

12th March 1935

THE

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

---

Volume III, 1935

(9th March to 28th March, 1935)

---

FIRST SESSION

OF THE

FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,  
1935



NEW DELHI  
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS  
1935

# Legislative Assembly.

## *President :*

**THE HONOURABLE SIR ABDUR RAHIM, K.C.S.I., KT.**

## *Deputy President :*

**MR. AKHIL CHANDRA DATTA, M.L.A.**

## *Panel of Chairmen :*

**SIR MUHAMMAD YAKUB, KT., M.L.A.**

**MR. S. SATYAMURTI, M.L.A.**

**LIEUT.-COLONEL SIR HENRY GIDNEY, KT., M.L.A.**

**SARDAR SANT SINGH, M.L.A.**

## *Secretary :*

**MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.**

## *Assistant of the Secretary :*

**RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.**

## *Marshal :*

**CAPTAIN HAJI SARDAR NUR AHMAD KHAN, M.C., I.O.M., I.A.**

## *Committee on Petitions :*

**MR. AKHIL CHANDRA DATTA, M.L.A., Chairman.**

**MR. S. SATYAMURTI, M.L.A.**

**DR. ZIAUDDIN AHMAD, C.I.E., M.L.A.**

**RAJA SIR VASUDEVA RAJAH, KT., C.I.E., M.L.A.**

**MR. N. M. JOSHI, M.L.A.**

# CONTENTS.

VOLUME III.—9th March to 28th March, 1935.

|  | PAGES.    |  | PAGES.    |
|--|-----------|--|-----------|
| <b>SATURDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1935—</b>  |           | <b>TUESDAY, 12TH MARCH, 1935—</b>  |           |
| Questions and Answers . . . . .  | 1959—91   | Questions and Answers . . . . .  | 2159—96   |
| Unstarred Questions and Answers . . . . .  | 1991—2023 | Short Notice Questions and Answers . . . . .   | 2196—98   |
| Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Arrests in Calcutta of prominent workers connected with the All-India Trade Union Congress—Ruled out of order . . . . .   | 2024—29   | The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>  |           |
| Statement of Business . . . . .  | 2029—30   | Demand No. 39—Army Department—   |           |
| The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>cont'd.</i>   |           | Indianisation and over-expenditure . . . . .   | 2198—2244 |
| Demand No. 23—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)—   |           | Demand No. 79—Baluchistan—   |           |
| Grievances of the Inferior Services . . . . .  | 2031—57   | Repressive policy in Baluchistan . . . . .   | 2244—48   |
| Position of the Bengal Mussalmans in the Office of the Postmaster General, Bengal and Assam Circle . . . . .   | 2057—63   | Demand No. 16—Customs . . . . .  | 2248      |
| Demand No. 18—Salt—Damage done to the poor Zamindars of the Khushab and Pind Dadan Khan Tahsils in the District of Shahpur and Jhelum in the Punjab on account of the Salt Range and the Khewra Salt Mines . . . . . | 2064—75   | Demand No. 17—Taxes on Income . . . . .  | 2248      |
| <b>MONDAY, 11TH MARCH, 1935—</b>   |           | Demand No. 18—Salt . . . . .   | 2249      |
| Members Sworn . . . . .  | 2077      | Demand No. 19—Opium . . . . .  | 2249      |
| Questions and Answers . . . . .  | 2077—2113 | Demand No. 19A.—Excise . . . . .   | 2249      |
| Short Notice Questions and Answers . . . . .   | 2113—15   | Demand No. 20—Stamp . . . . .  | 2249      |
| The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>cont'd.</i>   |           | Demand No. 21—Forest . . . . .   | 2249      |
| Demand No. 28—Executive Council— <i>cont'd.</i>  |           | Demand No. 22—Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works . . . . . | 2250      |
| Grievances of working classes . . . . .  | 2115—32   | Demand No. 23—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses) . . . . .                | 2250      |
| Necessity of adapting the administration to meet modern economic needs . . . . .   | 2132—57   | Demand No. 25—Interest on Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt . . . . .                                | 2250      |
|  |           | Demand No. 26—Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations . . . . .  | 2250      |
|  |           | Demand No. 27—Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor General . . . . .                            | 2250      |
|  |           | Demand No. 28—Executive Council . . . . .  | 2251      |
|  |           | Demand No. 29—Council of State . . . . .   | 2251      |
|  |           | Demand No. 30—Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department . . . . .                           | 2251      |

|   | PAGES.           |  | PAGES.          |
|---|------------------|--|-----------------|
| <b>SATURDAY, 23RD MARCH, 1935—</b>  |                  | <b>TUESDAY, 26TH MARCH, 1935—<i>contd.</i></b>   |                 |
| Statements laid on the Table . . . . .  | 2531—37          | Election of Members to the Court of the University of Delhi . . . . .                                    | 2762            |
| Election of Members to the Central Advisory Council for Railways . . . . .                            | 2538             | Government's Right to make any modification in the business of the House . . . . .                       | 2762            |
| Election of Members to the Standing Committee for Roads . . . . .                                     | 2538—39          | Demands for Supplementary Grants in respect of Railways . . . . .  | 2763—90         |
| Election of Members to the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research and its Governing Body . . . . . | 2539             | Demands for Supplementary Grants . . . . .   | 2790—2825       |
| Bill passed by the Council of State . . . . .   | 2539             |  |                 |
| The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded . . . . .                  | 2540—65, 2567—96 | <b>WEDNESDAY, 27TH MARCH, 1935—</b>  |                 |
| Statement of Business . . . . .   | 2565—67          | Questions and Answers . . . . .  | 2827—55         |
| <b>MONDAY, 25TH MARCH, 1935</b>   |                  | Short Notice Question and Answer . . . . .   | 2853—57         |
| Questions and Answers . . . . .   | 2597—2639        | Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Reservation of the Highlands of Kenya for Europeans—Withdrawn . . . . . | 2857—59         |
| Unstarred Questions and Answers . . . . .   | 2639—58          | Election of a Member to the Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore . . . . .              | 2859, 2898—2913 |
| Short Notice Question and Answer . . . . .  | 2659—61          | Demands for Supplementary Grants . . . . .   | 2859—98         |
| Statement of Business . . . . .   | 2662—65          |  |                 |
| Election of the Public Accounts Committee . . . . .   | 2665             | <b>THURSDAY, 28TH MARCH, 1935—</b>   |                 |
| Statement laid on the Table . . . . .   | 2665—70          | Questions and Answers . . . . .  | 2919—57         |
| The Indian Finance Bill—Motion to consider adopted . . . . .  | 2671—2714        | Statement <i>re</i> Tribunal for Indo-Burma Financial Settlement . . . . .                               | 2958—60         |
| <b>TUESDAY, 26TH MARCH, 1935—</b>   |                  | Motions for Adjournment <i>re</i> —  |                 |
| Questions and Answers . . . . .   | 2715—58          | Working of the new Constitution by Indians despite disclaimers—  |                 |
| Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Financial adjustments between India and Burma—Adopted . . . . .      | 2758—61, 2802—25 | Ruled out of order . . . . .   | 2960—64         |
| Election of the Standing Finance Committee for 1935-36 . . . . .                                      | 2761             | Confidential report made on Members of the Legislative Assembly—Ruled out of order . . . . .             | 2965—68         |
|   |                  | Demands for Supplementary Grants . . . . .   | 2968—3025       |



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 12th March, 1935.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

### MONTHLY ALLOWANCE SANCTIONED FOR THE TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON STATE RAILWAYS.

839. \*Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: (a) Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to state if the Governor General in Council sanctioned a monthly allowance only a year before last to the Travelling Ticket Examiners of all State Railways at the following rate:

- (i) Rs. 85 per mensem for a salary below Rs. 100 per mensem;
- (ii) Rs. 50 per mensem for a salary below Rs. 200 per mensem;  
and
- (iii) Rs. 65 per mensem for a salary above Rs. 200 per mensem?

(b) If so, is it a fact that this grant was only applied exclusively to the old staff of Travelling Ticket Examiners and denied to the Travelling Ticket Examiners in A and B grades under the Moody-Ward system on the East Indian Railway?

(c) If so, will the Honourable Member please state the reasons and the justification for such arrangement?

(d) Is the Honourable Member in charge of Railways prepared to take immediate steps to bring the new staff on an equal footing with the old staff of Travelling Ticket Examiners of the East Indian Railway?

(e) Is it not a fact that the new staff of Travelling Ticket Examiners do the same duties as the old staff of Travelling Ticket Examiners? If so, will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to state why the new and old staff of the Travelling Ticket Examiners of the East Indian Railway are not paid the same scale of pay?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) and (b). Yes.

(c), (d) and (e). As I have explained in answer to previous questions in this House, a consolidated allowance of Rs. 85, 50 and 65 was granted to certain travelling ticket examiners, who were formerly in receipt of mileage allowance, as a purely *ex-gratia* measure, in view of the fact that the new consolidated scales entailed a considerable loss in their emoluments. Government are not prepared to extend this concession to staff under the Moody-Ward scheme who were engaged on the lower scale of allowances.

**Mr. Lalchand Navai:** Did these Ticket Examiners agree to accept this scale?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** The staff who were engaged under the Moody-Ward scheme knew at the time they were taken that these were the allowances they were going to get.

#### HOUSE RENT ALLOWANCE OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

840. **\*Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Is it a fact that the house rent allowance of the Travelling Ticket Examiners in A and B grades under the Moody-Ward system on the East Indian Railway, has been withheld on account of economic stringency?

(b) Is that stringency over? If so, will Government be pleased to state when the house rent allowance will be restored and, if restored whether it will be given retrospective effect?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** Government are making enquiries and a reply will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

#### UNIFORMITY AND STANDARDISATION OF WAGES AND GRADES ON ALL STATE RAILWAYS.

841. **\*Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Is it a fact that there has been of late a tendency on the part of Railway administrations in India towards a uniformity and standardisation of wages and grades on all State-managed and owned Railways?

(b) If so, will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to state whether they have considered that the Travelling Ticket Examiners of the East Indian Railway under Moody-Ward system should be given the same pay and allowance and other privileges as enjoyed by Travelling Ticket Examiners of other State Railways? If so, when?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

#### NON-TREATMENT OF THE TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS AS BELONGING TO THE RUNNING STAFF.

842. **\*Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Is it a fact that the Travelling Ticket Examiners are not counted as belonging to the running staff? If so, why? Is it a fact that an engine-khalasi is privileged to get mileage allowance?

(b) Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to refer to the definition of the running staff given in this House in reply to the starred question No. 1369, dated the 11th December, 1933, and to state why the Travelling Ticket Examiners are not counted as belonging to the running staff and given mileage allowance in addition to other privileges?

**Mr. P. R. Das:** (a) and (b). Travelling Ticket Examiners are not considered as part of the running staff because they do not perform duties directly connected with the charge of a moving train. Nor are engine ~~cleaners~~ so considered, if the Honourable Member means by that term cleaners who look after engines in sheds.

**CORRESPONDENCE WITH HIS RELATIVES OF STATE PRISONER MR. MONORANJAN GUPTA.**

843. **\*Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if any order has been passed against the State Prisoner, Sj. Monoranjan Gupta by either (i) the Superintendent of Jail or (ii) by the Government of the province where he is confined, or (iii) by the Government of India, regarding his correspondence with his relatives?

(b) If so, will Government be pleased to state why such order has been passed and how long has it been in force, and when will it be withdrawn?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** I propose to answer questions Nos. 843 and 844 together.

I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given by me on the 21st February to Mr. Basanta Kumar Das's starred question No. 885. I may add that I have since been informed that two of the four State Prisoners have resumed correspondence with their relatives.

**STOPPAGE OF CORRESPONDENCE BY CERTAIN STATE PRISONERS.**

†844. **\*Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Are Government aware of the fact that the State Prisoners, Sjs. Monoranjan Gupta, Sjs. Bhupendra Kumar Dutta, Sjs. Satya Bhushan Gupta and Sjs. Arun Kumar Gupta have stopped all correspondence for over four or five months?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state if the relatives of the aforesaid State Prisoners had corresponded with the Political Department of the Government of Bengal, regarding the cause of their silence for over five months? If so, what reply was given by the authorities corresponded with?

(c) Do Government propose to hold an enquiry as to the cause of the silence of the aforesaid State Prisoners and inform this House of the result?

(d) Are Government prepared to advise the Government of Bombay to inform the relatives about the causes of their protracted silence?

(e) Will Government be pleased to state if the aforesaid State Prisoners are in correspondence now with their relatives? If not, do Government propose to withdraw the prohibitory order, if there be any, without delay and thereby relieve their relatives from anxiety?

(f) Will Government be pleased to state why the prohibitory orders against the State Prisoners were issued?

† For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 843.

**EXPIRY OF CONTRACT OF THE BENGAL AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.**

**845. \*Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha:** (a) Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways, please state when the contract of the Bengal and North Western Railway comes to an end?

(b) Will Government be pleased to lay a copy of the contract on the table?

(c) Do Government propose in the interests of the comforts and the conveniences of the travelling public to acquire the line as soon as the present contract terminates?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) Government has the option to terminate the contract on the 31st December, 1937, or failing that, on this 31st December, 1942, on giving 12 months notice.

(b) A copy of the contract is in the Library.

(c) The question whether the option of purchase in 1937 should be exercised will be taken up for consideration in the near future.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** What are the factors which Government usually take into consideration, in deciding whether to terminate the contract or not?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** One of the main considerations is the rate at which we can get the money required for the purchase.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Are questions concerning the conveniences of the travelling public also taken into consideration?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** Of course.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** What is the money that will be required for the purchase of this railway?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I think for the purchase of the Bengal and North Western and the Rohilkund Kumaon Railways together, it is about 12 million pounds or 16 crores of rupees.

**ABSORPTION OF THE PERMANENT STAFF IN THE MOODY-WARD SYSTEM ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

**846. \*Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether all the permanent staff, especially whose names appeared in the report of the Court of Enquiry demoted due to the abolition of the Crew System on the East Indian Railway have since been absorbed in the present Moody-Ward system? If not, when are they likely to be absorbed?

(b) Have all the above mentioned demoted staff now been restored to their old pay and grades, and allowed all the concessions already sanctioned?

(c) Have *ex-gratia* allowance sanctioned in lieu of mileage allowance now been paid to all the staff, especially the Travelling Ticket Inspectors

of Accounts Department, working as Head Ticket Collectors, etc., and on Station duty under the present Moody-Ward system? If not, when are they likely to be paid?

(d) Have all the retrenched staff, especially Travelling Ticket Inspectors of Accounts Department, due to the abolition of the Crew System now been absorbed? If not, when are they likely to be absorbed?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

**PRINTING THE NAMES OF TOWNS ABROAD ON THEIR PACKAGES BY FOREIGN FIRMS MANUFACTURING WITHIN THE TARIFF WALLS OF INDIA.**

847. **\*Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** Are Government aware that many foreign firms now manufacturing within the tariff walls in India, are still printing the names of towns abroad on their packages, and if so, what steps do Government propose to take to force the firms to print "made in India" on such articles?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply given by me to starred question No. 726 by Mr. S. Satyamurti on the 5th March, 1935.

**TRUST COMPANIES MANUFACTURING GOODS IN INDIA UNDER INDIAN NAMES.**

848. **\*Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** (a) Are Government aware that huge trust companies are manufacturing their goods in India under Indian names, and do Government propose to see that the names of the actual parent companies and the town and country of their incorporation are printed on each package, so that the public could plainly see whose goods they were purchasing?

(b) Will Government be pleased to lay a list of such firms and companies, and a classified list of the goods they manufacture, on the table?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** (a) Government have no information as to whether any Trust Companies manufacture their goods in India under Indian names but certain firms, although registered in India for the manufacture of various articles, are believed to be controlled and financed mainly by non-Indian capital. As regards the second portion of this part of the question, Government do not consider that the action suggested by the Honourable Member is necessary.

(b) No list is available but the attention of the Honourable Member is invited to table No. 8 of the publication "Joint Stock Companies in British India" which contain names of companies incorporated elsewhere than in India but which carry on business in the country and also shows the class or nature of trade handled by them. No detailed list of articles manufactured by such companies is available. Copies of this publication are in the Library of the Legislature.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** I was under the impression that under the Merchandise Marks Act, manufacturers have to show the places where the various things are manufactured. Why cannot Government enforce that?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** To the best of my recollection, that is not so. What the Merchandise Marks Act does insist upon is a correct description or designation; and if a correct description or designation is not given, those who are responsible can be prosecuted under the Act itself.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** That is just my point. For instance, take Gold Flake or cigarettes which are being manufactured in Bangalore or elsewhere. They put the place of origin as England or some other place, whereas they are being manufactured in India. That is surely not a correct description of those goods?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** I do not venture to express an opinion, because that is a legal question, but if that is so, then presumably they are open to prosecution under the Merchandise Marks Act.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalsai:** Is the Honourable Member aware that dealers mark goods as Indian when they are of foreign manufacture? What is the Honourable Member going to do about that?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** I do not know that, but, if that is the case, then obviously they lay themselves open to prosecution under the Merchandise Marks Act.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalsai:** As this disease is getting acute, may I suggest to the Honourable Member that they should insist that they should not only say that, it is made in India, but they should give a description to show that it is made in India?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** No, Sir, that is going rather too far, I think, but if my Honourable friend will bring to notice any specific cases in which according to him manufacturers or dealers are laying themselves open to a prosecution under this Act, I will see what action can be taken.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** In view of the fact that high tariffs are levied to protect Indian industries, will Government find out some means by which they can really protect Indian industries and stop these foreigners from coming to India under the protection of the tariff wall?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** My Honourable friend can make a suggestion about that.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** If I make a suggestion, will the Honourable Member carry it out?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** I will consider his suggestion.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** All right, wait and see. (Laughter.)

**ASSOCIATION OF ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY WITH THE INDIAN DEFENCE AND THE ARMY.**

**849. \*Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** (a) Is it a fact that Government have so far adopted no means whatsoever to secure any association by way of an advisory or consultative committee of elected members of the Legislative Assembly with:

(i) Indian Defence, and

(ii) Army?

(b) Are Government prepared to make a beginning in these directions?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** It is the practice of the Government to obtain the advice and assistance of Members of the Legislature on important questions of Army organisation and administration which are not of a wholly technical nature. I need only refer to the Auxiliary and Territorial Force Committee of 1924, the Indian Sandhurst Committee of 1925, the Indian Military College Committee of 1931 and the Army Retrenchment Committee of the same year, all of which contained a number of Members of the Legislature. There is also the Military Accounts Committee which considers the accounts of the Defence Services every year and contains as members two Members of the Public Accounts Committee of this House.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** Is it not a fact that there are at least two branches of Army Headquarters, the Quartermaster General's Branch and the Master General of Ordnance Branch which are wholly non-technical? Are we in any way associated with them in any consultative or advisory position?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I cannot admit that they are wholly non-technical. The M. G. O. Branch deals with very technical subjects indeed, such as the manufacture of all kinds of lethal weapons.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** What about the supply of clothes and things of that sort and contracts for supplies of provisions, etc.? Is not that within the province of the M. G. O.? And what about the Q. M. G.'s Branch where the only subject is provisions?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** There are certainly in both branches matters which can be described as non-technical: but there are also very technical matters in the Q. M. G.'s Branch which deals with mechanical transport and matters of that kind.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** Excluding the technical side, what about the non-technical side? In what way are we associated with the non-technical side of the army or defence?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I can only repeat what I have already said, that there is a Military Accounts Committee which goes into all questions of military expenditure, and, to that extent, the Legislature is connected with the army at the present moment.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** May I ask whether the attention of Government has been drawn to paragraph 176 of the Joint Parliamentary Committee's

Report where an advisory committee, of the nature that I have just now suggested, was really contemplated? They say:

"An advisory body similar to the Committee of Imperial Defence constituted at the Governor General's discretion would not be open to that criticism and would, we think, have many advantages."

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does the Honourable Member want to raise a debate on the question?

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali**: Not at all, Sir. I am simply asking a question and I want to know in what way we are associated with the defence and with the army of our country: are we only here just to discuss things in an airy way?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is not a matter for argument: the object now is to get information on facts.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali**: I am asking for information on facts: has the attention of Government been drawn to this paragraph that I have just now quoted?

**Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham**: Yes: I may say that that paragraph is partly the result of recommendations made by the Government of India.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali**: In that case, may I know what steps have Government taken to implement that advice in so far as the present Legislature is concerned?

**Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham**: I have already explained that, but the recommendations were made with reference to the new Constitution and not to the present Constitution.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali**: That is to say, under the present Constitution, we must be excluded entirely and absolutely even from the non-technical side?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would disallow that question.

**Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham**: Not at all.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti**: Apart from these *ad hoc* Committees, are Government considering any proposal to appoint Committees as have been appointed, with regard to other Departments of the Government of India?

**Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham**: They are not considering it at the present moment.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti**: May I know the reasons why they are not so considering associating some Members of this Legislature with the Department for which my Honourable friend is responsible in this House?

**Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham**: They are not considering it at the present moment, because, for certain special reasons, the Army Department, as I think Honourable Members will admit, is in a different position from



other Departments. I do not know of any Government in the world which has a Committee of the Legislature to advise it on military and defence policy. There is no such Committee in England so far as I am aware.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Can my Honourable friend give me any country in which the military budget swallows half the revenues of the country, and where the military budget is a sealed book to the Legislature?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** The defence budget does not absorb half the revenues of the country.

**ASSOCIATION OF ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY WITH EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (FOREIGN AND POLITICAL DEPARTMENT).**

850. **\*Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** (a) Is it a fact that Government have so far adopted no means whatsoever to secure any association by way of an advisory committee or consultative committee of elected members of the Legislative Assembly with external affairs (Foreign and Political Department)?

(b) Are Government prepared to make a beginning in this direction?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe:** (a) The fact is as stated by the Honourable Member.

(b) The answer is in the negative.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Why, Sir?

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** Has the attention of Government been drawn to a similar recommendation with regard to the Foreign Department?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe:** There is no such recommendation, I think, regarding the Foreign Department.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** Is it suggested that the foreign policy is in any way divorced from the defence of the country?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe:** I do not understand exactly what the Honourable Member wants from me as regards the question of fact.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** The question of fact is very simple: is the foreign policy of the Government in any way linked with the defence of the country or not? And if it is so, and we should form some sort of advisory committee for being associated with the defence of the country, are we or are we not also to be associated with foreign policy as well?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe:** I submit that that is not a question of fact, but a question of opinion.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** With regard to the answer to part (b), may I know what are the reasons why Government are not prepared to make a beginning in this direction?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe:** Probably because it is not understood what useful function such a committee could perform.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Has the Government considered the question at all, or are they merely making an *ex-cathedra* statement, that this Legislature does not contain any Members who may usefully advise them on such matters?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe:** I may say that this is an entirely new suggestion. At the time when the whole question was debated as regards setting up committees to assist the various departments, the Foreign, and, I think, also the Army Department were expressly excluded. That was accepted by the House and if the Honourable Member wishes to raise an entirely new question of policy I submit that a question and supplementaries are not the right way to do it.

#### BURDEN SHOULDERED BY INDIA OF DEFENDING THE EMPIRE.

851. **\*Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** (a) Is it a fact that Canada, South Africa and Australia have their own armies, and no British troops are maintained by them?

(b) Are these countries responsible for the defence of the Empire?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state why India has to shoulder the burden of defending the Empire in addition to the responsibility of defending her own frontiers?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** (a) Yes.

(b) To the extent that these portions of the Empire are responsible for their own defence against external aggression and for the maintenance of internal order they may be said to share in the defence of the Empire as a whole.

(c) India's position in this respect is the same as that of the three Dominions referred to.

The scale on which the military forces in India are maintained is no greater than is required for the defence of her frontiers against local aggression and the maintenance of internal security.

**Dr. G. V. Deshmukh:** With regard to the answer that British troops were stationed in South Africa, Australia and other places, did the British Government pay for them or did the colonies pay for them?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I must ask for notice of that question.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** What is the opinion to which my Honourable friend referred on the adequacy of the troops maintained? Is it the opinion of the Committee on Imperial Defence?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I referred to no opinion at all.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** My Honourable friend said that the scale on which the army is maintained here is adequate for the purposes of defending India's land frontiers: I am asking whose opinion this is.

**Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham:** That is the opinion of those who are responsible for the defence of the country.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Is it the opinion of the Committee of Imperial Defence?

**Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham:** Yes.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** What are the purposes for which the British troops are maintained in this country?

**Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham:** For the defence of the frontiers of India against external aggression and the maintenance of internal security.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Is it a fact that Indian troops cannot so defend India's frontiers?

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim):** That is arguing. Next question.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** May I put one question?

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim):** These are big questions of policy which cannot be debated on supplementary questions. The Chair cannot allow any further questions.

**PROMOTIONS TO THE POSTS IN HEADQUARTERS OFFICES OF THE  
TRANSPORTATION AND COMMERCIAL DEPARTMENTS.**

**852. \*Mr. Muhammad Ashar Ali:** With reference to the information laid on the table of this House on the 21st January, 1935, in reply to starred question No. 868 asked on the 6th August, 1934, will Government please state:

- (a) whether any promotions to the posts in Headquarters offices of the Transportation and Commercial Departments were made during the period 1st June, 1934 and 31st January, 1935;
- (b) whether any promotions to selection posts of Transportation and Commercial Inspectors were made during the said period in Divisional offices;
- (c) when and where the Selection Boards assembled;
- (d) what was the composition of the Selection Boards;
- (e) who were the candidates who appeared before the Selection Boards; and
- (f) who were the candidates eligible for the selection?

**Mr. P. B. Rao:** I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

**TICKET COLLECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

**853. \*Mr. Muhammad Ashar Ali:** Will Government please state:

- (a) whether there were Ticket Collectors posted at stations on the East Indian Railway prior to 1st June, 1931; and

- (b) what was their scale of pay, hours of employment, normal channel of promotion and the condition of accommodation provided for residence?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** Government regret that they are not prepared to conduct the exhaustive research into the history of the ticket checking system on the East Indian Railway which this question seems to call for.

#### NEW SYSTEM OF TICKET CHECKING.

**854. \*Mr. Muhammad Ashar AH:** Will Government please state whether under the new system of ticket checking every train is worked by two men as referred to in paragraph 48 on page 83 of the Report by the Railway Board on Indian Railways for 1931-32, Volume 7? If not, why not?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** So far as the Railway Board are aware, there has been no radical change in the system of ticket checking on the East Indian Railway. Circumstances may, however, arise necessitating the Divisional Superintendent concerned authorising a departure from the arrangement of having two men on each train.

#### MOVEMENTS OF A TOURIST CARRIAGE AND CERTAIN INSPECTION CARRIAGES ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

**855. \*Mr. Muhammad Ashar AH:** Will Government please state:

- (a) the movements of tourist carriage No. 5823 and inspection carriages Nos. 1994, 4884, and 2999 on the East Indian Railway between 7th and 12th February, 1935;
- (b) the purpose for which these carriages were hauled to a defunct station;
- (c) the number of persons who travelled therein;
- (d) the number of tickets or pass held by the travelling persons;
- (e) whether the pass was issued for the purposes of duty or privilege;
- (f) the days of halt at each station during the move;
- (g) the amount expended by the Railway Administration on the move of these carriages;
- (h) the amount recovered from the travelling public as the cost of the ticket; and the date of such revenues credited to accounts;
- (i) the amount of deficit between the amounts mentioned in parts (g) and (h); and
- (j) whether Government propose to withdraw the Inspection Carriages from the officers of the Operating and Commercial Departments and to see how far the deficit in revenues is made up; if not, why not?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) to (h). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to his unstarred question No. 115 on the 27th February, 1935. Apparently the allegation in this question is that private persons

were travelling in inspection carriages without tickets. I am asking the Agent to make enquiries into this allegation as well.

(i) Government have no reason at present to believe that these carriages were not used for inspection purposes, and there is no question of any deficit.

(j) No. Government consider that inspection carriages are necessary for efficient supervision.

**METHOD FOR THE REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES OF THE RAILWAY STAFF.**

856. \*Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali: (a) Has the attention of the Governor-General in Council been invited towards minute No. E. M. W/Sect/34, dated the 16th October, 1934, of the Divisional Superintendent, East Indian Railway, Allahabad, reading:

"Your No. O. P. E-370 of 5-10-34.

With reference to your above, this man was re-instated because he was acquitted by the High Court. He was discharged under my powers in terms of his agreement. The question of his subsequent discharge is a matter that is under the discretionary powers of my office. No appeal from this man lies to you as he was discharged by my Superintendent staff.

(Sd.) R. E. RUTHERFORD."

(b) What is the method for the aggrieved staff to have their grievance redressed by the Agent?

Mr. P. B. Rao: I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

Mr. Lalchand Naikalai: I think the Honourable Member can reply to part (b) of this question without sending for the information.

Mr. P. B. Rao: No, Sir, I want to know the circumstances of each case.

**DRAFT INSTRUMENTS OF INSTRUCTIONS TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL AND THE GOVERNORS.**

857. \*Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena: Were the Government of India consulted about the draft Instruments of Instructions to the Governor General and Governors? If so, will Government be pleased to state if it was approved by them?

The Honourable Sir Kripendra Sircar: The reply to the first part is in the affirmative. As regards the second part of the question it cannot be answered by 'yes' or 'no' and to give an answer which will not be misleading, it will involve disclosing contents of Government of India's confidential correspondence which in public interest, I regret, I am unable to do.

**CENTRAL PUBLICITY BUREAU OF THE INDIAN STATE RAILWAYS.**

858. \*Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: (a) Will Government be pleased to state when the Central Publicity Bureau of the Indian State Railways was established?

(b) What is the nature of the activities undertaken by this Bureau?

(c) What is the expenditure on the same, year by year?

(d) Is any benefit from its activities derived by Railways other than the Indian State Railways? If so, is any contribution made by such Railways towards its expenses?

(e) What has been the additional traffic since its establishment?

(f) Are Government in a position to give separate figures in regard to tourists' traffic after the establishment of the Bureau, and if so, how do they compare with this kind of traffic previous to the establishment of the Bureau?

(g) What steps have been taken by the Bureau in the direction of collaboration with similar Tourists' Agencies and Bureaus in other countries?

(h) What are the results of such efforts?

(i) Do any other public bodies, like the Municipalities, Local Boards, Provincial Governments or the commerce and trade of the country derive any benefit out of its activities?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) 1st March, 1927.

(b) A full statement of the activities of the Bureau is contained in a statement placed before the Standing Finance Committee for Railways in May, 1928, which will be found at page 36 of their proceedings, Vol. V, No. 1. Briefly, these cover the production and distribution of publicity pamphlets and posters, publication of the *Indian State Railways' Magazine*, press and other publicity advertising in all parts of the world and co-ordination of action as between Railways for the running of excursion trains, demonstration trains and bazaar special trains.

(c) I am placing on the table a statement showing the gross expenditure from 1927-28 to 1933-34.

(d) The reply to the first part is in the affirmative, but the exact proportion is difficult to assess with any accuracy. As regards the second part, the only Railway contributing is the Mysore Railways.

(e), (f) and (h). It has not been found practicable to ascertain, with any approach to reasonable approximation, what additional traffic has accrued to Railways as a result of the activities of the Bureau. A full explanation of the difficulties of making an estimate will be found in the foreword to the Annual Report of the Bureau for 1933-34, a copy of which is in the Library of the House. The estimate made by the Central Publicity Officer is that on the average each tourist spends over Rs. 2,000 on railway fares, hotel charges, sight seeing and purchases. The railway fares included are estimated at under Rs. 500.

(g) This Bureau has been collaborating with other travel agencies and bureaux by arranging for the distribution of publicity material, such as pamphlets and posters.

(i) To the extent that foreign tourist traffic is encouraged and stimulated by the activities of this Bureau, it is obvious that other public bodies do benefit thereby.

*Statement.*

(In thousands of rupees.)

|                             |       |
|-----------------------------|-------|
| 1927-28 . . . . .           | 4.28  |
| 1928-29 . . . . .           | 7.19  |
| 1929-30 . . . . .           | 40.46 |
| 1930-31 . . . . .           | 10.31 |
| 1931-32 . . . . .           | 6.37  |
| 1932-33 . . . . .           | 5.02  |
| 1933-34 . . . . .           | 5.17  |
| 1934-35 (Revised) . . . . . | 5.03  |
| 1935-36 (Budget) . . . . .  | 5.54  |

(The above figures represent gross expenditure and do not take into account receipts.)

**Mr. B. Das:** Will the Honourable Member kindly say what is the special necessity of giving so many allowances to the Central Publicity Officer of Railways?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** May I know what allowances my friend refers to?

**Mr. B. Das:** The allowance for editing papers and the special allowance of Rs. 500?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does that arise out of this question?

**Mr. B. Das:** Yes, Sir.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): From which part of the question?

**Mr. B. Das:** Expenditure.

**Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji:** Are Government satisfied that the outlay on this Bureau is justified by the results?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I think, from the fact that they are proposing to continue the Bureau on the present scale of expenditure, my friend can take it that Government are satisfied that this expenditure is justified.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Is this Bureau expected to give any suggestions to third class passengers as to how to use the carriages, to whom to complain in case of overcrowding and things like that?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I am afraid that is not part of its functions.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Will Government consider that suggestion?

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** May I ask if the Government of India cannot make an estimate of the traffic which they attract by means of this Central Bureau, specially by the Bureaux kept abroad, how can they say that they are satisfied with the results,—I should like to know.

**Mr. P. E. Rau:** An estimate has been made and the results will be found in the Annual Report of the Bureau, a copy of which is in the Library of the House.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Is it not a fact that this Bureau is expected to serve the convenience of both the railways as well as the passengers?

**Mr. P. E. Rau:** The functions of the Bureau are contained in the answer given already.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Will Government consider the desirability . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question, please.

#### EXPORT OF INDIAN PIECEGOODS TO PERSIA.

859. **\*Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the reports in the press regarding restrictions on the importation of piecegoods into Persia?

(b) Have Government obtained, officially, particulars of the reported arrangements in regard to such imports? If so, will Government be pleased to lay them on the table?

(c) What action have Government taken, or propose to take, to safeguard the Indian exporters of piecegoods into that country?

(d) Have Government considered the question of a trade arrangement with that country?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Honourable Member is referred to page 166 of the *Indian Trade Journal*, dated the 11th October, 1934, which contains the required information. Copies of the Journal are received in the Library of the Legislature.

(c) and (d). The matter is under the consideration of Government.

**Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji:** Will Government be pleased to consult the business community?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** Yes, Sir; if I mistake not, I think such reference has already been made.

#### PROTECTION TO THE GLASS INDUSTRY.

860. **\*Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) what action they propose to take in regard to the question of protection to the glass industry; and

(b) when the report of the Tariff Board on the industry may be expected to be published?



**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** (a) and (b). I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the answers given to Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant's question No. 851 and the connected supplementary questions on the 20th February.

**Mr. B. Das:** Did not the Honourable Member say that Government would take action shortly?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** Yes, Sir. I hope that Government's decision will be taken shortly.

**Mr. B. Das:** Will the Report of the Tariff Board also be published at the same time?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** I would refer my friend to the replies I gave to the connected supplementary questions.

#### REPORT OF THE TARIFF BOARD ON THE HEALDS AND REEDS INDUSTRY.

861. **\*Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji:** (a) Has the report of the Tariff Board on the healds and reeds industry been submitted to Government?

(b) Is so, what date, and as to when Government propose to publish the same?

(c) Do Government propose to announce their plans in regard to protection to this industry?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** (a) to (c). The Report of the Tariff Board regarding the Healds and Reeds Industry was submitted in June, 1934, and is under consideration at present.

#### IMPORT DUTY ON WHEAT.

862. **\*Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji:** (a) Have Government received representations for the continuance of the import duty on wheat, which will expire with the current financial year?

(b) If so, will Government be pleased to state what they propose to do in the matter?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** (a) and (b). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given to Sardar Sant Singh's starred question No. 467 on the 26th February, 1935.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** There was no reply to that question. The reply was, I think, "wait and see".

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** My friend will get a very satisfactory reply in the course of the next day or two.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** Thank you.

### ITALIAN DELEGATION IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROPOSED TRADE NEGOTIATIONS.

963. \*Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: (a) When is the Italian delegation in connection with the proposed trade negotiations expected in India?

(b) Will representatives of Indian commercial opinion be associated in these discussions?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** (a) No date has yet been fixed for the commencement of the negotiations.

(b) Representative Indian commercial opinion will in due course be consulted on any matter in which it is concerned.

**Mr. Sami Vencatachalam Chetty:** Are Government aware that in Italy many Indian Insurance Companies cannot carry on their business?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** I should like to have notice of that question.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Will agricultural interests also be given an opportunity to make their representations to the Government of India when the Italian Delegation visits this country?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** Does my friend mean himself?

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** No, Sir. I want to know whether agricultural interests will be given an opportunity to make their representations to the Government of India.

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** Yes, I shall not be here myself, but so far as I am concerned, I certainly think that agricultural interests should be consulted.

### GOVERNMENT ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CONGRESS ORGANISATIONS.

964. \*Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: (a) Will Government be pleased to state their present attitude towards the Congress organisation throughout the country?

(b) Are Local Governments expected to follow the Government of India in the matter mentioned in part (a) above?

(c) Have Government issued any instructions to the various Local Governments on the subject?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** (a) to (c). The views of Government in regard to the Congress, since the suspension of civil disobedience, were stated in the Communiqué issued by the Government of India on the 6th June, 1934. The Government of India are satisfied that Local Governments have given and are giving effect to the policy there stated, and further instructions to them are not needed in this matter.

**Mr. Ram Narayan Singh:** We know as a fact that in certain parts of the country the Government people are obstructing the Congress organisations. In the district of Singhbhum, Government officials cannot bear the sight of a Gandhi cap.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What is the question of the Honourable Member?

**Mr. Ram Narayan Singh:** I put the question now. (Laughter.) Who is responsible for this? Is it the Government of India, or the Government of Bihar, or the official concerned?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Orskine:** I understand that the Honourable Member's allegation is that certain Government officials cannot bear the sight of Congress workers . . . .

**Mr. Ram Narayan Singh:** No, no. I said, Gandhi caps. In the district of Singhbhum, Government officials cannot bear the sight of Gandhi caps. Who is responsible for this attitude?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Orskine:** Perhaps, the people who wear the Gandhi caps. (Laughter.)

#### NON-RESERVATION OF INTERMEDIATE CLASS COMPARTMENTS IN MAIL TRAINS FOR THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

865. **\*Mr. Muhammad Asrar Ali:** Is it a fact that the Railway authorities to the inconvenience of the travelling public do reserve intermediate class compartments in mail trains for Railway Mail Service in addition to the scheduled accommodation? If so, will Government please state:

- (a) whether any such accommodation was reserved on the 18th February, 1935 by Frontier Mail ex-Delhi to Peshawar;
- (b) the number of compartments converted on that date; and
- (c) the total number of intermediate class compartments on that train?

**Mr. P. E. Rau:** Additional accommodation for the carriage of mails is occasionally requisitioned by the Railway Mail Service. Intermediate class compartments are provided in compliance with such requisitions only on those trains on which there is no third class accommodation. Government are informed that this is done without causing inconvenience to the travelling public.

- (a) Yes, but only from Delhi to Lahore.
- (b) One compartment of eight seats and another of nine seats.
- (c) Fifteen compartments with seats for 117 passengers.

**MILEAGE ALLOWANCE PAID TO THE OLD TRAVELLING TICKET INSPECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

866. \*Mr. Muhammad Ashar Ali: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors of the Accounts Department on the East Indian Railway were paid mileage allowance which unlike all other forms of travelling allowances, was treated as pay for all practical purposes?

(b) Is it a fact that emoluments on which income-tax is assessed are considered as pay under Fundamental Rule 9 (21) (iii)?

(c) Is it a fact that under Fundamental Rule 15 the pay of an employee cannot be reduced save in cases of inefficiency or misbehaviour?

(d) Is it a fact that it was on the consideration of Fundamental Rules 9 (21) (iii) and 15 that Sirdar Bishen Singh on transfer from the cadre of Travelling Ticket Examiner to that of Special Ticket Examiner on the North Western Railway was given the benefit of 75 per cent. increase on pay and his pay was fixed as Rs. 140 against Rs. 80 which he was drawing as a Travelling Ticket Examiner in addition to mileage allowance?

(e) Is it a fact that on reversion as a Travelling Ticket Examiner he was again brought down to Rs. 80, plus mileage allowance?

(f) Is it a fact that once again he was transferred as Special Ticket Examiner and his pay was again raised from Rs. 80 to Rs. 140?

(g) If the reply to parts (a) to (e) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether other such employees have been given the benefit of 75 per cent. addition? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Yes, up to the end of May, 1931. These allowances up to a limit of 75 per cent. of pay proper were treated as pay for the purpose of leave salary, provident fund and gratuity.

(b) Fundamental Rule 9 (21) a(iii) lays down that pay includes any other emoluments which may be specially classified as pay by the Governor General in Council. This has no bearing on assessment to income-tax which is based under the Income-tax Act, 1922 (XI of 1922).

(c) Yes.

(d), (e) (f) and (g). Government have no information, but are making enquiries.

Mr. Muhammad Ashar Ali: Is it likely that we shall receive a reply during the present Session?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am sorry I am unable to say.

**MILEAGE ALLOWANCE GIVEN TO THE OLD TRAVELLING TICKET INSPECTORS OF THE EAST INDIAN AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAYS.**

867. \*Mr. Muhammad Ashar Ali: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that mileage allowance was given to the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors of the East Indian and North Western Railways for the hard life that they had to lead and for discharging the duties of responsibility dealing with money matters as acknowledged by the Chief

Operating Superintendent, East Indian Railway, in his Report on the Experimental Working of the Crew system, dated the 5th January, 1928, page 47?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state in what respects they do not justify the above conditions now to warrant the abolition of the mileage allowance?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) Government have not been able readily to trace the origin of this practice. In the passage, which has been imperfectly quoted by the Honourable Member, Mr. Harris gave only his conjectures.

(b) The reasons for the withdrawal of the allowance have already been explained by me on various occasions in this House.

#### CONSOLIDATED TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

868. \*Mr. Muhammad Ashar Ali: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that consolidated travelling allowance can be drawn all the year round, irrespective of a subordinate leaving his headquarter, as laid down under Government Supplementary Rule No. 22?

(b) If the reply to part (a) above be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state why the Agent, East Indian Railway, has denied this *ex-gratia* allowance to the employees who are posted on permanent station duty, as stated in this House in reply to starred question No. 488, dated the 7th August, 1934?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) Yes, but the essential condition for the grant of a permanent monthly travelling allowance is that the duties of the Government servant to whom it is granted require him to travel extensively.

(b) A monthly travelling allowance can be withdrawn by a competent authority if there is a change in the duties and the Government servant is not required to travel extensively.

#### CONSOLIDATED ALLOWANCE SANCTIONED FOR THE TRAVELLING TICKET INSPECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

869. \*Mr. Muhammad Ashar Ali: (a) With reference to the reply to starred question No. 488, dated the 7th August, 1934, laid on the table of this House on the 29th January, 1935, will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the *ex-gratia* consolidated allowance sanctioned for the Travelling Ticket Inspectors on the East Indian Railway, under the authority of His Excellency the Governor General in Council was intended for those employees who drew mileage allowance?

(b) Is it a fact that it was granted in consideration of the heavy loss sustained by the employees due to the abolition of mileage allowance?

(c) If the reply to part (b) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state in what respects this *ex-gratia* sanction has compensated those employees who had suffered a heavy loss in their emoluments due

to the abolition of mileage allowance and are denied this allowance when posted on permanent station duty?

(d) If it has compensated only one class, how do Government propose to accord consideration in respect of the others who have suffered equally a heavy loss, due to the abolition of mileage allowance, *vis.*, those posted on permanent station duty?

(e) Will Government be pleased to state if the orders of the Railway Board conveying the decision of His Excellency the Governor General in Council contained any such restriction in respect of the staff posted on permanent station duty? If so, will Government be pleased to lay a copy of the orders on the table of this House?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) to (c) and (e). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given to question No. 476 asked by Sardar Sant Singh on the 7th September, 1933, and to question No. 839, by Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya, to which I replied this morning.

(d) The allowance is a consolidated travelling allowance and the Government do not see any reason to grant travelling allowance to staff permanently transferred to stationary posts.

#### INAUGURATION OF A SIMLA TIME LIKE THE DELHI TIME.

870. **Mr. Muhammad Ashar Ali:** (a) Will Government please state whether on their move to Simla they propose to consider the inauguration of a Simla Time like the Delhi Time?

(b) Will Government kindly state what benefits they have derived from having summer time during the winter months and standard-time during the summer in Delhi?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** (a) The answer is in the negative.

(b) Delhi time was not introduced to benefit Government. Its object was to enable people to make greater use of the hours of daylight when the days were at their shortest.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** May I ask whether it is the intention of Government to introduce in various towns various local times in order to cause confusion as regards time tables, and so on?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** That question seems to me to contain arguments and inferences.

**Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** Are Government aware that the inauguration of the Delhi time has caused a lot of inconvenience to Members here?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** Not that I am aware of. On the other hand, I believe that it has generally been approved.

**Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** Is it not a fact that the Delhi time was introduced in order to enable Honourable Members to play tennis in the evenings . . . .

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim):** Order, order. It contains a personal reflection.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** May I ask whether the time of the Legislative Assembly was changed according to the wishes of the President?

**An Honourable Member:** There was no President at that time.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** May I know whether the Government of India had consulted the President before they changed the time?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Graft:** There was no President when the change was made.

#### ALLEGATIONS AGAINST SOME RAILWAY OFFICIALS AT TUNDLA.

871. **\*Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the "Allahabad notes" on page 4 of the *Masdoor* of Patna in its issue of the 28th May, 1934, regarding the so-called "Unholy alliance" of Mr. Marcon with a Deputy Controller? If so, have the authorities made any enquiries regarding the conduct of that Deputy Controller and Mr. Marcon? If so, with what result? If not, why not?

(b) Is it a fact that Mr. Marcon invariably consulted the said Deputy Controller regarding all questions of transfers and punishments to the Tundla subordinate staff? If so, in what capacity?

(c) Is it a fact that the said Deputy Controller carried on extensive motor business and often ran lotteries and raffles in Tundla? Had Mr. Marcon any share or interest in these concerns?

(d) Is it a fact that several articles belonging to Mr. Marcon, like the oil fan, cameras, etc., were raffled at Tundla by that Deputy Controller? If so, under what rules and under whose authority?

(e) Under whose names are the lorries Nos. 1887 and 1888 registered in Agra?

(f) Are Railway servants permitted to run extensive business in the name of their wives? If not, what action, if any, do Government propose to take against people who are doing business in the aforesaid manner?

**Mr. P. B. Rao:** (a) Government have not seen the article referred to.

(b) Government are informed that this is not a fact.

(c) and (e). Government have no information but they are making enquiries.

(d) Government are informed that it is not a fact that several articles belonging to Mr. Marcon were raffled at Tundla by a Deputy Controller. A camera was raffled by Mr. Marcon in June, 1933. Government have received no complaints that railway subordinates were forced to take tickets.

(f) The reply to the first part of the question is in the negative. As regards the second part, any case, in which it is alleged that existing orders have been contravened, will be decided with due regard to the circumstances of the case.

#### ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE DIVISIONAL SUPERINTENDENT, ALLAHABAD.

872. \*Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal: (a) Are Government aware that the present Divisional Superintendent, Allahabad, and some of his senior assistants are very fond of shooting and spend weeks together in this pastime at roadside stations?

(b) Is it further a fact that for the sake of this pleasure, all responsible work regarding the cases of subordinate staff is left to junior officials, particularly to Mr. Maroon?

(c) Are Government aware of the great discontent on this score in the Allahabad Division of the East Indian Railway? If not, do Government propose to enquire into the matter?

Mr. P. B. Ran: (a) Government are informed that the present Divisional Superintendent and some of his senior Assistants are fond of shooting. But it is not a fact that they spend weeks together in this pastime at road side stations.

(b) Government are informed that this is not a fact.

(c) The reply to the first part is in the negative, and the second part does not arise.

Mr. Lalchand Navarai: May I know, if it is not weeks, how many days they employ in this shooting?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: In view of the fact that I myself invited the present Divisional Superintendent and others to Etawah to have a shooting I can verify from personal experience that they spend a good part of their time in disposing of the office files and attend to cases and may I ask if that is not the case with officers in other Departments? Executive officers, while touring, combine shooting with work.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is not a question.

Mr. M. S. Anay: May I know what is the question of the Honourable Member?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: My question is, is not what I have said a fact? (Laughter.)

#### ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE DIVISIONAL SUPERINTENDENT, ALLAHABAD.

873. \*Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal: (a) Are Government prepared to enquire if allowances are charged by the present Divisional Superintendent of Allahabad even for days spent in shooting only?

(b) Is any record kept of the work done by these officers when out on the line? If not, why not?



**Mr. P. B. Rau:** Government are making enquiries and a reply will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

# **RUNNING OF MOTOR LORRY BUSINESS BY RAILWAY OFFICIALS.**

**874. \*Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Is it a fact that even the timings of local trains are arranged on the advice of Deputy Controllers?

(b) Are Government prepared to enquire whether some Deputy Controllers run their own lorries and are interested, in suggesting timings suited to their own trade?

(c) Are Government aware that the Railways have been losing heavily on account of motor lorry competition? If so, why are Railway servants permitted to run this trade privately?

(d) Is it a fact that a lorry No. 1465 is registered at Agra in the name of Deo Dutt Sharma, who is a relieving Assistant Station Master in Allahabad Division?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) No.

(b) The timings of trains are arranged by the Chief Operating Superintendent, East Indian Railway, and these are discussed with the Local Advisory Committees. Government are not aware of any railway servant running a lorry service.

(c) Government are aware that the earnings of Railways have been affected by motor competition. The second part of the question does not arise.

(d) Government have no information. I am, however, sending a copy of the Honourable Member's question to the Agent of the East Indian Railway, for such action as he may consider necessary.

# **RAILWAY MAGISTRATES AT TUNDLA.**

**875. \*Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) How many Railway Magistrates are there at Tundla?

(b) Are they allowed first class passes with two servants each on the whole division? If so, why?

(c) What are their duties?

(d) What is the number of Railway cases at Tundla?

(e) Is it a fact that some of these Magistrates are zamindars?

(f) What are the educational qualifications of the zamindar of Dhirpura and the zamindar of Mohamdsabad?

(g) What are the qualifications for which they have been appointed Railway Magistrates?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) So far as Government have been able to ascertain there are no magistrates dealing purely with railway cases; but a bench of four honorary magistrates has been constituted by the District Magistrate to deal with railway as well as other cases.

(b) Government are informed that they have been allowed first class passes, which ordinarily include two servants, over the Allahabad Division in connection with their duties pertaining to the railway.

(c) I presume the duties are those ordinarily entrusted to Magistrates.

(d) Approximately thirty-five per mensem.

(e) I understand one of these Magistrates is a Zamindar.

(f) and (g). Government have no information, I would remind the Honourable Member that these appointments are made under the authority of the Local Government and not by the railway.

#### **RUNNING OF A SHOP IN RAILWAY QUARTERS AT TUNDLA BY A RAILWAY MAGISTRATE.**

876. \*Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal: (a) Is it a fact that one of the Railway Magistrates at Tundla, who is a wine merchant, has also been permitted to establish a shop in railway quarters? If so, under what rules?

(b) Are Government prepared to make an enquiry into the whole affair?

(c) Does this man compete with the local Co-operative Stores?

(d) Have any representations been made by the Co-operative Stores regarding the competition forced on the stores by the fact that the railway Magistrate can import his wares free of railway fare?

(e) What action, if any, has been taken to stop this loss to the stores and other merchants of the place?

(f) Is it a fact, that his shop has been fitted with electricity at the cost of Railway? If so, why?

(g) Does this gentleman cater for the railway officers, when they go on shooting trips?

Mr. P. B. Rao: (a) One of the Honorary Magistrates is a general merchant and occupies a railway building rented to him under the rules of the Administration.

(b) If my Honourable friend will indicate on what point he suggests an enquiry, I shall consider it.

(c) Possibly, as his line of business is the same as that of the Co-operative Stores.

(d) Government are informed that the Co-operative Stores did submit a representation but it has not suggested that the competition is unfair or that stores are imported free of railway freight charges.

(e) None.

(f) All railway buildings in Tundla are electrically fitted.

(g) I understand the reply to this is in the negative.

#### **PROVISION OF AN ASSISTANT SURGEON IN THE RAILWAY HOSPITAL AT TUNDLA.**

877. \*Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal: (a) Is it a fact that Tundla is purely a Railway colony, having only one hospital which is a Railway hospital?

(b) Is it also a fact that the entire work in this hospital is in the hands of Sub-Assistant Surgeons, and there is not a single Assistant Surgeon either in the town or in the hospital, and the District Medical Officer of Tundla has to look after a whole district which has a number of smaller dispensaries, and has therefore to be out several days in the month?

(c) Do Government propose to order the provision of at least one competent and qualified Assistant Surgeon at Tundla?

**Mr. P. E. Rau:** I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

#### VENDORS AT THE TUNDLA RAILWAY STATION.

878. \***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Is it a fact that formerly retired railway servants were allotted vendorships at railway stations as a sort of help to them after retirement?

(b) Has this practice now been stopped? If so, why?

(c) On what principles are vendorships offered to outsiders now?

(d) How many retired railway-men and how many outsiders are vendors, at present, at Tundla?

(e) Why have outsiders been appointed in such large numbers?

**Mr. P. E. Rau:** I presume the Honourable Member's question refers to the East Indian Railway. If so, the replies are as follows:

(a) Yes.

(b) Retired railway servants are not debarred from being given a vending contract if they are considered fit, but the main question is whether they have the necessary qualification to do the work satisfactorily.

(c) Financial standing, reliability and experience.

(d) There are at present 18 vendors, three of whom are retired railway servants.

(e) It is believed that those who have been selected are in a position to give a better service.

#### PAYMENT MADE BY VENDORS AT THE TUNDLA RAILWAY STATION TO THE DOCTORS AND OFFICERS.

879. \***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Is it a fact that all the vendors at Tundla station have to pay a certain sum of money every month to the railway doctors and the railway officers? If so, how much?

(b) On what principles and under what orders are the amounts fixed?

(c) Under what head is the amount shown?

(d) Is there any limit to the monthly payment, or is it arbitrary?

(e) Are contracts given to the highest bidders?

(f) How much do the East Indian Railway realise every year in this manner?

(g) How is this income shown in the railway budget?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) Government are informed that this allegation is unfounded.

(b), (c) and (d). Do not arise.

(e) No.

(f) The Agent, East Indian Railway, states that the amount received at Tundla during 1934-35, in accordance with the schedule of hawking fees payable, was Rs. 2,200.

(g) It is credited to miscellaneous earnings.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** In view of the general complaints that if any misunderstanding arises between a railway officer and a doctor, then there is no remedy, why should not railway authorities accept the certificates of doctors belonging to the civil hospitals?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I could not follow the Honourable Member's question. Remedy for whom?

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** My question was, why should not the railway authorities accept certificates from doctors belonging to the civil hospitals?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** That question does not arise at all.

**Mr. Ram Narayan Singh:** Did the Honourable Member make an inquiry into the allegations?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** An inquiry into the matter was made by the Agent, who has reported that the allegations are quite unfounded.

#### RATES OF PAY AND OTHER PRIVILEGES OF CERTAIN APPRENTICES OF STATE RAILWAYS.

890. **\*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** (a) Will Government please state whether paid apprentices who were in the service of State Railways before the 15th July, 1931, are entitled to the privileges accruing under Railway Board notification No. 807-E. G./111, dated the 21st December, 1933?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, are Government aware that certain apprentices who joined the East Indian Railway before the 15th July, 1931, as paid apprentices, have been engaged on the revised rates of pay?

(c) Are Government aware that an appeal from the men affected has been submitted through the proper channel?

(d) Do Government propose to inquire into this matter and see that the notifications issued by the Railway Board and the interpretations placed by them on these notifications are not ignored but are given full effect to by the respective Railway Administrations?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** Enquiries are being made and a reply will be laid on the table in due course.

**APPOINTMENT OF PASSED APPRENTICES OF THE JAMALPUR WORKSHOPS AS FITTERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

**881. \*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** (a) Will Government please state whether it is a fact that the Railway Board has introduced a rule to the effect that only those apprentices who have passed through Jamalpur Workshops should be engaged as Fitters on the East Indian Railway?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government please state the date of this order?

(c) Are Government aware that there are employed to-day apprentices who were trained in other shops and Running Sheds of the East Indian Railway before the introduction of this rule?

(d) Are Government aware that the introduction of this rule seriously prejudices the chances for promotion and advancement of the apprentices trained in the other shops of the East Indian Railway who are still in the service of the Railway?

(e) Do Government propose to exempt these apprentices from the operation of the rule regarding the employment of Jamalpur apprentices?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) No.

(b), (d) and (e). Do not arise.

(c) So far as Government are aware, there are employees on the East Indian Railway who have been trained in other shops.

**EXEMPTION OF THE EMPLOYEES OF THE OLD EAST INDIAN RAILWAY COMPANY FROM THE OPERATION OF THE REVISED RULES ABOUT QUARTERS AND HOUSE ALLOWANCE.**

**882. \*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** (a) Will Government please state whether or not they are bound by the agreement the servants of the old East Indian Railway Company entered into with the Secretary of State for India when the State took over the management of the East Indian Railway?

(b) Is it a fact that this agreement states that "the pay and allowances will be regulated in all respects by the rules and conditions of the East Indian Railway as they stood on the 31st December, 1924"?

(c) Is it a fact that according to the old East Indian Railway Company rules, servants who held supervising grade appointments were entitled to free quarters or house rent allowance in lieu?

(d) Is it a fact that according to Railway Board letter No. 5001-F., dated the 12th May, 1934, addressed to the Agent, East Indian Railway, free quarters or house allowance in lieu thereof are to be given only to those who have held a "post which carried the privilege of rent free quarters or house allowance" in a substantive capacity prior to the date of the introduction of the revised rule, viz. 1st October, 1932?

(e) Are Government aware of the fact that there is a growing apprehension in the minds of the old East Indian Railway Company servants

that the agreement entered into by them with the Secretary of State for India at the time of the transfer of management of the East Indian Railway in 1924 is being ignored by the Administration?

(f) Are Government aware that several appeals on this matter have been submitted through the proper channel?

(g) Do Government propose, acting in accordance with the assurances of the Government, to exempt the servants of the old East Indian Railway Company from the operation of the revised rule regarding quarters and House allowance? If not, why not?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) It is unnecessary for me to say that all agreements entered into by Government, whether with the old East Indian Railway Company employees or with any body else, are binding on Government.

(b) In the Memorandum of terms and conditions offered in 1924 to the employees of the old East Indian Railway Company it was stated that the pay and allowances of the employees would be regulated by the existing rules and conditions of the East Indian Railway Company. It was also stated that the rules in force on State Railways as regards house rent would be applied.

(c) Certain classes of employees are allowed rent-free quarters; and if no quarter is available house rent allowance is granted.

(d) Yes. I should add that, on a further representation, the concession was extended to non-gazetted employees who were appointed in a temporary capacity, on or before the date of introduction of the revised rent rules, solely on account of the embargo on permanent appointments and who would, but for that embargo, have been appointed permanently.

(e) No. If there is any such apprehension, it is unfounded.

(f) No appeals from the staff have been received by the Railway Board though certain communications purporting to come from some of the railway staff were received.

(g) No. As I have already stated it was one of the conditions on which they were taken over that they would come under the State Railway Rent Rules.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** In regard to the Honourable Member's reply, I think, to part (c) of the question, will he kindly inform the House when these rules were issued granting free quarters to certain employees?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** That is the reply to (d). I am afraid I do not know the exact date.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** With regard to the Honourable Member's reply to (f), will he state whether or not it is a fact that he cannot receive appeals from railway servants as it is against Railway Board appeal rules, and, therefore, it will be impossible for him to receive such appeals? Has the Honourable Member received any appeals through the various Agents in this matter?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I do not remember any.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Will the Honourable Member be good enough to ascertain from Agents whether this is a burning question among the staff, as he knows it is, for I have brought it to his notice myself?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I shall make the necessary inquiries, Sir.

**VIOLATION BY A RAILWAY ADMINISTRATION OF THE PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING THE NOTIFICATIONS OF THE RAILWAY BOARD.**

**883. \*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Taking into consideration the limitations of the present appeal rules, will Government please state the procedure to be adopted in cases where there is a distinct violation by a Railway Administration of the principles underlying the notifications issued by the Railway Board?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** This is a hypothetical question. Government have not laid down any rules as to the procedure to be adopted in such a contingency which in their opinion is most unlikely. They have impressed on Railway administrations the necessity of adhering strictly to the substantial principles underlying the discharge and dismissal rules.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Are Government aware of the fact that in many cases appeals from subordinates are not forwarded to the proper authorities in accordance with the Railway Board appeal rules?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** Government are not aware of this.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Will Government be good enough to make inquiries, particularly from the Agent of the East Indian Railway?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** If the Honourable Member brings specific instances to my notice, then I shall take the necessary steps.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Will the Honourable Member state categorically on the floor of this House that representations have not come to him from any Agent, regarding the unrest and the apprehension in the minds of the people on the question of the appeal rules?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I am afraid I do not understand the question.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Let me explain to the Honourable Member. Will the Honourable Member be good enough to state whether or not it is a fact that many appeals have been made by the staff to Railway Agents which have not been sent to the Railway Board?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I am not aware of any appeals which should have been sent to the Railway Board that have been withheld by the Agent.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Is it not a fact that the Honourable Member in charge of the Department of Commerce and Railways stated on the floor of this House that appeals will not be regarded as mere scraps of paper, or words to that effect?

**Mr. P. B. Rao:** If appeals lie to Government under the appeal rules, they will certainly be looked into

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** May I ask. . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

**PROCEDURE IN RESPECT OF DISCHARGE, DISMISSAL, ETC., OF THE SUBORDINATE EMPLOYEES OF THE OLD EAST INDIAN RAILWAY COMPANY.**

**894. \*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** (a) Will Government please state whether Rule XIV of the Civil Services in India, framed by the Secretary of State in Council under sub-section (2) of section 96-B of the Government of India Act, 1919, and issued in Notification No. F.472-II-28, dated the 21st June, 1924, was applicable, on and from the 1st January, 1925, to those subordinate employees of the East Indian Railway Company who were given service by the Railway Board when Government took over the management from the East Indian Railway Company?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government please state up to what period this rule was applicable to such employees?

(c) If the answer to part (a) be in the negative, will Government please state what rules regulated the procedure in cases of dismissal, removal or reduction of those subordinate employees in 1925, 1926, 1927, 1928 and 1929 when orders were issued by the Railway Board in their letter No. 4060-E., dated the 15th November, 1929?

(d) Is it a fact that the Railway Board's order, No. 4060-E., dated the 15th November, 1929, governed the procedure in respect of discharge and dismissal only, and if so, will Government please state what rules governed the removal or reduction of an employee from a post?

**Mr. P. B. Rao:** (a) No. As stated in the preamble to the notification referred to the orders apply to Governors' Provinces.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) and (d). Government of India, Public Works Department, Circular No. VI-Railway, dated the 1st June, 1888, which was incorporated in paragraph 296 of the State Railway Open Line Code, Volume II, regulated the discharge and dismissal of the staff in question. In respect of punishments other than discharge and dismissal the staff in question were governed by paragraph 287 of the State Railway Open Line Code, Volume II. I have placed a copy of these paragraphs in the Library of the House.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Will the Honourable Member inform this House whether or not Government will consider the advisability of having a Complaints Departments in the Railway Board or in every State Railway?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** I am not prepared to give an answer on a matter like this in reply to a supplementary question.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Then, may I ask how the subject should be raised?



**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore:** My Honourable friend could raise it by way of a Resolution if he thinks fit.

**SENIORITY OF SUBORDINATES OFFICIATING IN THE TRANSPORTATION INSPECTORS' GRADE ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

**885. \*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Arising out of Government's reply to starred question No. 629 of the 4th April, 1934 regarding the seniority of subordinates officiating in the Transportation Inspectors' grade on the East Indian Railway, will Government please state whether this rule was in force when the Divisional system of operation was introduced? If not, when was this rule introduced?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

**SUGAR FACTORIES LIABLE TO EXCISE DUTY IN THE ROHILKUND DIVISION.**

**886. \*Sir Muhammad Yakub:** (a) Will Government please enlighten this House as to how many *khandasari* sugar works are declared up to this time under the Sugar (Excise Duty) Act, 1934 as factories liable to excise duty in each district of the Rohilkund Division?

(b) What are the grounds on which they are declared so? How many are declared after inspection and how many on mere assumption of the district officers in charge in each district of the Rohilkund Division?

(c) What is the number of those *khandasari* works which were previously not declared as factories under the Factory Act and in which also the condition of 20 workmen was applicable and which were checked by Factory Inspectors in working time, and which are now declared, and why, in each district of the Rohilkund Division?

(d) How many factories in each district of the Rohilkund Division are declared liable to the excise duty under the Sugar (Excise Duty) Act, 1934 only due to their being restarted at new sites and only on the basis of their old premises, while no record of employed workmen in the previous year is available?

(e) How many of the factories declared under the Sugar (Excise Duty) Act, 1934, liable to duty are now working this season and how many are closed?

**Mr. A. H. Lloyd:** The information has been called for and a reply will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub:** Are the Government of India aware that there is a general dissatisfaction in the Rohilkund Division that the agency appointed for assessing the factories is working very harshly upon the *khandasaries*, and that many small factories have already closed on account of this treatment on the part of the assessing officers? And also taking into consideration the fact that the season of making sugar is just on, will Government try to make an inquiry as soon as possible and make satisfactory arrangements?

**Mr. A. H. Lloyd:** I can undertake, Sir, that the inquiry will be made as soon as possible.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** May I ask a supplementary question? Are Government aware that the complaint made by Sir Muhammad Yakub is practically universal, and that it exists in my constituency also? And may I ask the Honourable Member how long it will take him to lay the facts before us? Will it be done before the close of this Session?

**Mr. A. H. Lloyd:** I am afraid I can give no undertaking as to when we shall receive the replies to our inquiries.

**Seth Govind Das:** Will the inquiry be made before these *khandeeries* are closed?

**Mr. A. H. Lloyd:** I am afraid, again, I cannot say when we shall receive the replies to the inquiries which we have made.

**Seth Govind Das:** Will it be this Session or the next Session?

**Mr. A. H. Lloyd:** The answer is the same, Sir.

#### RAILWAY RATES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

887. **\*Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** (a) Is it a fact that during the year, 1933, and 1934, only four cases were referred to the Railway Rates Advisory Committee (page 7 of the Administration Report)?

(b) What is the total expenditure per annum on Railway Rates Advisory Committee?

(c) Have Government considered whether it will not be more economical to appoint an *ad hoc* committee for each case instead of having a permanent Rates Advisory Committee?

**Mr. P. R. Ban:** (a) During 1933-34 four cases were referred to the Committee. They had also three other cases which had been sent to the Committee for investigation during 1932-33.

(b) The expenditure during 1933-34 was Rs. 71,000. The revised budget estimate for 1934-35 is Rs. 75,000.

(c) The question of appointing *ad hoc* Committees was examined, but it was considered desirable that there should be continuity in the post of the President of the Railway Rates Advisory Committee to permit of rules and precedents for the Committee being built up as it proceeded with its work. Similarly, in the case of the Railway Member of the Committee, continuity in the post was considered desirable, but, as a measure of economy, it was arranged that the Railway Member should combine his work with that of the Secretary.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** Who pays for this Advisory Committee—the taxpayers of India or the gentlemen who make an appeal to this Advisory Committee?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** No, Sir, the expenditure is borne by Government.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** May I ask whether the Rates Advisory Committee is permitted to hear complaints about the railway passengers' fares?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** I am afraid I must ask for notice of that question.

**Prof. H. G. Ranga:** Is it not a fact that if there were to be no permanent Railway Advisory Committee, and if Government were to appoint a Committee on each occasion whenever such questions arise, then much delay would result, because Government would have to decide about the necessity for a Committee like that and also about its personnel?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** That is a matter of opinion.

**Pandit Nilakantha Das:** Will they think of abolishing this Rates Advisory Committee?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** No, Sir.

**Pandit Nilakantha Das:** Is there under contemplation the setting up of a Rates Tribunal?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** No, Sir.

#### REPORT ON "COMMUNICATION" IN SIND WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE BARRAGE.

888. **\*Dr. Khuddin Ahmad:** (a) Did the Government of India appoint an officer to examine a report on 'Communication' in Sind with special reference to the Barrage? If so, when?

(b) When will this report be published?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) Yes, in November, 1933.

(b) The report is under consideration by the Government of India and the Local Government. As it is mainly of a technical nature a large number of spare copies were not struck off in anticipation of wide public sale, but a few copies are available from the Central Publication Branch at a price of Rs. 10 each. This was announced in a Press Communiqué issued on the 8th November, 1934. Copies of the report have been placed in the Library.

#### SUPPLY OF ALTERNATE ELECTRIC CURRENT FOR DOMESTIC PURPOSES INSTEAD OF DIRECT CURRENT.

889. **\*Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Are Government aware that electric companies supply alternate current for domestic purposes instead of direct current as used to be the case before?

(b) Is it a fact that alternate current is far more dangerous than direct current?

(c) Are Government aware that many deaths have taken place due to electric shocks?

(d) Are Government prepared to take steps to make the supply of alternate current illegal?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) Government are aware that certain electric supply companies supply electrical energy for domestic purposes on the alternating current system.

(b) Potentially, alternating current is more dangerous than direct current, but alternating current systems can be so constructed as to be equally free from danger.

(c) The general administration of the Indian Electricity Act and the rules framed thereunder is undertaken by Local Governments, and reports of accidents which occur on electricity supply systems are not ordinarily made to the Government of India, but they are aware that accidents sometimes resulting in death occur on electricity supply systems.

(d) As was stated in reply to part (b) of starred question No. 4 by Mr. Amar Nath Dutt in the Legislative Assembly on January 26th, 1932, Government do not propose to prevent supply companies from dealing with alternating current. I may, however, add that Government have under consideration the revision of the Electricity Rules, and it is believed that the revised rules, when introduced, will further minimise the risks of danger on electric supply systems.

**Pandit Nilakantha Das:** What is the advantage of alternating currents in preference to direct currents?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I am afraid I must have notice of that question. I am not an expert in these matters.

**Dr. T. S. S. Rajan:** Have Government any plan for converting all direct-current supply into alternating ones all over the country?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** No, Sir. I have stated that the alternating current system can be so constructed as to be free from danger, as is the direct current system. Therefore, there is no necessity to make the general alteration suggested by the Honourable Member.

**Dr. T. S. S. Rajan:** Is it not a fact that there is a general complaint that electrical companies have adopted the alternating system of current in preference to direct current?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I have not received any such complaint.

**Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Is it not a fact that the production of an alternating current is cheaper than the direct current?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** There, again, I must have notice. As I have said, I am not an electrical expert.

**Mr. Sri Prakasa:** What current is supplied in New Delhi?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I am afraid, I must ask for notice.

**Mr. Sri Prakasa:** I can give the answer: it is direct.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** Then, Sir, may I ask why the Honourable Member asked for the information?

**Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Because I want that current to be supplied everywhere. In the smaller places, they supply the alternating current. In the big cities, they supply the direct current, in order, presumably, that the Members of Government and their friends may be safe. Is it not a fact that in all European countries they supply the direct current? (Voices: "No, no.")

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** All I can say in reply to the Honourable Member's speech is that there is no question of any special Government interest in this matter. Direct current is not supplied in Delhi, because it is a Government City: I imagine the current supplied varies according to the circumstances which prevailed at the time the original installation was made.

**Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Have not Government received a representation from Professor Bhim Chandra Chatterjea of the Benares University on this subject?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I am afraid again I must ask for notice of that question.

#### ABOLITION OF MILITARY CANTONMENTS AT BENARES.

890. **\*Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Is it a fact that the Military Cantonments at Benares have been abolished?

(b) If so, what do Government propose to do with the extensive lands and buildings so long occupied by them?

(c) Will the removal entail expenditure in the acquiring of lands and raising of buildings any where else?

(d) What was the number of British and Indian troops stationed at Benares so long?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** (a) No, but it has been decided to transfer the Indian Infantry battalion from Benares to Agra next year.

(b) Certain properties in Benares will become surplus to requirements and the question of their disposal is under consideration.

(c) No additional expenditure will be entailed on the acquisition of land, but additional accommodation will be required in Agra costing about Rs. 1,75,000.

(d) One Indian Infantry battalion of 660 men and a detachment of British Infantry 180 strong.

**Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Do Government think that the expenditure of Rs. 1½ lakhs is a very small sum?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** No, Sir. We do not consider that a very small sum, but I would like to explain that the reason why we are doing this is partly because the buildings in Benares are falling down, and it would involve an expenditure of considerably over a lakh of rupees to put them in proper order; and also by removing this battalion from Benares to Agra (the battalion is a training battalion and not an active battalion), which is nearer the centre of the recruiting area for that particular regiment, we shall save a considerable sum of money annually in travelling allowances.

### SHORT NOTICE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

#### GOVERNMENT OF INDIA'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE PUNJAB GOVERNMENT ON ACCOUNT OF AHRAR PRISONERS.

**Mr. M. S. Anay:** (a) Will Government please state whether the Punjab Government demanded any assistance from the Government of India on account of Ahrar prisoners in the year 1984-85?  
12 Noon.

(b) What is the total amount, if any, contributed by the Government of India to the Punjab Government for this purpose, and what were the special reasons justifying the same?

(c) Will Government please state whether they have made similar grants to any other Provincial Governments in the same year? If so, to which Governments, how much and for what specific purpose?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** (a) The Punjab Government applied to the Government of India for the reimbursement of the cost of providing jail accommodation for the Ahrar prisoners who were received on transfer from jails in the Kashmir State for confinement in the Punjab jails.

(b) The total amount paid to the Punjab Government was Rs. 1,61,260. The payment was made in view of the fact that the Punjab Government had to incur additional expenditure for the accommodation of these Ahrar prisoners.

(c) No similar case has arisen in any other province so far as I am aware, and no similar payment has been made to any other Government. The circumstances under which the Punjab Government undertook to accommodate these prisoners at the time of the agitation in the Kashmir State were exceptional.

**Mr. B. Das:** Did the Government of India secure that money from the Kashmir State or they spent it themselves?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** The Government of India paid the money.

**Mr. B. Das:** Why should the Government of India pay the money? Why not ask the State to refund the money?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** It is a big question. It is argued that prisoners who invaded the Kashmir State were British subjects and that was possibly why the Government of India agreed to make the payment.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Under what head of the budget was this expenditure incurred?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** I do not know. (Laughter.)

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Was the consent of the Finance Department taken about it?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** Yes, Sir.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will the Honourable the Finance Member inform the House under what head this sum is shown?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** My recollection is a little vague. I think it must be under one of the political heads.

**WITHDRAWAL BY GOVERNMENT SERVANTS FROM THEIR GENERAL PROVIDENT FUND ACCOUNTS FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE RESERVE BANK SHARES.**

**Srijut M. C. Bardaloi:** (a) Is it a fact that Government allow the Government servants to withdraw money from their General Provident Fund accumulations for paying the premia of insurance policies, provided they assigned such policies to the Secretary of State?

(b) If the reply to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether they are prepared to extend the concession of withdrawal from the General Provident Fund up to a maximum of Rs. 500 for the purchase of the Reserve Bank shares when they are put on the market, provided such shares are assigned to the Secretary of State till the repayment of such advances?

(c) If the reply to part (b) be in the negative, are Government aware that the refusal of this small concession will debar a very large section of the educated Indians of all castes and creeds from being voters in the Reserve Bank?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** (a) Yes.

(b) No. Advances for investment purposes are not allowed under the rules—vide rule 15 of the General Provident Fund (Central Services) Rules read with Appendix B of these rules.

(c) I cannot help feeling that the Honourable Member exaggerates not only the proportion of the population who are Government servants but also the proportion of Government servants who will be prevented from applying for the shares of the Reserve Bank solely by the refusal of this concession the grant of which would, in any case, be entirely inconsistent with the purposes for which the Fund was instituted.

**Srijut M. C. Bardaloi:** Did Government receive any representations from the Government servants in the subordinate service?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** I believe there have been representations, but the request made has been refused.

**Srijut N. C. Bardoloi:** Will the Honourable Member consider their case sympathetically?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** No, Sir.

## THE GENERAL BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—*concl'd.*

### SECOND STAGE—*concl'd.*

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim):** Today, the Chair understands, the Independent Party will discuss certain motions that stand in the name of their Members. The Chair wants to know which is the motion which the Independent Party want to move.

**Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury (Assam: Muhammadan):** It is No. 499 in the list.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim):** The Honourable the Finance Member will move the demand first.

### DEMAND No. 89—ARMY DEPARTMENT.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member):** Sir, I beg to move:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,31,000 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, 1936, in respect of the 'Army Department'."

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim):** Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,31,000 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, 1936, in respect of the 'Army Department'."

### *Indianisation and over-expenditure.*

**Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury:** Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Army Department' be reduced to one rupee."

Sir, I move this motion for the refusal of supplies to the Army Department mainly by way of protest against the Government policy of Indianisation and over-expenditure in the military budget. It is perfectly obvious Sir, that this Indianisation of the army is most vital to the question of India attaining the status of a self-governing nation. So long as we shall remain dependent on the British officers and the British troops for the defence of our country, our demand for self-government will be a meaningless abstraction. Indians ought to be prepared to undertake the defence of their own country. It is not only that our self-respect demands it, but



our self-interest also demands that we shall gradually take over the defence of our own country. Our grievance has always been that we have not been given adequate opportunities for training in military science and military leadership, and the policy of the Government has been directed always to perpetual dependence of Indians on the British army and the British troops and the British officers for protecting the country against foreign aggression and for maintaining the internal security of the country. In recent years, the army is being Indianised to a certain extent. But that process of Indianisation is proceeding at a snail's pace, and, out of about 7,000 officers in the Indian army, there are only about 195 Indians. It is against this halting, hesitant policy of the Government of Indianising the army that we mainly intend to record our protest today.

I may tell the House at once what our demand is. Our demand is that the recruitment of the British officers for the army should cease immediately and all the new recruits to the army officers rank should be recruited in India, because we maintain that 800 million people of India can very well supply and continue to supply the adequate number of army officers, young men with suitable qualifications to take their training as army officers. As regards facilities for training, the Dehra Dun College may be extended to provide for the training of this increased number of officers. We ourselves see no difficulty in the way. There is no difficulty with regard to the supply of recruits, there is no difficulty with regard to the finances or facilities for training. The only difficulty in the way of Indians is the reluctance of the Government of India to increase the rate and pace of Indianisation. That, Sir, is in spite of the fact that high military officers have held this view that complete Indianisation of the army is both a practical and a feasible proposition. When I say complete Indianisation of the army, I do not mean that Indians are prepared just at once to take over the complete control of the army. For it has been calculated that even if we stop recruitment of British officers from today, it will take about 85 years before the British element is entirely replaced by the Indian element. The history of this agitation for Indianising the army is a very long one and a chequered one. I think it was during the War that Indians were granted King's Commission in the army. Later on, an arrangement was made with the army authorities in England according to which 20 recruits were admitted to Sandhurst and six to Woolwich and six to Cranwell. That was a long time ago,—in 1928. I shall begin the reference to the history of this agitation from the year 1921.

It was in the year 1921 that this Assembly passed a Resolution that not less than 25 per cent. of the recruits for army officers' ranks, those who are granted the King's Commission, should be from amongst the Indian subjects of His Majesty. After that came the Military Requirements Committee. That Committee was presided over by Lord Rawlinson and the report of that Committee is confidential. It has not been published. But it is generally well known that this Committee considered this Resolution of the Assembly and accepted it. And they went a step further. They said that this percentage fixed by the Assembly should be increased by 2½ per cent. every year till, within ten years, the proportion of entry of British and Indian recruits may be equalised. Then came another Committee, the Shea Committee; and I should like to draw the special attention of the House to the recommendation of this Committee. This Shea

[Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury.]

Committee was appointed during the Viceroyalty of Lord Reading and this Committee consisted entirely of military officials. And they held the view that complete Indianisation of the Indian officers' ranks is a practical proposition and that it can be done within 30 years. As a matter of fact, they prepared a scheme of completely Indianising the army within 30 years from that day. They divided that period of 30 years into three parts, 14 years, 9 years and 7 years. And they recommended that a military college should be established which would produce 81 cadets annually for the first 14 years, then, for the second period, they suggested that 182 cadets should be produced annually from that college; and, for the third period, I believe they suggested about 88. Now, Sir, the importance of this Committee's report lies in this that here was a body of military officials,—no politicians amongst them,—who found that it was a perfectly practical proposition to Indianise the entire army within 30 years. But that report also was kept confidential, and it was only during the discussions at the Round Table Conference that the late Sir Muhammad Shafi drew the attention of the Committee to the existence of such a report. In the year 1923, when the Government of India introduced their scheme of Indianising eight units of the army, they had in their possession the report of that Shea Committee; but, instead of giving effect to the recommendations of the Shea Committee, they produced an eight-unit scheme. That scheme was condemned by everybody, by the Indian public, the Indian press and by the Indian officers themselves. It was condemned, because, by this eight-unit scheme, Government segregated the Indian officers from the European officers and put them in different regiments. In support of that, Government said that they were segregated, because Indians will be given an opportunity of taking full responsibility without the help of the British officers. But the Indians contended that the main reason behind this segregation was that, when the Indian officers attained the senior rank, junior British officers may not be required to take orders from them. This eight-unit scheme was condemned also by the Skeen Committee which was appointed in the year 1925. Now, this Skeen Committee recommended that Government should establish a military college in India, and they also produced a scheme of Indianisation according to which half the cadre of the Indian army was to be Indianised in 25 years. Mr. Jinnah, who was a Member of that Committee, suggested 15. But though the report was published, probably in the year 1926, Government adopted delaying tactics in giving effect to the recommendations of that Committee; and matters remained in that stage till we came to the Round Table Conference. In the Round Table Conference, many high-sounding principles were enunciated which have now receded into the background. One of the Resolutions that was passed by the Defence Committee of the Round Table Conference was this. They said that the defence of India ought to be to an increasing extent the concern of the people of this country and not of the British Government alone, and that the rate of Indianisation should be substantially increased and that a military college should be established in India. It sounds very well in the form of a Resolution, but when it came to the question of giving effect to that, Government again restricted the scope of those Resolutions. They did appoint an expert Committee to work out the details of a scheme of a military academy at Dehra Dun. The Com-

mandar-in-Chief was the President, and you, Sir, were one of the members of that Committee; also Captain Sher Muhammad Khan and a few others. Government instructed that Committee to draw up a scheme of a college with an output of 60 cadets a year. The report was published, the college was opened, and I think the first batch came out of the college last year. I maintain that this fixing of the figure at 60 by the Government of India struck at the very root of a rapid process of Indianisation of the army. They fixed the number of cadets at Dehra Dun at 60.

**Mr. B. Das** (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadian) How many passed out?

**Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury:** That I do not know; perhaps my Honourable friend, Mr. Tottenham, will be able to tell us that. You, Sir, in your minute of dissent, protested against this fixing of the number at 60, but you were precluded from making any recommendations with regard to that. In any scheme of Indianisation, the most important question is what should be the rate and pace of Indianisation, that is, how many officers can be absorbed every year by the army. On that will depend how many recruits are to be taken. As to the actual number,—what is the total number of vacancies in the army every year on the average,—Government have never given any definite answer. To the Skeen Committee, they gave the figure of 160; to the Defence Committee of the Round Table Conference, they gave the figure of 120. Now, Sir, even if we accept the figure of 120 in the Dehra Dun Academy, Government ought to have provided for the training of these 120 officers and stopped the recruitment of British officers at once. Instead of doing that, they have arranged for the training of 60 officers at Dehra Dun and are still continuing to recruit officers from England, and, in this way, they are postponing the date of completely Indianising the Indian army.

There is another aspect of this question. If the position were that these 60 officers, who come out of the Dehra Dun College, would take the place that would have been otherwise taken by the British officers, that would have meant some increase in the ranks of the Indian officers in the army. It would have meant some progress in Indianisation, but that is not the case. Some of the cadets, who come out of the Dehra Dun College, do take the place that would have been taken by British officers of the King's Commissioned ranks; but others are employed in replacing the Viceroy's Commissioned officers in the Indianised unit. Replacing the Indian jemadars and subedars by Indian lieutenants is no Indianisation, and the result of this process is that the number of officers that would have sufficed to Indianise at least two divisions in the army will be entirely absorbed in one single division, and that would seriously hamper and retard the progress of Indianisation in the army. Just at present, the policy of the Government is to Indianise one complete division of the army in all its branches including the artillery. Here also they will send officers who have been trained at Dehra Dun, which means that they are still continuing or rather extending the same principle of segregation, which was condemned by the Skeen Committee and the Indian public in connection with the eight units scheme. I think it is only fair for the Indian officers to demand that they should be given

[Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury.]

the same free choice of choosing their own regiment as is given to other British officers, and our demand is that Indian officers of all divisions should be Indianised simultaneously, and there ought to be no segregation of Indian officers from European officers. These Viceroy's Commissioned officers in the Indianised units should be retained, as they are retained in other units which are not Indianised, and you should stop the recruitment of British officers and have all local recruits in future, and extend the arrangement in the Dehra Dun College to accommodate sufficient cadets to fill up the annual wastage in the army . . . . .

**Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham** (Army Secretary): May I ask the Honourable Member why he wishes to retain the Viceroy's Commissioned officers if British recruitment is to be completely stopped?

**Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury**: I want them to be retained, because their place is proposed to be taken by the Indian officers trained at Dehra Dun, and I want these latter officers to be free to Indianise other units: I do not want them to be absorbed in displacing the Viceroy's Commissioned officers. Take the case of a unit in which you require 16 King's Commissioned officers and 16 Viceroy's Commissioned officers. If 82 people coming out of the Dehra Dun college are absorbed in that one unit, then there will be 16 King's Commissioned officers left in another battalion to be replaced. Have I made myself understood?

**Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham**: No: I do not quite understand. I understand that Honourable Member's contention is that British recruitment should be stopped. I want to know on what grounds of principle he wishes to keep two classes of Commissions in the army in future if there are going to be no more British officers.

**Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury**: It is because this system of Viceroy's Commissioned officers has been prevailing for a long time past and it has stood the test of war and it has stood the test of peace time and the old system has worked so well that I see no reason why it should be abandoned when Indian officers are recruited to that unit. . . .

**Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham**: The system of having British officers has also worked well.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better go on.

**Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury**: In the second Round Table Conference, the Defence Committee made another recommendation, that the Government should undertake an expert inquiry whether the number of British troops in India cannot be reduced. That inquiry has been undertaken as we have been told that no reduction is at present contemplated. If Indians are to undertake the defence of their own country at some date, near or distant, in the future, Government should have adopted a policy of gradual replacement of the British troops by Indian troops; otherwise, if that step is not taken, there will always remain British troops in

the Indian army and complete Indianisation will never take place: I do not want to refer to that incident of the other day, but that is what I think was behind the back of the minds of army officers, that they do not intend to Indianise the Indian army completely.

This question of Indianising the Indian army is closely bound up with the question of reducing the military expenditure. In that pamphlet, which was circulated to us along with the budget, and in another pamphlet, which Mr. Tottenham was kind enough to send along at my request, I find that the cost of the British soldier comes to about Rs. 850 a year while that of an Indian soldier comes to only Rs. 285: it has been estimated that the replacement of the British element by the Indian element will save an amount of about Rs. 8 crores, and it has been said that it will take many years before this replacement can take place; but unless the Government adopt a definite programme of replacement, I think total Indianisation will never take place. Our army expenditure is showing signs of increasing from this year: for the last few years, it showed a decline, but from the note, that has been submitted by the Financial Secretary, it appears that this tendency to increase is likely to continue. One of the most effective ways of reducing army expenditure is to replace the costly British element by the Indian element. In fact, the question of Indianisation and reduction of the army expenditure are more or less inter-dependent and allied questions. On both these questions, Government decline to accede to the public demand . . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has exceeded his time limit.

**Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury**: I have just got a slip from some of my friends in the House that I should refer to the recruitment of Sayyids in the army. I am told that in the Punjab, though Punjab is taken to be a martial province . . . . .

**Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham**: I might possibly save the time of the House by saying that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief has got to deal with that question in another place tomorrow. It is a minor question after all, and we are discussing bigger matters today and I think it might save the time of the House if I let the Honourable Member have that information.

**Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury**: Sir, I move my motion.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Cut motion moved.

"That the demand under the head 'Army Department' be reduced to one rupee."

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali** (Delhi: General): Sir, I rise to support the motion so ably moved by my Honourable friend Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury. One of the excuses for my rising today in the House is that I have to represent, among others, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and all the British officers in the army who are among my constituents. (Laughter.)

**An Honourable Member**: Did they vote for you?

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** Whether they voted for me or they did not is another matter, but one of the excuses, as I said, for my rising today is that I also want to devote some time to the subject which seems to interest my constituents most, but a better reason than that is to present my own view of the question of India's defence. To my mind, this is the one subject which, to the exclusion of all others, is of the most vital importance to my country ("Hear, hear" from Opposition Benches), and, while I am saying so, I should just like to say another word. The grounds on which my friend, Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury, has moved his motion, to my mind, appear to be only one aspect of the question,—Indianisation and excessive expenditure are only two of the many grounds on which today I would like to refuse supplies to the Army Department. It is a most drastic step, Sir, constitutionally, and I assure the House that if it were a responsible Government, if the Government were responsible to us, and if this were a responsible Legislature, I would think a thousand times, nay a million times before ever dreaming of refusing supplies for the defence of my country. Why do I take this step today? To begin with, it is only a fraction, just a fraction of the expenditure which is incurred in respect of the army that is submitted to our vote, namely, Rs. 4,31,000,—out of how many? Out of, according to my calculation, Sir, 56 crores, although the visible budget which is placed before us is only 44 crores and a little more which comes to about 45 crores, but I say that the actual expenditure on the defence of the country rises up to about 56 crores, even according to their budget, because, they have left out the strategic railways, they have left out the Watch and Ward, they have left out the Ecclesiastical Department, they have left out many other services, which we would not dream of except in respect of our defence. And, that is not all, Sir. I would go further than that, and say that behind the defence of a country is always the foreign policy of a country. If you divorce your foreign policy from your defence, you cut yourself adrift from your proper moorings. Therefore, to my mind, the defence of the country also includes a great deal of the expenditure on the Foreign Department, and, therefore, I maintain that, out of a total expenditure of about 56 crores,—it may be a little less or a little more,—they are submitting to the vote of the House only Rs. 4,31,000, and, therefore, I make bold to say that I would take the most drastic step, because I know that by taking this step I shall not be leaving the defence of the country crippled. All that money is quietly stored away, and it will be utilised exactly as they would like to do. Even if they do not restore it, when we succeed in voting down this Rs. 4,31,000 and that amount is not restored, they will be able to find their way by making a reduction in the expenditure of their Chaprasis, communications, or stationery or things of that sort, so that the defence of the country is not touched. I, therefore, have no hesitation whatsoever in taking this drastic constitutional step, because I want to express my profound disapproval, the profoundest disapproval I should say, of the policy of the Government with respect to the defence of my country. And what is that policy, Sir? That policy, to sum it up in two words, is wholly, profoundly anti-national. The defence of the country has been organised along lines which run counter to my nationalism, which run counter to my pride, which run counter to my economic conditions, which run counter to the actual demands of the defence of the country. They have followed a policy not of defending India but of defending the British Empire, which, unfortunately, is swelling from day to day, which, unfor-

unately, is exposing India to greater and greater danger from day to day, because, the more they expand, the greater are the chances of their being exposed to the enemies abroad. Today there is not a spot on the globe where they have not some interest, where they have not some coaling station, where they have not some colonies, where they have not some highways, and so on,—all those are there,—and who suffers from them? We, by being within the Empire, because there is no spot in the world where they may be embroiled in a dispute into which we are not bound to be drawn. That is a policy which we do not wish to follow. I admit that the poor Government of India always turn round and tell us that they are helpless, and they deserve my deepest sympathy. I know in many directions they are as helpless as we on this side of the House are, and I believe the defence of the country and the question of the army of the country is one of those questions in which they are quite as helpless as anybody else. Only they do not say so. This morning, the Honourable the Army Secretary got up and said something which, unfortunately, was not altogether consistent with what His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief said the other day in another place. The Honourable the Army Secretary said this morning, Sir, that the policy with respect to the Army and Defence was laid down by the Imperial Council of Defence, and His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief said in the other place: "No, we consult them, but it is with our approval that these policies . . . ."

**Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham:** I did not say that. The policy had been laid down by the Committee of Imperial Defence. Mr. Satyamurti asked me a question whose opinion it was. I said it was the opinion of those who are responsible for the defence of the country. Then he asked me, if it was also the opinion of the Committee of Imperial Defence, and I said Yes. That is all I said. I did not say that the policy had been laid down by the Committee of Imperial Defence.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** I am very glad, Sir, for this elucidation. That only lends strength to my argument and you are not so helpless as I imagined you were,—and so all the more you deserve the condemnation which this refusal of supplies implies. ("Hear, hear" from the Opposition Benches.) If you were entirely helpless, perhaps you would have had my sympathy in a greater measure than I would have extended to you otherwise, but if you say you are not helpless, if you say that you have a margin of discretion, then the condemnation becomes all the stronger, all the more emphatic.

However, Sir, let us turn to some other questions. I was just saying that, in so far as expenditure on the army was concerned, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief some time ago promised to make a search for economies, and, amazingly enough, His Excellency's search for economy has resulted—I would not say about those Rs. 60 lakhs, I would not say about the Rs. 2 lakhs or something of the sort—but His Excellency's search for economy has resulted in an actual rise of expenditure on fighting services—I am comparing the figures of 1933-34 and your estimates now—by about Rs. 22 lakhs, and on the administrative services by about Rs. 5½ lakhs, on the manufacturing establishment departments by another Rs. 9 lakhs and on the Army Headquarters by Rs. 10 lakhs! And where does His Excellency register economies? In the Royal Indian Navy. And what does that indicate? It surely indicates nothing else but one thing, and

[Mr. M. Asaf Ali.]

that is, that the defences of the country are not being organised for the country itself but that the defences of the country are being organised for some other purposes, because the defence of the country, as far as I understand it, ought to have been organised along three different and definite lines, consistently with the foreign policy of the country. To begin with, the foreign policy that has been pursued by this Government, in so far as India is concerned, is wholly anti-national because you have created interests not merely in the Middle East, but you are creating interests in Central Asia, you are creating interests elsewhere too, and what is the result? The result is that you have to maintain larger armies here in India in order to be within striking distance of all these places. The Honourable the Army Secretary shakes his head as much as to say that this is not correct. I wish it were not correct, but what am I to do with the evidence that you have supplied me? I am only examining the evidence which is before me. You are keeping the British army in India for no other purpose but for the sole and simple purpose of being within striking distance of all these places around India; no other purpose can possibly be revealed. Why, what about your Imperial Airways? Have you not created interests in Arabia, have you not created amazing interests near about Persia, are you not looking towards Sin Kiang, are you not already looking beyond the frontiers of India in the North? All these are factors to be taken into consideration. And what was your Singapore base? You really wanted to have a base in India, and you really wanted to maintain that base in India, and that is why the British army is kept in India. Otherwise, where is the necessity for a British army with, according to your own calculations, 12 crores of human beings who are fit for military service in India, martial races—can you not get recruits enough to replace the British army in India? Can you not get men enough to replace the British army in India, particularly when it is remembered that the British army today is costing us four times as much as the same number of our own army. It is a scandalous state of affairs that we have to pay for the same numbers of the British army four times as much, and what does it imply?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I would just point out to the Honourable Member that three times 285 is about 850, and not four times.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** Mr. President, I am not prepared to accept that correction, because the calculation which I am giving you is perfectly correct, and I am prepared to prove it to the hilt indeed. If the Army Secretary will sit across the table with me, I will prove to him that they are costing four times as much as the Indian soldiers. Then, again, only the other day, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, speaking in the Council of State, quoted totally wrong figures, misleading figures. His Excellency said that in India the incidence of our expenditure on defence came to Rs. 1-8-0 per head.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim):** The Chair may remind the Honourable Member that it is not the etiquette to discuss speeches delivered in another place.



**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** I am not discussing that speech. I am only just using that quotation. I am only just using the figures which were delivered by His Excellency in another place. I do not mean to discuss His Excellency's speech in this House. I am only just using the figures which His Excellency has quoted. In fact, those were not figures quoted by His Excellency out of his own head; they were really supplied in one of these booklets.

**Munshi Iswar Saran** (Benares and Gorakhpur Divisions: Non-Muhamadan Rural): On a point of order, Sir. You will kindly bear in mind that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief is the highest military authority in this country and the pronouncements that he makes in the other place really give an indication of the policy which he proposes to pursue in this country. If it is not open to Members of this House to discuss those pronouncements, I venture to submit to you, with great respect, that we shall be placed at a great disadvantage.

**An Honourable Member:** He never comes here.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): When the Chair said that the speeches delivered in another place should not be discussed in this House, as is the established convention, it did not mean to preclude references to a speech or statement made by such a high authority as the Commander-in-Chief. All that the Chair meant was that any such reference should not be turned into discussion of particular arguments in minute details.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** I was just saying, certain figures were quoted, and I repeat them now. I am actually reading out of the proceedings of the debate:

"The incidence of the defence expenditure in India is Rs. 1-8-0 per head of the population. In England it is Rs. 80."

I challenge both these figures. Even if I leave out all the additional figures that I have relied upon today,—even then, according to their estimates, the expenditure on our defence comes to about Rs. 50 to 51 crores, including the strategic railways and Watch and Ward. I am talking of the defence; I am not talking of the army: there is a world of difference between the two. When you talk of defence, you take into consideration all the factors, all the heads under which expenditure on your defence falls. Therefore, Rs. 51 crores, or even if it is Rs. 50 crores, it would come per head to about Rs. 1-14-0, and not Rs. 1-8-0, and in terms of the incidence of average income in England, this Rs. 1-14-0 would rise to Rs. 82 in England. That is to say, in England the expenditure on the army, according to this scale, should have been Rs. 82 per head. And only on the army, and not on the entire defence, because after all, England is a vast world power. It is a European power, and as such, England is bound to maintain a huge navy and a huge air force, whereas we in poor India have got only to think of nothing else but just an army, and only about eight squadrons,—is it not,—of the air Arm, and the tiniest little navy in the world on which we are not spending more than Rs. 98 lakhs or so.

**Mr. M. S. Anay** (Berar Representative): There is no navy at all.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** How can you compare the incidence of expenditure on England's defence and our defence? You are defending the whole Empire. We have got to defend our tiny little country. (Laughter.) Will you leave us to defend our own tiny little country in our own way, and not unnecessarily force down our throats your army and your Imperial Expenditure which you are doing today? This is as far as the expenditure is concerned.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has already exceeded his time limit.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** Sir, I seldom participate in the debates

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There may be other Honourable Members wanting to speak. The debate has got to be concluded today.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** In that case all that I can do is to state my conclusions instead of going into any arguments, and these are the points I should like to urge on the attention of the Army authorities, if they would only care to take note of these things, which represent the conclusions I have drawn from my own study of the subject and I wish to place in the forefront the foreign policy of the Government, because, to my mind, the foreign policy of the Government is so inextricably bound up with the defence of the country that you cannot for a single second overlook the one while you are considering the other, and, therefore, I place in the forefront the foreign policy of India. Unfortunately, today, India has no foreign policy. The Indian foreign policy is really the Imperial foreign policy, because, if we were left to ourselves, I can assure you there would be no enemies anywhere. Today we are a part of your Empire and we are liable to be attacked not only on our own frontiers but we are liable to be attacked all along your imperial frontiers. Therefore, I would first of all say, that you should shape the foreign policy so as to reduce the necessity of maintaining too expensive an army because your present foreign policy appears to me to be increasing the dangers of India. For instance, you take into consideration the concentration that has taken place on the Trans-Oxus frontier. Why is that concentration taking place? I would draw the attention of the Army Secretary particularly to this point. It is simply because you have got your Imperial Airways and you have got at least eight squadrons. I believe, in Mesopotamia, and you have got eight squadrons somewhere in Egypt. Naturally, therefore, Russia has got about 400 aeroplanes right on the other side of the Oxus. Whose danger, I ask you, is being increased? Not yours. It is our danger, and what is the result? The result is that here you have got only eight squadrons. I would, therefore, urge upon the Government, so far as that point is concerned, to reduce the British forces gradually. You are now sending three battalions home. You can make it five battalions every year, and clear out the 45 battalions in nine years' time and every year by clearing out five battalions you will be saving up about two crores of rupees and two crores of rupees will be sufficient for both the capital and recurring expenditure on another eight squadrons, because, if you take your Audax machine, which is costing you only 58,000.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has already taken 25 minutes.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** I would beg you to allow me another five minutes.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim):** It is not fair to the other Honourable Members who want to speak. The Chair regrets to interfere, but the Honourable Member will get one minute more.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** Then, I will say this. I was just now talking about shaping the foreign policy so as to reduce the foreign expenditure and to that end I would ask you to encourage friendly buffer states all round the land frontier and conclude counterbalancing engagements with other Asiatic powers, to maintain equipoise beyond the borders of the buffer states. Replace your forward policy on the North-West Frontier by Sandemanisation within friendly trans-border territories. I am perfectly aware of the difficulties of that side but I am purposely putting that suggestion before you. So far as external invasion is concerned, increase the air arm to meet any contingencies on the North-West Frontier, bearing in mind the large Russian concentration on the other side. Mechanise the Indian army to the same extent as the British army and particularly, in so far as light artillery corps, tanks corps and air force are concerned and don't neglect gas, because after all you have got to take that into consideration. India is the weakest in Asia as regards air arm and gas. Regarding internal security, I only want to make one small point and that is that you should increase the territorials, if necessary by conscription. I would be a willing party to conscription on a large scale any time and your police should be militarised. They have certainly proved themselves, beyond a shadow of doubt, during the last 15 years. You have been telling us all the time that the police in quelling disturbances have proved most loyal and useful and are you going to turn round now and say that you do not trust the police?

Sir, I shall wind up my remarks with one word. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, speaking elsewhere some time ago, said that without the British forces our Indian army would be without a backbone. I wonder if His Excellency ever realised the implications of what he was saying? If I were an Indian officer or an Indian soldier, I would take it as a grave insult to me, to my manhood and my soldierly profession, because, it simply means that without the Britisher the Indian army would be worse than useless. It would be invertebrate, and what Indian would be prepared to hear such a condemnation of an army on which the Britisher has spent millions and millions of the taxpayer's money for 75 years, ever since 1859?

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official):** Sir, I have listened with great attention to the speech delivered by my  
1 P. M. Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury. I congratulate him very sincerely on the deep thought and attention he has given to such a complex matter as the army in this country. I have listened with greater attention to the extraordinary speech of my friend, Mr. Asaf Ali. Sir, I stand here today to support the principle, but not the method, underlying the speech of my friend, Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury. I believe, Sir, that the time has come when the army book, which has hitherto been more or less a sealed book, should be opened and that we should have a glimpse into the contents of that book and so understand more about the administration of the army. I also believe that the Army Member and the Army Department are making a serious effort to acquaint us, laymen, with the

[Sir Henry Gidney.]

complex problems that are involved in the administration of the army. I repeat, Sir, that I agree with the principle and the sentiments underlying this motion. But, I regret, I cannot agree *in toto* with the remedy suggested. Sir, I shall not delve into the past history of the Indian army, because I am not in a position to do so. I am closely familiar with many of the Committees concerned; I was a member of the Committee that sat about 1921-22 to report on the Esher Committee Report; I gave evidence before the Military Requirements Committee, before the Skeen Committee, I was a member of the Indian Territorial and Auxiliary Force Committee and which considered the formation of the Indian Military Academy, and I was a member of the Defence Sub-Committee, first R. T. C., and so I am somewhat familiar with the development of Indianisation in the army. Sir, the Army Member, the other day, said that it was impossible to realise complete Indianisation of the Indian army, and anyone who really has knowledge of the subject will agree with him.

**Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham:** To whom does the Honourable Member refer?

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** The Army Secretary.

**Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham:** Excuse me, Sir, I never said that. (Laughter.)

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** If I have misquoted the Honourable Member, might I be given an opportunity of explaining what I meant. I am sorry if I have misquoted the Honourable Member, but I think it was in reply to a certain question he said that to say that there could be complete Indianisation of the army in India would be impossible.

**Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham:** I have never said that. What I said was that, at the present rate, the Indian army would never be Indianised.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** I accept the qualification, but the implication is there.

Sir, before one can demand Indianisation of the army, he has to look at the formation of an Indian regiment. Those who are familiar with the composition of an Indian regiment must admit that it does not consist, except in special regiments as Gurkhas, of a single class or community: they are of a mixed caste. The reasons for this composition are not far to seek. But the vital point to remember is that the present efficiency of the Indian army is entirely due to the intimate and beneficial contact between the British Officer and the Indian Officer and sepoy that one cannot conceive of any separation that must result if the recruitment of British Officers is stopped.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban):** Oh, oh, oh! (Interruptions).

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Sir, I am going to answer only one interruption and I shall refuse to answer any more. The interruption just made was "no".

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** I said "oh"—I did not say "no".

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thinks the Honourable Member had better not take notice of these interruptions.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney**: Sir, can one readily conceive of the Indian army minus the British Officer of today? (Voices: "Why not? Why not?") Is it a question of the politician's point of view, or is it a question of the Indian soldier's point of view? Ask the Indian soldier. Does he want the British Officer removed from the Indian army? He is the man who is interested most of all. He is the man who is under training to defend this country, he is the man who realizes and appreciates that he is getting the best training possible from his British Officer. Sir, if it were not for the politician's point of view, as voiced by the Opposition back benchers, let me put before the House the following: The Honourable Mr. Asaf Ali stated in his speech that he objected to the army being ruled or commanded for all practical purposes by the foreign policy of the Government; and he said, as also did the Mover of the motion, that we should stop the recruitment of British Officers at once and that we should recruit all officers in this country. I am in agreement with him when he asks that we should recruit more Indian Officers. I am also in agreement, as I said in the Committee of which I was a member, the Indian Military Academy Committee, that 30 recruits per year from the country by open competition was hardly enough. The other 80 I know are recruited as Y cadets from the Indian army: total 60. I consider that it should have been sixty by open competition and I, as a member of the said Committee, held that view. So far as I am in agreement with him—I mean that there should be an increase; but let me ask this one question. If the cost of the British army in this country were debited to Imperial revenues, would any one in this country object to the British army remaining here?

**Mr. S. Satyamurti**: Yes.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney**: Yes, Sir, I know the politician objects to it, firstly because it wounds his national feeling and it is expensive. I sympathise with the national feeling, but let us face facts.

**Sardar Sant Singh** (West Punjab: Sikh): Why not endorse that feeling?

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney**: I cannot: I repeat the British army is here, and I again ask if the cost of it were debited to Imperial revenues, would anyone object to having that British army in this country? (Voices: "Yes, yes, yes.") Sir, I hope it will be a very long day before the British army leaves this country. It is no use playing with facts and it does not need much imagination to realise what will happen in India if the British army were to leave. India today is not safe from invasion. The North-West Frontier Province is a very vulnerable part.

**An Honourable Member**: From which side?

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney**: We have got Afghanistan ready.

**Maulvi Syed Murtaza Sahib Bahadar** (South Madras: Muhammadan): No, no—certainly not.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney**: Sir, if for no other reason, at least for our own internal peace, the British army is necessary. It is no use glossing

[Sir Henry Gidney.]

over facts and playing with sentiment. Sir, I make bold to say that, however much I sympathise with the principle—and I have said I am in agreement on the point that we should more rapidly Indianise the army—it is not true to say that this is a public demand. (Voices: "It is the national demand, it is the demand of the nation.") Sir, let my interrupters go to the villages and ask the villager whether he would do without the British army in this country.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** It depends on who asks the villager?

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Honourable Members have stressed the disadvantages of segregation. I quite agree that to completely segregate a class of officers and not to have them mixed with British Officers is undesirable, and I think that has been the cause of the failure of the eight-unit scheme. I also think that to segregate Indian Officers in a division would be equally objectionable. But if we are anxious for Indianisation and to test our Indian personnel, there is no other test available than segregation to stand on their own feet. But I am sure that as we are given further opportunities of learning the art of defence, and the martial spirit of India is re-awakened and fed by further opportunities than are being offered today, we will in time supply men who will be the equal of anybody as officers. We have the men in this country. It is no use saying that the youth of India do not possess the martial spirit and courage. It is ridiculous for anybody to say that. The past history of this country has proved it. But the proposition that the external defence of India, its internal security and the peace and tranquillity of this country would be safe without the British army, I am not prepared to accept. I am aware that the cost of the British soldier is much more than that of the Indian soldier. It has to be. Unfortunately it has to be; and the Honourable Member was quite right in his estimate that there would be a saving of eight crores. But to my mind this is the main reason for which the politician objects to the British army. He complains that the cost of this army is too prohibitive and prevents the development of the nation-building services. I quite agree in his calculation, but the risk would be too great. I do agree however that it is time Indianisation was, in a larger measure, speedened, but not certainly to the extent that the recruitment of British Officers should be stopped at once. This would be a suicidal policy.

Sir, much market has been made of the recommendations of certain Committees which were confidential in nature and which showed that the army could be Indianised within about 30 years. It is true that this point was raised, because I was a member of the Defence Sub-Committee of the First Round Table Conference, and I remember the controversy that arose, but that is beside the point. Now, what I want the Government to consider with regard to this cut motion is this. They should seriously consider whether or not the pace of Indianisation is too slow, and if it is too slow, how to provide ways and means by which more recruits could be enlisted in India into the Royal Military Academy at Dehra Dun. I would suggest to the Honourable the Army Secretary that he should double the number of Indian Officers annually recruited, and so, in a measure, meet this national aspiration, this national desire of India to learn to defend her country in time. It is no use saying we intend giving India complete control of her defence, and it is useless to say you intend ultimately giving

India Dominion Status, because, without complete control of her defence, Dominion Status is an absolute myth. I do think we should increase this Indianisation, but only in compatibility with the safety and tranquillity of the country. That does not mean we should stop recruitment of British Officers in India, but that we should increase the number of officers recruited in this country, and as this number increases and they show their fitness for such duties, the recruitment of officers from England should *pari passu* be gradually lessened. I also submit that this segregation of Indian Officers into a division will not be a fair test of India's fitness for military control, though I admit it is the only test—I would also submit that in this Indianisation of the army and in the training of the defence of this country, Indians should be given an opportunity of training in every branch of the services. I know a beginning has been made—a small beginning, but I think that when they show their fitness, the Government should speeden up further experiments on these lines. I, therefore, regret very much that, except in the principle involved, I cannot support this out motion, although my wholehearted sympathy goes out to the Mover in his reasonable and sincere desire to speeden up Indianisation of the Officer ranks of the Indian army.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Twenty-Five Minutes Past Two of the Clock.

---

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Twenty-Five Minutes Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

---

**U Thein Maung** (Burma: Non-European): Sir, we support the motion for the cut as to us Indianisation of the army means Burmanisation of the forces in Burma, and we are not at all satisfied with the present state of affairs in the military department in Burma. It is a disgrace to the Government of India and an insult to the manhood of the people of Burma that there is not a single Burmese unit in the army. Government have not even declared that it is their accepted policy to Burmanise any existing unit or to raise new Burmese units. On the other hand, they have gone to the length of disbanding such Burmese units as were raised during the great war in spite of their excellent work and splendid services during the war, and, since then, they have not trained the Burmese for the army, the navy or the air forces in spite of very strong popular demands therefor. Government's answers to our questions in this House have been absolutely unsatisfactory. They have simply told us that the whole question of the future defence of Burma is still under consideration. We do not know how long this question will remain under consideration and who are considering it at all. But we do know that the Burmese public opinion has not been consulted and that even the Legislatures have not been taken into confidence, and we are very much dissatisfied. We submit, Sir, that Government can safely take steps to train some Burmans at least for the army, the navy and the air forces even before they have come to a definite decision as regards the whole question of the future defence of Burma—Burmanisation of the forces in Burma being an accepted policy and differences of opinion being only as regards the pace thereof. Even the most

[U Thein Maung.]

conservative opinion as to the pace of Burmanisation must admit in fairness to the people of Burma that a beginning should be made now and that further loss of opportunities should be prevented.

**Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan** (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I must begin by congratulating my Honourable friend from Assam who had the courage to move this motion though I understand he has never ridden a horse or even a bike, and his province so far has not contributed a single recruit to the army. I expect that my Honourable friend, Mr. Fuzlul Huq, from Bengal, will move for the Bengalisation of the army. Sir, my right to take part in the debate today arises, not so much from the fact of my being an old Member of this House who has had his say on many similar occasions, but from the proud privilege which no other Honourable Member of this House can lay claim to of being a soldier and representing the soldiers. This privilege, Sir, enables me to take not an academic view of things, but view them from the standpoint of a practical soldier who knows the realities of a soldier's life, the requirements of a soldier, and, above all, the qualifications of a soldier. Soldiers like poets are not born, but made. A soldier, like Rome, is not built in a day. Soldiery is an institution in itself which grows through long experience and training. There is nothing that well-equipped, well-trained and efficient soldiers cannot attain, whether in the battle-field, in the playing field or the field of peace.

**An Honourable Member:** Or in the Assembly.

**Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan:** Or in the Assembly.

Sir, it is a well-known fact that no nation holds a square yard of territory by any right derived from heaven. Frontiers are made and altered only by human agencies alone. It must be thoroughly understood that the lost lands will never be won by solemn appeals to the good God or pious hope in the League of Nations, but only by force. By this I mean to say that no nation can dispense with the defence services despite the efforts of the League of Nations and disarmament conferences or by preaching the gospel of *ahimsa* of Mahatma Gandhi. Granting that defence is very necessary, the size and organisation of the defence forces should be left to the experts considering the condition of the country.

Now, Sir, before I come to the question of Indianisation, I will say just a few words to my friends. In my opinion, Indianisation is, of course, connected with the policy of defence, but my Honourable friends have spent most of their time on the policy of defence. I think if they had given more attention to the Indianisation of the Indian army, they would have thrown more light on the question. I have read the debates in the other House and have listened to Honourable Members' speeches in this House, I think there is a serious misconception in the minds of Honourable Members. When we talk of Indianisation, we mean the Indianisation of all Indian regiments and every branch of the Indian army should be officered purely by Indians. Indianisation does in no way mean the withdrawal of British troops.

**Mr. S. Satyamarti:** Why not?



**Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan:** Not at all. When Egypt Egyptianised the army, she did not ask for the withdrawal of British troops simply for the sake of Egyptianising the army. That is an absolutely different question. Sir, let us set aside all the prejudices and imaginary thoughts and see, as practical politicians, how far we are right in demanding 30 years to Indianise the army or to fix any period for complete Indianisation. Sir, I have been a strong champion of Indianisation, in this very House. When a similar motion was moved at Simla, I said:

"We are loyal, don't keep us under control and observation for ages. Our bravery and leadership we have proved in many wars, and we have excellent material. Give us opportunities."

Some of the Honourable Members have said in the other House that while our forefathers and grandfathers were Field-M Marshals and Generals, why should we not be Field-M Marshals and Generals? And they have tried to prove the gallantry of Indian soldiers. Nobody has ever questioned the gallantry of Indian soldiers. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief said the other day in the other House that the Indian soldiers' gallantry is without question, and I say more emphatically that no nation in the world can compete with the gallantry of Indian soldiers. But the question is not of soldiers, it is a question of leadership. The leadership is the chief thing; the bravest body of soldiers is of no use unless they have an efficient leader. To lead the troops in battle-field is not a joke; it can only be achieved after strenuous training and long experience. I must confess that before the Great War the Indian officers were not given an opportunity to lead troops: they were trained to be led. It was probably due to the mistrust of sepoys after the Mutiny or some other grounds which are well known to the Government. But, Sir, events make the man. It was in 1918, after the Great War, that the Indians were given the King's Commission: the first batch of Indian gentlemen cadets were gazetted in 1920 as second lieutenants: I had the honour to be one of them. Out of those officers, I think fifteen are left on active list, and I hope that none of them will be axed . . . .

**Mr. B. Das:** Why did you not become a Major? (Laughter.)

**Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan:** They will now: the officers who got their Commissions in 1920 will reach their majority in 1938, and promotion to the rank of Colonel, that is, to command a battalion, comes after 24 years . . . .

**An Honourable Member:** Good Lord!

**Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan:** That is the time scale: you cannot change it; and so, in 1944, probably, you will be able to see the first Indian Colonel in the Indian Army. Now, you can realise how you can Indianise the army within 30 years. Promotion to the rank of a Brigadier takes at least 30 years: not every Colonel can become a Brigadier, since promotion to the rank of General is absolutely by selection and not by seniority or service. Thus, in 1950, we will probably be able to see the first Indian General, from the first batch which was given Commission in 1920. It is impossible to promote all Colonels to the rank of General.

Let us now take the question of Indianising one Command. My Honourable friend proposed that probably in 30 years we could Indianise the

[**Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan.**]

whole of the Indian army; We take the question of Northern Command. The Northern Command is composed roughly of 22 Brigades, and each Brigade Staff is composed of one Brigade Commander, one Brigade Major and a Staff Captain and two or three additional officers. All staff officers must pass through the Staff College: unless an officer passes through the Staff College, he is not a *pukka* Staff Officer and he cannot take a permanent job as a Staff Officer. The first Indian, fortunately, Captain Kariappa, who has just qualified, has been given a staff job, I think, at Quetta—I am not sure where he has been appointed, but he has been given a staff job and he is the first Indian Staff Captain in the Indian Army . . . . .

**Maulana Shaukat Ali** (Cities of the United Provinces: Muhammadan Urban): How old is he?

**Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan:** He is very young: he was 18 in 1920.

**Maulana Shaukat Ali:** And would you tell me the age of a Field-Commander of a Brigade or Division?

**Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan:** Brigade Commanders are generally about 48 or 50. You can, therefore, imagine how it is possible to have complete Indianisation in 1952 unless we manufacture Generals or Colonels in some factory . . . . .

**An Honourable Member:** During the War, we did it.

**Another Honourable Member:** How long did it take Japan?

**Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan:** There has been a lot of talk about this, and Honourable gentlemen have said that in 1952 we could easily Indianise the whole army. I would merely say that both the Committee and the gentlemen are imaginative politicians, and that reminds me of a story which, with your permission, Sir, I shall relate, for the edification of those gentlemen and the Committee which recommend that Indianisation should be complete in 1952. In 1870, after the battle between the Germans and the French, when the Germans had conquered the two provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, the German Kaiser ordered the German officers to enlist French people in the German army and to teach them German language as soon as possible. To assure himself that his order was obeyed, he used to inspect them once a week and he used generally to ask three questions of the French recruits in order to know what they had done, and his first question was, "How old are you?" The second question was, "How long have you been in the service?" The third was, "Are you getting your pay and equipment regularly?" The German instructor noticed that when the Kaiser came he put these three questions regularly and so he said to the recruits, "Look here, when the Kaiser puts you the first question, you will reply "18 years, Sir"; when he asks you the second question, say "six months", and when he asks you the third question, say "both regularly, Sir". So, next week, when the Kaiser came round to inspect them, instead of asking the first question first, he put the second question first to the recruit and asked "How long have you been in the army?" The recruit replied, "18 years". The

Kaiser then asked "How old are you?" to which the recruit replied "six months, Sir" (Laughter), and finally the Kaiser said, "Either you or I am a fool". The recruit replied "Both regularly, Sir". (Laughter.)

But, Sir, having considered all these facts, I still persist that the Government should devise some ways and means to give larger opportunities for Indianisation of the Commissioned ranks of the army. There are about six or seven thousand officers in the Indian Army, and, at the present rate of Indianisation, it would take a very long time to replace all the British officers.

A few words about the Viceroy's Commissioned officers. My Honourable friend, the Mover, has just mentioned that he would not like the idea of eliminating Viceroy's Commissioned officers from the army. I was a great champion of keeping them, and, in the Indian Military College Committee, I fought their case and I was against the elimination of the Viceroy's Commission in Indianised units; but, after discussion, I was convinced that it is better the Indian officers, holding the Viceroy's Commission, should be altogether abolished. The reason is this: that in the past, when a recruit joined the Indian army, his highest ambition was only the rank of Subedar-Major or Risaldar-Major; but now, if you abolish these Viceroy's Commissions, if a recruit is well educated, his highest ambition will be to be the Commander-in-Chief or Field Marshal. If he has qualified himself and gets to Dehra Dun, after passing Dehra Dun he can go up to the rank of Field Marshal; but if he is a Viceroy's Commissioned officer, he can only go up to the rank of Subedar-Major or Risaldar-Major; and I most emphatically pressed upon the Government that the sooner the Viceroy's Commission is abolished in the Indian army the better for the Indian troops.

**An Honourable Member:** Question.

**Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan:** Probably he is right in some way: perhaps he wants to support some middle class people who cannot get education for their sons. But to them I would say, let them educate their sons and join the army and try to get an army cadetship and go to Dehra Dun to be trained as efficient officers to command troops.

**An Honourable Member:** But they can never be Commander-in-Chief!

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has only a few minutes more.

**Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan:** I come now to the question of the withdrawal of the British troops. This question was discussed at the First Round Table Conference, by the Defence Sub-Committee, presided over by Mr. Thomas. There was a large body of opinion against the idea of dispensing with British troops altogether. The Indian princes were strong supporters of the British army, because they stood on their treaty rights. Mahatma Gandhi, placing the Congress views before the Federal Structure Committee on November 17th, 1931, said that the Congress wanted command over the army in India with the goodwill of the British troops, and he wanted the British people to tell the British troops that they shall remain here, not to protect the British interests, but to protect Indian life against foreign aggression, and so on, and he still agrees with-

[Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan.]

the statement he made some time ago. At the same time, Sir, there are communal differences in the country, and, therefore, unless and until the various communities inhabiting this vast country come to a proper understanding, unless and until they have mutual confidence in one another, it cannot be said that India will be in a position to manage her own defence.

**Maulana Shaukat Ali:** Sir, I am very much interested in this question, and I have given a good deal of thought over it. I come with an absolutely unbiased mind, not with any intention to criticise the Army Member, but to hear his views as a responsible officer who represents the army in this House, and I assure him that when he rises to speak, I shall listen to him most patiently, so that I may thoroughly understand the point of view of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief. Sir, I never served on any Committee, and I know nothing about the subject, except that I have read a good deal as a layman. I am not going to quote figures to prove my case, but I have studied the question as an Indian, as one whose family has worked during the last 600 years as soldier-administrators. Sir, the martial spirit is in my blood, and I understand many of these things. I have been a rebel and an outlaw, but when my time came to show my mettle I was bowled out for reasons which may not be mentioned now.

Now, Sir, what is the idea of keeping the British army in India? You have 60,000 British troops here. Is this army meant for the defence of India, is it meant to give the British people, whose fate is linked closely with that of the Indian people, sufficient confidence that they have 60,000 British troops to back them up? If it is for the defence of India, then, for such a vast country like this, 60,000 troops are not at all sufficient. You have already got Indian troops, and, I believe, you have got several million troops elsewhere, in case India is attacked. Now, if you maintain all these British troops to give the handful of British people who live in this country sufficient confidence, then I think you are following a wrong policy, because without the goodwill of the people of the country, and without winning the Indian people's confidence, you can do nothing. As I said on the very first day, I have been an outlaw and a rebel, but I am perfectly willing,—nay, I am anxious to co-operate with the Britishers, I shall move every fibre in this big body of mine to bring about an honourable understanding, so that Providence may keep up the British connection with this country for the interest of both. Sir, we have many friends and well-wishers of India, amongst the English.

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Maulana Shaukat Ali:** You may say "No", you may be perfectly justified in holding that view. You have been under-dogs. I have been an under-dog also, but I never allowed bitterness to grow in my heart. . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must address the Chair. He need not take any notice of such interruptions.

**Maulana Shaukat Ali:** I say, as the Persian Poet says:

*"Urk agar ba girya mon-e-ar Shuday xisht ad ad meen tarwan ba tamanna girestan."*

"If by crying for years you could get a sweetheart, you may cry for 100 years, but the sweetheart does not come this way."

Sir, I know of one man at least intimately on that side, and that is my friend, Sir Joseph Bhore. When my brother was dying, he asked me to cultivate him. When I met him sometime later, there were tears in his eyes, and I think any man who shed tears when my brother was dying and whom Maulana Mohamad Ali loved and respected, he would be as good an Indian patriot as any in the country. Sir, I don't agree with many of my brethren here on this side (Congress) on this point. There are many competent Indians,—out of the so many, there are three Members sitting over there, who are occupying their places with such great distinction in the Executive Council, who have all proved their worth, and they are quite capable of looking after their respective departments. Then, there are my friends, Messrs. Rau, Bewoor, Kripalani, Mian Abdul Aziz and many others who have proved their capacity for work. There is no lack of men. They are as good as any in the world. Therefore, I say, that the time has come when we should get the best Indians possible without making any discrimination against men from England. I have no objection to pay them as high a salary as is necessary. Indianisation does not mean that you should at once get a few of the best Indians. What will be the use for new English recruits for the railway traffic department or for the locomotive shops or other purposes? Get the best young-men from our own colleges in India. As for experts, bring them down here, get good coaches, pay them well, promise them, besides high salaries, bonuses, if necessary, but with this condition, that within ten years they should train large numbers of good and capable young Indians. To such people I shall give even ten lakhs each, if necessary, as bonus, but they should get the best material and coach young and educated Indians. This is the basis on which India should be built, and I don't think mere destructive criticism will do any good. Sir, in spite of the provocation offered to me on this side or on that side, I am not going to lose my balance, and I am not going to allow any bitterness to get into my heart. Sir, I entered on my 68rd year only two days ago. I have not wasted my time all these years. I have been working in my own way for the advancement of my country. I think I have suffered, and if people were to judge me by the record of sacrifices I have made, I think I shall be inferior to none in this House. I, therefore, say, give the British another trial.

**An Honourable Member:** Trial?

**Maulana Shaukat Ali:** I say trial,—T, R, I, A, L. Give the British another trial for 10 years.

**An Honourable Member:** Will that do?

**Maulana Shaukat Ali:** Yes. As we stand today even, if all Hindus and Muslims unite, if the Indian princes show their affection to us, if we all combine together, we can certainly turn out the British from this country, but we must be prepared for rivers of blood which we must avoid. It is not a joke. It is not easy to expect Sir Henry Craik to pack up and go away. But, I say, the time has not come for all that, and so I don't think we should work up war, but exert for an understanding and peace.

There is another friend here for whom I have very great respect, I mean my friend, Sir Henry Gidney,—but, I regret, he said "Oh, when

[Maulana Shaikat Ali.]

the British army leaves the shores of India, you will send an S.O.S. and tell the British people: 'Please come back, mamma, we are afraid; come and take care of us.' Sir, today when we are not united, this is the present condition. Now, Sir, we have learnt many things from the British people, and we have yet to learn many more things. I honestly believe that we want Britishers to remain in this country on honourable terms, because we are demoralised. That is why we are in the present position. If there is no hope from them, and they will not share the Government of this country with us, I am perfectly willing to make up my mind with you all to start a mass rebellion, or revolution, and I shall not be lacking in my support to you. But I must understand what it all means, you must realise what it means, but today I see that we must seek every avenue for peace, and I do say that today I see there is a chance of coming to an understanding. I will give ten years, for this effort, if not much longer time. We should show our capacity for work instead of only criticising. If an outsider came and heard some of the language in this House, he would be tempted to call it a Monkey House. . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. The Chair cannot allow this kind of language to be used regarding the House.

**Maulana Shaikat Ali**: I have heard this language used here, Sir, and that is why I used the expression to avoid that. . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. The Honourable Member cannot use such language about the House. . . .

**Maulana Shaikat Ali**: Sir, I have no desire to wound the feelings of anybody, nor do I wish to attack anybody.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim). The Chair hopes the Honourable Member will withdraw the expressions he has used.

**Maulana Shaikat Ali**: I withdraw it, Sir. These expressions I heard. I withdraw them as desired by you, Sir.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can now go on with his speech.

**Maulana Shaikat Ali**: If you want to fight against 350 millions of people, 60,000 British troops are nothing. If the people of this country make up their minds to break this British connection, your 60,000 troops mean nothing. If these 60,000 are meant for the defence of India, they are not sufficient. Therefore, I would suggest that you can easily take off half the number of British troops now, and, within a few years, you will find, when you have acceded to the wishes of the people, that the people will co-operate with you and offer you when the time for help comes even a 100 million recruits from India. I assure you I can give you ten lakhs of fine young men within three months—men who would be as tall as myself and as big as my Honourable friend, Captain Sher Muhammad Khan. We need money for nation-building activities, then why should we waste our money by having a larger number of highly

paid British soldiers? How long are we going to depend upon you for India's defence? Supposing there is another world war like the last war. His Excellency the Viceroy, Lord Hardinge, had said that India had only 15,000 troops left and that it had bled white for Britain. If we are not trained to defend our country, some other country would come and conquer India, and we would be helpless if the British were defeated and withdrew from India. Therefore, instead of being a mill-stone round your neck, instead of dreaming and conspiring and training people to throw bombs and thrust their knives into British officials,—instead of all that, try to make friends with us. I was a rebel and an outlaw, and yet I have become a friend, and I have no doubt that many people will become friends, if you change your angle of vision. Indian people have been your best friends in the last war, and I think our reward should have been quite different. I am not ashamed of the lessons I have learnt from the British, but these lessons do not mean that I should always remain in perpetuity their slave. Personally, I think, if one fine morning I find every English man, or woman disappear suddenly from India, I would be very sorry, and people would be wondering what had happened to them, but I may tell all that, after four or five days' wonder, the Indian people, realizing what had happened, would carry on and the administration will be as good, if not better than it is today. ("Hear, hear" from the Opposition Benches.) That is my conviction. It does not mean that I do not want the Englishman. We want everybody who lives in India and makes India his home, Hindus, Muslims, Parsis, Sikhs, Christians, and Anglo-Indians, and in this connection, I have one grievance against my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, that he and his people are more proud of the father than of the mother. (Laughter.) I also include all the British merchant princes who have made the commerce of India, every British civilian who is serving India—his children must be allowed to compete with my children, but those who have nothing to do with India, but only send out their youngsters fresh from British colleges to occupy high appointments in this country, should be told "this place is not for them". The Nawab of Pataudi told me that he knew no cricket when he went to England and he said that he owed all his cricket to his coach, Frank Woolley. He said that when, for the first time, he went to play for England against Australia, no one was more happy or more proud than Woolley at his performance. We have been your pupils, and now we want to administer this country, and we want you to help us in that object. Why should it mean that we want to kick you out, or beat you or hurt you, or deprive you of the wealth that you have made in this country? It is peace and honourable co-operation that I want, and I think it is up to you to grant it. I say, the time has come when India must be trained to stand on her own legs. You have got no British troops in Canada; you have got no British troops in Australia, or in New Zealand, or even in South Africa, who fought you only a few years ago. Then, why in India alone? We have been your friends. We are tired of waiting and waiting and hearing all kinds of excuses and arguments. I do not want to say anything unpleasant, though I can say many things unpleasant quoting history. My desire is not to talk of war, my desire is to have peace and friendship. I want to hear the Army Secretary, and I want to see what they are going to do to Indianise the army, in order to give the people of India evidence of their honesty and good intentions, and also in order to show that, when we get power in our hands, we shall not touch even a single Englishman or woman or child, but it will be

[Maulana Shaukat Ali.]

the honour and good name of India that we should look after them.  
(Cheers.)

**Sardar Mangal Singh** (East Punjab: Sikh): I have great pleasure in associating myself with the views expressed by the Honourable the Mover of the motion. This amendment raises a very important question which is very intimately connected with our future political development. I wish to speak on this question with a great amount of caution and restraint. We should not do anything or say a word which will impair the discipline of the army or which will in any way lower the efficiency of the army. (Hear, hear.) I recognise that we do require a good and efficient army to defend our country from external aggression and from internal disorders. When we say that you should Indianise the army, we do not in the least mean that its efficiency should be lowered. If that is the insinuation, if that is the implication, it is a great insult to the profession of the arms, a great insult to the Indian soldier. The other day His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, whilst speaking in the other House, said that there was not a large supply of young men with long traditions of military leadership behind them. I do not know what to say to my Commander-in-Chief. During the last century and a half, the military authorities in this country have done everything to suppress the military leadership in us. They have done everything to deprive us of all those opportunities which cultivate and create the aptitude for military leadership in our men. And after doing all that, after a century and a half, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief comes to us and says, "You have not got that aptitude of military leadership now". I take it as a great insult to the profession of arms in India. I do not agree with my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, when he said that Indian officers and Indian men in the army do not desire Indianisation. I speak from personal knowledge, I hope it will not be taken as presumptuous on my part, but I do say, that I have been in the army myself and I have the honour to represent a community which contributes the highest share to the defence of the country proportionately. I daily come in contact with retired Indian military officers and those men who come on leave. I know their minds. They are more anxious than the Congressmen there for the speedy Indianisation of the army. It is they who are always suffering in the army from the inferiority complex, from the inferior status which they have got. I know their feelings. They are always smarting under this disgrace of always having to carry out the orders of British officers. I speak from personal knowledge and personal experience. I have listened to the speech of my gallant friend, Captain Sher Muhammad Khan, but I am sorry I do not agree with him when he says that the Viceroy's Commissioned officers should be abolished straightaway. I was rather surprised to hear it from him. He is the representative of those very officers and he comes here and says that his constituency should be abolished.

**Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan:** It is a matter of opinion.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** A matter of inspiration!

**Sardar Mangal Singh:** The Honourable the Army Secretary interrupted the Mover of the amendment and said, "Why do you require Indian



officers?" Sir, I submit there are two reasons why we do not want to abolish the Viceroy's Commissioned officers. The first reason is that it delays Indianisation.

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** May I say on this point that it will not delay Indianisation by one minute? If I may explain this point now, I will try to do so. An officer in the army takes 25 years or 26 years to reach command of a battalion. It will make no difference whether they begin as platoon commanders, which is what the Viceroy's Commissioned officers are, or whether they begin as company officers. It is perfectly true that the replacement of Viceroy's Commissioned officers by Indian officers will delay the commencement of Indianisation for a few years whilst these Indian officers are taking the places of the platoon commanders. That will take three or four years, or possibly a little more; but it will not delay by one minute the completion of that process because in either case it will take them 25 years to reach command of a battalion.

**Sardar Mangal Singh:** Had the Honourable the Army Secretary waited for a few minutes more, I was going to deal with that question. I say, Sir, in spite of the explanation of the Honourable the Army Secretary that the abolition of the Viceroy's Commissioned officers will delay the Indianisation of the army. We have at the present moment selected 15 regiments to Indianise, a complete war division and in that division there are about 300 Indian officers and about less than 200 British officers. For that if we are to abolish the Viceroy's Commissioned officers, we require in all 500 Indian commissioned officers, but if we keep those Indian officers there, we require only less than 200 Indian commissioned officers to Indianise the whole division. If you replace the Viceroy's Commissioned officer by Indian commissioned officer, you are not Indianising it. You are only replacing Indian by Indian. Is this Indianisation? You are simply changing the Viceroy's Commission into an Indian commission, which is only a change in name. What is the change? In this connection I am reminded of an incident. Once, Sir, there was a great agitation, about the unhealthy condition of Mianmir cantonment, in England. There were British troops there who were dying of malaria and there was a great agitation in the British Parliament that the Mianmir cantonment should be abolished. What did they do? They changed the name of Mianmir into Lahore cantonment and announced in the Parliament that they had changed the cantonment. This is typical of the Indianisation which you are carrying out now. They are replacing a Jemadar or a Subedar or Risaldar or Risaldar Major by an Indian commissioned officer from Dehra Dun. I ask the Army Secretary—is this Indianisation? This is merely change of name and we are not going to be deluded by it.

My second point as to why the Viceroy's Commissioned officer should be retained is this. If you abolish this order now, it will seriously affect the efficiency of the Indianised units. I tell you why. Now every villager who goes into the army has the aspiration to rise one day to the post of Jamadar Subedar or Risaldar or Risaldar Major. If you deprive that chance to that ordinary man, those efficient men and good soldiers would go to other units and not to your Indianised division which you are going to create. You are creating such conditions that after 14 or 16 years your Commander-in-Chief will come here and say: "Look here, these Indianised regiments are inefficient, and, therefore, Indians are not fit for the army".

[Sardar Mangal Singh.]

On account of these two reasons, I say that the Viceroy's Commissioned officer should be retained, and if you are going to abolish it, we shall consider it after the whole army is Indianised. At present the question is to replace the British officers by Indian officers.

I now come to the question of the Indian army. I am sorry to say that the whole structure and the whole composition of the Indian army is based on mistrust, doubt, suspicion and racial discrimination. I am sorry to say it but it is a fact. The policy which was chalked out, after the Mutiny, is still there in the army. The two counterpoises which were proposed at that time are still there in the army. Before the Mutiny there was one European soldier to five Indian soldiers and even sometimes one to six or seven but, after the Mutiny, they fixed the proportion as 1 to 2 and that proportion they are still carrying on. Another counterpoise which they proposed is that all the regiments should be mixed regiments. There should be a platoon of Sikhs, Punjabi Mussulmans, Gurkhas, Mahrattas, Rajputs and Dogras. The mixed regiments are in order to counterpoise amongst themselves, the proportion of the British and the Indian is the other, two counterpoises still exist. I ask, in all seriousness, in all humility, if the loyalty of the Indian soldier is still questioned.

**An Honourable Member On the Official Benches:** No.

**Sardar Mangal Singh:** Why are you, then, keeping this counterpoise? Why don't you withdraw the British army? This British army is a counterpoise to the Indian army. They probably feel that if there is a revolution in this country, the British army will stand by the British. In this sense, the British army is not an Indian army but it is an army of occupation to perpetuate the British raj and to carry on the exploitation of the country. It is to protect their interests and in this sense it is not a national army but an army of occupation.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has two minutes more.

**Sardar Mangal Singh:** About the military leadership. I said that they have not given us opportunities, and, even after 100 years, they would not give us small opportunities willingly, but, in the war, when the British officer died, our Indian officers got the opportunity to command the platoons and what happened at that time? They had no previous training. They were not the graduates at Sandhurst or Cranwell or any of the military colleges of England. They were simply Jamadars or Subedars or Risaldars and how did they behave. Here is book called: 'Deeds of Valour performed by Indian officers and soldiers'. I will give you only two or three instances as to how those officers and soldiers met that crisis, when the British officers were killed and the enemy was coming on. That will show that if you give us opportunities we will not be wanting in deeds of bravery. The first case is that of Jamadar Mir Dast who was granted the Victoria Cross. I will read an extract from the London Gazette:

"For most conspicuous bravery and great ability at Ypres on the 26th April, 1915, when he led his platoon with great gallantry during the attack and afterwards collected various parts of the regiment when no British officer was left and kept them under his command until the retirement was ordered."

Then, there is another instance—of Subadar Bhagwan Singh:

"For conspicuous gallantry and devotion to duty. When his Company Commander was wounded early in an engagement, he took command and led the company with great courage and skill, setting a most inspiring example to the men. Later, when the adjutant and the Subadar-Major became casualties, he carried out their duties in addition to commanding his company, and rendered invaluable assistance during the ensuing night."

Then, there is another Subadar Mit Singh:

"When his company commander was wounded during an engagement, he at once took command and led the company with great coolness and skill. By his excellent dispositions he repelled a counter-attack, and maintained the ground won. He set a magnificent example to his men."

Sir, this book is full of similar extracts, showing that when the Indian officers got the opportunity, they behaved well and they met the crisis. Sir, only yesterday, I came across in this book the deeds of bravery of our own Marshal. (Loud Applause.) This is what the London Gazette says of his conspicuous gallantry while serving with the Indian Expeditionary Force in France:

"During an advance on the 30th November, 1917, his squadron was caught in barbed wire. Under heavy shell-fire, Nur Ahmad Khan showed great presence of mind and initiative in extricating the squadron. By his personal bravery and good example, he succeeded in rallying his men and galloped through a barrage of heavy shell and machine gun fire."

(Loud and Prolonged Applause.)

—But mark these lines carefully—

"But by the time that 'D' (Pathan) squadron began to pass through the defile, they met with a very different reception. The leading troop was almost blown to pieces by the concentrated fire on the narrow opening, but the remainder of the squadron never wavered, nor did they change their pace."

(Loud and Prolonged Applause.)

"Advancing with the utmost steadiness through the gap, the troops spread out in diamond formation forty yards apart, and breaking into gallop crossed the intervening open ground under heavy shell and machine gun fire and joined the leading squadron in the hollow ground. This gallant episode, which was watched with admiration by onlookers, was one of which any army in the world might be proud. For mounted troops to advance in the face of modern fire-arms is in any circumstances an undertaking requiring the greatest pluck and daring. To make such an advance in orderly formation, first through a narrow defile and then across open ground, exposed throughout to hostile artillery and infantry fire, betokens not only dash and gallantry, but also coolness and nerve on the part of the leaders and steady discipline and morale of a very high order in all ranks."

(Hear, hear.)

Nor was this merely a vain display of reckless bravery. The opportune arrival of Hodson's Horse at a point where the defence was very seriously weakened, and at a moment when the single squadron of the 8th Hussars was in danger of being overwhelmed, was successful in definitely checking the German advance and materially assisted in keeping the line unbroken.

Major Nawab Ahmad Nawas Khan (Nominated Non-Official): All these things were taught by the British to us, Indians.

**Sardar Mangal Singh:** Sir, these certificates were earned at a moment of crisis by those men who were deliberately deprived of those opportunities of getting an aptitude for leadership. I submit, Sir, that we should never accept a position whereby you are merely going to have this Indianisation as an experimental measure. If you do it, we refuse to have it, we do not want it on that basis. (Hear, hear.)

The other day, in the Council of State, the Commander-in-Chief said that they will pronounce their judgment after fourteen or eighteen years.

**Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham:** No

**Sardar Mangal Singh:** Sir, if the Indians are fit to teach them in peace and lead them in war, then and then alone they will extend Indianisation. I do not accept that proposition. Sir, wherever you have given opportunities to Indians, they have shown that they are eminently fitted. See in the I.C.S. how they have acquitted themselves, and see in this very House how our Indian Leader of the House and other Indian Members are leading the Government men. (Laughter.) Wherever you have given us opportunities, we have shown that Indians are not less capable than any European or anybody else. (Hear, hear.) I say that on that ground I do not accept that proposition. How long shall we be under examination? They gave us reforms. They now say: "Look here, boys, have these reforms for ten years and you are under examination, and we will pass our judgment after that". Similarly, here Government come forward and say: "All right, we will give you some commissions, we will make some Lieutenants, some Captains and, after some time, we will pass our judgment, and if you get 45 per cent. of the marks, we will promote you to another class". Sir, we refuse to accept that position. (Hear, hear.)

Another important point which I want to allude to is the Commissions you are giving us in the army now. I maintain, Sir, that the Commissions, which are now being given, the Indian Commissions, are inferior to the King's Commissions, which, for instance, you gave to my friend, Captain Sher Muhammad Khan and to our Marshal. I know the Army Secretary will contradict me and he will probably come up with the argument that this is equal to dominion commissions. I do not want to hear that argument, because, in the dominions, these conditions do not exist. If there are any British people in the army, they are in the general army. Here they are not. Here they have got a separate army; and, if our Indian Commissioned officers and the King's Commissioned officers and even private men, if they go into mixed formations, then the Indian Commissioned officers will not be entitled to that rank—that is to command mixed formations. I know the Honourable the Military Secretary is shaking his head, but, in spite of that, I maintain that you are not giving those Commissioned officers that right. Even if the King's Commissioned officer is a junior to our Commissioned officer, he will not accept his command. That is the whole position. And this is not only in the case of officers. I ask the Army Secretary—supposing there is an Indian Commissioned officer going on the road and a British soldier meets him; if he does not salute the Indian Commissioned officer, I ask the Army Secretary if he is entitled to his salute, and if the British private soldier refuses to salute the Indian Commissioned officer, is he really entitled to put him under arrest and take him to the quarter-guard and punish him? Certainly not, under the present army conditions, and that is the whole point. I

again put the other question: will the Indian Commissioned officer be entitled to sit on a courtmartial of junior British officers, or even of private British soldiers? You will probably say that this condition will not arise for another 20 or 25 years. I say, these conditions are met with in every-day life. There are mixed formations, there are occasions when the Indian officers and the British officers come together, and if the Indian Commissioned officers are to be treated like that, I say, no respectable nation will accept that position, and India will not accept that position of inferiority complex and inferior status.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has exhausted his time.

**Sardar Mangal Singh:** I am finishing, Sir. With these words, I submit ~~that~~ the pace of Indianisation should be greatly increased, and the recruitment of British officers should be altogether stopped. (Hear, hear.) If we today stop the British recruitment, even then it will take nearly 40 years to complete the Indianisation of the army, and if we do not stop that recruitment,—well, the other day, the Honourable the Army Secretary frankly admitted that, at the present rate, Indianisation could never be accomplished and the Indian army could never be Indianised; and, if that is the position, we do submit that the least that the Government should do is that they should stop the recruitment of British officers from England. With these words, I heartily support the motion moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury.

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** Sir, if I intervene in the debate at this stage, I think it is in accordance with the wishes of Honourable Members, and I hope that they will give me a patient hearing on this controversial subject. With most of what has fallen from Honourable Members today, I shall deal in the general body of my speech, but I must admit straightaway that Mr. Asaf Ali took me by surprise and I do not quite know even now what he was really aiming at. He took one deep breath and inflated the army budget by ten crores, that is from 45 crores to 55 crores. I am still not quite sure how he did that. He then took another breath and said that this enormous sum must be greatly reduced, but for every reduction that we make in the way of abolishing British regiments we must make a corresponding increase in the air force and in the navy. Those increases were advocated, definitely to meet certain imperial liabilities which at present the army in India does not accept. He apparently wished us to accept these liabilities in addition to those that are now laid upon us. Last of all, he took an even deeper breath and suggested that we should introduce conscription in India which would mean, according to his own figures, conscripting 120 millions . . . . .

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** Not necessarily.

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I thought conscription meant universal service. However, it is not necessary to go on further with that. I should like to acknowledge very gratefully the very temperate way in which the Honourable the Mover placed his case before this House, and I hope I shall be able to do the same. It is obvious from what we have heard on the motion that it raises the whole policy of defence. I must, however, confine myself to certain aspects of it, if I am to keep within my time limit.

[Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham.]

Fortunately that is fairly easy, because the most important aspect of the whole problem is the question of Indianisation. I shall, therefore, confine most of my remarks to that subject.

There are, however, just four facts that I should like first of all to place before the House with regard to the general level of defence expenditure. Now, the first is this. At the present day, the defence budget stands at 45 crores, whereas in 1930, it stood at 55 crores. That shows a reduction of ten crores in six years and nobody can call that negligible. At the same time, the more we reduce, the greater seems to be the demand for reduction. When our budget showed 55 crores, the general cry was for a reduction to 50 crores, and now, when we have reduced the expenditure to 45 crores, the demand for reduction is even greater. At the same time one cannot help noticing a somewhat inconsistent tendency, and that is a tendency to increase the defence budget by putting on to it various items which at present find a place under various other heads of account. I can only conclude that the reason for this is that, the smaller our budget gets, the more difficult it becomes to criticise it: and so our critics want a larger target to aim at. They want to be able to produce telling statistics based on the size and the cost of the army. Now, one might point out that from the taxpayer's point of view, (and that is after all what we are mainly considering today) the mere transfer of items from one head of account to another does not make the slightest difference. I am thinking particularly of the case of strategic railways. But there is a point of substance behind that. The military authorities themselves have never clearly understood why the category of so-called strategic railways should be limited to a few lines on the other side of the Indus which do not work at a profit. There is another point of view, and I put it before the House, that the main lines from Karachi and Bombay to the north-west of India are of infinitely greater strategic importance than the comparatively few trans-Indus lines on which the loss is incurred. It seems to me to be equally sound, or unsound, to suggest that, if the army is to pay the loss on these trans-Indus lines, they might also claim a share of the profits on the other lines.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir** (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Were they constructed for military purposes?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** Originally, no doubt they were constructed partly for that purpose.

The second point is that this year undoubtedly the army budget has increased by about half a crore. Nobody can maintain, however, that that increase indicates any change of policy. Nobody can maintain that full warning was not given of that possibility; and nobody can maintain that in this respect the army are behaving in any way differently from all the civil departments of the Government. In fact it has been repeatedly said, during the last few years, that the reductions that we have secured have been secured partially by temporary cuts in pay, partially by the fall in commodity prices, partially by the fact that we have been living on our surplus stores instead of keeping up our reserves to the full extent and partially by the fact that we have postponed expenditure on building. It is, therefore, inevitable that, when the pay out is restored, when prices begin to rise, when we have consumed our surplus stores, and when it becomes no longer economical to postpone expenditure on buildings, there must be

an increase in the army budget. That is the second important fact that I wanted to mention.

The third fact is this. Honourable Members are very fond of saying that more than half the revenues of this country are absorbed in defence. Well, Sir, that is not correct. Actually the figure at the present moment is about 26 per cent. of the total revenues of India. But even that is not the really important point. The important point is that in 1914, that is before the war, the proportion of the revenues of India that was spent on defence was 34 per cent. In other words, before the war it was a little over one-third; while today it is a little over a quarter. We now spend eight per cent. less of our income on defence and eight per cent. more on the civil departments. If I may go back a further still, it may interest Honourable Members to hear extracts from a lecture, which a learned Professor of the Madras University gave the other day, about army organisation in ancient India. He says:

"We see that the military expenditure was a little over 50 per cent. of the total expenditure of the State."

That is talking of thousands of years ago. He goes on:

"It appears, the pay of the officers and the soldiers were dependent on the economic condition of the times and in the face of constant attacks and in the absence of necessary funds in the treasury, the King could encroach upon the private property of his wealthy subjects by levying more taxes upon them."

That merely shows how history repeats itself.

The fourth important fact is this. Last year, I made certain calculations from published figures and I found that the total cost of the defence of the British Empire by land, by sea and by air at that time came to roughly £160 millions a year, that is about 200 crores. Out of that enormous sum, the British taxpayer pays about eleven annas in the rupee and the Indian taxpayer pays rather more than three annas in the rupee, while the Dominion taxpayer pays under two annas in the rupee. It is perfectly true that the Dominion share compared with Indian share is small, but there are differences between the conditions in the Dominions and the conditions in India to which I need not refer at present. The point I wish to make now is that the Indian share compared with the share of the British taxpayer is also very small. It is indeed often apt to be overlooked or forgotten that, although India may pay a great deal for her army, she pays practically nothing for her naval defence and very little for her air defence. Those, I submit, are the sort of facts, or some of the facts, that ought to form the back-ground of any general consideration of the level of the defence expenditure.

But, Sir, I am perfectly well aware that what Honourable Members are mainly interested in is that, whatever the present figure of defence expenditure may be and by whatever amount we may have reduced it during the last five or six years, still, in their opinion, considerable further reductions could and should be secured by more rapid Indianisation. I, therefore, turn to the question of Indianisation and I will attempt first of all to explain the policy of the Government of India with regard to the Indianisation of the Indian army; that is to say, the replacement of British by Indian officers in the Indian army.

Sir, it is quite impossible to argue this case unless one fundamental proposition can be accepted, and that is that the replacement of British officers by Indian officers is an experiment. Now, by making an experiment

[Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham.]

' understand doing something that has never been done before and applying certain tests to it to see whether it will work. That is what I mean by an experiment.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** Does it imply that you can go back on the experiment?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** We must see whether the experiment works. By the test that we apply to this experiment naturally I understand the test of efficiency. And in this connection I think I need only quote the report of the Defence Sub-Committee of the first Round Table Conference, to which my Honourable friend, the Leader of the Independent Party,—who I am sorry to find is not present today, signed his name. What they then said was:

"It was unanimously agreed that in a matter of such importance as defence, the utmost care was necessary in expressing opinions and the Sub-Committee as a whole was very anxious not to create the impression that any one in any way to any degree wanted to say anything that could even remotely tend to imperil the safety of the country or to weaken the strength of the army. It was in view of this general feeling that all sections of the Sub-Committee emphasized the importance of maintaining the same standard of efficiency in training as prevails now in England."

Now, Sir, with those who hold that we already possess sufficient proof of the ability of Indians to train troops, as officers, in peace and to lead troops, as officers, in war, I am afraid it is impossible for me to argue. I can only say that at the moment we have no proof and only a certain amount of evidence. And in saying that I do not wish to be misunderstood. The valour and gallantry of Indian troops is fully, freely, gladly and unreservedly admitted and acknowledged. But, Sir, the qualities required of a soldier are very different from the qualities required of an officer whose business it is to train troops in peace and to lead them in war.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** May I ask the Honourable Member one question? Did not those gentlemen whose names were read out by Sardar Mangal Singh lead their men in war and act as officers?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** They certainly did and all credit is due to them for doing so. But it was not their life's work and they did it in the heat of the moment during the war. That does not prove necessarily, as I am now going on to argue, that they would have made good commanders of battalions or brigades or good Generals or good Commanders-in-Chief.

I have said it before, and I will say it again, that the mere fact that a number of young Indians are able to pass an examination into the Indian Military Academy and pass out of it with success, the mere fact that they are able to command with success small bodies of troops in peace time, does not necessarily prove that they will make good commanders of battalions or brigades or divisions or army corps. I have no doubt that many of my Honourable friends opposite would have had no difficulty themselves in passing these examinations and in learning the necessary drill. I have no doubt that even I myself could have done it, but, speaking entirely for myself, I have no doubt whatever that I should have made an extremely bad General. And, therefore, it does not necessarily mean that because young Indians can pass examinations in the Academy they are, therefore, fit straightaway to command large bodies of troops. Now, Sir, to those



who are prepared to admit,—and I think there are some,—that the Indianisation of the Indian army is an experiment, in the sense in which I have used the term, I will say as follows. In practically every speech and in practically every article that is written on this subject we are told that at the present rate it will take hundreds of years to Indianise the army. That is not true. It will not take hundreds of years or thousands of years or even millions of years. At the present rate, as I have said before, even if one British officer is recruited every year, the Indian army will never be completely Indianised. And if there are any Honourable Members who do not understand that even now,—I will refrain from using those terrible words that I used the other day,—I will merely hand them over to my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin, and ask the learned professor to give them a few lessons in elementary mathematics.

**Munshi Iqbal Saran:** When do you think the army will be completely Indianised according to your calculation?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I am coming to that now.

Now, Sir, I think the Leader of the Independent Party, Mr. Jinnah; and those who sit behind him, understand the position perfectly well. In fact, it was clear from what Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury said that they do understand the position. The position that Mr. Jinnah took up at the Round Table Conference was this. The quickest possible method of Indianising the Indian army is to stop British recruitment tomorrow. If you do that it will take 35 years; and, in his opinion, that was possible and should be done. He failed, however, to carry with him the rest of the Committee. Therefore he said: "If you are going to do anything short of that, you must lay down a definite indication of the pace at which you intend to proceed." Therefore to him Indianisation in 5, 10, 15 or 25 years clearly means that after those 5, 10, 15 or 25 years we must bind ourselves not to recruit any further British officers. I am glad we have got that clear. Let us apply that to our policy. Our policy is not, never was, and never could have been, intended to Indianise the whole of the Indian army, either completely or partially; and I do submit that it is unfair that it should be criticised as if that was its intention. The object of our policy is to Indianise a very definite portion of the Indian army in a very definite time. The portion of the army that we are Indianising is, as I have explained before, a division of all arms, and a cavalry brigade with a proportion of all the necessary staff and ancillary services, such as the Indian Army Service Corps, the Indian Army Ordnance Corps, Remounts and so on. We have made the most careful calculations and we find that an intake of 60 cadets a year into the Indian Military Academy, making due allowance for casualties and wastage, should be sufficient, or more than sufficient, to provide all the officers required to officer those units by 1952, that is to say, in 17 years from now.

Now, Sir, some Honourable Members may say, "how is it possible to Indianise those units in a period of 17 years when the period it takes to command a battalion is 26 years?" Sir, that is perfectly true. The army is one of the few professions in which infant prodigies are not allowed. There is a time-scale of promotion, 9 years to Captain, 18 years to Major and 26 years to Lieutenant-Colonel. The explanation of course is that, when we started this scheme for the Indianisation of a division and a cavalry brigade, we started with something in hand. We started

[Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham.]

with the officers who had already been recruited for the purposes of the old eight-unit scheme which began in 1924 and the first of whom, therefore, should be fit to command their battalions in 26 years from 1924, that is, in 1950. In this way, we calculate that, if all goes well, there should be sufficient officers of sufficient standing from about 1950 onwards to command, not only the original eight units, but also the additional units included in the division and cavalry brigade. And, by that time, these various units will probably have had their baptism of fire in some frontier engagement or other: they will have passed through the supreme test; by that time there can be no possible talk of experiment. . . .

**An Honourable Member:** And if there is a great war, sooner!

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** Honourable Members may ask: "Have we got to wait till 1952 or 1950 before any further advance can be made?" My answer to them is "Certainly not". An impression seems to have gained ground that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief said the other day in another place that no more Indianisation can take place for fourteen years. Sir, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief never said anything of the kind. His Excellency has always been strictly consistent in what he has said on this subject: and what he has said is that it is only when you get a sufficient number of Indian officers with fourteen years' service that you will be able to express an opinion about the success or otherwise of the experiment. I would like, if I may, to read the actual words of His Excellency's address to the Indian Military College Committee on this point—it was in 1931. His Excellency said:

"At the present moment, the young Indian officers in the eight units have seven years' service. That obviously is not long enough for us to tell whether they are going to be fit to administer and train a unit in peace and lead it in war. In seven more years (that will be in 1938) however, they will have had fourteen years' service and by that time I feel pretty certain that we shall be able to give a definite opinion whether they are going to be a complete success or not; and we need not wait until a further seven years, which would bring young officers now in the Army up to 21 years' service and approaching the time when they would command units, before we decide to carry the experiment further."

I should like to ask the House to compare this policy of ours with other policies that have been put forward for the Indianisation of the Indian army, and, in particular, the scheme of the Skeen Committee. Under the scheme of the Skeen Committee, half the officers in the Indian Army in 1952 would have been Indian and half of them would have been British. Now, let us suppose that there is somewhere—I do not say in this country or in England, but somewhere—an entirely imaginary body of very influential people who are bitterly opposed to Indianisation as such and who will take every possible opportunity to obstruct it. Let us suppose also that these semi-Indianised units, with half their officers Indian and half British, had acquitted themselves well and that the demand was put forward for the total stoppage of British recruitment. What would our imaginary obstructionists say? Surely it would be open to them to say: "Yes, it is all very well to say that these units have done well: but the reason why they have done well is largely because they have got so many British officers—half British and half Indian. We will increase the ratio of Indianisation; we will take in two Indians to one British or even three Indians to one British but we cannot go further at present." I quite

agree, at that rate, that it would take hundreds of years to Indianise the Indian Army. Now come back to our own scheme. We have, in 1950 or 1952 a number of units which are completely Indianised from top to bottom and commanded by Indian officers. Let us assume that those units, as we hope, will have also acquitted themselves well. If that is so and, if, then a demand for the stoppage of British recruitment were put forward, what possible answer could our imaginary obstructionists have? I for one can see no practical answer; and I would ask the House seriously to think out the implications of what I have said. It may mean, as far as I can see, the possibility of Indianisation within a much shorter time than either the British Indian delegation mentioned or than Honourable Members opposite seem to think.

Now, I shall turn to one other aspect of this matter. It is said that our policy is based on distrust of Indians. I deny that absolutely. To my mind, the making of an experiment, so far from involving distrust, must connote a very decided measure of trust combined with an ordinary measure of prudence. I will take an analogy from trade. Supposing a young man walked into a motor firm's office one morning and said that he had discovered a wonderful new invention which would make motor cars very much cheaper and would not affect or reduce their efficiency. He produces his plans and designs and specifications and the firm is impressed. But does that firm immediately incorporate this design in their next year's model and sell it to the public? No firm would think of doing such a thing. What they do is to build a few cars including the invention and subject those cars to the most rigorous tests on the beach and on the road; and then if they succeed in passing those tests they put the car into commercial production and sell it to the public. I need only say that the army is a much more complicated machine than a motor car; and incidentally if Honourable Members say that it is absurd to imagine that a country of the size and character of India is unable to produce officers to lead their army, surely it is equally true that it is incredible that a country of the size of India should not be able to produce motor cars. Still the fact remains that in both cases India has not yet done so. . . .

**An Honourable Member:** Thanks to you!

**Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham:** Now, my point is that we are trusting these young officers; we are launching them upon this experiment and we are giving them every possible guidance and assistance. Nobody can deny that. We are going out of our way to post to the Indianising units some of our best and most sympathetic officers to train these young men, as they gradually get senior, to take their places; and if we are doing that, I do not think anybody has any right to say that our policy is based on distrust. On the other hand I do say that the public generally and Honourable Members opposite could help enormously towards the success of this experiment, if they too were ready to trust us and also to trust these young men. At present what do we hear? Nothing but talk about inviolable distinctions or differences in powers of command and segregation. Now, what does segregation mean? Merely putting these young men by themselves to do a particular job with proper guidance and proper supervision. No Honourable Member opposite, I am quite sure, would admit that these young men are not capable of running the show by themselves: why then do they object to this word segregation? I believe it is entirely

[Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham.]

due to the supposition that our scheme of Indianising completely a portion of the army is based on our desire that British officers should never submit to the command of Indian officers.

**An Honourable Member:** That is just the point.

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I need only refer to the debates that took place in Simla last year on this subject. What did it all amount to? What our opponents then said was: "We want complete reciprocity of powers of command between British and Indian officers in the Indian army." We said: "We agree. That is the principle that we ourselves advocate and we are going to do it." Our opponents then said: "We do not trust you to do it: we want you to put a definite section in a definite Act and tie your hands in order to do it." We said: "That is not the right way to do it: powers of command are not regulated by the Indian Army Act or the Army Act at Home: they are regulated by the King's Regulations which are issued by His Majesty who grants the Commission." Now, only a few days ago an amendment to the King's Regulations was issued and I will read it to the House:

"The power of command to be exercised by Indian Commissioned officers in relation to personnel belonging to His Majesty's Indian forces will be the power of command vested in officers of corresponding rank and status holding commissions in the land forces."

That is exactly what the Honourable Members wanted. It gives complete reciprocity of powers of command in the Indian army without any reservation of any kind. I do hope, Sir, that that will be enough to convince Honourable Members. . . .

**An Honourable Member:** Will you put it in the Act?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** . . . . that we are just as much in earnest about this as they are. It is quite true, Sir, that we cannot possibly promise now, at this moment, to stop British recruitment in any fixed number of years, but what I have said will, I hope, show Honourable Members that our policy does at least contain the possibility of a rapid approach to that position, and possibly a far more rapid approach than Honourable Members seem to think.

Now, Sir, I have dwelt possibly too long on the Indianization of the Indian army. I should like to say a few words about the reduction of British troops. The first thing I must say is that I deny absolutely that any portion of the army in India, either British or Indian, is maintained here as, what Honourable Members are pleased to call, an Imperial Reserve. That, Sir, is not true. The army in India, both British and Indian is maintained on a scale which is sufficient to protect India against local aggression on her frontiers and to maintain internal security; and, so far from the army in India being constituted as an Imperial Reserve, it is a plain fact that if India, which God forbid, were ever to be faced by the major danger of attack by a great Power, the army in India, British and Indian, as it is constituted at present, would not be sufficient to repel that attack, and we should have to apply for assistance and re-inforcements from England. So much, Sir, for the actual strength of the army in India. I do not believe that if that army were entirely Indian, there would be one single Member in this House who would advocate its reduction by one single man. There does, however, remain the question of the possibility of replacing British troops by Indian troops. Now, Sir, as regards that, I can only refer to what the Leader of the Independent Party

said about it at the First Round Table Conference. What he there advocated was,—I will quote his own words, "As you go on with Indianization, British troops must be *gradually* reduced". Sir, I may be perhaps excused for placing more emphasis on the word 'gradually' than possibly Mr. Jinnah himself did, but I cannot believe that by the word 'gradually' he meant either rapidly or suddenly; and our policy, as I explained the other day, does involve the gradual replacement of British by Indian troops. Our programme of Indianisation includes automatically the gradual replacement of certain portions of the British army by Indian units. The whole of this policy has been very carefully considered, within the last few years, both by this Government and by His Majesty's Government, and it was considered in the full knowledge of the strength of Indian opinion on this subject. Surely, Sir, we should be guilty, to say the least of it, of extreme inconsistency if, at this moment, we were to change our minds and advocate a sudden or rapid acceleration of the process.

Sir, that is all I have to say. I do hope that, whether Honourable Members agree with me or disagree with me, at least they will give me credit for having put my views before them honestly and frankly. (Hear, hear.) I do myself believe that the Government policy in this matter is the right policy. (*Several Honourable Members from the Opposition Benches*: "No, no.") We have no reason whatever to fear criticism regarding it, and I say it is the right policy, because, I believe, in the long run, it will prove itself to be in the best interests of the safety, honour and welfare of this country. (*Several Honourable Members from the Opposition Benches*: "No, no.")

(At this stage, several Honourable Members asked for a closure.)

**Mr. G. Morgan** (Bengal: European): Mr. President, after the very full explanation given by the Honourable the Army Secretary, there  
4 P. M. is really very little left for me to say.

**An Honourable Member**: On whose behalf?

**Mr G. Morgan**: On my own behalf. In fact, the few notes that I had made related to points with which the Army Secretary has already very ably dealt.

Now, Sir, it is evident from the speeches delivered today that this House considers an army in India is necessary. One has only to look at the map of India to realise the necessity for a force to safeguard the country. The North-West Frontier is an eternal question. The North-East Frontier may at any moment become another serious problem, and the long line of seaboard renders India vulnerable. Now, Sir, taking it for granted that an army is a necessity, the next question is what should be the strength and composition of that army? For many years past innumerable Committees have discussed this question, and I will only refer to the Garon Committee, which is sometimes called the Capitulation Tribunal. The findings of that Committee were accepted by His Majesty's Government and by the Government of India, and India receives a contribution of two crores, which will relieve, in practice, the Indian taxpayer of payments equivalent to the cost of eleven battalions of British infantry, that is to say, about one-fourth of the British infantry in India.

As this House is aware, the total fighting strength of the army in India was 238,000 in 1914, whereas in 1934 it was reduced to 179,000. The reduc-

[Mr. G. Morgan.]

tion has been, therefore, 59,000, of which 20,000 were British troops. At present, the strength of the field army is about 69,000 and that is considered, by those responsible, to be the minimum sufficient for what is called the minor danger, not for a big war, although this fighting force would have to "hold the fort", so to speak, in the case of a big war, until reinforcements came from overseas. That position has been explained by the Army Secretary only a few minutes ago. Sir, accepting this position, we now come to the question of the replacing of British troops by Indian troops. Honourable Members must be aware that this cannot be done by a stroke of the pen. It must take time.

**An Honourable Member:** Why?

**Mr. G. Morgan:** Because it cannot be done. You have to face facts. It must take time. I ask Honourable Members to face facts, and they know perfectly well that it must take time. The Sub-Committee of the first Round Table Conference acknowledged, and this has been repeated in this House today, that it would take 35 years to complete from the time British recruitment was stopped. It is not possible to stop British recruitment at once, as the Army Secretary has explained, until the result of the training of the cadets from the Military College has definitely shown that a sufficient number of officers of the right type are available and that they prove themselves capable, after reaching the rank of Captain. That is where the real test comes in.

Now, Sir, as regards the replacement of British troops by Indian troops, I understand that under treaties, with some of the Indian States, some British troops have to be retained in India. I do not know how many British troops have to be maintained, but I understand that some British troops have to be maintained.

In discussing the strength of armed forces, one has to remember that there are, (1) internal security troops, (2) covering troops, and (3) the field army, each of which has special duties assigned to it. The total comes to, as I have said, 179,000. Out of this total, the British number 58,000. The present policy, which I repeat has been fully explained a few moments ago by the Army Secretary,—the present policy with regard to Indianisation of the Indian army— involves the replacement of certain units in the British army by new units of the Indian army, and this has a direct bearing on the reduction of British troops serving in India. That is a point not to be missed. Some of my Honourable friends have objected to the expression, "experiment", but taking the definition which the Army Secretary has given of the word "experimental", in the same sense, Indianisation is in its experimental stage and must be tested before the larger question is accepted.

Sir, coming to the expense of the army; the cost of the fighting portion of the army, from the figures which have been supplied to us, comes to something under Rs. 22 crores, less than one-half of the total defence budget. It is said that more is being spent than before the War. That is perfectly correct in the number of rupees, but here, again, the percentages have been given you. India today spends a smaller proportion of her revenue on defence than she did in 1914. Honourable Members may say

that still it is too much. Very well. How can we reduce this expenditure? Let us take first the replacement of British troops by Indian troops. That, as this House will realise, or at least I hope will realise, must be a gradual process.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**Mr. G. Morgan:** They say "No", but I think if they go into the question they will find it is so, and it must be so. That there will be a saving ultimately is not denied; there must be a saving when that is completed. Mr. Jinnah, to quote another utterance of the Leader of the Independent Party, at the Round Table Conference, when the question of reducing British troops was under consideration, said, "As you go on reducing British troops it may be necessary for the safety of India, external and internal, that our standing army of Indian troops should be increased". So, there would be no large saving there when it ultimately came to pass. Now, Sir, let us see whether savings in other directions could be made. The first that comes to my mind is some system of road-making on the frontier. I think if you study the Waziristan position and the result, you will come to the conclusion that it would provide a very good investment and save a great deal of money.

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**Mr. G. Morgan:** You can say what you like. I am sure that a proper programme of road-making would certainly reduce our army expenditure on the frontier by a very large amount. Another possibility, Sir, is the manufacture of motors, tanks and aeroplanes which we have to purchase in large quantities abroad. As regards lethal weapons we manufacture 96 per cent. of what we use in the army, in India. I am sure, if Honourable Members will read carefully this little pamphlet they will endorse the conclusions come to by the Department and which I am prepared to accept. There is one thing when the question of a return to pre-war cost is brought forward, I should like to mention the question of equipment. We quite realise that the equipment, etc., of the army should be thoroughly up to date. The Legislative Assembly in 1921 accepted a Resolution to this effect. I would ask Honourable Members to read paragraph 3 of Chapter VII of this pamphlet in this connection. If they do, they will find that the cost is bound to be higher than it was in 1914. Sir, I oppose the motion.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta).]

**Dr. G. V. Deshmukh** (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Mr. Deputy President, I am glad that the Honourable Member who represents the Army Department here has accepted two propositions as axiomatic and they will be sufficient for my purpose. One is that the gallantry of the Indian soldier is undoubted and the second is that the aim is Indianisation. There may be difference so far as the interpretation of the word Indianisation is concerned, but I take it that in a general way Indianisation is acceptable. Coming down to some of the things that he told the House, I am glad to say that a good deal of the information that he gave us is already supplied to us by this very valuable blue book, but one or two points are not mentioned in it and I find it my duty to bring

[Dr. G. V. Deshmukh.]

them to the notice of the House. My Honourable friend talked a great deal about the efficacy of the officers in leading masses of men. What I should like to know is this. Are you going to have officers for your army by the attempt that you are doing now? What is the attempt that you are doing at the present time? You have opened the so-called Indian Sandhurst or the Dehra Dun Military Academy in which you take about 70 students per year, that is 15 students every six-monthly, and altogether the College cannot accommodate more than 70 students. Taking all the six years course, there are not more than 70 students. Am I correct?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** The course at the College is 24 years and the total number of students there is over 200.

**Dr. G. V. Deshmukh:** If that be so, the information that I saw in the League of Nations report is wrong. Taking the figures given by my Honourable friend as correct, compare them with the attempt that is being made in England to provide officers for their army. You have Officers Training Course, both junior and senior. In the junior course you prepare the children and boys so that in future they may become competent to be your officers. So far as the senior training course is concerned, you have a regular staff of 795 or 800 officers as permanent staff and nearly 80,000 men to whom training is given to be future officers. This is not the only thing. you will find that they do it from the Public School course itself. At the Public School you aim at producing men, so that they may be officers afterwards. Look at the training that your Public School boys get. If that is the attempt that is being made in England, what is the attempt you are making in this country, and then you come forward each time and say that you have not got sufficient officers, that men are not accustomed to lead in this country!

In a country like India, where aristocracy and nobility of birth are held so much in dignity and at a premium, are we going to be told that there will be a dearth of officers to lead our men? You know very well that without experience, without having had previous training either at Sandhurst or at Woolwich, in the time of the great crisis during the War, you actually had men who led the armies in Flanders and in France. The proof of it lies in the fact that the Victoria Cross, which had not been given to Indians before, was given to Indians after the War. They showed rare courage and came up to more than your usual standard at the time of that crisis. And are you going to tell me that during peace time they will not be able to lead your armies? The whole thing appears to me to be some kind of an excuse to keep the intelligent Indian boy from his legitimate birthright, and that is, of leading his own men in the field.

You will not be able to achieve this Indianisation by your saying that we have made a beginning. What is the proportion of Indian officers in your tank corps? You have started the eight-unit system. How many officers are there in your air force? Out of the total number of 7,000 odd officers, I was grieved to see, I would not say ashamed, the number of Indians who are carrying the King's Commission is 219 and this is what we are supposed to gloat over and say that there is going to be Indianisation. It stands to reason, and you were perfectly right that day when you spoke about the rate at which Indianisation is going to be carried on. I will interpret Indianisation for the present in the way you take it, that is



to say, replacing British officials in the Indian army by the Indian. I say even taking it in that way I am inclined to agree with you that if you go on at this rate, that is at the rate of ten per year, it may take about 700 years to reach this Indianisation. The Round Table Conference is repeatedly mentioned before this House. What is the use of telling us half truths. It was insisted there that you should see the wastage, the vacancies per year which take place. The wastage or the vacancies which were taking place in the officer's cadre were from 120 to 150 and, taking it at its lowest, the minimum was 90 and it was suggested at that Conference that an attempt should be made to Indianise the army by putting a stop immediately to the British recruitment and this is not merely the Indian idea. Look at your Rawlinson and McMunn Committee. They suggested that within 25 years half the officers should be Indian, but before the Rawlinson Committee there was a committee which was appointed by the Government of India in 1922 and what was the conclusion which was arrived at? The report was not submitted to the Sken Committee nor to anybody else but it was circulated round to the Defence Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference. It was definitely mentioned there—and General Rawlinson was responsible for it—that perfect Indianisation could take place within 30 years. It is not Indians who are talking about complete Indianisation. It is your own Generals, your own efficient men, your own Committees. Then you hide some of the reports. You distort some of the other reports of the Committee and you come before us and say, "Oh, there is a lack of men capable of leading the armies in this country".

The world war, if it has taught anything, it has taught one thing. If you look into the lessons of history, you will find that all this talk about tradition and heredity has nothing in it. I have been brought up in a scientific atmosphere all through my life, and I tell you that it is the environment which will produce warriors and leaders. If you want to know, I can give you historical instances. There was a warrior class in Egypt, but how did they stand before the artisans and plebians of Rome? Take Japan. Before the army was democratised, what was the condition. Except the Samurai, nobody else could be a soldier. What is the result today? You will find that every ordinary man going in the street is a hero and as good as a Samurai. Coming down to your own country and your own nation, you thought that only the scions of great houses should become captains and commanders for leading the army but what did you see in the Great War. I knew that a tooting cockney became a trench hero and I am sure that no Englishman will deny that. If there is a will, there is a way. You can achieve everything, provided you have the will and you give the proper training. That is so far as the officers are concerned.

Now, so far as the British section of the army is concerned, we are constantly told: "Oh, don't touch that". It frays the nerves of a certain section of the House when we touch this part of the programme. The army is said to be for the defence of the country. For whose defence? I know that the Englishmen are well defended in their own homes. If defence has any meaning, it can have that meaning only for me, the Indian, and if in that defence I am not going to have my voice heard as to how I am going to be defended and as to how I am going to spend the money for that defence, then, so far as I am concerned, that defence is a farce and there is no good your telling me that the defence is for the good of my country. How do we stand so far as the officers are concerned?

[Dr. G. V. Deshmukh.]

Do you mean to say that we will not be able to replace the British section of the Indian army? The Honourable Member himself admitted that so far as the gallantry of the Indian soldier is concerned, it is unquestionable. If that is so, what is there to prevent the replacement of the British soldier by the Indian soldier. Are you suspecting his loyalty? I hope you will not do that injustice? There might have been a time in 1857 perhaps. During the last 80 years, the Indian soldier has been loyal according to your ideas and, if at the end of 80 years, that is after the passing of three generations, if you are even now inclined to suspect the loyalty of the Indian soldier, then it does not redound very much to your credit. If you don't suspect his loyalty, then why should you not replace the British soldier? Now, your army is divided into internal security 70,000 troops, covering troops 42,000 and the field army 69,000. If you read this book, you will find that the duty of the covering troops is supposed to be frontier warfare. I take it that the frontier warfare is the most onerous part of the army. So far as these covering troops are concerned, it will be instructive to see what is the proportion of the British troops to the Indian troops in the campaigns on the frontier. If you look into the statistics of the 20 campaigns you have had in your frontier, you will find that the average number of British troops to the Indian troops in these frontier campaigns was something like two per cent. and, when you have only two per cent. of the troops engaged in this frontier warfare, you must have 69,000 British troops to 120,000 Indians. So far as internal security troops are concerned, you allow 70,000 troops.

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** May I ask the Honourable Member where he got the figure of 2 per cent. from?

**Dr. G. V. Deshmukh:** I will get you the figures afterwards. I do not speak without my book. That means that for the internal security you have one thousand more than the field army which is 69,000 and pray, what is the function of these internal security troops? Internal security troops at the present time, or at any time, can do only police work and if that is not convincing, you have only to refer to the history of Ireland. Even in the Black and Tan period, it was the police which secured the internal security of Ireland. Now, do you want 70,000 troops for this internal security? And what is the proportion of Britishers to Indians in these internal security troops? You will find that the number of Britishers is much larger than Indians. Now coming to the field army. You have a field army of 69,000. If you are aiming all the time at defence against the frontier tribes, you do not want more than two per cent. of the British troops. What is your 69,000 standing army going to do if an army is marching from the Oxus or Ohio? You can quite well understand how modern warfare is going to be waged. What is 69,000? Don't you remember that when your 150,000 troops landed from England on the Continent what the Kaiser said? He said: "walk over that contemptible army"—and that army, Sir, was not contemptible, it ended in the retreat in the Mons, that is perfectly true, but, supposing this country had to face really a first-class nation on the frontiers of India, what are you going to do, and what is this 69,000 army going to do? All I say is this, that in fighting a first-class nation, it is absolutely insufficient and it will be inefficient. So far as fighting with any second-class army or frontier tribes is concerned, it is not more than absolutely necessary, but if you have any vision before you, you are bound to see that wars in future are

not going to be fought on a minor scale, but on a very much larger than that in 1914, and how are you going to arrange for our defence? By means of mercenary army of 69,000 Britishers and 120,000 Indians? No. We ourselves would very strongly resent and object to being defended by a mercenary army. Sir, we Indians would like to stand up ourselves, on our own legs, and defend our hearths and homes. (Loud Applause.) Supposing we have to fight against any first-class army in future, you must have the vision for that. See to that. We are all aware how you are making provision for your reserves and for your supplementary reserves and for your ancillaries and for your junior and senior training corps and even by starting rifle clubs and by your starting military education in your Public Schools.

Now, so far as our education is concerned, you will have to do something on the same basis so far as India is concerned. If you ask me, I am all for efficiency, I am for mechanization, but I am also for this, that in that mechanization the scientific and technical branches should exist not only for Europeans, I am for the due share of Indians therein. I say, that every Indian who is taken into the army must have a free access to all the technical and scientific and mechanised branches, but, as you are aware, that no Indian has. We know he is excluded from the Royal Air Force, any tank corps is taboo to him. I ask for admission to all these not because I want to invade England, not because I want to come and invade even my frontier provinces or my frontier neighbour, but simply because, in the wars of the future, I will not be left alone. Sir, I am not such a passivist. I believe in the military efficiency of a State. I do not think that human nature is going to be changed to such an extent that in future there is going to be a millennium and war is going to vanish. On the other hand, I take the realities of the situation as they are, and I can tell you that in future, India being the most coveted prize, what would England be without India? Sir, we know Lord Rothermere says for every pound that the Britisher earns fourteen shillings out of that comes from India and, therefore, India is looked upon as a coveted prize by every nation, whether it is Russia or Japan or the Chinese hordes. They all have their covetous glance at India. Are we going to wait till your eight squadrons of aeroplanes come round to the frontier or till your reinforcements come over from England and, in the meanwhile, am I going to be exploded? Sir, my standpoint is—and I take it that that is the right standpoint for every self-respecting Indian, whether he be the war-like Punjabi or somebody belonging to my Maratha country or even the Madrasi. (Loud Laughter.) I say that that would be the standpoint of every true Indian, and, therefore, what I say is this, that you will not be able to achieve your object of defending this country by this narrow view. You must not only replace the 69,000 British troops, but, I say, even more than that, you must have reserves. The Mesopotamian Commission said that in this country there is no dearth of warlike material. All this artificial distinction between martial and non-martial races does not appeal to me. I am proud of my Punjabi countrymen, but this invidious distinction is not scientific, it is not fair to others and it is absolutely selfish so far the martial and non-martial races are concerned. But even if you take that view, your Mesopotamian Commission told you that out of 23 crores there are five crores of war-like races in this country. Why don't you train them up, instead of depending upon reserves and supplementary reserves? Instead of that, you are satisfied as at present with 120,000.

[Dr. G. V. Deshmukh.]

Sir, this kind of thing will not satisfy us. You must look at it entirely from the defence point of view, and, therefore, I say, Sir, that I must have the right, and I owe it to my country that I must have the right so far as our own officers and men are concerned.

Now, Sir, I do not want to take very much time, but I cannot really sit down without alluding to this budget. Sir, this book is very valuable. Some of my friends, belonging to the Finance Department, might say that this is a military budget, and this item takes away 45 crores out of 120 crores, and what is the good of appealing to us, of the Finance Department? Sir, in this book, as on page 25, the military gentlemen make it a point that, so far as their expenditure is concerned, it has only gone up by 58 per cent. from 1914 up till now, but so far as the civil expenditure is concerned, it has gone up by 125 per cent. You cannot say to the military side—well, you cut down your expenditure. The necessary retort will be—yours has gone up very much. Why don't you reduce it? But that is not the only way how expenditure has gone up. You have combatant officers, and you have non-combatant officers so far as the ancillary forces are concerned. If this is your view that we want fighting units for the defence of the country, I can even agree and say "very well, temporarily, if you think so, by all means have your combatant units in India, but what about the auxiliary and the ancillary units? And do you know that in the ancillary units, the ratio of officers is very much more than in the fighting units? So far as the fighting units are concerned, whereas there is one officer to 50 fighting units, in the ancillary units you have one officer to 26 units". Where does all this money go to? It is absolutely unnecessary. If you are honest about Indianization, then, at least in the non-combatant units, you can make a good and decent beginning, and you can have a fairly large number. So far as the ancillary services are concerned, they cannot differ very much from the civil side. Well, Sir, that is the one point that I want to make that, naturally, the military side cannot be asked by the civil side to reduce their expenditure. Our cry from this side, representing the taxpayers, is that the expenditure of this country has grown up very high, and, therefore, we claim that there must be a reduction of taxation. You want to put it on a narrow issue. You say that the military people will say that there is the civil expenditure which has gone up, and the civil people will say, there is the military expenditure, which has gone up. Sir, all this reminds us of Moliere's play showing the singing master and the fencing master quarrelling with each other. Then, I do not really see why the motor industry cannot be started in India. You will be able to economise a very great deal, and this remark or suggestion coming from the military side is very good indeed, because in that way you will be able to start the motor industry at the present time and at a future date perhaps you may be able even to make your own aeroplanes. Therefore, my idea of educating this country in the art of providing from its own resources, both men and materials, must be carried out for the sake of our own defence, at the right time.

I hope in speaking thus I have not frayed the nerves of any section of the House more than I could help. I have taken my stand on the general principles, on the principle of self-respect and on the ground of honour. I know that grounds of honour are more respected on the military side than on any other side. You know very well, Sir, that without grounds of honour, there will be no army. When his honour is concerned, the soldier has to

lay down his life on the battlefield and die for his country, otherwise it will only be a gang of murderers. That being so I thought it better to appeal to the House on the ground of sportsmanship and on the ground of honour. It may be, Sir, that on account of incomplete information that the things I have said may not be correct, it may be that I am congenitally unable to understand, but if there is a congenital idiocy—acquired idiocy is the worst, stamped with the brand of hypocrisy on its brow. (Applause.)

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) resumed the Chair.]

**Several Honourable Members:** The question may now be put.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is that the question be now put.

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury:** I have no reply to make.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Army Department' be reduced to one rupee."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—79.

Aaron, Mr. Samad.  
 Abdoola Haroon, Seth Haji.  
 Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.  
 Abdullah, Mr. H. M.  
 Aney, Mr. M. S.  
 Asaf Ali, Mr. M.  
 Ayyangar Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.  
 Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.  
 Ba Si, U.  
 Radi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.  
 Bajoria, Babu Baijnath.  
 Banerjee, Dr. P. N.  
 Raqui, Mr. M. A.  
 Bardaloi, Sriji N. C.  
 Bhagavan Das, Dr.  
 Chhattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra  
 Nath.  
 Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.  
 Chetty, Mr. Sami Vencatachalam.  
 Das, Mr. B.  
 Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.  
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.  
 Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.  
 Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.  
 Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.  
 Essak Nait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.  
 Fakir Chand, Mr.  
 Fazli-Haq Piracha, Khan Sahib  
 Shaikh.  
 Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.  
 Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.  
 Giri, Mr. V. V.  
 Govind Das, Seth.  
 Gupta, Mr. Ghansham Singh.  
 Hidayatullah, Sir Ghulam Hussain.  
 Hosmani, Mr. S. K.  
 Iswar Saran, Munshi.  
 Jedhe Mr. K. M.  
 Jehangir, Sir Cowasjee.  
 Jogendra Singh, Sardar.  
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.  
 Khan Sahib, Dr.

Khare, Dr. N. B.  
 Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.  
 Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.  
 Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.  
 Mangal Singh, Sardar.  
 Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.  
 Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qasi.  
 Muhammad Nauman, Mr.  
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Syed  
 Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.  
 Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta.  
 Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.  
 Parma Nand, Bhair.  
 Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.  
 Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur  
 Makhdom Syed.  
 Rajan Dr. T. S. S.  
 Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.  
 Ranga Prof. N. G.  
 Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.  
 Sant Singh, Sardar.  
 Satyamurti, Mr. S.  
 Shafi Daudi, Maulvi Muhammad.  
 Sham Lal, Mr.  
 Shaikat Ali, Maulana.  
 Shewdas Daga, Seth.  
 Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib  
 Nawab.  
 Singh, Mr. Deep Narayan.  
 Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.  
 Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.  
 Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.  
 Sinha, Mr. Shri Krishna.  
 Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.  
 Sri Prakasa, Mr.  
 Thein Maung, Dr.  
 Umar Ali Shah, Mr.  
 Varma, Mr. B. B.  
 Vimanji, Mr. Mathuradas.  
 Yakub, Sir Muhammad.  
 Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr.

## NOES—48.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.  
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.  
 Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan  
     Bahadur Nawab Malik.  
 Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A. A.  
     Venkatarama.  
 Bajpai, Mr. G. S.  
 Bewoor, Mr. G. V.  
 Bhoré, The Honourable Sir Joseph.  
 Buas, Mr. L. C.  
 Chatarji, Mr. J. M.  
 Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.  
 Dalal, Dr. R. D.  
 DeSouza, Dr. F. X.  
 Drake, Mr. D. H. C.  
 Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya  
     Ananda.  
 Gidney, Lieut. Colonel Sir Henry.  
 Graham, Sir Lancelot.  
 Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.  
 Hockenbuhl, Mr. F. W.  
 Hudson, Sir Leslie.  
 James, Mr. F. E.  
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur  
     Sardar Sir.  
 Kirpalani, Mr. Hiranand Khushiram.  
 Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur  
     Chaudhri.

Lindsay, Sir Darcy.  
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.  
 Metcalfe, Mr. H. A. r.  
 Milligan, Mr. J. A.  
 Monteath, Mr. J.  
 Morgan, Mr. G.  
 Mukharji, Mr. N. R.  
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya  
     Charan.  
 Nayar, Mr. C. Govindan.  
 Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.  
 Owen, Mr. L.  
 Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. O.  
 Rau, Mr. P. R.  
 Richards, Mr. W. J. C.  
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.  
 Sarma, Mr. R. S.  
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.  
 Scott, Mr. W. L.  
 Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain  
     Sardar.  
 Singh, Mr. Pradyumna Prashad.  
 Sinha, Raja Bahadur Harihar Prosad  
     Narayan.  
 Sircar, The Honourable Sir Nripendra.  
 Sloan, Mr. T.  
 Swithinbank, Mr. B. W.  
 Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 79.—BALUCHISTAN.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** Sir, I beg to move:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 27,63,000 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, 1936, in respect of ‘Baluchistan’.”

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 27,63,000 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, 1936, in respect of ‘Baluchistan’.”

*Repressive Policy in Baluchistan.*

**Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon** (Sind: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I move:

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

By this cut motion, I want to protest against the repressive policy that is being pursued by Government in that province. I have very little time left, and I do not think I can explain this repressive policy in detail; but I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that for the last two years Government have started a repressive policy in Baluchistan, because these people want advancement for their province. They are not allowed to make any speeches in the province itself; they have also no right to publish a newspaper. Lately, a gentleman, called Abdul Samad Khan, came to Karachi and made a speech in a meeting where fortunately I was present, and I think I myself have made stronger speeches than this speech he made in Karachi. On account of this, he was, on his return to Quetta, placed before the *Jirgah* under section 124-A and a sentence of three years' imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 3,000 was imposed on him. He was sent to jail and he was not allowed any kind of pleader or barrister to defend him. Besides that, Abdul Aziz Kurd, who lives in Baluchistan, sent some article to a Punjab newspaper, and, on account of that, he was arrested on his return to Baluchistan and placed before the *Jirgah*. The *Jirgah* acquitted him. . . .

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe** (Foreign Secretary): Sir, on a point of order, I should like to point out that Abdul Aziz Kurd is a subject of Kalat State and that any action taken against him was taken by the Kalat State, and is, therefore, a matter of the internal administration of that State.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then the Honourable Member should not refer to that case.

**Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon**: I do not know if it was the Kalat State, but he was first of all placed before the *Jirgah* and was acquitted. The next day, he was again arrested and convicted to pay a fine of Rs. 500. On the third day, he was again arrested and sentenced to five years' imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 5,000. Besides these, there are many things I had to say, but the time is short, and, without saying more, I will appeal to the House to vote in favour of my motion.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Baluchistan' be reduced by Rs. 100."

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe** (Foreign Secretary): Sir, may I in the first place object strongly to this method of producing a case at the very last moment and stating it against a local administration without giving me any proper time to reply? Regarding Abdul Samad, I can say quite definitely that I, quite contrary to the Honourable Member, have seen the whole record . . .

**Sir Muhammad Yakub** (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): We expect a general answer from the Government. We do not want to deal with particular persons and individuals.

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe**: It is quite impossible for me in the space of three minutes to give a general answer to a complaint of repression against

[Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe.]

an administration. The Honourable Member has mentioned certain specific cases which I will do my best to deal with as rapidly as possible. . .

**Sir Muhammad Yakub:** That was by way of example only.

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe:** It may have been by way of example; but it was to my mind a gross libel upon the administration. As I was saying, I myself sent for the record of that case in order that I might be in a position, if necessary, to defend the case before this House. Abdul Samad received a fair trial according to the ordinary system of law in force in Baluchistan. He made no appeal against the conviction which he was able to do: he applied for no revision and he accepted the punishment, presumably as being just. I may add that I think it is rather unfair to bring a case before this House before the person convicted has taken any steps to obtain the ordinary legal remedies which are open to him.

The other case of Abdul Aziz Kurd, as I have already pointed out, was entirely a matter for the Kalat State, and it is, I believe, contrary to the rules of this House for matters concerning the internal administration of an Indian State to be discussed. As far as I know, the proceedings were perfectly regular and the conviction was entirely in order.

The next case which the Honourable Member mentioned was that of newspapers and meetings. I have discussed this matter frequently with the Agent to the Governor General in Baluchistan. He informs me that far from there being any restrictions upon meetings, anybody can have a meeting if he wishes and provided they confine the proceedings of the meeting within the law, there is no possible objection. As regards newspapers, I am prepared to admit that the attitude of the local administration, though reasonable, was not in accord entirely with modern tendencies. They took the view, whether rightly or wrongly, that newspaper agitation, among a primitive population of the kind which lives in Baluchistan, was impossible without exciting feelings and possibly disturbances which would have been a very grave responsibility upon themselves. They, therefore, desired to retain certain powers which they possessed which appeared to the Government of India to be rather archaic. They have now agreed and I am sure the House and particularly my Honourable friend who represents Baluchistan unofficially but nonetheless loyally in this House would like to hear it—the Government of India asked and they have agreed no longer to apply these special powers but to rely entirely on the ordinary Press Act which is in force. I recently inquired from the local administration as to what applications there were at present for publication of newspapers and I have been told that there were only three—I am speaking from memory owing to the way that this motion has suddenly been shot upon me—there were only three, of which certainly one had been granted and the other was under consideration. . . .

(It being Five of the Clock.)

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order: the question is:

"That the demand under the head "Baluchistan" be reduced by Rs. 100."



The Assembly divided :

AYES—75.

|                                     |                                    |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Aaron, Mr. Samuel.                  | Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.        |
| Abdoola Haroon, Seth Haji.          | Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.      |
| Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.          | Mangal Singh, Sardar.              |
| Abdullah, Mr. H. M.                 | Mehr Shah Nawab Sahibzada Sir      |
| Anwar-ul-Azim, Mr. Muhammad.        | Sayed Muhammad.                    |
| Asaf Ali, Mr. M.                    | Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.    |
| Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.    | Muhammad Ahmad Kasmi, Qazi.        |
| Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.            | Muhammad Numan, Mr.                |
| Ba Si, U.                           | Murtaza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi      |
| Badi-us-Zaman, Maulvi.              | Syed.                              |
| Banerjee, Dr. P. N.                 | Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.              |
| Baqui, Mr. M. A.                    | Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta. |
| Bardaloi, Srijut N. C.              | Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.       |
| Bhagavan Das, Dr.                   | Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.  |
| Chatopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra        | Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur    |
| Nath.                               | Makhdum Syed.                      |
| Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam. | Rajan, Dr. T. S. S.                |
| Chetty, Mr. Sami Vencatachalam.     | Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.       |
| Das, Mr. B.                         | Ranga, Prof. N. G.                 |
| Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.             | Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.            |
| Das, Pandit Nilakantha.             | Satyamurti, Mr. S.                 |
| Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.           | Shafi Daudi, Maulvi Muhammad.      |
| Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.             | Sham Lal, Mr.                      |
| Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.                 | Shaukat Ali, Maulana.              |
| Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sethar H.     | Sheodass Daga, Seth.               |
| Fakir Chand, Mr.                    | Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib      |
| Fazl-i-Haq Piracha, Khan Sahib      | Nawab.                             |
| Shaikh.                             | Singh, Mr. Deep Narayan.           |
| Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.                  | Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.            |
| Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.          | Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.        |
| Giri, Mr. V. V.                     | Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.          |
| Govind Das, Seth.                   | Sinha, Mr. Shri Krishna.           |
| Gupta, Mr. Ghansham Singh.          | Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.             |
| Hidayatallah, Sir Ghulam Hussain.   | Sri Prakasa, Mr.                   |
| Hosmani, Mr. S. K.                  | Thein Maung, Dr.                   |
| Iswar Saran, Munshi.                | Thein Maung, U.                    |
| Jedbe, Mr. K. M.                    | Umar Aly Shah, Mr.                 |
| Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.             | Varma, Mr. B. B.                   |
| Khan Sahib, Dr.                     | Viesanji, Mr. Mathuradas.          |
| Khare, Dr. N. B.                    | Yakub, Sir Muhammad.               |
|                                     | Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr.                |

## NOES—47

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.  
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.  
 Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan  
 Bahadur Nawab Malik.  
 Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A. A.  
 Venkatarama.  
 Bajpai, Mr. G. S.  
 Bewoor, Mr. G. V.  
 Bhowe, The Honourable Sir Joseph.  
 Buss, Mr. L. C.  
 Chatarji, Mr. J. M.  
 Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.  
 Dalal, Dr. R. D.  
 DeSouza, Dr. F. X.  
 Drake, Mr. D. H. C.  
 Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya  
 Ananda.  
 Graham, Sir Lancelot.  
 Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.  
 Hockenhull, Mr. F. W.  
 Hudson, Sir Leslie.  
 James, Mr. F. E.  
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur  
 Sardar Sir.  
 Kirpalani, Mr. Hiranand Khushiram.  
 Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur  
 Chaudhri.  
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy.  
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.

Metcalf, Mr. H. A. F.  
 Miligan, Mr. J. A.  
 Monteath, Mr. J.  
 Morgan, Mr. G.  
 Mukerjee, Mr. N. R.  
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya  
 Charan.  
 Nayar, Mr. C. Govindan.  
 Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.  
 Owen, Mr. L.  
 Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.  
 Rau, Mr. P. R.  
 Richards, Mr. W. J. C.  
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.  
 Sarma, Mr. B. S.  
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.  
 Scott, Mr. W. L.  
 Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain  
 Sardar.  
 Singh, Mr. Pradyumna Prashad.  
 Sinha, Raja Bahadur Harihar Prosad  
 Narayan.  
 Sircar, The Honourable Sir  
 Nripendra.  
 Sloan, Mr. T.  
 Swithinbank, Mr. B. W.  
 Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Before the demand, under which this motion has been made, is put, it may be mentioned that in putting this motion to the House the Chair has followed one or two previous rulings, but the Chair is itself not quite satisfied whether there was really a proper discussion of the subject. Therefore, the Chair wishes that this should not be taken as a precedent for the future.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a reduced sum not exceeding Rs. 27,62,900 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, 1936, in respect of 'Baluchistan'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 16—CUSTOMS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 78,81,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Customs'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 17—TAXES ON INCOME.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 87,92,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Taxes on Income'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 18—SALT.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a reduced sum not exceeding Rs. 72,81,900 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, 1936, in respect of 'Salt'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 19—OPIUM.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 34,23,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Opium'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 19A—EXCISE.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,68,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Excise'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 20—STAMPS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,42,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Stamps'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 21—FOREST.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,13,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Forest'."

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 22—IRRIGATION (INCLUDING WORKING EXPENSES), NAVIGATION, EMBANKMENT AND DRAINAGE WORKS.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,95,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works'."

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 23—INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT (INCLUDING WORKING EXPENSES).**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,55,95,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)'."

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 25—INTEREST ON DEBT AND REDUCTION OR AVOIDANCE OF DEBT.**

1

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 21,33,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Interest on Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt'."

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 26—INTEREST ON MISCELLANEOUS OBLIGATIONS.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 66,28,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations'."

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 27—STAFF, HOUSEHOLD AND ALLOWANCES OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,60,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor General'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 28—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 75,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Executive Council'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 29—COUNCIL OF STATE.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,34,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Council of State'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 30—LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEPARTMENT.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,03,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 31—FOREIGN AND POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,11,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Foreign and Political Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 32—HOME DEPARTMENT.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a reduced sum not exceeding Rs. 6,79,900 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, 1936, in respect of 'Home Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 38—PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,55,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Public Service Commission'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 34—LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,10,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Legislative Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 35—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, HEALTH AND LANDS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,05,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Department of Education, Health and Lands'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 36—FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,71,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Finance Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 38—COMMERCE DEPARTMENT.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,83,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Commerce Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 39—ARMY DEPARTMENT.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a reduced sum not exceeding one rupee 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, 1936, in respect of 'Army Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 40—DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIES AND LABOUR.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,64,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Department of Industries and Labour'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 41—CENTRAL BOARD OF REVENUE.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,97,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Central Board of Revenue'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 42—PAYMENT TO PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF ADMINISTRATION OF AGENCY SUBJECTS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,56,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Payments to Provincial Governments on account of Administration of Agency Subjects'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 43—AUDIT.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 96,91,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Audit'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 44—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 55,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Administration of Justice'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 45—POLICE.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim). The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,19,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Police'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 46—PORTS AND PILOTAGE.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,02,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 47—LIGHTHOUSES AND LIGHTSHIPS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,40,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Lighthouses and Lightships'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 48—SURVEY OF INDIA.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 21,11,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Survey of India'."

The motion was adopted.



DEMAND No. 49—METEOROLOGY.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,81,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Meteorology'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 50—GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,02,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Geological Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 51—BOTANICAL SURVEY.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,22,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Botanical Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 52—ZOOLOGICAL SURVEY.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 85,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Zoological Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 53—ARCHAEOLOGY.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,65,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Archaeology'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 54—MINES.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,20,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Mines'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 55—OTHER SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENTS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,55,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Other Scientific Departments'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 56—EDUCATION.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,11,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Education'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 57—MEDICAL SERVICES.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,22,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Medical Services'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 58—PUBLIC HEALTH.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,91,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Public Health'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 59—AGRICULTURE.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,31,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Agriculture'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 60—IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH DEPARTMENT.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,45,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 60A—SCHEME FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING IN INDIA.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,73,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Scheme for the Improvement of Agricultural Marketing in India'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 61—CIVIL VETERINARY SERVICES.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,90,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Civil Veterinary Services'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 62—INDUSTRIES.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,44,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Industries'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 63—AVIATION.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,06,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Aviation'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 64—COMMERCIAL INTELLIGENCE AND STATISTICS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,18,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Commercial Intelligence and Statistics'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 65—CENSUS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Census'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 66—EMIGRATION—INTERNAL.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 16,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Emigration—Internal'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 67—EMIGRATION—EXTERNAL.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,91,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Emigration—External'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 68—JOINT-STOCK COMPANIES.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,29,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Joint-Stock Companies'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 69—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,12,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 70—INDIAN STORES DEPARTMENT.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 19,67,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Indian Stores Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 71—CURRENCY.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,64,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Currency'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 72—MINT.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,83,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Mint'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 73—CIVIL WORKS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,10,25,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Civil Works'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 74—SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES AND PENSIONS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,13,55,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Superannuation Allowances and Pensions'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 75—STATIONERY AND PRINTING.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 33,33,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Stationery and Printing'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 76—MISCELLANEOUS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,61,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Miscellaneous'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 76A—EXPENDITURE ON RETRENCHED PERSONNEL CHARGED TO REVENUE.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 56,000, 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, 1936, in respect of 'Expenditure on Retrenched personnel charged to revenue'."

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 76B—MISCELLANEOUS ADJUSTMENTS BETWEEN THE CENTRAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,03,57,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments'."

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 77—REFUNDS.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,15,32,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Refunds'."

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 80—DELHI.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 43,00,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Delhi'."

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 81—AJMER-MERWARA.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,08,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Ajmer-Merwara'."

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 82—ANDAMANS AND NICOBAR ISLANDS.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 25,70,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Andamans and Nicobar Islands'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 83—RAJPUTANA.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,99,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Rajputana'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 84—CENTRAL INDIA.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,27,000 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 March, 1936, in respect of 'Central India'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 85—HYDERABAD.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 42,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Hyderabad'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 85A—ADEN.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,50,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Aden'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 86—EXPENDITURE IN ENGLAND—SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 22,63,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Expenditure in England—Secretary of State for India'."

The motion was adopted.



## DEMAND No. 87—EXPENDITURE IN ENGLAND—HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR INDIA.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 26,39,000. 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, 1936, in respect of 'Expenditure in England—High Commissioner for India'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 88—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON SECURITY PRINTING.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Security Printing'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 89—FOREST CAPITAL OUTLAY.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Forest Capital Outlay'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 90—IRRIGATION

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Irrigation'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 91—INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 55,06,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 93—CURRENCY CAPITAL OUTLAY.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Currency Capital Outlay'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 94—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON VIZAGAPATAM HARBOUR.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,50,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 95—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON LIGHTHOUSES AND LIGHTSHIPS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Lighthouses and Lightships'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 95A.—CAPITAL OUTLAY CONNECTED WITH THE INSTITUTION OF THE PROVINCES OF ORISSA AND SIND.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,00,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Capital Outlay connected with the Institution of the Provinces of Orissa and Sind'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 96—COMMUTED VALUE OF PENSIONS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,68,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Commuted Value of Pensions'."

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 96A—EXPENDITURE ON RETRENCHED PERSONNEL CHARGED TO CAPITAL.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel charged to Capital'."

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 97—DELHI CAPITAL OUTLAY.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 52,45,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Delhi Capital Outlay'."

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 98—INTEREST-FREE ADVANCES.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 70,18,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Interest-free Advances'."

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 99—LOANS AND ADVANCES BEARING INTEREST.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,00,72,000 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, 1936, in respect of 'Loans and Advances bearing Interest'."

The motion was adopted.

---

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): As regards the business for tomorrow and the day after, the Chair wishes to consult the House as regards questions. If the House so desires, the Chair is prepared to dispense with questions tomorrow and the day after and also to sit till 6 P.M., on both these days, so that as many Honourable Members, as possible, who desire to speak may have a chance of doing so. If that suits the wishes of the House, the Chair wishes to follow that course.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg** (Finance Member): May I ask, Sir, if it is on the understanding that we do finish the debate on the motion that the Finance Bill be taken into consideration on Thursday night at six o'clock? Is that your suggestion, Sir?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is certainly the Chair's idea. What the Chair has agreed to or rather the House has agreed to is to give this extra four hours to Honourable Members. The Chair believes, if the Leaders of Parties impose a certain amount of self-denial on themselves and their Groups, in that case the Chair would hope that the consideration of the Finance Bill might be finished day after tomorrow. At any rate, the Chair should like to have a chance of consulting Leaders of Parties tomorrow morning at 10-30 A.M. in order to decide what is the best course to adopt.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir** (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadian Urban): Has anything been decided about Friday and Monday definitely?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair understands from the Leader of the House that the Government are agreeable to the desire, apparently of Non-Official Members, that Friday should, as an exceptional case, be a non-working day and so also Monday. That will give six uninterrupted non-working days to Honourable Members, and, if we could finish the consideration of the Finance Bill on Thursday, then the House will be able to take up the Finance Bill clause by clause after the reopening.

**The Honourable Sir Wipendra Sircar** (Leader of the House): We have no objection to the House not sitting on Friday or Monday, but we would proceed on the footing that the matter will be finished on Thursday afternoon at six o'clock. If that is not finished on Thursday afternoon, then we do not commit ourselves not to sit on Monday.

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai** (Leader of the Opposition): That is rather too late to suggest. Whether Friday should be allowed or not is a thing in which I am entirely in the hands of the House.

**The Honourable Sir Wipendra Sircar**: If it is not finished by Thursday, then we shall not probably agree to both the days being let off. It is much better if we discuss it and come to some arrangement in the President's room tomorrow morning at 10-30 A.M.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadian Rural): What is the objection to our continuing the debate on the 21st?

**The Honourable Sir Wipendra Sircar**: There is no objection, except prologation of this matter.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg**: And with regard to the Finance Bill, some of the taxes expire on the 31st March and the Bill has to be disposed of before that date.

**Seth Govind Das** (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muham-madan): But it sometimes used to be discussed after the 31st March also. As an old Member of the Central Legislature, my memory reminds me that once the Finance Bill was discussed probably in the first week of April.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg**: But that is not a very desirable precedent.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): At any rate if the Leaders of the different Groups will be good enough to see me tomorrow in my room at 10-30, we may be able to arrive at some decision.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad**: But, at the same time, we should be told what are the reasons why the debate cannot be continued on the 21st March.

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar**: If the Honourable Member proceeds in that way, there is no good reason why the House should not sit on Friday.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 13th March, 1935.