

Friday, 18th March 1932

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

VOLUME III, 1932

(14th March to 6th April, 1932)

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

**FOURTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
1932**



CALCUTTA: GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
CENTRAL PUBLICATION BRANCH
1982

Legislative Assembly

President :

THE HONOURABLE SIR IBRAHIM RAHIMTOOLA, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.

Deputy President :

MR. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTY, M.L.A.

Panel of Chairmen :

SIR HARI SINGH GOUR, Kt., M.L.A.

MR. ARTHUR MOORE, M.B.E., M.L.A.

SIR ABDUR RAHIM, K.C.S.I., Kt., M.L.A.

SIR COWASJI JEHangIR (JUNIOR), K.C.I.E., O.B.E., M.L.A.

Secretary :

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

Assistants of the Secretary :

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.

Marshal :

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

Committee on Public Petitions :

MR. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTY, M.L.A., *Chairman.*

MR. ARTHUR MOORE, M.B.E., M.L.A.

SIR ABDULLAH SUHRAWARDY, Kt., M.L.A.

DIWAN BAHADUR HARBLAS SARDA, M.L.A.

MR. B. SITARAMARAJU, M.L.A.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME III.—14th March to 6th April, 1932.

	PAGE.
Monday, 14th March, 1932—	
Members Sworn	1923
Questions and Answers	1923—1948
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1948—1950
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Excesses of the Police in Delhi and Desecration of the Mosque in Kucha Rahman—Negatived	1951, 1985—2008
Election to the Standing Committee for the Department of Educa- tion, Health and Lands	1951
The General Budget—List of Demands—	1951—1985
Demand No. 28—Executive Council—	1952—1985
The Constitutional Issue	1952—1985
Tuesday, 15th March, 1932—	
Questions and Answers	2009—2018
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2018—2025
Bill passed by the Council of State laid on the Table	2025
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	2025—2083
Demand No. 28—Executive Council— <i>contd.</i>	2025—2083
Retrenchment	2025—2083
Wednesday, 16th March, 1932—	
Questions and Answers	2085—2095
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2095—2096
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	2096—2144
Demand No. 28—Executive Council— <i>contd.</i>	2096—2144
Avoidance of Income-tax	2096—2118
Indianisation of the Army	2118—2144
Thursday, 17th March, 1932—	
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	2145—2199
Demand No. 28—Executive Council— <i>contd.</i>	2145—2199
Royal Commission on Labour	2145—2155
Lack of Supervision over the Coal Transactions of Railways	2155—2172
Separation of Burma from India	2173—2193
Improper Interference by the Secretary of State in the Financial Affairs of India	2194—2199
Friday, 18th March, 1932—	
Questions and Answers	2201—2217
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2217—2224
Statement laid on the Table <i>re</i> Report on the Howard-Nixon Memo- randum regarding Financial Questions arising out of the Separation of Burma from India	2224—2229

Friday, 18th March, 1932—contd.

Statement of Business	2229—2231
Election of Members to the Public Accounts Committee	2231
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	2231—2281
Demand No. 28—Executive Council— <i>concl'd.</i>	2231—2232
Demand No. 16—Customs—	2232—2266
Insufficient Economy effected by Government under Customs	2232—2266
Demand No. 17—Taxes on Income	2267
Demand No. 18—Salt	2267
Demand No. 19—Opium	2268
Demand No. 20—Stamps	2268
Demand No. 21—Forests	2268
Demand No. 22—Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works	2268
Demand No. 23—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)	2268—2281

Saturday, 19th March, 1932—

Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Alleged Maltreatment of Women Political Prisoners—Request for leave to be renewed on Wednesday	2283
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>	2283—2345
Demand No. 23—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department— <i>cont'd.</i>	2283—2288
Demand No. 25—Interest on Ordinary Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt	2288
Demand No. 26—Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations	2288
Demand No. 27—Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor General	2288
Demand No. 29—Council of State	2288
Demand No. 30—Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department	2289
Demand No. 31—Foreign and Political Department	2290—2314
Demand No. 32—Home Department	2314—2325
Demand No. 33—Public Service Commission	2325—2334
Demand No. 34—Legislative Department	2334
Demand No. 35—Department of Education, Health and Lands	2334
Demand No. 36—Finance Department	2335
Demand No. 38—Commerce Department	2335
Demand No. 39—Army Department	2335
Demand No. 40—Department of Industries and Labour	2335
Demand No. 41—Central Board of Revenue	2335
Demand No. 42—Payments to Provincial Governments on account of Administration of Agency Subjects	2335
Demand No. 43—Audit	2336
Demand No. 44—Administration of Justice	2336
Demand No. 45—Police	2336
Demand No. 46—Ports and Pilotage	2336
Demand No. 47—Lighthouses and Lightships	2336
Demand No. 48—Survey of India	2336
Demand No. 49—Meteorology	2337
Demand No. 50—Geological Survey	2337
Demand No. 51—Botanical Survey	2337
Demand No. 52—Zoological Survey	2337

	PAGE.
Saturday, 19th March, 1932—contd.	
Demand No. 53—Archæology	2337
Demand No. 54—Mines	2337
Demand No. 55—Other Scientific Departments	2338
Demand No. 56—Education	2338
Demand No. 57—Medical Services	2338
Demand No. 58—Public Health	2338
Demand No. 59—Agriculture	2338
Demand No. 60—Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department	2338
Demand No. 61—Civil Veterinary Services	2339
Demand No. 62—Industries	2339
Demand No. 63—Aviation	2339
Demand No. 64—Commercial Intelligence and Statistics	2339
Demand No. 65—Census	2339
Demand No. 66—Emigration—Internal	2339
Demand No. 67—Emigration—External	2340
Demand No. 68—Joint Stock Companies	2340
Demand No. 69—Miscellaneous Departments	2340
Demand No. 70—Indian Stores Department	2340
Demand No. 71—Currency	2340
Demand No. 72—Mint	2340
Demand No. 73—Civil Works	2341
Demand No. 74—Superannuation Allowances and Pensions	2341
Demand No. 75—Stationery and Printing	2341
Demand No. 76—Miscellaneous	2341
Demand No. 76-A—Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel Charged to Revenue	2341
Demand No. 77—Refunds	2341
Demand No. 78—North-West Frontier Province	2342
Demand No. 79—Baluchistan	2342
Demand No. 80—Delhi	2342
Demand No. 81—Ajmer-Merwara	2342
Demand No. 82—Andamans and Nicobar Islands	2342
Demand No. 83—Rajputana	2342
Demand No. 84—Central India	2343
Demand No. 85—Hyderabad	2343
Demand No. 85-A—Aden	2343
Demand No. 86—Expenditure in England—Secretary of State	2343
Demand No. 87—Expenditure in England—High Commissioner for India	2343
Demand No. 88—Capital Outlay and Security Printing	2343
Demand No. 89—Forest Capital Outlay	2344
Demand No. 90—Irrigation	2344
Demand No. 91—Indian Posts and Telegraphs	2344
Demand No. 93—Capital Outlay on Currency Note Press	2344
Demand No. 94—Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour	2344
Demand No. 95—Capital Outlay on Lighthouses and Lightships	2344
Demand No. 96—Commuted Value of Pensions	2345
Demand No. 96-A—Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel Charged to Capital	2345
Demand No. 98—Interest-free Advances	2345
Demand No. 99—Loans and Advances bearing Interest	2345

Wednesday, 23rd March, 1932—

Members Sworn	2347
Questions and Answers	2347—2385
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2386—2408
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Alleged maltreatment of women political Prisoners—Negatived	2408—2409, 2442—2463
Statements laid on the Table	2409—2414
The Hindu Marriages Dissolution Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Committee on Public Petitions	2414
The Hindu Untouchable Castes (Removal of Disabilities) Bill— Presentation of the Report of the Committee on Public Petitions	2415
Election of Members to the Standing Finance Committee	2415
Election of Members to the Standing Committee on Emigration	2415
The Ancient Monuments Preservation (Amendment) Bill—Appoint- ment of Sir Cowasji Jehangir to Select Committee	2415
The Indian Medical Council Bill—Introduced	2415—2416
The Salt Additional Import Duty (Extending) Bill—Passed	2416—2438
The Bengal Criminal Law Amendment (Supplementary) Bill— <i>contd.</i>	2438—2442
Appendix	2465—2466

Thursday, 24th March, 1932—

Questions and Answers	2467—2489
Election to the Standing Finance Committee	2490
Election to the Standing Committee on Emigration	2490
Statements laid on the Table	2490—2499
Election of Members to the Public Accounts Committee	2500
Election of Members to the Standing Finance Committee for Railways	2500
The Bengal Criminal Law Amendment (Supplementary) Bill— <i>contd.</i>	2500—2542

Tuesday, 29th March, 1932—

Members Sworn	2543
Questions and Answers	2543—2590
Short Notice Question and Answer	2590—2591
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2591—2608
Death of Mr. K. V Rangaswami Iyengar	2608—2612
Election of Members to the Public Accounts Committee	2612
Election of Members to the Standing Finance Committee for Rail- ways	2612
Statements laid on the Table	2612—2617
Draft Convention and Recommendations <i>re</i> Protection against accidents of workers employed in loading and unloading ships	2618—2619
The Bengal Criminal Law Amendment (Supplementary) Bill— <i>contd.</i>	2619—2654

Wednesday, 30th March, 1932—

Questions and Answers	2655—2664
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2664—2667
Death of Mr. F. W. Allison	2668—2670
Statements laid on the Table	2670—2671
Election of Members to the Central Advisory Council for Railways	2671
The Bengal Criminal Law Amendment (Supplementary) Bill— Passed as amended	2672—2714

Thursday, 31st March, 1932—

Questions and Answers	2715—2721
Short Notice Question and Answer	2721—2728
Election to the Central Advisory Council for Railways	2729
Message from the Council of State	2729
Statements laid on the Table	2729—2730
The Port Haj Committees Bill—Introduced	2730
The Hedjaz Pilgrims (<i>Muallims</i>) Bill—Introduced	2730
The Foreign Relations Bill— <i>contd.</i>	2731—2776

Friday, 1st April, 1932—

Members Sworn	2777
Questions and Answers	2777—2784
Short Notice Question and Answer	2784—2785
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> unsatisfactory reply of the Leader of the House in regard to the expediting of the Reforms with Mahatma Gandhi in Jail—Negatived	2785—2788, 2820—2847
Statements laid on the Table	2788—2794
The Foreign Relations Bill— <i>contd.</i>	2794—2821
The Sugar Industry (Protection) Bill— <i>contd.</i>	2821—2829
Appendix	2849—2850

Saturday, 2nd April, 1932—

Statement of Business	2851—2852
Statements laid on the Table	2852—2854
The Sugar Industry (Protection) Bill—Passed	2855—2879
The Foreign Relations Bill—Passed as amended	2879—2902

Monday, 4th April, 1932—

Member Sworn	2903
Questions and Answers	2903—2908
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2908—2909
Short Notice Question and Answer	2910—2912
Statement laid on the Table	2912
The Indian Air Force Bill—Passed	2912—2925
The Indian Tariff (Wireless Broadcasting) Amendment Bill—Passed	2925—2933
The Public Suits Validation Bill—Passed	2933—2962

Tuesday, 5th April, 1932—

Member Sworn	2963
Statement <i>re</i> South Africa	2963—2966, 3012—3014
Statements laid on the Table	2966—2969
The Ancient Monuments Preservation (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of Select Committee	2969
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Passed	2969—2970
The Indian Partnership Bill—Amendments made by the Council of State agreed to	2970—2971
The Indian Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	2971—2978
The Tea Districts Emigrant Labour Bill—Referred to Select Committee	2978—2998

Tuesday, 5th April, 1932—contd.

The Port Haj Committees Bill—Referred to Select Committee	2998—3006
The Hedjaz Pilgrims (<i>Muallims</i>) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	3006—3009
Resolution to amend the previous Resolution on Roads—Adopted	3010—3012
Report on financial questions arising out of the proposed separation of Burma from India	3014—3025

Wednesday, 6th April, 1932—

Question and Answer	3027
Message from the Council of State	3027
Death of Sir Bomanji Dalal	3027—3029
Statement laid on the Table	3029—3030
Report on financial questions arising out of the proposed separation of Burma from India—Consideration postponed till the next Simla Session	3030—3050

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 18th March, 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.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIANS TO CERTAIN POSTS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

833. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that, as a general rule, prior to April, 1923, only Europeans, Anglo-Indians, Christians and Parsis were recruited in the senior subordinate and junior subordinate service of the Mechanical Branch of the North Western Railway for the posts of Foreman Boiler Maker, Foreman Erector, Foreman Blacksmith, Fitter Chargeman, Boiler Maker Chargeman, Locomotive Foreman, Locomotive Inspectors, Locomotive Drivers, Shunters in grade III and IV and Shedman in grade III and IV?

(b) Is it a fact that Indian apprentices in various categories mentioned in part (a) were recruited during 1923 to 1930, with a view to Indianise these posts?

(c) How many Indians were recruited during each year and in what category between 1923 to 1930 and appointed to various posts?

(d) Is it a fact that apprentices so appointed are not put on their proper posts although they stand qualified?

(e) Is it a fact that from the apprentices so appointed many have been discharged?

(f) What is the Railway at present doing to Indianise the posts stated in part (a) above?

(g) What is the total number of Europeans in the service mentioned in part (a) above as against the total number of Indians?

Mr. P. B. Rau: With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to questions Nos. 833 to 836 together. I have called for certain information and shall lay on the table a reply in due course.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIANS TO CERTAIN POSTS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

†834. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state the total number of drivers, shunters, firemen and boy-firemen in grade III and IV respectively and also totals under (i) Europeans; (ii) Anglo-Indians, (iii) Indian Christians and (iv) Miscellaneous, on 31st March, 1923, employed on the North Western Railway?

† For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 833.

(b) Is it a fact that before April, 1923, grade III was given to Parsis and grade IV to Europeans, Christians and Anglo-Indians on the North Western Railway?

(c) Is it a fact that from April, 1923, both grades III and IV were opened to Indians?

(d) How many Indians were recruited as boy-firemen or firemen in grade III and IV during the period 1923 to 1930?

(e) Was the purpose of the recruitment mentioned in part (d) to Indianise the posts of shunters and drivers mentioned in part (a) above?

(f) How many Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Parsis were recruited in grade III and IV respectively during the years 1923 to 1930 as boy-firemen, firemen, shunters and drivers, and how many Europeans, Anglo-Indians Parsis, Christians were promoted from firemen in grade III and IV to shunters and drivers during the period 1923-1930?

(g) From the Indians referred to in part (d) how many, recruited as firemen or boy-firemen during the years 1923 to 1926, have been promoted as shunters and how many as drivers?

(h) Is there any period fixed for automatic promotion to shunters and drivers for firemen of grade III and IV like apprentice for Permanent-Way Inspectors, Train Examiners, etc.?

(i) What is the total number of drivers, shunters, firemen, and boy-firemen in grade III and IV, respectively, on 31st December, 1930?

(j) Is it a fact that there is a larger number of drivers and shunters in grade IV and the firemen in grade IV, whose number is smaller, stand better chance of promotion, while the number of shunters and drivers in grade III being smaller and the number of firemen in grade III being greater they stand lesser chance of promotion? Is the Railway prepared to remove the grievance? If so, how?

PROMOTION OF FIREMEN, ETC., ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

†835. *Mr. S. C. Mitra: (a) Is it a fact that Indians who were recruited in 1923 to 1926 as firemen or boy-firemen grade III on the North Western Railway and who are qualified for promotion to shunters and drivers are not being promoted?

(b) If the facts stated in part (a) above are correct, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for the same?

(c) Is it a fact that the block in the promotion of firemen of grade III to shunters and drivers is due to promotion of firemen of grade IV against vacancies of grade III and also due to recruitment of drivers grade IV from outside?

(d) If the answer to part (c) be in the negative, will Government please give the number of vacancies reserved for firemen of grade III and IV, respectively, since 1923 and how they were disposed of?

PROMOTION OF FIREMEN, ETC., ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

†836. *Mr. S. C. Mitra: (a) Are Government prepared to fix a definite period of training for firemen of grade III for automatic promotion to shunters and drivers on the North Western Railway?

† For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 833.

(b) Is it a fact that many firemen-passed shunters of grade I got promotion to shunter both permanent and officiating, but the firemen-passed shunter of grade III were not allowed to take that chance although they were far superior by virtue of their education as well as grade?

(c) If the answer to part (b) above is in the affirmative, what preference the grade III firemen have over grade I or II firemen?

(d) What steps are Government taking to Indianise the posts of drivers grade IV and III which are at present held by Europeans?

(e) What facilities are being provided to firemen of grade III to enable them to pass drivers examination?

(f) If any Indians have replaced Europeans will Government please give their number as against the total number of Europeans employed as drivers in grade III and IV also stating whether Indians, if any, were taken from firemen of grade III recruited during 1923-1926?

(g) Are Government prepared to consider the case of promotion of firemen of grade III who have got seven years' training and above?

ALLOTMENT OF GOVERNMENT QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI.

837. *Mr. S. C. Mitra: Will Government be pleased to refer to the replies to unstarred questions Nos. 52 and 56, dated 18th February, 1932 and state whether Government have considered the question of appointing a committee of six men from different Departments of the Government of India selected by the ministerial staff of the Secretariat and Attached Offices for the purpose of making all necessary enquiries into the matter? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Government do not consider that investigation by a Committee would be a suitable method of procedure but would be prepared to institute enquiry into any definite complaints received.

MINISTERIAL AND INFERIOR STAFF QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI.

838. *Mr. S. C. Mitra: (a) Will Government be pleased to refer to the reply to unstarred question No. 55, dated 13th February, 1932 and state the reasons why, in the absence of any existing rules or orders, the New Delhi ministerial and inferior staff quarters are occupied by the local Public Works Department and other offices?

(b) Is it a fact that these quarters were actually constructed for the ministerial staff in the Secretariat and Attached Offices?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) and (b). Under the existing rules and orders the quarters in New Delhi are intended primarily for the use of establishments in the employ of the Secretariats of the Government of India and in all attached or subordinate offices, including the Local Administration, who are compelled to reside on duty with the Government of India in New Delhi. The local Public Works Department and other offices occupy the quarters under those rules and orders, but there are no rules or orders under which the offices referred to are given preference over the ministerial staff of the Secretariat and attached offices.

**MAINTENANCE OF PARKS AND FOUNTAINS ADJACENT TO THE IMPERIAL
SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS.**

839. *Mr. S. C. Mitra: (a) Will Government be pleased to state reasons why the parks and fountains adjacent to the Imperial Secretariat Buildings in New Delhi are maintained during winter months and not during summer?

(b) What objection have Government to issue necessary orders for the maintenance, from the ensuing summer, of the parks and fountains referred to above?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) and (b). The parks referred to are maintained throughout the year. The fountains are not used except during the cold weather on account of the cost involved in working them.

PROMOTION OF EX-WAR SERVICE RAILWAYMEN.

840. *Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan (on behalf of Maulvi Badi-uz-Zaman): (a) Will Government kindly state whether it is a fact that the Railway Administration 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 be in the affirmative, will Government be good enough to place a copy of their letter on the table or state on what grounds a preferential promotion was to be given?

(c) Will Government please also state the names and designations of the men who were given such promotions on the East Indian and North Western Railways?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given to unstarred question No. 111 asked by Khan Bahadur Haji Wajih-uddin on the 29th February, 1932, which was in practically identical terms.

**EXTENSIONS OF SERVICE GRANTED IN THE PUNJAB AND NORTH-WEST
FRONTIER POSTAL CIRCLES.**

841. *Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan (on behalf of Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur): (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, circulated the Government of India's instructions regarding retrenchment and retirement of officials?

(b) If so, will Government kindly state why extension of service is still being given in the Punjab and North-West Frontier Circle, and especially at Delhi?

(c) Do Government propose to order stoppage of extensions to safeguard the interests of approved candidates on the waiting list?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) Yes.

(b) The instructions referred to in part (a) of the question by the Honourable Member do not contemplate the entire suspension of the ordinary rules regarding the retention of Government servants in service.

(c) No.

SELECTION POSTS CONVERTED INTO TIME-SCALE APPOINTMENTS IN THE PUNJAB AND NORTH-WEST FRONTIER POSTAL CIRCLE.

842. ***Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan** (on behalf of Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur): (a) Will Government kindly state the number of lower selection grade posts in the Post Offices in the Punjab and North-West Frontier Circle converted into time-scale as a retrenchment measure?

(b) Will Government kindly state the number of such posts converted into time-scale in the Office of the Postmaster-General, Punjab and North-West Frontier Circle?

Mr. T. Ryan: (a) The Honourable Member presumably refers to the scheme for replacing officials in the lower selection grade of Rs. 160—10—250 in certain post offices by supervisors in the ordinary clerical time-scale of pay. The number so far replaced in the Punjab and North-West Frontier Circle is 11.

(b) The scheme just mentioned does not apply to the office of the Postmaster-General, where the organisation and condition of work are quite different from those prevailing in Post Offices.

APPOINTMENTS OF TICKET COLLECTORS.

843. ***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** Will Government be pleased to state if the instructions of the Railway Board contained in their letter No. 683-E. G., dated 3rd March, 1931, have been carried out in respect of the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors and Ticket Collectors when they were utilised in the Moody-Ward system?

Mr. P. R. Rau: With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to questions Nos. 843, 844, 845, 847, 848 and 850 together. I have called for certain information and shall lay a reply on the table in due course.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Considering the fact that the "necessary particulars" have been in the hands of the Railway Board for a long time and also considering the fact that these Inspectors have already suffered much hardship, will the Honourable Member kindly inform this House of the reasons why he is not able to answer the question now.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, the details required are in the office of the Agent, East Indian Railway.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Sir, if the details have been for so long with the Agent, East Indian Railway, why, I ask, are they not, by now, in the hands of the Railway Board, considering such a long time has elapsed?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, the Agent of the East Indian Railway is responsible for the detailed administration of the East Indian Railway.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Is not the Railway Board responsible for the administration of the East Indian Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I said "the detailed administration".

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Is not the Railway Board also responsible for the detailed or call it if you like the retailed or curtailed administration of the railway?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Sir, since this question has been before the Railway Board for the last five months, why have the Railway Board been unable to get the information during this long interval when they were expected to get the reply? It is not a new question, Sir: it has been before the Railway Board for five months.

Mr. P. E. Rau: As regards this question, we have had notice of it for only about ten days, I believe, Sir.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Is it or is it not a fact that the Railway Board is shelving a final decision on this question of a substitute system for the much criticised and abolished Crew System?

Mr. P. E. Rau: It is not a fact.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is it not a fact that the attention of the Honourable Member as Secretary of the Railway Retrenchment Committee was drawn to all these facts at the time, and should he not therefore have got the information by this time?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: The Honourable Member is entirely in error in supposing that this question did not contain a number of new details not mentioned in the earlier questions.

APPEALS OF TRAVELLING TICKET INSPECTORS.

†844. ***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) With reference to the reply to starred question No. 229 to 250, dated the 12th February, 1932, will Government be pleased to state the month in which the appeals were sent by the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors, to whom they were addressed and the cause of delay in considering those appeals by the Agent, East Indian Railway?

(b) Will Government please lay on the table a copy of the said appeal and a reply thereto given by the East Indian Railway authorities?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors sent a copy of the said appeal to the Secretary, Railway Board, direct; if so, what action was taken by Government on knowing the facts contained in the appeals?

(d) Will Government be pleased to state if the Railway employees have a right of appeal to the Agent of their Railway; if so, why the appeals of the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors of the East Indian Railway addressed to the Agent were disposed of by the Chief Operating Superintendent?

APPEALS OF TRAVELLING TICKET INSPECTORS.

†845. ***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) With reference to the reply to the supplementary question by Dr. Ziauddin to question No. 251, dated the 12th February, 1932, will Government please lay on the table a copy of the said rules relating to appeals?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state also if the appeals addressed by the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors to the Secretary, Railway Board, came within the provisions of the said rules justifying their being withheld by the East Indian Railway authorities? If so, in what respects?

RAILWAY TICKET CHECKING SYSTEMS.

846. ***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that Messrs. Moody and Ward, Officers of the Crew Enquiry Committee, were asked to suggest what preventive system should be adopted in case the Crew system was recommended by them to be abolished?

(b) If the reply to part (a) above be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state why this system has been adopted which is not a preventive system?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Messrs. Moody and Ward were asked to submit proposals as to what system should be adopted to prevent persons travelling without tickets.

(b) Because it is considered to be the most suitable system at a reasonable cost.

RAILWAY TICKET CHECKING SYSTEMS.

†847. ***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** With reference to the answer to starred question No. 1120, dated the 2nd October, 1931, will Government be pleased to state why the Railway Board do not know if the Moody-Ward system sanctioned by them is a permanent or a temporary measure?

LADY TICKET COLLECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

†848. ***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) With reference to answer to starred question No. 240, dated 12th February, 1932, will Government be pleased to state why the lady Ticket Collectors are retained on the Railway when the Travelling Ticket Examiners are authorised to check the tickets of female passengers?

(b) Will Government be also pleased to state how much economy would be affected per year if they are abolished and what is the percentage of such stations on the East Indian Railway where lady Ticket Collectors are provided?

SYSTEMS OF RAILWAY TICKET CHECKING.

849. ***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) With reference to the answer to supplementary question to starred question No. 389 by Sir Henry Gidney, dated the 16th February, 1932, will Government be pleased to state if up to 1922 identically the same systems of ticket checking prevailed on the North Western and the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railways (both under State-management) and that after amalgamation of the East Indian and Oudh and Rohilkhand Railways the same system was adopted on the entire East Indian Railway?

(b) Will Government be also pleased to state if it is also correct that the Crew system on the North Western Railway was adopted and abandoned, the same Crew system was afterwards started on the East Indian Railway and abandoned, that a system of two T. T. Es. followed the Crew system on the North Western Railway and that the same has followed the Crew system on the East Indian Railway now which is called Moody-Ward

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

system? Is it also true that on the North Western Railway since June the Travelling Ticket Examiner system has been replaced by the S. T. E., i.e., Special Ticket Examiner system and on the East Indian Railway since the same month, i.e., June, 1931, the Travelling Ticket Inspector system has been replaced by the Travelling Ticket Examiner system?

(c) If reply to part (b) above be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state if the local conditions on both the said Railways during the prevalence of those identical systems were the same and now different to justify the Moody-Ward system on the East Indian Railway and not on the North Western Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) The records of the Railway Board do not show what system of ticket checking was in force on the North Western, the old Oudh and Rohilkhand and East Indian Railways up to a period prior to the introduction of the crew system on the East Indian Railway.

(b) As regards the first part of the question, I would refer the Honourable Member to paragraph 6 of the Moody-Ward Committee's report which deals with the working of the crew system on a part of the Lahore District on which it had been introduced as an experimental measure in 1923. The position on the East Indian Railway is explained in the Moody-Ward Committee's report. As regards the second part of the question, in June 1931 the cadre of Travelling Ticket Examiners on the North Western Railway was abolished and was replaced by Special Ticket Examiners, and the arrangements for ticket checking recommended by the Moody-Ward Committee introduced on the East Indian Railway.

(c) So far as Government are aware, the detailed arrangements for the checking of tickets on the North Western Railway system generally have not always been the same as on the East Indian Railway.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Will the Honourable Member inform this House whether the Railway Board are satisfied with the system at present in vogue for checking tickets?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I cannot say that the Railway Board consider the present system to be perfect.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Will the Honourable Member inform this House whether the Railway possess any other variety of ticket checkers since the Moody-Ward Report has condemned this crew system?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No change is contemplated at present.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Then there is nobody checking the tickets, I understand?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is the Honourable Member aware of the fact that every Divisional Superintendent plays about with this scheme and changes this system along with the change of the office?

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

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Will he make an inquiry about it and find out if my statement is not correct? Will he make an inquiry?

Mr. P. B. Rau: Will the Honourable gentleman put a question on the subject, Sir?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Did I not draw attention to the case of the Divisional Superintendent at Allahabad in my previous question, on which he said he would make inquiries?

Mr. P. B. Rau: The results of the inquiry will be laid on the table in due course.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Is it or is it not a fact that the Railway Board, having been committed to the system, do not now know how to get out of it?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Are not the Railway Board prepared to make an inquiry as to why this system of examinations was introduced only in one Division and nowhere else and the method of examination is not free from suspicion?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: Government are not prepared to make inquiries. Surely, Sir, it is a reasonable thing to try a plan as an experimental measure in one Division without immediately extending it to all Divisions?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is not the Honourable Member aware of the fact that they have been making the experiments for the last six years and that the time has come when they should put a stop to those experiments?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I am unable to see the relevancy of my Honourable friend's question.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I am also unable to see the relevancy of the Honourable Member's interference?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Will the Honourable Member in charge kindly inform the House when he intends to cease experimenting and start working?

(No answer was given.)

RE-EXAMINATION OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS.

†850. ***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is true that in some Divisions of East Indian Railway the Travelling Ticket Examiners are ordered to appear at a departmental examination of checking duties?

(b) Is it also true that amongst them are included the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors who have already passed the same and have got long service and are now working on much reduced pay?

(c) If the reply to part (b) above be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state what is the reason for compelling the qualified and experienced hands to re-appear at the said examination?

LOSS OF EXCESS FARE RECEIPT BOOK.

851. *Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if the loss of an excess fare receipt book is considered a very serious offence?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state how many Travelling Ticket Inspectors worked in 1926 and how many such books were lost by them during the period?

(c) How many of the staff were employed on the whole of the East Indian Railway in 1929 who handled excess fare receipt books, *i.e.*, Travelling Ticket Inspectors, Crew Inspectors and Crew in charges, and how many books were lost during that period?

(d) Is it a fact that increase in the staff handling these books has increased the loss as well?

(e) Is it a fact that in the Crew system a circular was issued that loss of an excess fare receipt book would result in the termination of the service of the employee concerned and several from amongst the staff suffered this penalty?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) The loss of an excess fare receipt book is a serious matter.

(b) to (c). Government have no information.

REFUNDS IN RESPECT OF EXCESS FARES RECOVERED.

852. *Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin: (a) Will Government be pleased to state which officer on the East Indian Railway grants refunds in respect of excess fare recovered by staff, *i.e.*, whether it is the Chief Accounts Officer or the Chief Commercial Manager (Claims)—and to whom this application for refund should be made?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the percentage of amount refunded to the public in respect of the excess fare recovered by the Travelling Ticket Inspectors and Ticket Collectors between 1st January, 1926, to 30th June, 1926, and the same in respect of Travelling Ticket Examiners and Ticket Collectors between 1st June, 1931 and 31st December, 1931 (both separate)?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) The Chief Commercial Manager.

(b) These statistics are not compiled by the Railway Board and the information required is therefore not available.

TICKET CHECKING ON BRANCH LINES OF ASANSOL AND DINAPORE DIVISIONS.

853. *Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin: (a) Will Government be pleased to state why the Crew system did not operate on the branch lines of Asansol and Dinapore Divisions when the said system worked on these Divisions?

(b) Is it a fact that the said branch lines were worked by Travelling Ticket Inspectors who were brought from a non-Crew area?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) The Crew system was not introduced on certain parts of the Asansol and Dinapore Divisions as the Railway Administration considered that alternative arrangements were better suited for these parts.

(b) Government have no information.

TICKET CHECKING ON MAIN AND BRANCH LINES.

854. *Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that during the operation of the Travelling Ticket Inspector system, main and branch lines were worked by the Travelling Ticket Inspectors as per programme which was given to them by the Divisional Inspector?

(b) Is it true that there being about 125 Travelling Ticket Inspectors only for the whole of the East Indian Railway, every train was not manned with staff throughout its run as is done now due to the strength of Travelling Ticket Examiners being raised to 650?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) Under any system of check by Travelling Ticket Inspectors, the latter work generally to a programme drawn up by their superiors. Government are not aware what the actual procedure was on each of the Divisions on which Travelling Ticket Inspectors were employed.

(b) This is substantially correct.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: As the Honourable Member has replied that Government have no information on the matter and Government are not aware of the facts, will he kindly inform this House whether he is prepared to obtain the information and become aware of these facts?

Mr. P. B. Rau: The subjects dealt with in this question are matters of minor detail and Government do not propose to interfere with the discretion of the Agents in the matter.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Is it or is it not a fact that it is mainly these minor details that lead to unrest amongst railway employees? If the answer be in the affirmative, is it not the duty of the Honourable Member to inquire into these minor details, however minor they may be?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: Government do not consider that it is their duty to obtain information as regards these particular points to which the Honourable Member has referred.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Will the Government kindly inform this House what exactly is their duty in regard to the administration of the Railways?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: If the Honourable Member will travel like an ordinary passenger, then he will find out the unrest that is caused. Members of Government travel in saloons and they know nothing as to what is happening.

EXPULSION OF CERTAIN CITIZENS FROM MHOW CANTONMENT.

855. ***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state since how long Th. Amarsingh Laxmansingh and Mr. Bhagwan Dass Aggarwal have been under orders of expulsion from Mhow Cantonment?

(b) Are Government aware that Th. Amarsingh Laxmansingh is a man of 80 years and during his long exile from Mhow Cantonment, which is his home, he has suffered several losses by death in his family at Mhow owing to his inability to arrange medical attendance by reason of the order of expulsion?

(c) Is it a fact that Th. Amarsingh Laxmansingh has since his expulsion lived in Indore and has forwarded a certificate from the Chief Secretary to the Prime Minister, Indore, testifying to his being a law-abiding citizen taking part in social service movements?

(d) Was a copy of the certificate submitted to the Government of India by the All-India Cantonments Association?

Mr. G. M. Young: (a) Since 1922 and 1923, respectively.

(b) Government are not aware of this person's exact age and have no information in support of what is stated in the remainder of this part of the question.

(c) and (d). Government have received from the All-India Cantonments Association a copy of a certificate purporting to have been granted by the official mentioned, to the effect that this person's activities have been in no way objectionable. Government are however in possession of detailed information to the contrary effect.

Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal: Will the Honourable gentleman consider the desirability of cancelling these orders? They must have served their useful purpose long ago?

Mr. G. M. Young: Government have considered the matter and have come to the conclusion that these orders should not be cancelled.

Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal: Are they prepared to place the material against these people before any court of inquiry?

Mr. G. M. Young: No, Sir.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Are they prepared to place the material on the table of this House?

Mr. G. M. Young: No, Sir.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Why not?

Mr. G. M. Young: The Honourable Member might wait till the next question is put and replied to, to find the reason why Government are not prepared to lay the material on the table of the House.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Is it or is it not a fact that one of these gentlemen is related to the questioner on the other side?

Mr. President: Order, order.

Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal: Is the Honourable Member's insinuation based on any facts that he is in possession of?

Sir Hari Singh Gour: Sir, I very strongly disapprove the conduct of Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney in insinuating personal motives to any of the questioners.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): **The House** must have noticed that the Chair called the Member to order. (Applause.)

EXPULSION OF CERTAIN CITIZENS FROM MHOW CANTONMENT.

856. ***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Will Government specify the activities of Thakur Amarsingh and Mr. Bhagwan Dass since their expulsions that made their re-admission to Mhow Cantonment undesirable?

(b) Is it a fact that the All-India Cantonments Association forwarded with their letter No. 1924/A./B., dated 22nd April, 1931, a written undertaking from Mr. Bhagwan Dass that in case of the expulsion order being cancelled, he would do nothing that will bring him within the purview of Section 239 of the Cantonments Act dealing with expulsions?

(c) Are Government aware that there is a great agitation in cantonments against these two cases of long banishment from Mhow Cantonment?

(d) Are Government aware that the All-India Cantonments Conference, held at Lahore in October, 1931, passed a unanimous resolution urging Government to cancel these orders of expulsion and a copy of the same was forwarded by the All-India Cantonments Association to Government for consideration?

(e) Do Government propose to rescind the orders in these two cases?

Mr. G. M. Young: (a) Government are not prepared to disclose the information in their possession.

(b) The representation from Lala Bhagwan Dass Aggarwal forwarded with the Association's letter referred to contained no such undertaking.

(c) Government have no information to this effect.

(d) Yes.

(e) No, Sir.

SUPPLY OF ICE AND MINERAL WATER ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

857. ***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Are Government aware that ice and mineral water are sold on the East Indian Railway line at higher rates than those obtaining on the North Western Railway line?

(b) If the reply to the above be in the affirmative, will Government state the reasons for this difference in rates?

(c) Are Government aware that the high rates on the East Indian Railway have caused discontent among the passengers in these days of economic depression?

(d) Is it a fact that when tenders were recently called for the ice and mineral water contract on the East Indian Railway, the contract was not given to the tenderer of lowest rates?

(e) Will Government explain the reasons for the disregard of the lowest tender in this case and do they propose to take steps to reduce the price of ice and mineral water on the East Indian Railway to the level of the rates obtaining on the North Western Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) and (b). Government have no information beyond that appearing in the published time tables of the two railways referred to, which confirm the statement made in part (a) of the Honourable Member's question.

(c) No.

(d) and (e). Government have no information, but I am asking the Agent, East Indian Railway, for a report and will consider whether any action can suitably be taken.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: On a point of order, Sir. When questions are put in the form, "Have the Government any information", this is only a formal way of asking a question.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Honourable Member is making a statement.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I am raising a point of order, Sir. When we put questions in the form I have mentioned, we expect that the information will be supplied. We do not expect the reply that the Government have no information. We expect that the Government should give a definite reply containing the information asked for.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): If an Honourable Member asks a question as to whether Government are aware of a certain thing, they are entitled to say that they are not aware of it.

Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin: Are the Government prepared to make an inquiry and lay the result on the table of the House?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is it your ruling, Sir, that if we ask a question whether the Government have got information and they say that they are not aware of it, it is the end of the reply?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Honourable Member has. I think, sufficient experience of the Legislature to know that when you ask a question and an answer is given either in the affirmative or in the negative, it satisfies that question. The Honourable Member is not debarred either to put supplementary questions and get further information or to put further questions giving Government due notice. But when the Honourable Member asks a question whether Government are aware of certain things, it is perfectly open to Government to say, no, they have no knowledge about them.

Mr. P. R. Rau: May I answer, Sir, to the supplementary question put by Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin? I have already told the House that

I am asking the Agent, East Indian Railway, for a report and will then consider whether any action can suitably be taken. I am quite prepared to lay a statement of the action taken on the table in due course.

EXTENSION OF THE HOUSE-SCAVENGING TAX IN AMBALA CANTONMENT.

858. ***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Are Government aware that the Ambala Cantonment Board has, by a majority of votes, decided to increase the House-Scavenging Tax in Ambala Cantonment by imposing it on shops, offices, godowns that were hitherto exempt from that tax?

(b) Is it a fact that the Northern Command has issued a Circular to the Cantonments under its jurisdiction, on 17th December, 1931, not to submit any proposal of additional taxation and informing them that there was no prospect of getting any grant from Government?

(c) Is it a fact that the suggestion to increase the House-Scavenging Tax was based on the assurance that Government would give a substantial grant towards the water scheme of the Cantonment Board, Ambala?

(d) Does that assurance still hold good? If not, do Government propose to direct the Northern Command to make it clear to the Cantonment Board, Ambala, that their proposal to increase the House-Scavenging Tax did not entail any obligation on the part of Government to give a grant to the Ambala Cantonment Board?

(e) Are Government prepared also to give the Ambala Cantonment Board an opportunity to re-consider its proposal for enhancement in House-scavenging Tax in the light of Government's inability to pay any grant?

Mr. G. M. Young: (a) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given on the 15th February 1932 to Sirdar Sohan Singh's starred question No. 357 on the same subject.

(b) Government have seen a copy of the circular referred to.

(c) Government gave no such assurance.

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

APPEALS IN CANTONMENTS.

859. ***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Is it a fact that appeals submitted under Schedule V of the Cantonments Act can be heard and disposed of only by the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief a Command?

(b) Are Government aware that the Inspecting Officer, Military Lands and Cantonments, Northern Command, is himself disposing of appeals submitted under the above schedule and the Cantonment Authorities in the jurisdiction of Northern Command have been accepting his decisions on those appeals?

(c) Is it a fact that in the Ambala Cantonment Board, minutes of dissents have been filed pointing out that the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief being the appellate authority in case of such appeals, has no power to delegate or transfer that power to any of his subordinates and consequently the decisions on such appeals given by the Inspecting Officer are illegal?

(d) Is it a fact that the Inspecting Officer also sanctioned the Budget of the Ambala Cantonment Board for 1932-33 and also grants in addition

to the Budget? Is it a fact that such sanctions can under rules be given only by the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief?

(e) Are Government aware that there is growing dissatisfaction among the people as to the justness of the decisions given on such appeals by the Inspecting Officer?

(f) Do Government propose to take action to put an end to this practice and to instruct the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, Northern Command, to hear and dispose of such appeals and perform other statutory functions himself?

Mr. G. M. Young: (a) The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the third column of the schedule, which specifies the appellate authority for each class of appeal.

(b) to (f). I have called for a report and a reply will be laid on the table.

THE LUCKNOW-LALMONIRHAT TRAIN SERVICE.

860. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that the Eastern Bengal Railway have discontinued the running of the Lucknow-Lalmonirhat through train service from 1st March, 1932? If so, why?

(b) Are Government aware that it was a very popular train, and that its discontinuance has resulted in great inconvenience to the travelling public?

(c) Are Government aware that the Bengal and North Western Railway Administration are willing to continue the running of that train over their section of the line; and do Government propose to take steps to continue the service?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) The running of through services is arranged by Railway Administrations without reference to Government, who have, therefore, no information beyond that appearing in the published time tables. These show that the Lucknow-Lalmonirhat service is now a Lucknow-Katihar service.

(b) and (c). No. I am, however, bringing the Honourable Member's question and my answer to it to the notice of the Agent, Eastern Bengal Railway, for such action as he may consider necessary.

DISCONTINUANCE OF A THROUGH CARRIAGE ON AN EAST INDIAN RAILWAY EXPRESS.

861. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Are Government aware that the East Indian Railway have discontinued the running of the through bogie First and Second class carriage from Howrah by the 71 Up Express to Moghal Sarai, and thereafter by the 15 Up Express to Delhi, and this has resulted in great inconvenience to the travelling public concerned?

(b) Are Government aware that there is now no fast train from Patna on the main line for upcountry in the evening, and do Government propose to have the through carriage restored?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) The reply to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, Government are aware that passengers who previously made use of the through service carriage are

now likely to be inconvenienced, but they have been informed by the Agent, East Indian Railway, that when the through service carriage was running, the number of passengers travelling in it was not sufficient to justify the service being continued.

(b) The trains referred to in part (a) of the question continue to run, thereby giving an evening service from Patna on the main line for up-country stations, but involving transshipment at Moghal Sarai. Arrangements for the running of through service carriages are matters which must be left to the Railway Administration to deal with; any serious inconvenience experienced will no doubt be brought up for discussion at meetings of the Railway Advisory Committee.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Will the Honourable Member please state to what extent the loss was sustained in regard to the running of the through service and how much they have gained by abandoning the through service?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I want notice of the question.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Will the Honourable Member please state whether he will write to the Agent of the Railway to place this information before the Railway Board so that they may lay it on the table of the House?

Mr. P. R. Rau: If the Honourable Member will please give me notice of the question, I will consider it.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Will the Government hereby take notice of this question because the House is entitled to have information on that matter.

(No answer.)

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: As the Honourable Member has not answered my question and as he has treated my question with silence I propose to move an adjournment of the House tomorrow.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

DISCHARGE OF COMPOSITORS AND BINDERS FROM THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS.

191. Mr. S. C. Mitra: (a) Is it not a fact that the work in the East Indian Railway Press, both Calcutta and Howrah, was uniformly normal throughout 1930 and up to March, 1931?

(b) Is it a fact that, in reply to the unstarred question No. 153, dated 2nd February, 1931, Sir Alan Parsons stated that instructions were issued by the Railway Board to the Agent, East Indian Railway that on the acceptance of the recommendations of the Special Officer, he should bring surplus posts under reduction?

(c) Is it not a fact that Mr. Mackenzie, Officiating Superintendent, East Indian Railway Press, Calcutta, admitted before the Enquiry Committee under the new Trades Disputes Act at Calcutta, that the recommendations of Mr. A. F. Slater were accepted in reorganising the printing office?

(d) Is it not a fact that each department in the East Indian Railway Press is inter-connected with other departments?

(e) Is it not a fact that the recommendation of Mr. Slater was that the number of binders to be retained was to be 175 and the number of compositors was to be 79?

(f) Is it not a fact that 16 compositors and 26 binders were discharged from the East Indian Railway Press in March, 1931?

(g) Is it not a fact that there was no reduction in the supervising staff of the East Indian Railway Press?

(h) If the answers to parts (a) to (g) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for specially selecting these 16 compositors and 26 binders for dismissal?

Mr. P. R. Rau: With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to questions Nos. 191 to 194 together. I have called for certain information and shall lay a reply on the table, in due course.

APPEAL AGAINST DISCHARGE BY BINDERS IN THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS.

†192. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it not a fact that the Superintendent of the East Indian Railway Press, Calcutta, is immediately under the control of the Agent, East Indian Railway?

(b) Is it not a fact that an appeal against any decision of the said Superintendent lies with the Agent, East Indian Railway?

(c) Is it not a fact that the five persons of the Binding Section of the East Indian Railway Press, Calcutta, who were discharged by the Superintendent on the 31st March, 1931, appealed to the Agent through the Superintendent against their discharge?

(d) Is it not a fact that the said petition was not forwarded by the Superintendent on the plea that no appeal lay from such discharge?

(e) Is it not a fact that subsequently Mr. Mackenzie the Officiating Superintendent of the East Indian Railway Press, Calcutta, admitted before the Enquiry Committee under the Trades Disputes Act, that an appeal against the decision of arbitrary discharge lies with the Agent?

(f) If the answers to parts (a) to (e) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state what action has been taken or is intended to be taken against the Superintendent for not forwarding the appeal against his decision of discharge to the Agent?

CUT IN PAY OF BINDERS, COMPOSITORS, ETC., IN THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS.

†193. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that deduction is being made both from the pay of the ministerial as well as industrial employees of the East Indian Railway Press, Calcutta and Howrah?

(b) Is it not a fact that the industrial employees such as compositors, distributors, binders, etc., of the East Indian Railway Press, Calcutta and Howrah, are not allowed the privileges of closed holidays, bank holidays, and special early holidays like Armistice Day, like the employees of the ministerial staff in the same press?

†For answer to this question, see answer to unstarred question No. 191.

(c) Is it not a fact that the industrial employees like the composers of the East Indian Railway Press, Calcutta, are allowed only 13 days' leave in a year under Annexure (ii) whereas the ministerial staff enjoy more holidays under Annexure (i)?

(d) Is it not a fact that the earnings of the employees like composers, binders, etc., have come down considerably owing to the stoppage of the overtime system in the said Press?

(e) Is it not a fact that under the new revision of the scale of pay, as has been introduced from the 1st of November, 1930, the earnings of the industrial staff like the binders, composers, etc., in the East Indian Railway Press, Calcutta and Howrah have decreased as is evinced from the fact that the binders who used to get Rs. 42 per month before November, 1930, now get Rs. 36 and even that after 2 years?

(f) Is it not a fact that the industrial employees like the Composers, Binders, etc., submitted a memorial to the Honourable Member so far back as 12th January, 1931, stating that no consideration has been paid, at the time of fixing the initial wages, to the fact that the actual earnings were higher during the preceding twelve months and even in the past few years than the monthly wages now introduced?

(g) Is it not a fact that in the memorial, dated the 12th January, 1931, the memorialists submitted that they are to work compulsorily for about 47 hours more than what they did before the 1st of November, 1930?

(h) If the answers to parts (a) to (g) be in the affirmative, will Government state the reasons for introducing a cut in the pay of the industrial employees like Binders, Composers, etc., of the East Indian Railway Press, Calcutta and Howrah?

DEDUCTIONS FROM PAY OF INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYEES OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS.

†194. **Mr. S. O. Mitra:** (a) Is it not a fact that the deduction in the pay of the industrial hands in the Kanchrapara Workshops, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway and in the South Indian Railway has been stopped on the ground of their earnings being decreased considerably?

(b) If the answer be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether they contemplate to stop deduction in pay of the industrial employees of the East Indian Railway Press, Calcutta and Howrah, on the same ground? If not, why not?

STRENGTH OF SUPERVISING AND OPERATING STAFF IN THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS, CALCUTTA AND HOWRAH.

195. **Mr. S. O. Mitra:** (a) Is it not a fact that, in reply to the unstarred question No. 112, dated the 28th September, 1931 (regarding strength of supervising and operating staff in the East Indian Railway Press, Calcutta and Howrah), Sir Alan Parsons stated that certain information had been called for from the Agent, East Indian Railway?

(b) Is it not a fact that in reply to part (a) of the unstarred question No. 113, dated the 24th September, 1931, Sir Alan Parsons stated that information had been called for from the Agent, East Indian Railway?

†For answer to this question, see answer to unstarred question No. 191.

(c) If the answers to parts (a) and (b) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to furnish the House with this information?

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

(c) The information was supplied to the Honourable Member in the Railway Board's letter No. 579-E. G., dated the 15th January, 1932, a copy of which is laid on the table.

LETTER FROM J. C. HIGGET, ESQ., DIRECTOR, RAILWAY BOARD, TO S. C. MITRA, ESQ., MEMBER, LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, NO. 579-E. G., DATED NEW DELHI, THE 15TH JANUARY, 1932.

With reference to the replies given to your Question No. 112 and part (a) of question No. 113 in the Legislative Assembly on the 28th September, 1931, I am directed to communicate the following information:—

Question No. 112—

(a) See reply to part (g).

(b) No.

(c) No.

(d) No.

(e) The post now designated ' Office Superintendent ' was in 1926 designated ' Head Clerk '.

A Press Mechanic was appointed to maintain the modern plant in working order to undertake petty repairs which were formally undertaken by the Signal Workshops.

The Workshop Accountant is not an employee of the East Indian Railway Press.

Two compositors were for a time employed for checking compositor's worksheets. It has been found unnecessary to continue this.

(f) To provide the supervision requisite for more efficient and more economical working.

(g) Statement is attached.

Question No. 113—

(a) Reply is in the negative.

EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS.

Statement showing the strength of staff of certain categories as it stood on 31st March, 1926 and on 31st March, 1931.

	1926.	1931.
(a) Operative Staff:—		
Compositors	101	88
Distributors	22	22
Proof pullers	14	13
Machinemen	28	29
Inkmen Machine	42	36
Pressmen	11	5
Binders	185	165
Total	403	358

	1926.	1931.
(b) Subordinate Technical Supervising Staff :—		
Overseer	1	2
Foremen	4	4
Section-holders	2	4
Clerk in Charge Machine	2	..
Assistant Foreman	2
Jemadars	6	4
Press Machine	1
Litho Draftsman	1
Type Store Keeper	1	1
Stereo Plate Keeper	1	1
Total	17	20
(c) Superior Supervising Staff :—		
Printing Superintendent	1	1
Assistant Printing Superintendent	1	1

GOVERNMENT PRINTING WORK PLACED WITH PRIVATE PRESSES.

196. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that in reply to the unstarred question No. 103 of the 28th September, 1931 (regarding Government Printing Work placed with Private Presses) Mr. J. A. Shillidy stated that enquiries were being made?

(b) If the answer be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether the enquiries have been finished by this time? If so, what is the result of such enquiries?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I propose to deal with questions Nos. 196 and 197 together. The enquiries promised by Mr. Shillidy were duly completed and their result was communicated to the Honourable Member in the demi-official letters from the Department of Industries and Labour, No. A-332, dated the 3rd and 6th October, 1931, copies of which were also placed in the Library of the Legislative Assembly.

PAYMENTS MADE TO PRIVATE PRESSES FOR GOVERNMENT PRINTING WORK.

†197. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Is it a fact that in reply to the unstarred question No. 104, dated 28th September, 1931 (regarding payments made to private presses for Government printing work) Mr. J. A. Shillidy stated that information was being collected? If so, will the Honourable Member be pleased to state the result of such enquiries?

DEDUCTION FROM PAY OF PIECE-RATED EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, CALCUTTA.

198. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it not a fact that 10 per cent. deduction is being made both from the pay of the salaried staff and from the earnings of the piece-rated employees of the Government of India Press, Calcutta?

(b) Is it not a fact that the daily or piece-rated employees of the Government of India Press, Calcutta, are paid on the principle of "no work, no pay" and "pay according to the outturn"?

†For answer to this question, see answer to unstarred question No. 196.

(c) Is it not a fact that the piece-rated employees of the Government of India Press, Calcutta, are not allowed the privileges of holidays on the bank-closing days, Sundays, etc., like the salaried staff?

(d) Is it not a fact that the salaried employees of the Government of India Press, Calcutta, are made permanent under a regular systematic rule, whereas there is no rule for making the temporary piece-rated employees permanent?

(e) Is it a fact that whenever any reduction has been made in the establishment of the Government of India Press, Calcutta, the axe fell heavily on the piece-rated employees?

(f) Do the wages of the daily or piece-rated employees come under the definition of pay as given in the Fundamental Rules 9(21)(a)?

(g) If the answers to parts (a), (b) and (c) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for introducing a cut in the earnings of the piece-rated employees on the same basis as in the pay of the salaried staff?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) Yes.

(b) There are no daily paid employees in the Government of India Press, Calcutta. The piece-workers in that press are ordinarily paid on the basis of their outturn but the principles mentioned are not strictly applied as the men are given leave with pay.

(c) Piece-rated employees of the Government of India Press, Calcutta, like the salaried staff are allowed Sundays and gazetted holidays according to the list published annually in the Calcutta Gazette.

(d) The transfer to the permanent establishment is governed by definite rules both in the case of salaried hands and piece-workers in the Calcutta Press.

(e) As piece-workers constitute the majority of the establishment in the press, any large reduction probably has effected them seriously; but no such reduction has recently been made.

(f) Not, unless specially classed as 'pay' by the Governor General in Council.

(g) The question whether the piece-workers in the Government of India presses should be subjected to the emergency pay cut of ten per cent. is being considered by Government.

DEDUCTION FROM PAY OF PIECE-RATED EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, CALCUTTA.

199. Mr. S. C. Mitra: (a) Is it not a fact that the earnings of the piece-rated employees of the Government of India Press, Calcutta, have been adversely affected owing to the stoppage of payment for the tiffin period?

(b) Is it not a fact that the earnings of the piece-rated employees of the Government of India Press, Calcutta, have further been decreased in

comparison with their previous earning to a considerable extent on account of the abolition of the overtime system?

(c) Is it not a fact that the deduction in the earnings of the industrial workers of the Kanchrapara Workshop, Bengal, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway and the South Indian Railway, has been stopped on the ground of their earnings being decreased considerably?

(d) If the answers to parts (a) to (c) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether they contemplate to stop deduction in the earnings of the piece-rated employees of the Government of India Press Calcutta? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) The stoppage of payment for meal intervals involved a deduction in the earnings. But it was introduced at a time when Government were granting concessions to the piece-workers in other directions which in the aggregate were estimated to involve the disbursement of much larger sums than had formerly been paid for the intervals. Subsequently petitions were received in which piece-workers asserted that the changes made, taken together, had operated to their disadvantage, and, after examination of the case, further concessions were given by Government in 1930.

(b) I am not clear as to what the Honourable Member means by the "abolition of the overtime system". If he will specify precisely the orders to which it refers I shall have enquiries made.

(c) I assume the Honourable Member is referring to the temporary cut in pay. In applying this cut special consideration has been shown to employees in Railway Workshops whose normal gross earnings have been reduced on account of the imposition of short time working. In their case the aggregate of the deduction on account of the temporary cut in pay and for short time working is not allowed to exceed their normal wages for 23 hours and no deduction on account of the cut in pay is made if the deduction for short time working is equal to or exceeds the normal wages for 23 hours.

(d) Does not arise.

EXAMINATION OF APPRENTICES IN THE RIFLE FACTORY AT ISHAPORE.

200. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Will Government please place on the table a copy of the communication from the Director of Ordnance Factories and Manufacture, No. 20239 (M. G. 1), dated the 22nd January, 1932, regarding arrangements for examinations of all apprentices—student and trade—in the Rifle Factory at Ishapore?

Mr. G. M. Young: A copy of the letter and enclosure is reproduced below.

Letter No. 20239 (M. G. 1), dated the 22nd January, 1932, from the Staff Captain to the Director of Ordnance Factories and Manufacture, to the Secretary, Public Service Commission.

I have the honour to forward for the information of Sir Ross Barker a copy of the syllabus for Ordnance Factories apprentices, with reference to Army Department Notification No. 560, dated the 19th September, 1931.

Rules and Regulations for the recruitment of apprentices for training in Ordnance Factories.

The candidates must possess an elementary knowledge of Dynamics, Statics, Mathematics up to Quadratic Equations, Elementary Trigonometry and Physics.

The education standard which will satisfy Ordnance Factories when the candidates are examined by the Public Service Commission, is detailed below :—

Mathematics—

Algebra for Beginners, by Todhunter and Loney, 1920 Edition, up to Chapter 22 together with Chapter 24.

Trigonometry—

Plane Trigonometry, Part I, by Loney, 1920 Edition, up to and including paragraph 60, Chapter 4.

*Physics by Rajanikanta De—*1925 Edition.

(a) Part I.—General Physics, complete book.

(b) Part II.—Sound, Chapters 1 and 2.

c) Part III.—Heat, whole book.

(d) Part IV.—Light, Chapters 1, 2, 4 and 6.

(e) Parts V and VI.—Magnetism and Electricity up to and including Chapter 12.

NOTE.—It is considered that sufficient elementary Dynamics and Statics is contained in Part I—General Physics above.

PETITION FROM APPRENTICES IN THE RIFLE FACTORY AT ISHAPORE.

201. **Mr. S. O. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that Mr. A. W. Connolly, the Officiating Superintendent of the Rifle Factory at Ishapore, had made an announcement to the apprentices of that Factory on the 26th February, 1932, that the theoretical and laboratory classes for the apprentices in that Factory would be shut down with effect from the 1st April, 1932?

(b) Is it a fact that the apprentices of the Rifle Factory at Ishapore have made a joint petition to the officiating Superintendent of that Factory on the 3rd March, 1932, in which they have stated how cloudy are their future prospects and how valueless their certificates. will be under the new scheme? If so, will Government be pleased to state what action they propose to take on their petition?

(c) Do Government propose to redress the grievances of the apprentices? If not, why not?

Mr. G. M. Young: Inquiries are being made and a reply will be laid on the table in due course.

STATEMENT LAID ON THE TABLE.

REPORT ON THE HOWARD-NIXON MEMORANDUM REGARDING FINANCIAL QUESTIONS ARISING OUT OF THE SEPARATION OF BURMA FROM INDIA.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster (Finance Member): Sir, I beg to lay on the table the Report by the Standing Finance Committee on the Howard-Nixon Memorandum regarding financial questions arising out of the proposed separation of Burma from India.

Report by the Standing Finance Committee on the Howard-Nixon Memorandum regarding financial questions arising out of the proposed separation of Burma from India.

The Burma Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference, 1930 recommended that the financial consequences of a separation of Burma from India should be thoroughly explored by experts of the two Governments, and that the statements prepared by these experts should be laid before the Standing Finance Committees of the Indian Legislative Assembly and the Burma Legislative Council respectively. A Memorandum on the subject was prepared by Sir Henry Howard, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., on behalf of Burma, and Mr. J. C. Nixon, I.C.S., on behalf of India.

2. In the first place, the Committee recorded that its consent to take the Memorandum into consideration implied no expression of any views on the merits of the question of separation as such. It merely discussed the financial consequences which would ensue if Burma were separated from India.

3. The Committee has felt some difficulty in performing the task allotted to it owing to the highly technical nature of many of the issues which are involved. For this reason and also because it has had no opportunity of hearing arguments on the other side it has been reluctant to express final views. Moreover it strongly supports the view expressed by the Government of India in their despatch on Constitutional Reforms of September 20, 1929, that the main issues should be submitted to an Arbitral Tribunal.

The Committee wishes its expressions in this report to be interpreted in the light of the foregoing observations. Such expressions must be regarded essentially as advice to the Government of India as to the manner in which the case should be argued from the Indian side, and not necessarily as indicating that this Committee would not consider acceptable any other solutions than those which it has indicated.

4. **Currency** (paragraphs 6—17).—The Committee was generally of opinion that it would be to the mutual advantage of both countries for Burma to retain the same currency as India. Certain members considered that until Burma had discharged all its debt to India, India should have the right to insist on Burma's not changing its currency system. The Committee preferred not to express an opinion on the three alternative methods suggested in paragraph 9 for the management of Indian Currency in Burma, as it anticipated that a Central Bank would have been established before the issue arose. Certain members thought however that if a choice had to be made, then the agency of the Imperial Bank of India would be the best. The Committee preferred not to express a final opinion as to whether Burma (*vide* paragraph 8) should or should not be left responsible for its own sterling remittance arrangements, the essential point being that India should be safeguarded against its own financial or currency position being weakened by the conduct of finance in Burma.

The Committee agreed that if Burma retained the use of Indian currency, it should be permitted to participate in an Indian State or Central Bank when instituted. The Committee considered that the conditions proposed in paragraph 10 in case Burma continued to remain within the

Indian currency system were suitable and sufficient from India's point of view. As the Committee had not contemplated Burma's introducing its own currency, it expressed no opinion in regard to the circumstances (given in paragraphs 12—17) which should accompany any such contingency. It held however that Burma would have to give India adequate notice of any such intention, the period of notice to depend on the circumstances at the time.

5. **Public Debt** (paragraphs 18—49).—The Committee was of opinion that, assuming present conditions to continue, rupee and sterling obligations and values should be converted at the rate of 1s. 6d. to the rupee. It considered that the Government of India should reserve the right to require Burma to discharge a proper part of its liabilities to India in sterling in London.

6. The Committee agreed (*vide* paragraph 27) that "allocated" debt liabilities, *i.e.*, liabilities referable to particular assets, should be apportioned between India and Burma according to the location of the corresponding assets. It rejected unconditionally Sir Henry Howard's contention (contained in Annexure E) that the liability exhibited in the public accounts as allocated to Railways should be increased by about Rs. 39 crores representing the amount of specific "railway debt" already redeemed. The Committee also accepted the view (paragraph 28) that Burma should become directly responsible for certain debt liabilities referable geographically to Burma.

7. In regard to the "unallocated" debt, amounting on 31st March, 1930 to Rs. 226 crores, the Committee agreed that India should assume liability for the sum shown in the public accounts as due to the construction of New Delhi (Annexure G and para. 33). It observed however that India would be theoretically justified in demanding that an adjustment should be made at valuation instead of on cost figures. For the somewhat similar item involved in the Bombay Military Lands Scheme the Committee held that India should press for an adjustment at valuation and not at cost. The attitude of the Government of India in regard to both these items should however be dependent on satisfactory solutions being come to in regard to other parts of the settlement.

8. The Committee* was not in a position to arrive at any definite conclusion on the question whether it is possible (*vide* paragraph 30) to make a historic analysis of the elements composing the public debt in order to calculate Burma's liability to India in the matter of so-called "unproductive" debt. If it were proved that such an analysis (which many members would otherwise favour) is impossible, the Committee agreed that a composition on the lines set out in the Memorandum appeared to be the only possible course. A settlement on this question, as indeed on a number of other important questions, should be dependent on the settlement as a whole being on satisfactory lines.

9. On the assumption expressed in the last paragraph, the Committee approved of the plan proposed in the Memorandum for dividing the remaining "unallocated" debt (paragraphs 35—38). For the purpose of calculating the ratio it held that figures for Thatthameda and Capitation Tax should not be excluded (Annexure I). The Committee considered however that India could press for the elimination of figures for opium

*Mr. B. Sitaramaraju wanted it recorded that he thought that a historical analysis was possible.

receipts, but in that case it agreed that there was force in Sir Henry Howard's claim to have Excise receipts in Burma adjusted. As the margin shown in para. 7, Annexure I of the Memorandum between these relative contentions was small the Committee thought that the Government of India should be prepared to accept a compromise on the point.

10. The Committee accepted the suggested manner of calculating the rate of interest payable by Burma on its debt to India (paragraphs 42—44 and Annexures K and L). It held emphatically that Burma's debt charges to the Government of India should in the Act of Separation be made a statutory first charge on the revenues of Burma. It was not prepared to recommend the suggested repayment of principal at the rate of one crore a year as adequate. As a general principle it considered that the figure should be fixed in relation to the benefit which the revenues of Burma would receive on separation, having regard to the rates of taxation prevailing at the time.

11. **Pensions.**—The Committee remarked that it would be convenient to both Governments if the liability for old Family Pension Funds (Annexure J) could be capitalised, and advised the Government of India to pursue the matter and attempt to find a sufficiently accurate basis for the purpose. It held the same view in regard to the other pensionary liabilities which, according to the proposals, would have to be shared, and recommended that the Government of India should explore the practicability of a reasonably accurate manner of capitalising these also.

12. The Committee strongly supported the view expressed by Mr. Nixon in paragraph 70 of the Memorandum in regard to Burma's full liability for "live" pensions.

13. The Committee supported also the corresponding claim on Burma (paragraph 78) in the matter of "part-earned" pensions. It considered the suggestion of Mr. Nixon in paragraphs 78—81 of the Memorandum that this claim of India on Burma should be set off against Burma's claim on India for a share of the general immovable property of the Government of India situated outside Burma. The Committee considered that the case on behalf of India should be argued on the following lines. All transactions financed in the past from revenue resources or such like and carrying no present liabilities should be regarded as finally closed. The Government of India in the past has been responsible for weighing the various claims arising against the joint revenues of India and Burma and for applying these fairly and in the interests of India and Burma as a whole. In this view, Burma would have no claim on India for a share in these assets. If this is so, then the claim of India on Burma for part-earned pensions amounting to something like Rs. 4½ crores to Rs. 5½ crores would have no specific counterclaim to balance it and should be taken into account in the general settlement.

14. **Leave credits** (paragraph 84).—The Committee considered that India should formulate a specific claim against Burma for unexpended leave credits carried over by the joint staff at the time of separation.

15. **Military charges** (paragraphs 117—120).—It is of course accepted that Burma must bear the cost of any military garrison to be maintained in Burma and that this garrison must be maintained at sufficient strength to provide for all the normal requirements of Burma. The Committee, particularly having regard to the uncertainty as to the future constitutional position in the matter of the defence of India, did not feel able to

make any final recommendation on the wider issue as to whether beyond this Burma ought to contribute to the general cost of the Army to be maintained in India, but it recognised that there might be grounds on which such a contribution might be demanded.

16. **Tariffs** (paragraph 124).—The Committee was of opinion that the two countries would find it to their mutual advantage to preserve free trade between each other in all indigenous articles and products, subject to the observation that it is understood that India would in the future replace by import duties the existing excise duties on such part of Burma's production of articles at present excisable, such as oils and silver, as may be consumed in India.

17. **Other matters**.—Consistent with their other views, the Committee considered that the general fraction determining the division of "unproductive" debt and pensionary liabilities should govern the apportionment of reparation receipts (paragraph 116) and of the payment on account of the British Navy (paragraph 121).

GEORGE SCHUSTER.

G. MORGAN.

B. SITARAMARAJU.

HARBILAS SARDA.*

R. S. SARMA.

ARTHUR MOORE.

ABDUL QAIYUM.

S. C. MUKHERJEE.

ZIAUDDIN AHMAD.

MUHAMMAD MUAZZAM.

S. R. PANDIT.

JAGAN NATH AGGARWAL.*

HARBANS SINGH.

GAYA PRASAD SINGH.*

S. G. JOG.

NEW DELHI;

The 3rd March, 1932.

* Subject to a separate note.

Note.

As to paragraph 8, we are not at all satisfied with the way in which the question of the allocation of the so-called "Unproductive" debt between India and Burma has been settled. It is based on the assumption that it is not possible to have a historic analysis of the elements composing this unproductive debt or to prepare a debtor and creditor account between India and Burma from the earliest years. We quite realise that a strict creditor and debtor account may not be available, but some of the outstanding features can give sufficient data for an approximate calculation. It is possible, for example, to estimate the cost of the 3 Burmese Wars which was borne by the Indian Exchequer, and an approximate idea of the same is given in the "note of the Financial Transaction between India and Burma" appended to the report prepared by Mr. Nixon. According to this note, the cost of the first Burmese War was between five and fifteen million pounds, the second Burmese War about one million pounds, and the third Burmese War between four to six crores of rupees. It will be possible for an arbitral tribunal to arrive at a satisfactory figure between these various extremes. As the Indian Exchequer has borne the cost of all wars waged by the East India Company or the Indian Government in India and sometimes even outside India it is only fair that the Burma should bear this part of the burden. Next it must be remembered that Burma must have been a deficit Province for a large number of years and its Railways had been running at a loss till recently, an attempt should be made to find out to what extent the Indian Exchequer has contributed to the financial position of Burma.

2. As to paragraph 15, we would like to add that the present strength of the Army in India is based on the need of protecting the land frontiers of the country as also for maintaining internal security. If Burma with its large land frontier and its wide area were to cut itself away from India, there must be a contribution by Burma towards maintaining the present strength of the Army, or, the strength of the Army should be proportionately reduced. It cannot be maintained that the Army should continue at its present strength and the component parts of the Empire should be at liberty to cut themselves off from it. This will be placing a premium on separation. We do not think it necessary to go into any greater detail about the various other questions raised in the memorandum and about which final conclusions for reasons mentioned therein have not been arrived at.

HARBILAS SARDA.

JAGANNATH AGGARWAL.

GAYA PRASAD SINGH.

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy (Leader of the House): With your permission, Sir, I desire to make a statement as to the probable course of Government business in the week beginning March, the 21st, Monday, the 21st and Tuesday, the 22nd, being gazetted holidays, the House will not sit. The House will sit for the transaction of Government business on Wednesday, the 23rd and Thursday, the 24th. The first business on

[Sir George Rainy.]

Wednesday, the 23rd will be the elections to the Standing Finance Committee and the Standing Committee on Emigration. We shall then proceed with the Legislative programme in the order indicated below :

(1) A motion for leave to introduce a Bill to establish a Medical Council in India and to provide for the maintenance of a British Indian Medical Register. It is hoped on a later date in the Session to make a motion that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

(2) Motions to take into consideration and pass the Bill to extend the operation of the Salt (Additional Import Duty) Act, 1931.

(3) Completion of the consideration, to be followed by a motion for passing, the Bill to supplement the Bengal Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1930, as reported by the Select Committee.

(4) Motions to take into consideration and pass the Bill to provide against the publication of statements likely to promote unfriendly relations between His Majesty's Government and the Governments of Foreign States, as reported by the Select Committee.

(5) Motions to take consideration and pass the Bill to provide for the fostering and development of the sugar industry in British India, as reported by the Select Committee.

(6) Motions to take into consideration and pass the Bill to provide for the administration and discipline of the Indian Air Force, as reported by the Select Committee.

(7) Motions to take into consideration and pass the Bill to provide funds to enable Government to continue wireless broadcasting in India.

(8) Motions to take into consideration and pass the Bill to validate certain suits relating to public matters, as passed by the Council of State.

(9) Motions to take into consideration and pass the Bill further to amend the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, for a certain purpose, as passed by the Council of State.

(10) Motion to take into consideration the amendments made by the Council of State in the Bill to define and amend the law relating to partnership.

(11) Motions to refer to Select Committee :

- (i) The Indian Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill,
- (ii) The Tea Districts Emigrant Labour Bill,
- (iii) The Indian Medical Council Bill.

The other items of business outstanding are a Resolution in the name of Sir Joseph Bore in connection with the Road Fund, and a motion by Sir George Schuster to take into consideration the Report of the Standing Finance Committee on the Howard-Nixon Report.

On Thursday, the 24th, the House, after completing the election to (1) the Public Accounts Committee, and (2) the Railway Standing Finance Committee, will proceed with the business entered on the Agenda Paper of the previous day and not concluded on that day.

Friday and Saturday, the 25th and 26th March, being gazetted holidays, the House will not sit.

I desire, Sir, at this stage to intimate that in the event of the aforementioned business not being completed by the evening of the 24th March, we shall desire you to make a direction that the House shall sit in the week beginning the 28th March. Monday, the 28th March, being a gazetted holiday, we shall ask for your direction, Sir, that the House shall sit on Tuesday, the 29th, Wednesday, the 30th and Thursday, the 31st March. We have every hope, Sir, that the business of the session will be concluded by that date, but should we be disappointed it will be necessary for us to move you to make a further direction.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

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

“That the non-official Members of the Assembly do proceed to elect, in the manner required by rule 51 of the Indian Legislative Rules, four Members to be Members of the Committee on Public Accounts in place of Mr. S. C. Mitra, Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan, Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi and Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah, who have retired in accordance with sub-rule (4) of the same rule.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: I have to inform the Assembly that for the purpose of election of Members to the Public Accounts Committee, the Assembly Office will be open to receive nominations up to 12 noon on Monday, the 21st March and that the election, if necessary, will take place in this Chamber on Thursday, the 24th March, 1932. The election will be conducted in accordance with the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

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

— DEMAND No. 28—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL—*concl'd.*

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): Before taking up further consideration of Demands for Grants, the Chair would like to inform Honourable Members that in accordance with the arrangement which was agreed to by the House, the first four days have been occupied with token motions intended for the purpose of censure. The remaining two days, today and tomorrow, have been reserved for economy cuts, and the Chair holds in its hands a long list of agreed motions which are to be put before the House for the purpose of effecting economy. In that list the Chair notices a motion No. 22 which is obviously a token cut for the purpose of censure. According to the arrangement agreed to no token cuts can be taken up during these two days. The Chair however wishes to inform Honourable Members that if it is the unanimous desire of the House that the original arrangement arrived at should be varied to that extent and that the Chair should allow one more token cut to be discussed today,—as the first motion in continuation of the first four days,—then the Chair will raise no objection to such modification of the original arrangement, and would call upon the Honourable Member,

[Mr. President.]

Mr. B. Das, to move his token cut. The Chair would like to ask Honourable Members to state whether they desire such modification of the original arrangement.

Several Honourable Members: No, no.

Mr. President: Then it cannot be moved.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): May I inquire if it will come up in its order?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): Even then it is a token cut and is in conflict with the arrangement arrived at. I should like to inform the Honourable Member that the Chair could have refused to allow any further token cuts as not being in consonance with the arrangement previously arrived at, but the Chair did not wish to do so. The Chair wanted to give the House an opportunity of modifying the arrangement and to take up the Honourable Member's token cut now, but the House wishes to adhere to the arrangement which it unanimously arrived at, and the Chair cannot therefore help the Honourable Member.

Mr. B. Das: Sir, may I point out that a majority of the House, including the Government side, the Nationalist Party and the Independent Party are agreeable to it?

Mr. President: The Chair has put the matter to the House and it is clear that the House is not practically unanimous in favour of the proposed modification.

The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 84,800 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1932, in respect of 'Executive Council'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 16—CUSTOMS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 60,34,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1932, in respect of 'Customs'."

Insufficient Economy effected by Government under Customs.

Sir Abdur Rahim (Calcutta and Suburbs: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I move:

"That the Demand under the head "Customs" be reduced by Rs. 6,57,000."

In moving this economy cut, I wish to state certain general considerations which apply not only to this motion, but also to the other motions that will follow. The amount that is mentioned here is the difference between the amount of economy recommended by the General Purposes Sub-committee and the amount accepted by the Government hitherto. The

general position, Sir, so far as the proposals of economy are concerned, is this. The General Purposes Committee appointed to deal with the civil departments recommended, according to the summary given by the Government at page 77, a sum of Rs. 4,11,09,000; and the amount which the Government have so far been able to accept is Rs. 2,48,97,000, or nearly 2½ crores. There is thus a gap of Rs. 1,62,12,000. The total economy cuts effected by the Government both under the heads retrenchment and cuts in pay in the civil and military departments amount to Rs. 11,05,00,000. So far the economies that the Government propose to effect both in the civil and in the military departments are a great advance upon what they thought was possible at this time last year. At this time last year the Government thought that it would not be possible to accept a cut or to effect economies even to the extent of 2 crores; and the House will remember what a struggle there was between this side of the House and the Government Benches on this point. Sir, we feel that the Government have been able to advance in the matter of economy to a fairly substantial extent, but we also feel,—at least all the non-official groups including the European Group—that there is room for further economy both on the civil and on the military side, more on the military than on the civil, naturally, because the Military Budget is the much heavier Budget. The Honourable the Finance Member has told the House more than once with emphasis that he is prepared to go on pursuing all possibilities of further economy and will not rest satisfied until everything has been done that is possible in that connection. Sir, we accept that assurance. All that we are seeking at present is not to make up the deficiency that there is according to the committees' proposals and according to what is the demand of this side of the House, having regard to what has been done so far by the Government because the amount of 48 lakhs is the total amount of economies which could be effected if all the amounts that are on the agenda are accepted by the Government. That amounts only to 48 lakhs. It is far short even of the difference between the proposals of the General Purposes Sub-Committee and the acceptances of the Government. The difference is, as I have said, 162½ lakhs; but as the House is aware, it is not possible for us to make up the total amount, as a good portion of the Budget is non-voted. Therefore, we have to be satisfied with moving such motions as are permissible within the limits of the voted grants under the different heads. Therefore if we succeed in carrying this motion and other similar motions that are on the list, we shall only be able to effect economies to the extent of 48 lakhs and no more; and there is another difficulty in which we are placed by reason of the fact that portions of the Demands in the Budget are voted and other portions are non-voted; that is to say, we cannot in most cases lay our finger on the particular activities or the personnel which in our opinion ought to be retrenched. We have therefore to make a lump cut of the highest figure that is available and leave it to the Government to distribute the economies in the best way possible according to the recommendations made by the different Sub-Committees.

I have mentioned that at this time last year Government were not prepared even to reduce the Budget by the very moderate demand that we made at the time; our demand then was necessarily moderate, because we had not an opportunity of studying the Budget; we have been able to do that now in the various sub-committees; and the Government themselves had not been able to go into the question in the manner in which we have been able to do under the advice and directions of the Government. The

[Sir Abdur Rahim.]

financial position of the Government has been getting steadily worse for some time past. When the General Purposes Sub-Committee and the other Sub-Committees sat, the financial position was very acute and we were advised by the Honourable the Finance Member, who himself is the Chairman of the main Retrenchment Committee, that we should effect as much economy as was possible. He was also good enough to give us a rough estimate of what he thought was possible in the Demands under the purview of the General Purposes Sub-Committee; and I take it that he gave similar estimates to other Sub-Committees. We went to work on that basis, and as I have informed the House, our Committee went as carefully as they could upon the materials and evidence at our disposal, through all the different items of expenditure, and we came to certain conclusions which are embodied in the two reports, and we also gave the Honourable the Finance Member our recommendations as regards the Foreign and Political Department, with respect to which we have not been able to complete our report so far. The General Purposes Sub-Committee, for which I am in a special position to speak, consisted of members selected from all parts of the House, and also an Honourable Member of the Council of State and further of two distinguished public men from outside, the late Mr. K. C. Roy who had special experience of the working of the various departments of the Government of India and a very intimate knowledge of the composition and history of those departments, and Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar, who was a Member of this House some time ago and who is well known as a politician of distinction. Business experience was very well represented by the Honourable Rai Bahadur Lala Ram Saran Das, who carries on a large business in the Punjab and elsewhere, and Mr. Ramsay Scott, a member of the European Group. We had also the advantage of at least two gentlemen with experience of administration in the provinces, Diwan Bahadur Harbilas Sarada and Khan Bahadur Wilayatullah. Then we had also as our colleagues my friends Mr. S. C. Mitra and Mian Shah Nawaz. I may say that the Honourable the Finance Member will be surprised to learn that some of these gentlemen had as intimate a knowledge of the official arrangements in the Government of India as any official himself. And last, but not least, we had the advantage of having as one of our members, Mr. Nixon, a representative of the Finance Department and I may tell the House that Mr. Nixon is a man who always speaks out plainly his views, and he gave us a great deal of information on the subjects of our inquiry. He did not mince words in representing the official views and what the officials considered to be their difficulties with respect to certain recommendations that we might make. We had of course to examine official witnesses, representatives of departments, and one or two members of the public who had experience of certain departments and who were in a special position to speak of them,—men like Sir Chunilal Mehta for instance. Sir, the conviction that was forced upon us after our inquiry was that in most departments there was over staffing and that there was considerable room for retrenchment of staff without in any way impairing the efficiency of the departments, and that exactly corresponds with the general impression of the public, not only the Indian but the European public as well, as to the composition of the departments of the Government of India. My friend on the other side said that there are certain phrases current such as the administration is top-heavy and phrases of like character. These phrases

are not without meaning. This is still the conviction of every one on this side of the House, and I shall be very much surprised if that is not also the opinion of many officials themselves, that the departments are in many cases top-heavy.

Now, Sir, our investigations disclosed that the general impression that prevails in the country is thoroughly well founded, and if we have made proposals for retrenchment, we have done so with the full knowledge and consciousness of our responsibility in the matter, even though we are non-officials, fully aware of the responsibility that rested upon us not to make recommendations which would in any way impair the efficiency of the working of the various departments of the Government of India. All our desire has been throughout, I can assure Sir George Schuster, to strengthen his hands so as to enable him to convince his colleagues in the Government of India that there is room for economy, and he well knows what dire necessity there is for effecting economy in the administration of the Government of India. It will not be possible for us in moving these motions to discuss every demand at length or fully, and I submit to the House, it is not necessary that we should do so, because we have before us the Reports of the different Committees. They had the time and the opportunity to study these Reports, and the Government have been good enough to supply us with a summary of the results of their deliberations, how much they have been able to accept so far and how much is under consideration and what particular recommendations they have rejected. They have also given their reasons for rejecting some of our recommendations. The House is in full possession of all that information, and it would be simply waste of time if we were to discuss the whole matter once again on the floor of the House.

Now, Sir, I come to this particular motion, and I will just make one or two observations regarding this demand. I wish to assure Honourable Members, especially my friend Sir Henry Gidney, that there is nothing about the Customs Department which particularly appeals to me. I made it a point not to look at the personnel of the different branches though we were supplied with the information, because some Members wanted naturally to know what was the pay and the strength of the department and also how it was composed. I assure the House that so far as I was concerned, I had not the time to look at the composition of particular departments. That did not form the basis of our recommendations in any way. Sir, as regards Customs, we were fully aware that this department was engaged in collecting revenues for the Government, and if we made any recommendations to retrench the staff which would interfere with that collection, then of course such a proposition Government could not accept, but to the best of our judgment we studiously avoided making any such recommendation. As regards this 6 lakhs, a good portion of it consists of what are called overtime allowances and penalty fees. That subject has already been discussed and I only want to point out this that having regard to the nature of the work which these Customs officers perform, be they Anglo-Indians or Indians, it makes no difference, they are very much overpaid. It must be remembered that there are slack seasons and busy seasons, and in slack seasons naturally the preventive staff has a slack time; but then suddenly sometimes boats come in and some of the merchants want their cargoes cleared without delay, whether it be a Sunday or a special holiday, or it is night, and the merchants are quite willing to pay what are called overtime fees. Then a portion of the Customs staff

[Sir Abdur Rahim.]

is requisitioned to perform these duties,—it may be at night, say for four five or six hours,—but our case is that it is part of their duty to perform that work without any extra payment. They must be prepared when the busy time comes on to work beyond the ordinary allotted office hours. That is the position.

Then, Sir, the officers of the Customs Department of various classes are distinctly better paid than men in the provincial services who do the same class of work and are drawn from the class of people with similar, if not better, educational qualifications. We know what the responsibilities of the police officers are in the provinces. If you compare the salary of the Customs officers doing a particular kind of work, for instance the preventive work, with the salaries of provincial officers of the police doing similar work, you will find that the Customs officers are distinctly better off, and yet in the Police Department there is no such question as overtime payment. The Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors of Police are frequently called on at any time of the day or night, and they have to go and investigate cases on the spot, and some of them have to do preventive work more or less of the same class as work in the Customs Department. As a matter of fact, there is no doubt that police officers in the provinces have to work under far more arduous, difficult and risky conditions than the Customs officers. Take the preventive Inspector of Customs: his salary

12 Noon. is Rs. 575, some men get special pay. Let me take Calcutta, where the Customs officers also work. The Inspectors of Police there get Rs. 175 to Rs. 300. So, there is a very good margin, and the Customs officers are very much better off. The appraisers get Rs. 250 to Rs. 675, whereas the Sub-Inspectors of Police get, I think, Rs. 130 in Calcutta and Rs. 160, in the Delhi city. Look at this difference in pay. (*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney*: "Is that the police pay?") Yes, and I am giving the figures from the Civil List. These overtime fees, penalty fees, or whatever you call them,—they undoubtedly belong to Government. The Government distributes them to the officers that work there, and also partly to certain clubs and institutes in which the seamen are interested—recreation clubs, seamen's institutes and so on. These fees amounted in 1931-32 to Rs. 12 lakhs. Whatever might have been the origin of the practice, whatever might have been their justification in easy financial days, we have to consider whether in these hard times when Government are reduced to such straits we should not be justified in asking Government not to give away the whole of it. We only suggested that, having regard to the practice that has prevailed and the expectations which have naturally formed themselves in the minds of the people, let them have half, and let the other half go to the public exchequer. Only Mr. Ramsay Scott, one of the members, held that he would be satisfied if 25 per cent. was taken by the treasury to begin with, and then afterwards the proportion might be increased in favour of Government. What is the alternative that we have been faced with by the present financial position? The alternative is a crushing burden of taxation weighing heavily and most injuriously on industries, commerce, trade, and even on men of the smallest means. Even the veriest poor have to pay additional taxation. In those circumstances can it be said that our demand that 50 per cent. of these fees which belong to the Government, should be appropriated by Government, is unreasonable? That is the gist of our recommendations so far as these overtime allowances are concerned. The total Demand for

Customs is about Rs. 90 lakhs, and what we are proposing now is that that Demand should be reduced by Rs. 6 lakhs. Surely, it cannot be said that this is unreasonable. If the Finance Member could satisfy the House that the financial distress is gone, that we are really on better days, and revenue will be coming in now much faster than it has been doing for the last two or three years, then other considerations might arise. But I submit that at present there is really no room for choice, and I therefore commend to the consideration of the House the motion which stands in my name. Sir, I move.

Mr. President: Motion moved:

“That the Demand under the head ‘Customs’ be reduced by Rs. 6,57,000.”

Sir Hugh Cocks (Bombay: European): I was a little alarmed when I got this list of cuts, having regard to the largeness of the figures, but I now understand that they are really put up from the point of principle,—that Committees of this House which went into retrenchment last year with great care made certain recommendations, and Government not having accepted those recommendations in full, these cuts are put down to represent the difference between what was recommended by the Committees and what was accepted by the Government. Therefore, on that point, I think as a matter of principle one can make no complaint. The Honourable the Mover has covered a large field in his remarks, and we are indebted to him not only for his great services last year on the Retrenchment Committee, which I think this House appreciates very much (Cheers), but also for pressing home the recommendations that have been made. There is no good having retrenchment committees unless you stand firm and press the recommendations home, subject, of course, to Government satisfying us, if they can, that they have not been able to accept all the recommendations made. And putting down these cuts in this form does give the Government an opportunity of telling us why it has not been possible to accept the cuts. We have been told that Government in the aggregate have accepted about 87 per cent. I am inclined to think that that is fairly good. Certainly, in business if you write to your agent and tell him he has got to cut down his telegram expenses from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 5,000, you naturally demand something more than he can achieve, and if he cuts down the expense by one-fourth when you asked for half, you will probably be satisfied more or less in the end. But my particular reason for rising now is to ask Government to explain to the House very carefully why they have not been able to meet all the recommendations made. Taking the items under Customs, there are six items, and in several of them the Government have accepted practically the whole of the recommendations made. In two cases they have not done so. I think it is not for us to do the talking today; certainly not until we have heard the Government. We want the Government to explain. I hope Customs will not take the whole day, and I think we should be able to get on to other items. I do hope that Government will give us their reasons for not having accepted the recommendations of the Committee.

Mr. J. C. Nixon (Government of India: Nominated Official): The Honourable the Leader of the European Group pointed out that this motion has been raised as a matter of principle; and the principle that the Honourable the Mover is attempting to get the House to agree to is really this, that, when the Government have appointed a committee of the nature of these

[Mr. J. C. Nixon.]

Retrenchment Committees, it should, without further examination, accept that Committee's recommendations *ipso facto*. The Honourable the Mover of this motion is putting forward that point of view now, as he put it forward in some of the introductory remarks to one of his Committee's reports, where he held that the Government wasted time and money in going over the various recommendations of Committees which they had appointed, and in endeavouring to give effect to them. He held, in practically these words, that Government should, after they appointed their Committees, accept their recommendations *ipso facto*. At the same time, I may point out to you, Sir, and to the House that he made a similar charge against Government in regard to their treatment of their heads of departments and subordinate officers. The Committee said:

"We are convinced that supervision and co-ordination is generally very much overdone in the Government of India. What is clearly needed is greater reliance on the sense of responsibility of the various units of administration."

That is to say, the Committee also asked Government to give more weight to the advice and recommendations of their departmental heads. The recommendations of the Retrenchment Committees were in the normal course referred to the heads of the various departments, who gave the Government of India their careful opinions in the matter. Where the opinions of those heads of departments and the opinions expressed by the various Retrenchment Committees varied, the General Retrenchment Committee omitted to lay down the principle according to which Government should proceed. In the hurry of things, Government have, to some extent unfortunately, had to follow one of the principles laid down by the General Purposes Retrenchment Sub-Committee, and they have had to lay a very considerable amount of reliance on the opinions expressed by the heads of the various departments; and after all, Sir, it seems to me that any body which claims such jurisdiction as the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution is claiming is going beyond anything that any Government, either democratic or constitutional or otherwise, could ever possibly admit. It is going a long way beyond what a legally constituted court of law would ask for. I think the members of our Committee would acknowledge that in many cases they had had to frame the charges against their accused after the evidence had been recorded and after the accused had gone. Therefore, contrary to some part of the procedure in courts of law, the accused had not before our Committees an opportunity of answering the charges that were levelled against them. Yet despite that, the Honourable the Mover of this motion suggests that there should be no court of appeal. Not only does he urge the Government to carry out retrenchment to the last anna of the recommendations which the various Committees made and exactly along those lines, but as far as I was able to judge from various expressions used by Honourable Members sitting in his neighbourhood, he and they objected to Government conducting retrenchment and obtaining economies in any other directions. This, Sir, I suggest, is a state of things which no Government, either the present or the future, will be able to accept.

The Honourable the Leader of the European Group has invited Government to examine the actual proposals of the Retrenchment Committees and to state the differences of opinion between Government on the one hand and the Committee's recommendations on the other. In regard to

the Customs grant, this is a comparatively simple task. The difference between the Committee and the Government in this matter is focussed down to two items and to two items only. The Committee recommended that in the matter of Customs staff, by which I include both officers and the subordinate staff, there should be a general all round reduction of roughly 15 per cent., amounting in all to about 8½ lakhs of economy. Government, after considering the matter with the help of their heads of departments, have concluded that consistently with safety they cannot effect economy in that direction of more than 6 lakhs. I think myself that the House a few days ago did not altogether appreciate or give full value to some words which passed from the lips of an Honourable friend of mine in the European Group when he took up the subject of the Customs Department and said that in some respects the Customs Department was the last of the departments to be retrenched. It must be perfectly evident to all Honourable Members of this House that to conduct retrenchment in a sort of punishing spirit is not retrenchment at all. One is not conducting retrenchment in the Customs Department because one cannot let that department go scot free, when one was hitting some of the others. The definite object in view was to obtain economy and to help to balance the Budget, and any process which meant that we reduced the revenue collecting staffs so far that they were not physically able to collect as much revenue as before, and therefore we lost more on one side of the Budget than we gained on the other, would certainly not be described as retrenchment, and ought really to be described in terms which you, Mr. President, would probably not permit in this House. I have no doubt my Chief, the Honourable the Finance Member, will deal more completely with that aspect of the case when he takes up this subject, but there are one or two points of view in connection with this subject of the retrenchment of staff about which I should like to say a few words. The Honourable the Mover of this Resolution, at the instance of his henchman, if I may say so, quoted certain rates of pay to indicate that some of the preventive staff

Sir Abdur Rahim (Calcutta and Suburbs: Muhammadan Urban): I do not think the word "henchman" is a proper word to apply to any Honourable Member of this House.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The word is offensive and I should like the Honourable Member to withdraw it, especially as he has applied it to an Honourable Member who is a colleague of the Honourable the Mover.

Mr. J. C. Nixon: I withdraw that, Sir.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: May I point out, Sir, that in the proper interpretation of the word, there is really nothing offensive. Henchman simply means a follower. I do assure you that there is nothing offensive in the word in the ordinary sense.

Mr. President: The word has been used and it is being used in a very offensive sense.

Mr. J. C. Nixon: Sir, the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution quoted for the information of the House certain rates of pay which the preventive staff at Calcutta was getting, and made certain comparisons

[Mr. J. C. Nixon.]

with the rates of pay drawn by certain police officers. If I heard him correctly, he left this House with the impression that a certain grade of preventive officer was getting a rate of pay which started at Rs. 500 a month, and made a comparison with certain grades of police officers, who started on Rs. 130 a month. If he and the Members of this House will refer to page 17 of the Demands for Grants, they will observe that preventive officers in the Customs Department in Calcutta start on Rs. 130 a month, that is, at the same rate of pay as was quoted for police officers.

There is one other aspect of this subject which I should like to refer to and that is this. The Honourable the Mover of this motion in the earlier part of the week complained of the terms which we were offering to retrenched personnel and doubted whether we were giving them sufficiently lavish compensation. In presenting the cut of the amount which he has proposed he has not struck anything out, I notice, for the additional compensation which, if the matter was in his hands, he would pay to the retrenched personnel. Therefore, I take it that his proposal at present is that, despite the fact that we are not paying adequate compensation to the staff whom we are retrenching, we should still throw out more of them.

But, Sir, that is not the main point in the amount making up the sum of 6 lakhs odd which the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution is concerned in. The large item is the item of overtime allowance and such-like. In the Demands for Grants, at the end of the Customs Demand on pages 28 and 29 is an explanatory note giving the details of the figures composing this payment and also of those composing the corresponding item of receipt. It is perhaps not well known to Members of this House, at any rate it has not been frequently expressed so far, that this is a charge levied on a certain section of the trade for certain services rendered. It has been a principle expressed by Government ever since such charges were levied that they did not intend under any circumstances to make a net profit out of the transactions; that they were putting this imposition on the trade in order to make up for the extra expenditure in which they were involved. As a matter of fact Government have not entirely kept to that principle. Certain portions of these receipts do in certain circumstances accrue to Government. However, the point that I emphasize strongly is that at present this is a payment made by the trade for services rendered. It seems to me that the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution, in proposing that Government should take to themselves the major portion of these receipts, is rather liable to entrench on a privilege of this House which this House no doubt very jealously guards; for it seems to me to amount to this, that the imposition of this payment on a particular section of the trade of India shall no longer be for services rendered, but should constitute a sort of a tax. A tax of that sort can only be imposed through an Act and through the instrumentality of this House. (Laughter.) Also, I can see, there might be considerable objections put up by the merchants themselves, who at present feel it pays them to pay for services rendered, if they felt that this was no longer being paid out to the actual officers engaged in the job but was being taken into the Government coffers.

Sir, in this matter I would like to remind the House of some words expressed by my Honourable friend on the opposite Bench during the

course of this week's debate, because he and I on this occasion find ourselves seeing very much eye to eye—I refer to my Honourable friend, Mr. Mitra, who I think agrees to a considerable extent with the point of view which I am about to express. He and I quite agree that it is right and moral to take from the trade the money that we are taking for this particular purpose; he and I are, I believe, both agreed that we should pay at any rate some considerable portion of this sum to the labourer who does the work. I believe it is a principle of his that the labourer is worthy of his hire; therefore, I take it my Honourable friend, Mr. Mitra, is definitely against this motion, and that he does not think that Government can possibly appropriate this money to itself. What he thinks is that this money, instead of being paid to the present employees of Government, should be paid to another set of employees—a point of view with which I personally have very great sympathy—but I would point out to him that, if I have expressed his view correctly, it is hardly consistent that he should vote in the lobby against the Government. As regards the possibility of the overtime money being used, especially at the present moment, for giving relief to some of the men thrown out of employment, I may say that, under the instructions of the Honourable the Finance Member, the Central Board of Revenue are considering the matter.

Mr. K. Ahmed (Rajshahi Division: Muhammadan Rural): Then why don't you accept the theory of the Independent Group and consider it along with it? (Laughter).

Mr. J. C. Nixon: There is one other matter to which I would like to address myself, and that is to accuse the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution of what appears to me to be something of an inconsistency. You can, Sir, take a horse to the water, but you cannot necessarily make him drink. On the first page of this pamphlet which Government provided for the perusal of Members, under the head "Customs", a total was drawn of Rs. 16 lakhs odd showing the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee. The second section was devoted to those specific recommendations which Government had found themselves able to accept. The Honourable the Mover has subtracted those two sums in the motion before the House. The Committee proposed a reduction in the grant of 5.88 lakhs. Government have put it down that of those 5.88 lakhs, they have been able to achieve, as a matter of retrenchment, only 2.36 lakhs. Consequently the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution asks that this House shall reduce the grant for Customs on this account by 3.5 lakhs roughly. Had the Honourable the Mover continued his reading down that page he would have discovered at the bottom, almost the last item, a statement under the heading, "Reductions in overtime fees on account of the depression of trade", a reduction of 2 lakhs 12 thousand. Sir, we in the Finance Department and Government hardly felt that we should be right to call that "retrenchment". We are getting a saving on the expenditure side of our Budget of that 2 lakhs 12 thousand; this amount was actually in the 1931-32 Budget, but we felt that it would be a misnomer to call that a matter of retrenchment. Therefore we put it down below in a perhaps too inconspicuous place; but I do draw the attention of the House to the fact that of that 3.52 lakhs reduction, which forms part of the motion before the House, we have in fact already achieved 2.12 lakhs; and I have no doubt that as I have now pointed this out to the

[Mr. J. C. Nixon.]

Honourable the Mover, he will come up before this House and ask its permission to alter the figure in his motion by that 2.12 lakhs, because it is quite evident that this House can not expect to ask Government to subtract that figure twice over.

Sir Abdur Rahim: Will Government accept that?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I listened very attentively to the remarks made by my Honourable friend, Sir Abdur Rahim, and I was very glad indeed to receive his assurance that his desire to retrench in the Customs Service has nothing whatever to do with the personnel of that Department. I refer particularly to the Preventive Service. Let me assure him on my side that any criticisms I may make will also have nothing whatever to do with the personnel. The remarks I desire to make refer entirely to the criticisms he has made and the report the General Purposes Sub-Committee submitted for retrenchment in the Customs Department. Sir, although I was not a Member of that Committee, I claim to have some inside knowledge of this Department and it is, therefore, with a sense of responsibility that I again rise to take part in this discussion. I still say I am a whole-hogger so far as retrenchment goes. I consider the Finance Member and his army of Retrenchment Sub-Committee hydraheaded monsters have done a great wrong to employees of all grades trying to empty their purses by cutting their salaries, etc. They have reduced the salaries of public servants in order to serve the interests of the general public. I submit that is a wrong policy. I know my Honourable friend the Finance Member and I will never agree on that matter, so we must agree to disagree. In my opinion the Honourable Member in repeating his demand for further Customs retrenchment and demanding of Government to accept his cut is playing the role of Shylock who, in asking for his pound of flesh, wants every drop of blood, forgetful of the fact that this overtime is earned at the sweat of the brow.

Mr. K. Ahmed: You are therefore acting as Portia.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I am trying to. Sir, in his desire to obtain every drop of blood he brings this motion before the House today, notwithstanding the fact that it was very fully discussed and lost on a division about three days ago. I am really very much surprised he should have thought it fit to bring this motion again before the House. Sir, I gladly admit members of the General Purposes Sub-Committee deserve the thanks of this House for the great services they have rendered. But members of the Committee have yet to realise that of times economy and efficiency are not compatible factors specially in the administration of Departments. Moreover you can carry your campaign of economy a little too far. I believe many Members will agree with me when I say that you have carried this retrenchment stunt a little too far in the present instance. And what is bound to be the result, especially in a Department like the Customs—dissatisfaction, discontent, and a threatened lowering of the morale of the men. I have not the slightest doubt the Honourable the Finance Member is not very happy in his seat today when he hears this demand being made from those of his own creation—members of the General Purposes Sub-Committee, and I am tempted to

quote what the Railway Member said to me the other day, "He asked for it and he has got it". When I read this report and listened to the Mover's speech I was reminded of the fate of the Railway crew system as perpetrated by the Railway Board which was so severely criticised this morning at question time. The Railway Board introduced the crew system because they felt they were being defrauded of money by the public. They one day suddenly awakened to the fact that they must retrench the pay of the crew system to ultimately discover that the crew system make good the deficiency by defrauding the public. The Moody-Ward Committee was appointed who made drastic retrenchments with the result that today the Railway Board is losing money heavily and have a dissatisfied staff of employees. The Honourable the Mover has forgotten that the Customs is the greatest revenue earning department in the Government of India.

An Honourable Member: No.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I hear a "No" from the opposite side. I challenge you to deny what I have just said.

Mr. President: Order, order.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I beg your pardon, Sir. I challenge the Honourable the Mover or any one in this House to produce another Department in the Government of India that supplies the same amount of revenue to the Government of India as does the Customs Service. Sir, they cannot do it. Sir, the Honourable the Mover of this motion forgot to mention the great difference between the expenditure and the receipts of the Customs Department between 1913 and 1931. Government returns clearly show that whereas in 1913-14 the expenditure and receipts were respectively Rs. 41.34 and 1113.78 lakhs in 1931-32, these figures were 96.44 and 5445.97 lakhs. So here we have a department that is bringing into the Government as revenue more than sixty times the amount of money expended on it, and yet the Honourable Member has selected this one department for such drastic retrenchment and is insisting on Government accepting it. Sir, apart from what the Honourable the Mover has said and apart from what the Government Member, Mr. Nixon, has said on this matter, it will be interesting for this House to know what a great financier said about this Department, I mean Lord Inchcape. This is what the Inchcape Committee said in their Report regarding the Customs Department:

"This Committee's observation that compared with 1913-14 there was probably a falling off of trade in the period ending 1922-23 may be true of the state of trade to-day, but the precise position cannot be verified statistically. That Committee recommended that "strength and pay of the staff at the various customs houses should be examined with a view to possible economies," but "having regard to the importance of maintaining revenue", it did not recommend any further reduction. In fact it was found necessary to increase the staff, and in the case of some establishments, to enhance the scales of pay."

The Inchcape Committee came to that conclusion as far as the retrenchment on the Customs Department is concerned a few years ago, and today we have the General Purposes Sub-Committee recommending the very opposite. The Honourable Member for Government explained very fully what action the Government have taken. They have, in the natural course of events, submitted the recommendations of the Committee for the opinion of the heads of the departments. And after all, I ask this House who knows better than the head of a department as to what economy is possible and what is not especially when one and all realise the acute present day financial stringency. It may be said, the head of

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

a department has vested and even personal interests. Well, I again ask the Honourable the Mover of this motion, if an Ordinance were issued by the Government of India reducing the fees of all lawyers to a maximum of Rs. 50 per day with nothing extra for overwork, what would he, an eminent lawyer, do? Why, he would shout the law courts down. He would be up in arms.

Sir Abdur Rahim: Most certainly not.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: He would not tamely submit to this retrenchment. This is exactly what I am doing in response to his treatment of the Preventive Customs Officers. I am shouting down all his Committee recommendations and I intend to go on shouting till Government decline to accept his motion. I shall be silent only then.

Sir, on this Committee were eminent journalists and lawyers and eminent people from the Punjab, a province with no ports of its own or Customs Department, but there were no workmen on the Committee. What the Committee really needed was two or three workmen to put them in possession of actual facts. Now, Sir, what have Government done? The Government have accepted the major part of the retrenchment recommendations of this Committee. There is still a balance of about 6 lakhs which the Honourable the Mover wants to force the Government to still further retrench—his last drop of retrenchment blood—and that is the real reason why he has again presented it to this House today having failed, as I said before, in his previous efforts, three or four days ago, when my friend Mr. Mitra moved a motion before this House as a censure motion. Let us see what retrenchments have already been effected. Government have cut 10 per cent. of the staff; Government have cut 10 per cent. of pay; Government have cut down uniform and other allowances, but what is worst of all—and the Honourable the Mover cannot deny knowledge of it—is that in addition to this the men have for years found their overtime reducing, till today it is 44 per cent. below 1927, and this motion demands that this much reduced overtime be still further retrenched by 50 per cent. If any one will take trouble to work this out, he will really see how these men have suffered so far and what is now being demanded from them. Sir, the Honourable Member again drew a comparison between the Customs and the Police Departments. Surely he knows very well that the Police Department is not a revenue earning department; it is a money spending department. Surely, he realises, it does not require, as his report hints, physical force or a strong arm to demonstrate utility of an efficient Preventive Customs Officer. It wants brains, it wants a high sense of honesty and responsibility. I think the comparison is an absolutely illogical and absurd one. Then he said the police get no overtime or allowances. Surely the Honourable Member is aware of the fact that that is not so. The police do get overtime and allowances. When the Honourable Member says that they get no allowance he displays a lamentable lack of inside knowledge of the Police Department.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Additional fee for extra work.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Sir, the real point at issue is this. The Honourable Member demands of Government to deduct 50 per cent. of this overtime. He is upset because all his committee demands

have not been accepted and he wants to force the hands of Government. This overtime allowance is paid, as the House knows, to the over-worked Preventive officers of this Department. This overtime comes from the merchants' purse—not the Government. It is paid to Government by the merchants and Government gives it to the men in return for their overtime services, using a part of it for philanthropic purposes and social institutions. Now, Sir, say, the Government refused to receive this money from the merchants, would the Honourable the Mover and his Committee object to the merchants giving it direct to the men for extra services rendered? Then, say, the merchants refused to give this overtime money to Government, what would be the result? Government would have to engage additional staff on high initial salaries to perform this extra work. I ask the Mover, is this his idea of economy, would this be cheaper to Government in the long run? Surely he must now see the folly, the incongruity of his insistent demand for retrenching this overtime? Surely he must see that this will neither save Government a single pie nor increase its revenue and surely he will not deny that if Government did accept his cut motion and retrenched 50 per cent. of this overtime it would be forced to engage additional staff to clear the over-work at a much higher cost; otherwise it would have to face congested ports and reduced import revenues and other dock dues. Is this the unenviable position the Mover desires to force Government into? If so, then his aim is not economy but financial loss. I should prefer to call this retrenchment pennywise and pound foolish and one that has everything to condemn and nothing to commend it. The Honourable Member says 'No'. I suppose these are the blood drops he wants with his pound of flesh from the Preventive Officer's overtime, utterly obvious of the profound anæmia that will result in expecting overworked and underpaid officers to work long hours of overtime without adequate remuneration. Sir, I am one with the General Purposes Committee in their desire to retrench, but I really do think the retrenchments which Government have already accepted are ample. I submit, with all the emphasis I can command that if this Retrenchment Committee goes too far and if Government, in their weakness, accept any further demands for retrenchment of their staff, they will be asking for trouble. Government surely know they are today face to face with a situation of grave labour unrest. Your servants are giving you loyal service. They are silently bearing the burden of their reduced pay with increased labour loyalty and with the greatest forbearance and patience. Do not overstep the mark. I beg of Government, indeed I solemnly warn Government, do not go beyond that mark—in other words do not retrench any more—because, if they do they will only set ablaze the smouldering embers of grave discontent that today exists in every department of the Government of India and to which these Retrenchment Committees are adding fuel and which, as sure as night follows day, will result in such an unparalleled economic catastrophe that Government will regret they ever appointed these Retrenchment Committees and the Mover will equally regret he pressed his motion before this House today. With these remarks, Sir, and this warning I ask Government to reject this demand which I oppose.

(Mr. Yamin Khan rose to speak.)

Mr. President: Before I call upon the Honourable Member to speak, I wish to know how much time he is likely to take. Today being Friday,

[Mr. President.]

the Chair would like to adjourn the House now unless the Honourable Member is likely to finish in five or six minutes.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): I shall not take more than five or six minutes.

In the beginning I must pay my tribute to the General Purposes Sub-Committee, which took a lot of trouble in going thoroughly into this question and took great pains in examining this subject. We all appreciate the good work which has been done by this Committee. But with one remark which fell from my Honourable friend, Sir Abdur Rahim, I do not agree. He said that this Committee was composed of all parties and of all shades of opinion in this House. Unfortunately my party was not represented therein. He knows the circumstances, and I do not wish to repeat them on the floor of the House. My party was not represented, in spite of my great protests and in spite of my representations which I made at that time. But I do not wish to disclose as to who was responsible for my party not being represented on the General Purposes Retrenchment Committee. The one principle which I should like to make clear at the very beginning is this. It was decided that the reports of the various Sub-Committees should come before the main Retrenchment Committee and that the reports should be discussed there. After the interim reports of the various Sub-Committees were ready, they decided that they must give a chance to the Government of India to go through these reports without giving any chance to the main Retrenchment Committee or without allowing the main Retrenchment Committee to have any voice in the affair. So, these reports are really the reports of the various Sub-Committees, and they are not the report of the main Retrenchment Committee. We have got no share or responsibility in making these recommendations, but the responsibility for each report rests on the particular Sub-Committee which sat on particular subjects. In this way I do not stand committed to any proposals made by the different Sub-Committees, and therefore we must examine each point on its own merits. We have to go thoroughly into each case and to see whether any case has been made out for retrenchment, and it is only then that we can give our support to any proposal. But if we find that any proposal goes against the principle which we have adopted and if any recommendation, whether made by one Sub-Committee or the other, contravenes the principle which we had in our view, and if that recommendation was made, ignoring that principle, then we cannot find our way to lend our support. One principle which we have to take in considering the report of the General Purposes Sub-Committee, is that we should not touch very materially the salaries of the officials who draw a salary below Rs. 500. We, in the Sub-Committee of Posts and Telegraphs, took great care in going through this question of overtime allowance and discussed it at great length. We found there were some telegraphists who drew overtime allowance. We found there were people in the railways who drew overtime allowance. So this question of overtime allowance is not peculiar to the Customs Department. We find this prevailing in so many other departments, and so we must treat this similarly and simultaneously. If we pick up only one particular department, it will not be right or fair to stop it, unless the main Retrenchment Committee comes to the conclusion in future that it should be abolished all through. But before we come to this conclusion whether

overtime allowance should be retrenched or not, one principle will have to be taken into consideration and it is this: that a man who joins the service has in view the prospects in the service. He joins in the grade of Rs. 175 to Rs. 350, and he knows that he will make up over and above this Rs. 50 to Rs. 60 a month by doing extra work. If we make a sweeping retrenchment at this time, we will be depriving that man of the salary which he really expected at the time he entered service. We have already got a ten per cent. cut in the salary of all the employees. This man in the Customs Department will be deprived not only of ten per cent. of his fixed salary, but also his overtime in full. In this way he will forgo a substantial portion of his salary. This will act very harshly on the poor employee. If this recommendation is accepted, it will apply to low paid subordinates who are getting salaries from Rs. 175 to Rs. 350 and from Rs. 350 rising to Rs. 650. This is not a big salary at all. They are not people from whom you ought to take out a substantial grant of the kind which they are getting. I would not mind if 25 per cent., or 10 per cent. of this extra amount which they are getting, is also taken out. That would be quite sufficient; but beyond that, unless and until we come to one deliberate conclusion in the main Retrenchment Committee, I am afraid we cannot accept that proposal.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch Till Twenty Minutes Past Two of the Clock.

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

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I must at the very outset in regard to this motion, which has been described as an economic cut, make my position very clear. I was inclined to support this motion at the outset, but I have absolutely and definitely changed my mind after hearing the Leader of the Independent Party. He was the Chairman of a sub-committee known as the Retrenchment Sub-Committee and a Chairman of a retrenchment sub-committee cannot force his cut down the throats of an administration because he wants what he has recommended should be incorporated. As an Executive Councillor, he should have known—I regret his absence at present but I cannot postpone my speech awaiting his presence—as an ex-Executive Councillor he should have known that Committees are appointed to advise and, for members of committees, though they have constitutional authority, it is not the usual parliamentary etiquette, to say that every comma and every syllable of their recommendation should be carried out. I can understand the enunciation of the general principles. I can also understand the carrying out of large cuts. When my friend, Sirdar Harbans Singh, came forward with a censure cut—and I still maintain that a censure cut is a censure cut and a token cut is a token cut, but I do not understand an economic cut which is uneconomical—I say when my friend Sirdar Harbans Singh came forward with a censure cut reducing the supply to the Executive Council to one rupee, (he left one rupee so that it might be called a censure), there was not sufficient strength on the Opposition side, or for that matter there

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

was not sufficient opinion in favour of Mr. Harbans Singh in the all-Party collaborations to stand by that motion. This is the first time in the history of this Assembly when Ordinances rage outside, that a handful of Oppositionists do not make it possible for this side of the House to censure the Government. It is absurd and ridiculous for any Member on this side of the House to stand up and say, "We moved a censure cut". No. It was an economic cut that we moved, or a Rs. 100 cut; we have not censured the administration because we had not the courage to censure the administration as the Government was censured in the past by eminent men like Pandit Motilal Nehru and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, even when there were no Ordinances in the country. I absolutely decline to associate myself with Sir Abdur Rahim's motion as an economic cut, when neither his party nor my party nor any other party on the floor of the House had the courage to unfurl the flag of censure when confusion is raging outside. That being the case, it is ridiculous, it is absurd, to talk of an economic cut. All that the Leader of the Independent Party said to-day could have been said on a 100-rupee cut. There was nothing to prevent an economic cut being discussed under a 100-rupee cut. So much for politics and policy.

Now, coming to the merits of the question, because a Retrenchment Committee recommends that you must cut down so much, certainly it is not for the Chairman of that Committee to use this opportunity in this House—though he is perfectly entitled to do so from a constitutional point of view—it is not for him to use this opportunity in this House and set a pistol to the head of the Government and say, "Take this much or I censure you on economic grounds". That is not the way to deal with a situation like this. I am not in agreement with the figures of the Retrenchment Committee nor am I perfectly in agreement with the policy of retrenchment. I am very much appreciative of the facts that they have brought forward, and we all honour Sir Abdur Rahim for the laborious days he has devoted at very great personal inconvenience to himself in a great cause, but I do not accept his judgment in regard to retrenchment. I refuse to accept his figures because his figures in my opinion are unworthy of acceptance in toto, which is what he wants.

Now, coming to the attitude that I propose to adopt on this side of the House, it is an attitude certainly not of support for this motion. Whether it is going to be an attitude of neutrality or not or of active opposition to it, the future, which is not very distant before us, will reveal. But when I say this, I say it with a due sense of responsibility attaching to myself, not in any party capacity, but as a Member who has a constituency outside and who deeply felt the inability of this House to rise equal to the occasion and support the motion of Sirdar Harbans Singh, because he made it a censure cut and because he meant that only one rupee should be left for the Executive Council; and had his motion been carried, we would not have witnessed the painful luxury of conversations that we had from this side of the House, futile and in many respects unsatisfactory—as a memorial which we have submitted to the Honourable the Leader of the House will disclose when it is placed on the table—futile and unsatisfactory constitutional discussions that emanated from this House, because had Mr. Harbans Singh's motion been carried there would have been only one rupee left and you could not raise a constitutional discussion on that one rupee; and if you raised it on that one rupee,

subsequent discussions would have fallen to the ground; but what we wanted was not business; what we wanted was not censure; what we wanted, alas! was the luxury of futilities in which we have been indulging.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju (Ganjam cum Vizagapatam: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, I am very much surprised at the remarks of my Honourable friend Mr. Ranga Iyer. If I understood him aright, he is trying to cut his nose to spite his face

Mr. K. Ahmad: What face?

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: His face. He has mentioned about the cut motion of my Honourable friend, Sirdar Harbans Singh.

An Honourable Member: Speak louder.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: If he had any cause for complaint that that motion could not be discussed in this House, who is at fault?

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Who is at fault?

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: I am answering you. It is the fault of the Leader of the Nationalist Party whose cut motion was put down for that day.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Of every party; of all the parties including the Leader of the Nationalist Party.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: No. I maintain that it was not the fault of anybody else. It was an arrangement, as you know, Sir, that all the party leaders had come to a particular arrangement, and according to that particular arrangement my Honourable friend, the Leader of the Nationalist Party, had to move his cut; and when that cut was tabled, it was of necessity given preference to other cuts in accordance with the ruling you then gave on the understanding which we all unanimously agreed to follow; and I therefore say that my Honourable friend Mr. Ranga Iyer being a Member of this House is bound to obey the arrangement.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: I was not present at your party meeting.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: If my Honourable friend was not present, is that any reason why he should come now and censure us and bring this debate into disrepute?

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: You brought Sirdar Harbans Singh's motion into disrepute.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: And instead of having a quarrel with his own leader and with his own party or for that matter instead of settling the quarrels amongst themselves, he has wantonly attacked my leader. It is no use denying that fact. What has my leader done now? He wants that a certain retrenchment should be made in Customs, and he has shown the grounds why that retrenchment should be given effect to. And he has

[Mr. B. Sitaramaraju.]

shown grounds how retrenchment could be effected. Does it lie in the mouth of a Member of the Nationalist Party to say that there should not be retrenchment effected in the expenditure of the Government simply because Sirdar Harbans Singh's motion could not be discussed? Sir, I am very much surprised. I am always anxious that we should try to understand each other and perform to the best of our ability the duty that is cast upon us. We do not want to import unnecessary and personal matters into the debates on the floor of the House. After all, we have come at a great sacrifice

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Every one has come at a sacrifice.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: I am glad to hear that every one has come at a sacrifice,—I know Members come at great personal sacrifices,—all of us have come from long distances,—to share with the Government such responsibility as we can, to tell the Government when we cannot agree with them, why we could not and what they should do. When that is our object, why should we unnecessarily quarrel and then attack each other simply because Sirdar Harbans Singh's motion could not be moved.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: The merits of that motion, the censure motion.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: My friend says it is a question of the merits of that motion. Honourable Members of this House are aware that the merits of that motion have been discussed by a Resolution of this House.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: A ridiculous and fantastic Resolution.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: It may be a ridiculous Resolution, but my Honourable friend was himself a party to it. (Applause.)

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: A party under a compromise.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: My friend says that he was a party under a compromise, but still

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: A compromise which was not observed.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: A compromise, my friend says, which was not observed. So far as I understand the position, there was no such

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: I would point out, Sir

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): Order, order: The Honourable Member must remember that he was not interrupted even once during the course of his own speech. The Chair finds that the Honourable Member who is in possession of the House is hardly allowed to complete a single sentence without being interrupted by the Honourable Member. I should like to ask the Honourable Member whether it is wise to discuss on the floor of the House what happened inside party meetings. The arrangement to which the whole House agreed has

been carried out. I did not like to interrupt the Honourable Member when he was addressing the House, but it is not desirable in the opinion of the Chair that any discussion of what happened at party meetings should take place here as far as possible, and unless the question of principle is involved, it should not be brought on the floor of the House. The Honourable Member had full liberty to give expression to his views uninterrupted, and the Chair would ask the Honourable Member not to interrupt other speakers. If after the conclusion of the speech of the Honourable Member who is in possession of the House, the Honourable Member has anything to say by way of a personal explanation, the Chair will give him ample opportunity to do so, but in the interests of good debate the Honourable Member will abstain from interrupting so frequently as he has been doing.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: Sir, I am very grateful to you for your remarks. That is exactly what I am trying to convey. It is not for us to import into this question extraneous considerations.

There is just one more observation which my friend made. He said that it does not lie in the mouth of Sir Abdur Rahim, the President of the General Purposes Committee, to say that the Government should accept every one of the recommendations of that Committee, and that it was not open to them to say so. That is not exactly the position, Sir, that my leader has taken up. What he said was this, that there was considerable room for retrenchment, but still Government had not carried out retrenchments to the extent that they should have. Although we had the explanation of the Honourable the Finance Secretary and other Members, still we are not quite satisfied with the explanation offered, and we feel that Government have not effected retrenchments to the fullest possible extent.

Mr. S. C. Mitra (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhamadan Rural): Mr. Ranga Iyer should give notice of his own amendments, instead of criticising others.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Sir, this is a cut motion that the Demand under the head Customs be reduced by Rs. 6,57,000. That is called an economic cut, I understand. (Laughter.) It has been distinguished by my friend Mr. Ranga Iyer

An Honourable Member: He is your friend.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Yes, he is my friend but he does not ask me to lunch. (Laughter.) My friend has distinguished that economic cut and has called it a token cut, or a cut on a motion of censure.

An Honourable Member: What is the difference?

Mr. K. Ahmed: That is an elementary question. Now, Sir, according to my friend, by calling the cut an economic cut, it is implied that because he is a party leader he agreed to that cut, and the Honourable the President accepted it; but it is no use criticising the term, whether it is a "token cut" or a "censure cut" or an "economic cut", because now the whole country is fighting, and my friend Mr. Ranga Iyer has today forgotten—he

[Mr. K. Ahmed.]

is breathing so rapidly (Laughter)—he is not economising towards committing murder he is killing, he is inhaling and exhaling all his breath,—he is killing the insects of the atmosphere, particularly on the floor of this House. Be that as it may but the Honourable Member from Bengal, the Mover of this motion, wants to reduce a certain amount which is incurred on overtime payment for officers of the Customs Department. The figures can be found at pages 1 to 29, and it appears under head Preventive Officers. There are in the present year 273 such officers. Out of these 273 Preventive Officers mentioned by the Mover of the motion I understand that a majority of them belong to the community of my friend Colonel Sir Henry Gidney who I find is likened to Shylock, but he himself is pretending to play the role of Portia. He is rude, and instead of being tolerant, he is rough to his friends of the opposite party, forgetting that the major portion of the 273 appointments of Preventive Officers are held by members of his community and their salaries are paid out of the revenues collected from the majority community whom some of my friends represent in this House. And if he had any sense of humour (Laughter), if my friend Sir Henry had realised the situation, he would have seen that it is now over 12 years that he is representing a constituency, and if he is not doing any service to them, I am afraid that he is doing a great injustice to the constituency that he has the honour to represent; instead of trying to do good to his constituency, he is badly treating them, because he knows,—I am telling him through you, Sir,—he is sitting cheerfully on his seat (Laughter) without realising the whole situation and treating his colleagues as if they are, what shall I say, savage beasts. (Laughter.) (*An Honourable Member*: "They are friends.") Yes, but he did not invite them to lunch or was even courteous when speaking. Well, if my friend knows that his constituents should be treated well, particularly in view of his nomination to this House, then he should urge that the members of his community should be properly paid, and it is his duty to make matters smooth and not to make them rough. It is, Sir, for that reason

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: On a personal explanation, Sir. In view of the observations that are being made relating to my conduct, I should like to explain and it is supported by my side of the House that the question that this motion should be supported as a party arrangement is absolutely incorrect, because our party has not agreed to support the motion or to oppose it. The only arrangement was that it should be taken up for discussion, and every one of my party is a free agent. I have not therefore been a party to any breach of agreement.

Mr. K. Ahmed: That explanation should have been given by the Honourable Member much earlier or at least after I had finished (Laughter); out of courtesy he should have followed the rules of etiquette of this House or of any society and I am very much afraid that my Honourable friend is not conducting himself properly. (At this stage Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer rose in his seat to interrupt the speaker.) I am not going to yield. He is not in a proper mood and I am very sorry for him because his movement today from beginning to end shows that people in these hard days will not put up with it. We have got the licence to address this Assembly, with certain understanding, under certain rules of etiquette. If we conduct ourselves and become objectionable in season and out of season, will the independent Members, particularly the elected Members, and you,

Sir, who are elected by the people—will the Members of this House allow that sort of thing when people do not like it and if anybody is objectionable people would not put up with it. Sir, I leave my Honourable friend Mr. Ranga Iyer alone.

Coming to the cut of Rs. 6,57,000, which is called an economic cut, my friend the Leader of the Independent Party wants to carry home from the point of view of economy that the rate of payment for overtime work should be reduced by half. Many other Honourable Members have mentioned that in other departments there is no overtime for extra work, for instance, in the police and the C. I. D. They work day and night; they have to wield regulation *lathis* and watch day and night, and where are those Anglo-Indians, where are those people who want overtime which comes to Rs. 13 or 14 lakhs? This year time has lapsed and payment will be made up to the 31st March. There is no work in the port of Calcutta; very few steamers are coming in. I do not know about the condition in Bombay and Karachi, probably it is worse. The amount of reduction which is stated in the cut by the Leader of the Independent Party will not be the right figure, because all of us know even from the income of the other departments, such as the railways and others; probably it will be much less. So, I do not think there will be very much overtime that these Customs officers will have to work. But be that as it may, it is for the sake of a principle that the fight is taking place on the floor of this House. If Mr. Nixon, who has been in the Accountant General's office, Bombay, had not used the word "henchman" to Mr. S. C. Mitra he would have done better than what he did in his maiden speech to-day. 20 years ago I used that term in respect of a Junior Public Prosecutor of Alipore and the Magistrate immediately took me to task. I was then a practitioner of three or four years' standing, and I was in the same position as Mr. Nixon is to-day. I have since grown old. Once I called a Public Prosecutor as "Private Persecutor" and I lost my case. (Laughter.) Sir Henry Gidney has forgotten his position and is fighting with the Leader of a Party who is a very educated and experienced gentleman, the second of whom you cannot get in the whole of my province. It is high time that the Honourable the Finance Member came forward and asked politely the Leader of the Independent Party to withdraw his economic cut, giving a definite promise that Government will consider and follow the rules of economy. No Government can now-a-days become spendthrift. Their debts are becoming greater and greater. I do not know what danger is ahead in the coming year. So, it will be advisable if the Government explain the situation and try to bring about uniformity in the salaries paid in different departments. The majority of these Anglo-Indians, without passing any examination or being educated in any university, draw fat salaries. My Honourable friend Mr. Yamin Khan is far away from the port of Calcutta, in an upcountry district, Meerut, with very little experience of what happens in the Customs offices in Calcutta, Bombay and Karachi. He innocently stated in his speech that to start on a salary of 130 per month you must be a graduate at least. I challenge Government and Colonel Gidney to say how many of them are graduates. Now, this *jal* police (Port Police), as they call it, are not getting all sorts of extra pay and allowances in addition to their salary. I happen to have experience of both the police and the Customs officers as my Chamber is situated next door, so to say. I have been there for 22 or 23 years and I know every corner of the Customs House and the police court. I know the duty discharged by the police.

[Mr. K. Ahmed.]

Is there any justification for these Anglo-Indians in the Customs office to draw Rs. 130 to 575 without passing any examinations? Is it a joke or is he a spoilt child? (*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney*: "Spoilt child.") If it is a spoilt child then the parents know how to treat him and he will tumble down and realise that this is not the game of a child. My friend Col. Gidney must realise which community he is representing. It is a principle for which the fight is going on, and I hope that the Honourable the Finance Member will get up and explain how he is going to observe the rules for retrenchment.

I have a personal grudge against this office, speaking on behalf of my community. There are only three Muhammadan Preventive Officers out of 273 officers. One man, who was an M.A. with first class honours, has been permanently transferred to the Education Department as Lecturer at the Islamia College on a higher salary than Rs. 130. Members of my community are told in this House, in season and out of season, that though they have passed the examination, they lack experience and they cannot pass a departmental examination. The second Preventive Officer has got 14 years' service. On account of retrenchment his post has been reduced, while Anglo-Indians with 25 to 30 years service or even more and who ought to have been reduced first have been retained. My friend Col. Gidney does not realise the position. (*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney*: "What is that?") My friend asks what is that. Is there any country where this sort of jobbery, pilfering and extortion goes on at the expense of the tax-payer? That poor Muhammadan lad with 14 years experience in the service has been reduced. I want to ask the Honourable the Finance Member, Mr. Nixon, and the Revenue Board how long this injustice is going to be done to my community. My friend Col. Gidney is representing the Anglo-Indians, but why should the Government give him and his community any preference over the sons of the soil? Have you heard of any country where the sons of the soil are treated like this? If a man is a Muhammadan then you think according to you he must be disqualified. This is the sort of treatment meted out to members of my community, and I challenge the Honourable the Finance Member to make an inquiry into this matter, that if the rule for retrenchment has been infringed and a poor Muhammadan lad is the victim, that has got to be set right, and the sooner it is done the better, because our people are getting impatient, and the treatment meted out particularly in this department is certainly shocking.

Four years ago, Mr. President, when your predecessor was in the chair, it was myself that had taken to task a Customs officer in Calcutta, and also the Chairman of the Board of Revenue, because they would not listen to those memorials which they receive day and night. Sir, I might mention that I wrote a demi-official letter on the basis of certain information from some Muhammadan Association asking the Collector of Customs, Mr. Hardy—who was here sometime ago sitting in the seat of our Honourable friend, Mr. Nixon—but, Sir, he had not the courtesy to reply to my letter, though he is my intimate friend, as far as I am personally concerned. But, Sir, if injustice is done, in order to satisfy the Anglo-Indian community and in order to suffer illegalities known to the trade, then it is high time that something was done, so that justice may prevail, and if justice is not done, then woe to the Government. If the Government

already know all the facts and still they will say, "We shall consider", but will never consider the situation, and if that boy is removed from his post while men with 25 to 30 years' service or even more are kept on, so that they might continue to draw their fat salaries, is not, I ask, the very object and its principle laid down by themselves of retrenchment frustrated? Does not the Honourable the Finance Member or Mr. Nixon, who mentioned a court of appeal, realize that this is the court of appeal for him, and that if he had to appear before that court, contempt proceedings would have been drawn against him for negligence and dereliction of duty? I ask, Sir, in all seriousness that these matters should be inquired into and justice should be done to these poor people. As far as my friend, Sir Hugh Cocke, is concerned, he says there are certain items of retrenchment which were considered—I think two of them he said—but as regards the rest, "not till he heard from the Government"—said my friend—would he do anything. Is he not, I ask, the Leader of the European Group here? Is he not independent of the Government? Has he not got his own opinion? I thought my friend was very good at arithmetic and in audit, and if he will expect that the certification will follow, I am very sorry. With regard to Mr. Nixon's statement that he wants the sense of responsibility in the departmental heads to be waited for, it was his duty, Sir, that he should have at once, instead of making a lengthy speech, told his leader, of whom according to him he is the "henchman", that he would at once advise him to take into consideration all those six items, so that the Government would try their best to help the Sub-Committee in the matter.

Sir, the ten per cent. cut is no doubt a uniform cut all through; and they have agreed I believe that the ten per cent. should apply with regard to overtime also. Well, Sir, there is also the principle of the cut in the deduction of salary including overtime. But then if a definite amount will be reduced if this motion is carried, I do not know how far the position will be affected when the Honourable the Finance Member moves his motion for granting that Demand of about 13 lakhs I believe, and if there is a reduction for the sake of economy of 6 lakhs, I do not know how far those figures will be accurate because I know for certain that the same amount will never come, even if this House passes this motion for the sake of economy. But, Sir, I expect that certain undertakings should be given by Government.

With regard, Sir, to the income, the members of Honourable friend Sir Henry Gidney's constituency, who are in the Customs Offices, are receiving, I must tell him that the income has been reduced so much and the establishment cost has increased so much that now-a-days nobody can afford to speak in the tone that he has spoken. It may be that the Police Office is engaged on imposing fines, but certainly, Sir, the Customs Department that has brought about so much misappropriation, that has so much illegality to its credit and so much negligence, as has been shown, by its officers for the last few years, surely that Department cannot be allowed to have so much latitude for the sake of its Anglo-Indian officers. Sir, only a few days ago we came to know that certain revolvers and ammunition and cartridges, etc., were despatched from a foreign country like Germany or Russia and found their way to the toll office of the Customs Department in Calcutta through the negligence of its officers, who thus were instrumental in the smuggling of these revolvers which are the instruments of killing our I. C. S. men in Bengal if not in other

[Mr. K. Ahmed.]

places. Sir, the smuggling of revolvers and the smuggling of opium and cocaine have brought in very bad results and discredit to the Customs Department, and it is high time that qualified men, with experience of police methods, educated men having experience of C. I. D. work, should be recruited; otherwise, Sir, such nefarious smuggling will bring ruin to the case of Bengal administration—I do not know so much of Bombay, Karachi and other ports. Sir, I should ask the Finance Member to give a definite written direction to the Central Board of Revenue so that they might write to the Collector of Customs to be very very careful in the matter of future appointments and to consider all these matters, because, Sir, we are fighting here to save the Government and to bring safety to the country. It is scandalous that men should draw high and fat salaries and at the same time abuse their powers, with the result that valuable I. C. S. and other officers who work meritoriously and give their services for the good of our country should be saved from being done to death through the smuggling of arms through the customs in these days of difficulty. Now, Sir, on account of the negligence and unfitness of the Anglo-Indian officers, the Customs Department could not discharge their proper duty. I would not like to trouble the House with any other question except this that merit should be considered first of all the necessary qualification and not the other question of the communal right of their *pro tanto* percentage in the matter of appointment. With regard to the cut motion for Rs. 6,57,000 I ask the Government to be good enough to give certain undertakings to satisfy the Leader of the Independent Party and to satisfy particularly the elected Members that they will take certain steps to meet their request.

Sir Hari Singh Gour (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muham-
madan): Sir, I have very great pleasure in supporting the motion moved by my friend Sir Abdur Rahim and I am only sorry that the Honourable the Finance Member did not immediately get up and accept his very reasonable proposals. I would not have troubled the House were it not for the fact that some Member of my Party got up and said that he personally dissociated himself from the motion moved by the Leader of the Independent Party, in that there was no party question in it. Well, Sir, I think it is a matter upon which non-official Members, and even the official Benches, know what was passing behind the scenes. When we set out our procedure for the purpose of wasting as little time as possible on the various cuts, all Members who were present and the representatives of all parties appointed a small Budget Committee to go into the various cuts. That Budget Committee drew up its list, and on Wednesday immediately after you adjourned the House, Members met and generally approved of the action taken by the Budget Committee. They did not certainly bind the Members to any individual cut, but there was a general approval that these cuts should be tabled following the lines of recommendations made by the General Purposes Committee. Various Members who have given notices of these cuts have consequently given notices upon the strength of the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee. I therefore submit that while Members are free to speak on the merits of any particular cut, they cannot repudiate the pact that was made by the non-official Benches for the purpose of economising time.

Having said this, I wish to very clearly point out that the Honourable the Leader of the Independent Party has been, indeed, much too

modest in demanding only a cut of Rs. 6,57,000. If Honourable Members will turn to page 31 of part II of the General Purposes Committee's report, they will find that from overtime and penalty the Customs receive a revenue of Rs. 12,35,000, out of which Rs. 6,47,000 out of the overtime and Rs. 3,39,000 out of the penalty realised, is paid to officers and the balance of Rs. 1,91,000 is spent in grants to various seamen's institutions. Now, what the Honourable Members of the General Purposes Committee recommended was that the payment of this last sum of Rs. 9,86,000 to the officers in addition to their pay for overtime and a share of the penalty, was unjustified on two grounds. First, on the ground that they were whole-time officers and, secondly, upon the ground that these officers were well paid and in the present year of stress and national anxiety they should bear a certain proportion of the burden which falls upon every servant of the State. I submit that there is hardly anything to be said against the motion moved by the Honourable the Leader of the Independent Party. If I have understood the statement made by the Honourable the Finance Member on previous occasions in this connection aright, I understood his statement to mean this, that he is still exploring the further avenues for retrenchment and that the chapter of national economy is not yet closed. All that, therefore, we want the Honourable the Finance Member to do is to take into account the wishes of this side of the House that this item should be considered while dealing with the other factors on the subject of retrenchment. I submit that the Honourable the Finance Member's hands will be greatly strengthened by the vote of this House, and it is not merely for the purpose of making a cut on this or on other items of the Budget that we have tabled these motions. We are sincerely of opinion that there is a great room for further retrenchment, and it is in order to strengthen the hands of the Finance Department in their effort to make further retrenchments that we have tabled these cuts in a purely friendly spirit, with no desire to antagonise anyone on the Treasury Benches, but with the single purpose of strengthening the hands of the Finance and the other departments in effecting national economy. That, I submit, is our sole purpose and I have not the slightest doubt that the Honourable the Finance Member and his colleagues occupying the Treasury Benches will understand that that is our purpose and no other.

Sir, it is now quarter past three. I had hoped that, following the line of action that all Honourable Members had decided to take on Wednesday, we should be able, at any rate, to clear one page of the Agenda Paper. But unfortunately we are still on the first cut, and if Honourable Members express a desire, I should certainly ask the Honourable Members to place a curb upon their eloquence and see that all future motions are limited as to time for 10 minutes. I submit, Sir, that we must convert ourselves into a business House. Let us not repeat the lamentable spectacle which this House presented in connection with the Railway Budget, and I am sorry that I have to say so in such explicit terms today that we have wasted a greater part of today which we had reserved for formal business of moving economy cuts under the various heads of the demands. I appeal to the Honourable Members once more that these cuts were never intended to be debated upon at great length, or indeed at any length at all. The intention was that the speeches of the Members are contained in the report of the Retrenchment Committee, the facts are known to the Honourable occupants of the Treasury Benches and a formal motion by the authors of the cut would suffice for the purpose of justifying them.

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

I hope that that procedure will, at any rate, now be followed during the rest of today and tomorrow, so that we may be able to dispose of the business we have remaining in hand.

Several Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

Mr. President: I accept the closure. The question is:

“That the question be now put.”

The motion was adopted.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, in spite of the ruling which has just been given by my Honourable and learned,—I might almost say omniscient—friend, the Leader of the Nationalist Party, that there is nothing to be said in answer to the motion which has been moved by my Honourable and learned friend, the Leader of the Independent Party, in spite of that ruling, Sir, I am afraid I must ask the House to listen to what I have got to say. But, I hope, Sir, reciprocating what has fallen from the lips of my Honourable and learned friend, the House will appreciate that when I ask for the full amount of expenditure for which we have asked in the Demands for Grants, I do so in a perfectly friendly spirit. Sir, there is no malice in my attack on the tax-payers' pockets. I am friendly to every tax-payer, but I am afraid that I want his money. Sir, I have received a certain amount of support in the course of this debate, and I am grateful for the support whether it comes from the Benches opposite, from my Honourable and eloquent friend Mr. Ranga Iyer or from my right, from my Honourable and gallant friend Sir Henry Gidney, or from behind me, from my loyal “henchman” Mr. Nixon (Laughter). Who has indeed in all these engagements, in all these serious battles about retrenchment rendered to me the service of a true henchman, which is to stand by the side of his leader, to ward off blows which may fall on him and to deliver shrewd blows on his opponents. Sir, I will try to observe the directions which my Honourable friend the Leader of the Nationalist Party has laid down, namely, brevity in speeches on this subject. But I stand here to convince the House, if I can—and I am confident that I shall be able to do so,—to convince the House on its merits of the justice of the demand we are now making. The case is really a very simple one. There are, as Mr. Nixon pointed out, two main points of difference between the sum which we require and the sum which, if this motion were accepted, we should get. In the first place the recommendation of the General Purposes Sub-Committee was that there should be a general cut in establishment, allowances, etc., of 15 per cent., and we have felt that we cannot safely accept more than 10 per cent. That accounts for Rs. 2,85,000. And in the second place there is a difference between their recommendation as regards overtime fees and what we feel it fair to impose upon the staff. This accounts for Rs. 3,53,000. These two differences combined give us a total of Rs. 6,38,000 which is very near to the total amount of the cut. Now, in one respect, I think the way in which this cut has been put to the House is somewhat misleading. I should like to call the attention of Honourable Members to the summary which we have circulated, where they will find that under Demand 16 the recommendations of the Retrenchment Sub-Committee were for economies of Rs. 16,03,000. If they follow the table down to the bottom, and if they eliminate the increase in compensation and assignments due to the introduction of new arrangements for receipts of Cochin

Port of 9 lakhs, which of course is not an extra expenditure at all, if they eliminate that item, they will find that in fact even allowing for increments in pay and for certain new items of expenditure, we are actually reducing the Customs grant by 15 lakhs and 85 thousand rupees. That is only Rs. 15,000 short of the Retrenchment Sub-Committee's recommendations. I freely admit that in that total is included the sum for cuts in pay. But, I do think it is somewhat unfair, in judging of the effects of retrenchment, entirely to eliminate the effects of cuts in pay; because as the Retrenchment Sub-Committee themselves pointed out very early in their discussions, we must aim at retrenchment in two ways, partly by reducing the staff and partly by reducing the pay of the staff that we are retaining. I would put it to the House that an economy of practically Rs. 16 lakhs on a grant of about Rs. 96 lakhs is a very substantial achievement. Now, I feel it somewhat unfortunate that according to the order of priority which the parties in this House have adopted, we should have all these cuts on the revenue producing departments first. I feel it is unfortunate because—and I here put myself on the same side as my Honourable friends opposite—because I am anxious that the whole question of retrenchment should be fully reviewed by this House. But in connection with revenue collecting departments there are special considerations which apply, and it is really a very dangerous thing to carry retrenchment too far. I ought of course in a sense to be pleased that this order has been adopted because our case in defending our position is very much stronger as regards the revenue producing departments than it can possibly be as regards any other departments. In the latter you can, if you desire as a matter of policy, reduce the services which the Government are rendering. But in the case of the revenue producing departments, you are risking vast sums of money. Indeed if our proposals are open to criticism on any side at all, I definitely think that it is not on the side of inadequate retrenchment, for in the case of the Customs and the Income-tax Departments, we may be actually going too far in risking reductions of staff. Now, if I turn to the substance of the recommendations of the Retrenchment Sub-Committee, they have recommended what I am afraid I must describe as an entirely arbitrary cut of 15 per cent. I have found no explanation of why they hit upon exactly this figure of 15 per cent. In other cases, they have adopted different percentages, but in the Customs, as a matter of immediate judgment based on some sort of *a priori* intuition, they seem to have arrived at the conclusion that 15 per cent. is a fair amount. We, Sir, have approached the matter from the other side. We have approached it, if I may adopt the philosophical distinction, by empirical methods; we have gone down to the actual facts, considered our staff and considered what it would be safe to retrench. I would put it to the House that that is the only method which is safe when one comes to deal with a department of this kind; for it has a definite service to perform and we must not risk the efficient performance of that service. Otherwise, we shall defeat the whole object of the retrenchment campaign. Now, I have before me here a long note prepared by the Department going in very great detail into the various recommendations of the Retrenchment Sub-Committee. Obviously I cannot ask the House to bear with me in going fully through this note. But there are certain points to which I should like to call the attention of the House. To take practical example, the Sub-Committee, for example, made a recommendation that the net reduction among officers, taking Collectors and Assistant Collectors together, should be at least six. They said that

[Sir George Schuster.]

the Board's proposal to make a net reduction of three, that is to say, ten per cent., was not enough. They recommended six of the posts on their ideal percentage of 15 per cent. In the first place, I would point out that a reduction of six from a cadre of 35, which is the cadre, would be a reduction of 17 per cent. and not 15 per cent. I would point out, secondly, that in fact it is not correct to show that the reduction offered by the Board is three because the Board has actually proposed a reduction of five Assistant Collectors' posts partly counterbalanced by the creation of two new posts of Chief Accounts Officer. Now one Chief Accounts Officer is to replace the Pay and Accounts Officer at Calcutta, whose pay was formerly shown under Demand No. 37, and whose post was abolished from the first December, 1931. This officer's functions were indispensable functions and would have had to be assigned to an Assistant Collector of Customs but for the creation of the post of a Chief Accounts Officer. I merely mention that detail to show that, it is very difficult to give an exact picture when you take one grant by itself, because a good many of these grants hang together. Then again the pay of a Pay and Accounts Officer, and so of each of the two new officers is on a lower scale than that of the Imperial Customs Service, and also those posts do not carry various concessions. Allowing for all those differences, we reckon that each of these new posts is equivalent to only $\frac{2}{3}$ of one of the Assistant Collectorships which has been abolished. Following out that same precise arithmetical method of calculations, we find that against a cadre of five Collectors and 26 Assistant Collectors, plus two-thirds of an officer,—the figure I put in to represent one Pay and Accounts Officer,—from a total of 31, $\frac{2}{3}$ officers, the Board has proposed a reduction to a cadre of 5 Collectors plus 21 Assistant Collectors, plus $\frac{1}{3}$ of an officer, representing two Chief Accounts Officers, a total of 27, $\frac{1}{3}$ officers which gives a net reduction of 4, $\frac{1}{3}$ officers, or nearly 14 per cent. of the original staff of officers. I merely mention those figures to show that if there is any virtue in the particular figure of 15 per cent., if we really follow out what we have done, we have got very near to it. In the case of officers, we have in fact made a reduction of 14 per cent. That is really as far as we think it is possible to go. If another Assistant Collector were to go, which would bring the total up to 17 per cent., he would have to be taken from Madras. Now, we cannot take him from Madras at present until we have had time to gauge the extent of the extra burden that the Collector there will have to bear as a result of our decision to abolish the post of Collector of Salt Revenue and make the Collector of Customs the head of the Salt Department. That brings up another connected point which of course is not quite clear from studying this grant by itself.

Now, Sir, I must apologise to this House for having gone into these details, but really until you go into the actual staff in this way it is impossible to say whether you can effect a 10 per cent. reduction or a 15 per cent. reduction, or any other figure that you like to take. I would put it to the House that we have gone most carefully through the whole position; we have endeavoured to meet the recommendations of the Retrenchment (Sub-Committee as far as we possibly can, and we have gone a great deal further than our own departmental officers have advised us that it was safe to go. And I would ask the House to treat this matter,—in a sense perhaps it is a small matter but this discussion is typical of

what all the other discussions will be, particularly in matters connected with revenue departments,—I would ask every Member of the House to weigh very carefully the action that he will take before he commits himself to a line of action which I maintain would be one designed to force the Government into courses which are really unsound and really contrary to the public interest.

A good deal has been said by my Honourable friend Mr. K. Ahmed about certain expectations and undertakings that he might get from me. I do not know exactly what my Honourable friend had in mind. But I can give him this undertaking—that although I stand here now and say that this is the minimum demand which we feel we can safely put before the House in the present circumstances, that is not, as I have said to the House on many occasions, our last word on the subject. We do not regard this as the sum and end of our attempts to achieve economy. We have got to go on making efforts as long as the present economic conditions remain, not merely in order to effect further reductions but in order to keep where we are. I would remind the House that we are not like a man standing on a pavement who if he stands still remains where he is; we are standing on a sort of moving platform, and unless we actually move backwards we are bound to go on moving forwards as regards expenditure, because we have to face every year this automatic increase owing to the increments of pay; and we shall certainly require an effort, as I say, not merely to reduce expenditure but to keep it at its present level. That effort, I assure the House, will be made, but I ask them not to force Government now beyond what we consider after the fullest possible consideration to be safe.

Then, Sir, I hesitate to weary the House with any further discussion of this question of overtime pay. But I would just like to put before them exactly what is the position of one of these officers who is entitled to overtime pay. We are informed that owing to the decline in business, the average rate that any man will get from these overtime fees will be reduced by considerably more than 30 per cent. The Board has actually cases of one class of men whose average earnings from fees have declined from Rs. 70 over the last three years to Rs. 37 in the current year. Now, Sir, if the House will consider the position of one of these men, it is this. Supposing his pay is Rs. 300 and he can expect from overtime Rs. 70, he loses in the first place his cut of 10 per cent. on his pay of Rs. 300 which brings him down to Rs. 270. Then instead of getting Rs. 70 on his overtime fees he actually gets Rs. 37, which brings him down to Rs. 307. Then on top of that his Rs. 37 is subject to a further cut of 10 per cent., so that he goes down to about Rs. 303 as against his former expectation of total emoluments amounting to Rs. 370. Now, whether it was right originally to allow the whole of these overtime fees to persons who were doing the work is a question for consideration. But what the House has got to realise is that these were the definitely accepted conditions of service, and I maintain that to make deductions in that form of remuneration is exactly the same and on exactly the same basis for those who have engaged to serve on those terms as to cut their pay. And owing to the decline of the amount of fees which have been received, these men are very much worse off now,—they have suffered much greater deterioration in their conditions than any other class of Government servants. I think it is important to realise those facts. There is another point in connection with these overtime fees of which I want to remind the House, although

[Sir George Schuster.]

the point was made by my Honourable friend Mr. Nixon in his speech. I want to put before the House that even if we were to accept the whole principle of this cut motion, we could not possibly achieve the economy of 6½ lakhs which it purports to impose upon us, because in their calculations the Retrenchment Sub-Committee have relied on getting Rs. 5,88,000 out of a change in the method of distributing overtime fees. But unfortunately the amount that we are receiving in overtime fees has declined very considerably and we could not possibly make this saving out of adopting their principle. Mr. Nixon has pointed out that that is made clear in the general summary which we have circulated, and that we have already included in economies Rs. 2,12,000 owing to this decline in the amount of fees which we can collect. So that, in any case on this principle, the cut as it stands is an impossible one.

I have said that my Honourable friends who sat on this Retrenchment Sub-Committee were acting on an arbitrary principle in selecting 15 per cent. as the proper measure of saving. I should like to read to the House one passage from their report; they say :

“The Board has offered to effect a 10 per cent. reduction in establishments; we do not consider this offer adequate in the case of this department.”

And then they go on—and this is the sentence to which I wish to draw the attention of the House :

“India’s overseas trade, both import and export, has declined appreciably.”

I do put it to the House that in the first place that is really a misleading statement. The value of India’s trade as we all know has declined appreciably. In fact as I pointed out myself in my Budget speech, it is but a bare half of what it was two years ago. But the volume of trade has not declined in anything like the same proportion, and even if it had it would be quite impossible for us, and entirely unjustifiable for us to try and regulate the extent of our Customs staff according to temporary fluctuations in the volume of trade. We cannot follow cycles in trade, up and down; we cannot deal with a staff of a department like the Customs Department on this basis; and of all that stands in that report, that one sentence seems to me to be the most misleading. “The volume of India’s overseas trade has declined appreciably.” I take an entirely contrary view. India’s trade, like the trade of every country in the world, is suffering today; but India’s trade is, if you take a long period of years, on a clear upward grade, and we can look forward to an increase in India’s trade in the future. We have enormous irrigation schemes such as the Sukkur Barrage scheme which is coming to fruition; that alone may make an enormous difference in the volume of India’s exports and consequently in the volume of India’s imports. We are on the upward grade and one of the dangers against which we must most carefully guard is, lest under the influence of a temporary depression, we may cripple permanently the public services of this country. Sir, anxious as I am for retrenchment, that nightmare, if I may so call it, is always before me that in order to meet this temporary need we may do irreparable injury to the whole of the Government services in this country. We have tried to keep the balance fair; and I put it to the House that in these Demands—this Demand of the Customs Department—we have struck a fair balance, erring if at all on the side of going too far to meet my Honourable friend’s recommendations.

I will not take any more time of the House. I trust that they recognise that I speak with sincerity on this matter. I trust that they recognise that if I had more time I could have made out an even more convincing case to them, and I trust also that they recognise that if I stand here now and say that we cannot go further today, it does not mean that I am in any sense weakening in my determination to do all that I can to promote economy and retrenchment. If they recognise that, I think that every Member of this House can feel that he can vote against this motion without in any sense putting himself on the side of those who fail to recognise that economy in public expenditure is the most vital interest of India today.

Sir Abdur Rahim: Mr. President, I do not think it was necessary for the Honourable the Finance Member to make any long speech against the motion that I put before the House, as he is sure of considerable support from a section of the Nationalist Benches. Mr. Ranga Iyer has made his position, and I believe the position of some other Members of his party, quite clear upon this motion. He is entirely opposed to the principle on which this and other motions are based, and if I understand his attitude aright, although he is in theory entirely for economy in the administration, he is not going to support any specific proposals for economy. If that is the proper attitude taken up by a section of the Nationalist Party

Sir Hari Singh Gour: I wish to point out to the Honourable Member that there is no justification for saying that that is the view of any section of the Nationalist Party. My friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, made it plain that that was his personal view; and he is entitled to give expression to his personal view; but to impute that view to any section of the Nationalist Party is unjustifiable by anything that Mr. Ranga Iyer has said this afternoon.

Sir Abdur Rahim: Mr. Ranga Iyer is the Vice-President of the Nationalist Party, and I take it that when he speaks, he does speak at least for a section of that party; otherwise he would not have occupied the position of Vice-Leader. Further, he read out a statement which was supported, he said, by at least several members of his party, that the arrangement was not to the effect that there will be general support from his party, but that every one will be entitled to say what he has to say on the several motions and vote as he likes. If all that has any meaning, that means that the Honourable the Finance Member and the Government have considerable support in the Nationalist Party against any motion for economic cuts. In fact Mr. Ranga Iyer said that he does not care for any economic cuts when the censure cut was not moved. Whose fault was it? What censure cut was not moved? As regards the Ordinances, a motion was moved and we gave it full support; but is that any reason, whatever may have happened, why this question should not be dealt with on the merits? But as I have said, the position now is that the Nationalist Party as a whole is not going to support us on these economy proposals.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: I wish, lest there should be any misunderstanding on that point, to assure my friend, Sir Abdur Rahim,—and I have the authority of my friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, to say—that his statement was purely personal to him and was not made by him as a representative of the party.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: Can you speak for your party?

Sir Hari Singh Gour: I can.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: Can you?

Sir Abdur Rahim: If my Honourable friend Sir Hari Singh Gour was so sure that that was not the attitude of his party or of any section of his party, one would have expected that when Mr. Ranga Iyer was speaking he would have got up and corrected him and said that that was not the attitude of any section of his party but only the personal view of Mr. Ranga Iyer himself.

As for Mr. Ranga Iyer, we all know him and I need not point out that there are many Members of the House who would not take him seriously on this or any occasion at all. He has made his position quite clear as to these Committees and their reports. He told us on a previous occasion that he threw the report of the General Purposes Committee into the waste-paper basket; he never read it and never intended to read it; and I suppose he has done similar honour to the second report of the General Purposes Sub-Committee. After that to expect. . . .

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: On a point of personal explanation, all that I said on that occasion—and if the honourable gentleman refreshes his memory he will find it—was this, that I did not believe in reading reports distributed to us in driblets; I wanted to read them all together.

Sir Abdur Rahim: Did not the Honourable Member say that it ought to be consigned to the waste-paper basket? If he reads through his speech again he will find that he did say that. Anyway, Sir, I shall now come to the merits of the proposal before the House, but having regard to the attitude taken up by the Vice-Leader of the Nationalist Party, we do not propose to press this motion to a division.

Now, Sir, as regards the reduction of 15 per cent. in the Customs establishment, our justification was that there was a considerable decline in the volume of trade, and this was admitted by many witnesses who appeared before us, in fact some of the official witnesses who were questioned on the point said that it would take some years,—some said five, some said seven years, before we could expect a trade revival. Under those circumstances 15 per cent. reduction in the establishment could not be said to be too much. The Honourable Sir George Schuster has not told us that the volume of trade has not declined by 15 per cent., it has declined much more. These are the figures:

1929-30, it was 22 crores 93 lakhs and odd.

1930-31, it was 14 crores 49 lakhs and odd.

1931-32, it was 10 crores 93 lakhs and odd.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Would the Honourable Member inform the House what figures he is reading?

Sir Abdur Rahim: I am reading from the summary of table showing the value of imports and exports and of the total exports for each month. This is from the accounts relating to the sea-borne trade and navigation of British India.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: But these are figures of the value of trade. If I might be permitted to do so, I should like to make one point clear. I fully admitted,—in fact it was the main theme of my Budget speech—that the value of trade had fallen by about a half. In the speech which I have just made, I drew a distinction between the *value* of trade with the *volume* of trade. As to the latter I may perhaps give my friend some figures which I intended to give the House in my speech. The total number of bills of entry and shipping bills handled at all ports in 1930-31,—that is to say the last year for which we have figures,—and it was a very bad year,—was 1,319,767 as against for 1926-27, which was one of the biggest years of trade for India, 1,841,893. That is to say, there was a decline of only 2½ per cent. in the total number of bills of entry and shipping bills handled at all ports. I think that gives a fair idea of the position as regards the business of the customs officials, and it shows that there has not been any sensational decline.

Sir Abdur Rahim: I ask my friend if the decline in volume could have been only 2 per cent. while the decline in value has been 50 per cent.?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Certainly it could. But the reason why there has been this fall in value is a question to which I too would like to know the answer.

Sir Abdur Rahim: As regards the Central Board of Revenue, they themselves recommended 10 per cent. My friend complained that we applied a higher figure to this department, but he will find that we did not have and could not have a uniform percentage for all departments. We had to look into the case of each department before suggesting how much should be reduced.

One general remark made by my friend was that the revenue collecting department should be treated on a different basis. In fact, in the summary that has been supplied to us, the position of the Finance Department is stated in this way:

“ This second report covers the cost of collection of revenue in the Customs, Salt and Opium Departments, the expenditure on the Secretariat departments, expenditure on Ports and Pilotage and Lighthouses which is wholly or partly covered by receipts, the operations of the currency and mint departments, all of which are fields in which retrenchment by the elimination or reduction of particular activities is not possible to the same extent as in the scientific and research departments of which the activities can be temporarily suspended or restricted without grave risk to the efficiency of the administration.”

That has been the attitude of the Finance Department throughout. Their view is, cut out as much as you can in the Education, scientific and research departments, but do not make any cuts in what are called the revenue collecting and administrative departments. That is a position we could not accept. It was rather amusing that, only the other day my friend Sir Fazl-i-Husain came in here and protested in the presence of Sir George Schuster that we were cutting all the scientific departments, departments to which popular opinion attached great importance. Now, what is the exact position of Government? If we handle the Education, Health and Lands Department and say that here there is too much of administration instead of real work, and therefore the superfluous officers should be reduced, they say—“Oh, you are going against public opinion”. If we deal with the administrative departments and say that

[Sir Abdur Rahim.]

they do not want so many officers, then they say, "Oh, this is dangerous to the entire administration". On this point, I shall read a reference in the General Purposes Sub-Committee's Report to the evidence of the Public Service Commission, and this is what I think Mr. Nixon referred to:

"What is clearly needed is greater reliance on the sense of responsibility of the various units of administration. This view of the position is confirmed by such an eminent body as the members of the Public Service Commission in their replies to our questionnaires. They say:—'In most matters of importance with which the Public Service Commission deal it appears to them, as far as we can ascertain, that after the matter has been most elaborately considered by the 5 Members of the commission, it is considered *ab initio*, in the Government offices'."

That is the sort of procedure we protested against, and yet we find that in the whole of the Secretariat, so far as I can gather from the summary that has been supplied to us, very little of our proposals have been accepted so far as officers are concerned. We however formed a very clear conclusion that in the administrative departments of the Secretariat and other administrative departments under the Government of India if Government could reduce a great deal of the noting that goes on, the expenditure could be reduced considerably. Sir, the opinion of the Public Service Commission must be respected, and the same opinion was given by a number of persons holding very responsible positions and who knew what they were talking about. The same observation applies in the case of non-official committees and commissions. Is it not a fact that so many commissions and committees are appointed and afterwards all their labours are thrown away? Look at the constitutional inquiry that has been going on for the last four or five years, with what result? We do not know in fact whether any result whatever has been achieved so far. These are some of the directions in which economies can be effected. All that we can at present do is to ask the Finance Member and other Members of the Government to reconsider the position, because I do not think that the Government or the country is yet out of the woods. We do not

know what the real financial position is. The financial difficulty must continue for some time, is bound to continue for some time, and therefore I ask with all the emphasis that I can command, whatever may be the result of the voting, if there be voting, on this motion, that the Government will go on steadily with retrenchment and economy. (Applause.)

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Customs' be reduced by Rs. 6,57,000."

The motion was ~~negatived~~.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 60,34,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges, which will come in course of payment, during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1933, in respect of 'Customs'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 17—TAXES ON INCOME.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I beg to move:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 79,21,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges, which will come in course of payment, during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1933, in respect of ‘Taxes on Income’.”

Sir Abdur Rahim: Our Party Members will not move any of these cuts

Mr. President: Order, order. Motion moved:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 79,21,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges, which will come in course of payment, during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1933, in respect of ‘Taxes on Income’.”

On that motion there is an economy cut motion* from Mr. A. Das.

Mr. A. Das (Benares and Gorakhpur Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): In view of the representation made by the Leader of my Party that the members of the Nationalist Party are not going to support the cut motions, I do not think it is necessary to move any cut motion at all.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member does not wish to move his motion?

Mr. A. Das: I do not wish to move it.

Mr. President: As the Honourable Member does not wish to move his motion, I put the original motion to the vote. The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 79,21,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges, which will come in course of payment, during the year ending the 31st March, 1933, in respect of ‘Taxes on Income’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 18—SALT.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I beg to move:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 71,42,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges, which will come in course of payment, during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1933, in respect of ‘Salt’.”

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali: I do not move my cut motion.†

Mr. B. N. Misra: I do not move my cut motion.†

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 71,42,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges, which will come in course of payment, during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1933, in respect of ‘Salt’.”

The motion was adopted.

*“That the Demand under the head ‘Taxes on Income’ be reduced by Rs. 1,50,000.”

†“That the Demand under the head ‘Salt’ be reduced by Rs. 1,86,000.”

DEMAND No. 19—OPIUM.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I beg to move:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 69,90,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges, which will come in course of payment, during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1933, in respect of ‘Opium’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 20—STAMPS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I beg to move:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 13,24,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges, which will come in course of payment, during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1933, in respect of ‘Stamps’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 21—FOREST.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I beg to move:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,93,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges, which will come in course of payment, during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1933, in respect of ‘Forest’.”

Mr. B. V. Jadhav: I do not move my cut motion.*

Mr. President: The question is:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,93,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges, which will come in course of payment, during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1933, in respect of ‘Forest’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 22—IRRIGATION (INCLUDING WORKING EXPENSES), NAVIGATION, EMBANKMENT AND DRAINAGE WORKS

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I beg to move:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,45,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges, which will come in course of payment, during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1933, in respect of ‘Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 23—INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT (INCLUDING WORKING EXPENSES).

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I beg to move:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,67,90,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges, which will come in course of payment, during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1933, in respect of ‘Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)’.”

*“That the Demand under the head ‘Forest’ be reduced by Rs. 1,25,000.”

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): I propose, Mr. President, to oppose this motion of the Honourable the Finance Member. My reason for opposing this motion is that the Posts and Telegraphs Department have made retrenchment on a very wrong principle. Sir, the Retrenchment Committees appointed by the Government of India decided that in order that there should be some saving in their expenditure, salaries of their employees receiving more than a certain number of rupees should be cut down, but in the case of the Post Office as well as some other departments like Railways and other departments having factories, the Government of India did not observe this rule. They decided that in this department, which is regarded as a commercial department, the salaries of people should be cut down irrespective of what minimum they receive. Now, Sir, I consider that a very wrong principle, because if Government wanted to save money by cutting down the salaries of people it is absolutely necessary that people getting a certain minimum should be saved from the cut, because these people have absolutely no margin for saving, and I therefore feel that the Assembly should not grant this Demand. If the Government of India accepted the principle for the employees in other departments, that people with certain minimum salaries should be free from the cut, I do not know why the postmen should have been excluded from this benefit. I cannot understand the argument that the Postal Department as well as the Railways are commercial departments. If they are commercial departments, the best thing is that they should proceed on the best commercial principle. I quoted yesterday the principle laid down by Henry Ford, and if your department is not doing well financially and if there is a depression, the worst method that people should follow is to cut down the wages of the people. This is the principle laid down by Henry Ford, a commercialist and an industrialist. Therefore the right principle for a commercial department is not to cut down wages of the lowest paid. I therefore feel that this Demand should not be granted.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt (Burdwan Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): It would not have been necessary for me to rise on this occasion but for the observations made by my Honourable friend who represents labour. He has said that the whole grant should be refused. Does he mean to say that we should no longer have Posts and Telegraphs in India? We appreciate the motive with which my Honourable friend acts on behalf of labour. We also feel for labourers. My Honourable friend must remember the dire economic distress to which the country has been reduced at the present moment. When you talk of labour, you only talk of highly paid labourers whose income is, say, Rs. 500 a year or Rs. 1,000 a year. Now we know and my friend also knows the sort of life that is led by the poor agriculturists in the villages. At present they have been thoroughly ruined. A family consisting of five or six members can hardly get one meal a day and their income is not more than Rs. 3 or 4 per month and on this they have to maintain themselves. If we find that the agriculturists, who compose more than 80 per cent. of the population, live on this small pittance, I do not think, anybody, whether he be a labour leader or commercial magnate, can censure the Government for a cut that may be made in the wages of their labourers. I know that the champions of labour act from disinterested motives, but they do not belong to the labouring class. They are well dressed and well fed men, and some of them get Rs. 100 a day for pocket money.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I have no pocket money for myself.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: It is praiseworthy that people getting Rs. 3,000 should feel for the lot of the man getting Rs. 30 or 50 a month. I appreciate the noble motive, but I would ask them to look at the condition of the country. The agriculturists are ruined. The medical practitioners and the lawyers have got their incomes reduced by at least 50 per cent. District court lawyers, who used to earn ten to twelve thousand a year do not now earn even four or five thousand a year. People cannot afford to call qualified medical men in their homes, but take their children in their arms to the dispensary. That is the condition in the country. I hold no brief for the Committee, and it will not be proper for me to do so, but I trust that in order to keep the department itself living, my friend will not oppose this motion. There are two alternatives before us. One is to abolish the Postal Department because the Government cannot go on working the department at a loss. The ordinary expenditure of the Postal Department is 12 crores, while their income is 10 crores and the income is going down. So we cannot expect that the Government will maintain the department in order to give us the luxury of communicating with our friends and relations. There are two alternatives before the Government. Either to retrench the men or to retrench salary. Sir, none of us would like that men who, after passing the B.A. or B.Sc., entered the Postal service on Rs. 60 a month should now be thrown out of employment, after having been in the Department for some years. To ask them to get out at this stage and seek other avenues of employment is very hard indeed and I ask what is the prospect before them? Sir, we all know the enormous difficulties at the present moment of getting any job; so I would suggest that instead of championing the cause of labour, which will really not do them any good, let us be more reasonable. We won't ask the Government, Sir, to retrench a single individual; I am against that procedure; and if there has been any retrenchment of men, I strongly oppose that, because I do not think that a single individual should be retrenched and thus be deprived of his bread. It is far more humane to retrench salaries than retrenching men; by retrenching men you make them and their families starve while allowing others, the unretrrenched men, to enjoy fat salaries. Sir, in this connection I may relate a story. On a journey to Bombay I met one young man drawing a salary of Rs. 200. I wanted to know his exact views on the retrenchment operations. Sir, he almost came down on his knees and said, "Pray, do not retrench a single individual. Look here, I am drawing Rs. 200 a month. Do you mean to say that if you cut out 25 per cent. of my salary and thereby saved the axing of some other man, I would mind that so much? Of course it is fortunate that I have got an appointment on Rs. 200 a month; but if I am now suddenly thrown out in the streets, I might not get even Rs. 50 a month or possibly any appointment at all. So it is far more equitable all round to retrench salaries howsoever heavily, rather than to retrench individuals with dependents". So I would ask those of my friends who really feel for labour and for their countrymen to ponder over this aspect of the case calmly and let us all advise Government not to retrench a single individual but to retrench men's salaries.

Mr. E. F. Sykes (Bombay: European): Sir, I was listening with very great interest to Babu Amar Nath Dutt's speech. I am quite sure that

if I had had an opportunity on Wednesday of moving the motion that stood in my name, I should have had his support. I may now read it out to him :

“ Failure of the Government to adopt the policy of reconciling the rates of pay to the low cost of living.”

Sir, I must also express my gratitude to Mr. Joshi for opposing this motion, because it did not appear to me that it was a motion on which a discussion of this kind would be germane, but as you have permitted his observations and those of Babu Amar Nath Dutt, I see no reason why I myself should not contribute to a discussion of the whole question. This, Sir, is a very important question, and it is one

Mr. President: The question before the House is that a grant be made for the Posts and Telegraphs Department, and anything arising out of that is relevant and nothing else.

Mr. E. F. Sykes: Or also arising out of the speeches delivered by Members?

Mr. President: They were perfectly relevant because they were dealing with employees of the Posts and Telegraphs Department.

Mr. E. F. Sykes: Sir, Mr. Joshi's point was that he opposed the motion for a grant to the Posts and Telegraphs Department on the ground that the Posts and Telegraphs Department had made undue retrenchments in the pay of their servants. (*Mr. N. M. Joshi:* “In the pay of postmen.”) Exactly, I am quite prepared to accept the limitation that Mr. Joshi suggests. Now, Sir, this matter was considered very early in the proceedings of the Retrenchment Committees and they came to certain decisions, and the Government also adopted certain decisions, but the curious thing is that in this large volume in which are reported the recommendations of the Committees and the Government's orders on them, there is no reference to the terms of these reductions. You will find under each head a lump sum shown at the end, “Cuts in pay”. Now I take it from Mr. Joshi that there is a cut in the pay of the lowest-paid man. I believe Government accepted the recommendations of the Committees that dealt with this subject and made a reduction of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of pay. Mr. Joshi considers that that is excessive. Now the department to which my Honourable friend refers is not the only commercial department concerned, and Mr. Joshi will possibly be interested in the views of the Railway Retrenchment Committee. (*Mr. N. M. Joshi:* “I am not at this stage interested in railway men but only in the postal men for my present purpose.”) That Committee, Sir, said :

“ The next question that arose was whether the cut should be uniform or graduated. It can be argued that present circumstances have already hit the higher paid classes harder. The increased taxation, both direct (like income and super taxes) and indirect (like customs duties), has very considerably reduced not only their net income but the purchasing power of that income ; and the fall in the price of foodstuffs has affected them but little as expenditure on food forms a relatively small part of their total cost of living. Nevertheless we felt that it was reasonable to maintain that the higher the pay, the more the margin of surplus of income over expenditure and the less the hardship inflicted by a cut. We therefore came to the conclusion that the cut should begin with half an anna in the rupee on incomes of Rs. 30 and under and progress gradually.”

Sir, some people might say that they see in those remarks of the Retrenchment Sub-Committee a failure in logic. Perhaps some do not. But I submit that if there is any failure in logic in their recommendations, or in the measures taken by Government as a consequence of those

[Mr. E. F. Sykes.]

recommendations, there is equally a failure in logic in the process by which, when prices rose after the war, the scales of wages were correspondingly increased. However, no one is entirely guided by logic, and I think that the argument of Lala (Laughter) Amar Nath is much to the point. (*A Voice*: "Babu.") I beg your pardon, Babu Amar Nath Dutt—I thought he was a Kayasth. (*A Voice*: "He is.") Sir, Babu Amar Nath Dutt's argument is very much more relevant. My Honourable friend drew a comparison between the remuneration of persons engaged in agricultural operations and contrasted that with the earnings of postmen whose wages we are at present discussing. His view was that, so far from it being a matter of reduction by $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., it was much more a reduction by 80 per cent. that they were suffering from. As to the exact percentage by which the agricultural labourer is worse off; I do not propose to detain the House this evening with a discussion on that subject or with any attempt to estimate closely, but if only, Sir, you observe the falling off in customs, in excise and in railway revenues, you will perceive very clearly that the agriculturist must have had a very considerable reduction in resources, which reduction is not such as can be measured by $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of his sources. Now, Sir, the Government have apparently accepted the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee in this matter, but I have not noticed that they have been extraordinarily anxious to defend the recommendations or their acceptance for them. On two occasions I have raised this question. I raised it on the general discussion of the Railway Budget and the subject was carefully avoided by the Member in charge. I raised the subject again on the general discussion of the General Budget. It was equally avoided then. I tried to raise the point subsequently by means of a question put to the Government on the subject of the wages which they were paying in Delhi and which were being paid in the same place by other employers. Now, Sir, a very remarkable thing has happened. A fortnight elapsed between the time I put in my question and the time when it was answered and the Government were unable to obtain any information on the subject. The Government here are in effect the Local Government. They have a very large staff . . .

Mr. President: The Chair sympathises with the Honourable Member in the grievance which he seems to have, but the Chair should like to ask him whether he is supporting the motion or opposing it. If he is doing either of the two, then the relevant observations would be to state his reasons why he is supporting the grant or opposing it?

Mr. E. F. Sykes: I am opposing the grant because the reduction of wages referred by Mr. Joshi is entirely unreasonable and it is one that the Government themselves, as I have shown by instances, are not in the least anxious to defend. Therefore, I am prepared to come to Mr. Joshi's assistance and oppose this grant.

Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal (Jullundur Division: Non-Muhammadian): Sir, I have much pleasure in supporting the motion of Mr. Joshi. It is for various reasons that I am compelled to take this step. It is not in the words of Mr. Amar Nath Dutt that I am opposing this grant, but it is because this is a department for which I have the highest respect among the various departments of Government. Sir, our grievances on this score

fall under various heads, and it is time that we ventilated them on this occasion which has come rather suddenly. Well, Sir, we may just as well recognise the solid fact that the post office is one of those departments that comes into contact with the life of every citizen, be he in a town or be he in a village. The postman is one of those ubiquitous officers of the Government who reaches every far away nook and corner of the country and who at times carries messages from friends and relations to most inaccessible corners of the country. Sir, one of the biggest monopolies enjoyed by the State is under the head of the post office, and I am glad to say that it is one of the most efficiently run departments too. Every one will be thoroughly justified in paying his tribute of respect to the unflinching performance of duty by the postman who goes from door to door both in a village and in a town. He does his work in all kinds of weather and under all sorts of difficulties. Sir, Mr. Joshi's sympathy with the postman is certainly not misplaced. If he stands up for labour, then the postman is the person who deserves the respect and the sympathy of every one. Now, Sir, what is the treatment that has been meted out to this postman? Well, Sir, he has suffered because there are so many of them who draw in small amounts a large sum from the exchequer. I will put my proposition shortly. The position is that in other departments a limit has been placed at Rs. 40 below which the retrenchment axe cannot be operated. But there are two exceptions to it, one is the Postal Department and the other is the Railway Department. What is the reason for doing so? It is not that the people in these departments who are getting less than Rs. 40 have other means of making money and therefore you are at liberty to cut away their salaries. That is not the reason. In the Postal Department there is not the least possibility of a man having any extra income, but there is every possibility of getting extra kicks. The point is that the small salaried people in the Railways and the Postal Department are so many and the amount of their salaries runs into so many crores that there is an obvious temptation that by cutting off a few annas in the rupee, the retrenchment comes to several crores. Now, Sir, that is not justifiable. Sir, if I may say so, the argument should be put in another way. People drawing higher salaries could produce by retrenchment probably a far greater saving without affecting such a large number of people than has been done by this economy campaign in the Postal Department.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: On a point of explanation, Sir. May I tell my Honourable friend that the salaries of officials in the Postal Department is only 51 lakhs whereas the pay of others comes to eight crores and by abolishing the whole lot you do not touch the fringe of the problem, viz., the deficit of two crores.

Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal: The explanation supports my argument. I am much obliged to my friend for these figures. Sir, I should like to know the justification for not leaving these postmen alone? I put a charitable construction on it, that the reduction of salaries of these people will bring a large sum of money and the Finance Department or the Retrenchment Committee could not forgo the temptation or the prospect of making a huge saving by a cut on salaries under that head. Well, Sir, if that is so, I am sure some means could have been found for not encroaching upon the paltry salaries of these people. Our tale of grievances, however, does

[Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal.]

not end here. If the pay of the humble official of the post office, who is doing his duty so well, is going to be cut, how does the public get the benefit of this retrenchment? You pay more and you get less. The postal rates against the wishes of this House have been enhanced to a figure which they never reached in the history of this country. For the mere pleasure of writing a letter to somebody you have to pay not half anna or an anna, but you have to pay an anna and a very inconvenient fraction of 3 pies. And for the privilege of writing a postcard and what man in this land has not got to write a postcard just as a means of salutation or of remembrance from one part of the country to the other—you have got to pay not one pice or 2 pice as it was last year but 9 pies. The public has got to pay an exceedingly large figure—something like 25 to 50 per cent. more—for using the services of this public utility department, the pay of the employees of which is going to be so ruthlessly cut down. So, there must be something radically wrong with this department. I feel, Sir, that that is the grievance which my friends have been ventilating on more than one occasion that the campaign of economy has started at the wrong end. If you look at these reports, then the inevitable conclusion you come to is: 500 men in the lower grades turned out and part of their salaries taken away. As you move upwards the scale of retrenchment grows less and less till you find that very near the top just one man moved from one place to another. That I submit is the real explanation of this discrepancy we have. The public have got a lot more to pay in services than before. The public have to use the public utility services. The faithful and humble employees of the department have got to work day and night and they get their emoluments cut down. I think there is certainly something wrong in all these matters which requires much more careful looking into and an examination from a different angle than has been done hitherto. Realising that this department cannot be put an end to as somebody suggested, nor is it possible to upset this department by bringing something else in its place, and realising the great utility of this department, I submit that the way in which we have treated it in the matter of retrenchment, etc., is certainly not the proper way. I have therefore much pleasure in supporting the motion of Mr. Joshi.

Mr. S. G. Jog (Berar Representative): We are practically reaching the flag end of this evil day. I say, Sir, evil day for various reasons. We have moved today throughout in an atmosphere of mutual distrust and we have also moved in an atmosphere of non-co-operation. I never thought for a moment that the Independent Party under the able guidance and lead of an able administrator and sportsman like Sir Abdur Rahim would have taken recourse to a spirit of non-co-operation.

Mr. President: What has that to do with this motion? The Honourable Member should come to the point at once.

Mr. S. G. Jog: The object of my rising is that we want to discuss all motions on their merits. It is quite immaterial whether one Member of a Party brings a cut or whether . . .

Mr. President: The Honourable Member must speak on the motion.

Mr. S. G. Jog: Coming to the motion, I have great pleasure in supporting my Honourable friend Mr. Joshi; and of all the departments, if I have got regard for any one, it is for the Postal Department. For the last two years, I have come in contact with the grievances of the Postal Department, and I have no hesitation in saying that their grievances are real. As pointed out by my Honourable friend, Mr. Aggarwal, of all the departments, the Postal Department has suffered most. The Government has made an invidious distinction in not making sufficient provision in the case of Postal employees drawing less than Rs. 40. There is a maxim in Sanskrit which I should like to repeat to the House and which runs:

“*Daivo dhurbala ghataka*”.

When translated it means, “God or luck or fate generally goes against the weak”. Employees of the Postal Department, who toil more than others and who take such great pains to deliver your letters in time and do all sorts of things for you, are not properly treated. It is a matter of great regret to me that the wicked hand of retrenchment should fall on the postal employees. Last year when I made a speech on this subject, I brought it to the notice of the Postal Department that their decision would not receive the approval of the public at large. My Honourable friend, Mr. Amar Nath Dutt, having been in the Retrenchment Committee, has got the Government view now, and instead of leaving the Government Members to defend the policy of retrenchment, is now supporting the Government and taking the Government view. I quite see that he may have his own reasons for making some retrenchment proposals, but we must also express our view, and I should bring to his notice that the retrenchment proposals which he has made have not received the public approval. I think it is time that Government should reconsider their decision as regards the cuts, and they should exempt the low-paid employees from the operation of the cut, and the Postal employees should be brought into line along with the other departments, and if anything more cannot be done, at least this should be done. With these remarks I support the motion of Mr. Joshi. There is no question of any sympathy with labour, and I say I do not support his motion on that ground. I hold no brief for the labour movement, at the same time I hold a brief this way, that equity should be so adjusted between all classes of labour and employees and Government and all other classes so that there will be no hardship to any one. Sir, I support my friend Mr. Joshi.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Sir, I am very grateful to my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, who has always the good of labour at heart, for having moved the motion with his unflinching sympathy for labour, and I am wholly in agreement with every word that he uttered on this occasion, and when I say it, I do so as an *ex-President* of more provincial Postal Conferences than one and as an *ex-President* of more all-India Postal Conferences than one. Sir, on previous occasions, if Honourable Members only cared to read the report of the proceedings of this House, in those great days of Swarajism when the Opposition was surging from this side of the House, there were more advocates of labour from this side of the House than we find to-day. When the Swarajists, when the Congress people went from this House out into the country on a great national endeavour in which I, from this place, wish them early success, and incidentally the early dawn

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

of good sense on Whitehall, when those Swarajists went out of this House, with them went out the surging sympathy that used to exist for my friend Mr. Joshi. He was not then ploughing a lonely furrow in this House, and I rise to assure him that even though the support for him in this House may be little, the support for him out in the country is large. The very fact that the Labour Commission had toured the country and made certain recommendations in regard to the future of labour and labour's own place in the constitution is a feather to the cap of Mr. Joshi inside this House and to my friend Mr. Chaman Lall outside this House in regard to the manner in which they have been fighting the cause of labour, including Postal labour.

Sir, we do not agree for a moment that Government have shown adequate sympathy to Postal employees. It may be retrenchment, but retrenchment whether it takes the shape of volumes sent to us in the shape of Reports produced slowly and steadily like the Ganges breaking out of the Gangotri Glacier, coming through different rugged mountain sides and then through the plain to meet the mother of waters, the ocean. Whether it is rapidly produced as it was produced by Mr. Shanmukham Chetty, whose presence I miss to-day because he has gone on an ^{ir} of ^{the} ^{com} ^{mission}, or whether it is produced in a very ugly manner in which ^{wh} ^m ^{any} ^{the} ^{process}, with purposes which are familiar to us, I must say that no retrenchment report, in whatever manner it has been produced, which recommends retrenchment or suggests retrenchment or creates that suggestion or impression of retrenchment out in the country so far as Postal labour is concerned, will be acceptable to the supporters of labour. Sir, under retrenchment, and owing to a sort of misguided enthusiasm for retrenchment on the Opposition Benches, it must be amazing to any one that under cover of retrenchment the poor postal employees should have been thrown into the wilderness. I know a number of people who have no jobs. Retrenchment I can understand. I know the Finance Member spoke with feeling when he said that it is a nightmare. It is something worse than a nightmare. It is a dreadful reality with which these people are faced, men whose bread is taken out of their mouths because some people say there should be retrenchment. I am opposed to retrenchment altogether unless you retrench the Military Budget and reduce the military expenditure. I have been patiently, sullenly, silently watching this progress of retrenchment talk. I carefully kept out of these retrenchment committees, for once you agree to retrenchment without the power to regulate retrenchment, you don't know what will happen because we are not sitting on those Benches (pointing to Treasury Benches). That was the position of the late Mr. C. R. Das; that again was the position of the late Pandit Motilal Nehru. We have no business to give advice to Government which they are entitled to put into the waste-paper basket; because we are only an Opposition without power. We co-operate to retrench. And what has happened? Hundreds and thousands of poor postal employees have been sent into the wilderness. I have got letters as an *ex-President* of the Postal Union. I have also seen men who come to me. A few men came three days ago and said, "Can you not approach the Government Member-in-charge?" I said "No". I have followed a regular policy of non-interference in this business. I say the Opposition has bungled. The Opposition has no imagination. Imagine Sir Hari Singh Gour is the Leader of the Opposition, a gentleman who was a member

of a committee which was boycotted by this country,—the Central Committee. The very fact that the Opposition Leadership is held by Sir Hari Singh Gour is an indication of the fact that we in this House are committed to policies and programmes which, knowing as I do, cannot cut much ice in the country. The very fact that we have on the Independent Benches Sir Abdur Rahim, whose career was a career of notorious agreement with the policy of repression in Bengal, indicates the downfall of the Opposition. That is the position of the Opposition to-day, and that is why it has helped Government in creating this programme of retrenchment, which is responsible for this state of affairs, because Government cannot accept our suggestions. Once you agree to the principle of retrenchment, they will not accept your programme of retrenchment. Sir, it is all well and good for the Opposition to agree to the principle of retrenchment. I am opposed to the principle of retrenchment, and when I said so, the Honourable the Finance Member repudiated me last year. He repudiated me strongly. He strongly defended Sir Abdur Rahim and stated that his retrenchment report will be of "considerable" support.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Honourable Member always goes much further than the issue before the House. How is the attitude of the Opposition, the question of the position of the Leader of the Nationalist Party, the question of the position of the Leader of the Independent Party, relevant to the issue now before the House which is the grant of 10 crores and over to be made for the Posts and Telegraphs Department?

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Sir, I am thankful to you for reminding me of the relevancy, and with all the respect due to the Chair I bow to your suggestion. I only beg to suggest, with your permission, that when Sir Abdur Rahim agreed to serve on the Retrenchment Committee, he was committed to the principle of retrenchment. And there has been so much retrenchment in the Postal Department that it has resulted in sending away the postal people to the wilderness. Had only the Opposition said to the Government, "We refuse to go into your trap, we refuse to draw your allowances for the Retrenchment Committees, we are altogether opposed to the principle of retrenchment and it is your responsibility only", then this calamity which has fallen on the Postal Department and which I am standing up here to deplore would not have happened. Sir, I maintain, and with all respect due to your rulings and with the suggestion that you have given, I believe I am right when I maintain that this policy and this principle resulted in a programme which was not duly observed. And not having been duly observed,—we know the Government,—it was observed in some other direction, namely, sending away men from the bottom, the poor labourers, the under-dog, for whom Mr. Joshi stood up in this House. Sir, I refuse this supply to the Postal Department because I do not believe in the principle of the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department working together. If only you take some time, Sir, as you did take some time in your unattached days, to go through the expenditure of the Postal and Telegraphs Departments: and then if Honourable Members of this House will care to read the arguments that have been urged by me out in the country and urged by distinguished Members on this side on the floor of the House, it will be crystal clear that Government have always taken shelter behind the fact that they cannot go further in the

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

direction of ameliorating the condition of the postal employees because it is a commercial department, and being a commercial department both Posts and Telegraphs must pay. I can as well say that you can join this Telegraph Department with any other department, including the department of my Honourable friend the Home Member, and then if they say that it is not a paying proposition because the Home Department is not a productive department but a spending department, the argument of Government would be as absurd as their present argument is. So if you maintain that a particular department is to be treated as a commercial proposition, then I say here and now, separate the Postal Department from the Telegraph Department. What has happened in the past is robbing Peter and paying Paul, robbing the Postal Department and paying the Telegraph Department. What, may I ask, has been the argument of Government? Their argument has been this: they say that the departments must be taken together because the purpose of the departments is the same. I beg to differ from that. The purpose of the Postal Department and the purpose of the Telegraph Department is not exactly the same. The purpose of all departments in that sense is the same. The purpose of the department of my Honourable friend Sir Lancelot Graham is as much to keep the King's Government going as it is the purpose of my Honourable friend the Home Member's department. The purpose of the Finance Department is the same; the purpose of the department of Sir Joseph Bhore, that is now and that is going to be is the same. All departments are tarred with the same brush. There is no use saying that the work of the Postal Department is the same as the work of the Telegraph Department. The work that is done by the Postal Department is different from the work that is done by the Telegraph Department. The

5 P.M.

postal employees are different from the telegraph employees. The education that the postal employees have got is different from the education that the telegraph employees have got. The postal employees do not require so much technical qualification as the telegraph employees require, and you do not have so many experts in the Postal Department as Government say they should have in the Telegraph Department. Why, then did this arise, this differentiation in treatment between the postal employees and the telegraph employees? Why, I ask? Why? Because if only Honourable Members interested in the subject will look back to the old records, the telegraph employees resorted to the short cut, whereas the postal employees resorted to the constitutional way. The telegraph employees went to their own leaders outside, took their stand upon the gospel of self-reliance and self-help and resorted to what telegraph employees in other countries have resorted, or to be more correct, they were going to resort to a general strike. They held a pistol as it were to the head of the Member-in-charge of that Department: you know the story of the highway robber in the middle ages who seeing a man wandering alone says, "Your life or your purse"; and the poor Member-in-charge of that department succumbed, painfully, abjectly, timidly succumbed as the postal employees grinned at him—but in my own opinion nobly, courageously, righteously, for he realised there could not have been this threat without actual grievances and with the responsibility due to his employees he examined their grievances and he found it was a just grievance that each one of them had got, and having found that, what did he do? He inquired, responded and satisfied them. That was an admirable move on the part of the Government in regard to the Telegraph

Department. But the poor postal employees did not get the same help, and that is what I am going to develop in another half an hour or so before me

Mr. B. V. Jadhav: They went on strike in Bombay for about six weeks.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: My Honourable friend, with the information for which he is always noted in this House, says that the postal employes went on strike for about six weeks. I quite admit that his information is correct: but when I was talking of telegraph employes, I was talking of them as an organised people, the whole lot of them, not one provincial group. In the case of the postal employes as my Honourable friend, Mr. Jadhav, no doubt knows, there was no unanimity: there could be no unanimity; they are educated in a different way, or rather they were educated by their Union people in a different way. Their Union people advised them to go to the Members of the Central Legislature. It was all well and good to go to the Members of the Central Legislature; the Central Legislature in the past and in the present, and as Mr. Joshi has rightly shown to-day, will sympathise with them and work for them in a constitutional way, but when the others took to direct action, the Government yielded to them. Even in a constitutional way I admit we have made a tremendous impression on the Government. For instance, my old friend, Sir Bhupendranath Mitra, finally yielded to the pressure which was brought year after year from this side of the House, and he looked into the case of the postal employes; after very careful thinking and a little wavering—wavering not because he lacked sympathy, because he was so full of sympathy for them—but because in all these matters, as it was truly said, the master of the purse is the master of everything, he had to go to the Finance Member or Chancellor of the Exchequer and ask him, "Can I embark on this enterprise?" And if the Finance Member would not have agreed, he could not have embarked on it. He had to persuade the Finance Member; that the times were good, much better than they are now; but we have played into the hands of the Government by suggesting retrenchment and having suggested retrenchment, even those good days when the pay of the postal employes was not cut have been banished into the limbo of oblivion. Can you imagine anything more painful—and I may assure you I am expressing the feeling of a large number of unemployed people who have been thrown out into the wilderness in the name, the ugly name, even though the blessed name of retrenchment placed in the hands of the Government by an indiscreet Opposition a set of misguided but very honest and very sincere enthusiasts of retrenchment. What has happened? Poor postal employes getting less than 100 rupees a month had their salaries retrenched.

Speaking from this side of the House, I may make my position perfectly clear. I will not agree to retrenchment going too low. My friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, said to the Finance Member with his usual earnestness, "I do not subscribe to your doctrine about sound finance. It may not be sound finance to borrow, but it is sound policy to borrow on these occasions." But the Honourable the Finance Member, a careful student of finance, thought it was better to take his stand on sound finance even though there may have to be retrenchment in the manner in which he practised retrenchment. I shall come to the practice of that

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

retrenchment presently, and I shall show you how the practice of that retrenchment has affected the people. But before coming to the practice of retrenchment, I should point out very clearly to the Honourable the Finance Member that by cutting down the salary of an employee getting less than 100 rupees a month, or even less than 50 rupees a month, he came very very low. Fancy a salary like that being cut in the name of retrenchment. Honourable Members can imagine the difficulty of such a man trying to make both ends meet and of keeping body and soul together. It is a tragedy not only in this country but it is also a fact which all economists admit, all students of a certain science will admit, it is a fact that the poorer the man the larger his family. Poverty and procreation seem to advance *pari passu*; in this poor country, a country full of poverty stricken people, the poorest country in the world, I can say without any fear of contradiction that the employees whose salary has been cut, whose salary has been retrenched, are men who have large families. If Honourable Members on the Treasury Benches feel, and rightly feel, that they do not want their salaries to be cut down because they came under a contract,—and I admit the sanctity of contract,—unless they voluntarily cut it down, no Member on this side of the House says, “Violate the contract”.—what they say is speed up Indianisation, that is our view,—when they hesitate to cut down their salaries, though they can very well afford to do it more than the poor employees I have mentioned, very much more indeed in spite of their ground that they have to maintain one establishment in this country and another establishment in their own,—when they do not want to give up what they felt they should give up, how can you expect the poor man to give up what he has been compelled to give up? Sir, unless the Government assure me that the salaries of the postal employés, the salary of the under-dog, will forthwith be restored, I may tell the Government that they are not contributing to the satisfaction of a large number of good and loyal people, people who day in and day out, through thick and thin, have stood by the Government. For, Sir, did not the wave of non-co-operation time after time pass over this land, but it left the bed-rock of the postal employees untouched, and my friend from Bengal Mr. Ghuznavi who has great sympathy for the labouring people, and who, I believe, has been in touch like my friend Sir Abdullah Suhrawardy, with postal employees in Bengal, will bear me out when I say that there is a real and genuine feeling of discontent among these unfortunate men whose salary has been cut down. Sir, I may have to face them in future; I may have to preside over their conferences (Hear, hear), and they will ask me what have I done for them. Mr. Joshi may be a nominated Member, but he is not nominated in the sense in which nomination generally takes place, for just as my friend Sir Henry Gidney is nominated for his community whom he has been vigorously representing on the floor of this House, sometimes to the embarrassment of the Opposition, even so Mr. Joshi has been vigorously representing and exercising his vote vigorously and independently, because he is acting as elected Member for labour and if there was to be an election tomorrow, and if labour were to have a constituency, Mr. Joshi will be elected unopposed, and if he were opposed

Mr. K. Ahmed: It is rather outside the subject-matter under discussion.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: I will show that it is not entirely outside the subject in a minute if you will allow me to complete the sentence. And if Mr. Joshi were to be opposed, it will be clear to his opponent that when the results are announced he would have lost his security. Therefore, Sir, such being the position of Mr. Joshi,—I say with all respect to the Honourable gentlemen who expressed a disagreement with him on this side of the House,—I am not ashamed of supporting labour, nobody on this side of the House, even those who do not see eye to eye with Mr. Joshi, is opposed to the real and legitimate grievances of labour.

Now, then, Sir, let me come to the other aspect of the question, namely the practice of retrenchment. I was up to now talking on the cutting down of salaries and pointing out that the salary was improperly cut, that it has been unreasonably cut and that it should be immediately restored. But now I am coming to the question of the practice of retrenchment, I said men have been sent away. But half a loaf is better than no loaf, and that is where the Finance Member stands on solid ground, because he says he had to cut down pay because he wanted to reduce the number of men who would be sent away. While not disputing that fact, I should have liked the retrenchment in some other form, in some other department like the Military Department. That has not taken place. I have behind me years of rhetoric, years of reasoning that the Military Department is a white elephant, and it puts its elephant foot on every other department. Why indeed, I ask, should the Military Department not be cut down to meet the necessities of the Postal Department? Why, indeed, I ask, should not the salaries of those who have been asked to accept a lower wage be restored to their old level and the military department be cut down to meet that restoration? I again ask, should those men have been sent away, because by sending them away, you have deprived them of a means of livelihood? Sir, I want you to imagine, I want to pass through the crucible of your imagination, the great trouble

Mr. K. Ahmed: I want to support you; give me a chance to speak.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Imagine the great trouble which discharged employees are undergoing. By sending them away, Government do not seem to realise that they have sown discontent in the hearts of good and loyal people. By sending them away Government do not seem to realise that they have caused a genuine grievance for people who should not have been hurt. The Government ought to have maintained at any cost, even by borrowing, those people who have been sent into the wilderness. I am sorry, Sir, I have taken so much time, and I beg your and the Honourable Members' pardon, and I thank you and them for listening with such kindness. But I had a responsibility to my people, to the labouring classes, and as I realised that there was not sufficient support for my friend Mr. Joshi which the occasion required, especially when he raised the opposition to the whole cut, I thought my friend Sir Abdur Rahim should not have the opportunity in the future to describe any Member of this House except himself as frivolous, though the climax of frivolity has been to ask for the extension of the publication and the period of Retrenchment Committee's Reports.

Mr. President: The House will now stand adjourned till 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Saturday, the 19th March, 1932.