustrated above. These conditions very appropriately illustrate the saying that 'might is right'; it is the poor Muslims who are being sandwiched from either side. Even at the present juncture the Government would not safeguard our just claims; and when Swaraj is granted—though considering the prevailing conditions the chances of its attainment appear yet to be very remote—it will be the Muslims who will suffer. The fact is that the Hindu gentlemen, as well as the Europeans, and, to crown all, even the foolish Mussalmans, all are anxious to oppose the Muslims and to damage their interests. May God look after the true Muslims. If there existed true Muslims, no one would have dared to usurp their rights. A number of Muslims are very often found outraging the sanctity of the month of Ramzan by smoking cigars in the verandah of the Assembly Chamber, and yet call themselves Muslims. Well, if this offence was confined to beard-shaven people only, it might not have appeared so very unseemly, but even the venerable bearded fellows indulge in the enjoyment of their cigar puffs publicly.* Under these circumstances, how can the calamities be averted from the Muslims?

As a well-wisher of the British Government, I would emphatically warn them that if they would continue the practice of ignoring the just claims of the Muslims, the Muslim Party will also be obliged to change the trend of its policy—a change to which it already appears to be drifting—and the whole responsibility for this change of policy would lie at the doors of the British Government, and not with the Muslim Party. At the same time, I regret to say that the authorities of the Aligarh University are certainly to be blamed for their attitude of indifference in procuring the additional grant for their University, although they have been feeling a pressing necessity for it.

The Aligarh University is greatly handicapped by the shortage of residential accommodation; and due to this shortage a large number of students have to go back to their homes annually. It is quite necessary to extend the College Lecture Room, and to enlarge the University Hall, while the Drawing Room too requires further expansion. The supply of filtered water and electricity is quite inadequate to meet the demands of the University.

It has been suggested that Rs. 25,000 will be reduced from the grants of both the above Universities from the next year's Budget. This reduction would be sheer injustice. Because, so far, the conditions prevailing at the above Universities do not justify the adoption of any such measure. Instead, I would propose that the annual grants to each of the two Universities should be raised by Rs. 25,000, and, considering the circumstances of the Aligarh University, it most certainly deserves this enhancement. It is incumbent on Government to prepare a revised budget, including an additional grant of Rs. 10,00,000 for the Aligarh University or the absence of this grant will prove a great source of grief for the Mussalmans of India.