

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

MONDAY, 29th FEBRUARY, 1932

Vol. II—No. 6

OFFICIAL REPORT



CONTENTS.

Questions and Answers.

Unstarred Questions and Answers.

Statement Laid on the Table *re* Examination of Accounts in
the Income-tax Department, Bombay.

The Foreign Relations Bill—Presentation of the Report of the
Select Committee.

Election of Members to the Standing Committee for Roads.

Railway Budget—General Discussion.

NEW DELHI : PRINTED BY THE MANAGER
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS : 1932

Price Five Annas.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 29th February, 1932.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

CONTRACT FOR THE CONVEYANCE OF MAILS BETWEEN ERODE AND SATYAMANGALAM.

515. ***Mr. Bhuput Sing:** (a) Are Government aware that the Postmaster General, Madras, about the 17th October, 1931, accepted a revised tender for Rs. 200 for the conveyance of mails between Erode and Satyamangalam and directed the Superintendent of Salem to get the formal deed of contract executed with the party concerned?

(b) Is it a fact that the Superintendent of Post Offices, Salem, withheld the Postmaster General's order and did not execute the formal deed of contract with the party concerned? If so, why?

(c) Are Government aware that in spite of the orders of the Postmaster General, Madras, the Superintendent of Post Offices, Salem, on his own authority did not give the contract to the party whose tender was accepted by the former?

(d) Is it a fact that the Superintendent, Post Offices, Salem, gave away the contract to another individual whose tender in the original instance was rejected by the Postmaster General, Madras, as being a conditional tender?

(e) If the replies to parts (c) and (d) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state if the action of the Superintendent of Post Offices, Salem, was in order? If not, what action do they propose to take against the Superintendent of Post Offices, Salem?

Mr. T. Ryan: With your permission, Sir, I propose to take questions Nos. 515 and 516 together.

Information is being collected and will be placed on the table of the House in due course.

5 CONTRACT FOR THE CONVEYANCE OF MAILS BETWEEN ERODE AND SATYAMANGALAM.

+516. ***Mr. Bhuput Sing:** (a) Is it a fact that the Postmaster General, Madras, after having once passed final orders in regard to the contract for mail service between Erode and Satyamangalam asked the Superintendent of Post Offices, Salem, to secure further fresh tenders showing the lowest offers from two individuals?

† For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 515.

(b) If the reply to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state if the tender of one of the two individuals mentioned above was rejected in the original instance and no negotiations of any sort were ever entered into with him by the Postmaster General, Madras?

(c) Once tenders are called and final orders passed, can the orders be cancelled and fresh tenders called for? If so, what were the reasons which actuated the Postmaster General, Madras to call for fresh tenders? Why did the Postmaster General, Madras call for fresh tender from the same individual whose tender was originally accepted and final orders passed and another individual whose tender in the first instance was rejected?

(d) Is it a fact that the gentleman whose tender was accepted in the original instance is the Government contractor for mail conveyance from Erode to different other places and holds several testimonials for efficient service and appreciation from Government?

(e) If the reply to part (d) be in the affirmative, what were the reasons that prompted Mr. Shujat Ali, the Superintendent of Post Offices, Madras, to patronise a new individual?

PARTY TO THE POSTMASTER GENERAL, MADRAS, BY THE MANAGING DIRECTOR OF A MOTOR MAIL SERVICE.

517. *Sardar G. N. Mujumdar (on behalf of Mr. B. N. Misra):

(a) With reference to the answer given to starred question No. 1075 of Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar on 29th September, 1931, are Government aware that "to bid farewell to Mr. H. M. Richardson, the outgoing Postmaster General, and to welcome Mr. C. D. Rae, the new Postmaster General, Mr. C. Rajam, Managing Director, The Garage, Ltd., was "At Home" on the 1st February, 1932 "at India House, his residence" in Madras?

(b) Are Government aware that high officials of the Postal Department attended the function?

(c) Are Government aware that "after tea the guests moved to the drawing hall upstairs where they were entertained to a programme of dance by Srimati Ragini Devi, the famous oriental dancer" with instrumental music by her troupe of Patiala Court musicians?

(d) Is not the host, the Managing Director of the company, which is given a subsidy for Mail-Motor Service in Madras and in Calcutta?

(e) If the answer to part (d) is in the affirmative, what is the amount of subsidy given for Madras and for Calcutta?

(f) If the answer to part (a) is in the affirmative, are Government prepared to stop these officials accepting these parties from Government contractors?

(g) If the answer to (a) is in the negative, do Government propose to make enquiries and also see *The Hindu* of Madras, dated 2nd February, 1932?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a), (b), (c) and (d). Government have no information other than a report contained in the issue of *The Hindu* referred to by the Honourable Member in the last part of part (g) of this question.

(e) and (f). The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the answer to Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar referred to by him in part (a) of the question.

(g) Does not arise.

RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF BENGAL ON THE SHOOTING AT THE HIJLI DETENTION CAMP.

518. ***Mr. S. C. Sen:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the Government of Bengal's resolution on the report of the Hijli detenus shooting enquiry?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether a copy of the Bengal Government's resolution was forwarded to them officially as was mentioned in the resolution? If so, will they please state what action, if any, the Government of India have taken or intend to take in connection with the said resolution?

(c) Is it a fact that the Government of India empowered the Local Government by the said resolution to oust the jurisdiction of the ordinary criminal courts of the land and deal departmentally with public servants who have committed murder and murderous assaults without any justification and without the order or direction of their superior officer? If so, why and under what Act or Acts of the Indian Legislature?

(d) If the answer to part (c) be in the negative, will Government be pleased to state whether the officers connected with the Hijli shooting affair were ordered to be dealt with departmentally?

(e) Is it a fact that the Commandant of the military forces located in the Hijli Camp in Bengal was found guilty of murderous assaults on the inmates of the said detention camp? If so, will Government be pleased to state what punishment was awarded to him?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: (a) and (b). The Government of India received a copy of the Bengal Government's Resolution on the Hijli Enquiry Committee's Report. The matter was within the competence of the Local Government, and the Government of India have not taken any action in connection with the incident.

(c) I cannot accept the Honourable Member's description of the action taken. If he is referring to the power to refuse sanction to prosecution. I would refer him to section 132 of the Criminal Procedure Code, by which discretion is vested in the Local Government.

(d) I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to paragraph 10 of the Bengal Government's Resolution.

(e) There were no military forces employed in the Hijli Camp. I presume therefore the Honourable Member is referring to the Commandant of the Camp. I would invite attention to paragraphs 20 and 21 of the Report of the Enquiry Committee and to paragraph 6 of the Resolution I have referred to, from which he will observe that the Committee found that the insinuations made against this officer were entirely unfounded.

Mr. C. C. Biswas: Is the Honourable Member aware if any application was made to the Local Government for sanction to the prosecution of any officers concerned in this incident?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: I have no information on the point.

Mr. B. Das: Is it a fact that the Bengal Government asked the Commandant to take leave and clear out of India, and they went against the Commandant's Report and issued a communiqué which was false?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: No.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: Is the Honourable Member aware that in his evidence before the Inquiry Committee this Commandant virtually stated that the communiqué originally issued by the Bengal Government with regard to this matter was more or less a fabrication, as it was not based on anything that was supplied to the Government either by the Commandant himself or by the Camp authorities?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: No.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: Is the Honourable Member aware that the Government had appointed a counsel to look after the interests of the Detention Camp people, that is to say, of people against whom the charges were brought, and that in opening the case for these people, *i.e.*, the people who were in the position of accused, their own counsel appointed by Government made the statement that even if all the allegations that were made by the Detention Camp authorities were held to be true, there was no justification for the firing?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: My attention has not been called to that particular passage.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: Does the Honourable Member care to read newspapers, or has the Honourable Member ever cared to ask the Director of Information for a cutting of the newspaper press on this subject?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: In matters of this kind I prefer to see the original documents.

Mr. B. Das: Did not the Bengal Government forward to the Government of India a copy of their Report of the inquiry over the Hijli incident?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: Yes, Sir.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: Do I take it that it was barely the Report that was sent to the Government of India and not the materials on which it was based?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: I have already answered that the Government of Bengal sent us the full text of the inquiry Report.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: Will the Honourable Member, now that his attention has been called to this matter, call for the evidence and also for the report of the address of the counsel appointed by the Bengal Government to look after the interests of these people?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: I think, Sir, the matter has already been disposed of by the Resolution of the Local Government and the information which they gave in a recent debate in the local Legislative Council, to the official report of which I would refer the Honourable Member.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: Does the Honourable Member not think that in view of the responsibility which is laid upon the Government of India with regard to the superintendence, direction and control of Provincial Governments, some further action is necessary on the part of the Government of India in such a grave matter?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: As I have already stated, the Government of India do not intend to take any further action in the matter.

Mr. K. G. Neogy: Are the Government of India in a position to say that the action taken by the Government of Bengal in this matter has been adequate without looking into the materials on which the Report was based?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: I have nothing to add to what I have already said on this subject.

TICKET CHECKING ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

519. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** (a) With reference to the statement of Government in reply to the supplementary questions on starred question No. 230 on the 12th February, 1932, will Government be pleased to state whether the decision of the Agent that the Moody-Ward system was more efficient than the T. T. I. system was referred to the Railway Board?

(b) What was the decision of the Railway Board?

(c) Did the Agent of the East Indian Railway change the designation without changing the duties of the T. T. Is., and reduce the pay of T. T. Is. to one-third and one-fourth? If so, did the Railway Board notice this fact?

(d) Did the Railway Board notice the fact that the Agent switched-off the responsibility to the Divisional Superintendent?

(e) Will Government please lay on the table the letter of the Agent, East Indian Railway and the reply of the Railway Board?

Sir Alan Parsons: (a) The Agent did not express an opinion on the comparative efficiency of the various systems, but communicated his acceptance of the system recommended by the Moody-Ward Committee, and asked for the Railway Board's approval to his proposals for the adoption of this system.

(b) The Railway Board approved of the East Indian Railway adopting this system.

(c) The position is that under the new system there are comparatively a smaller number of Inspectors and a larger number of Travelling Ticket Examiners. The duties of a Travelling Ticket Examiner are not the same as those of an Inspector and the rates of pay are lower.

(d) No, but I will bring the Honourable Member's question to the notice of the Agent, East Indian Railway, for such action as he may consider necessary.

(e) Government are not prepared to lay copies of their departmental communications on the table.

ALLEGED ROUGH HANDLING OF A LADY PICKETER BY THE POLICE.

520. ***Mr. B. Das** (on behalf of Mr. B. R. Puri): (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to an incident reported in the *Tej* of 6th and 8th February, and in the *Hindustan Times* of 5th and 6th February, 1932 of rough handling and using abusive and provocative language to a respectable lady by Sub-Inspector Abdul Wahid of Delhi at the time of arresting her while she was picketing foreign cloth?

(b) Are Government aware that this incident was witnessed by a large crowd?

(c) Have Government taken any steps to investigate the alleged behaviour of the Police officer, and, if so, what is the result?

(d) Is it a fact that women have been added to the Delhi Police force? If so, why were they not employed in effecting the said arrest?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: (a) I have seen the report in the *Hindustan Times*. It is true that there was a good deal of abuse but it came from the person arrested and not from the police.

(b) Yes.

(c) An enquiry was made on the day of the occurrence by a Gazetted Officer. The Sub-Inspector was found entirely blameless.

(d) Yes; but as they had just been enlisted and had no uniform they had not been put on duty.

DANGER OF INFECTION FROM TUBERCULOSIS AT THE NEW CENTRAL JAIL, MULTAN.

521. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Is it a fact that political prisoners, some of them being of "A" Class, from Delhi, have been sent to the New Central Jail, Multan?

(b) Is it a fact that the New Central Jail Multan has got about 120 ordinary convicts who are suffering from tuberculosis?

(c) If the answers to parts (a) and (b) are in the affirmative, are Government aware that there exists anxiety in the minds of the political prisoners and that there is serious danger of catching infection? If so, why do not Government propose to transfer them to a place which is free from any such risk?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) There is no danger of infection as tuberculosis cases are kept in a separate block at a distance from healthy prisoners. Multan is one of the healthiest places in the Punjab.

EXPENDITURE INCURRED ON TRANSFERRING PRISONERS FROM DELHI TO MULTAN.

522. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** Is it not a fact that the Government incur a very heavy expenditure for transferring prisoners from Delhi to Multan? If so, have Government considered in these days of economy the question of having a camp jail at Delhi?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: Arrangements are being made to erect a camp jail for C Class prisoners, but A and B Class prisoners are transferred to Multan because special arrangements exist there for the accommodation of such prisoners.

CHARGES FOR GOODS ON THE BENGAL NAGPUR RAILWAY.

523. ***Sardar G. N. Mujumdar** (on behalf of Mr. S. G. Jog): (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the Bengal Nagpur Railway Company has been recovering more charges for the goods from the consignors or consignees, by way of transshipment or terminal charges, than those prescribed in the Goods Tariff on the Katni-Murwara and Bilaspur section during December, 1926 to July, 1927 at a rate of six annas per maund without complying with the provisions of sections 47, 143, and 54 (1) of the Indian Railways Act of 1890 prescribed for the due publication of the goods tariff for the information of the public?

(b) If the action of the said Railway Company was justified and was not illegal or irregular, will Government be pleased to state the authority under which the Railway Company was entitled to recover excessive charges from the public on the goods consigned by them during the said period of December 1926 to July 1927 on the said section of the Bengal Nagpur Railway Company?

(c) Are Government aware of the fact that owing to this action of the Bengal Nagpur Railway Company, the members of the public were put to serious inconvenience and loss and were obliged to seek redress in the law courts?

(d) Are Government aware that the civil courts have decided that the public remedy for refund of these charges of 0-6-0 per maund in question would be by complaint to the Governor General in Council for the appointment of a Commissioner who would determine whether the charge has been made with or without proper sanction and at a reasonable rate?

(e) Are Government aware that the public have applied to the Governor General in Council, but the latter has refused to appoint the Railway Commissioners under the Indian Railways Act of 1890, *vide* their letter Nos. 195-11/29-C. & G., Legislative Department, dated Simla, the 5th June, 1930, and 195-111/29-C. G., dated 21st August, 1929?

Sir Alan Parsons: (a) The rate of six annas per maund was a charge which the Bengal Nagpur Railway levied on consignments transhipped at the site of the Johilla Bridge, which had been washed away by floods, when they accepted consignments for carriage over this section, as an alternative to carriage by the dearer route *via* Gondia. The fact that this charge was leviable was known at the stations from which consignments were booked.

(b) The additional charge was justified by reason of the special arrangements that were made for transshipment and carriage across the river.

(c) Government are aware that certain suits were filed; but are not aware of any inconvenience experienced by the public.

(d) Government believe that this was the view taken by a District Court.

(e) Yes.

**TRANSHIPMENT CHARGES OVER THE JOHILLA BRIDGE REALISED BY THE
BENGAL NAGPUR RAILWAY.**

524. ***Sardar G. N. Mujumdar** (on behalf of Mr. S. G. Jog): (a) Will Government please state the total amount realised by the Bengal Nagpur Railway Company on account of a rule of levying transshipment charge at a rate of 0-6-0 per maund extra on goods traffic in 1927 over the Johilla Bridge? Was it to the extent of Rs. 54,281-4-0?

(b) Will Government please state the authority which makes the Bengal Nagpur Railway Company competent to levy the said terminal or transshipment charge mentioned above from the public without due notification in the goods tariff? If the answer to this question is in the negative, are Government prepared to order the Bengal Nagpur Railway Company to refund the said amount mentioned above to the traders? If so, when; if not, why not?

(c) Was the imposition of the said transshipment charge at a rate of 0-6-0 per maund duly notified in the Bengal Nagpur Railway Goods Tariff under section 54 (1) of the Indian Railways Act of 1890, Circular No. 9, dated 14th May, 1895 of the Government of India Railway Department?

Sir Alan Parsons: (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). The charge was not embodied in the Tariff but its levy was authorised by the Administration, and under section 60 of the Indian Railways Act, any person could have seen at the station the document in which the charge was authorised.

**TRANSHIPMENT CHARGES OVER THE JOHILLA BRIDGE REALISED BY THE BENGAL
NAGPUR RAILWAY.**

525. ***Sardar G. N. Mujumdar** (on behalf of Mr. S. G. Jog): Will Government please state:

- (i) how many persons who had to pay this extra transshipment charge of 0-6-0 per maund, in addition to due notified rates, have up to date made complaints against the Bengal Nagpur Railway Company to Government for refund of their respective amounts;
- (ii) how many of them have directly applied to the Bengal Nagpur Railway administration;
- (iii) how many of them have taken the help of the civil court of justice; and
- (iv) how many of them have got refund of this amount through civil courts and out of court and how many have not?

Sir Alan Parsons: (i) Nine.

(ii) Government have no information.

(iii) Government are aware of there having been more than two suits, but do not know the exact number.

(iv) Government are aware that in one suit the decision of the Sub-Judge's court was against the plaintiff; they have not seen the judgments in the other cases.

REFUND OF TRANSHIPMENT CHARGES BY THE BENGAL NAGPUR RAILWAY.

526. ***Sardar G. N. Mujumdar** (on behalf of Mr. S. G. Jog): (a) Is it not a fact that Messrs. Baldev Dass Ghasi Ram of Mirzapur, East Indian Railway, have got the refund of the excess transshipment charge of 0-6-0 per maund in question out of court, from the Bengal Nagpur Railway Administration on their consignment of lac weighing 120 maunds booked Champa station to Mirzapur under Railway Receipt No. F. O. R. 25446 of 14th June, 1927, amounting to Rs. 45 and a similar refund has again been granted to them for a consignment booked from Pendra Road to Mirzapur in 1927?

(b) Is it not a fact that firms of Rampershad Sheo Pershad Pooran Makhan, Magni Ram Jhumal Mall, Munney Ram Kishen Pershad, Baldev Kunj Beihari all of Katni Murwara Bansi Lall Khoob Chand of Pendra Road and Gebiram of Satna station besides others had to pay this extra charge of 0-6-0 per maund amounting to a large sum of money and they have not yet got their refunds? If so, why? Will Government please state when their amounts will be refunded?

(c) Are Government aware that the action of the Bengal Nagpur Railway Company is contrary to the provisions of the Railway Act, sections 47 and 54 (1)? What steps have been taken or are proposed to be taken against them? If not, why not?

Sir Alan Parsons: (a) A statement to this effect was made by Messrs. Panna Lall in a representation submitted by him to the Governor General in Council. Beyond this, Government have no information.

(b) Government have no definite information as to what firms paid this extra charge, and the question of a refund of any alleged overcharge is a matter for the Bengal Nagpur Railway Administration to deal with.

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

COMPLAINTS AGAINST THE RAILWAY COMPANY BY THE ex-STATION MASTER, KATNI.

527. ***Sardar G. N. Mujumdar** (on behalf of Mr. S. G. Jog): (a) Is it not a fact that the Government of India have had due notice from Thakur Harparshad Singh, ex-Station Master, Katni (*vide* their acknowledgment letter No. 4010-T., dated the 17th September, 1931) in respect of various important matters and troubles affecting trade and the great inconvenience to general public in their dealings with the railway company in India?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state what steps were taken to safeguard the public interest; if not, why not?

Sir Alan Parsons: (a) A letter from Thakur Harparshad Singh was received, alleging that civil courts in the Central Provinces were deciding cases in contravention of the provisions of the Indian Railways Act.

(b) No action was taken, as it was open to plaintiffs concerned to appeal against judgment adverse to them.

FREIGHT RATES ON THE BENGAL NAGPUR RAILWAY.

528. ***Sardar G. N. Mujumdar** (on behalf of Mr. S. G. Jog): (a) Is it not a fact that the Railway companies in India, especially the Bengal Nagpur Railway Company, the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway Company, and the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Administration, do not legally claim freight applicable to the dearer route for carriage of goods by railway? Is it a fact that they are not permitted to do so under the General rule No. 19 printed in their Goods Tariffs and under section 54 (1) of the Indian Railways Act of 1890?

(b) If the answer to part (a) above is in the affirmative, will Government please justify how the Bengal Nagpur Railway Company, realised rates of the dearer routes from the public without due written endorsement of the consignors on the consignment notes and railway receipts?

(c) Are Government aware that in certain cases of the same nature, overcharges were realised and have been refunded to the public concerned by the same railway authorities?

Sir Alan Parsons: (a) Government have no reason to think that Railways claim to retain freight charges at higher rates than they are entitled to claim.

(b) and (c). Government are aware that cases do arise where freight charges are recovered at higher rates than are due and that refunds of the amounts overcharged are subsequently given.

EXCESS FREIGHT CHARGED TO TRADERS BY THE CERTAIN RAILWAYS.

529. ***Sardar G. N. Mujumdar** (on behalf of Mr. S. G. Jog): (a) Is it not a fact that certain traders of Pindra Road care-of Thakur Harparshad Singh, Alphert Ganj, Katni, have applied to the Bengal Nagpur Railway Company, and the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway Company and also Messrs. Munshi Ram Kishanpershad Kafni Murwara applied to the Bengal Nagpur Railway Company for the refund of overcharges realised from them in 1927 without due remarks on the consignment notes of General Rule 19, but the railway companies have not refunded the money as yet?

(b) Will Government please quote the authority consistent with the Railway Act of 1890 empowering these railway companies not to refund the overcharges to these traders?

Sir Alan Parsons: (a) and (b). Government have no information of the cases referred to, and do not propose to interfere in matters relating to claims for the refund of overcharges which can be referred to courts of law for settlement.

FREIGHT RATES ON THE BENGAL NAGPUR RAILWAY.

530. ***Sardar G. N. Mujumdar** (on behalf of Mr. S. G. Jog): Is it not a fact that the wagon load consignments booked on the Bengal Nagpur Railway stations for Katni-Murwara, Bengal Nagpur Railway, are not dealt with at Katni or Katni Murwara Great Indian Peninsula Railway Stations, nor are they charged at a freight other than the local Bengal Nagpur Railway cheaper rates as per rules regarding the routing and rating of traffic notified in the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Goods Traffic, Part 1A of 1926, even in spite of the consignments having travelled *via* any other dearer routes for any cause?

Sir Alan Parsons: I am not quite sure that I have correctly understood the Honourable Member's question, but Katni and Katni-Murwara are joint stations of the Bengal Nagpur and Great Indian Peninsula Railways, and traffic booked from a station on the Bengal Nagpur Railway to Katni-Murwara, if not routed *via* another Railway's junction would be the local traffic of the Bengal Nagpur Railway.

LOANS ASKED FOR BY PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

531. ***Sardar G. N. Mujumdar** (on behalf of Mr. S. G. Jog): (a) Is it not a fact that several Provincial Governments have asked for loans from the Provincial Loan Fund of the Government of India?

(b) If so, will Government state the amount each Provincial Government has asked for?

(c) Do the Government of India propose to make some inquiry as to the necessity for such a loan before the loans are sanctioned?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) The answer is in the affirmative.

(b) It is estimated that during the current year Provincial Governments would require loans from the Fund to the extent mentioned below:

Province.	(Amounts in lakhs of Rupees.)
Madras	47
Bombay	5,78
Bengal	2,32
United Provinces	2,91
Punjab	2,34
Burma	55
Bihar and Orissa
Central Provinces	83
Assam	44

I may add that the figures given now are gross figures and that Provincial Governments will repay to the Fund on account of past loans a sum of Rs. 2,63 lakhs during the current year.

(c) This is done.

IMPORT DUTIES OR BOUNTIES ON GALVANISED IRON AND STEEL SHEETS AND PIPES.

532. ***Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to an article headed "The Tata Iron and Steel Co. Ltd." in the *Amrita Basar Patrika* (town edition), dated the 2nd February, 1932?

(b) Is it a fact that while the increased import duties on galvanized and iron steel pipes and sheets were proposed to be continued till 31st March, 1932, it was also proposed that Government should make enquiries in order to ascertain whether the system of bounties might not be substituted wholly or in part for increased duty? If so, will Government please state whether any enquiry has been made by them, and, if so, with what result?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: (a) Yes.

(b) Government have made an enquiry and found that there are no insuperable administrative difficulties in adopting a bounty scheme. But as I explained during the debates on the Resolution relating to the continuance of protection to the galvanised sheet industry, it is impossible in present financial conditions to consider any scheme for the grant of a bounty.

OUTPUT OF GALVANISED SHEETS FROM TATAS.

533. ***Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Is it a fact that the total output of galvanised sheets at Tatas is less than $\frac{1}{3}$ of the total consumption in India and that there was a tacit understanding that the Tata's will increase their output? If so, has there been any increased output since then and in that case, to what extent? Are Government aware of any steps being taken to further increase the output?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: On the basis of the present consumption the output of galvanised sheet from the Tata Iron and Steel Works is approximately one-third of the total quantity consumed in India.

The Company gave an undertaking during the last Tariff Board Enquiry that they would take steps to increase their production and have stated in a Press note published recently that they have made extensions to their galvanising plant at Jamshedpur which will come into operation in about two months' time. The Company consider that they will then be in a position to supply over 40 per cent. of India's requirements.

NEGOTIATION WITH A FOREIGN FIRM BY MESSRS. TATAS FOR ERECTION OF A SHEET MILL.

534. ***Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** (a) Are Government aware that the Tata Iron & Steel Co. are not taking any steps to extend their own sheet mills to meet the country's requirement but are negotiating with a foreign firm to come to India to take up the work?

(b) Are Government aware that the Tatas propose to subscribe half of the capital required for the working of the sheet mill by the foreign firm, while the other half of the capital, viz., Rs. 75 lakhs to be subscribed by the foreign firm will be their abandoned and out of date sheet mill plant by bringing the same to India?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: Government have no information beyond that contained in the Press note published by the Tata Iron and Steel Company on the 20th February last which I read to the House in speaking on the Resolution to which I have just referred.

PROSECUTIONS UNDER THE FOREIGN RELATIONS ORDINANCE.

535. ***Khan Bahadur H. M. Wilayatullah:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the total number of prosecutions which took place under the Foreign Relations Ordinance of 1931?

(b) Is it a fact that the Ordinance expired on the 5th October, 1931?

(c) If so, was it revived and for what period? If not, were there any occasions which made it necessary that there should have been such a provision of law?

(d) How were such cases dealt with?

Sir Evelyn Howell: (a) Six.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) The answer to both parts is in the negative.

(d) Does not arise.

CENSORSHIP OF PRESS MESSAGES OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

536. ***Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi** (on behalf of Sardar Sant Singh): (a) Since the commencement of the present session of the Assembly in New Delhi have there been any cases of censorship of Press messages regarding the proceedings of the Assembly? If so, in how many cases was censorship exercised?

(b) Who is the Censor for Press telegrams and what are his qualifications therefor?

(c) Have there been any instances in which while censorship was exercised over telegrams the same messages appeared in the local newspapers? If so, how many?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: I invite attention to the reply I gave on the 23rd February to a short notice question on the same subject by Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar.

SUPERIOR STAFF OF THE VARIOUS PORT TRUSTS.

537. ***Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi** (on behalf of Lala Hari Raj Swarup): Pursuant to the Resolution moved by Sir Phiroze Sethna on Thursday, the 26th January, 1922, in the Council of State which was accepted by the Government of India, will Government be pleased to state: (a) the names, (b) the number of years of service, (c) the present salary drawn and the grades of superior officers confirmed and unconfirmed, Indian officers separately, in each of the departments of the Port Trusts of Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Karachi, Rangoon and Chittagong?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: The information asked for by the Honourable Member is being obtained from the Port Trusts concerned and will, when received, be laid on the table.

CENSUS ENUMERATION OF CHRISTIAN AND MUHAMMADAN DEPRESSED CLASSES.

538. ***Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi** (on behalf of Lala Hari Raj Swarup): (a) Will Government be pleased to state the number of the people of depressed classes, province by province, as found during the last census?

(b) If any of them are Christians or Muhammadans, will Government be pleased to enquire whether those representatives of the depressed classes were subtracted from the Christian and Muhammadan population respectively and shown only as depressed classes at the time of census?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: (a) The number of the people of the depressed classes (Hindus) is being extracted from the Hindu totals. The following is the information so far available:

Province.	Population.
United Provinces	12,819,949
N.-W. F. P.	5,468
Coorg	25,343
Ajmer-Merwara	76,735

(b) No corresponding figures are available as regards Muslim and Christian communities.

RATE OF INTEREST ALLOWED ON THE GENERAL PROVIDENT FUND.

539. ***Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi** (on behalf of Lala Hari Raj Swarup): (a) Will Government be pleased to state the rate of interest allowed on General Provident Fund money accounts of Government during the last three months of the year 1931?

(b) Does it vary with the rate of interest of Government loans raised?

(c) If not, will Government be pleased to state why Government servants are not allowed the option to withdraw portions of their savings for the purpose of lending them out to Government at the higher rate of interest allowed by Government themselves?

(d) Will Government be pleased to state whether the same restrictions apply to members of the All-India Services?

(e) If not, will Government be pleased to state why members of the All-India Services are differently treated from those of subordinate services as regards the rules and regulations of the General Provident Fund accounts of Government?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) and (b). The rate is fixed annually at the average redemption yield during the five preceding calendar years of all Government of India rupee loans with an unexpired term exceeding five years. The current rate is 5 per cent. but it is shortly to be revised for 1932-33, and from now onwards there will be a tendency for the rate to increase.

(c) The withdrawal of Provident Fund deposits for investment in Government loans would be contrary to the provisions of the Provident Funds Act, which limits withdrawals to amounts required for the payment of premiums on life insurance policies and subscriptions or premiums in respect of a family pension fund.

(d) Yes.

(e) Does not arise.

COMMUNITIES OF CLERKS, ETC., ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

540. *Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to an article published by the daily *Inqilab* of Lahore under the Caption "Multan Railway Division men Hindu-nawazi" in its issue of 14th February, 1932?

(b) If the answer to part (a) above is in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state if the facts contained therein are correct; if not, will Government be pleased to lay on the table correct figures of clerks, Sub-heads, Head Clerks and Office Superintendents by communities in Multan Divisional Superintendent's Office as well as in the North Western Railway Headquarters Office and other Divisional Superintendents' Offices of the North Western Railway?

(c) Will Government be further pleased to lay on the table a similar statement of all the Divisional Accounts Officers' Offices as well as of the office of the Chief Accounts Officer of the North Western Railway?

Sir Alan Parsons: I have not been able to obtain a copy of the article mentioned, but the Honourable Member will find such information as is available in the North Western Railway's classified list of subordinate staff, a copy of which is in the Library.

RECRUITMENT OF MUSLIMS AS APPRENTICE MECHANICS ON VARIOUS RAILWAYS.

541. *Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: (a) Will Government be pleased to state what is the total number of candidates recruited as Apprentice Mechanics during the period 1927-28 to 1930-31 in:

- (i) the North Western Railway,
- (ii) the East Indian Railway,
- (iii) the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, and
- (iv) the Eastern Bengal Railway?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state how many of these were Muslims?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state if the order of the Government about reserving 33 per cent. places for minority communities is applicable to this recruitment?

Sir Alan Parsons: (a) and (b). The available information is contained in paragraph 136 of the Report on the representation of Muslims and other minority communities in the Subordinate Railway Services.

(c) The rule under which one-third of the vacancies is reserved for the redress, so far as may be necessary, of marked communal inequalities applies.

DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTIONS IN ALL-INDIA SERVICES.

542. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** (on behalf of Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon): (a) Is it a fact that the Government of India, while laying down their policy to prevent the preponderance of any one class or community in the case of the All-India Services, declared in the Home Department Office Memorandum No. F.-176/25-Ests., dated the 5th February, 1926, that departmental promotions would continue to be regulated on merit?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether the above order of the Home Department has since been superseded by making "seniority" the basis of selection for Departmental promotions? If so, will Government be pleased to place a copy of the order on the table?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: (a) Yes.

(b) As has been explained on various occasions in this House, the orders of 1926 regarding communal representation in the Services do not apply to departmental promotions. These orders were not intended to alter the existing practice of regulating such promotions, *viz.*, to take both seniority and merit into account. I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member in this connection to the reply given to question No. 563 on the 17th September, 1929.

OFFICE HOURS OF MUSLIM EMPLOYEES OF THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS, DURING THE *Ramzan*.

543. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** (on behalf of Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon): (a) Is it a fact that, during the month of *Ramzan*, Muslim employees of the office of the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs are permitted to attend office at 10 A.M. instead of at 10-30 A.M. and leave office at 4 P.M. instead of at 4-30 P.M.?

(b) Is it a fact that the Muslim employees applied this year for similar permission as usual but they were asked to attend office at 9-30 A.M. and leave office at 4 P.M.?

(c) If the replies to parts (a) and (b) are in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the reason for enforcing attendance of the Muslims one hour earlier than the usual office hour while permitting them to leave office only half an hour earlier?

Mr. T. Ryan: (a), (b) and (c). The facts of the case are that certain Muhammadan employees of the Director-General's office applied for permission to leave office at 4 P.M. during *Ramzan* instead of at 4-30 P.M., the usual hour. It was decided that this concession should be granted if the men made up the resulting deficit by attending office half an hour earlier. This condition was accepted. No official was compelled to attend office one hour earlier in order to be permitted to leave office half an hour earlier.

ALLEGED PARTIALITY IN THE ALLOTMENT OF QUARTERS.

544. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** (on behalf of Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon): (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the article published in the January issue of the *Postal Advocate* under the heading "Partiality in Allotment of Quarters"?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether the statements made therein are correct?

(c) If the reply to part (b) is in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state what steps they propose to take in order to avoid recurrence of similar acts of partiality?

Mr. T. Ryan: (a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

SEGREGATION IN TANGANYIKA.

545. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to an article published in the *Tanganyika Opinion* at page 7 in its issue of the 4th September, 1931, under the heading "Segregation in Tanganyika"?

(b) Is there any proposal of introducing segregation in the settlement scheme of the Government of Tanganyika as found in the report of a committee appointed in 1930 in connection with land development in Tanganyika?

(c) Do Government propose to take any steps to avert the situation; and, if so, will Government state the measures likely to be adopted in that regard?

Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes.

(b) No. On the contrary the report contains a sentence which should set all doubts at rest in this matter. That sentence is "The Committee, after thorough discussion, came to the conclusion that a settlement scheme for non-natives was essential to the needs of the Territory, and that in such a scheme there must be no race discrimination". I would add that there were two Indian members on the Committee and that the report was unanimous.

(c) Does not arise.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST INDIANS IN TANGANYIKA.

546. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the leading article of the *Tanganyika Opinion* published in its issue of the 1st January, 1932, at page 3, under the heading "Discrimination against Indians in Tanganyika"?

(b) What is the state of affairs in this connection and do Government propose to do anything in the matter?

Sir Frank Noyce: (a) and (b). In the article referred to by the Honourable Member it was suggested that the leaders of the Indian Association, Dar-es-Salaam, should present the grievances of the Indian community in Tanganyika to the delegation of the Government of India which was then on its way to South Africa and should submit later a detailed memorandum on the subject to the Government of India. No memorandum has yet reached the Government of India.

GRIEVANCES OF INDIANS IN EAST AFRICA.

547. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the resolutions passed at the East African Indian National Congress held in Nairobi on January, 1st and 2nd, under the presidentship of Mr. Amritlal D. Sheth as published in the *Tanganyika Opinion* of the 15th January, 1932, at page 6, under the heading "East African Congress"?

(b) Do Government propose to support the protest of the Indian community as regards the franchise recommendations of the Joint Parliamentary Committee and the grievances as embodied in resolution No. 2? If so, how?

(c) What steps do Government propose to take to alleviate the Indian position in Kenya especially, and East Africa generally?

Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). As regards a common electoral roll, the Government of India are awaiting the decision of His Majesty's Government on the report of the Select Committee of Parliament on Closer Union in East Africa. As regards the other grievances to which reference is made in the Resolutions of the Congress, some of them have already formed the subject of representations by the Government of India. They have not recently received any communication in this matter from the Indian community in East Africa.

TAXATION OF INDIANS IN TANGANYIKA.

548. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the article published in the *Tanganyika Opinion*, dated the 23rd October, 1931, and 22nd January, 1932, regarding proposals for taxation on Indians in that territory?

(b) Is it a fact that the Indian community has to pay the highest customs duty on food-stuffs imported from India while the Europeans pay on their food-stuffs a uniform customs duty of 20 per cent.?

(c) Is a Bill going to be introduced in the current session of the Tanganyika Legislative Council by which trades licensing will be restricted, and monopolies will be granted for doing business with the natives? Can a copy of the proposed Bill be made available?

(d) Do Government propose to make an enquiry into the above, and state what steps, they have so far taken, or propose to take now in the matter?

Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes.

(b) The imports of food-stuffs from India into Tanganyika consist mainly of wheat, rice, dhall, butter and ghee. Customs duties are levied on these articles at the following rates per 100 lbs.:

Wheat	(1) in grain	3s.
	(2) Ground or otherwise prepared	4s/50
Rice	(1) in grain	4s.
	(2) Otherwise prepared	20% <i>ad valorem</i>
Dhall	4s.
Butter	20% <i>ad valorem</i>
Ghee	45 cents per lb.

As regards food-stuffs for Europeans, if the Honourable Member will kindly indicate which articles in his opinion should be included in this category, I shall be glad to furnish information in regard to the customs duties levied on those articles.

(c) Government have only recently seen in the *Tanganyika Territory Gazette* of the 22nd January, 1932, a copy of the Trades Licensing (Amendment) Bill. It is reported that this Bill will be submitted to the Legislative Council. A copy is being placed in the Library of the House.

(d) The matter is under consideration.

INDIAN EDUCATION IN FIJI.

549. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) With regard to the education of Indians in Fiji, are Government aware that as far back as 1910, the Secretary of State wrote expressing surprise that he had not been informed what measures had been adopted to provide for Indian education in Fiji, in 1913, he wrote that Indian education is the most urgent duty of the Government, and in a later despatch approved the establishment of five schools, and instructed the Governor of Fiji to proceed with the scheme without even waiting for the necessary legislation?

(b) Are Government aware that the first of the schools for Indian students in Fiji was built only in 1919, and the second has not yet been started even now?

(c) Are Government aware that in 1913 at the request of the European elected members of Fiji, Indians were excluded from the schools of Suva and Levuka?

(d) What steps have Government taken, or propose to take to advance the cause of Indian education in Fiji?

Sir Frank Noyce: (a) It has not been possible to trace in the records of the Government of India the despatches of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, to which the Honourable Member has referred, but from such papers as are readily available, it appears that the information is probably correct.

(b) It is true that the first Government school for Indian children in Fiji was established in 1919, but private schools, which received Indian pupils, existed even before that date. In 1930 there were five Government schools for Indians as well as several other schools which received grants-in-aid from Government.

(c) The Education Ordinance, 1916, provided that with certain exceptions no applicant would be refused admission into any school on account of his religious persuasion, nationality, race or language but the exceptions included the English public schools in Suva and Levuka. This Ordinance has now been repealed by the Education Ordinance of 1929, which empowers the Board of Education to declare that a particular school has been registered for the education of children of a particular race.

(d) In his address to the Legislative Council in June, 1931, the Governor of Fiji gave an assurance that Indian education continued to receive the close attention of his Government. He also stated that tenders had been invited for the erection of two other Government schools. In view of the interest already taken by the Government of Fiji in providing additional facilities for the education of Indian children, no representation from the Government of India appears to be called for.

INSTITUTION OF A TRIBUNAL TO CONSIDER CAPITATION CHARGES.

550. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state what further action and practical steps after the statement made by the Honourable the Finance Member in reply to Mr. Das' question No. 1155 on the 4th November, 1931, Government have taken towards the institution of an independent tribunal to go into the question of capitation charges?

(b) What are the difficulties in setting up without any further delay the independent tribunal as promised by the late Secretary of State?

(c) Now that the session of the Round Table Conference has concluded, will Government be pleased to state what action they propose to take in this behalf?

(d) Are Government in a position to announce the personnel and terms of reference of the tribunal?

Mr. G. M. Young: (a) to (d). His Majesty's Government have not yet appointed a tribunal. The whole matter is still under the active consideration of His Majesty's Government in consultation with the Government of India, and I am not at present in a position to make any statement.

DUMPING OF RUBBISH OUTSIDE THE TURKMAN AND DELHI GATES.

551. ***Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the deplorable state of the road running outside Ajmeri, Turkman and Delhi Gates and joining them?

(b) Why is the land lying outside Delhi and Turkman Gate being utilised for dumping all the filth and night soil of the old city?

(c) Are Government aware that this accumulation of rubbish is a menace to the health not only of the old city but that it will have also an effect on New Delhi?

(d) What steps do Government propose to take to remove this menace to public health? Why was anyone allowed to dump all sorts of debris, etc., on an open ground which should be the healthy lungs of the city? Who is responsible for this?

(e) Are Government aware of the horrible effect of this on the whole suburbs of Turkman Gate after there has been a shower of rain? Do Government propose to take steps to have the rubbish removed to a far distant place?

Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes.

(b) The land lying outside the Delhi Gate was in use as a dumping ground for a number of years long before New Delhi came into existence. The use of land outside the Turkman Gate for dumping purposes was discontinued in 1915 and no night soil has been dumped there since then.

(c) Yes.

(d) and (e). A scheme for the closing of the dumping ground and for its removal to a distant place was prepared, but as it involves heavy non-recurring and recurring expenditure, it has had to be held in abeyance owing to financial stringency.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: Does the Honourable Member remember that flies are a great nuisance in New Delhi and this is the breeding place which is mentioned in the question.

Sir Frank Noyce: I have already answered various questions relating to the fly nuisance in Delhi. I fully realise the inconvenience caused by the existence of this dumping ground and it is the earnest hope of Government that times will improve and we shall be able to set matters right.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: Has the Government taken any action after consulting the Medical Officer of Health to meet this nuisance? This has been going on for the last four or five years.

Sir Frank Noyce: The Health Officer has recently issued a circular in regard to the fly nuisance in New Delhi and I shall be glad to send a copy of it to the Honourable Member.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Will the Honourable Member inform this House whether the Chief Commissioner of Delhi has taken any action on the questions I previously asked about these flies?

Sir Frank Noyce: As I said, the Medical Officer of Health issued a circular two or three days after the Honourable Member's question on the subject was answered in this House. I shall be glad to send my Honourable friend also a copy of this circular.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Is the Honourable Member aware of the fact that in despite of the issue of that circular, flies are still circulating in New Delhi? (Laughter.)

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: In larger numbers!

GALVANISED CORRUGATED SHEETS OBTAINABLE FROM TATAS.

552. ***Mr. G. Morgan:** Will Government be pleased to state whether in view of the extra protection given last year to the Tata Iron and Steel Company on corrugated sheets by the raising of the import duty from

Rs. 30 per ton to Rs. 67 per ton, the Company is now in a position to meet the demand for gauges of galvanised corrugated sheets other than 24 gauge?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: Government have no information.

SURPLUS WARRANT AND NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE INDIAN ARMY ORDNANCE CORPS.

553. ***Mr. S. G. Jog:** Is it a fact that some warrant and non-commissioned officers of the Indian Army Ordnance Corps have been declared surplus to requirements? If so, how is it proposed to employ them?

Mr. G. M. Young: The answer to the first part is in the negative; the second does not arise.

APPOINTMENT OF BRITISH MILITARY CHIEF CLERKS IN ARSENALS AND ORDNANCE DEPOTS.

554. ***Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) Is it a fact that in 1925 the Government of India sanctioned duty allowance to Head Assistants in ~~Arsenals~~ and certain Clothing and Ordnance Depots? Is it not a fact that this duty allowance was sanctioned after due consideration of the duties entrusted to them?

(b) Is it not a fact that from time immemorial the Head Assistants or Head Clerks have remained in the Indian Army Ordnance Corps and have carried on their duties efficiently?

(c) Is it a fact that it is proposed to employ British Military Chief Clerks in Arsenals and Depots? If so, what are the reasons for such appointments and how far will they deprive the Head Assistants of their present status?

(d) What are the reasons that have led Government to replace the Head Assistants by Military Chief Clerks who were tried in 1911, 1929, 1930 and 1931? Why were they discontinued on those occasions? If Government do not propose to employ Chief Clerks in ~~Arsenals and Depots~~, are they prepared to give an assurance that the present status and pay and duty allowance of the Head Assistants will remain intact? If so, what steps do Government propose to take in the matter to give effect to their decision?

(e) Is it a fact that the local Chief Ordnance Officers of certain arsenals have already taken steps to appoint Chief Clerks in their offices and have taken from the Head Assistants the control hitherto exercised by them? If so, what steps do Government propose to take in the matter?

(f) Is it not the general policy of Government to Indianize the Army? If so, what are the reasons that have led them to Europeanize the Indian Army Ordnance Corps by replacing the Indian Head Assistants by Military Chief Clerks?

Mr. G. M. Young: (a) The answer to both parts is in the affirmative.

(b) The appointments of Head Assistants in the Indian Army Ordnance Corps were created in April, 1925. Generally speaking, the work of Head Assistants has been satisfactory.

(c), (d) and (e). The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply that I gave on the 14th July, 1930, to Mr. Anwar-ul-Azim's starred question No. 32. Government have now decided to appoint a British Military Chief Clerk in each arsenal office. There is a great deal of work in these offices which requires military technical knowledge not possessed by Head Assistants. Head Assistants have not been replaced by Military Chief Clerks. The duties of the latter are distinct from those of the former. As I have stated previously, the appointment of Chief Clerks will neither lower the status of Head Assistants, nor affect their pay and allowances.

(f) It is not the case that Indian Head Assistants are being replaced.

TAKING OVER OF THE H. M. HIGH SCHOOL BY THE AMBALA CANTONMENT BOARD.

555. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Is it a fact that the Cantonment Board, Ambala, has proposed to take over the H. M. High School, Ambala, from private management and to maintain it as a Board High School in the future?

(b) Is it a fact that there are outstanding liabilities of about Rs. 12,000 to be paid, before the school is taken over?

(c) Is it a fact that the Northern Command has sanctioned the proposal on the condition that the Cantonment Board provides extra money required for the maintenance of the High School, by some increase in existing taxation?

Mr. G. M. Young: With your permission, Sir, I will answer questions 555 and 557 together.

The information has been called for and the replies will be laid on the table in due course.

EXTENSION OF THE HOUSE-SCAVENGING TAX IN AMBALA CANTONMENT.

556. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Are Government aware that the Ambala Cantonment Board has by a majority of votes submitted proposals for the levy of a house-scamvenging tax on offices, shops and godowns which were hitherto exempt from that tax?

(b) Are Government aware that the proposed enlargement of the scope of house-scamvenging tax as stated above is being vehemently opposed by the people who are memorialising the Local Government against the necessity and justification of that enlargement?

Mr. G. M. Young: Parts (a) and (b). The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given on the 15th February to Sirdar Sohan Singh's starred question No. 357 on the same subject.

TAKING OVER OF THE H. M. HIGH SCHOOL BY THE AMBALA CANTONMENT BOARD.

†557. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Is it a fact that the maintenance of a High School is not one of the obligations of a Cantonment Board, as defined in the Cantonment Act of 1924?

(b) Are Government aware that the taking over of the H. M. High School by the Ambala Cantonment Board from public management is resented by a large section of the people?

†For answer to this question, see answer to starred question No. 555.

ASSESSMENT OF INCOME-TAX PAYABLE BY LANDLORDS.

558. ***Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon**: Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that in assessing income-tax, the landlords are allowed only one-sixth (equal to 16·666 per cent.) on account of municipal taxes and repairs;
- (b) whether they are aware that at Karachi municipal taxes alone amount to at least 14 per cent. (or more in respect of premises fetching rent less than Rs. 97 per month);
- (c) if the answers to parts (a) and (b) above, are in the affirmative, what is the reason for allowing to the landlords only 2·666 per cent. at the most (or less or *nil* in some cases) for repairs, wear and tear and so on; and
- (d) whether Government propose to look into the matter and fix separate allowances for (i) repairs and (ii) wear and tear, apart from the municipal taxes?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) One-sixth of the *bona fide* annual value of property is allowed as a deduction to cover the cost of repairs. This allowance has no reference to Municipal taxes and is in no way intended to cover them.

(b) Government have no information.

(c) From the answer to part (a), it will be apparent that this question is based on a misconception of the position. The full allowance of 1/6th is made to cover cost of repairs and should be sufficient to provide against depreciation from wear and tear.

(d) The Government of India are not satisfied that it is necessary to amend the law so as to permit the deduction of Municipal taxes. As already indicated, they consider that the allowance of 1/6th of the annual value to cover repairs should be sufficient to prevent depreciation in the value of property.

EXHIBITION OF MOHENJODARO ANTIQUITIES IN THE NEW DELHI MUSEUM.

559. ***Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur**: (a) Are Government aware that while pre-historic archaeological objects from Baluchistan and Mesopotamia have been liberally displayed in the New Delhi Museum, not a single exhibit from Mohenjodaro is yet to be found in it?

(b) Will Government kindly state whether they have considered the desirability of making a small collection of Mohenjodaro antiquities available for public view in the museum in its New Capital?

Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes.

(b) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to parts (a) to (c) of question No. 58 asked by Mr. Lalchand Navalrai on the 26th January, 1932. I would add that the disposal of the Mohenjodaro antiquities on the lines mentioned in that reply will be considered towards the end of this year, after the publication of Mr. Mackay's monograph on the later finds in that area. The desirability of having a small collection available for public view in New Delhi will then be borne in mind.

PROVISION OF THE *Unani* SYSTEM OF TREATMENT IN NEW DELHI.

560. ***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Is it a fact that the New Delhi Municipal Committee has opened an *Ayurvedic* dispensary in New Delhi? If so, are Government aware that there is an equally large demand for the *Unani* system of treatment also?

(b) Is it a fact that in March 1931 an application, under the signatures of nearly one thousand residents of New Delhi, for the opening of a dispensary for the *Unani* system of treatment also was submitted to the New Delhi Municipal Committee? If so, will Government please ascertain and state what action was taken on that application by that Committee?

(c) Are Government aware that the *Unani* system of treatment not being available in New Delhi, most of the residents, at great personal inconvenience and expense, go to Delhi City for obtaining advice and treatment?

(d) Is it also a fact that another representation in the matter signed by nearly one thousand persons mostly belonging to the ministerial establishment of the Government of India Secretariat (both Hindus and Muslims) and residing in New Delhi has again been submitted to the New Delhi Municipality recently? If so, will Government please say whether the New Delhi Municipality has now made any provision for the *Unani* system of treatment for the benefit of its tax-payers?

Sir Frank Noyce: (a), (b), (c) and (d). An *Ayurvedic* dispensary has been opened in New Delhi under Municipal control. The representations referred to by the Honourable Member were received. The Municipal Committee has sanctioned a scheme for the establishment of a *Unani* dispensary during the current financial year. It is hoped that this decision will satisfy the demand for the *Unani* system of treatment and remove any inconvenience which residents of New Delhi desirous of obtaining *Unani* treatment may have experienced in the past.

INDIAN CHRISTIANS EMPLOYED ON RAILWAYS.

561. ***Dr. F. X. DeSouza:** (a) With reference to the statistics regarding recruitment by communities given in paragraphs 74, 76 and 80 of the Report of the Railway Board for the year 1930-31 (Vol. I), will Government be pleased to give the figures separately for the Indian Christians also?

(b) Are Government prepared to direct that in future Reports similar statistics should be given for the Indian Christian community separately?

(c) Is it a fact that the Indian Christian community according to the census of 1931 number more than five million souls and forms the third largest community in India, and if so, have Government considered whether they receive adequate representation on the staff, superior or subordinate, of the several Railways in India, whether State or Company-managed?

Sir Alan Parsons: (a) and (b). The question of showing the figures relating to Indian Christians separately is under consideration.

(c) The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. In regard to the second part, as figures relating to the number of Indian

Christians employed on railways have not hitherto been kept distinct, Government are not in a position to give a precise answer to the Honourable Member's question.

Dr. F. X. DeSouza: Will the Honourable Member see that in future Reports the position with regard to Indian Christians is separately shown? Also if, as stated in para. (c) of the Honourable Member's answer, Indian Christians are not adequately represented among the railway staff, will they take steps to ensure that they are adequately represented in the future?

Sir Alan Parsons: Sir, as I have explained, the question of showing the figures relating to Indian Christians separately is now under consideration. If, when we have got the statistics, they are found to be inadequately represented, then the ordinary rules with regard to communities not adequately represented will apply.

Dr. F. X. DeSouza: May I know when the decision will be taken, and, when that decision is taken, whether it will be communicated to this House?

Sir Alan Parsons: I cannot give the exact date. It ought not to take long to reach a decision.

Dr. F. X. DeSouza: Will it then be communicated to this House?

Sir Alan Parsons: Certainly.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Will the Honourable Member inform this House whether it is a fact that in the Railway Board's Administration Report all communities except Europeans are placed under one head, "Statutory Indians"? If that is a fact, will the Honourable Member state whether any useful purpose is served except encouraging communal recriminations by altering this communal classification (Hear, hear)? If the Honourable Member's answer is in the affirmative, will he state whether Government are prepared to stop this division into communities so as to satisfy some particular community?

Mr. B. Das: Did you do it at the Round Table Conference?

Sir Alan Parsons: The reply to the first of my Honourable friend's question is that he has accurately stated the facts with regard to what is given in the Railway Board's Administration Report. As regards the second question, he is asking me to express an opinion which I am not prepared to do. As regards the third question, that is obviously a matter on which I could not alone give an answer.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: Is it a fact that the suggestion made by the Honourable Member for the Anglo-Indian community will have the effect of camouflaging the large percentage of Anglo-Indians who at present find employment in the Railway Department?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Is the Honourable Member an expert in camouflage, or does he want assistance?

Mr. B. Das: Is it not a fact that the Honourable Member's community manages to secure various special privileges that are allowed to the European community such as in the matter of carrying arms and becoming members of auxiliary forces on the ground that his community is allied to or identical with the European community?

PRESS CENSORSHIP.

562. *Mr. S. C. Mitra: (a) Are Government aware:

- (i) that news, reports, communications, etc., for the Press are allowed to appear in the newspapers of one province and refused publications in newspapers of other provinces;
- (ii) that Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya's letter to the Viceroy was allowed to appear in the newspapers of all provinces except Bengal;
- (iii) that reports of *lathi* charges by the Police are allowed to appear in the newspapers of the United Provinces, Madras, and Bombay but not those in Bengal;
- (iv) that proceedings of law-courts are not allowed in full in the Bengal papers but they are allowed in the papers of other provinces;
- (v) that speeches of members of the Assembly undergo various censorship in the provinces and that in Bengal the censorship resulted in the deletion of portions of speeches of members of the Assembly on Sir Hari Singh Gour's Resolution of February 1st relating to the Ordinances; and
- (vi) that the joint letter of the Bengal National Chamber of Commerce and the Indian Chamber of Commerce to the Viceroy on the subject of the Ordinances was allowed to appear in Bombay papers but was refused publication in the Bengal papers?

(b) Are Government prepared to issue instructions to the Local Governments so as to ensure uniformity in regard to Press censorship?

The Honourable Sir James Crerar: I have made enquiries and will give the Honourable Member a reply in due course, of which a copy will be laid on the table.

EMPLOYMENT OF MUSLIMS IN THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

563. *Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi: (a) What is the total permanent clerical strength of the Finance Department of the Government of India and what is the number of Muslims employed therein?

(b) Is it a fact that of the 35 Second Division clerks in the Finance Department only four are Muslims? If so, will Government please state their reasons for the inadequate number of Muslims, and say how they propose to make up this inequality of communal representation?

(c) Is it a fact that in spite of qualified candidates being available in the Department the Second Division vacancies in the Finance Department have not been filled since 1928?

(d) Is it a fact that two non-Muslims were promoted to the First Division, one in 1930 and the other very recently?

(e) If the reply to part (d) above is in the affirmative, why have the Second Division vacancies (which have existed since 1928) been kept open?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) The total permanent strength of the clerical establishment of the Finance Department is 87. Of these, 29, or exactly one-third, belonging to minor communities, and of the 29 the Muslims number 18.

(b) Excluding personnel recently retrenched, the permanent strength of the Second Division is 28, out of which four are Muslims. Government consider that the strength of this Division is disproportionately large, and have accordingly not made any recruitment to it since 1926. Government do not admit any indifference to Muslim rights, and have actually appointed ten Muslims to the permanent establishment of the Department during the six years ending 1931 as against eight during the preceding 20 years.

(c) The mere possession of qualifications for employment in a higher Division does not confer a claim for promotion to that Division. In this case, as stated in the answer to part (a) of this question, recruitment to the Second Division has been stopped since 1926 in order gradually to reduce its strength.

(d) Yes; but the more recent appointment is a purely temporary arrangement in a vacancy which will last till the end of March next in the Branch of the clerk in question, and does not imply any supersession of his seniors whether Muslims or non-Muslims.

(e) I would refer the Honourable Member to the answers to parts (b) and (c), and add for his further information that the two posts in the Second Division which have been vacant for some time have now been finally abolished as a measure of retrenchment.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Is it a fact that four vacancies occurred in 1928 of which two were filled by non-Muslims and two have not yet been filled?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I am afraid I must ask for notice of that question.

Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar: Is it not a fact that Muhammadan interests did not suffer in any way by the number of Muhammadan clerks in the Finance Department?

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: May I know since when religious faith has come to be the sole test in preference over efficiency?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I am afraid I must ask the Honourable Member to repeat his question.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: I would like to know since when religious faith has come to be the sole or almost the sole test for entering Government service, especially in the Finance Department instead of efficiency?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: My Honourable friend is aware that this question is one of great interest to the House. He is also fully aware of the policy which the Government have adopted in the matter.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know whether Government are going to change that policy or not?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Government see no reason to alter the policy which they are at present following in the matter.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: Do they consider that policy to be very sound?

Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum: May I know if Government still find Muslims less efficient than non-Muslims for Government services?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: That, Sir, is a question of opinion, and I would rather not express an opinion.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: May I know the number of M. A.s in mathematics belonging to the various communities in India who have qualified themselves for appointment in the Finance Department—the percentage of Hindus and that of other communities?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I must ask for notice of that question.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Will the Honourable Member ever be able to answer it even after receipt of notice?

Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi: Is it not a fact that a community gains strength by the extent to which it can participate in the administration of the country and therefore by their representation in a particular Department?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I think I must ask my Honourable friend to repeat his question.

Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi: Is it not a fact that the administration of the different Departments of the Government, if handed over to one community, will give undue strength to that community as against the others who are equally interested in the administration of the country?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I think my Honourable friend is trying to take me into a very dangerous field which I do not propose to enter!

EMPLOYMENT OF MUSLIMS IN THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

564. ***Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi:** (a) Is it a fact that in reply to a representation from the *Anjuman-i-Islamia*, Simla, the Finance Department promised to consider the claims of Muslims when making promotions of Second Division clerks to the First Division?

(b) If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, is it a fact that Mr. Lachman Das, a very junior unqualified Second Division clerk, was promoted to the First Division superseding three Muslims? If so, why?

(c) Are Government aware that discontent is prevailing among the Muslim clerks?

(d) Is it a fact that no Muslim clerk has been recruited in the Second Division of the Finance Department since 1917?

(e) Are Government prepared to fill the existing Second Division vacancies by Muslim clerks at present employed in the Finance Department? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) The *Anjuman-i-Islamia* made no representation to this Department about promotions from the Second to the First Division; and there was accordingly no opportunity for giving it a promise such as that referred to by the Honourable Member. The *Anjuman* did, however, refer to the question of promotion from the Third to the Second Division, and was told in October, 1930 that the cases of qualified and unqualified Muslims in the Third Division awaiting promotion to the Second Division were then under consideration along with those of members of the other communities, and that the claims of Muslims would receive due attention. No such promotions were, however, made in view of the impending retrenchments, and the *Anjuman* was told in April, 1931 that the question of these promotions was bound up with general policy, and that it was by no means unlikely that the posts then vacant in the Second Division would be abolished, as the number of posts in that Division was disproportionately large. As stated in the answer to part (e) of the preceding question these vacant posts have since actually been abolished.

(b) Does not really arise; but, as stated in the reply to part (d) of the preceding question, Mr. Lachman Das' promotion to the Second Division is a purely temporary local arrangement and does not imply any special preferment.

(c) Government see no justification for discontent among Muslims of the Third Division as there are also non-Muslim candidates in that Division awaiting promotion to the Second Division.

(d) Yes.

(e) As stated in the answer to part (e) of the preceding question, the vacant posts in the Second Division have already been abolished.

EMPLOYMENT OF MUSLIMS IN THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

565. ***Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi:** (a) Is it a fact that some unpassed Hindus were recruited by the Finance Department on rates of pay which exceed even the substantive pay of some of the Muslim clerks in that Department?

(b) If so, will Government please state why the appointments carrying higher pay were not given to individuals already in the Department in preference to unqualified outsiders?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: It is not clear what appointments the Honourable Member is referring to; but if he will kindly give further particulars, I will enquire into the matter.

EMPLOYMENT OF MUSLIMS IN THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

566. *Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi: (a) Is it a fact that four temporary clerks have recently been recruited in the Finance Department, out of whom only one is a Muslim?

(b) Is it a fact that this Muslim clerk has been engaged on less pay than his non-Muslim colleagues? If so, why has this differentiation in emoluments been necessary? Is it a fact that the grade in which the Muslim clerk has been engaged, viz., Rs. 60, does not exist in the Secretariat service?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) Six temporary clerks have recently been appointed to the Finance Department in short vacancies. Out of them, three are Hindus, two are Muslims and one is a Sikh.

(b) Out of the two Muslims, one is a graduate and has been appointed on Rs. 75. The other has only read up to the Intermediate standard, has not qualified for appointment to the Secretariat, and has no previous experience of office work. He was accordingly given a pay of Rs. 60 as against Rs. 75 given for similar work to the remaining four clerks, three of whom are graduates, while the fourth has about three years experience of office work. There is no objection to the pay of a temporary post in the Secretariat being fixed at Rs. 60 to suit the circumstances of an individual incumbent.

EMPLOYMENT OF MUSLIMS IN THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

567. *Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi: (a) Is it a fact that Messrs. Chatterjee, Perrier and Abdul Hamid, temporary clerks, were employed by the Finance Department on Rs. 100, 100 and 75 respectively?

(b) Is it a fact that Mr. Perrier, who was not a graduate, was given Rs. 100 per mensem while Mr. Abdul Hamid who is a graduate was given Rs. 75 per mensem. If so, why?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) Yes.

(b) Yes. Mr. Abdul Hamid is employed as a clerk in the Third Division, while Messrs. Perrier and Chatterji were employed on First Division work.

APPOINTMENT OF UNDER SECRETARY IN THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

568. *Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi: (a) Is the appointment of Under Secretary in the Finance Department a tenure appointment for three years? If so, how long has the present incumbent been holding this appointment?

(b) Do Government propose to consider the advisability of reverting him to the Indian Audit and Accounts Service, to which he actually belongs, after the expiry of the term of his office?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) Yes. The present officiating Under Secretary has been holding this post for about 35 months.

(b) The point will naturally be one of those for consideration when the occasion arises.

APPOINTMENT OF UNDER SECRETARY IN THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

569. ***Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi**: Is it a fact that the ministerial subordinate establishment in each office of the Government of India is usually under an Assistant Secretary? If so, why is the establishment being controlled by the Under Secretary in the Finance Department?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: The practice varies. The present officiating Under Secretary was in charge of the establishment as Assistant Secretary and continued to do this duty when promoted to *officiate* as Under Secretary because he had the longest experience of the office. No final orders are passed by him on establishment cases. The final control rests with the Deputy Secretary.

Mr. B. Das: May I ask, Sir, whether the Honourable Member recruits his Assistant Secretaries and Under Secretaries in the Finance Department on a communal basis or the criterion is ability and efficiency?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Obviously, ability has the first claim to our consideration.

Mr. B. Das: Thank you.

Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi: Is it not a fact that one gentleman has been controlling the appointments in this department and that is the reason why the Muslim representation is so inadequate?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I do not admit that the Muslim representation is inadequate. I think the answers I have already given to my Honourable friend's questions rebut that charge. I would ask my Honourable friend in connection with these questions, of which he has put a very long series to me, to consider in future when he puts questions of this kind whether the Department has been given an opportunity of going into the alleged grievances. I would inform him in this particular case that no opportunity has been given to my Department to consider these grievances. I would put it to all Honourable Members that when they are approached to ask questions of this kind, they would render great assistance to the Department concerned if they would ascertain in advance whether representations have been made to the proper authorities. In that case, I think a great deal of time would be saved in this House and we should have a better chance of arriving at the truth. I do not accept my Honourable friend's implication as regards the way in which appointments are made.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: May I ask, Sir, whether the Honourable Member is sure that the representations made by persons who are aggrieved will reach the proper quarter or will they not be suppressed in the middle?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Certainly, Sir.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: What is the meaning of "Certainly"? Would they reach the proper quarter?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Certainly.

Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum: May I know, Sir, whether these questions, which are put in such large numbers, influence or affect in any way the general policy of Government in making these appointments? If they do not affect or influence the discretion of Government, will they not take some steps to put a stop to these questions?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I think it is quite clear when questions are asked in this House that they afford means of calling the attention of the Members of Government responsible for the particular Department which is involved to points in which Honourable Members take interest. To that extent, they serve a valuable purpose; but I do suggest to Honourable Members that in putting questions of this particular kind they would achieve their purpose better, and save the time of the House, if in the first place they would ascertain what representations have been made to the head of the Departments and, if possible, consult the Honourable Member who is responsible for that Department on the matter before they actually put questions.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Is it not a fact that such questions are asked at the instance of some one in the office who feels aggrieved?

Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi: Does not the Honourable Member realise that after all the avenues of redressing the grievances have been tried, this is the last avenue that is taken by Honourable Members by putting questions like this.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I fully realise the value, as I have already said, of putting questions in this House, but the only point that I would like to put to my Honourable friend is that before approaching what he calls the "last avenue" he should try one or two other avenues.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: What are those other avenues?

Mr. President: Order, order: Next question please.

EMPLOYMENT OF MUSLIMS IN THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

570. ***Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi:** (a) Is it a fact that the services of clerks are requisitioned temporarily by the Finance Department during the Budget season from different accounts offices who draw Rs. 50 per mensem as duty allowance?

(b) Is it also a fact that not a single Muslim has ever been employed for this job? If so, why is this differential treatment being meted out to the Muslims?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) Yes.

(b) The selection rests primarily with the Accounts Officers concerned, who select the men most suitable for this specialised work. No question of communal differentiation arises. I may also add for the information of the Honourable Member that the present system will be discontinued from next year.

EMPLOYMENT OF MUSLIMS IN THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

571. ***Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi**: Are Government aware of:

- (a) the indiscriminate promotion of non-Muslim clerks to higher grades,
- (b) the increase in the numbers of Sikh clerks out of all proportion to their numerical strength, and
- (c) Muslims being deprived of their just claims in the matter of promotions and appointments,

in the Finance Department of the Government of India? If so, how do Government account for these facts?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Government emphatically repudiate the insinuation that there has been indiscriminate promotion of non-Muslim clerks to the higher grades of the Finance Department, and that Muslims have been deprived of their just claims in the matter of promotions and appointments. The number of Sikhs on the permanent staff of the Department is four as against 18 Muslims.

SIKH AND MUSLIM CLERKS IN THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

572. ***Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi**: (a) How many permanent appointments in the ministerial cadre of the Finance Department are at present held by Sikhs and how many of them are at present on deputation from their substantive posts?

(b) Is it a fact that some of the Third Division Muslim clerks in the Finance Department were not allowed to accept Second Division appointments in other offices of the Government of India when such were offered to them? If so, why?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) There are four Sikhs on the permanent establishment of the Finance Department out of whom two are on deputation.

(b) Cases have occurred in which clerks in the Third Division, whether Muslims or non-Muslims, have not been allowed to accept officiating appointments in the Second Divisions of other Departments in the interests of work in the Finance Department itself. But ordinarily every facility is afforded whenever possible to allow them to obtain employment in other Departments irrespective of communal considerations.

EMPLOYMENT OF A HINDU STENOGRAPHER IN THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

573. ***Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi**: Is it a fact that the names of two stenographers were suggested in 1929 by the Public Service Commission for employment in the Finance Department and that the junior of those two men, who was a Hindu, was offered an appointment, the senior man who was a Muslim having been ignored? If so, why was the senior man ignored?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: It is a fact that the names of two stenographers were suggested by the Public Service Commission for employment in the Finance Department in 1929, but the Hindu was appointed, as he was immediately available in Delhi.

Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi: Is it not a fact that the Public Service Commission objected to these appointments as against their recommendation?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I have no knowledge of that. It is contrary to my own information but I should be very pleased to inquire into it.

NON-EMPLOYMENT OF MUSLIM STENOGRAPHERS IN THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

574. *Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi: (a) Is it a fact that of five stenographers recruited by the Finance Department since 1926 not a single one is a Muslim?

(b) If so, will Government please explain why all the appointments of stenographers in the Finance Department are reserved for Hindus to the total exclusion of Muslims?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) Yes.

(b) The appointments are not reserved for Hindus. The difficulty has been to find suitable Muslims qualified and available for this work.

Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi: How does the Honourable Member say that there was difficulty in finding out qualified Muslims?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I am giving the Honourable Member the information which has been afforded to me by my Department. I would ask him to accept the facts from me.

Shaikh Sadiq Hasan: Is it not a fact that sometimes wrong information is supplied to the Honourable Member by his Department?

Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi: Is it not a fact that the officer who controls the appointments has a prejudice against Muslims and therefore the correct information is not supplied to the head of the Department?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I emphatically repudiate these suggestions. My Honourable friend is well aware that, as a result of the number of questions asked in this matter, I have myself taken a personal interest in it and have discussed the question with the members of his community who are Members of this House, and have suggested to them that they should form a sort of employment organisation which would see that the names of suitable candidates are always brought to the notice of the various departments. I suggest to him that he can advance the cause of his community much better on these lines than by criticising the Government or asking questions of this kind in the Assembly.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Will Government encourage the formation of similar organisations for the Sikhs and other communities also?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I think my Honourable friend's community is quite capable of looking after itself.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: I am not a Sikh.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: May I ask, Sir, whether the Government intend to adopt any other criterion for recruiting British Indian subjects, namely, race instead of religious faiths?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: May I ask, Sir, whether the Honourable Member has ascertained the cost of these questions by getting the necessary information? As a Finance Member he ought to know this.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: We have never actually commercialised this part of the work of the Government. I imagine that to maintain proper 'costing' accounts would hardly be practicable. But undoubtedly it does involve the Government in a considerable amount of extra labour and reduces the possibilities of retrenchment.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Is the Honourable Member aware that in the case of certain Provincial Governments the figure as to what it costs to answer a question has been ascertained?

Mr. President: Order, order: How does that question arise out of the reply given?

Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar: May I ask, Sir, whether Government propose to encourage the establishment of an employment organisation for other minority communities?

Several Honourable Members: That has already been answered.

ENCROACHMENTS ON MUSLIM BURIAL GROUNDS IN AJMER.

575. ***Maulvi Sayyid Murtuza Saheb Bahadur:** (a) Will Government please state whether it is a fact:

- (1) that a special committee, consisting of the Civil Surgeon, Colonel Watson, and two other members of the Municipal Board, Ajmer, was appointed by the Municipal Board, Ajmer, in accordance with resolution No. 39, dated 16th August, 1923, to prepare and submit definite proposals for delimiting all burial grounds within the Ajmer Municipality and for dealing with all existing constructions therein;
- (2) that the said special committee prepared and submitted a report with the plan of all grave-yards in the Ajmer Municipal area;
- (3) that the said plan was unanimously approved by the Municipal General Committee, Ajmer, in resolution No. 10 of the 19th August, 1925, with a remark that a second copy of it should be made and the original plan kept in the safe custody of the Secretary;
- (4) that some encroachments on the demarcated grave-yard near Idgah Chand Baori, Ajmer, defined in the said plan were made by some persons without the permission of the said Municipal Board, after the above resolution; and
- (5) that injunctions were issued by the Municipal Board, Ajmer, to put a stop to the said encroachments, but were not obeyed?

(b) If what are stated in part (a) above are facts, will Government please state whether the Municipal Board, Ajmer, took any action against the said persons in connection with their encroachments on Muslim burial-grounds in defiance of the said Board's injunctions? If so, what? If not, why not?

Sir Evelyn Howell: With your permission, Sir, I propose to answer questions Nos. 575 to 579 together. The information is being collected and will be given to the House in due course.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Will the replies be given as a matter of course or will it be necessary to put another question?

(No answer was given.)

REPORT ON THE ENCOACHMENTS ON MUSLIM BURIAL GROUNDS IN AJMER.

†576. ***Maulvi Sayyid Murtuza Saheb Bahadur:** (a) Will Government please state whether it is a fact:

- (1) that Mr. Walker, the Convener of the Public Works Sub-Committee of Ajmer Municipality, and Mr. Gainda Lall, Ward Superintendent, inspected the Idgah Chand Baori demarcated graveyard in 1929, in accordance with resolution No. 14, dated 22nd July, 1929;
- (2) that the said Mr. Walker made a report relating to the graveyard on 14th October, 1929 to the Municipal Board, Ajmer, and
- (3) that the said report of Mr. Walker has not yet been placed before the General Committee of the said Municipal Board, but has been kept in the custody of some officials of the said Municipal Board?

(b) If what are stated in part (a) above are facts, will Government please state where, why and with whom the report of Mr. Walker referred to above is lying and why it has not been produced before the General Committee of the said Municipal Board?

(c) Will Government please state whether it is a fact that Mr. Gainda Lall, Ward Superintendent, referred to in part (a) above, did not submit his report along with the report of Mr. Walker referred to above, but submitted a separate report on 19th May, 1930, seven months after the said report of Mr. Walker, when the latter had ceased to be the Convener of the Public Works Sub-Committee? If so, what was the cause of the Ward Superintendent's long delay in submitting his report?

(d) Will Government please place on the table of the House a copy of Mr. Walker's report referred to in part (a) above and a copy of the Ward Superintendent's report referred to in part (c) above?

†For answer to this question, see answer to starred question No. 575.

ENCROACHMENTS ON MUSLIM BURIAL GROUNDS IN AJMER.

†577. *Maulvi Sayyid Murtuza Saheb Bahadur: (a) Will Government please state whether it is a fact:

- (1) that the *Anjuman Nazir-i-Auqaf* Committee, Ajmer, made several representations to the Chairman of the Municipal Committee, Ajmer, on the subject of encroachments on Muslim demarcated graveyards;
- (2) that no reply has yet been given by the said Chairman to the said *Anjuman Nazir-i-Auqaf* Committee;
- (3) that no action has been taken to carry out the resolutions passed by the Municipal Committee concerning the said encroachments;
- (4) that Mr. Gainda Lall, Ward Superintendent, dissented from the resolution No. 14 of 22nd July, 1929, whereby it was resolved to refuse permission to construct private houses in demarcated Muslim graveyards; and
- (5) that a number of persons are at present, constructing houses on Muslim graveyards?

(b) If what are stated at part (a) above are facts, what steps do Government propose to take in the matter?

MISMANAGEMENT IN MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS IN AJMER.

†578. *Maulvi Sayyid Murtuza Saheb Bahadur: (a) Will Government please state whether it is a fact:

- (1) that till recently there was no Executive Officer in the service of the Ajmer Municipal Board and, consequently, the executive functions were, to a large extent, exercised by the members of the said Municipal Board;
- (2) that the said members are unwilling to part with executive powers and to entrust them to the recently appointed Executive Officer; and
- (3) that a good deal of mismanagement prevails in the municipal affairs in Ajmer?

(b) If what are stated in part (a) above are facts, what steps do Government propose to take in the matter?

HOUSES BUILT ON THE MUSLIM GRAVEYARD AT IDGAH CHAND BAORI, AJMER.

†579. *Maulvi Sayyid Murtuza Saheb Bahadur: Will Government please state how many houses have been built and are under construction on the Muslim graveyard at Idgah Chand Baori Ajmer, since 21st December, 1931?

†For answer to this question, see answer to starred question No. 575.

APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT TRAIN CONTROLLERS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

580. ***Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) Will the Honourable the Railway Member please see the reply to my starred question No. 385 of the 16th February, 1932 and say definitely if he is in a position to say when the Assistant Train Controllers of the North Western Railway will be confirmed?

(b) When is a reply to my starred question No. 1292 of the 13th November, 1931, likely to be given or laid on the table for the information of the House?

Sir Alan Parsons: (a) The Agent reports that confirmations against existing vacancies will be made before the end of March.

(b) A reply to the Honourable Member's starred question No. 1292 of the 13th November, 1931, is laid on the table. Replies to Mr. Lalchand Navalrai's questions Nos. 1361, 1362 and 1364 of 18th November, 1931, on the same subject are also laid on the table.

Reply to question No. 1292, put by Mr. S. G. Jog, M.L.A., in the Legislative Assembly, on the 13th November, 1931.

(a) Confirmation of 51 Assistant Train Controllers was countermanded by the Agent, after full consideration when the matter came under his review.

(i) No.

(ii) No.

(iii) This was one of the reasons.

(b) (i) and (ii). Divisions are not allowed to engage Assistant Controllers on Rs. 300 per mensem, but they make officiating promotions in temporary vacancies.

(iii) Confirmation orders were issued from the office of the Agent and were countermanded by an order of the Agent.

(iv) The confirmation of Assistant Controllers confirmed before the 1st January, 1931, is not affected.

(c) (i) Yes.

(ii) Yes. The new scales apply to all men including the 51 Assistant Train Controllers referred to by the Honourable Member who on the 14th September, 1929 were neither permanent nor officiating in the Control Branch.

(d) (i) In 1927 the staff were advised that when Train Controllers were available in sufficient numbers, other qualifications being equal, preference would be given to men with control experience in filling vacancies of Station Masters.

(ii) Except for the 51 confirmations made in January, 1931, and subsequently countermanded, no confirmation in the Control Branch has been made since June, 1927.

Replies to questions Nos. 1361, 1362 and 1364, put by Mr. Lalchand Navalrai, M.L.A., in the Legislative Assembly on the 18th November, 1931.

Question No. 1361.

(a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes, from the date on which that grade was introduced.

(d) Yes.

(e) Probably, since appointments in the Control Branch were filled by selection of men who were most suited for the work.

(f) Orders confirming 51 Assistant Controllers from the 1st January, 1931, were issued.

Question No. 1363.

(a) The grade of Rs. 300—10—350 was already in existence prior to the 14th September, 1929. Two lower grades were added from that date.

(b) Yes.

(c) and (e) The 51 Assistant Controllers were officiating and their pay in the grades of Assistant Controllers was fixed according to rules in force.

(f) It is understood that the Agent, N. W. Railway, has received memorials in the matter and is giving these his consideration.

(g) and (k) No decision has yet been come to.

(i) The matter is within the competence of the Agent, and Government do not propose to intervene.

Question No. 1364.

(a) Passing of Station Master's examination is not a condition for appointment as an Assistant Controller. Guards or other staff are not appointed as Assistant Controllers unless they have passed the Senior Assistant Station Master's examination. The duties of Station Masters are different from those of Guards. Control work is not the duty of a Station Master or a Guard, but Station Masters or Guards or other staff may be appointed to the Control Branch if they have passed the senior Assistant Station Master's examination.

GRANT OF EXTENSIONS TO SUPERANNUATED OFFICERS.

581. ***Mr. S. G. Jog:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) the rule about the grant of extensions to superannuated persons in the gazetted rank; and

(b) whether on account of retrenchment the rule of non-grant of extensions is rigidly enforced?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) I presume that the Honourable Member is referring to Government servants in civil departments. If so, I would refer him to rule 56 of the Fundamental Rules available in the Library of the House, and add that Provincial Governments have now full power to make rules in so far as Government servants belonging to the services under their rule making control are concerned.

(b) I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer which I gave in the House on 25th January, 1932, to starred question No. 17.

EXTENSIONS GRANTED TO SUPERANNUATED OFFICERS IN THE INCOME-TAX DEPARTMENT, BOMBAY PRESIDENCY.

582. ***Mr. S. G. Jog:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) the number of retirements on an average in the gazetted cadre of the Income-tax Department, Bombay Presidency, during the past five years;

(b) how many extensions to superannuated men have been granted during the past five years;

(c) whether the practice of granting extensions to gazetted staff in the Income-tax Department, Bombay Presidency, is the same as the one prevailing in the Income-tax Department of the other Provinces; and

(d) if not, the reason why extensions were granted in the Income-tax Department, Bombay Presidency?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: The information is being obtained and will be laid on the table in due course.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: Will the Honourable Member kindly lay on the table the amount of income-tax paid by the various communities?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I think my Honourable friend should put down a question on that point.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

GRADATION LIST IN THE INDIAN STORES DEPARTMENT.

96. Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan: (a) Is it a fact that on the 4th March, 1925, the Chief Controller of Stores, Indian Stores Department, at the time of the confirmation of the clerical staff of his office issued an office order containing the names, designations, gradation, etc., of the cadre of the Indian Stores Department?

(b) Is it not correct that this office order formed the basis of the gradation list of the clerical staff of that Department and was worked up to for all official purposes?

(c) Are Government aware that in 1930 the Chief Controller of Stores issued a revised gradation list which altered the seniority of many members of the clerical staff?

(d) If the answer to part (a) above be in the affirmative, will Government please state the reasons why the seniority of certain members of the clerical staff was altered in the revised gradation list?

(e) What do Government propose to do with the men whose further progress in the cadre has been affected on account of their position having been altered after five years?

(f) What were the main principles on which the revised gradation list was based?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhow: With your permission, Sir, I propose to deal with questions Nos. 96, 97 and 98 together.

No formal gradation list of the clerical establishment employed in the office of the Chief Controller of Stores, Indian Stores Department, was issued until the year 1930. The principles which should regulate seniority were under consideration for a considerable time. In the meantime seniority was sometimes determined by rate of pay, and, later by date of appointment to class. It was finally decided to determine each individual's seniority taking into account all the relevant factors of his case.

No regard, whatever, was paid to communal considerations in preparing the gradation list, but the position has now been analysed and Government are satisfied that Muslims have on the whole benefited more than Hindus by the final list.

Government do not propose to take any further action in the matter or to place copies of any papers on the subject on the table.

GRADATION LIST IN THE INDIAN STORES DEPARTMENT.

†97. **Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan:** (a) Will Government please state why it was found necessary to alter the seniority of many clerks of the Indian Stores Department in 1930 when they had established it in actual practice for over a period of eight years?

(b) Will Government please state if each Department has a free hand in the alteration of the seniority of its cadre at any time and without recording any reasons and can change the position of any clerk as it thinks fit?

(c) If the answer to part (b) above be in the negative, will Government please state why in 1930 the Chief Controller issued a seniority list materially altering the seniority of many members of the clerical staff?

(d) Is it a fact that, as a result of the revision of seniority in 1930, several Muslim clerks were made junior to their Hindu confrères though the latter were junior to the former from the time of the formation of the Indian Stores Department, up till 1930?

(e) Will Government please state the reasons for making a Hindu clerk senior to a Muslim clerk in 1930 when the latter has longer approved Government service, is better qualified educationally and has been well reported on?

(f) Is it a fact that a Hindu clerk was made a Muslim's senior though the former had previously been punished for inefficient work and his pay reduced by a large sum?

GRADATION LIST IN THE INDIAN STORES DEPARTMENT.

†98. **Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan:** (a) Will Government please state why up to 1930 there was no gradation list of the clerical staff of the Indian Stores Department? If there was no such list how were promotions being affected in the clerical cadre?

(b) If as a result of no seniority list being maintained a member of the staff suffered a serious set back in his advancement without his own fault, will Government please state how they propose to deal with such cases now?

(c) Do Government propose to take any action in regard to the establishment officer responsible for not keeping the seniority list? Why did he not prepare one for so long?

(d) Will Government please lay on the table a copy of office order No. 181, dated the 30th January, 1926, which was issued by the Chief Controller of Stores at the time of the formation of a new branch in his office?

APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING IN THE RIFLE FACTORY AT ISHAPORE.

99. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** With reference to their answer to my starred question in the Legislative Assembly No. 114, dated the 3rd February, 1932, regarding training of apprentices in Ordnance Factories, will Government be pleased to place on the table the particulars of the present scheme of apprenticeship training in the Rifle Factory at Ishapore, regarding syllabus, rules, conditions, object, scope and hours of training both theoretical and practical?

† For answer to this question, see answer to unstarred question No. 96.

Mr. G. M. Young: Enquiries are being made and replies will be laid on the table in due course.

APPOINTMENT OF APPRENTICES TRAINED IN ORDNANCE FACTORIES.

†100. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** With reference to Government's reply to my starred question No. 114, parts (c) and (e), dated the 3rd February, 1932, will Government please state what are the names and designations of the junior appointments referred to therein and the pay and prospects thereof?

CERTIFICATES GRANTED TO APPRENTICES IN ORDNANCE FACTORIES.

†101. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** With reference to their answer to my starred question No. 114, part (b) answered on the 3rd February, 1932, do Government propose to enquire into the facts referred to therein? If not, why not?

RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES OF EXISTING APPRENTICES AT THE RIFLE FACTORY, ISHAPORE.

†102. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** With reference to their answer to my starred question No. 114, part (h) answered on the 3rd February, 1932, are Government prepared to protect the rights and privileges of the existing apprentices in the Rifle Factory, Ishapore? If not, why not?

STANDARD OF TRAINING OF APPRENTICES IN THE RIFLE FACTORY, ISHAPORE.

†103. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** With reference to their answer to my starred question No. 114, part (f), dated the 3rd February, 1932, will Government please state whether the standard of technical training to Trade Apprentices is that of Woolwich Trade lads or in certain cases Student Apprentices syllabus?

APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING IN THE RIFLE FACTORY AT ISHAPORE.

†104. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Will Government please state what is the actual position in respect of student apprenticeship training in the Rifle Factory at Ishapore, and place on the table a copy of the Master General of Ordnance's letter to the Superintendent, Rifle Factory, Ishapore, No. 1048/75 (M. G. 1), dated the 19th October, 1931?

APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING IN THE RIFLE FACTORY AT ISHAPORE.

†105. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Will Government be pleased to state whether the student apprenticeship scheme in the Rifle Factory at Ishapore is being abolished? If so, why?

VOCATIONAL TRAINING IN ORDNANCE AND CLOTHING FACTORIES.

†106. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Will Government be pleased to place on the table the Army Department letter to the Master General of Supply, No. 1048/52 (M. G. 1-A.), Simla, dated the 20th September, 1927, and annexure thereto regarding vocational training in Ordnance and Clothing Factories?

†For answer to this question, see answer to unstarred question No. 99.

APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING IN THE RIFLE FACTORY AT ISHAPORE.

†107. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Will Government be pleased to state whether the opinions of the Indians in the teaching and educational profession on the new scheme of apprenticeship training in the Rifle Factory at Ishapore were invited? If so, what are the opinions and by whom? If not, why not?

APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING IN THE RIFLE FACTORY AT ISHAPORE.

†108. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state to what extent the theoretical training to apprentices in the Rifle Factory at Ishapore is being reduced under the new scheme during factory working hours in lecture rooms and laboratories?

(b) Will Government please state when the existing scheme of Apprenticeship Training was introduced?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state the names, qualifications, designations and duties of the whole-time teaching staff borne on apprenticeship training in the Rifle Factory at Ishapore?

APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING IN THE RIFLE FACTORY AT ISHAPORE.

†109. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Is it a fact that Mr. J. H. Welford, the permanent Superintendent, Rifle Factory, Ishapore, had submitted a scheme of apprenticeship training in that factory in his letter to D. O. F. & M. (A. H. Q. India, Simla), No. 15/1, dated the 25th June, 1931? If so, will Government be pleased to place on the table the correspondence and the scheme referred to?

APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING IN THE RIFLE FACTORY AT ISHAPORE.

†110. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Is it a fact that Mr. J. H. Welford, the permanent Superintendent, Rifle Factory, Ishapore, suggested to D. O. F. & M. in his letter to him dated the 27th August, 1931, that apprentices in the Rifle Factory at Ishapore should be required to pass the final examination of the Board of Apprenticeship Control, Bengal, it being the local officially recognised standard for technical training and that it will have the advantage of giving apprentices a recognised qualification? If so, will Government be pleased to place on the table a copy of that letter?

PROMOTION OF EX-WAR SERVICE MEN ON RAILWAYS.

111. **Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Will Government kindly state whether it is a fact that the Railway Administrations were asked by the Railway Board to consider the question of preference for promotion for such members of their staff as were lent by them for service overseas during the Great War?

(b) If the reply to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be good enough (i) to place a copy of their letter on the table or state on what grounds a preferential promotion was to be given, and (ii) to give the names and designations of the men who were given such promotions on the East Indian and North Western Railways?

†For answer to this question, see answer to unstarred question No. 99.

Sir Alan Parsons: (a) Yes.

(b) (i). A copy of the Railway Board's letter No. W. B.-645, dated the 25th January, 1917, to the Agents of Railways is laid on the table.

(ii) Government regret that they cannot, after this lapse of time, undertake to collect the information asked for by the Honourable Member.

COPY OF LETTER NO. W. B.-645, DATED 25TH JANUARY, 1917, FROM THE SECRETARY, RAILWAY BOARD TO THE AGENTS OF RAILWAYS.

In connection with the recruitment of certain State Railway staff lately for service overseas, I am directed to inform you that the Railway Board were informed that a difficulty arose because the men in question were apprehensive that they might be overlooked in matters of promotion in their absence. It will be remembered that the Railway Board in their telegram No. W. B.-11, dated 28th. October 1916, stated that subordinate staff who rendered approved service abroad should receive special preference for promotion after return over men, who have refused to go, and desired that this order should be published for the information of the staff.

The Board's intention was that such men should not only receive the special advantages stated but should also not be prejudiced in any way whatever in consequence of their loyal service overseas. The rule is of course of general application to all State Railway staff who have gone abroad even before the date of the Board's telegram quoted above.

This will doubtless have been fully appreciated by you, but it is important that the fact should be equally understood by all officers and subordinate staff on your railway, and I am, therefore, to request that you will take such steps as you consider suitable to ensure that the point is clearly understood by all concerned and that full effect is given to the Board's wishes.

I am to add that a copy of this letter is being sent to the Director of Railways, East Africa and Mesopotamia as well as to others concerned for their information.

STATEMENT LAID ON THE TABLE.

EXAMINATION OF ACCOUNTS IN THE INCOME-TAX DEPARTMENT, BOMBAY.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster (Finance Member): Sir, I lay on the table the statement promised in reply to starred question No. 309 asked by Bhai Parma Nand on the 12th February, 1932, regarding the examination of accounts in the Income-tax Department, Bombay:

(a) The Government have no such information.

(b) Assesseees are not "called before the Chief Examiner". The Income-tax Officers send from 20 to 25 assesseees to the Chief Examiner daily, and the Chief Examiner distributes the work among the Examiners. Since there are usually about 21 Examiners at work, no assessee is ordinarily kept waiting for an unreasonable time, but it is impossible to foresee exactly how long the examination of each set of accounts will take. On the other hand, it is necessary to post a sufficient number of cases each day to ensure that all the Examiners will be fully employed. Over 21,600 cases were examined in 1930-31.

(c) The Examiners' work in one large hall under the eye of the Chief Examiner, an arrangement that is considered essential in order to prevent allegations of attempted malpractices. The Examiners' tables are so spaced as to ensure privacy.

(d) The Government see no reason to issue any orders on the subject.

THE FOREIGN RELATIONS BILL.

PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE.

Sir Evelyn Howell (Foreign Secretary): Sir, I lay on the table the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to provide against the publication of statements likely to prejudice the maintenance of friendly relations between His Majesty's Government and the Governments of certain Foreign States.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR ROADS.

Mr. President: Honourable Members will now proceed to elect six members to serve on the Standing Committee for Roads. There are nine candidates whose names are printed on the ballot papers which will now be supplied to Honourable Members in the order in which I call them.

(The ballot was then taken.)

RAILWAY BUDGET—GENERAL DISCUSSION.

Mr. President: Order, order. The Assembly will now proceed to consider the Railway Budget. As only one day is allotted to the
12 Noon. general discussion of the Railway Budget I have decided to fix a time limit of 15 minutes for each speech.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I offer my thanks to the Honourable the Railway Member for the able manner in which he has presented a very gloomy Budget for the year. Sir, his cheerful disposition, his courtesy and his coolness have left a very good impression on the minds of the Members who came in contact with him, but I have been feeling rather keenly that some change is absolutely necessary. The Railway Member should be made responsible for all the statements or mis-statements in regard to railways that are made on the floor of the House. At present he considers commerce to be his main charge and railways as a secondary object. He should not sit here as an interested spectator. Sir, I will just say a few words about the discussion on creating a statutory body. I am strongly opposed to the creation of a statutory body for the administration of the railways because it would really mean handing over the control from the Assembly to a certain clique or a certain body of men, and we would have the same troubles with railways as we are having now in connection with the administration of the Imperial Bank. Sir, as far as this Assembly is concerned, I think we will fight tooth and nail for the administration of the railways to be directly under the control and supervision of the Legislative Assembly. Sir, during the last three years we were given a very hopeful picture in the presentation of the Budget, but unfortunately our expectations have not materialised. Last year we were promised an income of 102 crores, but the actual income was 90 crores. This year we have been promised an income of about 95 crores but I am positive that the real income will be much less than what is anticipated. On the other hand the expenditure is

always under-estimated. No payments have been made to the Government of India this year and no provision is made in the Budget for 1932-33. May I remind the Honourable Member of Article 2 of the convention which we passed on 24th September, 1924? It says:

"Subject to the condition that if in any year the Railway revenues are insufficient to provide a percentage of one per cent. on the capital at charge, the surplus profits of the next or subsequent years will not be deemed to have accrued for the purposes of division until such deficiency has been made up."

It consequently follows from this that the amount that has been left unpaid to us should be considered as a debt though it may be a debt without interest, and whenever good times come we should be able to realise the whole amount; and this fact should be indicated very clearly in the Railway Budget as well as in the General Budget of the country. We should not forget this fact.

Sir, the second point to which I should like to draw the attention of the House is the deficit of about 2 crores we have been having every year on the strategic lines, and this thing ought to be settled once for all. Either they should be treated as part of the military organization, in which case these 2 crores ought to be supposed to have been paid to the Government of India and debited to military accounts, or that amount should be absorbed altogether by the railways, and separate accounts should not be shown. Therefore, one of these things is absolutely essential, either you should put down these 2 crores on the debit and the credit side of the military accounts or absorb the whole thing in the general revenue and expenditure of railways. But the thing which I strongly object to is that the Railway Budget shows that the sum of two crores (odd) is paid to the general revenue, but the General Budget refuses to acknowledge it. Sir, in the convention which I have just quoted and to which I drew attention two years ago, there was an important omission made and it was the control of capital expenditure. We provided in Article 8 that the whole convention should be reconsidered and revised, after three years. I think the time has now come when we ought to revise the convention and provide better supervision on capital expenditure. As soon as the railway accounts were separated from the general accounts, the Railway Board wrote letters to the Agents of the various railways asking them to spend the money as quickly as possible and with as little consideration as they could manage—I say it with full responsibility, because I am going to prove the whole thing by actual facts. We find that in the new construction they have spent 45 crores of rupees during this period, and on each occasion at the time of demanding sanction a guarantee was given that the expenditure would yield an income from 5 to 13 per cent., but taking all facts into consideration we find that the income is only about 1 per cent. Therefore, I would like to know whether the Honourable Member could explain to us to-day why their assurances were falsified. These new constructions were undertaken by giving a strict guarantee to the Railway Administrations who fully satisfied themselves that they would yield a particular rate of interest, but we find from experience that the yield is only about 1 per cent., and not from 5 to 13 per cent. which we were originally promised. No explanation was ever given by any Railway authority.

Coming to the capital expenditure on the running lines we find the case is still hopeless, because the expenditure on running lines is practically a dead loss and no income can be derived from it. Under this head during

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

the same period they spent about 186 crores of rupees. Out of this 73 crores are taken from the Depreciation Fund and 113 crores were borrowed at an average of 5·7 per cent. The Government have unnecessarily added to the burden of our taxpayers by this disgraceful expenditure. They mis-spent about two crores on the railway stations at Lucknow and at Cawnpore and about 4 crores on the electric installation at Kalyan and on many other undertakings of this kind. Was it wisdom? The time has now come that we should provide better machinery for scrutinising the capital expenditure, and the terms of the convention of 1924 may be revised. No doubt, according to the letter of the law of our convention, they follow the usual procedure. They lay the matter before the Standing Finance Committee and also before the Assembly, but how is it done? I notice that they held their meetings at 5 in the afternoon for the discussion of the capital expenditure and they had altogether only three meetings. At this awkward time they could not expect full attendance. Mr. Sykes and Sir Alan Parsons were the only two members who were present at all these three meetings. More material ought to have been supplied to members and suitable time should have been given for discussion. The proceedings of these meetings are very scrappy. When the matter comes before the Assembly, owing to the shortness of time at our disposal we never reach the question of capital expenditure. Therefore, though no doubt you take the opinion of the Standing Finance Committee and also of the Assembly, it is done in such a shabby manner that you really follow the letter of the law and not the spirit of the law, and therefore, I think, the time has now come when you should change and modify the convention of 1924 and have better supervision and control over capital expenditure, because truly speaking we have no confidence whatsoever on the manner in which the Railway Board has been spending money recklessly and in many cases the expenditure was double and even treble the estimate and no explanation was ever given for this mistake.

Sir, the Honourable Member made a reference to debentures, and I think this is a point which we ought to discuss more closely and if possible we should have a special convention for this purpose, because no commercial undertaking can possibly have the high interest as the first charge, and if we have some portion of this thing adopted in the issue of the debentures and the remaining in the form of a fixed rate, then our position will be more cheerful. After the war we have raised capital at an average of 5·7 per cent., while the yield of all Railways is 3·7, a loss of 2 per cent. I suggested several times, especially in connection with the question of the purchase of the B. N. W. R. that if we could guarantee 3 per cent. to people and also participation in the profits, then I am positive there will be enough money forthcoming in India itself, because there are a large number of people who do not want to take interest at fixed rates but who would like to participate in loans of this kind which guarantees 3 per cent. and also gives them participation in the profits.

Sir, coming to the expenditure, I should like to refer to one very important point, and that is the Report of the Retrenchment Committee. This Committee had the opportunity to discuss only the expenditure connected with the Railway Board, and there we found that in the coming budget the expenditure had been reduced from 14·3 crores to 12·8 crores

.....

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Why did you not discuss the whole railway expenditure in the Railway Retrenchment Committee of which you were a member.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: We could not go to the running lines and we were not allowed to discuss that expenditure.

Mr. B. Das: Why? Did you get cold feet in the Retrenchment Committee, and did not examine every aspect of the question?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: We find that the expenditure on running lines (operation) has been increased from 23 crores to 24.62 crores, and taking the expenditure as a whole, it remains almost stationary, it was 63.26 last year and 63.21 this year, *vide* page 8 of the explanatory memorandum.

Mr. B. Das: Why did you not

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Sir, I would like to have these minutes added to my 15 minutes.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): No, that cannot be done. If the Honourable Member objects he need not yield.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: All right, Sir. We have been hearing all the time that so many thousands of people had been retrenched; so many thousands have been thrown out of employment; the salaries of T. T. Is. have been reduced to one-third by calling them under different designation, but still we find the expenditure remains the same. The retrenchment has really meant that you have reduced so many low paid Indians in order to find money for increased salaries and for promotions of officers. The fifteen minutes of my time do not permit me to go into all the details, but in the case of the East Indian Railway we find the gazetted officers have actually increased by 9 during this year, while men have been retrenched by 8,356! That is retrenchment of the men, and not of officers. In the case of the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway, which is the most paying concern of all the railways yielding maximum of 6 per cent. against 3.7 for all Railways, there has been no increase or diminution in the case of officers. In the case of the Nizam's Guaranteed State Railway, that is the only railway in which they have actually diminished the officers by one and increased the men by 1,854.

Now, Sir, about the maladministration and getting sanction of the Assembly by incorrect quotations, I shall give two definite illustrations. One is the separation of accounts from audit. When the question was raised we were told that this would lead to economy, and on this clear understanding the Assembly accepted the recommendation, but we find that the expenditure is increasing by leaps and bounds; in fact, practically the expenditure has increased, nay, doubled: that is to say, the expenditure in 1924-25 was 1.03 crores and in 1931-32 it was 1.48 crores, that is, 46 per cent. higher than the expenditure in 1924-25.

The second point is the organization of Divisional Superintendents. We were definitely told on the floor of the House that the divisional organization was not more expensive than the old district organization. We were not allowed to examine this case by going actually to the Divisional head-

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

quarters and to the headquarters of the railways. (*An Honourable Member*: "Why not?") Otherwise we would have proved conclusively that this organization has certainly not proved less expensive. If this thing was organised on the analogy of the German railways, it was forgotten that Germany has only one Agent. This divisional organisation could only be satisfactory if we abolished all the agencies and had one Agent for all the railways. Have either the one or the other. Either have so many Agents and district organisations, or have one Agent with so many divisional organisations and preferably identical with territorial divisions as in Post Office. But if you have so many Agents over and above divisional organisations, it is bound to be more expensive, it will lead to duplication of work, duplication of work in all directions,—engineering, transport and other aspects of the railways. The Agents will either be post offices and if they function, they will be the extra wheel. Just one sentence as regards the recruitment of Mussalmans. I could not discuss it at this stage, but I may just add one sentence that their promotions and employments depend upon methods which we would not adopt if we could and we could not adopt if we would.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member's time is up. Sir Hugh Cocke.

Sir Hugh Cocke (Bombay: European): The Honourable Member who has just spoken in his opening remarks referred to the question of capital expenditure, and he rather took the Government to task because they had embarked upon schemes which according to the estimates were likely to produce a certain figure of return but which did not in fact produce that figure of return. Sir, it is very easy to be wise after the event, and I think this House has got to share the responsibility for those schemes which were embarked upon five, six or seven years ago. I was on the Railway Finance Committee at that time, when all these schemes were put before us. We had a scheme for, say, 50 miles of railway line, and as far as it was possible to work out an estimate, estimates were worked out and they were gone into in some detail in certain cases in that Committee. That Committee, as far as it could be satisfied, was satisfied that the particular return anticipated, say it was 5.65 per cent., was a justifiable estimate. Now, the Honourable Member comes to the House and says the Government ought not to have embarked upon that scheme because, in fact, it has only produced 2 per cent. or no per cent. at all. I do not think that that criticism carries us very far. Every one was agreed I think five years ago and more that it was essential to develop the railways of India. The mileage of Indian railways was comparatively small, and money was available on loan at a lower rate of interest than the rate that it was anticipated would be earned on the projects embarked upon. Therefore, I say it is not entirely a matter for the Government to accept responsibility for these schemes which have not so far been justified by results. We have passed and are passing through very exceptional times and we have got to shoulder the burden as we find it. The rate of capital expenditure for the last three years since the advent of the present Finance Member has slowed down very considerably. We may say that in Sir Basil Blackett's time it was a period of optimism, but very soon after he went, clouds began to gather and the financial outlook became very different, so much so, as I have said, that the capital programme had to be cut down very considerably. Roughly 9

crores of rupees were spent in 1930-31; that was reduced to Rs. 5½ crores in the current year, and in the next year we shall be down practically to 3 crores. But I think that we must always look ahead in this matter, because it is no good assuming that we are going to be continuously in the state of depression in which we find ourselves to-day. We have got to look ahead and consider what developments to pursue when better times come along. Obviously we cannot spend a lot of money at the present time on examining projects, but we have at any rate to make up our minds on the policy that must be pursued, and it is in that connection that I want to say a few words this morning.

I do not know how many omnibuses there are running parallel to Indian railways to-day. But supposing there are 10,000 and supposing each of them takes Rs. 10 daily from the railways, it comes to one lakh a day, or say, 3½ crores a year. Double the number of buses, or keep the same number of buses and assume they earn Rs. 20 a day, and you have got Rs. 7 crores a year taken from the railways. I venture to submit that in the future we may have to regard the problem of roads and railways together. We have got to have a common outlook, and instead of having a Railway Member, what we want is a Minister of Transport. It is perfectly absurd for the railways to be managed in the way they are—it is perfectly absurd to my mind that they should run their own show and compete with and fight road development. The two ought to be worked together. You have got many buses of course feeding the railways to-day and they are valuable in that respect. But you have also got a very large number competing. It does not matter where you go, you see hundreds of these buses running on parallel roads to the railways. I suggest in the future that, instead of developing feeder lines, it will probably be very much better to devote your funds to develop the roads. I know it has been discussed whether the railways have really got powers to raise money to build roads to feed their railways. That is a somewhat doubtful question perhaps, but it is a matter which can be put right. The point I want to stress is that it is absurd that the railways and roads should be run in watertight compartments, that the railways should really be in opposition to road development. The present Railway Member is leaving us, much to our regret, and it is not for him to solve this problem, but I have no doubt he has given considerable thought to it during the last five years. It is one which will have to be considered very carefully in the future, and I venture to think that we have to consider this matter as a matter of transport rather than as a matter of railways.

On the question of the results, I think it is rather a pity that we are not given a rather more lucid comparative statement of results. I have no fault to find with the figures as they stand, but they do not go far enough. For instance, if we want to ascertain final results from the Memorandum, we cannot do so. (I have no doubt it is all in the accounts—I am talking about the Memorandum which is the first thing that one looks into.) I find the figures for 1930-31 are on one page and those for 1932-33 are in another, and we have got to put them together to get a comparison. Then, again, they do not go far enough. They have given the result of the working, but the disposal, the appropriation, the relation between results and the Reserve Fund and the Depreciation Fund—that is only given in the manuscript of the speeches, and I have had to ferret it out for myself. It is interesting

[Sir Hugh Cocke.]

to note that, whereas the results in 1930-31 showed a loss of something like 5.18 crores, that, together with the contribution to Central Revenues which was paid for that year, amounted to just under 11 crores, which, of course, was met entirely from the Reserve Fund. That was the last year in which the contribution was paid. That is a fact which I had to find out because I was not quite sure that the contribution of Rs. 5.74 crores was made in 1930-31 for the last time and I had to get it from the manuscript of the speeches. But, then, in the next year there was a loss of Rs. 9½ crores and the Reserve Fund was, as you know, unable to meet that in full. It met it to the extent of Rs. 5 crores, and we were left with Rs. 4½ crores, which for practical purposes we carried forward. I know we are told that it is being met by a loan from the Depreciation Fund. That is quite true, but for practical purposes we are providing in our accounts each year working expenses *plus* depreciation. That is a charge correctly made and therefore what it really amounts to is this. In 1931-32 we have an estimated loss of 4½ crores, which we have got to carry forward to 1932-33, and on our Budget figures of 1932-33, we are anticipating a loss of 7½ crores, and those two figures together will amount to a loss of 12 crores, which we have to make good out of future profits. If we are going to have a sustained period of depression with a loss of 5 crores or thereabouts every year for a period of years, it will be a serious matter, because it is not merely a question of temporary borrowing from the Depreciation Fund. We are piling up losses which will have to be made good out of future profits, and, as the Honourable Member explained in his Budget speech, we cannot do it by stopping our dividends. The interest has got to go on being paid, as we are financed by debenture loans, and therefore we are piling up losses to-day which have to be made good out of the profits of future years and this is a matter which has to be very carefully watched.

In conclusion, I should like to say that it is a matter of great regret to me that this is the last occasion upon which Sir George Rainy will be introducing the Railway Budget in this House, and I think this House owes a very great debt of gratitude to him for the services he has rendered. Perhaps not many who are now here were present in the Assembly when Sir Charles Innes brought about the separation, and I shall always consider that it was the finest piece of work which Sir Charles Innes did, and it has had very practical results, and the way we are benefiting to-day, as a result of the separation, is very encouraging. Obviously the future is black, if we are going to make continued losses, but assuming that these are going to be only temporary, I think the convention, which was established by Sir Charles Innes, has stood the test of time reasonably well, considering the extraordinary conditions with which we are faced to-day.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Unlike the General Budget, the Railway Budget does not contain any great surprises. At the time the General Budget is presented by the Finance Member, we always attend to the speech of the Finance Member with great care and anxiety and we are always anxious to know what the financial results of the year are going to be, but in the case of the Railway Budget my Honourable friend the Commerce Member does not rouse in the minds of Honourable Members on this side of the House any such misgivings or hopes. Those who follow the figures of railway earnings from week to week in the *Gazette of India*,

realise long before the Railway Budget is presented, what the financial prospects of the railways are going to be in the current year. In this particular case the Retrenchment Sub-Committee of the Railways had the occasion to examine even as early as July last the possible financial position of the railways in the current year and for some years to come, and those Honourable Members who have read the Report of that Committee will realise that, even as early as September last, the Committee anticipated that the current year would close with a deficit of 7 crores. The figures given by my Honourable friend the other day actually revealed a deficit of over 9 crores. Sir, after listening to the speech of my Honourable friend, I was really at a loss to know what it is that I should discuss during the general discussion to-day. The Budget that my Honourable friend has presented to us might in a sense be considered as a sort of consolation Budget. We feel a sense of relief that things are not worse than what they actually are. That is the feeling with which we are left after listening to the speech. I think, Sir, the problem that now faces us is the problem of the future of Indian railways. The Indian railways have, I think, now reached a turning point in their history. During the five or six years beginning from 1923-24, the Indian railways were enjoying a period of prosperity, and the gross traffic receipts were in the neighbourhood of 100 crores. In certain years they went up as high as 103½ crores, and what we have to ask ourselves to-day is this, whether in the next five or six years we can anticipate the railways earning anything like 100 crores. The Railway Retrenchment Sub-Committee very carefully examined this question with the help of the Members of the Railway Board, and we came to the conclusion—and as each day passes we are convinced that our conclusion in this matter is correct—that the railways have now definitely reached a stage when, for some years to come, they cannot expect to earn more than 90 or 95 crores from gross traffic receipts. Even taking the gross traffic receipts as 92 crores, which will be 5 crores more than what is budgeted for in the coming year, we find that even if expenditure is kept at the present level, which it will be very difficult to do with the existing order of things, working expenses will come to 64 crores, leaving the railways a net earning of only 28 crores per annum. Our interest charges alone come to 33½ crores of rupees, with the result that we are short of 4½ crores even to meet our interest charges. If to this is added the annual contribution of 5½ crores which the railways are called upon to make to the general revenues, Honourable Members will realise that the problem before the Railway Administration in future is to make good a deficit of over 10 crores of rupees per annum. I maintain that the position looked at from this point of view is rather a serious one. The Railway Retrenchment Sub-Committee was charged with the task of finding out economies, and in the time at our disposal we were able to examine only those items of expenditure which could conveniently be examined from headquarters as it were. On account of the time at our disposal and the enormous number of questions that came up for solution, we felt that mere tinkering with the problem of the Indian railway administration will not do, but that what is wanted is a thorough overhauling of the entire railway system, if necessary. It is for this purpose that we recommended the immediate appointment of an expert committee to go into the whole question of railway administration in India. We expected that this Committee would be working almost immediately, but unfortunately the Committee has not been appointed and I have been assured by my Honourable friend the Commerce Member that if the Committee has not been appointed, it is no fault of the Government

[Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty.]

of India but it is entirely due to the fact that within the short notice that they had they could not get the right type of men to serve on this Committee. I very much hope that at least during the next cold weather this expert Committee will start its investigation and I shall take this opportunity of impressing upon my Honourable friends opposite the need for getting one or two absolutely first-rate men with experience of English and Canadian railways, with whom might be associated men with experience of the working of Indian railways, to overhaul the system here and examine the railways from the point of view of enabling them in future to make good this deficit of 10½ crores. Sir, if the railways are to satisfy the criterion laid down by the Inchcape Committee that they should earn 5½ per cent. on the capital at charge, then they would have to make good a deficit of 12½ crores per annum. I hope therefore that during the next cold weather this expert Committee will start this investigation.

My Honourable friend, Sir Hugh Cocke, referred to a problem which is of tremendous importance for the future development of the Indian railways, and that is the possible competition of railways with road motor traffic. In viewing this problem, I think the conditions in India are radically different to the conditions that prevail in England. For one thing, in England, with short distances, it is very difficult to eliminate motor competition, and for another thing, the English railways are all owned by private companies. Therefore, the Government in England cannot very well discriminate between one form of private transport and another form of private transport. I maintain, Sir, that the conditions in India are entirely different. Here, luckily for us, the railways of India, with negligible exceptions, are a magnificent State property, built up by the taxpayer's money. That being so, it is up to the State here in India to safeguard the interests of the 750 crores of the taxpayer's money invested in Indian railways; and if my contention is correct, then I maintain that the State in India would be entitled to assume control over the regulation of motor traffic in such a way that that traffic will not come seriously into competition with the railway system in India. Sir, I think there are several instances in which motor cars run along a route parallel with the railway in many parts, and I consider the continuance of such a system anything but an absurdity. The Government of India should not permit me or any private person to build up a railway parallel to the one they have got. Why? Because they do not want that any railway should come into competition with their railway system. For the same reason I do not myself favour the running of motor traffic on parallel lines. (*An Honourable Member*: "How?") If by one form of transport you reduce the railway earnings, you thereby endanger the investment of the taxpayer in this great concern. I contend therefore that the State in India must retain the power of regulating motor traffic so that it will not come seriously into competition with the Indian railways. Sir, if a wise policy is pursued in this direction, it need not detrimentally affect railway traffic. India is a very peculiar country. We have got nearly 40,000 miles of railway. I say, let there be some co-ordination of policy, with the result that your motors will run at right angles rather than parallel, and act as feeders to your railway system and not as downright competitors. This problem I think will assume serious proportions in the future constitution. I want to raise the question whether steps ought not to be taken now to

make some provision in the future constitution so that this conflict of interest might not arise. Road traffic is an essentially provincial subject and the future federal provinces might claim the right to develop it as they please and thereby seriously injure the railway system. I therefore propose that the Government of India must immediately take some steps for the examination of this question, so that when the whole question of the classification of subject between the federal provincial Legislatures is being examined, some provision will be made for a scheme of co-ordination between the federal Ministry of Transport and the Local Governments whereby there will be a co-ordinated policy of transport and no conflict of interests between the railway system in India and the motor traffic system. I hope, Sir, the Government of India will pass on this suggestion to the necessary quarters, and I hope that they themselves will begin to devote their attention to this aspect of the problem. I do not think, Sir, I can say anything more at this stage. My Honourable friend the Commerce Member in the concluding part of his speech struck a personal note. I wish to join my Honourable friend, Sir Hugh Cocke, in paying my own tribute to the great work that my Honourable friend has done. (Applause.) I have no doubt that he will himself realize that behind the parliamentary ferocities of Honourable Members on this side of the House, there has been no personal malice or animosity against him (Hear, hear); even though some of us have been very harsh in our criticisms, we have always appreciated the genial courtesy and kindness of my Honourable friend (Loud applause); and let me assure him that while in his retirement he will look back with pleasure tinged with regret on the days that he spent with us in the Indian Legislature. we also shall for many a long year to come remember his genial and charming personality in this House and the great work that he has done for India.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I am sure the Honourable the Commerce Member would be the last man to thank me if I were to congratulate him on his speech. I join with other Members of this House in admiring him for the able manner in which he and the Railway Board have faced the serious difficulties of the past year. But while I listened to his speech, it struck me more as a lament and an apology for the action the Railway Board had taken during the past year in its fight against stupendous odds. Sir, time was in this House when we used to laugh at Budgetary deficits of 16 to 20 crores. Today we are faced with a deficit of 9½ crores; and if I judge aright the attitude of the Honourable Member and that of the Railway Board as mirrored in their policy of retrenchment, it strikes me that they are suffering from a bad attack of funk and nervousness in their feverish efforts, amounting to an epidemic of retrenchments, to increase their revenue and reduce their expenditure, mainly at the expense of their subordinate staff. Sir, the national debt of England is about £4,000 million. The national debt of this country is somewhat over £400 million. Last year the French railways lost over £25 million and the Canadian railways, with half the mileage of India, show a deficit of 59,000 dollars in their debenture interest, and yet they have not resorted to measures of retrenchment in like fashion. Sir, whatever these measures are—and I am in favour of trying in every way to balance the Budget—let us consider a little in detail what these measures have been. The first measure is that of retrenchment. Sir, I know the Railway Board have tried to be as kind and as considerate as possible in the various orders they have issued regarding their policy

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

and method of retrenchment, but I should like to ask whether it is not a fact that the Agents of the Railways have not interpreted and operated these orders in strict accordance with the orders issued by the Railway Board. I know for a fact,—indeed we have only to look at the Report published by Mr. Hassan in order to corroborate what I have stated. Personally I openly charge the Railway Agents with not carrying out the orders prescribed and this is evidenced by the varying procedures of retrenchment as practised on different Railways. For instance, on the G. I. P. Railway retrenchment utterly regardless of communal percentages as ordered by the Railway Board was started in the early part of last year though the Railway Board's order was dated in March. On the E. I. Railway it started in July. On the E. B. R. it started earlier. Whereas any serious retrenchment of officials started later, *i.e.*, towards the end of the year and then only after pressure was exercised on the Railway Board, months after subordinates of the Railways had borne this burden, and suffered from its attendant sacrifices and privations. But the other Government of India Departments did not start their retrenchments or reductions in pay until the 1st January of this year. I ask! Was it fair that subordinates of the Railway Department alone should have carried this burden and suffered such hardships? I submit, Sir, it was not fair. Again, if you will compare the way in which retrenchment has been carried out between subordinates and officials, you will appreciate the invidious differences made. While various and multiple means have been used to retrench subordinates, such as, discharges, demotion at times to an inhuman extent of $\frac{1}{3}$ the original salary as in the case of T. T. Is., enforced leave on half pay, reduced allowances, etc., and on the top of all these reductions a 10 per cent. cut was made (and I would add no such demands have been made on any other class of Government servant), Railway officials have enjoyed a comparative immunity from such deductions and it was only recently that a 10 per cent. cut was made with minor deductions in allowances. Sir, Railway subordinates are very grieved at this difference of treatment between them and other Government servants as also Railway officials, and there is the spirit of restless anxiety and resentment amounting to open hostility against the Railway Board. In my opinion there was no occasion for any retrenchment because in the ordinary course of retirements from Railways, I understand about 30,000 go out every year. So, if the Railway Board had waited for 2 years, they would have got 60,000 employees without resorting to retrenchment. Now, Sir, take the number and manner in which these subordinates have been retrenched and compare it with the way in which the officials have been treated. The Honourable Member himself said in his speech that 169 official posts have been retrenched consisting of new construction posts, no doubt all temporary appointments, the deputation reserve of 4 per cent., training reserve of 41 posts which posts have never been created, that 28 posts were held in abeyance and only 31 posts had been actually abolished. I should like to know how many officials have been actually retrenched. I do not want to know of appointments that have not been created or held in abeyance. What I want to know is, how many officials have actually been axed?

Now, Sir, I shall deal with another point. I desire to associate myself with the Honourable the Commerce Member in the very appreciative remarks he has made about the loyalty, devotion to duty and the patriotism of the subordinate railway staff. There is no doubt that the staff has

splendidly borne and continues to bear the great burden of retrenchment, but I should like to warn him that there is a limit to their sufferings and their loyalty. It is not right that they should be made to still further suffer. If rumour be true, I understand there is to be an additional cut in their salary. I desire to warn Government not to exploit the loyalty of these workmen any more by asking them to bear any additional burden, for they will not stand the strain. Why don't you increase your tariffs and rates and save your servants from this burden? What have you done? You have reduced your staff on the Railways because traffic has lessened. But do you not realise that in reducing your staff you have not only *ipso facto* increased the work of the retained staff and added to their labours but on the top of this you have cut their salaries by 10 per cent. after having reduced their substantive salaries in some cases to less than one half. This, I submit, is too heavy a burden on the subordinate staff and I think the time has come when the Railway Board must realise that this must end and devise means to place this burden somewhere else, for the men will not stand it any longer. Let it fall on the general public rather than on your public servants. Another point I would like to discuss is the co-operation between the Railway Board and the Railway Agents and Administrations. Again, I would like to refer to the Report of Mr. Hassan in many pages of which he has proved conclusively that the Railway Agents throw most of the Railway Board's orders into the waste paper basket. They take little or no notice of them. The result is that multiple systems of retrenchment are in operation because Railway Agents send their orders to the Heads of the departments and Heads of the departments send them to the Divisional Officers and there they remain and no notice is taken of them or as one of the Loco. officials stated before the recent Court of Inquiry he passed the orders on to his subordinates to operate. This fact very largely accounts for the way in which Muslims have been retrenched and recruited on Railways. I congratulate Mr. Hassan very heartily on his Report for every page of it is evidence of the great labour and skill he has given to the subject. By his labours he has supplied us with averages and percentages which I believe will be of great benefit in our discussions. That Report has pre-eminently shown two points. It has shown (1) the inadequate recruitment of Muslims on Railways although there is an ample number of qualified men for recruitment and (2) the preponderance of Hindus in every grade of Railway employment. In this connection, I would like particularly to refer to the Railway Accounts Department where 83 per cent. employees are Hindus and 9 per cent. are Muhammadans. In the Accounts Department of the Eastern Bengal and Assam Railway 93 per cent. are Hindus and 3 per cent. are Muhammadans. In the East Indian Railway Accounts Department 92 per cent. are Hindus. Sir, I submit that this state of affairs is not only due to the absence of co-operation between the Railway Board and its Agents but to the utter disregard amounting to disobedience of orders by Railway Agents and Heads of departments who should be at once served with charge sheets of insubordination and punished. Another matter that I would like to touch upon is the treatment accorded by Agents to the various Railway Unions. I openly charge Railway Agents, with one or two exceptions in which I include the Agent of the B. N. Railway who has shown political sagacity and foresight, with having shown little or no sympathy with Railway Unions and so disobeying the orders of the Railway Board. I know that the Railway Board has advised them to show greater help and sympathy. I would ask the Railway Board to take note

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

of this and to instruct their Agents to carry out their orders and so stop a growing feeling of mistrust between employer and employee.

Now, Sir, I desire to deal with other points regarding retrenchment. There is one school of thought that says we should not retrench at all, instead we should re-employ all those retrenched and maintain them by increasing our rates and tariffs especially the 15 per cent. surcharge that is placed on coal. With that school of thought I have great sympathy and I regret the Railway Board did not see the advisability of raising a loan so as to keep open the Railways and so encouraging industry and tapping new areas instead of wanting to close these down. Sir, I join with Sir Hugh Cocke in what he said regarding the constitution of the Railway Board. India is at the parting of the ways in regard to its railway administration. Hitherto Indian railways which have a mileage of nearly 50,000 miles and which is unparalleled in the history of the world have been controlled by the Railway Board whose members are recruited from the various Agencies and Heads of departments of various Railways. Sir, I do not deny that these members have done excellent service as far as their training, experience and ability have allowed them, but faced as Indian Railways are today with a world-wide trade depression and faced as Indian revenues are with intricate business and commercial problems demanding the attention of expert business men, I submit with all respect to the Railway Board that its members, being inexperienced in such affairs, are not the right persons to control such a huge Railway administration and that the time has come when the Railway Board must be reorganised and administered on sound up-to-date commercial lines. I admit in the present Board we have got some exceptionally able men, men with great talents and worth. I regret we are about to lose our Honourable Member in charge of Commerce and Railways, one who has shown great talents in the administration of Railways. I join with my friend Sir Hugh Cocke and the Deputy President in thanking him for what he has done, particularly for what he has done for the community I have the honour to represent in this House and in bidding him adieu, let me say of him:

“Let us now praise famous men,
 Bayards whom we follow :
 They with toil of their ‘To-day’
 Bought for us ‘Tomorrow’.”

I join with them in wishing him good health and Godspeed when he retires. Sir, I do consider that with one or two exceptions, the present Railway Board is not constituted and managed properly. Let us for a moment reflect and see from where we recruit its members. Agents or Heads of Railway departments are at present recruited as Members of the Railway Board. This I submit is not the proper field of recruitment. In its place I would suggest that the Railway Board should consist of two separate committees. There should be a committee of technical experts recruited from the various Indian Railways and from men who have experience of railway matters. The second body should be a committee of businessmen recruited from the best business brains in this country and the chairman of this committee should be a businessman of world-wide reputation and experience. These two committees should be responsible for Railway administration to the Honourable Member who

should be responsible to the Legislature. This Honourable Member should not hold the portfolio of Commerce and Railways as he does today but of Roads and Railways only. In this criticism it is not my desire to belittle or deprecate the work the present Railway Board have done for they have faced a very difficult situation very bravely, but Indian Railways today demand the control of the best business brains available; not technical experts such as Railway Agents are with no business foresight. The Honourable Member in his acceptance of an Expert Sub-Committee to enquire into Indian Railway administration as recommended by the Railway Retrenchment Sub-Committee practically admits the need of a reconstitution of the Railway Board.

There is one other point which I want to discuss. I refer again to **Mr. Hassan's Report.** **Mr. Hassan** has referred to certain **P.M.** matters in that Report which are very important to the various communities in India. He has advocated certain communal employment percentages but, though I agree with a lot of what he has said, yet there are certain fundamental points on which I am in distinct disagreement. He has fallen into a grave error when he compares the population of a community with the total population of India and on this basis works out its percentage of Railway employment. To illustrate my point—there are 800,000 employees of all kinds in Indian Railways. They are divisible into menial, subordinate and official. For menials no English education is demanded. For subordinates, you do desire English education. I therefore submit that while the total population of India may be accepted for menial employment percentages, it is only the total English educated population that can be so utilised as one's basis for subordinate Railway employment. Taking this as the more correct basis one will find that many of the recommendations of Mr. Hassan fall to the ground; indeed it will prove that many of the percentages he has advocated should be altered and as far as the Anglo-Indian community is concerned it has been given its correct percentage in subordinate employment. I respectfully offer this to the Honourable Member for his serious consideration.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member's time is up.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I sympathise with the Honourable the Railway Member for having had to present, just on the eve of his retirement, a very gloomy Budget which is a deficit Budget, on account of circumstances over which he or anybody else had no control. Trade depression is universal and has spread all over the world. It is not peculiar to us. It was impossible under those circumstances to have presented any other Budget than one of the kind which has been presented by the Honourable the Railway Member. I must congratulate him for the cheerfulness with which he has met this bad situation, and I assure him that when this Assembly meets next time at Simla and we do not find him in his place, every one in this House will be feeling very sorry to miss him.

There are only one or two points which require any comment in this Budget. I must in the beginning reply to one criticism levelled by my Honourable friend Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad at the way in which the meetings of the Standing Finance Committee have been held. I have been a Member of this Committee for many years and I had no grievance. I can

. [Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

assure him and this House that I had no grievance of any kind for holding the meeting at the time or the way in which the meetings had been held. If they were held on one or two occasions at 5 o'clock in the afternoon, that was simply on account of the fact that it could not be held at any other time. The day to which my Honourable friend Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad referred as to why the meeting was held at 5 o'clock, on that day the reason was that the meeting was held with the full consent and the full concurrence of the Members who had been present on a previous occasion, and that time was suggested by the Members of the Finance Committee. It may have happened that, on account of circumstances which were not foreseen at the time when the time was fixed, as members were prevented from attending as that happened to be a day in the month of Ramzan. It is not right for my Honourable friend to say that the meetings were held in which only one Member, Mr. Sykes, had been present. In my whole time as a Member of this Committee I have missed only one single meeting and that was the only one held at 5 o'clock on that day. It was the Ramzan month and we had finished practically the whole business before us on the previous day and there were only one or two items remaining in which Sir Alan Parsons required the co-operation of all those Members also who were not present on that previous occasion. It was on account of those Honourable Members and for their convenience that it was postponed on that occasion. As a matter of fact, when the Budget came before the Finance Committee, we knew there was practically no work before the Finance Committee. The Committee has to give its sanction for new expenditure, while on the contrary we were required to meet in the Finance Committee to give our sanction to the curtailment in the previous expenditure which had been going on.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): And do no work.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: If my Honourable friend had liked to be present and do some work, I should have been very glad. It was a meeting simply to get the sanction for an expenditure which had previously been sanctioned and for which there was no money available then and those items had to be taken out from the Budget. When Honourable Members did not take any care to know what kind of business was transacted, it is not right and proper to criticise the functions or the working of any Committee, but they should take care beforehand to know what was the nature of the work and the reason why Members were not present on that occasion.

Mr. S. C. Mitra (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Ten minutes are nearly over and yet the Honourable Member has not come to general discussion on the Railway Budget.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: My Whip and my Members will act just in the same way when the Members on that side will be speaking. Now, I want to refer to one or two things which my Honourable friend Sir Henry Gidney touched upon, namely, that there should be no further reduction in salaries. I say there are only two ways in which to meet the present situation. One is the income should be increased and the other is the expenditure should be decreased. First of all the income can be

increased only by increasing the rates and fares. But this suggestion can be summarily rejected. No proposition of this kind will be acceptable to this House in any way. Then the only two ways of reducing the expenditure will be either by reduction of salaries or by reduction of the posts. I think I will be voicing the feelings of the whole House if I say that Honourable Members would not like the reduction in posts. Then there is only one course left, that is reduction of salaries. That is the only possible way left for meeting the future deficit in the Budget. But what should be the reduction in salaries? I will leave it to the Retrenchment Committee to suggest that in co-ordination with the Railway Board. I must point out one thing, and it was referred to by my Honourable friend Mr. Hoon last year, but I am sorry to see that he is not present to-day. He said, "If the expenditure goes on in the way in which it has been increasing and five crores had been taken out of the Reserve Fund, then there would be nothing left as reserve for future years"; that prophecy which he made last year has come true unfortunately. He drew attention to the salaries paid to railway officials in Europe and in America, and pointed out that they were not paid as high salaries as are paid in India. One tendency which has been growing lately in all departments, including the Railways, is that everybody demands the same salary which is paid to the Civil Service. There may be justification for paying high salaries to the Civil Service, but there cannot be any justification for paying the same salaries to other persons in the other departments of the Government of India. (*An Honourable Member*: "Why?") The first reason is—and I am talking of the present situation—that a Civilian nowadays carries his life in his hands. No Civilian who is working in the districts can say that his life is safe. Then the responsibility which their post carries requires a different salary to be paid to them. Then again the qualifications, which they have to acquire before their employment, require a different treatment than we would be justified in giving to people whose duties or qualifications are not of the same kind. The only policy to be adopted is that in the Railway administration there should be some kind of limit on the salaries. There should be a maximum and a minimum fixed. I suggest a minimum, because nobody can live below a certain standard, and I suggest a maximum because there will be no justification for allowing a salary beyond a certain limit fixed by the Retrenchment Committee.

Then, Sir, another point to which I would refer is that I whole-heartedly support the suggestion which has been made by my Honourable friend, Sir Hugh Cocke, and so ably supported by the Deputy President, that a Road Development policy is absolutely necessary, by which the motor traffic can be diverted, rather than leave it to compete with the Railways. That is a suggestion which I think will find good support in the House.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju (*Ganjam cum Vizagapatam*: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, when we are told that the reserves have been completely wiped out and when we are told that the Depreciation Fund has been depleted, one would consider that the circumstances disclosed in the Budget are bad enough. But the Honourable the Deputy President said they could be worse. It requires the optimism of the Deputy President and the philosophical calm of the Honourable the Railway Member to view with equanimity the forebodings of the future when such circumstances are disclosed. It cannot be gainsaid that the expenditure incurred on the Railways has been very heavy and that we cannot afford it. It is said that every

[Mr. B. Sitaramaraju.]

attempt has been made to retrench expenditure. A Retrenchment Committee has been appointed and the Honorable the Deputy President said that they were only able to deal with the expenditure involved in the maintenance of the Railway Board and other branches of administration located at headquarters. Thus it would seem that the expenditure touched by the Retrenchment Committee was something like 18 or 20 per cent. while 80 per cent. of the expenditure involved has not been touched by anybody; and therefore we are not placed in a position to judge what retrenchment is possible, unless Government themselves come to our aid, and enable us to see ways and means by which expenditure can be reduced. As we are not in a position to deal with 80 per cent. of the railway expenditure, we have to confine ourselves now to that expenditure that has been dealt with by the Retrenchment Committee, even though it is only 20 per cent. which has been touched by them. The Retrenchment Committee made several recommendations, but those recommendations have not been carried out fully. In their Report we find that among the superior staff they recommended that the number of officers should be reduced from 25 to 18; and the most notable feature of that recommendation was that the number of Members of the Railway Board should be reduced from three to two. But what did the Government do? Did the Committee recommend anything very extraordinary there? No, Sir. In recommending the reduction from three to two, the Retrenchment Committee was only asking Government to keep to the strength which was there in the year 1929. Therefore I would like to ask, what is the use of Government asking us to co-operate with them? What is the use of constituting these Retrenchment Committees if after making recommendations which are reasonable and against which there is no Government opinion, these recommendations are not carried out by Government? What useful purpose is served by these Retrenchment Committees and by discussions in this House?

An Honourable Member: Retrenchment of subordinates.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: If retrenchment of subordinates is the only policy of Government why don't they honestly say so? We will have nothing to do with it if we cannot effect retrenchment of the superior staff.

I will now draw attention to another item which was recommended by the Retrenchment Committee. It is the old question of audit and accounts. It has been mentioned by one of the speakers that expenditure is found to have increased in this direction during the last five or six years by 46 per cent. To be exact, the expenditure in 1930-31 was 151 lakhs, *i.e.*, exactly 46 per cent., while the increase in the general charges during that same period, *i.e.*, from 1924-25 to 1930-31, was only 20 per cent. Here in this item we find expenditure increasing by something like 50 per cent. And what is more interesting to note here is that when the Financial Commissioner was asked about it, he agreed that the expenditure involved under this head was certainly heavy, but he could not suggest any ways and means for reducing that expenditure, and the members of the Retrenchment Committee have made a special note on that aspect, expressing their inability to make detailed suggestions. Why? Because the Financial Commissioner said he could not help them as the Controller of Army Accounts was not able to furnish him with the analysis for the growth of the expenditure, and therefore the Financial Commissioner was not able to say anything about retrenching this expenditure. He could not suggest

anything for the reduction of that expenditure because the analysis was not before him and the Retrenchment Committee could not say anything because that analysis was not placed before them even when they were sitting over these accounts. From the tables furnished by the Committee, we find abnormal expenditure was incurred by the separation of this audit and accounts. It may also be interesting to note in this connection that when the separation of audit from accounts was first broached before this House, this House agreed to the separation as an experimental measure on a certain understanding, and that was that this separation would mean a definite saving by this change in the system. In this connection, I would like to read, Sir, a few lines from the Retrenchment Committee's Report:

"We observe", says the Retrenchment Committee "that when the Standing Finance Committee for Railways accepted the proposal, it was estimated that the ultimate net financial effect of the proposals was an annual saving of Rs. 1,97,000 after paying for the cost of the independent audit establishment amounting to 13½ lakhs per annum, and that, in addition, substantial economies amounting to several lakhs of rupees in other than establishment charges would follow the extension of the system to all railways. We also note that Sir Frederic Gauntlett, the then Auditor General, in recommending that the experiment be accepted as a success and be adopted as a permanent measure and extended to other railways, was partly guided by the expectation that the separation could be effected with some eventual saving in the total cost of Accounts and Audit taken together. We have no doubt that both the Standing Finance Committee for Railways and the Legislative Assembly were influenced to a considerable extent by the saving promised."

An Honourable Member: It was a stunt.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: But, Sir, instead of these savings, what has actually resulted? There has been a considerable increase in the expenditure. All those officials who have been examined by the Public Accounts Committee and the Retrenchment Committee were practically unanimous in the opinion that the separation has not done any good and that if there is any reversion to the old system of the combination, there can be a possibility of considerable saving. Further, Sir, they were of the opinion that in the matter of higher audit, the system of combination will be far more advantageous than separation. Even in the audit taken as it is, we find that expenditure has been very considerable under this head. The Auditor General himself has admitted before the Retrenchment Committee that it was heavy, but he could not make any suggestions for reduction of the expenditure. If there is no general desire on the part of the Government to come to the aid of the Retrenchment Committees and other Members who have been co-operating with them to find ways and means to reduce expenditure, then what possible good can there be in discussing this Budget?

I wish to turn to another point, and it is this. Mention has been made about the statutory creation of the Railway Board. Sir, the circumstances under which this suggestion has cropped up in the Reports of the Round Table Conference are disclosed by a perusal of those records. There the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri asked the Chairman of the R. T. C. how, when the question of the statutory creation of the Railway Board was not actually discussed by them in the Report, the passage relating to the statutory creation of the Railway Board found a place there. Sir, the answer was that a mere examination of the question

[Mr. B. Sitaramaraju.]

would do nobody any harm. Then, Sir, when we were sitting in the Standing Finance Committee a proposal was made for providing the expenditure for the examination of this question, and I raised an objection to the proposal that we were not prepared to accept anything of this kind. We wish jealously to guard the privileges of this House, and we would resist with every possible power in our hands to see the Railway Board is not taken away from our hands and from our control. In spite of my dissenting note, it was agreed by the Committee that this question might be examined. I may repeat, once again, that we are going to oppose stoutly any attempt to take away the Railway Board from the control of the Assembly.

One more point, Sir, and I have done. Both my friends, Mr. Yamin Khan and the Deputy President, have made some reference to the motor traffic. I would like to suggest that all the eloquence of my friends would not make the people think that they could see with equanimity any attempt to deprive them of that competition which is so desirable and to reserve the railways as a strict monopoly of Government, to which the road traffic is sought to be made subservient.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Half Past Two of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President in the Chair.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi (Dacca *cum* Mymensingh: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, it is not merely a conventional expression of regret, but our regret, the Honourable Members will agree with me, is genuine that we are soon going to part company with our Honourable friend the Member for Commerce and Railways. Sir, I must say, and his worst critics will admit it, that in Sir George Rainy we had a gentleman amongst us who did not know what temper was (Hear, hear), and whose genial temperament and courtesies made him popular with every section of this House, however they might have disagreed, they might have differed from his views or from his policy. May I assure Sir George Rainy that he will be carrying with him our best wishes and he will be remembered by many of us for many long, long years to come. We wish him every happiness in the sweet and pleasant recess of his home.

In Sir Alan Parsons we are losing from the Railways an uncommonly highly capable officer, who had devoted himself for a very large number of years to the study of the finances of the Indian Railways. He was, if I may say so, the guiding spirit of the Railways, and in my opinion, his transfer to the Finance Department from that of the Railway is a distinct loss to the Railways. (*An Honourable Member*: "And a gain to the Finance.") Government, Sir, never do nor will they ever do what they should (Laughter.) And there is nothing to wonder at this transfer even at this transitional period of Indian history when a new constitution is in the making. We are losing an officer who was ever

alert in railway matters, be it finance or otherwise, and who had made a special study of every branch of the Railway administration. We wish him every prosperity in the new sphere of his activities, and express the hope that his counsel on the railway administration will not be withheld if it is sought even though his association with the Railways may have ceased.

Sir, coming to the general discussion of the Railway Budget, it is not possible for any individual Member to deal with all the items within the time allotted to him. I would, therefore, confine my observations to three specific matters, namely, first, purchase of coal for State and other railways, then mismanagement of State-owned collieries, and thirdly, inadequate employment of Mussalmans in the Railways. I would only touch upon these points now, reserving my detailed criticism of them for the day I move my cuts. I have no doubt that, when I have said all that I have to say, the Honourable Members will join with me in condemning the Railway Board for not doing their duties, for abdicating in favour of Mr. Whitworth, the Chief Mining Engineer, and his lieutenant Mr. Surendranath Banerjee, and thus allowing serious allegations to be made and causing enormous loss to the Railways.

I would now, Sir, refer to the Railway Board's present system of purchase of coal for State and other railways. According to the present system of purchase of coal, the coal firms are in a manner at the mercy of the Chief Mining Engineer. Sir, the Chief Mining Engineer practically decides from which firms coal should be taken and what quantity each of them should supply. This policy is responsible for huge loss to the Railways, inasmuch as higher prices are given to the favourite tenderers of the Chief Mining Engineer, and though coal of better quality is tendered at lower prices by others, such tenders are not accepted. (Mr. B. V. Jadhav: "Is it really true?") Yes. I will prove it to the hilt. The Honourable Members may be aware how the late Mr. Church, who was the Chief Mining Engineer of the Railways then, the predecessor of Mr. Whitworth, entered into a clandestine arrangement with coal contractors which cost him his life. (Mr. B. Das: "He committed suicide?") That is my information. Older Members of this House will remember that Mr. Church landed the Railways into a scrape by making forward contracts extending over many years at exorbitant rates, just on the eve of his retirement. After Mr. Church had retired, the contractors naturally gave him the go-by and did not fulfil their obligations, and Mr. Church, perhaps in utter despair and counting on Mr. Whitworth's assistance, addressed a letter to him which formed the basis of his prosecution. And for the information of this House, I would quote the following significant lines from that ill-fated document. That letter, Sir, said, "You remember that afternoon, . . ."—I will not mention the name of the person—"was here about the coal tenders and you (Whitworth) said afterwards that if there was anything in it, don't forget it is fifty-fifty". (Cries of "Shame" from the Nationalist Benches.) Mr. Whitworth had perhaps passed many a sleepless night before he decided to make over that letter to the Government, and extradition proceedings were taken against Mr. Church to bring him back to India to stand his trial. In those proceedings Mr. Whitworth had to give evidence in London, and it is said that Sir Marshal Hall K. C., who was defending Mr. Church, hailed Mr. Whitworth with the following observations as he was getting into the

[Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi.]

witness box. "So, you are the little fifty-fifty....."—I will not use the next word that is used thereafter that—"So, you are the little fifty-fifty. . . . from Calcutta, are you?"

Such is Mr. Whitworth, our present Chief Mining Engineer. Mr. Church escaped punishment—that is what I am informed—by poisoning himself on the night preceding the day when the judgment was to have been delivered. (*An Honourable Member*: "Is it all known to the Government?") Certainly, and I ask the Honourable Members to request the Government to produce those records in those criminal proceedings which will conclusively prove what I am saying. (*Mr. K. Ahmed*: "I asked Mr. Parsons a long time ago but he did not take notice.") The judgment was not delivered. The result was that nobody is aware of what the judgment contained, and I am not sure, if that judgment had been delivered and we had the benefit of that verdict—we are in the dark at present—whether Mr. Whitworth would have come out untarnished. It is also interesting to know how this gentleman, Surendra Nath Banerjee, the assistant of Mr. Whitworth, leaped into his present position. He was a clerk on Rs. 30 in the Eastern Bengal Railway and joined the office of the Chief Mining Engineer in 1914 on a pay of Rs. 35. His present emoluments are Rs. 800 a month. As I said, Mr. Whitworth and Mr. Banerjee decided everything about the coal purchase. I would give you one instance, and I shall give you later on dozens and dozens of similar instances. The Chief Mining Engineer also purchases coal for other railways. When the Bombay Baroda and Central India Railway called for tenders, Mr. Whitworth was in England—the Railway Board afforded him the privilege of visiting his home every year—and Banerjee opened them and tabulated them and then sent the tabulated sheet to Mr. Whitworth to Aden. Mind you, the tabulated sheet was sent to Aden. Then Banerjee proceeds to Bombay with all his papers and immediately on his arrival, between themselves they decide who should get orders and what quantity should be allotted to each. The recommendations are presented to the Agent and are automatically accepted. Under cover of extending patronage to as many concerns as possible, contracts are given to favourite firms. Mr. Whitworth has his reasons of course, for he says, "I am the Nawab of the Coal Kingdom. I have 250 Begums and I cannot certainly satisfy all". Certainly not. Is it any wonder then that he cares only for his favourite Begums. And a most glaring instance is the acceptance by the Railway Board of Rs. 9-2-0 per ton, for 1,40,000 tons, rejecting offers of Rs. 7-6-0 and Rs. 7-8-0 per ton for the same quality, acceptance of which would have given the Railways a saving of 2½ lakhs. That I want you to investigate.

Now, the second point is the mismanagement of collieries. I shall crave your indulgence for five minutes more.

Mr. President: You cannot get more than two minutes. You have two minutes more.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I shall then proceed straightaway to the third point. My third point is about the inadequate employment of Muslims in the railways. What have you done, I ask the Railway Board Member

on staff duties, since you gave your solemn undertaking on the floor of this House? I say "Nil". That is so. I do not know what his answer would be. I will refer my Honourable friend Mr. Hayman to what he said, and with your permission, I will read a few lines from page 975 here: Mr. Hayman said:

"I think, Sir, I can bring my remarks to a close just now. Before I do so, I wish again to emphasise that I am still not satisfied with the representation which the Muslims have in the upper subordinate posts on our railways. But I give my solemn undertaking that I have this question at heart and I will push it forward with all the energy that I can command. I will be the driving force in this question, and I shall get the Agents of railways to take my view and to rectify the existing defects. But, Sir, I also wish to make it clear that nothing that I or the Agents will do will be done in a way to bring injustice to any of the other communities."

Since that solemn undertaking, has he done anything? Except for appointing Mr. Hassan and another officer

Mr. President: The Honourable Member's time is up.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhammadan Rural): As observed by the Honourable the Deputy President, I feel I have very few observations to make in connection with the Railway Budget presented by the Honourable Member for Commerce and Railways. So far as the policy of the Railway administration is concerned, the Retrenchment Committee has been distinctly told that the Government would decide what action it would take, and all that the Retrenchment Committee could do was to go over certain portion of the railway expenditure and to make recommendations, some of which have since been accepted and others entirely ignored. This Budget speech is one doleful story from the beginning to end. I have not been in this House for very long, and am not therefore entitled to speak with any authority, but I endorse all that has been said by the previous speakers about the Honourable the Railway Member. From the few occasions on which I have had the honour of listening to his speeches, I fully endorse all that has been said regarding the way in which he has done his work. Sir, we are not here in a position to determine what we are going to do or what we are not going to do owing to the world conditions. There is one point however I want to mention, and that is the reduction of the freight rate of agricultural produce. The position of the railways now is rather unfortunate. As my friend Colonel Gidney pointed out, we have had deficits of 16 and 17 crores and we are now straining at a gnat of deficit of a crore and a half or two crores and they do not think of the most important thing, namely, of giving relief to the agriculturist by reducing the rates for produce. It is perfectly true that in the Honourable Member's speech there is a mention of the attempt that has been made to reduce the freight on wheat, and how it did not really produce the desired effect. But wheat is not the only produce of India. Probably there were certain conditions that attended the transport of wheat, which resulted in the conclusion arrived at by the Honourable Member, but there is lots of other produce down South which would have got relief if a reduction had been made in the freight on those commodities. That, Sir, is an unfortunate position, and although it is perfectly true that in these times of depression every pie has got to be saved or brought together, I consider that we should take into consideration the relative advantages and disadvantages, and I think the agriculturists as a whole ought to have been given relief by reducing the rates on produce and the 3rd class fares.

[Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar.]

Then, I submit with all the strength I can command that there is absolutely no reason to make these large cuts in the salaries of subordinate officials. I would submit that there is absolutely no justification, whatever may be the result of the present conditions, why you should cut the salaries of officers drawing salaries below Rs. 150 per mensem. Sir, it is all very well to say that they have loyally accepted these cuts, but I respectfully submit that they have not willingly done so; on the contrary they had no other alternative at the stage of service at which they had arrived. How at that stage of their service could they throw up their jobs, where could they go, how to look after their wives and children and other dependants? Could they really say, "We do not like this cut therefore we are going to give up the service?" That, Sir, is the mentality of the men brought forcibly under the axe, when the decision of the cut was announced. On the other hand, you can retrench largely. This you have not done. Now the Railway Sub-Committee pointed out that by bringing into existence an expert committee to go into the whole system, you could thoroughly overhaul the administration, and save a great deal. Sir, if the proceedings which led to the appointment of this advisory committee were referred to, it would be found that I said exactly the same thing at the time, that it is absolutely no good appointing Members of this House who, amiable men of general experience as they are, are nevertheless absolutely unfitted so far as the technical details of administration are concerned to make any useful suggestions. That I was glad to find is exactly the conclusion at which the Railway Sub-Committee arrived at; and I submit with all the force that I can command that sufficient endeavours have not been made in order to bring together a committee of say two or three persons—it is no use having a big bulky committee—who have made a special study of these subjects, in order thoroughly to overhaul the system here. Sir, if they had done that, the crore and a half or two crores which you have taken virtually out of the blood of these subordinate officials need not have been taken; on the contrary you would have given them real relief. Beyond that, Sir, I do not think that there is anything useful that can be said, because the policy which was dilated upon by the Honourable the Railway Member dealt with what was simply a hypothetical proposition which really does not admit of any specific correct answer.

Mr. E. F. Sykes (Bombay : European): Sir, the Honourable the Deputy President in his speech, to which we have listened with our usual pleasure, said that there was likely to be in the future a deficit of 10 crores of rupees annually; and my intention at the moment is to indicate the manner in which a portion of this deficit could be met. If you will permit me, Sir, I shall read a short extract from the Report of the Sub-Committee of Railway Retrenchment. In paragraph 186 of their Report they say:

"One of our number strongly dissents from this proposal. Whereas he would be willing to accept an emergency cut of so much per cent. all round, whose simplicity would compensate for its want of logic, he cannot accept the proposal of the Committee which purports to be based on some principle but is in effect based on none. The Railway Board has so far been unable to produce the orders regulating the post-war scale of increases; but it is well-known that they were mainly based on the proportion of each man's pay that was estimated to be spent on food stuffs; where the proportion was high the increase was high amounting in some cases to as much as 100 per cent. This principle, *mutatis mutandis*, should apply to the reductions consequent on the present unprecedented fall in the prices of foodstuffs. The proposals of the majority tend still further to accentuate the contrast between the well-being of public servants and that of the bulk of the population which is dependent on agriculture."

Mr. B. Das: It was nice of you to dissent.

Mr. E. F. Sykes: I will now give you rather stronger stuff. This is from the All-India Government Employees' Federation Retrenchment Bulletin, published by the General Secretary, S. C. Joshi, Esq., M.A., LL.B., Advocate:

"This deplorable situation enables a few to live exceptionally well by impairing the capacity of the State to undertake larger activities and employing much larger numbers. It gives an artificially elevated position to the official where he comes to consider himself as an altogether superior person. The conclusion is that salaries of public officials must bear an intelligible relation to the income of the labouring classes." (Hear, hear.)

Now, Sir, that is from the writing of a very highly respected gentleman, and I would like to be interrupted if anyone disagrees with his statement. I therefore now assume that the House accepts this as perfectly reasonable. I must for a moment now diverge to express my appreciation of the courage of Mr. Joshi in publishing such things in a publication like this.

Now, Sir, what is the income of the labouring classes? Last week I met a very esteemed labour leader, and I asked to him, "what are the agricultural wages in the Punjab?" He said, "about Rs. 6 or 7 a month" I asked him what they had been in the immediate past; he replied "From Rs. 13 to 15". These are very remarkable figures but he told me that I could quote his authority for them, if necessary.

Now, the position of the railway people in this matter is stated very clearly in a memorandum which they submitted to the Royal Commission on Labour. On page 202, you find their minimum wages described. If you take common labour, such as gangmen, trollymen, etc., their minimum—I hope, Sir, you will mark the word minimum—is Rs. 13 rising by one rupee to Rs. 17. The trollymen get Rs. 15 rising by one rupee to Rs. 19. The gate-keepers get Rs. 14 rising by one rupee to Rs. 17. Now I ask, does that bear any kind of relation to the wages of the bulk of the population, which is agricultural labour? I am not in a position to verify these minima, but I assume they are still in force. I think that every body who has anything to do with agriculture will agree that the figures given for agricultural labourers in the Punjab are correct. I may say myself that I enquired during the last harvest season as to what a man was earning. I found he was earning five annas a day during harvest time. We need not go to the Punjab to see these contrasts. I am credibly informed in this very place the Government of India are paying for common labour Rs. 15 and their officers are not allowed to pay less. Common labour here in the open market is five annas a day or by the month Rs. 7 to Rs. 8, perhaps less. Now, Sir, let us turn to Mr. Joshi:

"It gives an artificially elevated position to the official where he comes to consider himself as an altogether superior person. . . . The conclusion is that salaries of public officials must bear an intelligible relation to the income of the labouring classes."

The House has accepted this position. Now, it is for the House, having accepted this position, to enforce it on the Government Benches.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): Is it all that?

Mr. E. F. Sykes: Mr. Joshi's opinions were very general. They referred to the social condition as a whole, and said that it was very undesirable to have a specially privileged class, whose emoluments compared too favourably with those of the ordinary working men. But in this matter the Government have a further duty. The Government are always telling us, "We want to run the railways on commercial principles". I ask you, Sir, is it commercial working when labour is getting Rs. 6 to Rs. 7 a month, to pay them a minimum of Rs. 13 with annual increments?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: About Rs. 3,000 and 4,000.

Mr. E. F. Sykes: I am talking of common labour. I am not talking of Members of Council and Financial Commissioners. Common labour, Mr. Joshi, I am talking about.

Mr. B. V. Jadhav (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): They are also labourers.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: But they are not worthy of their hire.

Mr. E. F. Sykes: I have laid before the House the plain facts of the case. If the facts I have placed before them do not move the House to insist on retrenchment in this matter by the Government, then I have spoken in vain.

Mr. B. Das: Sir, on the 25th of this month, two speeches were delivered on the Railway Budget, one on the floor of this House and the other in another place, where elderly men usually gather to pay mutual compliments to one another. In this House the Honourable the Railway Member cooed like a dove. Sir, we will not hear his melodious voice after this session, that melodious voice which occasionally but so often silences the parliamentary ferocity of the Opposition. The Opposition, at times are faced with great difficulties, and while we steer our bark between the Scylla and Charybdis,—the Home Member on one side and the Finance Member on the other,—I think a little further we meet the Honourable the Leader of the House with his siren songs trying to soothe the Opposition, and it has such narcotic effect on the Opposition that our ferocity becomes mild criticism. I join with my Honourable friends in saying that I, too, will miss the Honourable Sir George Rainy on the floor of this House. He comes from my province of Bihar and Orissa, and particularly his very friendly relations with many public men in Bihar as well as in Orissa will make him long remembered, and I join those who said his place will be long missed in this House and also his genial temperament by which he very often tries to soothe the temper and the ruffled feelings of the Opposition. At the very time that my Honourable friend was cooing like a genial dove in this House, what happened in the other House was this. The Chief Commissioner of Railways, while he was afraid to speak as a prophet, tried to speak as the absolute. He talked in terms of absolutism. He said that he had done the absolute things in retrenchment and those were the absolute essentials and the absolute minimum. So, if Honourable Members in this House or the other House try to level criticism towards the Treasury Benches either in reduction or retrenchment, the absolute thing has been said by the absolute Chief

Commissioner and that's the end of it. I think, Sir, the time has come when certain transactions that are made in the name of the Military Department should not be merged into Railway finance. One Honourable Member also referred to the strategic railways and these should not be shown separately and losses thereon should not be debited to general finance. Strategic railways should be merged with commercial lines. I think it is high time that Government should take note of the concessions which the military get from the Railways and which are to the tune of nearly one crore of rupees and they should debit the sum to the Military Budget. The financial result of the railways is very alarming, and while I appreciate the loyalty of the Honourable the Railway Member to the Financial Commissioner and other Members of the Railway Board, I think his analysis of the situation is entirely wrong. His analysis is that there could be no further reduction, and that certain experts should be called from outside to tell him what is to be done in the present situation. That I do not approve. I never agreed with my Honourable friend the Deputy President that he and his Committee were not competent to judge and to direct the Railway Board as to how to retrench. I think it was within their rights and they could have done so. But somehow they got cold feet, as we heard from my Honourable friend Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad this morning, and they suggested that experts should be brought from foreign countries especially from England though we know that English climatic conditions and English working conditions are so very different from the working conditions in India. My Honourable friend the Deputy President suggested a gentleman from Canada, a gentleman from England and probably one railway expert from India would constitute that expert Committee. Why not get experts from the United States of America where the climatic condition and working conditions of railways are the same? And if I know something of railway engineering in India, very little has been copied from England. Whatever mismanagement and over expenditure there is, that has been copied from England or has come through the Englishman's mismanagement, otherwise the working conditions in India are the same as in the United States. Why not get experts from France or from Germany? They have not got the same high standard of efficiency as the British "so-called" experts try to make us follow. We know what English experts are and what Englishmen are. In the desert of Sahara in a temperature of 135 degrees the English officer, although he may be the only Englishman there, must don his dress suit and dine alone. So we do not want any English ideas to be transplanted here, and we know how those ideas transplanted through these officers have mismanaged our railways and have brought the railways into that state of chaos in which we find them now. (*Sir Hugh Cocke* : "Question".) My friend Sir Hugh Cocke questions me. I know he belongs to a great House of Auditors and Accountants and his opinions regarding financial results I will always respect, but I wish that he should look into the financial mismanagement of the railways and suggest ways and means as to how the Budget will balance and how the taxpayer will not be deprived of his money. My friend the Railway Member insinuated that the shareholders of the company will be probably asked in future to let go their profit for contribution to the general fund.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy (Member for Commerce and Railways): Sir, I am quite unaware of having made any suggestion that the shareholders will ultimately have to forego their profits.

Mr. B. Das: I am glad to know it, but another Honourable Member on that side, Sir Henry Gidney, talked of the railways coming under a statutory body; and as he happened to be a member of the Round Table Conference, I thought a certain plot was being hatched on that side of the House at the back of the Members on this side to deprive the general finances of the contribution and also to take the control of railways away from the Legislature.

Sir Hugh Cocke: Sir, may I ask the Honourable Member if, when he states that Englishmen have brought the railways of India to a state of chaos, he is merely alluding to the financial situation, or to the actual administration of the railways?

Mr. B. Das: I am concerned with the financial results of the railways. If the financial results have proved to be bad, I maintain that those who managed the railways have failed in their management.

Sir, the Honourable the Railway Member said that there is no chance of increment of rates and fares in goods traffic and passenger traffic. Why is the traffic not going up? There is the economic depression, but there is another side of the situation. There is the political situation in the country to which my Honourable friends on the other side are a party, which has helped to deteriorate the railway revenues. My friend who wanted to be a prophet last year, has told us that he cannot be a prophet this year and say if the railways will have an increased revenue. I do not think the railways can have an increased revenue. There is the world economic depression and there are other causes for which his colleague the Finance Member is responsible. But what about the political situation? Today goods cannot move from one place to another; there is no security in the country, and we have not added to that insecurity as the Honourable Members on the Treasury Benches have done. Today the people have no money; they do not feel it safe to move from one place to another. If my Honourable friends on that side want the railways to have their proper earnings again, they ought to bring about a peaceful atmosphere in the country. Are they trying to do that? They are not; and next year my Honourable friend's receipts on the railways will go down to 80 crores and not what he has estimated. It is bound to be so, because the people have not the money to buy goods and the goods do not move about. If my Honourable friend Mr. Mody transfers his Bombay cloth to any place in Bengal, nobody has any money to buy it; and if the world economic depression is a contributory factor, it is only to the extent of 25 per cent., the other 75 per cent. being due to causes for which the Treasury Benches are responsible, namely, the political situation in the country when everybody is suspicious of everybody else and when peaceful citizens live in constant terror of Ordinances.

Sir, I think in spite of my opposition to this Expert Committee, that Expert Committee is bound to come, and if it is coming, I want that no railway engineer should be the Chairman of that Committee, but an economic expert should be Chairman. Let him be an Englishman; I know the partiality of Government for Englishmen, but I do not want that the man should be a railway engineer. And what are engineers? I am an engineer myself and I can say that engineers in their fond of efficiency and experimenting have committed in the past and will commit Government to heavy expenditure from which Government cannot get out. Between

1924-25 and 1932 there was an additional 200 crores of capital expenditure, and as my friend Mr. Chetty pointed out, the interest charges on the total commitments are 32 crores today. And still in Mr. Russell's speech we find that he wants to strengthen three bridges on the Eastern Bengal Railway. Sir, the engineer wants larger locomotives, and as soon as they come the permanent ways have to be changed. If 90 pound rails are used today, then it must be changed to 120 pounds. In this way the engineer goes on experimenting, but who foots the bill? It is the poor taxpayer, the people of India. Sir, it is a most disastrous thing in our national economies and so I do not want a railway engineer to be the Chairman of the Expert Committee. I also hope Indians will find representation, because the economic condition of India is known to Indians alone and no outsider can understand that aspect as the standard of living is so different in India. The Committee must have Indian economists and Indian administrators on it else the enquiry will do blessed little.

***Khan Bahadur Makhdum Syed Rajan Bakhsh Shah** (South-West Punjab: Muhammadan): Mr. President, I beg leave to present before the House facts which, on examination, would on the one hand help to improve the existing defects, thereby bringing to an end the increased volume of public inconvenience and grievance, and stop on the other the feelings of ill-will and resentment growing against the Government, resulting at the same time in financial advantage to them. I therefore particularly invite the attention of the Honourable Member in charge to this.

First of all I desire to express my appreciation of the great labour and ability with which the Honourable Member in charge has prepared the Railway Budget; and if one is liable to criticism for one's omissions, I see no reason why one should not be praised for the good work one has done and the time and trouble that has been devoted to it. I therefore very gladly give him the credit for all the labour and care he has devoted to the preparation of the Railway Budget.

Then, Sir, I would remind the House that this House is not the representative only of the thousands of people who travel in the first and second class, but it is also the representative of millions upon millions of those dumb, down-trodden, poor Indians who must of necessity always travel in third class even at the risk of impairing their health thereby.

I consider it my duty first of all to ask for the removal of the inconveniences experienced by third class passengers, inconveniences which are still increasing and are due to the neglect or stinginess on the part of the authorities concerned. And, if it is an established fact that the present elaborate system of the railways in India derives its strength mainly from the fares paid by third class passengers, it is all the more pitiable that every possible convenience and comfort should be provided for people travelling above that class, while third class passengers should be left to be treated like cattle. For instance, how very sad it is to see that third class *Musafir-khanas* have been built regardless of whether they can give any shelter to the inmates in the freezing cold of the winter or the blood-boiling heat of the summer, whereas every possible comfort, fitting in with the varying requirements of weather, are made available for first and second class passengers in most of the railway stations.

*The Honourable Member delivered the speech in Urdu.

[Khan Bahadur Makhdum Syed Rajan Bakhsh Shah.]

Similarly the woes of third class passengers on running trains at times become unbearable. Fares continue to be increased from day to day, with the result that people are more and more inclined to travel by motor lorries in order to save themselves both trouble and expense involved in railway journeys. This is leading to losses in the earnings of the railways. The authorities, in their anxiety to bring down the expenditure, are cutting down the number of trains. The result is that there is an extraordinary rush of third class passengers on the trains and going through the journey is with them like going through hell. They can hardly get room to sit in day time. To think that they can sleep in their journey at night would be preposterous. Most of them may be seen going through their journey standing between station and station, and instances may not be wanting in which passengers have found it difficult even to breathe. Is it for this deplorable state of affairs that the Railway Administration offers to sing its own praises? And, if, during the tenure of office of the present Honourable Member in charge, who has a reputation all his own as regards his popularity and administrative ability, these defects have not been or could not be removed there can be no hope of their being removed ever afterwards.

This most Honourable House, which represents the country, would be failing in its duty by the country if nothing could be done to allay the unrest and remove the almost unbearable discomforts experienced by passengers travelling by third class. And if this cannot be done because the income of the Administration is falling, it is imperatively necessary to fix the railway fares at their original rates and to provide third class passengers with all the necessary and adequate comforts and conveniences both at stations and on running trains. Only in this way can the Railway Administration successfully compete with motor traffic. But if the Administration is not in a position to do anything to remove the many woes attending the journey of millions upon millions of poor third class passengers, it would be better if, instead of running for the sake of a few thousand country or foreign capitalists or salaried servants, the trains altogether ceased to run, the rails were removed, or at best the service reserved for official use only, so that it caused no more distress to crores upon crores of His Majesty's loving but poor subjects.

One other problem connected with the Railway Administration is that of communal representation. Now, Sir, like several other glaring defects, this defect is now clearly noticeable, in that particular grades of service are distributed over particular classes and communities with quite unjust partiality. For instance, superior posts are entrusted to British officers, middle class appointments to Hindus, and menial staff is recruited from among the Muslim community.

I would like to ask the Government why, in this civilised age when capable Indians can be found to work side by side with British officers, are they not given the opportunity of serving their country, and why, instead, are foreigners invited from across the seas to come to this country.

Similarly it is not understood why, especially when educationally qualified Muslims in their thousands are crying for employment, are their rights neglected in the railways all over the country, while Hindus are given more than their due in that respect everywhere? I do not consider

the opinions of those to be right who attack the intentions of the Government and say that the claims of Muslims as against Hindus are neglected with a view to making Muslims displeased with Hindus and increasing the tension between the two. It is equally unfortunate that Muslim representations and appeals on the subject have met with little or no response from the authorities concerned. They have at best been patted on the back with some such remark as "50 per cent. or 60 per cent. of appointments would be reserved for Muslims in future", a remark confined only to paper and never translated into action. This is how they make fools of the Muslim community and its representatives, and this is why I am afraid, Muslims are losing faith in the Railway Administration, and that too not unjustly.

I would at the same time request my Hindu fellow-countrymen that, at this critical period of political changes in the country, the greatest service that can be done to the Motherland is to try to compose the differences between the different communities living in this country. And this is impossible to achieve unless and until there is mutual confidence between the various communities which can only come from one community treating the other on a fair and equitable basis. I do not ask for any favour either from the Government or from the Hindu community for my community. All I ask for is justice and justice only. And for this reason I strongly appeal that my community may be given their just proportion in the service of the railways all over the country.

In conclusion, I cannot help inviting the attention of my friend, the Honourable Member in charge of Railways, to Multan, a historic city of the past but still an important town of Northern India, a large trading centre, and a station possessing the headquarters of a political Division and a number of railway offices. Yet, the Punjab-Karachi Mail is not run *via* Multan, but is diverted in a different direction from Khanewal situated at a distance of only 25 miles from Multan. Much inconvenience is naturally felt by tourists, traders, Government officials and the public by this arrangement. Shuttle trains keep running up and down to enable passengers to catch the Mail, but then all this means extra expense and much time wasted. I would therefore particularly invite the attention of my esteemed friend, the Honourable Member in charge, to the need for running the Punjab-Karachi Mail *via* Multan as before.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I am sorry that my Honourable friend the Leader of the European Group is not here in his place because I wanted to answer one or two of his arguments. I am also sorry that my Honourable friend Mr. Sykes is not in his place, because I wanted to meet his arguments. But I hope by the time I conclude my speech they may be present, and therefore I shall begin with certain observations that were made by an Honourable gentleman belonging to the Independent Party about what I consider to be a thought-compelling suggestion of my Honourable friend the Deputy President. I know that, when a new idea is thrown out on the floor of this House, instead of calm thinking, it causes some amount of confusion. Mr. Chetty, I believe, by making the suggestion about regulating the road motor traffic in order to increase the railway revenue, created as much sensation on this side of the House as would be created by a stone thrown into a pond. Sir, the ripples seem

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

to have ceased. I have no intention to disturb the placid waters, but it is just as well that I place before this House what the implications are of that suggestion.

I cannot follow the example of my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, and say, I reject the conception of the statutory Railway Board. You have a statutory Railway Board at present in the sense that it is provided in accordance with the statute. And we have got to have another statutory Railway Board, especially when great schemes are being worked, when federation is in contemplation and there will be inter-provincial competition as well as competition between the provinces and the Central Government. Sir, roads are a provincial subject, and there may be a great tendency on the part of the autonomous provinces to compete with the railway. Such competition exists in England but there the railway is under the control of private enterprise. In India it may be necessary that there should be something in the nature of an Inter-State Transport Council, which I do not think has been contemplated within our knowledge at any rate either by the Round Tablers or for that matter, by the Government of India. For this is entirely outside the scope of what you may call the statutory Railway Board. It is an entirely new idea, and I dare say that, if Mr. Chetty's observations were carried to their logical conclusion, you would have to have something in the nature of an Inter-State Transport Council as you have in the United States of America an Inter-State Commerce Commission. Sir, this is a very important consideration, and I hope that gentlemen seated on this side of the House will give it more serious thought, because railways in this country are being nationalised. The control by the State of certain of the railways is nothing but nationalisation. Sir, I am an extremist of extremists so far as nationalisation of railways is concerned. I look forward to the day when the Company-managed railways will also come under national control. Now, when national control is within sight, it is just as well for us to think how to increase the railway revenue because the railway revenue is the biggest contributing factor to the general revenue. (Mr. B. Das: "How?") My Honourable friend, Mr. B. Das, asks "How?" I do not want to answer questions at present as my time is woefully limited, but if you give me control of the railway revenue or general revenue,—if the choice is before me, I would try to control railway revenue, for its possibilities are very great, and in India at present you have only 40,000 miles of railways. It is a large country compared to other countries, and railway enterprise will have to increase. Railway revenue will feed the general revenue, feed the people of this country, and in a country like India where the taxing resources are very small, where the field of taxation is not so wide as in England, the railway revenue will be a very important factor, and I think being under State control we cannot easily get rid of the idea that, if other competitors stand in the way of the railway, without hurting private enterprise it will be necessary for us to increase the railway revenue. For instance,—Mr. Chetty spoke of running motors at right angles, but I believe it will be better to put it in a more understandable and less geometrical manner. The competition in the motor traffic is really killing the competitors themselves. There is among them a kind of cut-throat competition which would cease if motor traffic could be regulated—I do not for a moment say that there should be no competition

on parallel lines with the railways, and that is where I perhaps am not in agreement with Mr. Chetty, or Mr. Chetty is not himself in agreement with the idea that he is misunderstood to have put before the House. He did not say that there should be no such competition at all, but he said that competition has got to be regulated. This is a matter on which there should be no serious controversy. Then there are places where railways cannot go, where railway enterprise cannot pay, and so far as these particular places are concerned, they can be connected by motor service. Thus motor traffic will have to be helped in order to be feeders to important railway junctions by bringing passengers from the interior. Here are matters of importance for the consideration of something in the nature of an Inter-State Council.

Now, coming to the argument of my Honourable friend the Leader of the European Group, whom I am glad to find now in his seat—it is very difficult for any of us on a tiring day like this to sit always in his seat, and I did not make any reflection at all on the Honourable the Leader of the European Group when I made that observation. In the course of his very interesting and usually informing speech on a subject of this kind he said:

“I was on the Railway Finance Committee at that time when all these schemes were put before us. We had a scheme for 50 miles of railway line, and as far as it was possible to work out an estimate, estimates were worked out and they were gone into in some detail in certain cases in that committee. The Committee, as far as it could be satisfied, was satisfied that the particular return anticipated... was a justifiable estimate.”

He went on to say that it was very easy to be “wise after the event”. He thought that this House and the Finance Committee should share the responsibility regarding the schemes they had accepted. If it is easy to be wise after the event I do not desire to enquire whether it is not easier to be foolish before the event! It was rather imprudent I should think for those who placed certain estimates before the Railway Finance Committee to have recklessly calculated. I admit the difficulties. I admit no one could deny the difficulties of calculation by way of anticipation. But, Sir, in some cases, as I shall presently show, the estimated return was hopelessly wrong so much so that it would seem that the estimates are made by laymen, not experts. Take, for instance, the return on the Kurramgam Longai Valley Railway. What was the original estimate so far as that particular railway was concerned? Sir, they had made an estimate of 5.5 per cent. profit. That was expected, and this expectation was placed before the Finance Committee. How did it turn out? It turned out into a loss of 15.46 per cent. I take these figures from the official report—their own literature. Surely, this is a gross miscalculation. It is no use for the Leader of the European Group, a very responsible gentleman himself, to justify such gross miscalculation. Take, again, the case of the estimate on the Kangra Valley scheme. The estimated cost of this scheme was Rs. 124 lakhs and how did it turn out? I believe, it was more than double the original estimate—Rs. 295 lakhs. Sir, the return estimated was 2.8 per cent. in this case, but instead of profit it yielded a loss of nearly one per cent. There is no use telling us, “You are responsible”. Yes, we were responsible; our Members on the Finance Committee were responsible; this House was responsible. For what? For sanctioning a particular thing on the estimates that were placed before

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

us. (Mr. B. Das: "The original estimate.") We were prepared to approve the original estimate after hearing what the gentlemen responsible for the estimate had put before us. What happened subsequently? There was a tremendous miscalculation. It is no use telling us that we were wise after the event. I do not want to follow the example of the Honourable the Leader of the European Group and say it is more easy to be foolish before the event.

Sir, it is always a pleasure to hear my friend Mr. Sykes. He seldom talks in this House. He unnecessarily went out of his way to talk about the labour wages of agricultural people. I admit that the agricultural labourers get a certain amount of wage, but a comparison is extremely improper, for the simple reason that the agricultural labourers are not entrusted with the responsibility with which the railway labourers are entrusted. For instance, when a pointsman goes to sleep, disaster follows. I would ask the Honourable Member not to indulge in such unhelpful analogies. I can place before him a contrast of the salaries here and in other countries as between the highest and lowest. He will find that the salary in Holland is one to seven, in Japan it is 1 to 22 between the top and the bottom. In India it is 1 to 400. These are the facts which I quoted several years ago in this House, and I had a mild controversy with Sir Clement Hindley over that. I wish that absurd calculations were not placed before this House.

Lastly I wish to conclude with a few remarks about the Honourable the Leader of the House who is also the Railway Member. It is a matter of real regret to us that Sir George Rainy is going to leave us. He has been in his period of office animated by pro-Indian sympathies. The very fact that Sir Alan Parsons is going to be succeeded by an Indian shows how much pro-Indian sympathy Sir George Rainy has. He has also been responsible for introducing another Indian on the Railway Board, my friend Mr. Hayman. It is a matter of great regret to us that when things are to shape beautifully in this country and we expect big things to follow that a man so full of sympathy for Indian aspirations should be going away from our midst. As for the optimism with which he spoke about the future, it was almost the optimism of a born optimist, I can only say that I was reminded of Emerson's message to the bee, because we are living in gloomy days:

"Seeing only what is fair,
Shipping only what is sweet,
Thou dost mock at fate and care."

This year is pregnant with events. The war between Japan and China is going to affect Indian trade. India is trading with countries which are still on the gold standard and therefore we are under a disability. The economic conditions are not good. Such being the case, I do not believe that Government's calculations for the year will be any better than the calculations in the past. Such being the case, I can only say with Browning that Sir George Rainy was animated with the thought that:

"God's in Heaven,
All's right with the world."

Mr. N. M. Joshi: The Honourable the Railway Member has painted a very gloomy, indeed a very black picture of the financial position of the Indian Railways. If we consider the policy which the Honourable Member has been following in the management of railways, it is not a matter for surprise at all that the picture he had to paint was a very black one. You will agree with me that if an industrial undertaking is to be prosperous, it can only do so if those who are engaged in that industry and upon whom that industry depends are contented. If the railway men in India are contented, you can expect the railways to be prosperous, and if they are not, we have no right to expect that the Indian railways will be prosperous. The policy which the Honourable Member has followed in the management of railways is a wrong one. It is to give more to those who have. They are willing to give all sorts of concessions and good conditions for those people who already have it. Take for instance the class of officers engaged on railways. They come from middle class families who are already provided for generally by their birth, but when you consider the conditions upon which they are engaged you find that they are the best conditions of all the railway employees. Take again the salaries. My friend Mr. Ranga Iyer said that the relation between the wages of the lowest paid railway employee and the highest paid was 1 to 400. I agree with the principle enunciated by my friend Mr. Sykes, that there should be some relation between the wages of the labourers and the wages paid to the highest class of railway employees. (Interruption by Mr. Sykes.) My friend did not realise that the quotation which he was making was from a printed paper and there was a printer's devil in it. In place of the word "official", the word used should have been "officer". Then if you consider the position of the officers on railways and the position of the workers, you will find that the policy of the Government of India is absolutely wrong and if they continue in that policy, the railways are bound to suffer from financial difficulties. Take the question of leave. The officers are in the least need of liberal leave rules which the Government of India have provided for them. They get privilege leave, furlough and sick leave and so on. It is the poorest man who does not get any sick-leave at all. Take again the question of quarters. We find the lowest paid employee is not provided with quarters. Take again the question of railway passes. They are given generously to the officers and the grants of passes are the meanest in the case of the lowest paid servants. If the Railway Board follows this policy, is it any wonder that the railways have to face financial troubles? As regards the management of railways, there has been grave discontent among railwaymen. The discontent has been of long standing. About eight years ago, this House passed a Resolution asking Government to make an inquiry into the innumerable grievances from which railway employees suffer. The Government of India refused to make an inquiry, not only in accordance with that Resolution but in accordance with the votes of this Assembly during the Budget discussions on several occasions. Then the Government of India appointed a Royal Commission on Labour which inquired into the conditions of railway employees. They made several recommendations, which, if given effect to promptly, might to some extent have removed the grievances from which the railway employees suffer. Sir, the Report of the Royal Commission has been published, and it is more than eight months that their recommendations have been before the Railway Board. I would like to know what the Government of India have done to give effect to these recommendations. I feel, Sir, that this Assembly will not fail to lodge a protest against the delay which the Government of India are making in giving effect to these recommendations.

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

I do not wish to go into the details of those recommendations. I shall mention only a few of them. The first and the most important recommendation is to give some kind of security of service to the railway employees. Then they have made certain recommendations as regards the service agreements. Then they have also made a certain recommendation that people who are called daily-rated people should not be treated as such after a certain period of service. Then there is a recommendation about the medical service—concerning racial discrimination. Sir, the Government of India always tell this Assembly that there is no racial discrimination on the railways. Sir, they are not telling the truth. They themselves admitted in the book which they published last year that they had discrimination as regards appointments and even as regards promotion in the case of certain classes of people. Therefore it is wrong for them to tell this House that there is no racial discrimination. The Royal Commission on Labour has made a definite recommendation on that subject that racial discrimination should cease within a specified number of years, and they ask the Government of India to formulate a policy and get rid of racial discrimination within a certain number of years. Then, Sir, the Royal Commission has made recommendations on several other subjects. There are some recommendations made by at least three members as regards the hours of work. Then they have also made some recommendations about the provident fund, gratuities and the debit system. Leaving aside these recommendations, they have made very important recommendations as regards the permanent machinery which the Railway Board should set up in order that the disputes between railway employees and the Railway Board and the Government of India should be amicably discussed and settled. Now, I want to know what the Government of India have done as regards the bringing into existence of that machinery. Sir, since last year the Government of India have been following the policy of reducing the number of the people employed on the Indian railways. They say that the policy is necessary on account of the depressed condition of the Indian railways. I do not wish to go into that question at all. What I feel, however, is this. In India there is no provision for maintaining people when they are unemployed. We have no unemployment insurance Act and no legislation by which men can claim some work from Government when they do not ordinarily find work. Under these conditions, when a Government for any reason undertakes to reduce the number of people who are already in service, they must do so with great caution and consideration. Sir, the Railway Employees Federation, which represents the railway employees in this country, do not take this line that no man should be discharged in spite of the difficult times through which the Government of India are passing, but they are justified in taking the stand that, if at all it is necessary for Government to discharge their employees, they should do so after consultation with their organizations. This policy presumably has been accepted by Government, that when they discharge a large number of employees, they should give a chance first to the organisations of the railway employees to state what their view is. Last year the Government of India launched the policy of retrenchment. But the Railway agents did not consult the organizations of the railwaymen before they undertook the policy of retrenchment. Then, Sir, there were certain discussions between the Railway Board and the Railwaymen's Federation, and ultimately the Government of India appointed a committee of inquiry to go into the question of retrenchment,

and the question is being considered by that Committee. The Report of the Committee is not yet out, but before that, the Government are already launching some more proposals for retrenchment. Now, may I ask you whether it is fair that any Government should appoint a Committee of Inquiry to go into the question of the methods by which retrenchment should be secured and then, before the report is made, launch further proposals for retrenchment

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: May I point out to my Honourable friend that to state that the Court of Inquiry was appointed to consider the methods by which retrenchment should be secured is a very strange way of describing the functions of that body. It has nothing to do with that.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: He should have described the functions of the Committee.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: My Honourable friend should study the terms of reference.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Well, Sir, the Honourable Member says that this question is excluded, but I do not think so. The Committee's function is to find out by what methods retrenchment could be secured. (*Cries of "No, no," from the Official Benches.*) Now, it is open to the Committee to suggest methods, as I think, whereby economy can be secured or reduction effected. For instance, instead of reducing 40,000 men the Committee might suggest that you can employ a certain number of people for a shorter period every day. Then the Committee might also suggest that if the number of hours of work for certain employees is increased, if their burden of work is increased, the Committee is bound to make a recommendation that that should not be done. Then, while this Committee was considering this question, the Government of India launches proposals for further retrenchment. So, I feel, Sir, that this is not the right method of treating your own Committee of Inquiry.

I shall now say one word more about the attitude of Government in conducting these committees of inquiry. The Government of India have employed a barrister: and I do not know what they paid that barrister, but I am sure they paid him more than a thousand rupees a day. Now, this action of Government in employing a barrister in conducting the work of a Committee of Inquiry of this kind is to treat that Committee like an ordinary court of law. This in my judgment is against the policy which brought into existence the Trade Disputes Act and the Committee of Inquiry. If the Government of India employ the Advocate General of Bengal to place their case before that Committee of Inquiry, how can poor railway employees find a barrister and pay him Rs. 1,000 a day? Sir, it is wrong for the Government to conduct cases before a Committee of Inquiry of this kind by employing highly-paid barristers. Then, Sir, I wish to say one word more. The Government of India should follow the right policy of caring for their employees. They should follow the policy of treating their employees with humanity. It is wrong to treat an employee or any kind of employees as if they were mere ordinary goods who should be paid according to the market rates. This is against the principles for which the League of Nations stand and to which the Government of India have given adherence.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member's time is up.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, I do not wish to say anything more, but I hope

Mr. President: Will the Honourable Member kindly resume his seat?

Maulvi Sayyid Murtuza Saheb Bahadur (South Madras: Muhammadan): As there is a cut motion in my name which will be taken up in the course of this week, I do not propose taking much of the time of the House. As an old Member of this House, I feel bound to thank the Honourable Sir George Rainy for his geniality, winning manners and for his courtesy, and on behalf of our community and also on behalf of the party to which I have the honour to belong, I convey our sense of gratitude to him and also express the wish that he should be spared long to enjoy his well-merited pension. (Applause.) Again, it is my bounden duty to repudiate the remark levelled against the Railway Standing Finance Committee by my Honourable friend, the Deputy Leader of my party, I mean Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad. He said that the Standing Finance Committee meetings are not attended properly and things are being done there in a hurly-burly way. I am sorry my Honourable friend Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad is not here now. I may assure him that it was poorly attended only at a time when meetings were held during the month of Ramzan when the Muslim Members were observing fast and could not therefore make it convenient to attend the meeting. When we asked the Chairman of the Committee, he said he had no other time to arrange to have a meeting and so those meetings might have been poorly attended. If my Honourable friend would take the trouble of looking into the attendance of our meetings, he will find that Members were evincing as much interest as the members of any other Committee. The Chairman of that Committee, who will of course excuse me for saying so, though he appears to be a military gentleman, he is as civil as any civilian. Fortunately for us his would-be successor also is very affable, and we were getting papers in advance so that we were in a position to go into each and everything and the Chairman would always make it a point to ask each and every Member as to what his view was on a particular point. We were not blindly following the Chairman, whoever he might be. So, Sir, it was an insult not only to the Chairman but also to the members of the Finance Committee to say that the committee meetings were not well attended.

In this connection I have to make a few remarks about the special officer Mr. Hassan who was deputed by the Government of India to look into the grievances of the minorities and particularly those of the Muslim community. He has taken much trouble in drawing up the Report which is very elaborate and vivid. If one takes the trouble of going through the Report, one will come to know what kind of injustice is being done in the case of minorities, particularly that of the Muslims. Mr. Hassan had no time to look into the figures of the Company-managed railways. I come from a place in Madras which is the headquarters of the South Indian Railway, I mean Trichinopoly. So far as the South Indian Railway is concerned, we have not got proper figures. But, I may assure the House that the minorities there are being ignored. The case of Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway is even worse. Tomorrow or the day after, I will be in a position to place facts and figures before the House to prove my allegations. Now, I do not want to take up the time of the House any more. With these remarks, I resume my seat.

Bhai Parma Nand (Ambala Division: Non-Muhammadan): I rise to enter my protest against the policy of racial and communal discrimination as followed in the railway services. I have been approached by a number of railway employees in Lahore and Delhi. They were all Hindus and their chief complaint was that in the matter of reduction, Hindu clerks who had been in service for over 8 years and 9 years, were turned out while new Moslem recruits, who had been in service of the railway for one year and less, had been retained. To ventilate their grievance they sent representations to the Railway Board, but no satisfactory reply was given to them, nor any serious attention was paid to this matter. This question of communal representation in railway services, on the very face of it, is most unreasonable. We can claim the right of communal representation if it is a question of the Legislature. The minorities can claim their rights, even if it comes to the question of civil administration but the railways are a sort of trading companies working purely on business lines. In matters of business, I do not think any community with any show of reason has a right to claim that they should be represented in services according to population.

Shaikh Sadiq Hassan (East Central Punjab: Muhammadan): Then why Indianise them?

Bhai Parma Nand: Indianise, if there be some political matter or if it be the question of the Legislature, and if the power is put in the hands of one particular community the question can be raised. But when there is the question of business, there can be no talk of tyranny by one community over another.

Shaikh Sadiq Hassan: I said, why Indianise them?

Bhai Parma Nand: The question is raised of Indianisation. Indianisation is a political matter. We want self-government for the country. At the same time we wish that Indians should be in a position to control all the business and all the trade that is being carried on at present by others in this country. In order to acquire that fitness, we claim that we should have this privilege along with Swaraj or self-government. In order to be completely self-governing we say it is essential that these railways as they have been managed by the State, should be transferred to the management of Indians. There is a difference between Indianisation and Muhammadanisation. There is a great difference between these two things. I admit certain privileges should be given to the minorities in certain matters, although on principle they too are quite unreasonable, irrational and anti-national, but all the same as the minorities want them for their protection, we concede their demand. But in matters of business and trade, I do not see how any communal question can come in. Therefore I say these communal representations on the basis of racial or communal discrimination should not at all be supported by the Railway Board and I take this opportunity of entering my protest against this vicious principle. Let me take a simple case. A man has been serving a railway for 8 years, he has served faithfully; he has been trained in his work and has got great efficiency and experience. Another man comes in; he is there only a year and he has not got that experience nor that kind of efficiency. But if simply on communal considerations the latter is kept on and the former is retired, I think there cannot be any grosser injustice than shown in the case, and yet that is going to be the practice according to this policy of the Railway Board.

[**Bhai Parma Nand.**]

Then, Sir, not only this, but I oppose the policy even in the case of fresh recruitments. Let us again take an instance. There are several persons who apply for a post. One man is well qualified, say he is a graduate; the other man is only a matriculate but he claims that job simply because he belongs to one particular religion or community. What is the result? We refuse that post to the man who has got greater qualifications and give it to the man who has got comparatively low qualifications. So far, the minorities or that particular community is satisfied, but then comes the question, what is going to be the corollary of this? The implication would be that the highly qualified person who is a graduate says in his mind—and I know many cases like this—that if he had only changed his name or his religion he would have got that post. He with higher qualifications does not get it. but the man with inferior qualifications gets it simply because he came from a particular community or believes in a particular religion. Sir, this is a most serious religious disability that can be imposed by any State. This nullifies the principle of religious equality in the eyes of law and I think any Government that allows such religious or communal discriminations and invidious distinction cannot be called a fair and just Government. This practice is against all principles of equity and justice.

Then, Sir, coming to the facts and figures, I may be asked why I am protesting. I am protesting simply because of the method of appointing a Moslem gentleman to make inquiries into the grievances of minorities, and especially the grievances of the Muslim community, as has been referred to by my friend Saiyid Murtuza Saheb. I say this inquiry into the grievances is simply an attempt to encourage the minority community to demand things which they do not deserve. Then coming to the Report of Mr. Russell which has been recently published, I want to give certain figures to show that the Muslim claim which has been made so much of, is quite unfounded. I am surprised to find that about 12 Honourable gentlemen belonging to the Muslim community have given notices of cuts for lack of Muslim representation in railway services. I ask, on what principle do they want representation in the railway services? Taking Mr. Russell's figures from the Report we find that taking the average of all the State-managed railways nearly one-fourth of the appointments go to the Muslims. And if we take it that they are one-fourth of the population, they have already got their due proportion in the railway services, and I do not see any reason why so many Honourable gentlemen should take the trouble of proposing cuts on the ground of lack of Muslim representation in the railway services.

An Honourable Member: This refers to subordinate services.

Bhai Parma Nand: This Report gives figures for all the posts, subordinate and higher. Taking the grand total for all the State-managed Railways you will find that the Moslems, inspite of their coming in so late, have not got less than one-fourth of the appointments in the department.

An Honourable Member: On what pay?

Bhai Parma Nand: The Report is there. I will give the figures. I will first take the Eastern Bengal Railway. There are 6,600 permanent and 512 temporary Hindus. The Muslims are 1,080 permanent and 236 temporary.

An Honourable Member: What is the population of Eastern Bengal?

Bhai Parma Nand: The Eastern Bengal Railway does not run only through East Bengal. It runs through various other parts, where the population is not in the same proportion. So, on this railway we find that the Muhammadans have got nearly one-fifth of the appointments.

Then we come to the North Western Railway, which is the biggest Railway. They have got 10,052 permanent and 1,242 temporary Hindus. In opposition to this, they have got 4,147 permanent and 753 temporary Muhammadans. That is to say, against 11 thousand Hindus they have 5 thousand Muhammadans, which comes to nearly one-half.

An Honourable Member: What is the Muslim population of the Punjab?

Bhai Parma Nand: The North Western Railway does not run only through the Punjab, but through several other provinces.

An Honourable Member: What about the Frontier Province?

Bhai Parma Nand: The Frontier Province has got a population of 25 lakhs, which is one-twentieth that of the United Provinces through which this railway runs.

(Interruptions by some Muslim Members.)

Mr. President: Order, order. Honourable Members can contradict the speaker when their time comes.

Bhai Parma Nand: This railway runs through the United Provinces. Punjab, the Frontier Province and also Sind, and taking the average population of all these places through which this railway runs, you find that out of 11,000 Hindus, 5,000 Muslims is in no way a low proportion for the Muslims. The railways are not provincial concerns and you are not to find out the proportion of services according to the population in the provinces. Taking India as one whole country and all its people as one people you have to take the Muslim proportion as one-fourth. Therefore I say that in the North Western Railway they have got almost half of the services in their possession, and they have no right to grumble about lack of representation on this railway.

Then we come to the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. Here we find that there are 9,295 permanent and 368 temporary Hindus. Against this, there are 1,459 permanent and 62 temporary Muslims. Here the proportion is somewhat lower, but I want to point out that one particular feature of this railway is, that besides these 1,459 Muslims, you have got 1,308 Anglo-Indians and 1,307 Christians. That is to say, from the minority communities combined there are 4,000 altogether.

Mr. President: Order, order. The Honourable Member has got one minute more.

Bhai Parma Nand: If the minority claims are to be regarded, these 1,300 Anglo-Indians and 1,300 Christians should be reduced, and their places should be given to the Muhammadans. Why should the Hindus suffer because the Muhammadans want their rights on a population basis?

[Bhai Parma Nand.]

Then there is one other railway, the East Indian Railway. There are 13,000 Hindus and 3,000 Muhammadans in that railway in permanent service and over 1,100 Hindus and over 400 Muslims in temporary service. In this case also there are Anglo-Indians 1,581. Therefore taking 1,581 Anglo-Indians and 3,500 Muhammadans, their total number comes to more than 4,500 minorities and 14,000 Hindus. Thus, Sir, the question of majority and minority rights can be settled by fixing the principle according to a population basis in India taken as a whole and not by taking the provinces singly.

Mr. K. Ahmed (Rajshahi Division: Muhammadan Rural): Why does not the Hindu Mahasabha settle that?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): Having regard to the number of Honourable Members who are still getting up to address the House, the Chair should like to ask Honourable Members what their views are as regards sitting today. If Honourable Members wish to sit till a late hour, the Chair has no objection; but if they want to conclude as usual at about 5 o'clock, then the Chair cannot call upon any Honourable Member now to address the House. The Honourable Member in charge will require reasonable time to answer the criticism which has been made. The Chair is entirely in the hands of Honourable Members and is quite willing to sit till a late hour if they so desire.

Mr. Maswood Ahmad: Some misrepresentation has been made and misleading figures have been quoted by the last speaker and he must be corrected. The figure includes bhistis, bhangis and many other menials. The whole speech is full of misrepresentations so any one of us should be given a chance of reply.

Mr. President: Honourable Members will have ample opportunity to reply when the cut motions are being discussed. There are so many cut motions on this subject that a complete reply could be given when the opportunity arises. I should like to know if the House desires to sit till a late hour today; the Chair is perfectly agreeable. (*Several Honourable Members*: "No, no.") I take it, then, that the general desire is that I should now call upon the Honourable Member in charge to reply. (*Several Honourable Members from all sides of the House*: "Yes, yes.")

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: Sir, I find myself in the usual difficulty in which I am placed annually because it naturally happens in the course of the general discussion that each Member takes up the points which specially interest him. The result is that a very considerable variety of points come under review during the course of the debate, and I am afraid it would hardly be possible within any reasonable time to reply to all that has been said by speakers from various parts of the House, nor indeed is it necessary that on all points that I should do so. For instance, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad was very severe on the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee and the absence of Members from these meetings. I regret to see that he is absent now, and I hope he will not suggest that in his absence we have been doing improper things . . .

An Honourable Member: He has got fever.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: But on that point he has been sufficiently answered both by my friend Mr. Yamin Khan and by another Member.

Then again, I do not know whether it is necessary for me to reply at length to the last speaker, Mr. Bhai Parma Nand, believing, as I do, that several Honourable Members sitting on my right will probably undertake the duty of making that reply, perhaps tomorrow, or perhaps the day after. It might be rather an anticipation of coming events if I were to relieve them of that duty now. Therefore, what I must attempt to do, Mr. President, is to select the more salient points that have emerged in the various speeches which have been made and to say something about the more important of them.

Perhaps, I might begin with the point raised by my friend Sir Hugh Cocke, and also by the Deputy President, namely the question whether we had not now reached a point in the history of the railways in India when it had become necessary not to treat the railways as if they were in isolation, but to consider the whole question of transport as a single problem, and in particular, to consider the relation and co-ordination of rail transport and road transport. Personally, I think that is a very important question which must, as time goes on, more and more occupy the time and the thoughts of those who are responsible either for the administration of the roads or for the administration of the Railways.

(At this stage Mr. President vacated the Chair which was taken by Mr. Deputy President.)

I am glad that the point has been brought forward in this House as one which might engage the attention of those who have under their consideration at the moment matters connected with the future constitution of India. I should not dream to-day of offering any solution of my own as to how the matter might be adjusted, but certainly the course of events all over the world in one country after another, and also in India itself, suggest that, before very long, the necessity of co-ordination will be forced upon us whether we will or no, and that therefore it might be advisable that some provision on the subject should be made in the constitutional structure. But in saying that I should wish to make it very clear that I do not pose as an authority on constitutions nor do I desire to speak as one who has any special knowledge on the subject. On the other hand both of my Honourable friends, the Leader of the European Group and the Honourable the Deputy President, spoke from the same point of view, not as experts, but as men of intelligence who had been deeply impressed by what they saw going on before their eyes from day to day, and that is a point of view, Sir, from which all of us in this House are certainly entitled to speak. My friend Sir Hugh Cocke raised a small point about the manner in which the figures were presented in the Railway Board's memoranda on the Budget. All I should like to say about that is that, when suggestions are placed before us, we usually, I think, consult the Standing Finance Committee, and to a large extent we are guided by their advice. I have no doubt that before the next Budget is introduced the matter will be considered, but I understand that sometimes on matters of this kind opinion is not unanimous, and it is always difficult, I think, for those of us

[Sir George Rainy.]

who are responsible for presenting the Budget to know just how it appears to those who receive it, because naturally our point of view is somewhat different and we do not have the same difficulties in following the figures.

Now, Sir, my Honourable friend Sir Henry Gidney took a line which surprised me a little. His argument at the outset of his speech apparently was this that other railways in many other countries had made much bigger losses and they had done nothing in the way of retrenchment, and so why should the Indian railways do very much. I do not think, as far as I could gather, he earned a great deal of support from any quarter of the House, and therefore I do not propose to dwell on that because it was implicitly answered in other speeches. On this topic the variety of opinions is a little embarrassing. If I were to try to give effect to all that has been said in all quarters of the House, I should find myself in a little difficulty between those who object to any increase in freights and fares, those who object to any reductions in pay or establishment, and those who demand the most rigid retrenchment. Between those somewhat divergent streams of thought I might have to swim for my life.

On some of the points raised by my Honourable and gallant friend I shall no doubt have an opportunity of speaking when some of the cuts are moved, as for instance, his accusation that we have discharged too many subordinates and too few officers. Then Sir Henry Gidney said, do not put the burden on the staff; put it on the general public. I am sure that what I am about to say will clash with the feelings of every Member in this House, but my reply would be simply this, "I only wish I could"; and I am afraid that my abstaining from trying to take that course is due not so much to any innate virtue of mine, but to my profound conviction that I cannot do it. As I said in my speech, I do not believe that there is any solution of our difficulties to be found in a general increase of freights and fares, and that being so, I am afraid very much that we cannot think of doing it. Finally, my Honourable friend wanted to reorganise the Railway Board, or rather he forecasted the necessity of reorganising the Railway Board and he gave an interesting little sketch of the kind of organisation which he contemplated. It was not very different from what has been suggested on various occasions; that is to say, you would have at the top of the organisation something corresponding to a board of directors consisting largely of men of business with financial experience, and you would also have something corresponding to an executive committee of management which could in the main consist of railway officers. It is a very interesting and very important question, but I am afraid it would lead me very far afield, and it would take far too long if I were to attempt to open up that topic to-day.

Sir, I come to the speech of my Honourable friend Mr. Ghuznavi. I am grateful to him for all he said about myself, and I entirely agree with what he said about Sir Alan Parsons. But I am afraid I must say that I never listened to a speech in this House with more pain or more regret, because that speech contained what I am afraid I must call a very violent attack on the Chief Mining Engineer of the Railway Board, Mr. Whitworth. I regret, and I think I had reason to do so, that any Member of this House should have made that attack in the manner he did. (At this stage Mr. K. Ahmed tried to interrupt the Honourable Member). I am afraid I cannot give way to my Honourable friend, The first statement to which

I wish to draw attention is his statement that, "The Chief Mining Engineer practically decides from which firms coal should be taken and what quantity each of them should supply". If my Honourable friend believes that, he is under a complete illusion. The proposals of the Chief Mining Engineer for coal purchase are examined extremely closely and very carefully by the Railway Board, and especially by the Financial Commissioner, and all important points are referred to me. It is very far indeed from being the case that the Chief Mining Engineer has an unfettered discretion. The second statement to which I wish to refer is this :

"This policy is responsible for huge loss to the railways inasmuch as higher prices are given to favourite tenderers of the Chief Mining Engineer, and though coal of better quality is tendered at lower prices by others such tenders are not accepted."

There is no foundation whatever for that statement, Mr. Deputy President. (Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: "I can prove it".) And I repudiate the insinuation which it contains. It ought not to have been made, and I hope my Honourable friend will regret what he has said.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: You will change your mind when you have heard me later on.

(At this stage Mr. President resumed the Chair.)

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: My Honourable friend then went on to another matter which occupied the greater part of his speech. He referred to incidents which took place seven years ago, some of which I remember very well. The implication of my Honourable friend's speech—I have the report of the Reporter before me—I understand his suggestion to be that Mr. Church in that case was guilty of criminal conduct and that Mr. Whitworth was his accomplice. Now, I suggest that, when an Honourable Member on the floor of this House brings forward a charge of this kind,—I think the House is entitled to have from him at the time he makes it some explanation of why the charge is made at this particular time. Except for his reference to a rumour as to the cause of Mr. Church's death, except for that, I find nothing in the facts alleged in the speech that have not been public property since seven years ago. Now, why after seven years is that matter brought up? Government have been perfectly well aware of these facts, and their confidence in Mr. Whitworth has never been shaken. And I do think that it is incumbent upon my Honourable friend to explain his reasons, because I have seen nothing in the newspapers to suggest what was coming, no one has approached the Railway Board, no complaints have been made, and then suddenly like a bolt from a clear sky comes this attack on the floor of the House where the Honourable Member is sheltered by his privilege. It will be for the House to judge how far that is a fair thing for any Honourable Member to do.

Now, Sir, I propose to pass on from that. It was necessary for me to say as much as I did, but I do not wish at this stage to say more, and I turn to what fell from my Honourable friend Mr. Joshi. His main complaint was that my policy was all wrong from beginning to end. I make no complaint of that; indeed, if I may say so, it is a little refreshing during the course of this discussion to find some men who prefer smooth pebbles from the brook to the wreaths of flowers as their ammunition. When I think of Mr. Joshi, I always think of the scriptural text "Faithful are the

[Sir George Rainy.]

wounds of a friend", for he is always faithful in his dealing with the Members of the Government in this House. He asked me a great many questions, and to some of them I certainly could not give answers offhand, but I dare say he will find an opportunity of repeating his questions during the debates on the cuts. But I had to intervene when he was dealing with the functions of the Court of Inquiry, not the "Committee of Inquiry" as he persistently called it. It is a Court of Inquiry established under an Act of the Legislature. When he said that the functions of that Committee were to find out the method by which retrenchment should be effected, I felt bound to protest, and I think perhaps the simplest plan will be to read out the actual terms of reference:

"(1) Whether the retrenchment has imposed improper conditions of work on the staff still employed;

(2) Whether the terms allowed to the staff that has been discharged are inadequate or unreasonable;

(3) Whether, having in view the limitations imposed by the commercial management of railways, the fullest regard has been paid when discharging the staff to the following alternatives: stoppage of recruiting, the operation of normal wastage, working short time, the retirement of staff taking their gratuity and provident fund, or the transfer of individuals to other departments or other railways on similar or even reduced rates of pay;

(4) Whether there has been victimisation or favouritism in discharging; if so, whether this can be avoided and how; and

(5) Whether the staff discharged on the ground of retrenchment can or should be given any assurance of re-engagement", etc.

All these questions are connected with retrenchment and the measures taken to bring about retrenchment, but I do not think it is in any way correct to say that the Court of Inquiry was appointed to consider and devise methods of retrenchment. He also complained that we had employed a very expensive barrister to conduct our proceedings before the Court. Well, Sir, the railwaymen on their side had the services of a very able and distinguished former Member of this House, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, whom we remember very well. If such a formidable champion comes out to attack us, we must also endeavour to see that we are suitably defended by the right kind of champion. The attempt to move my pity for the down trodden railwaymen on the ground of the expensiveness of the barrister, I am afraid, rather missed fire.

Then I come to my friend Mr. Das. I was glad to find that my blandishments had not completely conquered his more independent views of life, but the particular point which I wish to make about his speech is this. He said it was the wretched English management—the methods borrowed from England and these officers borrowed from England—that had brought about financial chaos in the railways. Then he went on to say that the times were so bad that no one can afford to buy anything. How does my Honourable friend expect the railways to sell their tickets if nobody has the money to buy them? I would suggest to my Honourable friend that, when he proposes to make use of several different arguments, he should try to satisfy himself whether they are perfectly consistent, or whether it may not be possible to turn the point of his weapon back against himself.

One more remark I should like to make about what fell from my Honourable friend Mr. Sitaramaraju. He complained of the excessive

cost of audit. What I feel about audit is this. Audit is so to speak the dog which is appointed to bite me when I go wrong, and when somebody raises the question how many teeth the dog should have, I feel a certain delicacy as to whether I should express any opinion or not. Naturally as the victim of audit, I might consider it advisable that it should have as few teeth as possible, but on the other hand those who think that we are dangerous people may think that the dog should have a great many teeth which means a very strong audit department. I wanted to mention that point, because it gives the reason, one reason at any rate, why I feel some difficulty in going into that question in any detail. I know the Railway Retrenchment Committee thought that there should be a considerable reduction in the audit establishment. We have not yet had the final opinion of the Auditor General, and in the absence of that, and until it has been fully considered, I am afraid it is not possible for me to say more.

That, Sir, brings me to the end of what I can usefully say on this occasion, and before I sit down I should like to thank all Honourable Members for the many kind things that they have said about me, I try hard to believe them, but I do not find it very easy to do so. I was particularly touched by the little verse that my Honourable friend Mr. Ranga Iyer quoted which I thought was singularly apposite and of which he was good enough to send me a copy. "Seeing only what is fair"—and it is always on the Opposition Benches that my eyes rest in this House. "Sipping only what is sweet,"—and my ears have been drinking it all in to-day. "Thou dost mock at fare and care,"—I do, Mr. President, I do. I would, however, in a more serious vein add this. I have never in this House experienced anything but the greatest kindness and courtesy from Honourable Members in every part of it, and I am very grateful if in any way they feel that I have been serviceable to them, for belonging as I do to a "service," that is what matters most to me, that my service should be effective, and if it may be, appreciated.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 1st March, 1932.