

6th March 1937

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

Volume II, 1937

(23rd February to 13th March, 1937)

FIFTH SESSION OF THE FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY 1937



**PUBLISHED BY THE MANAGER OF PUBLICATIONS, DELHI.
PRINTED BY THE MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, SIMLA.
1937**

Legislative Assembly.

President :

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

Deputy President :

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

Panel of Chairmen :

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

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

SIR LESLIE HUDSON, KT., M.L.A.

SIR COWASJI JEHangIR, BART., K.C.I.E., O.B.E., M.L.A.

Secretary :

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.

Assistant of the Secretary :

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.

Marshal :

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

Committee on Petitions :

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

SIR LESLIE HUDSON, KT., M.L.A.

SARDAR SANT SINGH, M.L.A.

MR. M. GHIASUDDIN, M.L.A.

MR. MATHURADAS VISSANJI, M.L.A.

M89LAD

CONTENTS.

VOLUME II.—23rd February to 13th March, 1937.

	PAGES.		PAGES.
TUESDAY, 23RD FEBRUARY, 1937,—		WEDNESDAY, 24TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—<i>contd.</i>	
Members Sworn . . .	905	Demand No. 6-B—Working Expenses—Maintenance and supply of Locomotive Power—	
Questions and Answers . . .	905—10	Construction of Locomotives in India . . .	1020—23
Unstarred Questions and Answers . . .	910—12		
Statements laid on the Table . . .	912—16	THURSDAY, 25TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—	
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Amendment of the Rules of Business of the Assembly relating to the Privilege of Interpellation—Ruled out of order . . .	916—21	Election of Members to certain Standing Committees . . .	1025
The Railway Budget—List of Demands—		The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 1—Railway Board—		Demand No. 6B—Working Expenses—Maintenance and Supply of Locomotive Power— <i>contd.</i>	
General Policy of Railway Administration . . .	921—4	Construction of Locomotives in India— <i>concl'd.</i> . . .	1025—41
Control of Expenditure . . .	941—5	Demand No. 1—Railway Board—	
WEDNESDAY, 24TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—		Grievances of Third Class Railway Passengers . . .	1041—67
Members Sworn . . .	961	Indianisation of Railway Services . . .	1067—80
Short Notice Question and Answer . . .	961—64	FRIDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—	
The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>		Questions and Answers . . .	1081—92
Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>contd.</i>		Unstarred Question and Answer . . .	1092
Exclusion of Indians from the Wedgwood Committee . . .	965—1000	Attempted Budget Leakage . . .	1092—93
Taking over the management of the B. and N. W., R. and K. and S. M. Railways under State control . . .	1000—19		

	PAGES.
FRIDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1937,— <i>contd.</i>	
The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>	
Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>concl'd.</i>	
Paucity of Muslims in the Railway Ser- vices	1093—1113
Rail-Road Competition	1113—46
Demand No. 2—Audit	1146
Demand No. 3—Miscel- laneous Expenditure	1146
Demand No. 5—Pay- ments to Indian States and Companies	1146
Demand No. 6-A.— Working Expenses— Maintenance of Structu- ral Works	1146
Demand No. 6-B—Work- ing Expenses—Mainte- nance and supply of Locomotive Power	1147
Demand No. 6-C—Work- ing Expenses—Mainte- nance of Carriage and Wagon Stock	1148
Demand No. 6-D—Work- ing Expenses—Mainte- nance of Ferry Stea- mers and Harbours	1149
Demand No. 6-E—Work- ing Expenses—Expenses of Traffic Depart- ment	1149
Demand No. 6-F— Working Expenses— Expenses of General Departments	1150
Demand No. 6-G— Working Expenses— Miscellaneous Expens- es	1150
Demand No. 6-H— Working Expenses— Electric Service De- partment	1150

	PAGES.
FRIDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1937,— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 7— Working Expenses— Appropriation to Dep- reciation Fund	1150
Demand No. 8—Inte- rest Charges	1150
Demand No. 11—New Construction	1151
Demand No. 12—Open Line Works	1151
SATURDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—	
Members Sworn	1153
Presentation of the Budget for 1937-38	1153—70
The Indian Finance Bill— Introduced	1170
Statement of Business	1170
TUESDAY, 2ND MARCH, 1937,—	
Members Sworn	1171
Questions and Answers	1171—82
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1182—88
Short Notice Question and Answer	1188—90
Statement laid on the Table	1190—92
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Department of Edu- cation, Health and Lands	1192
Election of Members to the Standing Committee on Emigration	1192
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Department of In- dustries and Labour	1193
Message from the Council of State	1193
General Discussion of the General Budget	1193—1245

	PAGES.
WEDNESDAY, 3RD MARCH, 1937,—	
Questions and Answers	1247—52
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Department of Commerce	1252
General discussion of the General Budget— <i>contd</i>	1252—1303
THURSDAY, 4TH MARCH, 1937,—	
Members Sworn	1305
Questions and Answers	1305—37
Election of Members to the Central Advisory Board of Health	1337—39
The Code of Civil Procedure (Third Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1339
The Indian Red Cross Society (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1339—40
The Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1340—51
The Indian Tea Cess (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1351—52
The Indian Army (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1352—85
The Repealing and Amending Bill—Discussion on the motions to consider and to refer to Select Committee not concluded	1385—92
FRIDAY, 5TH MARCH, 1937,—	
Members Sworn	1393
The Child Marriage Restraint (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the report of the Committee on Petitions	1393
The General Budget—List of Demands—	
Demand No. 18—Finance Department—	
Revenue Duties	1394—1415

	PAGES.
FRIDAY, 5TH MARCH, 1937,—<i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 12.—Executive Council	1415—47
Policy of Protection	1415—48
SATURDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1937,—	
Member Sworn	1449
Questions and Answers	1449—81
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1481—88
Statements laid on the Table	1488—90
Message from the Council of State	1490
The General Budget.—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 20.—Defence Department—	
Indianisation of the Army	1492—1522
Demand No. 12.—Executive Council—	
Social Insurance for Industrial Workers	1523—39
MONDAY, 8TH MARCH, 1937,—	
Member Sworn	1541
Questions and Answers	1541—71
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Arrest of a Member of the Legislative Assembly and subsequent withdrawal of Proceedings against him—Ruled out of order	1571—77
Election of Members to the Central Advisory Board of Health	1577
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 12.—Executive Council—	
Labour Grievances	1577—85
Demand No. 17.—Department of Education, Health and Lands—	
Treatment of Indians abroad	1585—1615

	PAGES.
MONDAY, 8TH MARCH, 1937,—	
<i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 12—Executive Council—	
Frontier Policy . . .	1615—20
TUESDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1937,—	
Member Sworn . . .	1621
Questions and Answers . . .	1621—36
The General Budget.—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 12—Executive Council— <i>contd.</i>	
Frontier Policy— <i>contd.</i>	1636—48
General Policy of the Government of India	1648—89
WEDNESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1937,—	
Members Sworn . . .	1691
Questions and Answers . . .	1691—96
Message from the Council of State . . .	1696
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 21—Department of Industries and Labour—	
Recognition of Trade unions by employers and withdrawal of recognition of Unions in certain cases	1696—1702
Demand No. 12—Executive Council— <i>contd.</i>	
Policy of Repression	1702—50
Demand No. 1—Customs	1751
Demand No. 2—Central Excise Duties . . .	1751
Demand No. 3—Taxes on Income including Corporation Tax . . .	1751
Demand No. 4—Salt . . .	1751
Demand No. 5—Opium . . .	1751
Demand No. 6—Provincial Excise . . .	1751
Demand No. 7—Stamps	1752
Demand No. 8—Forest . . .	1752

	PAGES.
WEDNESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1937,—<i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 9—Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works . . .	1752
Demand No. 10—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses) . . .	1752
Demand No. 11—Interest on Debt and other Obligations and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt . . .	1752
Demand No. 12—Executive Council . . .	1752
Demand No. 13—Council of State . . .	1753
Demand No. 14—Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department . . .	1753
Demand No. 15—Home Department . . .	1753
Demand No. 16—Legislative Department . . .	1753
Demand No. 17—Department of Education, Health and Lands . . .	1753
Demand No. 18—Finance Department . . .	1753
Demand No. 19—Commerce Department . . .	1754
Demand No. 20—Defence Department . . .	1754
Demand No. 21—Department of Industries and Labour . . .	1754
Demand No. 22—Central Board of Revenue . . .	1754
Demand No. 23—India Office and High Commissioner's Establishment charges . . .	1754

	PAGES.
WEDNESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1937,— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 24—Pay- ments to other Govern- ments Departments, etc., on account of Services rendered . . .	1754
Demand No. 25—Audit . . .	1755
Demand No. 26—Adminis- tration of Justice . . .	1755
Demand No. 27—Police . . .	1755
Demand No. 28—Ports and Pilotage . . .	1755
Demand No. 29—Light- houses and lightship . . .	1755
Demand No. 30—Survey of India . . .	1755
Demand No. 31—Meteoro- logy . . .	1756
Demand No. 32—Geolo- gical Survey . . .	1756
Demand No. 33—Botani- cal Survey . . .	1756
Demand No. 34—Zoologi- cal Survey . . .	1756
Demand No. 35—Archæo- logy . . .	1756
Demand No. 36—Mines . . .	1756
Demand No. 37—Other Scientific Department . . .	1757
Demand No. 38—Educa- tion . . .	1757
Demand No. 39—Medical Services . . .	1757
Demand No. 40—Public Health . . .	1757
Demand No. 41—Agricul- ture . . .	1757
Demand No. 42—Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department . . .	1757
Demand No. 43—Scheme for the Improvement of Agricultural Marketing in India . . .	1758
Demand No. 44—Imperial Institute of Sugar Tech- nology . . .	1758

	PAGES.
WEDNESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1937,— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 45—Civil Veterinary Services . . .	1758
Demand No. 46—Industries . . .	1758
Demand No. 47—Aviation . . .	1758
Demand No. 48—Capital Outlay on Civil Aviation charged to Revenue . . .	1758
Demand No. 49—Broad- casting . . .	1759
Demand No. 50—Capital Outlay on Broadcasting . . .	1759
Demand No. 51—Indian Stores Department . . .	1759
Demand No. 52—Commer- cial Intelligence and Sta- tistics . . .	1759
Demand No. 53—Census . . .	1759
Demand No. 54—Emigra- tion—Internal . . .	1759
Demand No. 55—Emigra- tion—External . . .	1760
Demand No. 56—Joint Stock Companies . . .	1760
Demand No. 57—Miscel- laneous Departments . . .	1760
Demand No. 58—Currency . . .	1760
Demand No. 59—Mint . . .	1760
Demand No. 60—Civil Works . . .	1760
Demand No. 61—Supera- nnuation Allowances and Pensions . . .	1761
Demand No. 62—Station- ary and Printing . . .	1761
Demand No. 63—Miscel- laneous . . .	1761
Demand No. 64—Grants- in-aid to Provincial Gov- ernment . . .	1761
Demand No. 65—Miscel- laneous Adjustments be- tween the Central and Provincial Governments . . .	1761
Demand No. 66—Expen- diture on Retrenched Personnel charged to Revenue . . .	1761

	PAGES.		PAGES.
WEDNESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1937,—<i>contd.</i>		WEDNESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1937—<i>concl.</i>	
Demand No. 67—Delhi	1762	Demand No. 81—Interest free Advances	1764
Demand No. 68—Ajmer-Merwara	1762	Demand No. 82—Loans and Advances bearing Interest	1764
Demand No. 69—Panth Piploda	1762	FRIDAY, 12TH MARCH, 1937,—	
Demand No. 70—Andamans and Nicobar Islands	1762	Members Sworn	1765
Demand No. 71—Capital Outlay on Security Printing	1762	Questions and Answers	1765—73
Demand No. 72—Irrigation	1762	Short Notice Question and Answer	1773—76
Demand No. 73—Indian Posts and Telegraphs	1763	Unstarred Questions and Answers	1776—85
Demand No. 74—Capital Outlay on Schemes of Agricultural Improvement and Research	1763	Statement laid on the Table	1785—87
Demand No. 75—Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour	1763	The Indian Soft Coke Cess (Reconstitution of Committee) Bill—Introduced	1788
Demand No. 76—Capital Outlay on Lighthouses and Lightships	1763	The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded	1788—1833
Demand No. 77—Currency Capital Outlay	1763	SATURDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1937,—	
Demand No. 78—Delhi Capital Outlay	1763	Questions and Answers	1835—55
Demand No. 79—Commuted Value of Pensions	1764	Unstarred Question and Answer	1856
Demand No. 80—Expenditure on retrenched personnel charged to Capital	1764	Statements laid on the Table	1856—59
		The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded	1859—1907

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Saturday, 6th March, 1937.

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

MEMBER SWORN :

Mr. John Anderson Thorne, C.I.E., M.L.A. (Government of India: Nominated Official).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

DEFECTS OF THE MURRAY SYSTEM AND MUTILATIONS AND DELAY IN TELEGRAPH MESSAGES.

599. *Mr. Sami Vencatachalam Chetty: (a) Are Government aware ~~that~~ since the introduction of Murray working, mutilations and delay to traffic are on the increase?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether there is any increase in public complaints about delays and mutilations in 1934, 1935 and 1936 compared to 1932 and backward? What is it due to?

(c) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the articles published in the *Telegraph Review* for August and November, 1935, and November, 1936, on the defects of the Murray system?.

(d) Will Government be pleased to state if it has been found that the introduction of the increased rate of 200 revolutions per minute on Baudot circuits on long main lines has not been found satisfactory resulting in greater number of mutilations consequent on the signals becoming more attenuated?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Government have no reason to believe that the facts are as stated by the Honourable Member.

(b) Full information is not available, but Government have no reason to believe that there is any increase in delays and mutilations.

(c) Government have now seen the articles.

(d) No, but the position is being closely watched.

Mr. Sami Vencatachalam Chetty: Is it not a fact that the working strength of the staff in almost all ranks of the Department has been curtailed?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: It has been fixed at the strength justified by the various standards according to the volume of the traffic.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Is it not a fact that ever since that depletion in the ranks, these delays and mutilations have been occurring?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: I do not admit there has been any depletion.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Are Government aware that telegrams booked at Bombay early in the afternoon often reach business houses in the United Kingdom the next day, instead of the same day as before the pre-reform days?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: I want notice of that question.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Is it a fact that in certain places and on certain occasions telegrams from central and local offices take longer time than one can go and come back in a modern conveyance?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: I cannot say. If the Honourable Member will give me concrete instances, I will have the matter looked into.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Is it not a fact that in some offices telegrams are sent by messengers to local offices

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has been asked to give concrete cases, so that he may be in a position to inquire.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE VARMA COMMITTEE OF THE POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT.

510. ***Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the articles published in the *Telegraph Review* for March, May, July and August, 1936 under the heading "The Working of Varma Reforms, Parts I, II and III", respectively?

(b) Is it a fact that the late Sir Thomas Ryan while Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, characterised the recommendations of the Varma Committee as "Revolutionary"?

(c) Is it a fact that Government contemplate to depute an officer of suitable status on special duty, a year or two after the Varma Committee's Reforms have been put into operation, to examine the results thereof? If so, when do they intend doing so?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Government have since seen the articles.

(b) The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the speech made by the late Sir Thomas Ryan in the Legislative Assembly on the 10th March, 1934. Sir Thomas Ryan considered some of the recommendations as of a revolutionary character, but he made it clear that he believed that the recommendations, taken as a whole, were most valuable. I would point to the Honourable Member that the recommendations of the Committee were not accepted in their entirety, and that such of them, as were accepted, have been brought into force gradually.

(c) Yes, after an interval sufficiently long to enable the suitability of the recommendations to be judged.

GOVERNMENT'S POLICY IN RESPECT OF THE TRAINING SHIP "DUFFERIN".

511. ***Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state their policy in respect of the Training Ship "Dufferin" and how far that policy has been adhered to? If any departure has taken place since that policy was announced, will Government be pleased to state their reasons for such departure?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether they have addressed any communication to the Captain Superintendent, or the Governing Body of the Training Ship "Dufferin", telling him, or them, that the prospectus of that ship should lay greater emphasis on the fact that the "Dufferin" gave Public School education, which may serve as a necessary preliminary to a university career, and, if so, to lay a copy of that communication on the table of the House?

(c) If the reply to part (b) above be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the reply of the Governing Body of that ship, and to lay a copy of that reply on the table of the House, as also to state what action they have taken or propose to take on that reply?

(d) If the answer to part (b) above, as regards the fact of Government having addressed such a communication as mentioned in that part be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state how that communication is in accordance with their declared policy in respect of the Training Ship "Dufferin", as contained in their Resolution issued by them, in the Department of Commerce No. 238-S. (9) (a), dated Delhi, the 25th November, 1925?

(e) Have Government, at any time since the issue of their Resolution referred to in part (d) above, revised or reconsidered their policy and reviewed the working of that policy in actual practice? If so, will Government be pleased to lay on the table of the House (i) a copy of their Resolution or *communiqué*, in which such a reconsideration or revision of the policy is contained; (ii) the results, since the institution of the Training Ship, of the training given there as regards (1) the number of men trained in that institution; (2) the number of men who have secured employment suited to their training; and (3) the number of such men, trained in that ship, who have failed to secure employment in their profession, and have accordingly remained either unemployed, or have resorted to some other occupation?

(f) Will Government be pleased to state what steps they are taking to secure prompt and suitable employment to men properly trained on this ship?

(g) Will Government be pleased to state whether their present attitude towards the Training Ship "Dufferin" regards that institution as a sort of a public school where such education would be given as would enable the cadets to join the University, rather than as a ship established for the purpose of creating a properly trained Indian personnel for sea service?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the paragraph headed "Aims and Objects of the 'Dufferin'" in the Prospectus of the Ship, wherein the policy of Government is clearly defined. A copy of the Prospectus is available in the Library. The policy has undergone no change.

(b) Government are not prepared to disclose their communications to the Captain Superintendent.

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

(e) Government have not revised or reconsidered their policy in respect of the Training Ship, but they have been carefully watching its results. Part (i) of the latter portion of the question does not arise. As to (ii), I would refer the Honourable Member to my reply to parts (a) and (c) of starred question No. 199, asked by Mr. T. S. A. Chettiar on the 25th January, 1937. Of the 66 certificated *ex*-cadets, 58 (including two who are preparing for higher examinations) have found employment suited to their training, one has joined the Royal Air Force, one is in civil employment, and six, so far as is known, are unemployed. I may observe that two of these are in the United Kingdom, in regard to whom particulars are not available.

(f) Government addressed the leading shipping companies last year on the general question of the employment of *ex*-"Dufferin" cadets and have also been in constant correspondence with them about individual cases.

(g) There is not, so far as Government are aware, any justification for the imputation conveyed in this question. Government's attitude has consistently been to regard the object of this ship to give the training to its cadets which will best fit them for actual service at sea, and any changes or modifications suggested in the curriculum as training have had, and will continue to have, this sole object in view.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: With reference to the Honourable Member's answer to part (e), did the person now in the Royal Air Force secure his job on account of the naval training he received on the "Dufferin"?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I do not know whether training on the "Dufferin" was necessary to enable him to join the Royal Air Force; but as he preferred to do so and selected that career for himself, surely no objection can be taken.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Is it an answer to the question as to how many persons who received special training on the "Dufferin" have got employment, to say that a person has secured employment in the Royal Air Force, unless the training on the "Dufferin" is the sort of training necessary for the Royal Air Force?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Surely the Honourable Member cannot take any possible objection to the reply I have given, that 58 out of the 66 have found employment suited to their training, one has joined the Royal Air Force and one is in civil employment. I did not imply that the one who had joined the Royal Air Force did so as a necessary result of the training on the "Dufferin".

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Has the Honourable Member reconsidered the question of reserving coastal traffic for Indians so that all the persons who are trained in the "Dufferin" may get employment?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Surely this does not arise from the question.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Is it not a fact that the recent amendments in the rules of the "Dufferin" change the policy which was laid down by the Government when this institution was first started—the amendment which made a diploma of the "Dufferin" equivalent to the diplomas of other schools?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No; the Honourable Member must be under some misapprehension. The mere fact that the diploma of the "Dufferin" has also been recognised by some universities surely does not make any difference to the actual training given on the "Dufferin".

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it, therefore, that the training given in the "Dufferin" ship is not primarily intended to train Indian personnel for being employed as officers on ships going overseas?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I have already answered that question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know, therefore, why this new rule has been laid down that today the training in the "Dufferin" is also intended to be an additional means of training for higher university education or as a preparation for the university course?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Where is that laid down?

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Is it not a fact that this amendment in the rules

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: What amendments in the rules.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: That the final year's diploma of the "Dufferin" will be recognised as equivalent to the matriculation pass? This leads to the impression that Government do not wish that the cadets who undergo training in the "Dufferin" should continue to follow the sea career only, but that some other outlet is being thrown open to them and this is a change in the fundamental policy of the "Dufferin".

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am sure the Honourable Member will forgive me if I have not been able to follow him. The mere fact that the diploma of the "Dufferin" is recognised, say, for instance, by the Bombay University also, does not mean that the object of the training given on the "Dufferin" has changed. Is it the suggestion of the Honourable Member that any recognition obtained should be dropped?

Sir Muhammad Yakub: I think so.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know if the primary object for which the "Dufferin" training ship was started is still kept in view?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Yes.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Does the training given in the "Dufferin" qualify a man to hold office in the Air Force?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I think the Honourable Member has already answered that.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I know, Sir, whether Government have considered that, if there are difficulties in the way of the *ex-cadets* of the "Dufferin" being employed, those difficulties are due to the attitude of the companies not being willing to give sufficient employment to the cadets or they are due to some other reason?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: There is at present no such question requiring consideration. In the normal course, people who have completed their training in the "Dufferin" and then have gone on to complete their sea training and have passed the qualifying examination have been able to obtain employment.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: With reference to part (f) of the question, may I know if Government are taking any steps to provide them employment or they are allowing those cadets who have come out successful to choose careers for themselves by their voluntary efforts?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No, Sir, the Captain Superintendent as well as Government continue to make every possible effort to secure suitable employment to *ex-cadets* who have fully qualified themselves for employment at sea.

NON-EMPLOYMENT OF *EX*-“DUFFERIN” CADETS AS OFFICERS ON STEAMERS OF THE PENINSULAR AND ORIENTAL SHIPPING COMPANY.

512. ***Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether they have received any representation from the Governing Body of the Training Ship "Dufferin", inviting their attention to the fact that the P. & O. Company were not employing any *ex*-“Dufferin” cadets as officers on their ships and whether that Company enjoys a large patronage both from the Government and the people of India?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state what action they have taken or propose to take to see that the P. & O. Company employ *ex*-“Dufferin” cadets as officers on their steamers, in the words of the previous Commerce Member, Sir Joseph Bhole, in “adequate numbers”?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) It is a fact that the P. & O. do not employ any *ex*-“Dufferin” cadets as officers, and that both Government and individuals in India make use of the facilities provided by the Company.

(b) The P. & O. Company have agreed to take a certain number of *ex*-“Dufferin” cadets as apprentices, but have not undertaken to employ them as officers.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know how many cadets have the P. & O. agreed to take as apprentices?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Altogether six at one time.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know if Government have been told any reasons why the P. & O. will not take *ex*-“Dufferin” cadets as officers on their ships?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am afraid I cannot enter into details, but Government have not been able to persuade them so far to employ *ex*-“Dufferin” cadets as officers.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know if Government have been told any reasons,—I do not want details, I only want to know the reasons why the P. & O. refuse to take *ex*-“Dufferin” cadets as officers?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: There has in the past been a certain amount of correspondence with the P. & O. Company, but Government were not able to secure any promise that they would employ a certain number of *ex*-cadets on their ships.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Do Government then propose to withdraw the concessions given to the P. & O. until they submit to the suggestions of the Government of India to employ *ex*-“Dufferin” cadets as officers on their ships?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No concessions are given to the P. & O. Company.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government consider not using the P. & O. Ships for any purpose at all until they listen to the reasonable demands made by the Government regarding the employment of suitably qualified *ex*-“Dufferin” cadets as officers on their ships?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am afraid that could not be done.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know why they don't want to do it?

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Are no concessions granted to the P. & O. Company?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No, Sir, but in answer to (f) of the previous question, I have said that Government are prepared to continue their efforts in that direction.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Do Government insist upon those who proceed to Europe at Government cost that they should, as far as possible, travel by the P. & O. liner?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: "Insist" and "as far as possible" are rather inconsistent.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I know whether the Government of India insist,—I will drop the words "as far as possible"—that those who proceed to Europe at Government cost should travel by the P. & O. ships only?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No, Sir.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Will Government be pleased to arrange with some other liners to carry their mails instead of giving this work to the P. & O.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That does not primarily concern me, but I have already answered that in the negative.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Have Government considered that the new Empire Air Mail scheme offers a fresh field to the Government for making fresh efforts to negotiate with the Imperial Airways to employ *ex*-"Dufferin" cadets on their sea planes?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I may assure the House that if Government find an opening in that direction, they will take advantage of it.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: The lever has already been offered. A demand is going to be made in connection with the Empire Air Mail scheme which includes a subsidy to the Imperial Air Mail Service. I want to know whether Government are prepared to make efforts to negotiate with the Imperial Airways for employing *ex*-"Dufferin" cadets on their sea planes?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: On sea planes, I am afraid the training required there would be entirely different.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Will Government be pleased to make provision for the necessary training

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is asking for an expression of opinion.

Pandit Krishna Kant Malaviya: Am I to understand, Sir, that the all-powerful Government of India find themselves powerless as against the P. & O. Company?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That is a hypothetical question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know if Government will undertake to direct all their officers who travel at Government expense not to travel by the P. & O. until the P. & O. Company employs suitably qualified *ex*-"Dufferin" cadets as officers on their ships?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am afraid Government would have no power to do it.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I know whether the Government of India have suggested, by means of issuing circulars, that people who travel at Government expense should travel as far as possible by the P. & O. liners?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I believe the suggestion is that they should travel as far as possible by Empire shipping.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I know, Sir, in view of the fact that the P. & O. Company does not employ Indians as officers, whether Government would withdraw their circulars as regards Empire shipping?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No, Sir, I am afraid that would not be feasible.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if all their efforts and persuasions have failed, and do they feel that they are impotent to do anything?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That is a hypothetical question.

EMPLOYMENT OF EX-"DUFFERIN" CADETS ON STEAMERS OF SHIPPING COMPANIES.

513. *Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if they have received any representations from the Governing Body of the Training Ship "Dufferin", expressing their anxiety as to the uncertainty of future employment for the ex-"Dufferin" cadets as officers in the mercantile marine and requesting the Government of India to exercise their influence with the shipping companies, carrying on trade on the coasts of India, to recruit officers from the ex-"Dufferin" cadets, at any rate proportionately to their tonnage employed in that trade?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state what action they have taken or propose to take, to use their influence in securing employment for ex-"Dufferin" cadets on the steamers of the shipping companies, at any rate plying in the coastal trade in adequate numbers or at least in proportion to the tonnage of the steamers of those companies employed in the coastal trade?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Yes.

(b) Government addressed the leading shipping companies last year on the general question of the employment of ex-"Dufferin" cadets and have also been in constant correspondence with them about individual cases.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: To how many of them have they addressed these letters?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I believe I gave an answer in detail in the previous Budget Session.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have they all replied?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Yes.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Is it a fact, Sir, that the P. & O. is the only company that refuses to employ as officers the *ex*-cadets of the "Dufferin"?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The only company out of whom?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: The only one of British passenger shipping company who comes to India.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No, there are several others.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What is the nature of the replies that Government have received?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable Member will look up the proceedings, he will find it.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: The Honourable Member did not say what kind of replies he has received.

EMPLOYMENT OF *EX*-“DUFFERIN” CADETS ON STEAMERS OF SHIPPING COMPANIES.

514. ***Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that as a result of the representations made by the Governing Body of the Training Ship "Dufferin" in regard to the uncertainty of employment of *ex*-“Dufferin” cadets as officers, they issued a circular letter to certain shipping companies on the subject of the employment of these cadets as officers on their ships?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether they have received any replies from those companies and, if so, will they be pleased to lay the same on the table?

(c) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether such a circular letter was addressed to the P. & O. Company?

(d) If the answer to part (c) be in the negative, will Government be pleased to state why they have not done so?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Yes.

(b) I would refer the Honourable Member to my reply to Mr. Chettiar's supplementary question asked in connection with his starred question No. 1164 on the 12th March, 1936.

(c) No.

(d) I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply just given by me to part (b) of his question No. 512.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I do not see any reason in the answer,—I am asking about clause (d) of the question?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The circular letter, I believe, was not addressed to the P. & O., but there has been previous correspondence with the company.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I want to know why the circular letter was not addressed to the P. & O. Company?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The circular letter was addressed to all the companies that carry coastal shipping.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Are the companies which carry mails subsidised by the Government?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is the answer to clause (b) of the question, Sir?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I said I had already replied to that question in detail in answer to question No. 1164 on the 12th March, 1936.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am talking of the latter part of the question.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That was also answered on that occasion.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are the replies placed on the table now?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No.

NON-EMPLOYMENT OF ~~Mr.~~ "DUFFERIN" CADETS AS OFFICERS ON STEAMERS OF THE PENINSULAR AND ORIENTAL SHIPPING COMPANY.

515. ***Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state what sum they have been paying to the British Post Office for the conveyance of mails from India by the steamers of the P & O. Company?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether their attention has been drawn to the remark made by the Chairman of the P. & O. Company, at their meeting in 1935, about "the recent rally to the British Lines of soldiers and civil servants in India"? What amount is paid by Government on account of passage money payable to the civil and military servants of the Crown in India under the Lee Concessions to the P. & O. Company?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that they have called upon, or recommended to their civil and military officers, under Circular issued by the Home Department, dated 17th March, 1934, to travel only by Empire ships, and, if so, what Lines of steamers are included in the Lines of Empire ships covered by the above Circular?

(d) If the answers to parts (a) and (b) above be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether they propose to exercise their influence with the P. & O. Company, and request them to employ ex-"Dufferin" cadets, duly trained as officers on their steamers?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) I lay on the table a statement giving the desired information.

(b) The reply to the first part is in the negative. As regards the second part the information asked for is not readily available. Government consider that the advantage to be gained by collecting it from various sources will not be commensurate with the labour involved.

(c) Yes; the term "Empire Ships" includes all ships registered in any part of the British Empire.

(d) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply just given by me to part (b) of his starred question No. 512.

Statement showing (in round figures) the payments made to the British Post Office during the years 1932-36 for the conveyance of mails from India.

	For conveyance of letter mails.	For conveyance of parcels.	Total.
	£	£	£
1932	31,124	9,022	40,146
1933	29,888	10,115	40,001
1934	24,827	10,744	35,571
1935	*28,000	10,139	38,139
1936	*28,900	11,816	39,816

* These payments have been made in the shape of advances subject to adjustment at a later date when accounts with all countries using the P. & O. service on the basis of statistics taken are known.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With reference to the answer to part (c) of the question, will the Honourable Member be good enough to withdraw the circular or at least amend it so as to say that Empire Shipping will not include the P. & O. Company so long as they do not agree to take in ex-"Dufferin" cadets?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I have already given a reply to that question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know why Government will not do it?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: As I have said, it is not feasible.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Why?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member will have an opportunity of debating this matter if he so chooses.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Is the Honourable Member aware that Government have power to influence companies in more ways than one, and will Government in this case use all their influence and those indirect powers which they so well possess, to make the P. & O. Company take a few of these officers?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I do not know what the implications of the Honourable Member's questions are, but I have already stated that Government are prepared to again pursue this matter.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: May I remind the Honourable Member that he has answered this in the same way during the last three years?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Hear, hear.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: All these three years, to my recollection, the Honourable Member has said the same thing over since he became Member—that he is pursuing the matter. May I know after these three years how far he has pursued the matter?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: This is my second Budget Session as Member, I have not been here for three years.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: How long has my Honourable friend been a Member?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Less than two years.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Then, his predecessor gave the same answer.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: As I have said, our previous efforts have not borne fruit. I am prepared to start fresh efforts if the Honourable Member so desires.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Do Government generally take a defeat of this sort, sitting down, in other matters?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That is an expression of opinion.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With reference to the answer to clause (a) of the question, may I know if the amount that Government have been paying to the British Post Office for the conveyance of mails from India by the steamers of the P. & O. Company is the lowest they can get at competitive rates?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am afraid I could not express an opinion upon that, as I did not settle the amount.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of this grievance of the Indian people, may I know if the Honourable Member will approach his Honourable colleague and get information to satisfy himself that this is the lowest possible rate, and if not, will he take such steps as may be necessary in the interests of the taxpayers of India and these *ex-"Dufferin"* cadets?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I have no doubt that my Honourable colleague has considered that matter from that point of view.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is the result of that consideration?

Mr. G. V. Bewoor: They are the cheapest that we can possibly get to send our mails.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am glad I have got my Honourable friend here. Will he tell this Honourable House whether he or his Chief will use their influence more effectively than the Honourable the Commerce Member, to persuade the Company or to coerce them to take these *ex*-“Dufferin” cadets?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: My Honourable friend cannot expect me to add anything to what my Honourable friend has said.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: You are retiring soon and you need not worry.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: May I ask the Honourable Member if the officers, who get concessions under the Lee Concession Scheme, get only their tickets and not money and that they are allowed to travel only by the P. & O. Company?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: This is a far cry from “Dufferin” cadets.

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

NON-EMPLOYMENT OF *EX*-“DUFFERIN” CADETS AS OFFICERS ON STEAMERS OF THE PENINSULAR AND ORIENTAL SHIPPING COMPANY.

516. ***Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if the name of the following company, *viz.*, “P. & O. Steam Navigation Company India China Steamers”, was included in the list of the companies mentioned in the prospectus of the Indian Mercantile Marine Training Ship “Dufferin” and issued by the Government of India as the companies on the ships of which “the Government of India consider that apprentices, who gave satisfaction, should be able to obtain employment”?

(b) Is it a fact that the P. & O. Company have intimated to the Governing Body of the Training Ship “Dufferin” that they cannot employ *ex*-“Dufferin” cadets as officers on their steamers?

(c) If the answer to parts (a) and (b) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the grounds on which the P. & O. Company have gone back on their past promises, and will they further state the action which they propose to take to request the P. & O. Company to redeem their previous assurances on the subject of employment of *ex*-“Dufferin” cadets as officers on their ships?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Yes. The statement in the prospectus is, however, founded on no promise made by the Peninsular and Oriental Company, which in fact has never undertaken to employ as officers the *ex*-cadets whom it trains as apprentices. The statement is being amended in the revised edition of the prospectus which is now in the Press.

(b) Yes.

(c) In view of the reply to part (a) above, this part does not arise.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Why is the prospectus being amended if my Honourable friend is hopefully pursuing his efforts with the P. & O. Company?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is a question in which many Members take a great deal of interest and they can have full opportunity later to discuss it if they so desire. The question time is not the time for that.

Mr. K. Santhanam: May I know who was responsible for including this P. & O. Company in the prospectus originally?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Does the Honourable Member mean the original statement that is being amended?

Mr. K. Santhanam: Yes.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Government.

NON-EMPLOYMENT OF *EX*-“DUFFERIN” CADETS AS OFFICERS ON STEAMERS OF THE PENINSULAR AND ORIENTAL SHIPPING COMPANY.

517. *Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the P. & O. Company have promised in the past to take two Indian cadets of the Training Ship “Dufferin” as apprentices on each of their three steamers running on the Bombay China line?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether the P. & O. Company have taken six cadets of the Training Ship “Dufferin” as apprentices during each of the last five years?

(c) If the answer to part (a) be in the negative, will Government be pleased to state the number of cadets they have taken during the last five years, and will Government be pleased to state whether they have taken any action or propose to take any action in requesting the P. & O. Company to redeem their assurances as regards the taking of *ex*-“Dufferin” cadets as apprentices on their steamers?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) The Company expressed its intention to take a few *ex*-“Dufferin” cadets for training as apprentices on its three steamers based on Bombay and stated that each such steamer could take two—a total of six under training at any one time. The normal period of apprenticeship is three years, and the total annual intake thus works out to two.

(b) and (c). The Company has taken ten cadets during the last five years at the rate of two cadets annually, and its undertaking has thus been fulfilled.

Mr. K. Santhanam: May I know how many ships of the P. & O. call at the port of Bombay?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What has that to do with this question?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know if any of these apprentices have found employment?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Out of these ten?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am afraid I would require notice of that question.

TRAVELLING OF OFFICERS UNDER THE LEE PASSAGE CONCESSIONS BY EMPIRE SHIPS.

518. ***Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the number of civil and military officers who travelled under the benefit of the Lee passage concessions after the issue of the Circular D. O. No. F. 5533 by the Home Department on the 17th March, 1934, calling upon them to travel only by Empire ships?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the number which actually travelled by Empire ships out of the total number of officers referred to in part (a) above, and the number which travelled by the P. & O. Company?

(c) Are Government aware of the remark made by the Chairman of the P. & O. Company at its annual meeting in 1935 about "the recent rallying to the British Lines of soldiers and civil servants in India"?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) and (b). The information asked for is not readily available. Government consider that the advantage to be gained by collecting it from various sources will not be commensurate with the labour involved.

(c) No.

TRAVELLING OF GOVERNMENT AND RAILWAY SERVANTS IN AIR-CONDITIONED COACHES.

519. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (on behalf of Mr. Sri Prakasa): (a) In view of the proposal for air-conditioned coaches being available on certain railway lines, will railway servants, who receive free first class passes now, get passes enabling them to travel by these air-conditioned coaches?

(b) Do Government intend to add to the travelling allowance of their officers who now travel in first class at public expense, so as to enable them to travel in such cases paying the requisite surcharge also at the tax-payers' expense?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) It is intended that pass holders should be allowed to travel in air-conditioned coaches only when room is available and after payment of the surcharge prescribed for passengers holding tickets.

(b) No.

ALLEGED PREVENTION OF A PRINCE GOING TO BOMBAY TO BOARD A FIRST CLASS COMPARTMENT BY RAILWAY OFFICIALS HOLDING PASSES.

520. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (on behalf of Mr. Sri Prakasa): (a) Is it a fact that a ruling prince, while trying to board a first class compartment with a view to proceeding to Bombay to attend a meeting of the princes, was effectively prevented from doing so by railway officials holding passes who were travelling in that compartment?

(b) Is it further a fact that the intervention of the station master was of no avail and that the prince was left behind?

(c) Have Government taken any action in this connection, and if so, what?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) The Agent, Great Indian Peninsula Railway, reports that an officer of the Assam Bengal Railway, who was travelling with his wife on a pass, declined to allow anyone else to enter his compartment, and that one of those to whom admission was thus refused was a Ruling Chief.

(b) Yes, but the Chief declined to take an upper berth in a coupe compartment.

(c) The matter has been taken up with the officer, who is in England, and his explanation is awaited.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Do Government realise that similar difficulties and inconveniences arise if persons who have got passes try to occupy and monopolise all the seats in the first and second class compartments?

Mr President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): This question relates to a specific case, and it is only that that can be dealt with now.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Will the Honourable Member take immediate steps to see that passengers who pay are allowed to occupy the compartments in preference to those persons who have passes?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Instructions have already been issued and are in operation that at starting stations pass-holders must give way to ticket-holders. Surely that cannot be done at intermediate stations.

SYSTEM OF MARKING AND RESERVATION OF SEATS IN INTERMEDIATE AND THIRD CLASSES ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

521. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (on behalf of Mr. Sri Prakasa): (a) What is the extra cost involved by the East Indian Railway in getting its third class and intermediate class berths sub-divided by lines for reservation purposes?

(b) Are Government satisfied that this system of marking and reservation has been conducive to the enhancement of railway revenue and the convenience of intermediate and third class passengers?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) I have called for the information required by the Honourable Member and will place a reply on the table when it has been received.

(b) Government have no reason to believe that the arrangement is proving otherwise than satisfactory.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: May I know from facts and figures whether the finances have improved since the division of the seats in that manner by putting up railings?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am unable to follow the Honourable Member.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Receipts under that head—besides causing inconvenience, they have resulted only in causing inconvenience,—have they enhanced the receipts of the railway in any way?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Surely there can be no inconvenience to the public. People are assured of a seat if they have reserved it, and there is no overcrowding at least in these carriages. It is not inconvenient for the public; on the contrary, it is very convenient.

NON-BOOKING OF PASSENGERS FROM AND TO THE CHHEOKI STATION ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

522. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (on behalf of Mr. Sri Prakasa): (a) Is it a fact that passengers are not booked to and from the Chheoki Station on the East Indian Railway?

(b) Is it a fact that the Calcutta-Bombay Mails stop at the station for the convenience of passengers to and from Allahabad and that a shuttle train connects this station with Allahabad?

(c) Are Government aware of the inconvenience to persons who want to see friends passing Chheoki or who desire to see friends off or receive friends there because passengers cannot be booked to and from that station?

(d) Do Government propose to recommend to the authorities concerned that passengers may be given special return tickets at reasonable cost at Allahabad for journey to and from Chheoki, or permit them to travel by the shuttle trains connecting Allahabad and Chheoki with platform tickets?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) No.

(d) I understand that the Administration is arranging to issue at Allahabad return journey tickets for Chheoki.

LEVY OF ENTRANCE FEE FOR VISITING THE MUSEUM AT SARNATH IN BENARES.

523. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (on behalf of Mr. Sri Prakasa): (a) Is it a fact that admission to the museum at Sarnath in Benares was free before, and that now a charge is levied?

(b) Since when has this charge been levied, and what is the average monthly income from the same?

(c) Are any persons exempted from the payment of this entrance fee? If not, will Government state whether Viceroy's, Governors and their parties pay the entrance fee when they visit the museum?

(d) Do Government propose to make sure that local commissioners and collectors when they visit the museum, are also made to pay the fee?

Sir Raghavendra Rau (on behalf of Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai): (a) Yes.

(b) Since November, 1931. The average monthly income is Rs. 90 to Rs. 100.

(c) The personages referred to in this part of the question are not required to pay the admission fee as they visit the institution on invitation.

(d) The question whether any official who does not visit the museum on duty should pay the admission fee is under consideration.

EXHIBITS IN THE MUSEUM AT SARNATH IN BENARES.

524. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (on behalf of Mr. Sri Prakasa): (a) Is it a fact that a large number of exhibits that were formerly in the museum at Sarnath in Benares have now been put away in a courtyard outside, which the ordinary visitor is not allowed to see? If so, why was this done?

(b) Have any of the exhibits of the museum been sent to England? If so, will Government furnish a list of these and also state where they are placed at present?

Sir Raghavendra Rau (on behalf of Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai): (a) The collections in the Sarnath Museum have recently been re-arranged with a view to exhibiting the most important and typical specimens in chronological order. This has involved the shifting of duplicate specimens to other rooms and the placing of stone umbrella tops, architecture fragments and the like on an open platform erected at the back of the building. This platform is presumably the "courtyard" to which the Honourable Member refers. Visitors are not debarred from viewing these specimens.

(b) No. The second part of the question does not arise.

PROPOSAL OF THE GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY TO REMOVE THE WIRE-FENCING OF THE RAILWAY LINES.

525. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (on behalf of Mr. Sri Prakasa): (a) Is it a fact that the Great Indian Peninsula Railway is intending to take away the wire-fencing on either side of the railway lines in the interest of economy?

(b) When do they propose to do so?

(c) Have Government considered the danger to the lives of men and cattle which such removal will involve?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The required information is being obtained, and a reply will be laid on the table in due course.

AIR-CONDITIONED COACHES ON RAILWAYS.

526. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (on behalf of Mr. Sri Prakasa): (a) When do Government expect air-conditioned coaches to be available on Indian railways?

(b) On what railway lines is it intended to run them?

(c) What will be the cost of each coach? And what will be the temperature maintained in such coaches?

(d) What will be the amount of sitting and sleeping accommodation provided in each coach?

(e) Will only long distance passengers be allowed to travel in them or would they be available for all?

(f) Are Government aware of the danger to the health of passengers who may have to detrain from these coaches at noon on a hot day at the termination of their journey, or to that of travelling ticket examiners because of sudden changes of temperature to which they will be exposed when going in and coming out from these coaches? If so, what arrangements are being made for their safety?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Experimental coaches are expected to be in service during the hot weather of 1937.

(b) The matter is under consideration.

(c) The total estimated cost of each coach is Rs. 95,000. As regards the latter part, the internal temperature will be capable of regulation and, within the capacity of the equipment, will be kept within the comfort zone dictated by the clothing normally worn. During the hottest weather, an internal temperature of 85° is anticipated and during the coldest weather the circulating air will be suitably heated.

(d) Sitting accommodation for 21 passengers and sleeping accommodation for 14 passengers will be provided in each coach.

(e) The air-conditioned carriages will be available for short as well as for long distance passengers.

(f) Government have no reason to apprehend any such danger to the health of the passengers; the latter part does not arise

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury: May I ask the Honourable Member whether provision has been made to prevent dust getting into the compartment?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I explained briefly in my budget speech what the conditions in air-conditioned coaches are expected to be.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: On which railways will the air-conditioned coaches be tried first?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: May I draw the Honourable Member's attention to the reply I have read out to part (b) of this question.

INCONVENIENT TIMINGS OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY 24-DOWN EXPRESS.

527. ***Babu Kailash Behari Lal:** (a) Is it a fact that a representation was made before the Chief Operating Superintendent, East Indian Railway, Calcutta, by some important persons of Bhagalpur and Monghyr regarding the inconvenient timings of 24 Down Express?

(b) Is it a fact that the reply was to the effect that the timing was so changed on account of the complaint of the Patna people and that the Railway authority was unable to make any further change in the timings of the 24 Down Loop Express?

(c) Is it a fact that there being no direct train between Patna and Bhagalpur, the 23 Up and 24 Down Loop Express, which run between Dinapore and Howrah *via* loop line, have been given as the direct result of agitation and representation of the Bhagalpur and other people on the loop line mainly for their convenience?

(d) Are Government aware that Patna, being on the main line, has a number of trains to meet the needs of the people and that the diversion of 24 Down for the convenience of Patna people has partially deprived people on the loop line of the advantages of the only direct train that was meant for them?

(e) Are Government aware that the necessity of running a suitable shuttle train from Monghyr to Bhagalpur after court hours has been represented before the Railway authority and that the absence of the same not only causes inconvenience to a large number of public but also loss to the Railway on account of the passengers taking recourse to motor buses?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) to (e). Government have no information. I am, however, sending a copy of the Honourable Member's question to the Agent of the East Indian Railway for consideration.

INTEREST CHARGED UPON STATE-OWNED RAILWAYS ON BEING TAKEN BY THE COMPANIES AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE RAILWAY DEPRECIATION FUND.

528. ***Babu Kailash Behari Lal:** (a) What was the amount of interest charged upon the different State-owned Railways when they were first taken over from the different companies, and what is the amount of interest charged at present?

(b) Has any payment towards the principal investment of the companies been made either by Government, or out of the Railway finances since the State-owned Railways have been taken over by the State?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, what is the amount paid towards the principal investment?

(d) What is the balance of the unpaid principal over which interest is charged?

(e) Is there any company which has been incorporated in India and which receives interest on the investment in Indian Railways?

(f) Which companies or corporations have invested capital in the Indian Railways? Are all the companies foreign?

(g) Who administers the Railway Depreciation Fund, and where is it invested and how much interest has it fetched this year?

Sir Raghavendra Rau: (a) A statement giving the information in regard to the three States-owned lines the working of which was taken over by the State from the Companies is laid on the table.

(b) Yes.

(c) (1) A sum of £3,500,000 representing part of the debenture stock of the East Indian Railway Company which was taken over as a State liability in 1924-25 was paid off from General Revenues in 1935-36.

(2) A sum of ₹2,575,000 representing the share capital of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company was paid off in 1925-26 from Railway Revenues.

(3) A sum of £3,000,000 representing the share capital of the Burma Railways Company was paid off in 1928-29 from Railway Revenues.

(d) The balance of unpaid principal on which interest is being paid at present by the Railway Department relating to the three railways is as follows:

	Debentures.
	£
(1) East Indian Railway	15,000,000
(2) Great Indian Peninsula Railway	3,500,000
(3) Burma Railway's	1,250,000

(e) The answer is in the negative if my Honourable friend refers to State-owned railways: but in the affirmative if he refers to all railways in India.

(f) Lists giving the information required are laid on the table. Some of the companies owning minor railways have been incorporated in India.

(g) The Railway Depreciation Fund is administered by the Government of India and at present forms part of the general balance of Government. The interest credited to railway revenues on this account during 1936-37 is estimated at about 60 lakhs.

Statement showing the year in which East Indian, Great Indian Peninsula and Burma Railways were taken over by State and interest payment.

Railway.	Year in which taken over by State.	Interest charges in the year of taking over.	Interest charges in 1935-36.
East Indian Railway	1924-25	(a) 3,79,42,808	(b)&(c) 5,94,38,471
Great Indian Peninsula Railway	1925-26	3,51,06,382	(c) 4,29,13,474
Burma Railways	1928-29	1,23,34,364	1,46,72,164

(a) Excluding the Oudh and Rohilkand Railway.

(b) Including the Oudh and Rohilkand Railway which was amalgamated with the East Indian Railway in 1925-26.

(c) Certain sections of the line were transferred from the East Indian to Great Indian Peninsula Railway and vice versa.

List of Railway Companies domiciled in England

1. Assam Bengal Railway Company Limited.
2. Barsi Light Railway Company Limited.
3. Bengal and North Western Railway Company Limited.
4. Bengal Doonars Railway Company Limited.
5. Bengal Nagpur Railway Company Limited.
6. Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway Company Limited.
7. Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Company Limited.
8. Rohilkund and Kumaon Railway Company Limited.
9. South Bihar Railway Company Limited.
10. South Indian Railway Company Limited.

List of Companies incorporated in India.

1. Ahmadpur Katwa Railway Company Limited.
2. Ahmedabad Prantij Railway Company Limited.
3. *Arrah Sasaram Light Railway Company Limited.
4. Bankura Damodar River Railway Company Limited.
5. *Barasat Basirhat Light Railway Company Limited.
6. †Bengal Provincial Railway Company Limited (includes Dasgbara Jamalpurganj Railway).
7. *Bukhtiarpur Bihar Light Railway Company Limited.
8. Burdwan Katwa Railway Company Limited.
9. Champarmukh Silghat Railway Company Limited.
10. Darjeeling Himalayan Railway Company Limited.
11. *Dehri Rohtas Light Railway Company Limited.
12. Assam Railways and Trading Company Limited (Dibru Sadiya Railway and †Ledo and Tikok-Margherita Colliery).
13. Dhond Baramati Railway Company Limited.
14. Central Provinces Railways Company Limited. (Ellichpur-Yeotmal and Pulgaon-Arvi Railways).
15. Futwah-Islampur Railway Company Limited.
16. Guzerat Railways Company Limited.
17. Hardwar-Dehra Railway Company Limited.
18. Hoshiarpur-Doab Branch Railways Company Limited.
19. *Howrah Amta Light Railway Company Limited.
20. *Howrah Sheakhala Light Railway Company Limited.
21. *Jacobabad Kashmir Feeder Company Limited.
22. *Jagadhri Light Railway Company Limited.
23. Kalighat Falta Railway Company Limited.
24. Katakhal Lalabazar Railway Company Limited.
25. Khulna Bagirhat Railway Company Limited.
26. East India, Distilleries and Sugar Factories Ltd., of Madras (Kalaseharapatnam Light Railway†).
27. Larkana-Jacobabad (Sind) Light Railway Company Limited.
28. Mandra-Bhaun Railway Company Limited.
29. *Mathern Steam Tramway Company Limited.
30. Mayurbhanj Railway Company Limited.
31. Sind Light Railways Limited (Mirpurkhas Khadro Railway).
32. Mymensingh Bhairab Bazar Railway Company Limited.
33. Pachora Jamner Railway Company Limited.
34. Sara Serajganj Railway Company Limited.
35. *Shahdara (Delhi) Saharanpur Light Railway Company Limited.
36. Sialkot-Narowal Railway Company Limited.
37. Tapti Valley Railway Company Limited.
38. *Tezapore Balipara Light Railway Company Limited.
39. *T. N. Chetty and Sons, Madras (Trivellore Light Railway.)†

List of railways in which District Boards and other bodies (excepting Indian States) have invested funds.

1. Bezwada Masulipatam Railway.
2. Bombay Port Trust Railway.
3. Calcutta Port Commissioners' Railway.
4. Madras Port Trust Railway.
5. Podanur Pollachi Railway.
6. Salem Suramangalam Railway.
7. Tanjore District Board Railways.
8. Tenali Repalle Railway.
9. Tinnevely Tiruchendur Railway.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With reference to the answer to clause (b), may I know at what rate interest is being paid on these amounts to which my Honourable friend referred?

*These were constructed under Local Government orders under the Indian Tramways Act, 1886.

†Unassisted Company.

Sir Raghavendra Rau: The rate differs with regard to different debentures.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is the maximum?

Sir Raghavendra Rau: I should like to have notice of the question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With reference to clause (g), may I know how much of the Railway Depreciation Fund is now left. I am talking of the latest time for which figures are available.

Sir Raghavendra Rau: At the beginning of this year, the balance at credit of the depreciation fund was 9 crores 60 lakhs.

RAILWAY ENQUIRY COMMITTEE.

529. ***Babu Kailash Behari Lal:** (a) Will the Honourable the Railway Member be pleased to state what special reasons led Government to appoint a South African on the Railway Enquiry Committee?

(b) How long did it take for the Wedgwood Committee to tour round India; and how many places did the Committee visit?

(c) Has the report of the Committee been prepared in India, or will it be prepared after the Committee has left the shores of India?

(d) Is it a fact that the members of the Wedgwood Committee, before leaving the shores of India, have happened to express that the working of the Railway system in India is not worse than the working of Railway system in other countries?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to the speech I made on the subject during the course of discussion on the railway budget on the 24th February, 1937.

(b) The Committee were in India about 3 months and visited seven or eight of the principal places.

(c) The report will be completed and signed in London.

(d) Government have no information.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: May I know if the railway mileage in India is equal to the railway mileage in South Africa?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: How does that arise.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: To show that the so-called experts cannot have expert knowledge of the subject.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is a matter of argument. Next question.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: What are the qualifications of the experts?

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

Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Have I no right to put a supplementary question?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has already called the next question.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: I am submitting to you to reconsider your order.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has already considered it.

AMOUNT ALLOTTED OUT OF THE ROAD FUND TO THE PROVINCES.

530. ***Babu Kailash Behari Lal:** (a) What is the amount allotted out of the Road Fund to each of the Provinces during 1936-37?

(b) What is the amount drawn by each of the Provinces out of the allotment made to them during 1936-37?

(c) What amount has each of the Provinces actually been able to spend over the projects taken up by them?

(d) What is the amount outstanding to the credit of each of the Provinces in the Road Account Fund?

(e) What is the unspent balance lying with the Local Government of the Provinces in respect of the Road Fund?

(f) What projects have Bihar Government taken up during 1936-37 out of the Road Fund, and what is the estimated cost of those projects?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a), (c) and (e). A statement, showing the allotments shortly to be made to provinces for 1936-37 and the estimated allotments and expenditure to end of 1936-37, is laid on the table.

(b) and (d). Under the Resolution on Roads adopted by the Indian Legislature on the 21st April, 1934, the shares due to provinces are credited to them to be spent on road development, the progress of expenditure being left to the Local Governments. The system of releasing money when actually needed for expenditure on roads, which the Honourable Member has apparently in mind, will take effect after the new Resolution on Roads has been adopted by the other House.

(f) No new schemes were taken up during 1936-37.

Statement showing allotments made to Governors' Provinces to end of 1936-37 and estimated expenditure therefrom to end of that year.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Name of Province.	Share allotted to to end of 1935-36.	Probable share to be allotted during 1936-37.	Total estimated share to end of 1936-37.	Estimated expenditure to end of 1936-37.	Unspent Balance at the end of 1936-37.
	Rs. lakhs.	Rs. lakhs.	Rs. lakhs.	Rs. lakhs.	Rs. lakhs.
Madras	90.79	16.70	107.49	62.00	45.49
Bombay	88.33*	22.65	110.98	56.82	54.16
Bengal	86.85	15.70	102.55	53.00	49.55
United Provinces	36.28	7.19	43.47	40.00	3.47
Punjab	45.79	10.05	55.84	33.00	22.84
Burma (including Federated Shan States)	64.04	14.89	78.93	34.00	44.93
Bihar	21.16*	3.64	24.80	13.50	11.30
Central Provinces	20.09	3.97	24.06	20.00	4.06
Assam	13.80	2.96	16.76	14.00	2.76
North-West Frontier Province	11.59	2.15	13.74	11.00	2.74
Sind	29.34*	0.80	30.14	23.18	6.96
Orissa	1.29*	0.20	1.49	0.50	0.99
Total Governors' Provinces	509.35	100.90	610.25	361.00	249.25

* After taking into account probable adjustments on account of separation of Sind and Orissa.

CONDEMNATION BY THE HEALTH OFFICER OF THE BHAGAT BAZAR SUB-POST OFFICE BUILDING IN JULLUNDUR.

531. *Mr. Umar Aly Shah: (a) Are Government aware that the building of the Sub-Post Office, Bhagat Bazar, Jullundur, has been condemned by the Health Officer as being very unhealthy and insanitary?

(b) Are Government further aware that the same building is still occupied by the Post Office?

(c) If the reply to part (b) be in the affirmative, what are the reasons for delaying the shifting of the Post Office to some other building?

(d) Do Government propose to order the immediate shifting of this Post Office to another building approved by the Health Department? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) to (d). Government have no information. The matter is within the competence of the Postmaster-General, Punjab and North-West Frontier Circle, to whom a copy of the question is being sent for such action as he may consider suitable.

PRESENT CONDITION OF THE HEALTH OF MR. SUBHASH CHANDRA BOSE.

532. *Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: (a) Will the Honourable the Home Member be pleased to state in detail the present condition of the health of Srijut Subhash Chandra Bose?

(b) What is the diagnosis of his present ailment?

(c) What is his present weight and what was his weight at the time of his admission in the Calcutta Medical College Hospital?

(d) Is it a fact that Srijut Bose has, since his removal to the hospital, lost six pounds in weight? If so, what is this loss due to?

(e) Is it a fact that his temperature continues to rise thrice a week?

(f) Under whose treatment is he at present? Has he been given an opportunity to have his disease diagnosed and to be treated by any private physician of his own choice?

(g) What facilities, if any, are being granted to him for his nursing by the members of his family?

(h) Are any facilities given to him for walking or driving in the morning or in the afternoon outside the hospital area for the improvement of his health?

(i) What facilities are given to him for reading and writing? What newspapers, if any, are supplied to him?

(j) Is it a fact that Government are at present contemplating to remove him to some jail in or outside Bengal—even though his ailment still continues—and he is not thoroughly cured? Has any decision been reached on this point? If so, on whose report, if any, is this decision based?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) and (b). Mr. Bose has been under treatment for slight enlargement of the liver in the Medical College Hospital, Calcutta. He has also received treatment for chronic tonsillitis.

(c) and (d). At the time of his admission to hospital his weight was 153 lbs.; it is now 146 lbs. In the opinion of the Professor of Medicine, at the Medical College, the loss of weight is due to some residual infection in the bile ducts.

(e) There is a slight rise of temperature every evening.

(f) He is under the treatment of the Professor of Medicine and of a specialist in diseases of the throat. He was recently allowed to consult Sir Nilratan Sircar.

(g) Nursing is done by the trained staff of the Medical College Hospital.

(h) Yes. He is allowed to go out daily for a drive in a motor car, to visit his mother twice a week and to take exercise in the grounds of the hospital.

(i) He is allowed to write seven letters a week and to read anything not proscribed under the ordinary law.

(j) No.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: With regard to part (g), may I know from the Honourable Member if the members of Mr. Bose's family are permitted to nurse him in the Hospital?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The nursing is done by the trained staff of the Medical College Hospital. Whether he has asked for the members of his family I do not know.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: I want to ascertain if it is a fact. Our grievance is that the members of Mr. Bose's family are not allowed to give him necessary service in the Hospital. Did the Honourable Member inquire about that?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I am not sure if the rules of the Hospital permit patients to be nursed by their own family.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Is it not a fact that Mr. Bose, since his admission to Hospital, has lost weight to the tune of 14½ lbs. and not seven pounds?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have said the loss of weight was seven pounds.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: When was the last weight taken?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Since his admission to the Hospital.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Is there no foundation for the reports which have appeared in the press that the Government of Bengal are contemplating removing him to some other place outside Bengal?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have replied to that; I said "no".

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Is he then going to be kept permanently in the Hospital in Calcutta?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Is it not a fact that medical opinion has expressed itself in favour of the view that Kurseong, the place of the original internment of Mr. Bose, is wholly unsuitable to his present condition?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: He is not in Kurseong, he is in Calcutta now.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Do Government propose to send him back to Kurseong or keep him in Calcutta?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I cannot answer that.

NEW ROAD FUND RESOLUTION.

533. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** (a) Will the Honourable Member in charge of Industries and Labour be pleased to state whether the full text of the New Road Fund Resolution was forwarded to all the Provincial Governments likely to be affected thereby and their views thereon obtained, before placing it for consideration in this House?

(b) Were the Provincial Governments unanimous in their approval of it?

(c) Will the Honourable Member be pleased to state the names of the Provincial Governments which expressed their agreement with the Resolution *in toto* and of the Governments which were not in agreement?

(d) What portions of the Resolution were agreed to and what portions objected to by the Provincial Governments?

(e) Will the Honourable Member be pleased to lay on the table of this House the whole correspondence on the subject that has passed between his department and the different Provincial Governments?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes, but certain minor amendments were subsequently made which met some of the criticisms of Local Governments.

(b) No.

(c) to (e). I am not prepared to lay the whole correspondence on the table or to refer in detail to the views of different Local Governments by name. In general, however, I would state for the information of the Honourable Member that the replies indicated substantial agreement with the general principles of the Resolution, but that one or two Local Governments criticised the provisions of sub-paragraph (2) of paragraph 3, while the majority took exception to sub-paragraph (3)(a) of paragraph 3 and a few objected to sub-paragraph (3)(b) of paragraph 3 or considered it redundant.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Before the Government of India give effect to this Resolution, will they consult and consider the views of the Provincial Governments once again?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No, Sir, they have already been consulted.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: May I ask why Government feel nervous about placing the entire correspondence between the different provinces and the Central Government on this subject on the table of this House?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No, Sir.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Why then is the Honourable Member not prepared to lay the correspondence on the table of the House—the correspondence that passed between the Provincial Governments and the Government of India on this Road Fund Resolution?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: It is not customary to place correspondence of that nature on the table, and I am not prepared to depart from the usual practice in the matter.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Is it not a fact that many provinces objected to important items in the Road Fund Resolution, particularly in the matter in which the Central Government propose to put some restrictions upon the Provincial Governments unless they comply with certain conditions to which the Road Fund is attached?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have already replied to that point in my reply to the question, the objections were also raised in this House and debated in it when the Road Resolution was passed.

ADDRESS PRESENTED TO SIR MUHAMMAD YAMIN KHAN AND RAIZADA HANS RAJ IN THE ANDAMANS.

534. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (on behalf of Mr. Sri Prakasa): (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the speech of Raizada Hans Raj in reply to the address presented to Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan and himself during their visit to the Andamans?

(b) Was permission of Government obtained for presenting or receiving the said address?

(c) Do Government intend to take any action on Raizada Hans Raj's speech?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). No.

ANDAMAN ISLANDS.

535. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (on behalf of Mr. Sri Prakasa): (a) When were the Andaman Islands annexed by Government and why are they so called?

(b) When was it decided to make it a convict settlement? And who were the prisoners first sent there?

(c) What is the population of the Islands, apart from the convicts and the original inhabitants?

(d) What would be approximately the number of the original inhabitants?

(e) Have any attempts been made to come to a proper understanding with them?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) to (e). The information required by the Honourable Member is contained in the Census Report of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands for the year 1931, a copy of which will be found in the Library of the House. As regards parts (c) and (d), Government have no later information.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Is there any similar convict settlement for convicts sent from England? (*A Voice*: "Australia.")

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Honourable Member's supplementary question does not arise out of any answer I have given.

SALOON OF MAHARAJA OF DHOLPUR LENT FOR THE USE OF THE MAHARAJA OF BARODA.

536. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (on behalf of Mr. Sri Prakasa): (a) With reference to the reply to clause (f) of starred question No. 309, on the 26th January, 1937, is it a fact that the Maharaja of Dholpur lent his saloon for the use of the Maharaja of Baroda when the latter was ill at Benares during his last visit there and that that saloon took the Maharaja from Benares to Baroda?

(b) If so, under what rules and conditions was this transaction permitted?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) and (b). Government have no information of the case in question, but in the circumstances referred to, the use of the saloon by His Highness the Maharaja of Baroda could have been allowed as a special case. I may inform the Honourable Member that the haulage rates for saloons for Princes are exactly the same as those charged for saloons for the public.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: May I know, when the Honourable Member replies to a question stating that the Government have no information, does he mean that the Government tried to ascertain the information, but did not get it, or that they did not try to get the information arising out of the question?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The reply means exactly what it says.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: I wanted to know whether the Honourable Member tried to ascertain the facts on receipt of the notice of the question. I say this in no light-hearted manner. Did they give the answer in a light-hearted manner?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: There was no light-heartedness, I am sure.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has no business to make any reflection like that.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: I wanted to know if the Honourable Member did try to make an inquiry.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I presume the answer was quite satisfactory. It was no use making inquiries. I understood there was some impression that probably this was a free use of the saloon; and I have said that, so far as the railways are concerned, the railways charge the full rate for haulage. Therefore, there was no need to make any inquiry.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask whether the intention of the Honourable the questioner is not that. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): How can the Honourable Member say? (Laughter.)

Mr. N. M. Joshi: The Honourable Member said something about the intention of the questioner. May I ask him whether it was right for one prince to use the saloon given for another prince?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: That is another misapprehension. Government do not give a saloon to any prince. The prince owns his own saloon.

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

SUPPLY OF ICE-CONTAINERS TO FIRST AND SECOND CLASS PASSENGERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

537. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (on behalf of Mr. Sri Prakasa): (a) Is it a fact that on the East Indian Railway ice-containers with ice are supplied to first and second class passengers on payment?

(b) Are these permitted only at particular periods of the year, or are they available throughout the year?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to his starred question No. 314 on the 11th September, 1936.

(b) They are available from 1st April to 31st October each year.

CHARGE FOR EMPTY HAULAGE OF SALOONS OF MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

538. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (on behalf of Mr. Sri Prakasa): What, if any, charge is made for the empty haulage of saloons when these are required for Members of the Executive Council at stations where they are not available at the time they are wanted?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Six annas per mile on broad gauge lines and four annas per mile on metre gauge lines.

**PUNISHMENT FOR VIOLATION OF GOVERNMENT SERVANTS' CONDUCT RULES
IN THE CENTRALLY ADMINISTERED AREAS.**

539. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (on behalf of Mr. Sri Prakasa): Have any Government servants been punished for violation of the Government Servants' Conduct Rules in the centrally administered areas during the last five years?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Government have not the information: and the collection of it would mean an amount of labour which would hardly be justified.

Mr. Ganga Singh: May I know whether these Government Servants' Conduct Rules are applicable to Indians only or they apply to Europeans also?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: They apply to all Government servants whose case is covered by the rules, whether Indian or European.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Do not Government maintain any statistics of persons punished for the infringement of the Government Servants' Conduct Rules?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir.

WASTE OF ELECTRICITY IN CERTAIN GOVERNMENT QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI.

540. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (on behalf of Mr. Sri Prakasa): (a) Are Government aware that there is a great deal of unnecessary waste of electricity in Government quarters in New Delhi, where electric energy consumed for lights is included in the rents to an unlimited extent, while electricity consumed for fans, heaters or for other instruments is charged for, not on the score of the amount consumed but for each instrument at so much per month whether in constant use or not?

(b) Do Government propose to consider the desirability of fixing the amount of units that can be consumed free as being included in the rents and charge for amounts consumed above that, regardless of the purposes for which the tenant may use the same?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) and (b). The present practice according to which an inclusive charge in addition to the rent for quarters and furniture is made for special services is in accordance with the wishes of the House Committee of this Assembly. This charge includes supply of electric energy but excludes hire charges for fans and is based on the actual expenditure on these services in the preceding year. The arrangement saves Honourable Members the inconvenience involved in dealing direct with the New Delhi Municipal Committee which they would otherwise have to do.

RULES PERTAINING TO THE NUMBER OF LETTERS TO BE SENT IN THE SAME ENVELOPE.

541. ***Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar** (on behalf of Mr. Sri Prakasa): (a) With reference to the reply to starred question No. 248, on the 26th January, 1937, will Government state what other communications besides the letter of introduction can be enclosed in a letter addressed to one person but meant for another not living at the same address?

(b) Do Government propose to make this matter quite plain by publishing complete information on the subject in the post office guide?

(c) What process do Government adopt to make sure that the rules in this behalf are strictly adhered to?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) I would draw the attention of the Honourable Member to my reply to part (a) of his own starred question No. 443 on the 17th September, 1936. So long as the provisions of section 4 of the Indian Post Office Act are not contravened a communication addressed to one person may be sent in a letter addressed to another person not living at the same address.

(b) Government do not consider that any further elucidation of the matter is called for.

(c) The Honourable Member is referred to my reply to part (d) of his starred question No. 443 on the 17th September, 1936.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

RICE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

42. **Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** Will Government please state:

(a) when the Rice Standing Committee of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research was constituted;

(b) how many times did it meet since its inception—when and where;

(c) when is the Committee going to meet next time;

(d) has the Committee got any sub-committee;

(e) when and how was the sub-committee formed;

(f) how many times did the sub-committee meet;

(g) when is the next meeting of the above sub-committee going to be held; and

(h) whether the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research propose to form a marketing sub-committee of Rice Standing Committee, and take non-official members of the Rice Standing Committee on it?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) In February, 1936.

(b) Once, in January, 1937, at New Delhi.

(c) Probably next cold weather.

(d) Yes; one Research Sub-Committee.

(e) The sub-committee was formally appointed by the Committee in January, 1937.

(f) Once in January, 1937. As a matter of fact, *ad hoc* Committees with almost the same personnel have been appointed by the Advisory Board on several occasions to advise on schemes, technical programmes and progress reports.

(g) If there is enough business, the sub-committee will meet in the summer when the Advisory Board of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research ordinarily meet; otherwise it will meet at the same time as the main Committee, that is, during the next cold weather.

(h) There is no such proposal now before the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research.

PROPOSED SALE OF CERTAIN AREAS IN THE KARACHI CANTONMENT TO THE KARACHI MUNICIPALITY.

43. **Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon:** (a) With reference to my question and Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham's reply regarding the proposed sale of certain areas in the Karachi Cantonment to the Karachi Municipality, will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the military authorities have informed the Municipality that the occupied sites in the areas in question are held on what is known as Cantonment Tenure and that consequently compensation for buildings alone would be payable to the holders of the plots and not for the land under the buildings?

(b) Are Government aware that the above assertion as to the nature of tenure is strongly contested by the landholders affected?

(c) Will Government be pleased to refer to the Defence Department Press Note, dated the 31st August, 1936, issued after a deputation of the All-India Cantonments Association had waited on the Defence Secretary on the 10th August, 1936, in which, *inter alia*, it was stated:

"An important point that was made clear was that Government had no desire to make money out of these old holdings or to disturb their present occupants, except on grounds of military necessity, and that therefore they would be generally prepared to grant to such persons perpetual leases on nominal rents containing the fewest and simplest possible conditions",

and will Government be pleased to state:

(i) whether the perpetual lease referred to in the above extract from the press note has since been issued, or, if not issued yet, when it is expected to be issued; and

(ii) whether it has been ascertained how many of the landholders affected by the proposed sale would be entitled to the grant of a perpetual lease as above in the ordinary course when such a lease came to be issued, if their holding continued to form part of the Karachi Cantonment; if so, whether Government are prepared to lay a statement on the table giving particulars of the plots so entitled, with the names of their holders; if not, whether they propose to call for this information and place it on the table as soon as available?

(d) Are Government aware that if the proposed sale to the Municipality goes through before the new perpetual lease is issued to those landholders in the areas in question who would be entitled to the grant of such a lease, they would be inflicting on such landholders serious hardship?

(e) Do Government propose to consider the advisability of withdrawing the negotiations now pending with the Municipality or other quarters, or at least postponing them until such time as the contemplated perpetual lease referred to above has been issued to the holders entitled to the same?

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

(b) No. On the other hand, Government understand that the Karachi Landholders' Association accept Government's title to the lands.

(c) (i) The lease form has been drafted, and Government are shortly going to discuss it with the representatives of the All-India Cantonments' Association.

(ii) The answer to the first part is in the negative. The second part does not arise. As regards the third part, the information will be collected and laid on the table in due course.

(d) The question is hypothetical.

(e) No.

GOVERNMENT'S POLICY REGARDING EMPLOYMENT OF RETRENCHED OFFICIALS

44. Mr. Umar Aly Shah: With reference to the answer given to starred question No. 295 asked in this House on the 26th January, 1937, will Government please state whether the general rule referred to therein is applicable to State Railways in India in the present policy of discharges on reduction of establishment?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: On the State-managed Railways an employee selected for discharge in the course of retrenchment may in certain circumstances, as an alternative to discharge, be offered demotion to a lower grade in which he may previously have been employed.

ABOLITION OF THE CREW SYSTEM OF TICKET CHECKING ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

45. Mr. Umar Aly Shah: Is it a fact that a statement on behalf of the Secretary of State for India in Council was verified by the Deputy Agent, East Indian Railway, in the Court of the Additional Subordinate Judge at Lucknow in the Civil Suit No. 79 of 1933 and *inter alia* stated: "That in accordance with the report of the Moody-Ward Committee the *Crew System* was ordered to be abolished and was finally abolished with effect from the 1st June 1931" and "That according to Government of India, Railway Department's order, a committee was appointed in the year 1930 to inquire into the working of the *Crew System* on the East Indian Railway. This committee known as the Moody-Ward Committee, submitted a report to the Government in which they recommended the abolition of the *Crew System* on the East Indian Railway and proposed that in place of that system Travelling Ticket Examiners and Collectors should be appointed under the Divisional Superintendent and the Chief Operating Superintendent, East Indian Railway." and "that finally he held the post of a Travelling Ticket Inspector in the *Crew System* under the *Accounts Department*, both before and after the amalgamation of the Oudh and Rohilkund Railway and East Indian Railway systems" and the Deputy

Agent declared that the statements made are true? If so, will the Honourable Member for Commerce and Railways please state:

- (a) the actual quotation from the said statement in which it was clearly stated that the posts of Travelling Ticket Inspectors on the East Indian Railway were abolished with effect from the 1st June, 1931 [as stated by the Government of India in the Railway Department (Railway Board) d. o. No. E.-36-T.L. 13 (2), dated New Delhi, the 14th December, 1936];
- (b) the notification or order under which the *Crew System* was placed under the Accounts Department during the years 1926—1931; and before and after the amalgamation of the Oudh and Rohilkund Railway and the East Indian Railway system;
- (c) the number of posts of Inspectors in the *Crew System* and the scales of pay of those posts which were ordered to be abolished;
- (d) whether the holders of those posts held any substantive posts; if so, under what departments of the Railway Administration, in what capacity and on what scales of pay;
- (e) whether the *Crew System* from 1926 to 1931 for all working and accounting purposes was under the administrative control of the Chief Operating Superintendent, East Indian Railway; and
- (f) whether the provisions of the Government of India, Finance Department, Circular No. 1690 and No. 2653, dated the 22nd July, 1878, and the 6th September, 1878, respectively were observed; if so, the extent of the real saving to the Government produced by abolition of the posts of Travelling Ticket Inspectors under the Accounts Department on reduction of establishment for re-organising the establishment?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to questions Nos. 45 and 46 together.

I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to my reply to Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi's starred question No. 832 asked on the floor of this House on the 26th February, 1936.

DESIGNATION OF TICKET CHECKERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

†46. **Mr. Umar Aly Shah:** With reference to the statement laid on the table of this House on the 25th January, 1937, in reply to starred question No. 1228 asked on the 15th October, 1936, will the Honourable Member for Commerce and Railways please state the resolution or date of the order by which the Railway Board accepted the recommendations or opinion of the Chief Operating Superintendent, East Indian Railway, in regard to Travelling Ticket Inspector System?

ELECTRIC SUPPLY IN SHAHDARA, DELHI.

47. **Mr. Umar Aly Shah:** With reference to the statement laid on the table of this House on the 25th January, 1937, in reply to starred question

No. 1241 asked in this House on the 15th October, 1936, will the Honourable Member for Industries and Labour please state:

- (a) the rate per unit on which the United Provinces Grid System supply the energy to the Upper Jumna Valley Electric Supply Company, Limited;
- (b) whether the United Provinces Grid System have established a Sub-Power Station at Shahdara near Railway Station for the supply of energy to the Shahdara Notified Area;
- (c) the nature of evidence or otherwise collected by the Pitkeathly Enquiry Committee in respect of Shahdara; and
- (d) whether they propose to take necessary steps to reduce the rate per unit at present charged by the Upper Jumna Valley Electric Supply Company, Limited, from the consumers at Shahdara; if not, why not?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) The initial bulk rate, at which energy is supplied to distributing licencees in the United Provinces Grid System, varies from two annas six pies per unit for lights and fans to seven pies per unit for energy used for agricultural purposes. The rate for lights and fans is subject to the guarantee of a minimum annual consumption per head of population in the area of supply.

(b) Yes.

(c) and (d). Government have not yet received the report of the Enquiry Committee and are, therefore, not aware either of the evidence collected by it or of its recommendations.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE THAT VISITED A CERTAIN SCHOOL ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

48. **Mr. Umar Aly Shah:** With reference to the statement laid on the table of this House on 25th January, 1937, in reply to starred question No. 1326, asked on the 15th October, 1936, will the Honourable Member for Commerce and Railways please state the difference between the rules as framed and the actual practice as prevailed?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The procedure laid down in paragraph 7 of the East Indian Railway Gazette Notification No. 2 of the 24th January, 1934, a copy of which was laid on the table of the House on 31st August, 1936, in reply to unstarred question No. 491 asked by Dr. N. B. Khare on the 7th April, 1936, was that a committee of two transportation officers would visit the Chandausi School once a year or oftener as the Chief Operating Superintendent might direct. It was, however, found more convenient for administrative reasons to detail only one transportation officer for this purpose.

RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES OF NON-GAZETTED RAILWAY STAFF.

49. **Mr. Umar Aly Shah:** With reference to the statement laid on the table of this House on 25th January, 1937, in reply to unstarred question No. 173, asked on the 16th October, 1936, will the Honourable Member for Commerce and Railways please state the notification or otherwise through which the Governor General in Council under the 'Direction' delegated the powers to Agents of State Railways for modification, alteration, reduction,

curtailment, cancellation of the vested and accrued rights and privileges of non-gazetted staff under their control?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The Governor General in Council issued the orders under the "Direction" that the powers, previously exercised by the Agents of State-managed Railways in regard to non-gazetted railway servants, shall remain in operation.

POWERS GIVEN TO AGENTS OF STATE RAILWAYS TO MODIFY THE RULES FOR THE GRANT OF ALLOWANCES.

50. Mr. Umar Aly Shah: With reference to the statement laid on the table of this House on 25th January, 1937, in reply to unstarred question No. 234, asked on 16th October, 1936, will the Honourable Member for Commerce and Railways please state the notification or otherwise through which the Agents of State Railways are vested with the powers to affect the vested rights of the staff with retrospective effect or otherwise?

Sir Raghavendra Rau: I invite the attention of my Honourable friend to the Schedule of Powers of the Agents of State-managed Railways, a copy of which is in the Library of the House.

PROCEDURE ON STATE RAILWAYS FOR PUNISHING OR REDUCING THE STAFF FROM SUPERIOR TO INFERIOR SERVICE ON FAILURE TO PASS AN EXAMINATION.

51. Mr. Umar Aly Shah: Arising out of the reply given on 25th January, 1937 to unstarred question No. 245 asked in this House on 16th October, 1936, will the Honourable Member for Commerce and Railways please:

- (a) state whether there was any rule prevalent before 24th January, 1934 under which a railway employee is liable to reduction from superior to inferior service on failure to pass an examination or reduction in pay; and
- (b) if so, lay the same on the table of this House?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) and (b). I would refer the Honourable Member to paragraph 953 of the East Indian Railway Weekly Gazette, dated the 8th August, 1928, a copy of which is in the Library of the House.

MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS OF SUBORDINATE NON-PENSIONABLE SERVANTS ON STATE RAILWAYS.

52. Mr. Umar Aly Shah: With reference to the reply given on 25th January, 1937, to unstarred question No. 247, asked in this House on 16th October, 1936, will the Honourable Member for Commerce and Railways please state whether the record of service of non-pensionable servants on State Railways is open to inspection by the employee concerned? If not, how can an employee satisfy himself of its accuracy and correctness?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am collecting information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

ALLEGED LOSS OF LIVES DUE TO OVERCROWDING IN TRAINS DURING THE GARHMUKTESWAR FAIR.

53. Mr. Umar Aly Shah: With reference to the reply given to starred question No. 1255, asked in this House on the 15th October, 1936, has the attention of Government been invited towards a news item published in the *dak* edition of *The Hindustan Times*, dated the 29th November, 1934, and reading as under:

"Ganges Fair Takes its Toll
Two Persons Crushed in Trains
(From our correspondent)
Ghaziabad, November 27.

The Ganges fair at Garhmukteswar has taken the toll of three lives this year. Two persons are reported to have been crushed in the trains due to over-crowding, in spite of the elaborate railway arrangements. And one person lost his life in a scuffle between the cartmen."

Was the said news contradicted by the Railway administration? If so, when and in which paper?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I have not been able to obtain a copy of the paper referred to, but have called for the information required by the Honourable Member and will place a reply on the table when it has been received.

QUOTA SYSTEM ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

54. Mr. Umar Aly Shah: Will the Honourable Member for Commerce and Railways please state:

- (a) the amount increased in the revenues by the introduction of the quota system on the East Indian Railway;
- (b) the amount expended on the maintenance of staff and publicity for the quota system on the East Indian Railway; and
- (c) the net profit or loss on the quota system for the years 1935-36-37?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) and (c). It is not practicable to evaluate even approximately the effect on revenue of the quota system.

(b) The information has been called for and will be placed on the table of the House when it is received.

WAITING ROOM CHARGES LEVIED BY MESSRS. G. F. KELLNER AND COMPANY, REFRESHMENT ROOM CONTRACTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

55. Mr. Umar Aly Shah: Will the Honourable Member for Commerce and Railways please state the authority under which Messrs. G. F. Kellner, & Co., Ltd., Refreshment Room contractors on East Indian Railway, are permitted to charge waiting room charges on supplies of one cup tea, etc., during January, 1937, and whether Indian Refreshment Room contractors are also permitted likewise? If not, what is the reason for this discrimination?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The Agent of the East Indian Railway states that no additional charge has been authorised for serving tea or meals in waiting rooms, and that enquiries show that no such charge is being made.

CATERING IN THE RAILWAY SCHOOL OF TRANSPORTATION, CHANDAUSI.

56. **Mr. Umar Aly Shah:** Will the Honourable Member for Commerce and Railways please state:

- (a) whether the accounts of the Railway School of Transportation, Chandausi, East Indian Railway, were audited by Mr. Vidyarathi, Accounts Officer, East Indian Railway;
- (b) whether no Indian was available in the lower grade for the post of Instructor;
- (c) why no tender for catering contract of Rs. 30,000 was called for;
- (d) whether the expenditure on the maintenance has been increased; if so, why;
- (e) whether any complaint against catering was received from the students during the past two years; if so, what action has been taken; and
- (f) whether the steward supervises the catering contractor's work?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am collecting information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

INTERVENTION IN APPEALS OF RAILWAY STAFF NOT LYING TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL.

57. **Mr. Umar Aly Shah:** With reference to the reply given to unstarred question No. 165 asked in this House on 16th October, 1936, will the Honourable Member for Commerce and Railways please state, (a) whether the communications referred to in Government of India, Railway Department (Railway Board), No. E36 A. E. 6 (2), dated the 7th August, 1936, are appeals or representations; and (b) whether he can intervene in cases where no appeal lies to the Governor General in Council under the appeal rules?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) The communications referred to are neither appeals nor representations under the Rules.

(b) I would refer the Honourable Member to rule 25 of the Rules regulating discipline and rights of appeal of non-gazetted railway servants, a copy of which is in the Library of the House.

STATEMENTS LAID ON THE TABLE.

Information promised in reply to parts (c) and (d) of starred question No. 938 asked by Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha on the 9th October, 1936.

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE MAGISTERIAL CHECKING AT SAMASTIPUR STATION ON THE BENGAL AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

(c) No. The arrangements made in connection with these ticket checking raids provide for a magistrate being available at the station as soon as possible after the

checking of trains has begun. In the particular case to which the Honourable Member's question refers, through some misunderstanding, the Magistrate arrived later than was anticipated, but I understand every facility for obtaining food and drink was given to the passengers.

(d) Does not arise.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 261, asked by Mr. Sri Prakasa on the 26th January, 1937.

ISSUE OF POSTAGE STAMPS AND CURRENCY WITH NEW KING'S EFFIGY.

(a) Yes.

(b) Studio work for stamps forms part of the normal overhead charges of the Security Press, and its cost is not separately ascertainable. The expenditure incurred on the purchase of dies for coinage was approximately Rs. 4,500, and that on the purchase of dies and mould covers for bank notes about Rs. 1,750. The latter amount will be recovered from the Reserve Bank of India.

(c) No.

Information promised in reply to starred questions Nos. 438, 439 and 440 asked by Khan Bahadur Shaikh Fazl-i-Haq Piracha on the 23rd February, 1937.

DISCONTENT AMONG THE STAFF OF THE RAILWAY CLEARING ACCOUNTS OFFICE.

Question No. 438.—(a) The object of inaugurating the Railway Clearing Accounts Office was to simplify procedure and to reduce expenditure. The staff was reduced as a result of the reduction of work to be done consequent on simplification of procedure.

(b) and (c). The office Manuals were issued in 1937. In certain matters of detail the actual procedure in force prior to the issue of the Manuals had been different from that laid down in the Manuals. In some of these matters the old procedure was allowed to continue temporarily till the procedure had been examined further. As a result of this examination the relevant paragraphs of the Manuals have been suitably amended in certain cases and the revised rules are now enforced.

(d) No.

(e) No.

(f) In a large office of this size which has been in existence for over nine years it is not possible to get out the comparative statistics asked for without incommensurate trouble; and the Government do not propose to call for them.

(g) The Assistant Accounts Officer did summon sub-heads and impressed on them the necessity of a higher standard of test-check. There is no warrant however for the suggestion that he asked sub-heads somehow or other to find fault with the clerks and recommend punishment for them.

(h) The sub-heads in their test audit reports have not alleged the existence of mistakes which had not been made.

(i) No. There is absolutely no justification for attributing "vindictiveness" to this or any other officer of the Railway Clearing Accounts Office.

(j) Does not arise.

NON-CONFIRMATION OF MUSLIMS IN THE SUB-HEAD GRADE IN THE RAILWAY CLEARING ACCOUNTS OFFICE.

Question No. 439.—(a) Four, of whom no one was Muslim.

(b) Yes; two of the four referred to above were promoted in preference to the Muslim clerks in question, having worked as sub-heads for longer periods while the other two were promoted out of turn on account of their outstanding merit not only in supersession of the particular Muslims but of a much larger number of Hindus.

(c) Yes; but one of the two Muslim clerks superseded is still officiating as a sub-head and will no doubt be considered for confirmation in that post in due course subject to the claims of others.

(d) Nothing has been recorded against these two Muslims, except that one of them has been considered fit to be a sub-head for a particular branch only. Promotion to the grade of sub-head is, however, by selection and the mere absence of a record against a clerk is in itself no qualification for promotion.

(e) No.

(f) Does not arise.

INCREASE IN THE VOLUME OF WORK IN THE RAILWAY CLEARING ACCOUNTS OFFICE.

Question No. 440.—(a) No. The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the reply to parts (b) and (c) of question No. 438.

(b) No. Occasionally office clerks are required to attend office on days when the office is entirely closed. For such attendance they are allowed compensation leave.

(c) and (d). No concessions are given as a rule and none can be claimed as a right.

(e) The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given to Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar's starred questions Nos. 1098 and 1099 on the 12th October, 1936.

Conditions in the Railway Clearing Accounts Office are different from those in the Government of India's Secretariat offices, the latter having fewer holidays and Government see no reason to alter either the working hours or the concessions now in force in the Railway Clearing Accounts Office.

MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATE.

Secretary of the Assembly: Sir, the following Message has been received from the Council of State:

"I am directed to inform you that the Council of State, at its meeting held on the 5th March, 1937, agreed without any amendment to the Bill to amend the Contempt of Courts Act, 1926, for a certain purpose, which was passed by the Legislative Assembly at its meeting held on the 9th February, 1937."

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

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair understands that today the Independent Party will move their cut motions. Which is the motion going to be moved now?

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur (South Madras: Muhammadan): Sir, I wish to move my cut motion in Late List No. 2, under Demand No. 20.

DEMAND NO. 20—DEFENCE DEPARTMENT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,17,000 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, 1938, in respect of 'Defence Department'."

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,17,000 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, 1938, in respect of 'Defence Department'."

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: Sir, I wish to move the cut motion which appears on Late List No. 2.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham (Defence Secretary): Sir, I rise on a point of order. May I draw your attention to Standing Order No. 72 which runs thus:

"If notice of a motion to omit or reduce any grant has not been given two clear days before the day on which the demand is to be considered, any member may object to the moving of the motion, and such objection shall prevail, unless the President, in the exercise of his power to suspend this standing order, allows the motion to be made."

I understand that the Honourable Member wishes to move the motion on Late List No. 2 which stands in his name. It is for the reduction of the demand by Rs. 100 for "persistent refusal of Government to heed the opinion of the House in defence matters". This notice was received last night, and, therefore, does not comply with the Standing Order. Until last night the only two motions in the name of the members of the Independent Party on this grant were Nos. 238 and 239, both of which were for a reduction of Rs. 100 to discuss the Indianisation of the army. I wish to make it clear that the objection I am taking is something more than technical. Members of Government have to prepare themselves to meet the debates which they anticipate from the wording of the cut motions on the paper. I have hitherto prepared myself to answer a debate on the subject of Indianisation, and it is obvious that the wording of this motion goes very far beyond the question of Indianisation and it will be quite impossible for me to give an adequate reply on matters which fall outside the scope of the subject of which notice was given before.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Under those circumstances, the Chair cannot allow this motion.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): May I, Sir, make a submission? If you will kindly look at page 21 of the printed list of cut motions, you will find that motion No. 240 standing in the name of Sardar Mangal Singh relates to exactly the same subject.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): But that has not been moved.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am submitting to you that the wording of the cut motion is exactly the same, and, therefore, my Honourable friend cannot complain of want of notice. The very same words are being given in cut motion No. 240.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair understands his point.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): May I, Sir, just intervene for a minute? As you know, Sir, it is usual, while giving these cuts on the budget, that you do allow a certain amount of latitude, and when cuts are given at a very late date, you waive the rule and allow them to be moved. In this particular instance, may I point out that the subjects that will be discussed are generally very well known to

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

the Honourable Member who is in charge of this Department in this House, and his universal knowledge of his Department surely will give him all the arguments he requires to answer any arguments that may be put forward from this side of the House. This is the first time when we have heard, may I say, an excuse of this sort placed forward before the House when a cut motion is sought to be moved. Besides this, it has been pointed out just now that this does not take the Honourable Member by surprise. It has already been on the Final List (No. 240) and the Honourable Member said just now that he is always prepared to meet cuts that are on the agenda paper. It has just been pointed out that the wording of cut motion No. 240 is exactly the same as that proposed to be moved by Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I would point out that notice has been given of 20 or 30 cuts on different matters, and I naturally confine myself to those cuts which are in the name of the 'Party' which it has been agreed is going to move them.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Standing Order is quite clear that two days' notice must be given of any cut motion that any Honourable Member wants to move. The President has the discretion in a proper case to waive the Standing Order and allow a motion to be moved even though two days' notice has not been given. In this particular case, the Army Member objects to the motion which stands in the name of Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur to be moved today on the ground that he received notice of this motion only last night, and he has not had sufficient time to prepare himself in order to deal with the questions that might be raised on this motion. It has been, however, pointed out that on page 21 of the printed list of the cut motions, motion No. 240, standing in the name of Sardar Mangal Singh, is practically to the same effect as the motion now sought to be moved by Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, but it has always been the practice, having regard to the number of cut motions of which notices are given on an occasion like this, that the members of the Parties amongst themselves select certain cut motions which they want to move on behalf of their respective Parties. In this particular case, the motion that has been selected by Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur (of which he did not give notice before) is the one of which notice had been given by Sardar Mangal Singh. But it could not be expected of the Government Member to anticipate that motion No. 240, notice of which was given by another party would be selected by Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur in order to move it as a motion on behalf of the Independent Party. As the Army Member says that he is not in a position to deal with this motion as he had not sufficient time, the Chair must accept his objection and disallow that motion to be moved today. The Independent Party can select any other motion of which sufficient notice has already been given.

Indianisation of the Army.

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: In these circumstances, I have no other alternative but to move my original motion, No. 238, which runs thus:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Department' be reduced by Rs. 100".

Sir, when I heard the objection raised by the Honourable the Defence Secretary, I was very much astonished.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That has perhaps been dealt with. The Honourable Member can now proceed
 1? NOON. with his speech on the present cut motion.

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: The present cut motion covers all these things. We have been urging on the Government the necessity of curtailing the Army budget and we have been putting before the Army authorities the method of effecting reduction in the army expenditure. We have been making constructive proposals regarding that, the best constructive proposal being that the Indian Army should be Indianised. We know that, so far as the Defence Department in India is concerned, it has no voice in shaping the policy of the military department. Nor are the Government of India powerful enough to force their will on the Government at home. We also know that even the Secretary of State for India has to abide by the decision of the Imperial Defence Department, popularly known as the War Council in London. Year after year, we have been urging on the Government the necessity of curtailing military expenditure, so that the nation-building items might be attended to which are now being hopelessly neglected and ignored. The other day it was pointed out that we have been spending about 63 per cent. of our revenues towards the upkeep of the army in India, whereas 15 per cent. is being spent by England and Germany and seven and four per cent. by Australia and Canada, respectively.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: On a point of order, Sir. I would ask your ruling whether reduction of military expenditure is relevant to the question of Indianisation.

Some Honourable Members: Quite relevant.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Army Member has raised a point of order and it is for the Chair to deal with and not for any Honourable Member. The Chair thinks it would be perfectly relevant in this way, provided the Honourable Member makes it so by arguing that the cost would be less. If that is his object, he can proceed with his speech.

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: Thank you, Sir. According to the figures, we have a British force of 66,000 in India. It has been proved to the hilt on so many occasions in this House that the cost of maintaining one British soldier is four times.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Three times.

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: Well, between three and four times. We do not have any grudge against the British force being stationed here, but what our contention is that it is not wanted for our defence. (Hear, hear.) We are in a position to defend ourselves. If you think that we are not fit to defend ourselves against any foreign aggression, we will advance the same argument against you and say that even this force

[Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur.]

of 66,000 British soldiers cannot defend India so far as our Frontier is concerned. Sir, as regards our capacity, it cannot be questioned now. Even our opponents cannot for a moment question our capacity. When opportunities were given, our soldiers and officers have shown what kind of capacity they possess. It has been admitted on all hands that we are not lacking in capacity, but what we say is that we have been denied opportunities. The rate at which Indianisation is going on is hopelessly slow. So it will not serve our purpose. There are about 7,000 British officers in India. According to the statement made last year, if we are getting 60 officers or even 70 officers every year, it will take 100 years, or one full century, so that all the British officers may be replaced by Indian officers. Is this called Indianisation? Even granting that only 50 per cent. of the officers should be Indians, it will take 50 years. These kinds of things cannot satisfy us. Every student that comes out of the college, as the House is well aware, is imbued with patriotic feeling and the motto before every student is:

*"Students Taghai Tho tham banke niklen
Sipahiyo able galam banke niklen."*

Every student should be armed with a double-edged sword, the thin edge should be used for military purposes and the other for civil department. That is the feeling with which every Indian student is now imbued. The Government should be aware of how the wind is now blowing. The result of the recent elections should have opened the eyes of Government. (Hear, hear.) They cannot go on ignoring all the Resolutions which have been passed by this House to the effect that there should be a Standing Committee to go into all these matters and to devise means by which reduction could be effected in military expenditure without impairing the efficiency. Last year my Honourable and gallant friend, Colonel Gidney, said that efficiency could not be sacrificed for the sake of economy. Sir, we on this side of the House do not advocate the cause of inefficiency. We are all quite for efficiency and we have proved that we are as efficient as any other nation in the world. That was proved not only once or twice but on many occasions. Therefore our efficiency cannot be challenged or questioned now. It was never challenged or questioned up to now. It was astonishing that our Honourable and gallant friend who comes under the category of statutory Indians should speak of inefficiency. That our demand is legitimate has been proved on many occasions, that we are not agitating for the sake of agitation has also been proved beyond doubt and it has been conceded that our demand is quite legitimate. Therefore, it is the duty of the Government to respect our feeling, to heed our wishes and not tamper with them. Knowing as I do the Army Department in India, even His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and the Government of India are powerless, as I have already stated in the first portion of my speech. But my object and the object of the House is that Government should realise their duty. They have up till now failed to do their duty. They ought to have made out a very strong case in favour of Indianisation. They should have made proper representations to the War Council in London through the Secretary of State for India which they have failed to do. In these circumstances, the speed with which Indianisation is going on cannot for a moment satisfy us. Therefore we should get a reply from the Defence Secretary as representing the Commander-in-Chief to the effect that our Resolutions will be given effect to without any further delay.

and that a standing committee will be appointed. Otherwise we will have to pass a censure motion against this Government for having failed to do their duty by this country of which they pose themselves as custodians. With these words I commend my motion to the House.

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

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Department' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, this subject has been debated in this House since 1921, and we have been pressing year after year that Government must rise to the occasion. Unfortunately, their action has been so slow that even after 17 years I find that nothing has practically been done which is worth mentioning. A period of 17 years would have been quite sufficient to Indianise the whole Indian army or at least the Indian regiments, and we would have found Indians as officers of the Indian regiments.

I moved a Resolution in 1922 in which I laid down a specific scheme to the effect that recruitment as subalterns of Indian regiments should in future be confined to Indians only. If that scheme was accepted in 1922, we would today have found all officers' ranks in Indian regiments up to Major filled by Indians only, and that would have given Indians a better realisation of defending their own country. But that scheme was not accepted by Government in 1922 and they only came out with a scheme of their own which hoodwinked the Indian Members of the Assembly at that time. They put up a scheme of eight units being Indianised at once. That scheme was wrong and Government, to my mind, committed a blunder; and I think the Legislative Assembly at that time did not understand the full import of the suggestion made by Government, and they thought that it was a good and great thing and they, therefore, agreed to it. I was justified in not having accepted the Government scheme, and I challenged a division and lost badly though Indians were in a huge majority in that Assembly. Today if the war clouds mature in Europe, as we always apprehend, there might be a world war; and then what will be the state of India? You cannot prepare an army at five minutes notice or whenever you want. You have to prepare an army by long training. And if a war starts and England is involved in it, she will have to send all her officers to fight in Europe. Are we going to be left in the same condition as we were in 1914? It might have been Lord Hardinge's good policy in 1914 which saved India from being attacked from outside, but is that policy or that diplomacy going to succeed every time? Are we to be left undefended by our Government when they are busy outside? That is what I have said year after year in this House, and I think Government would be wise in acceding to the demand of this House that they must distinguish between the two portions of the army,—the British regiments and the Indian regiments. The Indian regiments must be entirely officered by Indians. I do not agree with those who say that we cannot find sufficient good material or sufficient people to be trained efficiently as officers of Indian regiments. It is the greatest insult that any Member on behalf of Government can throw on the Indian regiments and Indian officers of the Viceroy's Commission and on Indian soldiers. This argument can never stand. The Indian soldier has distinguished himself on the battle-fields of Europe, Mesopotamia, Palestine, Syria and Egypt, and other places, and he has proved that he is second to none in the world. Not only that but the Indian officers who held minor ranks proved that they can

[Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

take command and acquit themselves efficiently in the battle-field and in every position where he may be called for duty. If they are given proper training, I do not think they would be second to anybody in the world. It is only Government which is not affording a proper opportunity to the sons of low-paid Indian officers. The Indian officer, when he rises to the rank of Risaldar-Major, is a Viceroy's commissioned officer, but he gets a very small pay, and, on that pay, he cannot be expected to get his children trained in the public school at Dehra Dun, where he has to pay about Rs. 100 for one boy. Therefore, some kind of concession must be given by Government to the children of these Indian commissioned officers who should be trained at Government expense; and when these boys come out fully trained and are recruited as Second Lieutenants in the army, they will prove a great asset to the Indian army and will be as loyal to the traditions of their forefathers as can be expected of anybody.

Now, Sir, I think Government are making a series of blunders in the policy which they are pursuing. I ask them, in the most friendly manner and for their own sake, that they must open their eyes now. They must see that their wrong policy is giving rise to bad results. The only great asset that Government have today is the Indian army. The people who are recruited as soldiers must be kept contented. If discontent creeps into the army, the Government will find that the army will get into a hopeless condition and they will not be able to get as many recruits as they did before. There may be people who offer themselves for recruitment, because they are hungry, but they will not be good soldiers: a soldier must be one who is prepared to lay down his life for the sake of a certain cause and that cause must be his cause. At present, he has no other cause except loyalty. At present, he has proved that he is ready to lay down his life for the sake of his country and that he is ready to defend his frontiers: he is ready to go anywhere. But is it right and proper that they should not be given full opportunity to train their sons as officers? Is it right that when Indian officers are being recruited, there should be a distinction between them and the men who get the King's Commission in England and the Indian commissioned officer is not going to enjoy the same privileges as in the past? If an Indian had been recruited two years ago and enjoyed certain privileges, in future you are not going to give them the same privileges. Think, and think rightly what would be the effect of this discontent in the officers' minds, whose career you are going to stop at a certain point. Will he be ready to give his life with the same readiness as the men in the past have done? . . .

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: May I ask what particular privileges the Honourable Member is thinking of and what they have been deprived of?

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: The privilege is this: if the Honourable Member reads the speeches of 1934 at Simla, when he was not present in the Assembly, and another officer, Colonel Lumby, was officiating, and a Bill was introduced at that time, he will find what privileges have been stopped from Indian officers. According to that law of 1934, an Indian officer cannot in future command British regiments; and although he may be placed in the same rank, when mixed regiments are going to be commanded, it might go to the British officer and not to the Indian officer. That was the point taken by you, Sir, very seriously and I said the same and there was no reply from the Government to satisfy us on that point . . .

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): The military does not believe in reading anything!

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: The Honourable Member is always careful, and I cannot accuse him of not having read all this. I merely want to draw his attention, when he gives his reply, so that he may be prepared after reading the speeches of 1934.

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

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: If this discontent prevails, it will be a loss to the Government; it will be a loss to the country, and it will be a loss to the Indian army which is as good as any other army. I feel proud of our efficient army—there is no question about their being efficient. Our forefathers came from different countries and they conquered a great part of Europe with their soldiers. The Indian soldier has fought very efficiently against European soldiers of all nations and they showed the Germans what kind of soldiers they are. Therefore, any discrediting, or any kind of aspersion, direct or indirect, will be greatly deplored. I ask the Government to rise to the occasion, to open their eyes and try to teach the Indians properly and give them full opportunity to defend their own country. If British regiments are required to go out of India, the Indian regiments must stand to safeguard their own country.

Sir, the one point which ought to be taken notice of is this . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's time is up.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: With these words, I support the cut motion. —

Mr. N. V. Gadgil (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, your ruling has somewhat narrowed the scope of the discussion. However, I feel that this question of Indianisation is not an abstract question. It cannot be considered without considering the financial aspect and, incidentally, but relevantly, without considering the standard and the possible dangers to India from outside. Within these limitations, I propose to speak, and I am sure that I will not be ruled out of order.

It has been laid down as the considered policy that the purpose of the Indian army is two-fold, internal security and security from external aggression. I will not take the time of the House so far as the internal security question is concerned. I shall deal with the other aspect of the policy and just consider for a few minutes who could possibly be the aggressors of Indian freedom. So far as the sea-coast is concerned, I see no possible danger from that quarter, because no great power is in a position to attack India today or in the immediate future. But if we are to take the policies that still govern the countries which lie adjoining to our continent, we may consider the danger to be possible, firstly from Afghanistan, and secondly the usual bugbear of British policy, namely, Russia or the U. S. S. R. today, and with that policy I shall briefly consider what we have been doing on the frontier. It was remarked during the course of last year's debate that we are trying to sacrifice efficiency for the sake of economy. I shall be able to point out, not from a biased observer, but

[Mr. N. V. Gadgil.]

an Englishman who *prima facie* is to be considered an unbiassed observer, that the policy we have followed in connection with the tribal area on the North-West Frontier is not a proper policy. I shall read from a book "Modern War and Defence Reconstruction" by Captain Kennedy, about our policy with respect to this question. He is an Englishman and an army officer. He says:

"For close on a hundred years now we have been fighting wars on the North-West Frontier of India. The area involved is only some 450 miles in length and a few miles in depth. Lives and treasure have been poured into that little strip of country directly during wars, and indirectly in peace in the maintenance of huge armaments in preparation for the next outbreak. Nearly all our wars have been failures from the point of view of good military execution, and all have failed to achieve anything in the nature of permanent peace."

That is the certificate given by an English officer . . .

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: On a point of order, Sir: the Honourable Member appears to be discussing foreign policy. I understood that this debate was supposed to be about the Indianisation of the army. I do not think that this is relevant.

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: If my Honourable friend, the Defence Secretary, will bear with me a little while, he will understand, as I know he always tries to understand, the relevancy of my remarks. If with the help of the British element in the army this is the result of our policy during 100 years, it is time now that we changed our policy and followed the policy that has been followed by Russia, namely, that of peaceful penetration, and in that connection Indianisation will be of far greater use than the co-operation of the British element in fighting the tribes in the N. W. F. P. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That does not arise out of this question of the Indianisation of the army. What should be the foreign policy is far too remote.

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: Sir, the standard has to be evolved as to the exact strength of the army, and it has been laid down that one-third of that ought to be constituted from British troops. I propose to show that, in view of the possibility of Afghanistan attacking India, or in view of the possibility or impossibility of U. S. S. R. doing anything towards India, the standard that is available today is considerably high, and if reduction is to be made, it can be made in two ways, namely, (1) by reducing the British element, and (2) by Indianising a considerable section of it. Therefore, in the beginning, Sir, I said it is not an abstract question; it has some relation to finance

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is rather remote. That cannot be entered into here. The Chair thinks the Honourable Member should deal with the question of Indianisation of the army.

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: Then, Sir, coming to the limited scope of this cut motion

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): Another less remote reason you can give.

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: Then, another less remote question is about finance. The Capitation Tribunal found that by keeping the strength as it is and Indianising the whole army, the extra cost that would be saved would amount to 14 crores. The extra cost of maintaining the British troops in India over the cost of maintaining a corresponding number of Indian troops is estimated at ten million pounds, and, working on the present ratio, the cost will approximately come to 14 crores

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: May I ask the Honourable Member to read the next page where it says that none of these formulae from which he is quoting appear to have any satisfactory foundation in principle?

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: This is your official report, and you can continue to challenge it. I thought you had been concluded by the findings of this Report. However, the point I was dealing with was one of finance. By using the word "Indianisation", I do not merely say that Indian officers should be substituted for British officers on the same scales of pay and allowances. Indian officers must receive less, and their salaries must have some relation to the economic circumstances of this country. That is another aspect of Indianisation. The main objection that has often been taken is that no good material is available, but I find, Sir, from this pamphlet,—“Summary of Important Matters concerning the Defence Services in India—1935-36”—I hope the findings here also will not be repudiated,—I find from this pamphlet these remarks—this is from the Extracts from the Proceedings of the Interview and Record Board during 1935-36:

“The Board thought that on the whole the standard had risen that in that there were more good candidates and the best were rather better than before.”

Then, with respect to Navy candidates, they say:

“The general standard of the boys was good; educationally and physically they appear of the proper type.”

Then, as regards the candidates for Air Force, this is what they say:

“As 11 candidates received 60 per cent. marks or more, there should be no difficulty in filling suitably the two vacancies offered for competition.”

I submit, Sir, at least in the matter of the Navy, there cannot be any question of tradition. because this arm of the defence has been very recently evolved. A point was made that there are martial and non-martial races

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Like our friend Captain Lal Chand.

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: He still believes that bulk has everything to do with war. (Laughter.) He ought to know that war has been modernised; the army has been mechanised, and it is brain that counts more than bulk.

Rao Bahadur Captain Chaudhuri Lal Chand (Nominated Non-Official): Is that your monopoly?

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: I don't say that bulk is your monopoly; we have Lala Shamlal on our side too. (Laughter.)

[Mr. N. V. Gadgil.]

Then, Sir, apart from these little jokes which you have so kindly permitted us to indulge in, I propose to show that given the necessary intention and the will, we can build up a very good army. That has been the policy and that has been the result of that policy in the U. S. S. R. It has been often stated that the conditions of Russia approximated to those in India. In 1930, the social complexion of the Russian army was this:

31.2 per cent. from the working classes,

57.9 per cent. from the peasants, and

10.9 per cent. from the employees.

and, in 1936, for which the latest statistics are available, the position is this:

45.8 per cent. from the workers,

42.5 per cent. from the peasants, and

11.7 per cent. from the employees,

and I don't think that what Russia has done cannot be done by India if she is given full control over her own destinies. Therefore, the objection that suitable material is not available is irrelevant and not correct.

Then, Sir, the distinction between the martial and non-martial classes is created artificially. You have artificially and deliberately created this distinction between martial and non-martial races. Let another war break out. I don't see any possibility of that,—not that people in England are not willing to face a war; they are quite willing to sacrifice men and money, but they care more for the economic consequences that will result immediately after the war is over, because the capitalistic system will fall. That has happened in the last war. With the birth of U. S. A., the same thing will happen

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

Mr. N. V. Gadgil: I, therefore, submit, Sir, that this question of Indianisation, if properly approached and solved, will not only solve the problem of our defence, but it will also considerably facilitate the other aspect of the policy, namely, of internal security. Why is it that there are riots, why is it that there are disturbances? It is because of two reasons,—economic depression, poverty, destitution and unemployment. Have you any idea, Sir, of what the other countries spend on social services, on unemployment doles? What are the Government of India doing? They appointed a Committee. Their Report, I think, is still in the Secretariat, and nobody will hear anything more about it. If we can release, say, at least 14 crores, and by cutting down the salaries as well, an amount to the tune of about 25 crores of rupees would be available for social services. If that is utilised in a wise manner, I am sure, there will be less of unemployment and a new nation altogether will come out of this programme. But this will not be done unless and until we get full control of the military policy. With these words, as you have limited the scope of the discussion, I support the cut motion.

Mr. P. J. Griffiths (Bengal: Nominated Official): I do not know whether to congratulate or to commiserate with the Independent Party on the reappearance of a motion which has become almost part of their traditional equipment—a motion which fifteen years ago might conceivably have been of some interest or even of some use, but which, in the actual state of the facts concerning the Defence Department today, is of no more value than a spent bullet. If I may change the metaphor, it reminds me of one of those perennial garden flowers which, however beautiful may be their fragrance in the first year in which they are planted, continue to linger in the garden, despite all the efforts of the gardener to eradicate them, long after they have ceased to have any relation to the general scheme of the garden. This motion is merely one of a long series of attacks which have been continuously launched against the Defence Department ever since the inception of the policy of Indianisation. Those attacks all conform to one of three definite types. First, it is alleged that the pace of Indianisation is too slow. Secondly, we are told that the segregation of Indian commissioned officers in specific regiments is unfair, and, thirdly, we are informed that the presence of the British Army in this country is neither desirable nor necessary. It will be my aim to deal only with the first of those three customary allegations and to leave it to other speakers to deal with the remaining two.

Indianisation, we are told, is proceeding too slowly. Why must Indianisation proceed slowly? The answer, Sir, is not far to seek. Indianisation of the commissioned ranks of the Indian army in its present form is an experiment (*An Honourable Member*: "Why?") which may or may not succeed and which must be fraught with some considerable measure of risk during the interval in which we have to judge its ultimate success or failure.

[At this stage, Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan tried to interrupt.]

Well, if you will contain yourself for a minute, I will try to explain. It is the first and foremost duty of the Defence Department to minimise this risk during the transition period. In this respect the position of the Defence Department is entirely different from that of any other Department of the Government. Suppose, for example, that the Agricultural Department decides to embark upon some new experimental policy. It is justified in incurring a reasonable measure of risk in so doing. Why? Because, if, by chance after a few years, that policy is found to be a failure it is always possible to discontinue it, to go back again, and to start where you were before you embarked upon that new policy. In the case of the Defence Department, that argument has no application whatsoever. If you embark upon an experiment and if that experiment proves a failure, you run a very serious risk of suffering from foreign aggression or from internal disorder to such an extent that you will be utterly unable at the end of that experiment to go back and build again on new foundations. It would be criminal negligence on the part of the Defence Department to undertake too great a degree of risk in introducing either this or any other experimental measure. I know that when I speak of the risks attendant upon Indianisation, my Honourable friends of the opposite side of the House will protest furiously. They will ask why are risks involved in Indianisation? My Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, will probably rise shortly and make an impassioned speech in which he will ask, have we not had hundreds of Indians who have proved their fitness for war, who have shown

[Mr. P. J. Griffiths.]

their heroism, who have demonstrated their valour? Of course, we have, many of us on this side of the House have had even better opportunities, than most of the Honourable Members on that side of the House, of appreciating the heroism, the valour and the martial qualities of Indians. But if you wish to build up an army, you want something very much more than heroism, than martial qualities, than valour. You want, first, a closely knit organisation; secondly, you want a carefully crystallised tradition; thirdly, you want all those qualities of leadership which can only come from experience and possibly from experience through several generations. Finally, you want the existence of that mutual confidence between officers and men which cannot be engendered in a day, but which can only grow up through years and years of experience of war. I want my Honourable friends to realise that replacement—for what you are doing is replacement, you are replacing one set of commissioned officers by another set of commissioned officers, you are replacing the Viceroy's commissioned officers by Indian commissioned officers—that replacement is not a simple process. For it involves a complete change in the whole system upon which the Indian army is today constructed. I do not know what experience my friends of the Congress Party have of the internal organisation of a non-Indianised unit. During the past few years, it has been my privilege to work in very close contact with such units and to spend many months in the midst of their camps. I have been much impressed with the fact that there is nothing in the world quite analogous to that closely knit organisation—nothing quite similar to the bonds which like family ties link together the different units of an Indian regiment. In the first place, the relations between the British officers and the Viceroy's commissioned officers are almost uniformly good.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): Who told you?

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: I will answer that interruption. I have been told it by dozens and dozens of Viceroy's commissioned officers who have no political axe to grind whatsoever. (*Some Honourable Members:* "Oh!") Secondly, by reason of their training, their origin and even of their status, there is a contact between the Viceroy's commissioned officer and the rank and file much closer than can ever be attained by any officer holding the ordinary King's Commission. As you raise the officers' status, so you widen the gulf between the officers and the men. Between the Viceroy's commissioned officers and the men there is a very remarkable absence of formality off parade. (*An Honourable Member:* "Question.") Of course, it is a question, but I am giving you the answer. That absence of formality combined with the fact that the Viceroy's commissioned officer himself is nearly always one who has risen from the ranks gives him an insight into the wishes and feelings of the men under his command which will never be obtained by officers with a higher status.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: How does this argument apply to the British army?

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: I am not giving way.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is not giving way.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Of course, he must. If the Honourable Member makes insinuations and reflections, he must give way to a question which will make his position more clear. I asked him, how this argument applies to the British army. There is a similar difference between the officer and the soldier in the British army, and how does he explain it?

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: If the Honourable Member will listen with patience, I will try to explain to him. This is not an argument against Indianisation. Everybody on this side of the House believes in Indianisation. I am merely trying to establish the point that the proposed scheme of Indianisation does involve a radical change in the whole structure of the Indian army as it exists today, and it is because such a radical change is involved that we on this side of the House insist, in season and out of season, on the necessity for proceeding slowly. After all, the army exists for one job only. The army does not exist to vindicate this or that political theory. The army exists today for the task which it has done very well for very many years past, *viz.*, to keep this country safe from foreign aggression and from the grave menace of civil commotion. I turn to another reason why Indianisation must be slow—*viz.*, however Honourable Members may deny it, there is a very considerable dearth of suitable candidates for commissions. If my Honourable friends opposite deny that statement, I hope they will take the trouble to read the report of the Boards of Interview and Record who examine candidates as they come forward. They will be very much struck by one statement in one of those reports, a statement to the effect that, of the candidates for Indian commissions, there is a very considerable proportion who, before their applications for commissions, have had no interest whatsoever in military affairs and to whom a commission in the army is merely a job. In England that is not so. In the case of the British army, amongst the middle classes of England you have a very large proportion of people who grow up in a military tradition. It is, therefore, not difficult to find suitable candidates for the British army, but it is really difficult to find sufficient suitable candidates for the Indian army. The real trouble is

Prof. N. G. Ranga (Guntur *cum* Nellore: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Yourself! (Laughter.)

Mr. P. J. Griffiths:that very often those, who have grown up in martial traditions and whose families have long been connected with the business of fighting, have only just begun to realise the importance and the necessity of education—in many cases, therefore, those very classes who would be most fitted for commissions in the Indian army have not yet reached a stage where they are educationally qualified. On the other hand, you have another class of persons well qualified educationally, but devoid of any interest in military affairs—education without military traditions or military traditions without education. Until you can bridge this gap, until you have a sufficient number of people fitted both by education and by tradition to hold commissioned rank, it will not be possible for Indianisation to proceed as fast as we on this side of the House could desire.

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

Mr. P. J. Griffiths: But, Sir, progress although slow, is being made. During the past two years, very considerable advances have been made in certain directions. In the first place, the Kitchener College is now being made use of to give proper educational facilities at an earlier stage than formerly to cadets from the Indian army. The trouble in the past has been that cadets from the Indian army either had not sufficiently high educational qualifications, or else they came in too old. To meet this difficulty, the Kitchener College is now being used as a training centre. I had many more points to make to illustrate the progress made but my time is up. I must, however, make this one point. While the Congress Party and the Independent Party have been muttering the old shibboleths about Indianisation, the Defence Department has been pegging away steadily at the practical problem of how to introduce Indianisation and how to speed it up as far as is consistent with safety. Finally, I will make this appeal to Honourable Members opposite: Give up this carping criticism—give up this habit of opposition for opposition's sake. Join with us—bring forward practical suggestions—join with us in making a success of the greatest experiment that has ever been tried in this country.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin (Punjab: Landholders): I am thankful to you, Sir, for giving a ruling that the issue here should be confined to Indianisation of the army only. My Honourable friend, Mr. Griffiths, who spoke before me, said that Indianisation was only in an experimental stage and that the process of Indianisation has to be slow. I agree with him that it has to be slow, because it is to the interests of the British that it should be slow. It has to be slow, because the British officers and men do not want to serve under the Indian officers, and I am going to prove this thing to the hilt. I have with me this book, "The Life of Lord Kitchener". I will show to my Honourable friend what the feelings of his own countrymen have been and still are in this matter. This is a book written by Sir George Arthur, and before I quote from this book I will relate to the Honourable House a little history of Indianisation. The first movement for Indianisation started in the late eighties. Then the villain was the "Fat Bengali Babu". The other Indians were all right according to the bureaucrat of the day. It was the "Fat Bengali Babu" who wanted to replace the British. I am saying it with an apology to you, Sir, because you are a Bengali too. It was the "Bengali Babu" who was at the root of the whole trouble. He was the object of the wrath and ridicule of the bureaucracy as we know from the writings of Kipling. Now, Sir, in 1885, there was a gentleman, Sir George Chesney by name, and he was one of those Englishmen, who are very sympathetic towards Indians. He wanted to introduce Indianisation at that time, but he was opposed tooth and nail by Lord Roberts, the same Lord Roberts whose tomb we are told to worship today. I shall now read a quotation from this book:

"The question of promoting native gentlemen to the higher grades of the Indian Army was a theme which after some years' fitful discussion had been laid aside. As long ago as 1885 the Military Member, Sir George Chesney, and the Commander-in-Chief, Lord Roberts, had expressed diametrically opposite opinions on the subject. Chesney maintaining that the Indian army suffered from the exclusion of natives from the higher military commands, while Roberts grounded his objection to the proposal on the strong feeling inveterate to all ranks of the British Army that natives are neither physically nor morally their equals."

Then, further on, Lord Roberts says:

"It is this consciousness of the inherent superiority of the European which has won for us India. However well educated and clever a native may be, and however brave

he may have proved himself, I believe that no rank that we could bestow upon him would cause him to be considered as an equal by the British officer, or looked up to by the British soldier in the same way that he looks up to the last-joined subaltern. Thus, for the present at any rate, the grant of such commissions to Indian gentlemen as would necessarily place them on the same footing as British officers is in my opinion much to be deprecated."

So, Sir, this was shelved for the time being, and, after that, Sir George Chesney, who was evidently a very conscientious man, brought up the matter again and Lord Roberts again shelves it with the remark:

"I would resist the beginnings on however small a scale."

These were the predecessors of the Treasury Benches with whom we have to deal. Some time passed, and, instead of Lord Roberts, **1 P.M.** Lord Kitchener comes. I believe three Commanders-in-Chief had passed in between them. Lord Kitchener was more sympathetic towards the Indianisation of the army; as a matter of fact, he was more sympathetic towards Indians and so he tried to do something in the matter. He raised the Cadet Corps and all that, but when those gentlemen came up from the Cadet Corps, they were not given employment in the regiments.

Mr. B. Das: And they became "nominated" Members? (Laughter.)

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: In the meanwhile, Mr. Morley had become the Secretary of State for India, and he wanted to expedite this Indianisation. So he wrote to Lord Kitchener, and some correspondence passed, and, for the information of this House, with your permission, I may read a part of the Despatch by Lord Kitchener to the Secretary of State for India, which will show to this House the mentality of the Army Headquarters. He says:

"I have considered the question from every point of view and have discussed it with very many of those in India whose opinion is entitled to the most weight. I enclose a paper which embodies the conclusion which I have arrived at."

Then, there is a scheme referred to for a military college with which we are not concerned in the present debate. Then, he says:

"The difficulty of finding a practical solution of this most delicate question is immense, for, although there is a general consensus of opinion among the senior British officers of the Indian Army that some measure of reform is required, I cannot find any remedial means likely to secure the support of the majority. This is due in part to the dislike of change, and in part to a deep-seated racial repugnance to any step which brings nearer the day when Englishmen in the Army may have to take orders from Indians . . ."

And, Sir, this is the spirit that rules Army Headquarters today! (Hear, hear.) Sir, it is all tall talk of "experiment"! We know the value of that sort of statement! I am here quoting one of their *ex-Commanders-in-Chief*; what he said years ago has been proved by what we have seen today! We are treated to tall talks of "Indianisation" and "experiments", and whenever this Honourable House has pressed for reforms, we have always been told of the bogey of the King's Regulations, "that these were the King's Regulations, you cannot touch them", and so on and so forth. I ask—who makes these King's Regulations? Not surely His Imperial Majesty whose august name is associated with these regulations; surely these regulations are made by some Generals either at the Army Headquarters at Simla or in the War Office in London, by the type of Generals whose attitude generally is: "Shoot the brute and stand no nonsense", and this Government come forward and say: "We can't touch it, these

[Mr. M. Ghiasuddin.]

are King's Regulations". Sir, the Honourable the Defence Secretary can convey this message to those gentlemen who make these King's Regulations that so long as the British troops stationed in this country are not put under the command of the Indian commissioned officers, it is abhorrent and repugnant to us that any British officer of the British army should command a single Indian sepoy. (Loud Applause.) Sir, that is our answer,—the answer of the elected representatives of the people. Sir, it is not a matter of small dimensions. It is a matter where our honour is concerned, where our prestige as a nation is concerned, that while on the one hand British officers of the British army should have the right to command our Indian ranks, our Indian commissioned officers should be denied the same privilege. Now, I want to bring to the notice of the Honourable the Defence Secretary and the House at large some observations about the practical difficulties which will stand in their way, in matters of discipline, if they keep to the present system. Supposing that in a frontier campaign there is an Indian commissioned captain and there is a British officer of the Indian army and there is a British sergeant with about 30 men under his command, and now the position as created by the Army Act and the King's Regulations is this, that this captain will be able to command this British lieutenant in the Indian army, but when he gives his orders to the sergeant, the position will be that this sergeant of the British army will be prepared to take his orders from this lieutenant, who is really a subordinate to that captain, but he will not be prepared to take his orders direct from the captain. Supposing that link is cut off, that lieutenant is shot, what will be the result? This man will say: "I obeyed your orders so long as that connecting link was between us, but as it has been broken, I am independent". This is the sort of thing they are creating, this is how they themselves are undermining the discipline of the army, and yet when we make protests, they do not listen to us. (Hear, hear.)

Now, with your permission, Sir, I will say a word or two to the arch-champions of the Viceroy's commissioned officers, namely, the gallant Knight from Jhelum and the gallant Captain from Rohtak. Both these gentlemen pretend to be arch-champions of the Viceroy's commissioned officers! They say: "These boys coming from Dehra Dun are all wrong, our old and tried soldiers are all right". Now, I am putting a plain proposition before them. I say, at present, there are some 35 rankers of the British army posted as special branch quartermasters with the Indian units. Well, I will make the proposition to the Defence Secretary to replace them by Indians, by our own rankers, enhance their commissions and make them quartermasters, and if the Honourable the Defence Secretary gives me the assurance on the floor of this House today that he is going to do it with regard to 75 per cent. at any rate of the vacancies that fall due, then I will go with him, but I am sure he is not going to give this assurance.

Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham: Is the Honourable Member referring to quartermasters in British units?

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: No, quartermasters in Indian units. The Honourable gentleman has 35 quartermasters posted with the Indian units which posts should rightly go to our rankers, our subedars and our jemadars, of which they are now deprived; and if the Honourable the Defence Secretary does not listen to me, then I would appeal to these arch-champions of

jemadars and subedars to come and vote with me in the Opposition Lobby. Sir, what is the good of talking like that—that they are the champions of our subedars and our jemadars? Here is something which purely concerns the subedars and jemadars. If the Government accede to our demand, then we will go with them into the Lobby, but I know that Government will not accede to our demand

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

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: Sir, I have, a lot to say yet

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): No Honourable Member will be allowed to exceed his time-limit.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: Here is the Army List before me. There is another little trick to which I invite the attention of the Defence Secretary. If we look at pages 238 and 240, we will find that the seniormost cadet from the Dehra Dun College is junior to the juniormost of those cadets who pass out from Sandhurst. I ask, is not that rank injustice? It means this that, after 20 years or so, when the time comes for the higher commands, these poor fellows will be handicapped by having so many Britishers above them. I think there should be some equitable method by which the seniority of these officers should be regulated. Let there be a competitive examination and whoever of the cadets comes first should be given the first place. After putting all these disabilities in our way, I am surprised to hear that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief does not know why suitable candidates are not coming forward for the army. They are not coming forward because their self-respect is being undermined by joining the army and their pockets are being touched when they are put as the junior-most on the army list.

These are a few of our complaints which I have tried to place before this House, but I am afraid Government will not listen to me, because whoever disagrees with them is considered something to be despised. I can assure the Government that this is the voice of the Punjab, a voice of a province which supplies half the strength of the Indian army, and I represent the Punjab landholders who constitute what they call the most pro-British element in India and I say, speaking with authority and full responsibility of my constituents, all those loyal people who have got their sons and nephews in the Indian army, that we are dissatisfied with this rotten state of things and we want a change for the better. (Applause.)

Sardar Mangal Singh (Last Punjab: Sikh): Sir, before I come to the points raised by my Honourable friend, Mr. Griffiths, I wish to examine the question that is now before the House. The motion which is now before the House raises a very important issue on which Indian opinion has been very emphatically expressed in this House as well as outside whenever it has come up for discussion. By the Indianisation of the army we understand that the Indian army should be officered by Indian officers, that the rank and file of the army should be all Indians and that the Indian army should be controlled by Indians. That is what we understand by the Indianisation of the army. This question is very closely connected with the complete responsible Government in this country. Unless and until the Indian army is wholly and completely Indianised, both in its personnel

[Sardar Mangal Singh.]

and in its control, it is impossible to establish any Government resembling responsible Government. Therefore, the position is this. We demand the Indianisation of the army so that in this country really true self-government can be established. We demand the Indianisation of the army not in the spirit of experiments; we resent these remarks. We demand the Indianisation of the army as a self-respecting nation so that our country may be defended and protected by an army which is controlled and officered by Indian officers. This being the position, there are three aspects of this question. The first is the provision that all our officers should be Indians. It has been pointed out that sufficient material is not available. I say to the Government that this sort of nonsense should not be talked in this House. Indian youngmen and self-respecting Indians are cut to the quick when they hear such remarks from these people.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can continue his speech after Lunch.

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

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta) in the Chair.

Sardar Mangal Singh: Sir, when the House rose for Lunch, I was saying that the question of Indianisation has three aspects, firstly the Indian officers of the army, secondly the Indianisation of the rank and file of the army, and thirdly the Indianisation of the machinery of the control of the army. As regards the first, the Government of India have made a scheme for the Indianisation of the officers of the army, and this scheme, I submit, is wholly unsatisfactory. Its pace is too slow, and if we carry on with this scheme, it is absolutely impossible that the army would be Indianised within the living memory of the present generation.

I do not know whether I should congratulate the Defence Secretary for importing a new recruit to defend the Army Headquarters in the person of Mr. Griffiths. He has come here to defend the army presumably with his personal contact with certain persons for a few months and he comes before the House as an expert on army affairs and he gives us a lecture and talks of experiments and talks of not having good material in this country. It was difficult for us here to listen to his speech which was full nonsense. It is time that such talk is stopped. He should know that it hurts our feelings, it hurts our sense of self-respect. If he is a future candidate for the post of Defence Secretary, then I have no doubt that the pace of Indianisation will be very much quickened than it is at present. He says that good material is not forthcoming. I do not know how to convince him that if it is not coming, whose fault is it? I think men like Mr. Griffiths will only understand that good material has come forward when the young Indian nation will rise, and if they do not listen to us, they will drive them forcibly out of India, and it is only then and then alone that you will realise that good material has come forward. (Applause.) That will be the only answer to the speech of Mr. Griffiths. If he talks like that, I think the Indianisation of the army will come at once. It

was for advisers like him that the Czar of Russia lost his throne, and it would be if the bureaucracy falls, on account of the advice of Honourable friends like Mr. Griffiths who come here and openly declare that good material is not forthcoming. Can any man in his senses believe that, out of 335 millions, a few officers cannot be recruited, a few good officers cannot be had.

Last year, I had the honour to be on the Board of Interview and Record Board. I had myself examined several candidates, and amongst those candidates there were several Europeans, and I can confidently say, as has been rightly pointed out by my Honourable friend, Mr. Gadgil, that very good material is forthcoming. The question is whether you want that good material or not. If you really want to Indianise the army, it can be completely Indianised within ten years. One of the Commanders-in-Chief gave you a scheme that the army could be Indianised within a limited period, but that scheme has never seen the light of the day.

Another argument put forward by Mr. Griffiths is that the cut proposed by the Independent Party is like an old withered flower. He illustrated his argument by saying that a fresh flower has value. I may remind the Honourable Member that it is not this cut, but it is men like Mr. Griffiths who are withered flowers and who are out of date and they are not needed here and they should make room for others who can think better and who can speak better.

Major Nawab Sir Ahmad Nawaz Khan (Nominated: Non-Official): It is a great credit to Mr. Griffiths what you are saying.

Sardar Mangal Singh: As regards the Indianisation of the rank and file, it is not difficult even according to the argument of the bureaucrats. They say that good material is not forthcoming for the officers. If for arguments sake we admit it, but what about the rank and file? Why can you not withdraw the British regiment? You admit that their valour, their bravery and their loyalty, if I may say so, is beyond question. Then, what prevents you from withdrawing the British army? By withdrawing the British regiment, you reduce the heavy expenditure against which Indian public opinion have been protesting for the last 50 years and more. Why can you not withdraw that army unless it is an army of occupation? Can you imagine that any self-respecting nation desiring and fighting for complete independence would ever tolerate a foreign army of occupation? The whole scheme of the Indian army is based on a complete mistrust of Indians. If you study the internal organization of the army, you will find that the whole composition of sections and companies and then regiments and divisions is based on a complete mistrust. There are different sections. Then, there is a definite proportion of so many Indians and so many Europeans. This proportion was laid down in 1857 after the famous Indian Mutiny. That proportion is still being continued, and it is continued because the Government of India want to keep a certain counterpoise in the army. It may be argued by the Defence Secretary that in this matter the Government of India are sometimes helpless. I can admit the force of this argument, but we cannot force the real culprit to come here and accuse him. He is sitting behind the *purdah*, probably several thousands of miles away, and from there the composition of the Indian army is dictated. We cannot force him to come out of his seclusion. The next best thing is for us to censure the Government of India, and, through the Government of India, we can censure that Council of Imperial Defence which dictates and frames the policy of the Indian army.

[Sardar Mangal Singh.]

The third point is the Indianisation of the control of the army. It is here that the position is most unsatisfactory. Under the new Government of India Act, the position will become still worse. At the present moment, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief is a member of the Governor General's Cabinet. Military affairs are discussed in the Cabinet and the other Members of Government have a chance to influence the policy of Government. But, under the new Act, the Commander-in-Chief would no longer sit on the Cabinet, and military affairs would be decided between the Governor General and the Commander-in-Chief and the Council of Imperial Defence sitting in England. The Indian Members of Government will have no chance to have their say, and, therefore, as regards military affairs, the position under the new Government would still be worse. We have been pressing for the last several years that Indian public opinion should be associated with the administration of military affairs. It was probably in 1934 that the Defence Secretary gave this House an assurance with the consent of the Secretary of State that this House would be consulted before despatching Indian troops abroad. This assurance was again repeated next year

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member has two minutes more.

Sardar Mangal Singh: When this point was pressed very much at Simla at the time of despatch of Indian troops to Abyssinia, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, referring to the appointment of a standing committee on army affairs said:

"I am quite certain the Government would consider that sort of a request with every desire to meet your wishes and the wishes of political India provided that you put up an absolutely agreed proposal concurred in by all parties in India."

After this speech was made, a Resolution was brought forward in this House with the concurrence of all Parties

Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham: Sir, may I ask how this is relevant to the question of the Indianisation of the army?

Sardar Mangal Singh: I am talking of the Indianisation of the control of the Indian army. I am developing the argument that there is no Indianisation of the control of the Indian army. A promise was made of a very small concession that a certain machinery would be created under which military officers would consult this committee from time to time.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member's time is up.

Sardar Mangal Singh: So this House passed a Resolution and the Government of India did not accept that Resolution. With these words, I strongly support the motion.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, the question may now be put.

(At this stage, Mr. S. Satyamurti rose to speak.)

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Sir, if this debate is to conclude at 3 o'clock, it will be necessary, if the Government spokesman is to reply, for me to reply now. That is the agreement between the Parties. I wish to make it clear that we on our side have no objection to the debate continuing, but I do want to be assured that I shall have a right of reply.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, may I say one word? The time from 3 o'clock to 5 o'clock is allotted to unattached Members. As one of the unattached Members who has great interest in these two hours, I have no objection to the debate going on, on condition that, if I do not get two hours today, I shall get the balance of the time on Monday.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The arrangement is already known to the House. If the arrangement is to be disturbed, it can certainly be done. If any encroachment is made upon the time allotted to unattached Members, the Chair is assured that the Congress Party have agreed to make good the deficiency out of the time allotted to them.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali (Delhi: General): About half an hour, and no more.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): If that is the maximum amount of time that may be conceded by the Congress Party, the Chair proposes to call upon Mr. Satyamurti now and then Mr. Tottenham.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, it has never been my misfortune even in this Honourable House,—I mean no reflection,—to listen to a more insulting or arrogant speech than that of the friend who till now adorns the Indian Civil Service, and hopes to join the European non-official ranks very soon. I commiserate with them on this catastrophe. They cannot have a more irritating, and a more arrogant member of their group. I do not know what they are going to do in the new India, but I warn them in time, that, if they are going to have representatives who make speeches like this in this House, they are storing up trouble for themselves.

Now, Sir, he indulged with poetic fervour in the metaphor of a garden, and talked of the Independent Party nurturing a stale flower while fresh flowers like him are blossoming in this garden. The truth of the matter is this—that the Independent Party have been rendering great services to the freedom of this country, by constantly taking up as their subject this subject of the Indianisation of the Indian army. Sir, there is no more important subject for the future of this country, and, I am sure, this side of the House is very grateful to them for the persistence, with which year after year they have been bringing forward this cut motion. And I think, therefore, they may well congratulate themselves that the flower they are nurturing is not stale, but will soon grow and will become so plentiful that all these weeds like the speaker will be wiped out of this beautiful garden, and this country will consist only of beautiful flowers like those which the Independent Party brings out.

Then, my Honourable friend spoke as if he was the Government of India, the Secretary of State, His Majesty's Government. The arrogance of some of these Europeans who "assume the God, affect to nod, and seem to shake the spheres" seems staggering to me. I know my

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

Honourable friend, the Army Secretary, would not have spoken in this strain; but this gentleman, more loyal than the King himself, suddenly gets up, and with all the responsibility of the British Empire on his frail shoulders, tells us that this is an experiment, that you dare not go further than this, "I warn you" and the rest of it. It seems to me, Sir, a sense of humour will add to my friend's many accomplishments very much. (Laughter.)

Then, he defined, in that gubernatorial language with which the British Government has made us so familiar "the inception of the policy of Indianisation". And how long this inception will go on I do not know. He naturally stated our complaints very correctly, that of the pace being too slow. May I ask my Honourable friend one question? He cannot answer it now, but sometime when he gets a chance he may answer it. According to his idea of the pace, how soon will the Indian army be completely Indianised in all its ranks, officers and men? A century, I suppose. (*Voices of "Five hundred years."*) Do you expect us to wait till then? Then you have not read history aright. When men like him have gone away, then the army will become completely, not Indianised, but will have become completely Indian, long before you think we can do that. He patronised us by saying, "Of course we on this side",—he spoke for all the Government,—“we on this side accept the policy of Indianisation”. Thank you very much. You have accepted the policy of Swaraj; it will come a century hence. We must be grateful for small mercies, I suppose. Then, he referred to our second complaint, segregation of Indian officers. Yes, that is the sting of the thing that young Indian officers who are good young fellows should not be placed on the same footing as British officers. I know my Honourable friend, the Defence Secretary, will give various reasons as to how they are gradually approximating to that position, and how one day even Indian officers may command British officers. But I am sure he is convinced, and were he free to speak his own mind, he will himself say that there is behind the minds of all the army commanders, a feeling that, for all the time they can conceive of, Indian officers shall not command British officers. That is what we object to.

Then, he also said that we object to the presence of British troops in this country. Yes. I believe we do not want them. I believe we can defend our country without them; at any rate we do not want them on these terms; and, if at any time India wants foreign troops, I can assure my friend that we can get mercenaries on better terms than we are paying the British mercenaries today. What are you in this country but mercenaries? This country is nothing to you but a field for exploitation of my countrymen, and you have sold yourselves for defending your hold over this country. Look at Spain. If I want volunteers to help me, I will get heaps of better men on better terms—French and Italians, if at all I feel like wanting them. But I do not want Englishmen at all. My friend for the first time laid down a new principle, and I would like the Defence Secretary to say, on behalf of the Government, whether my friend spoke, in this instance, for the Government. It seems the whole scheme of this Indianisation is an experiment. Is it an experiment? Therefore, you have not made up your mind that this army shall be Indianised even a thousand years hence. You are now trying an experiment: it may fail: if it fails, you are going back upon the whole

thing. Is that the position of the Government? I want to know, and I think it is a matter on which the House is entitled to an answer . . .

Mr. M. S. Aney: What is the meaning of failure in a case like this?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: And, as my Honourable friend says, what is the meaning of failure in a case like this? I want to tell my friend who spoke just before lunch that this country used to exist before England came here, and we were then defending ourselves: we were a free country and we defended ourselves. Secondly, I want to ask my friend one question: how did you conquer this country? Did you have a single straight fight against my countrymen? You always used traitors to defeat my own countrymen. From Mir Jafar's days right up to last year, you have been using my own men to defeat us: you have never defeated my nation in a straight fight: you cannot do it. You also said that there is a dearth of ample material. I am glad to see my Honourable and gallant friend, Sir Henry Gidney, here—and I have his authority to say this—when he sat on the selection committee last year and interviewed the young gentlemen who came up for being interviewed, he was of the opinion that he never had seen in his life a finer set of lads, who could officer any army in the world; and he tells me that the General who was there agreed with him. Why insult us? By all means be honest about it. Say you have conquered this country and you are afraid of your own future and you want to remain here as an army of occupation. We will then respect your honesty. But, please do not put us off with this silly excuse, which convinces nobody.

The Honourable Member then talked of traditions. Yes. It was Napoleon who called you a nation of shopkeepers. What are your traditions? As for us, we are an ancient nation: we have well defined traditions of martial valour. My Honourable friend then said that the Viceroy's commissioned officers never used to complain to him. I know that. Look at the company he keeps now. (Laughter.) They will never complain, and I am not surprised. Slaves love their own claims, and it is no use quoting slaves against us.

Then, my Honourable friend said that this army is here to keep this country safe. May I know for whom? You want to keep this country safe for British imperialism, not for my countrymen. He then very cleverly argued in this fashion: it seems they regard people who apply to become officers in this way: if they have military traditions, they have no education: if they have education, they have no military traditions:

"Maunanmookah pravachanapathu veechakee jalpakowa."

If a man is silent, he is dumb: if he speaks, he is voluble; therefore, in any case, he cannot come in. It seems to me this antithesis between tradition and education is one of these new shibboleths, not one of the old shibboleths, which he accuses of. He appealed to us that we must co-operate in this slow process of Indianisation. I want to give him a warning. Another war is coming. You will ask us to co-operate then, and I say, unless you . . .

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan, Rural): He was tendering advice: you tender him some!

Mr. S. Satyamurti: My Leader reminds me that one good turn deserves another, and as he has given us advice, we will also give him some advice: that, when the next war comes and he wants us to help him, we will advise him to go home. I do not wish to say anything more as I wish to give an opportunity to the Leader of the Independent Party the chance of saying a few words. I shall conclude by saying that I hope that every section of this House, every Indian, elected and nominated, will walk into the lobby with us on this motion, or will at least have the self-respect to remain neutral.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): With the consent of the Congress Party and with the necessary implication involved in that consent, the Chair will call upon the Deputy Leader of the Independent Party to speak.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Mr. Deputy President, my Honourable friend, Mr. Griffiths, to whom we owe our thanks, has given us something to bite. In the first instance, he complained that the Independent Party have been moving this cut year in and year out, and that it was a withered flower. May I reply to him by a very short story? I am not accustomed to tell stories in this House, but I will give just this very short one. Once a very famous Indian lawyer, a man of European reputation, Sir Rash Behari Ghose, had the misfortune to appear before a district judge. The district judge did not recognise him. Sir Rash Behari Ghose had to take into the Court a large number of law books. The district judge, ignorant of law, turned to Sir Rash Behari and said: "Babu, have you brought your library along with you?" Sir Rash Behari replied "Yes, to teach you law". Therefore, we bring this Resolution year in and year out to teach men of the mentality of my friend, Mr. Griffiths, something about the army.

Now, I will touch upon the main issue which he was pleased to enlighten us about. His one argument was this: that in the Indian army, as it is at present composed, the Indian officers, that is to say, the Viceroy's commissioned officers come from the same class as the sepoy, and, therefore, when they get this commission, they are able to be on better terms with the sepoy than with Indian officers of a better social and educational standing, and, therefore, to Indianise this Indian section of the Indian army was a very difficult problem, because there was the danger of the sepoy not being able to get on with Indian officers of a different social class and education as well as with the kind of officers he was accustomed to. Now, that goes to the root of the whole question. Are we Indianising the Indian army or are we merely substituting Indians of better educational standard—I will not say social—than the Indian officers that are at present in service? That is not Indianisation. Indian for Indian is not Indianisation. What we have been asking for, even if slowly but steadily, is the substitution of Indian officers in the Indian army for British officers. Why is this class of Indian officer, the Viceroy's commissioned officer, a necessity in the Indian army? It is because the army is officered by British officers who cannot naturally come into intimate contact with the sepoy except through an intermediary class called the Viceroy's commissioned officers who come from the same class as the sepoy, and it is because up to now the army has been officered by British officers, that this class of Indian officers has come into existence and has

been in existence all these years. Naturally when you try to convert that class of officer into a different class of Indian officer, you come upon the difficulty of the British officer not being able to keep in touch with the sepoy as he has done up to now. That is your difficulty. Now, we ask that it is the British section of the Indian army which should be Indianised,—again I repeat,—slowly, but steadily,—and we don't mean that an Indian should be substituted by a more highly paid Indian. That won't tend to economy; that would only tend to bring in another class of officer, better educated, better socially fitted, in place of the one you have got, which would not fulfil either your object or our object. Therefore, to call this Indianisation is not what we intended, nor what you originally intended. When you originally talked of Indianisation, it was—I again repeat, slowly but steadily,—the displacement of the British officer by the Indian officer, and not by replacing the present Viceroy's commissioned officers by a class of Indian officers more highly qualified or better socially fitted, costing us more, and not giving us the results required. That is the answer to my friend, Mr. Griffiths. The difficulties are of your own creation. Leave the Indian commissioned officer where he is,—call him the Viceroy's commissioned officer or by any other name you like,—because as long as the British officer remains in India, that class may be necessary for that personal contact which is essential between officers and men, because you cannot obtain that personal contact without this intermediary, as the British officer is not an Indian . . .

Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham: Does the Honourable Member mean to suggest that the Indian commissioned officer should take the place of the Viceroy's commissioned officer and should not be allowed to rise in the army above the rank of a platoon commander?

3 P.M.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: When I say Indianisation, I mean that the British officer should go gradually and the Indian officer should take his place, that the Indian officer should have a much better educational and social standard, but the inferior types of Indian officers you have today have become a necessity to you, because the British officers in the Indian army are not of the same race and creed as the sepoy. Naturally, as long as you have the British officer in the Indian army, you must have an intermediary. You should replace your English officer by Indian officers and make it increasingly less necessary to have that intermediary class of officers whom you now are pleased to call as Viceroy's commissioned officers. That is my point, and that is my answer to my friend, Mr. Griffiths' objection to a faster speed of Indianisation. Sir, I am surprised that this point should have been placed before this House at this very late stage in the history of Indianisation. It only shows how little Mr. Griffiths knows about the real problem of Indians or the Indian army, and I do echo the sentiments that have been expressed by my friend, Mr. Satyamurti, though perhaps not in such forcible language, that it would be better if our friends on the Government Benches really try to understand the Indian mentality. It seems, Mr. Deputy President, that 10 or 15 years residence in this country is not sufficient for Englishmen to understand the Indian mentality, but if they would only realise that they don't understand the Indian mentality, I would be satisfied. But if they are led to believe by some of their Indian friends whom they are accustomed to mix with, that they understand everything about India after their short residence in this country including the Indian mentality in every

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

part of India, then I regret they are very much mistaken. British officials have done very great service in this country, but don't let them believe that in a few years time they can learn everything that there is to be known about Indians in every part of India. That is the greatest mistake they make, and my friend, Mr. Griffiths' speech has only been an exhibition of that great fallacy, from which many of my friends suffer in this country, about knowing all about India and Indians after a stay of a few years in this country.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Sir, I think this debate has illustrated the validity of the objection that I took this morning to the cut motion that my friend originally wished to move. The debate has wandered over a very wide field, and I have always protested in this House on the occasions when it has fallen to me to defend the defence budget against being expected to deal with the whole field of defence policy, expenditure, Indianisation and everything else within the short period of half an hour. After all, Sir, the army and the other defence forces in India rank in importance and size at least with the railways in this country. The railways have five days for discussion of their budget, and I have half an hour in which to reply to all these questions.

Sir, I will now come to the particular subject of this debate. It has been my lot on previous occasions to deal with debates on Indianisation, and on these occasions I have always done my best to explain the policy of the Government and to remove certain misconceptions that prevail with regard to it. I have explained that we are now in process of carrying out a definite policy for the replacement of British by Indian officers in a cavalry brigade and a division of all arms with a due proportion of the ancillary departments. I have explained before, although in view of what Mr. Satyamurti said I hardly dare to use the word, that we do regard this scheme of Indianising a cavalry brigade and a division as a definite experiment,—in the sense that it is something that has not been done before—and we must have time to see whether that experiment succeeds in practice. I have also explained very clearly on previous occasions that there is no chance whatever of our reconsidering our policy or expanding our scheme until we have had ample time to see how it works. In addition, Sir, I have explained that, apart from the gradual substitution of Indian for British troops which is involved in this very scheme of Indianisation, we have no intention at present of making any permanent reduction in the number of British troops in this country. I have also pointed out that we have since the war reduced the number of British troops in this country by some 20,000 men. Now, today, Sir, I cannot announce any change whatever in that policy. And, having said that, I suppose I might as well sit down and await the inevitable result. (Laughter.) I have, however, thought it better to preface my remarks with these rather blunt statements, because I see no value in beating about the bush. On the other hand, I certainly do not want to leave this House, as I shall shortly be leaving it, under the impression that the Government of India, and if I may speak on their behalf, the military authorities also, are not fully conscious of the strength of Indian feeling on this subject. If the Government of India, having after due deliberation laid down a certain policy for the Indianisation of the army four or five short years ago, are determined not to be

deterred from that policy, it is, I may assure the House, not on account of any callous or complacent disregard of the feeling to which I have just referred, but because they honestly believe that any other course would be inconsistent with their very grave and heavy responsibilities for the safety and security of this country.

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): The vote of this House does not affect.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Acknowledging as we do the sincerity of the views of Honourable Members opposite, I hope they too will at least do us the credit of having honest views in this matter. (*An Honourable Member:* "No".) Now, I should like to proceed, if I may, and make just one more effort to explain certain features of our policy and to remove certain misconceptions with regard to it. Before I do so, I would like to read to the House certain extracts from a note which I supplied last year to the Leader of the Independent Party, whose absence, we deplore so much today, Mr. Jinnah. He asked for certain information about the scheme, because it was obvious from what he said in his speech last year that he did not fully understand it. This scheme, as I say, aims at the Indianisation, or replacement of British by Indian officers, of a cavalry brigade and a division of all arms and services. That includes three cavalry regiments, 12 infantry battalions, 13 batteries of artillery, 4 troops or companies of sappers and miners, some signal units, a proportion of the Indian Army Service Corps, the Indian Army Ordnance Corps, the Indian Army Veterinary Corps, the Military Engineer Service, the Remount Depots and Grass Farms and also a proportion of the Staff. The Indian Army has hitherto been composed, as Honourable Members are aware, of infantry and cavalry together with those departments I have mentioned just now, and it has also had its share of staff appointments. The total number of officers in the Indian army today is in the neighbourhood of 3,000 and the annual wastage in the neighbourhood of 120. The officers required to fill these 120 vacancies at present come mainly from the Sandhurst, although a small proportion are sometimes transferred from the British service, that is, from British cavalry or infantry regiments. Our division and cavalry brigade scheme involves, first, a reorganisation of the officer establishment of the infantry battalions and cavalry regiments of the Indian Army to correspond with the British model; that is to say, the Indianised cavalry regiment will contain 27 officers and the Indianised infantry battalion will contain 28 officers, plus 4 officers for the training battalions, as against the present Indian army establishment of 12 British officers and 20 Viceroy's commissioned officers per unit. In the second place, it will involve the creation of certain entirely new units in the artillery and signals because there are no such units in the Indian army at present. The twelve infantry battalions of this scheme represents about one-eighth of the infantry strength of the Indian army and about one-twelfth of the infantry strength of the army in India; the army in India includes the British army as well as the Indian army. The three cavalry regiments in our scheme represent about one-seventh of the cavalry strength of the Indian army and one-ninth of the cavalry strength of the army in India. Thirteen batteries of artillery represent about one-sixth of the artillery strength of the army in India. Four troops or companies of Sappers and Miners represent about one-seventh of the engineering

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

strength of the army in India, and two Signal units represent about one-seventh of the Signal strength of the army in India. The number of officers who are required to man these fighting units that I have just mentioned on the scale to which I have referred adds up to a total of roughly 600, and to provide the correct proportions of ancillary services and departments and staff, it has been calculated that 20 per cent. of the total cadre will be required. The total cadre will therefore be about 600 combatant officers and about 150 officers belonging to the services and departments, a total of 750. The intake of 60 a year into the Indian Military Academy, provided that all those 60 succeed in passing out and that there is no wastage in future years after they obtain their commissions—that number would be sufficient to produce this cadre of 750 in a little over twelve years. But, Sir, one has to take wastage into account, both wastage at the Academy and in later years. One has also to take into account the fact that when we started this scheme for the Indianisation of a division and a cavalry brigade, we started with some 130 Indian officers already in hand who were serving in the old eight-units scheme. Taking both these facts into account, it has been calculated that an actual output of even 50 a year from the Indian Military Academy would be sufficient to fill this cadre by about 1951. By that time there ought to be a sufficient number of Indian officers of the required seniority, that is to say, of about 25 years' service, to command the units contained in the plan. Obviously if the output were to exceed that figure the total number of officers required might be obtained before a sufficient number of them were sufficiently senior to command their units. On the other hand, if the progress made is satisfactory, it has always been indicated that a further advance may take place long before 1950 and that would provide a means of absorbing the surplus that might occur in the meanwhile. Now, if an output of between 50 and 60 officers a year from the Indian Military Academy may be taken as sufficient to Indianise a cavalry brigade and a division in about sixteen years in the circumstances which I have described, that is to say, starting with 130 officers on hand, it is perfectly obvious, in the first place, that this rate of output would be considerably more than sufficient to Indianise a division and a cavalry brigade if the process was spread over the full normal regimental career of 25 years. It would also follow, in the second place, that the present output of some 120 British officers from Sandhurst which is required to fill the present Indian army cadre, with its smaller number of officers per unit, can form no criterion whatever of the annual number of officers that will be required to fill a completely Indianised army of the future. Very elaborate calculations would be required to work out with any degree of accuracy what that annual requirement would be. But on such calculations as I have been able to make, it appears that the number of officers that you would require every year to fill a completely Indianised army corresponding to the present Indian army would be in the neighbourhood of 250 instead of the present 120 from Sandhurst. Those are certain facts which I think Honourable Members may be interested to learn.

I will now go on, if I may, to concentrate on the three points which, as the debate today has shown, still figure most prominently in the minds of Honourable Members who oppose this scheme. I refer, firstly, to what is called segregation, secondly, to status and powers of command, and thirdly, to this question of Viceroy's commissioned officers. Now, as regards

segregation, I have very frequently explained before, that what we are aiming at is the complete Indianisation of a part of the Indian army and not the partial Indianisation of the whole of the Indian army. That process, as I have just explained, so far as a cavalry brigade and a division are concerned, ought to be complete by about 1950, and I have always held and maintained that it will provide a far quicker approach to complete Indianisation than any other possible method. That is a statement I have made several times in this House and I submit it has never been taken up on its merits or challenged. Under the Skeen Committee proposal, which is the alternative, the whole of the Indian army might possibly have been half-Indianised in about the same time, that is, by about 1950. But the very admixture of British with Indian officers under that scheme would have provided a handle to those who are opposed to Indianisation. It would have provided them with a handle to postpone the final step. That final step, as everybody must be aware, is the complete cessation of the recruitment of British officers for the Indian army. After that step has been taken, a period of from 30 to 35 years must elapse before the last British officer disappears from the Indian army and before that step is taken, no scheme can ensure the complete Indianisation of the Indian army within any measurable period of time. Now, Sir, if we had adopted the plan of the Skeen Committee, that is the plan of sandwiching Indian officers in between British officers, I am quite sure that we should have been accused of distrusting Indians. "You cannot trust Indians to run their own show", it would have been said: "That is the reason why you still insist on putting Indian and British officers together in the same unit so that you may be able to say that the Indian officer cannot do without the British officer." When, however, we take the other course of trusting Indians to run their own show, we are immediately accused of invidious segregation and, Sir, I have never been able to understand that accusation. What we are offering in respect to a considerable section of the Indian army, is complete independence or swaraj. Honourable Members opposite, so far as I am aware, have never described complete independence or swaraj as invidious segregation on the political side and I have always failed to understand why they should describe it as such on the military side. That, Sir, brings me to the second point about status and powers of command. The real reason, I suggest, why Honourable Members object to our plan and call it segregation is not that they really mind these Indian officers being put into separate battalions, but because they think it is a deep laid plot to prevent Indian officers from ever exercising command over British officers. That is a myth that should have been exploded long ago. I have explained not once or twice but several times on the floor of the House that the Indian commissioned officer enjoys complete reciprocity with the British officer so far as powers of command are concerned inside the Indian army. I have read out the King's Regulation on the subject before. I can read it out again; but I can assure the House that in the Indian army the powers of command of the Indian officers are exactly the same as the powers of command of a British officer. So far as the British army is concerned, the Regulations have been amended to secure that the Indian commissioned officer exercises powers of command over personnel of the British army on every occasion unless he is specifically debarred from doing so; and as far as I am aware, no occasion has yet arisen where an officer has been debarred from exercising these powers. Finally, I should like to nail to the counter one mis-statement which was made the

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

other day about Indian commissioned officers not receiving salutes from British soldiers. Every soldier is required by regulation to salute any person whom he knows to be an officer, whether in uniform or not, and he does, as a matter of course, salute the Indian commissioned officer without thinking twice about it. I have never heard of any occasion on which a British soldier has failed to salute an Indian commissioned officer. I do most profoundly wish that we could hear the last of this inferiority complex which is leading, if I may say so, to the manufacture of these complaints. It does no good whatever to the Indian commissioned officers who are already joining their units in the Indian army and I believe it is doing disservice to the plan of Indianisation that we are doing our best to work out.

Then, finally, there is this vexed question of the abolition of the Viceroy's commissioned officers. Here again I am sure most of the objection is based on the feeling that it is a sort of dodge to delay Indianisation. I have explained before that it does not delay Indianisation by one single minute, because in whatever capacity an officer begins his military career he must spend at least 24 to 25 years before he reaches the command of his unit. Now, it does not matter two pence whether he spends his first years as a commissioned officer in command of a platoon, as every British subaltern does in the British army, or whether he spends a longer period as a company officer, which is the present practice in the Indian army. Exactly the same time is taken in either case to reach command of the unit. It may be true that this plan does postpone the particular date by which we shall begin to reduce British recruitment from Sandhurst, but it does not delay in any way the final achievement of Indianisation. One thing I have never been able to understand and which no Honourable Member has ever been able to explain to me is what possible justification there can be, when you are starting a national army, for continuing the altogether unique practice, which now prevails in the Indian army, of having this grade of Viceroy's commissioned officer in between your commissioned officer and your other ranks. The Viceroy's commissioned officer is necessary today, as Sir Cowasji Jehangir has pointed out, as a link between the British officer and the sepoy and in that capacity he has performed most invaluable services in the past; but when you are starting a purely Indian army I cannot see what possible justification there can be for having two forms of commission in your units.

Now, Sir, in the few minutes that are left to me, there are just one or two particular points which I should like to refer to and which were raised in the debate. Mr. Ghiasuddin raised the question of quartermasters. I think he imagined that it was the practice for us to promote a man from the ranks of a British unit as quartermaster in all units of the Indian army. That is not correct. There is what is known in the Army List as the special list of quartermasters who are appointed to the training battalions of Indian army regiments. The training battalion, as you know, is a sort of parent to the active battalions and combatant officers from the active battalions go to the training battalion for short periods. A great deal of the work of administering the stores and accounts of the regiment is carried on in the training battalion. We used to find it a matter of great difficulty to secure continuity in the post of quartermaster in the training battalions, where this officer has an enormous amount of

work to do connected with stores and has to keep perhaps 50 or 60 different accounts. If we had been able to find Viceroy's commissioned officers of sufficient education and knowledge of accounts and so on, it might have been.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: Does the Honourable Member mean to say that there has not been a single Viceroy's commissioned officer who was competent enough to be appointed to these posts?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Viceroy's commissioned officers have never been appointed to these posts, because from their standard of education and the kind of upbringing they have had, they are not qualified for that kind of work. There may have been one or two cases in which Viceroy's commissioned officers have acted as quartermasters and the result has been unsatisfactory. The point is that in the active battalions of the different regiments the quartermaster has invariably been one of the regimental officers, and in every Indianised battalion, if the Honourable Member will look at the army list, he will find that the quartermasters are Indian commissioned officers. It is only in the training battalions that the other scheme prevails and that means only about 18 officers altogether. Now, Sir, the second point was the question of the seniority of Indian commissioned officers compared with British officers when they pass out of Sandhurst. Now, as the House is aware, the course at the Indian Military Academy is 2½ years; at Sandhurst it is only 1½ years. One might think, therefore, that every Indian commissioned officer who passes out of the Academy was a year junior, automatically, to his confrere at Sandhurst. That is not so, Sir. Every officer who passes out of the Indian Military Academy gets automatically one year's ante-date to put him on a level as far as possible with his confrere at Sandhurst. The practical effect of that is that Indian commissioned officers who pass out of the Academy and join their units six months later than British officers are in every case senior to that batch of British officers. Then you get the case of the batch that passed out of Sandhurst one full year before them, not six months before. The question was how we should grade our Indian officers compared with that batch of one year previous. It might have been possible to make all the Indian officers senior to all the cadets who came from Sandhurst. It might have been possible to make them all junior, or, Honourable Members might suggest, it might have been possible to dovetail them in some way. It was, however, found that there were great practical difficulties. Their passing-out examinations are not the same, their standards are not the same, and there was no particular way of deciding whether so and so of the Indian Military Academy passed out higher or lower than so and so from Sandhurst. I think Honourable Members of this House will agree that we could not possibly have put the whole batch of Indian commissioned officers senior to a whole batch of officers from Sandhurst who had passed out and actually joined their units a year before they did, and we have therefore adopted the course of making them one day junior. The ante-date of one year does, however, put them as far as possible on an equality with officers from Sandhurst. Now, Sir, the next point I should like to mention was the point raised by Sardar Mangal Singh about what he was pleased to call the Indianisation of the control of the army under the new constitution. It is perfectly true that under the new scheme of reforms His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief will

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

cease to be a Member of the Government and the constitutional responsibility for defence will fall upon the Governor General alone. That is the scheme of the constitution, we cannot alter it, but I think the Honourable Member has forgotten that in the Instrument of Instructions to the Governor General he is specially enjoined to consult his Ministers on defence matters and especially on questions such as Indianization, which is actually mentioned in the Instrument of Instructions, and also with regard to the size of the Defence Budget. I believe myself that any Governor General of the future will certainly find it necessary to consult the Ministers of the future in regard to the defence policy, and if he did not do so. . . .

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member has only two minutes more.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: . . . Sir, I have nothing more to say.
(Loud Applause.)

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Defence Department' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, I wish to move motion No. 110 on page 10 . . .

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Has there been any arrangement between members of the Unattached Party? In the absence of an arrangement between members of the Party, we have to go in order of priority.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: By all means please go in that order, but there is no other unattached Member who has got a motion, who is here now; if there is an unattached Member, he will rise in his seat and defend his right, but if there is no Member present, he will not rise.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Chair will now call upon Mr. Anwar-ul-Azim. (The Honourable Member was not in his seat.)

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I point out that Mr. Anwar-ul-Azim is a member of the Independent Party and he cannot take up the time of the unattached Members.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): He is not.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: He told me himself he is.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Mr. Joshi need not be impatient, he is coming presently, in a moment.

(After a pause.) **Mr. Joshi.**

DEMAND No. 12—~~EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.~~*Social Insurance for Industrial Workers.*

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Mr. Deputy President, I move:

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

My motion is intended to draw the attention of this House and of the Government of India to the urgency of establishing a unified system of compulsory State insurance for the protection of industrial workers in this country against various risks incidental to their life.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce (Member for Industries and Labour): What did the Honourable Member say was the object of his motion?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: My motion is intended to draw attention to the urgency of establishing a unified system of compulsory State insurance against risks of various kinds incidental to the life of the industrial workers in this country.

Mr. Deputy President, in the year 1935, during the Budget discussion, I had suggested to the Government of India that they should take steps to immediately establish a system of health insurance in this country for industrial workers. Today I am asking the Government of India and the Legislature to take steps to establish a unified system of compulsory State insurance against all risks incidental to the life of the industrial worker. This change in my demand on behalf of the working classes of this country is due to a change in my opinion as to the best way of securing a system of social insurance to be established in this country. Moreover, the change is also due to the fact that the recent elections have brought about a change in the character of the Provincial Governments in this country. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Deputy President, in 1935, when I spoke on my motion, my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, stated that in making my proposal for the establishment of a health insurance, I was voicing my personal desires and not the desires of the working classes of this country. He said that the working classes of this country will not be ready to have some amount deducted from their wages as contributions to an insurance fund and he gave as an instance the effort made by the Government of India in the salt mines at Khewra. He said that the Government of India had thought of a good scheme for the working classes employed at Khewra but he found that the workers were unwilling to take advantage of that scheme. The failure of the Government of India in persuading the employees of the Khewra mines was, in the first place, due to the fact that the workers of these mines, who were very low paid, did not like any deductions to be made out of their low wages. This attitude is easily understood. But is that a reason why we should make no provision against the risks incidental to the lives of the working classes? If the wages are low and the workers are unwilling to have their low wages deducted for contributions for the insurance schemes, let us first increase their wages immediately and start the insurance schemes. If you do not want to do that, then start insurance schemes which will not require any contributions from the workers. There are many countries in the world which have established insurance schemes without any contribution from the working classes.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Which ones?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: In Great Britain itself, for a long time the workers did not pay any contribution for their old age pensions. If the Government of India does not want to increase the wages and if it does not want to establish non-contributory schemes, then I suggest to the Legislature and to the Government of India that they should be ready to deduct even from the low wages of the working classes in order that they should get protection against unprotected sickness, unprotected unemployment, unprotected childhood, motherhood and widowhood. There are people—I hope my Honourable friend the Member in charge of the Department of Industries and Labour is not one of them—who will say that the poor people have no right to have their sickness protected, to have their unemployment protected, unless they begin to get sufficiently large wages to enable deductions being made. Sir, I have pointed out why the efforts of the Government of India at Khewra failed, but there are other reasons why efforts made by the employers will fail in a voluntary scheme. Voluntary schemes have not succeeded anywhere in the world beyond a certain limit. It is because the voluntary schemes failed in Great Britain, Germany and other countries that they established compulsory schemes. It is wrong to expect that when voluntary schemes have failed in Great Britain they should succeed in India. Moreover, the failure of the Government of India at Khewra was also due to this fact that the working classes show distrust in schemes made by the employers and the scheme made by the Government of India at Khewra was not made as a Government but as employers. I, therefore, suggest to the Honourable Member in charge of the Department of Industries and Labour that the failure at Khewra should not discourage him from taking measures for the protection of the working classes.

My Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, also asked me in 1935 what I had done towards the establishment of schemes for social insurance. He asked the labour movement to say what they did.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: And the answer that I got was that the Honourable Member had brought a cut motion in this House as he is doing today.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I will give another reply today, because my last reply was not fruitful. My reply is this that I tried in my humble way for the establishment of health insurance schemes but I failed. I failed because schemes for social insurance by trade unions and by other bodies interested in the welfare of the working classes cannot succeed beyond a certain limit. That has been the experience of the world. It was because the trade union movement failed in establishing a universal system of social insurance that the Government in Great Britain introduced a compulsory State system of social insurance. Moreover, my British friends in this House should remember that when the British trade union movement started schemes for social insurance and when the friendly societies were established in Great Britain, it was not recognised as a part of the duty of the State that they should establish systems of social insurance. Those schemes of social insurance were established in Great Britain by the trade union movement and friendly societies about 100 years ago when the Government did not recognise that it was its duty to provide social insurance. The trade union movement in India has come

hundred years later when not even our Government will say that it is not their duty to protect the working classes against the risks incidental to industrial life. I, therefore, feel that my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, should not wait for the labour movement in this country to establish proper system of social insurance.

My Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, also told us in his speech what the Government of India was doing in that matter. He told us that the proposals of the Royal Commission were placed before the Standing Committee attached to his Department. My own feeling is that if the Government of India wanted proper consultation on this subject, he should have appointed a special committee of this House. The Standing Committee attached to his Department may consist of very able men and very good men too but you cannot say that they were therefore necessarily the fittest people to consider a scheme of health insurance. The Honourable Member also stated that, in consultation with the Committee, the Government of India were issuing a circular asking the views of the public as regards the desirability of collecting statistics and, secondly, the desirability of establishing experimental schemes. Statistics are quite helpful, I admit that. But statistics are not so essential that even a good scheme for social insurance must wait till we collect statistics which are not easily available. Moreover, the experience of the world has shown that experimental schemes of a voluntary character will not succeed. What is the use of trying to make other experiments again in this country. Let us learn by the experience of the world and not try to gain experience again in India and waste time. The right way of approaching this problem is to establish a unified scheme of compulsory social insurance even of a limited nature immediately. I am suggesting that a compulsory scheme should be established for this purpose, because if a voluntary scheme of social insurance is established by the employers that scheme will be based upon factory as the unit and such a scheme can never succeed. If there is such a scheme for social insurance and workers make contributions towards that scheme, and if the workers leave that factory and go to another factory, their contributions are lost. Secondly if we once begin to make experiments of this nature and every factory has its own schemes we shall have such a variety of schemes of social insurance that if after some time we try to have a state insurance, we will find it very difficult to unify these schemes in one system. Thirdly, as I have pointed out, a voluntary scheme of employers will always be distrusted by the workers. It may be said why should not trade unions start schemes. The voluntary schemes of trade unions have also a drawback. In the first place even if a trade union starts a scheme for social insurance, it is only the better paid members of the trade union who will join. That is the experience of the world, that is the experience of Great Britain. Moreover if a trade union starts a scheme, the trade union membership dwindles down in bad times when wages are reduced and unemployment prevails with the result that the number of members of these schemes dwindle down in times of depression. When in a depressed period the workers require the help of a trade union, the trade union is unable to give that help. There is a third objection to a trade union starting a voluntary scheme. In England these voluntary schemes were started by working classes through friendly societies and trade unions and there was a competition between one friendly society and another society for securing membership with the result that there was a lot of money wasted on account of the competition. These schemes also were-

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

not quite safe on account of the free competition that existed between various schemes. It is on account of these reasons, that countries like Great Britain, Germany and various other countries decided to have a compulsory scheme of state insurance.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) resumed the Chair.]

I am suggesting a scheme not only of compulsory insurance, but of State insurance. I want the scheme to be conducted and organized and managed by the Government for this purpose, that insurance schemes managed by private bodies are more costly. Insurance schemes managed by Government are less costly. That is, Sir, the experience of the world, that is the experience of Great Britain, that is the experience of United States. I will give some figures to show that Government schemes are less costly. In Great Britain, the old age pension is managed by Government and the cost of management is 3.5 per cent. The workmen's compensation is generally paid by private company and the cost of management in Great Britain is 50 per cent. of the premia. In the United States, the average cost of management of the Workmen's compensation through private companies is 37½ per cent., of the mutual companies, it is 20 per cent. and of competitive State fund it is 12½ per cent., and of exclusive State funds it is five per cent. I shall not dwell upon this point at any length. I am suggesting, Mr. President, that the scheme should not only be compulsory, but the scheme should be a State scheme.

Lastly, I am suggesting that there should be a unified scheme of social insurance covering all risks. There should be one scheme out of which sickness benefits should be paid, the benefits for unemployment should be paid, and the old age pensions should be paid. Similarly, pensions to children or to widows or to unprotected mothers should be paid. The reason is this that if there is one scheme, the cost of administration will be much less. That has been the experience of those who have tried a unified scheme. Besides the waste of competition will be also avoided. Thirdly, if there is one department managing the unified scheme of social insurance, the workers will have to go only to one place either for benefits against sickness, benefits for unemployment or for old age pensions. It has therefore been found that a unified scheme will be a much better scheme. The necessity of amalgamating the different schemes of social insurance has been felt in Great Britain. Mr. Baldwin the premier of Great Britain himself has admitted that there must be some order brought in the chaos caused by the various schemes in Great Britain. He had suggested that the old age pensions and some other schemes should be unified.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must conclude now.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I have pointed out that persons like Mr. Baldwin and Sir William Beveridge have now come to the conclusion that a unified scheme is a much better scheme. I have stated one thing that whatever have been the reasons in the past for the Government not accepting my proposal, whatever may have been the reason for their hesitation in not following a bold policy, the times have changed and now if Government propose a bold scheme

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must conclude now. He cannot be allowed any more time.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: All right, Sir. I commend my motion for the acceptance of this House.

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

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Dr. R. D. Dalal (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, with your permission,

4 P.M. I propose to address a few remarks to this Honourable House on the subject of sickness insurance of industrial workers, which comes within the scope of social insurance for industrial workers. It is quite true that the incidence of sickness is much higher in India than in Western countries; the medical facilities are much less adequate; and the wages generally paid make it impossible for the workers to get through even a short period of sickness without borrowing; so the question of making provision for workers during sickness calls for the exploration of all methods that may lead to the alleviation of the hardships due to the absence of sickness insurance scheme. But, Sir, the subject of sickness insurance is one of peculiar difficulty in India; and I feel doubtful that sickness insurance is the first subject that should be taken up in any comprehensive campaign for the amelioration of labour conditions in India. In the first place, I would point out that sickness statistical data are not available. The workers prefer to be treated by quacks, *vaid*s, and *hakims*, who have a knowledge of the indigenous system of medicine. In many industries labour is migratory; so the question of certification will present great difficulties. The scheme for subsidizing medical practitioners to settle in rural areas has so far proved a failure. Illiteracy is a great obstacle to the working of any sickness insurance scheme. Labourers do not understand the merits of such insurance; and as the level of intelligence in the labour force is not high, any contributory system of sickness insurance would be resented by the wage-earners. In the present circumstances, the burden of organizing, supervising, and working any sickness insurance scheme would fall upon Government; but the funds at the disposal of Local Governments are strictly limited, and there is also a limit to the burdens that can be placed upon the employers of labour in addition to the burdens already imposed upon them by labour legislation in recent years. Local Governments are in favour of providing increased medical and sanitary facilities, which would benefit the whole population and not the small section of industrial labour. In many industries the employers provide medical relief. In tea and coffee plantations and in all organised industrial concerns medical assistance is given free.

Sir, it is suggested that a committee should be appointed to investigate thoroughly into this matter. Personally I am strongly of the opinion that the appointment of a committee is premature, and I feel doubtful that any committee could, within a reasonable time, arrive at any result reasonably conclusive.

Mr. M. S. Anay: Sir, may I ask the Honourable Member, who has suggested the appointment of a committee now?

Dr. R. D. Dalal: I, therefore, suggest that as a beginning a sickness statistical inquiry should be instituted by the Government of India with the assistance of the standing advisory committee of the Central Legislature attached to the Department of Industries and Labour, and then a limited scheme of sickness insurance should be introduced in selected centres where medical practitioners are comparatively numerous and where hospital accommodation is adequate.

Mr. V. V. Giri (*Ganjam cum Vizagapatam: Non-Muhammadian Rural*): Sir, I rise to support the motion so ably moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi. So far as unemployment and unemployment relief are concerned, these subjects are as old as the hills, so far at least as this Assembly is concerned. It was in the year 1924 that the subject of unemployment came before the Assembly; then in the year 1926, then in 1928, and again in 1934 and also in 1935. But still we are where we were when the subject cropped up before the Assembly. Sir, it was in the year 1919 when the Government of India, which is supposed to be an original member of the League of Nations, or the League of Nations ratified an employment convention which required a member to have unemployment statistics, to provide reports every quarter stating the steps taken to combat unemployment, and so on. Nothing was done by the Government of India in the matter. On the floor of the Assembly the various Parties that sponsored Resolutions on this subject desired an all-India committee to go into this subject; but the Government of India gave a deaf ear, and in the year 1926 the late Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra stated that after the Provincial Governments have done their work and have constituted local committees, it was then time for the Government of India to appoint an all-India committee. It will be relevant, Sir, if I am permitted to refer to a few passages in the report of the Unemployment Committee of the United Provinces Government, established under the chairmanship of a very moderate gentleman, a very reasonable politician and leader, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru. Even he was of the opinion that unless there was a regular plan of action to combat unemployment, this demon of unemployment could not be driven away from this poor country of ours. On page 18 of that report, it is stated as follows:

"We are distinctly of the opinion that there are several remedial measures which can be taken only by the Government of India and in regard to which the Local Governments, whether on the Transferred side or the Reserved side, must find themselves unable to take action independently of the Government of India. The question of employment is intimately connected with the development of big industries and the development of big industries, in its turn, raises many intricate questions of policy relating to Finance, Currency, Tariffs, etc., which are clearly outside the scope of the Provincial Governments. It is conceivable also that in regard to the development of agriculture too there may arise, and there will probably arise, many questions of policy which will be beyond the purview of the Local Government We are, therefore, clearly of the opinion that whatever justification there might have been in 1926 for postponing action by the Government of India there seems to be little now, particularly if it is borne in mind that notwithstanding the hope that was expressed by the Government in 1926 and again in 1928 that the problem would be dealt with initially by Local Governments and notwithstanding the fact that in the year 1927 immediately after the debate that is to say one year after the debate in the Assembly, several Local Governments appointed provincial committees to go into the question, the problem has only tended to become more and more acute."

Under the circumstances, the Government of India deserve the censure of this House for not tackling a problem of this character. If it is possible for a country like Russia to tackle this problem in a very able way from the time the Tzar was driven to his doom, it would have been

possible for the Government of India, better constituted as they are compared to Russia, if only they had the mind and the will to tackle this problem. I may refer to a few lines in the International Survey of Social Services, 1933, issued by the International Labour Office, as to what Russia could do with reference to unemployment insurance or other insurance regarding health of workers, holidays for workers, old age pensions, and so forth. The House will realise what a responsible government can do if it has the mind to do it and if it stands by the workers of the country. Of course, as my friend here suggests, it is because we have no responsible Government in this country—we have no national Government in this country, and the present Government

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: May I ask my Honourable friend if he seriously considers the Russian Government a responsible Government?

Mr. V. V. Giri: Any Government that looks after the poor, any Government that guarantees the right to live, the right to work and the right to employment or unemployment benefits, I consider, with great respect to my Honourable friend, as a responsible Government, and I am prepared to have any Government which guarantees these rights, and I am prepared to be an honest citizen of that Government. It has been stated at p. 638:

“Social assistance in the Soviet Union is based on the citizen's right to employment or assistance from the State in case of need, and not on ‘charity’.”
 “The principal forms of public assistance for disabled persons are as follows: assistance in kind, assistance in the form of work, assistance in cash. Further legislative provision is made for the admission to invalid's homes of persons totally incapable of working by reason of old age, invalidity or chronic illness, who do not stand in need of systematic treatment and present no danger of infecting others (in this last case they are sent to hospital). Disabled and assimilated persons may also be admitted to special establishment under the education or public health authorities.”

I do feel, therefore, that it is the duty of the Government of India, if they really mean to do something to eradicate the evil of unemployment, that they must have a plan of action, a five year plan or a ten year plan, and they must have a cut and dried programme to carry that plan into effect. I consider that the Government of India must take an all-India view of these matters with respect to the state insurance proposed by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, and then have a committee of experts, representing the workers, the employers and Government interests, and that committee must sit and lay down plans of action. It is only in this way that the unemployment problem can be tackled and unemployment insurance systems established in this country.

I do not wish to go into the general question of unemployment because this motion relates to unemployment of industrial workers. Otherwise I would have been in a position to place my plan of action to eradicate unemployment in this country, not only of industrial workers, but of the agricultural workers, and, therefore, I shall confine my attention to this motion. I support the motion so ably moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, it is not a surprising thing for us to have to debate today whether or not we should ask this Government to organise social insurance for the protection of the industrial workers in this country. The necessity that has arisen for this debate is itself enough condemnation

[Prof N. G. Ranga.]

of this Government which has been here for the last 150 years and which considers itself to its own satisfaction that it is a more responsible Government than the Russian Government in the U. S. S. R. We do not have any sort of compulsory insurance in this country, not even life insurance.

In England, which certainly is not a socialistic country, where even today the conservatives are ruling the roost and are trying to oppress the workers in every possible manner, there are all kinds of social insurance which are organised by the state itself, which are significant by their absence in this country, and the advocacy of which seems to be rather a revolutionary step to this Government of India. We have not yet even begun to talk of the establishment of either trade boards or labour exchanges or a minimum wage for industrial workers, not to speak of the millions and millions of agricultural workers. While in England they are trying to establish unemployment insurance even for that small section of labour employed in agriculture, in India we have not had even an attempt made by this Government of India or by any Provincial Government at least to gather statistics regarding the incidence of unemployment. There is family endowment scheme in England, whereas we do not have any sort of protection, not only for the unemployed families, but also to the famished and maimed families whose numbers are growing every day all over the country. There are labour exchanges in England, private as well as public decasualisation schemes, to see that unemployment is minimised as far as possible, and not only unemployment relief schemes, but also industrialisation schemes carried on by the State in order to provide work for the unemployed. But in this country the only thing that we have heard of as an attempt on the part of the Government of India to relieve unemployment in this country was their New Delhi construction scheme, the disastrous results of which the country has known for a very long time and to its cost. There is old age pension and old age insurance in England, and this was not the creation of the British Government either. It was instituted, I think, for the first time in Germany by that great autocrat, Count Bismarck; and even this Government, which considers itself to be less autocratic than Count Bismarck, has not thought of establishing even this old age insurance. What can we expect from this Government but to say "We cannot undertake these schemes: they are too costly"? What is not costly? Only this morning we were debating about the cost of our defence forces in this country. Has this Government ever tried to be parsimonious in regard to their defence services? Have this Government ever tried to economise in their expenditure on the defence services? No. Why? It is because as one Honourable friend put it this morning, defence services are needed to maintain the British Imperialism in this country. But this Imperialism has somehow or other managed to pull on without having to organise any of these social insurances: they care not for the welfare of the masses, although their sufferings are growing day after day. We have asked in vain for the gathering of unemployment statistics in this country. Government would not provide us any such machinery for gathering those statistics. Our demand was a very moderate one: we only wanted an inquiry committee: that has not been granted to us. They are going to establish a special research bureau, with another foreign expert, I dare say, to preside over it, called an Economic Adviser to this Government, but I do not know whether the Government of India propose to make use of this new office to gather any statistics at all. But there were attempts made in this country to make some sort of estimate

of the incidence of unemployment in this country. If you take both agricultural as well as industrial workers together, Mahatma Gandhi has once made an estimate and it came to 50 millions—taking half-employed, under-employed and the totally unemployed together: that was the estimate of Mahatma Gandhi. My Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, may smile at the mention of Mahatma Gandhi as an authority on these problems, but I can assure him that Mahatma Gandhi is one of the best authorities as far as the rural Indian conditions and employment and unemployment questions are concerned. Prof. Radha Kamal Mukherjee is the head of the Economics Department at the Lucknow University, and he has made another estimate, and his estimate comes to about 45 millions of people. I also have made an estimate; it is a little more moderate than either of these estimates, and it comes to 40 millions of people.

Well, Sir, the population thus unemployed in this country is just as big as the total population of Great Britain and Ireland. What is this Government doing? What have they done for the protection of these people? Have they provided unemployment insurance to them? Never. Have they at least provided them with work when they are unemployed? Never. Only when, according to the stringent provisions of their Famine Code, famine is supposed to prevail and therefore famine is declared to be prevailing in a particular area, the Government take upon themselves the responsibility of providing work for the unemployed; even when real red hot famine prevails devastating hundreds and hundreds of people and millions of cattle, even then Government is most unwilling to agree to notice the existence of famine, and, therefore, how can we expect this Government to take notice of the prevalence of unemployment of a disastrous kind in different parts of India. How will these 40 millions of people live? Who is maintaining them? Who is feeding them? Who is giving them any work? Sir, it is a well established theory that an unemployed man is a nuisance to society, he is a nuisance to himself, he rapidly degenerates in his efficiency, he goes down in his mental equipment, his mental equipment gets itself so hopelessly demoralised that he becomes useless both to himself and to society after a long period of unemployment. But yet we are not even given the assurance that statistics of unemployment will be gathered in this country.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Why do you want statistics? You know them already?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Sir, the argument is trotted out that the reforms are going to come, the new legislatures are going to sit, it is more the duty of the provinces to undertake the social insurance schemes

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Congressmen have got majorities in some provinces.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: The Congress itself has got majorities in a great majority of the provinces in this country. What does that mean? It is only a confession on the part of this Government of India of the failure of their duty towards the famished millions of this country. Have they at all done anything for them till now? No, nothing. But they expect the Congress to take on the rotten legacy left behind by the Government and help the unemployed people

Mr. M. S. Aney: Do you mean to suggest that they have voluntarily done it?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: They have been forced, of course, to part with just a wee-bit of power, and even that is not so much, and it is over that we are now quarrelling amongst ourselves whether we can accept office and make use of that power or not, whether it is worth while to have that power or not. Well, Sir, even if we were to accept ministries, I don't think that the funds placed at our disposal would be enough to enable our ministers to tackle those problems as they ought to do, and so the Central Government itself must be prepared to discharge its own responsibility to back them up with funds.

Sir, my demand for unemployment insurance is a very moderate one. In England the dole comes to approximately Rs. 60 a month. I do not want even Rs. 30 a month. My demand for a minimum wage for an industrial worker need not be, according to me, even Rs. 10 a month. I shall be quite content with Rs. 0-1-9 per day. It will not work out to more than Rs. 4 a month. That is not very much, but I am told that Rs. 4 a month or Rs. 50 per head per annum for 40 millions of people would come to a tremendous sum, and that this Government would become bankrupt if so much amount is provided, and it is said that it is a revolutionary scheme. I would like my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, or any other representative of this Government to go to the International Labour Conference or any other World Conference and plead before them that this Government is not prepared, is not competent, is not able to provide £3 of annual subsistence for the unemployed family of this country. I know what sort of sneer those countries would hurl at this Government. How can this Government claim to be civilized? How can this Government claim to be a real Government at all? Yes, it is a real Government in putting us down, in persecuting us, in harassing us, but it is not a real Government to provide even £3 per annum for each unemployed person in this country

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

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I thought I had a little more time, Sir. Very well. I shall finish presently.

We want sickness insurance, but we are told we have no statistics. It is the Government which should have collected these statistics. They have not done it. We have not got any precedents, there are no voluntary schemes, and the few voluntary schemes that have been organized have not been successful, and, therefore, they do not want to do anything at all. I can quite see that point, because even the little money they have spent on hospitals in this country has been more to the benefit of the urban classes. Only 20 lakhs was granted for rural sanitation in the Madras Presidency in 1921 because of the non-co-operation movement. Today that sum remains the same, and not a pie more is paid. It is not because there is no money, but because neither the Government of India nor the Provincial Governments wish to do anything whatsoever in this direction. My friend, Sir Frank Noyce, may claim to his credit a number of laws, a number of non-interfering and non-troublesome laws. Of course, my friend the Baronet from Bombay has had many occasions to protest against his readiness to pass those laws. Those laws are needed, quite true, but they were not even the minimum, they were less than the minimum. The most minimum provision he could have made was to provide unemployment and sickness insurance schemes, minimum wages, trade

boards and family insurance. He has failed to do any of these, and if the Government allows the masses to go on like this, I know what it will cost to the landlords in this country

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's time is up.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I shall conclude now, Sir. If this Government really wish to save their own skin, if this Government wish that their name should go down to history as having awakened themselves at least at the last minute, they must certainly accept this demand of ours, and agree at the earliest possible moment to take the necessary steps to organise these social insurance schemes.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury (Bengal: Landholders): Sir, I have very great pleasure in supporting the motion moved by my friend, Mr. Joshi, because I am strongly of the opinion that this is a very necessary and legitimate measure and that it ought to receive the serious consideration of the Government of India. Sir, I had the privilege to go to England as a delegate to some of the International Conferences, and I may say here that wherever we went, the first and foremost question that came before us was the unemployment problem, but here in this country, even the Government are reluctant to consider it. They are unable to collect even statistics relating to the unemployed. And as has been stated by my friend, Prof. Ranga, it is indeed very deplorable that after 150 years of British rule in this country, our Government are not even in a position to place before us the real statistics of unemployment. Who is responsible for these unemployed people, and who is responsible for this unemployment? It is the Government that is responsible. Everywhere, in every part of the world, whenever there is unemployment, the Government have taken the matter in their own hands. It is only in this unfortunate country that we are deprived of that benefit and today we are faced with a situation the like of which we have not seen before. Even in Delhi, even in Calcutta, we do not know how many people are unemployed. I myself started this question of unemployment and sickness insurance a little bit with the deliberate intention of eradicating the real evil in this country. I mean, terrorism. Times without number the Government, and particularly, my Honourable friend, the Home Member, have said that this terrorism in Bengal is partly due to the unemployment problem. If such be the case, I hope that the Government of India will take active measures to eradicate this evil, and I hope that if those people who are sick, if those people who are unemployed, can get a chance of having something, I do not think, as my Honourable friend, Prof. Ranga, has shown, that the Government will become the poorer. If they can maintain a top-heavy administration,—I am really surprised that my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, put the question, is the Russian Government responsible? May I ask the same Member, is this Government responsible to the people? Does it pay any attention to the public demand? Please have a kindly look at these unemployed starving people being ground down by the pangs of hunger. I think the Honourable Member will realise that this is not a matter to be ignored. It is a matter which requires serious consideration, and, from that point of view, I would request my Honourable friend in charge of the Department of Industries and Labour to take up this matter before he retires and attempt to find some solution. Then he will receive the blessings of all the unemployed in this country. I support the cut of Mr. Joshi.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Sir, before I offer any comments on the motion which is before the House, I desire to pay a tribute to the memory of my distinguished predecessor, Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra, whose recent death has, I know, been deeply regretted by all sections of this House. That tribute comes appropriately on a motion dealing with labour questions, for he was greatly interested in all questions affecting labour, not only during his tenure of office as Member in charge of the Department of Industries and Labour, but also after he left this country and became High Commissioner for India. He represented the Government of India very frequently at the International Labour Conferences and was also a Member of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office. I know that he made a deep impression there by his great ability, his obvious sincerity and the gift of quiet humour which he possessed.

Sir, last year, when Mr. Joshi and I were discussing this question, I said that the appropriate title for our annual duet would be "I will give you the keys of Heaven". I explained that not being Saint Peter, I did not possess those keys. I have been looking round for another title for this year's discussion. If Honourable Members generally share the taste possessed by some distinguished Members of this House for the form of fiction known as "thrillers", they will know of a novel by "Sapper" called "The Last Round". This, Sir, is the last round that I shall have with my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi (Laughter), and before I take the button off my foil for our annual fencing match, I should like to take advantage of what may be the last opportunity that I shall have to say that, however much I disagree with him as I very frequently do, I have the greatest admiration for the ability and sincerity with which he has fought the cause of labour in this House (Cheers) during the five years I have been Member in charge of the Department which has to deal with labour and with him. The trouble with Mr. Joshi (Laughter) is that he only sees a part of the field, that part of the field which lies to the extreme left. I, Sir, endeavour to see the whole of it, though I admit that my vision may be imperfect. Never have I felt that failing in Mr. Joshi to a greater extent than I have this afternoon. But before I proceed to deal with what he said specifically, I should like to remind the House that no subject has been discussed more frequently on the floor of this House than the question of social insurance. It is a hardy annual. Mr. Joshi always brings it forward every year either in the form of a cut motion, or, if, as was the case last year, he cannot get that in, he then raises it in the general discussion on the Finance Bill. But those are not the only occasions on which in recent years the question has been discussed and very fully discussed in this House. I would remind the House that there was a full dress debate in 1934 on the question of unemployment. There were lengthy discussions in 1933 on the Draft Convention and Recommendation regarding invalidity, old age and widows and orphans' insurance, which had been adopted at the Seventeenth Session of the International Labour Conference, and there were similar discussions in 1935 on unemployment insurance and various forms of relief for the unemployed on which a Draft Convention and Recommendation had been adopted by the International Labour Conference at its Eighteenth Session. On both those occasions, this House, after a very full and interesting debate, recommended to the Governor General in Council that the Draft Convention should not be adopted and that the Recommendation should

not be accepted. In those circumstances, it must be obvious to the House that there is very little fresh that I can say today. What I would say is that Mr. Joshi has strayed even further from realities this afternoon than he usually does. He has completely ignored the financial and the constitutional implications of his motion, and so have the speakers who followed him. I would remind the House that the Whitley Commission said that no scheme of unemployment insurance had been placed before them which was at all practicable. I will read to the House what they actually did say:

"So far as the relief of the unemployed is concerned, we received some suggestions for the establishment of a statutory system of unemployment insurance but we cannot regard any national system of insurance with which we are familiar as feasible at present in India. With the existing turnover and in the absence of an industrial population, which is both permanent and regular, the risk is not a calculable one. Therefore, even if the workers were able and willing to contribute (*Mr. Joshi has assured us several times that the workers are neither able nor willing*) there is no basis on which a scheme could be built."

As regards old age insurance, the Whitley Commission made no reference at all to it, obviously because they knew that it was out of the question. As I said, we had a debate on that subject two years ago. In the course of that debate, I pointed out that to give a pension of Rs. 5 a month to those classes of industrial and agricultural workers who were covered by the Draft Convention, that is workers over 60 years of age, would cost Rs. 7 crores a year. I asked where the money to pay for such a scheme was to come from.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury: From the pockets of the State.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I would remind the House that the pockets of the State mean the pockets of the taxpayer, in fact, Mr. Lahiri Chaudhury's own capacious pocket. I had thought that, in all probability, my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, in raising this question this afternoon, would deal only with the question of health insurance which the Whitley Commission did recognise was well worthv of further examination. I thought I should hear the old familiar cry "What have the Government of India done about it and what has been the result of the inquiries which the Honourable Member in charge of the Department of Industries and Labour told the House last year were in progress". I can tell my Honourable friend, if he is still interested, the result of those inquiries.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Those Governments are disappearing!

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: What we put before the Local Governments was the choice between the statistical inquiry contemplated by the Whitley Commission or the alternative policy also suggested by that Commission of building on the actual experience gained in the operation of small experimental schemes. We have received their replies and shall be very glad to give my Honourable friend a summary of them if he would like to have it. I will consider the question whether, and, if so, in what form they might be published. The information contained in them should, I think, be of considerable use to those who have to consider this question in the future. The Local Governments were in general agreement with the Government of India that the statistical inquiry would be too elaborate in character, almost impossible of execution, and, even if it could be carried out, would not yield results commensurate with the time and

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

trouble involved. It may be argued that we could at any rate get some experience from Government institutions and other well run establishments where the employees are much better treated than they can hope to be under any scheme of insurance, but such experience would obviously be unrepresentative, especially in the case of Government employees where the comparison would be further vitiated by the fact that they have to be medically examined before they are taken on and are, therefore, a selected class. A statistical inquiry proving impossible, the next question was the extent to which it might be feasible to build on actual experience of small schemes. Unfortunately, there is very little actual experience available. We were told that there were only 14 schemes in operation, and, even in regard to those, the information supplied was incomplete in many cases. That, Sir, is unfortunately the position. My Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, says, "Very well, do without any experience in regard to all these schemes, not only health insurance, but old age, invalidity, women's and orphans' pensions and any other risk that may occur to the industrial workers". Why only the industrial workers he has not explained. Why should the industrial worker get an old age pension and not the rural worker? We all know what the fate of the man is, who builds a house and does not count the cost. He usually ends in the bankruptcy court. I hope I have shown the House that the financial obligations which Mr. Joshi would have the Government of India undertake are such as would crush any Government. If the Government were to undertake them they would be undertaking an incalculable liability, one of the very highest order of magnitude.

I come now to the constitutional implications of Mr. Joshi's motion. Mr. Joshi, and the speakers who followed him,—Mr. Giri, Prof. Ranga and Mr. Lahiri Chaudhuri,—have entirely overlooked the changes which will come into operation on the 1st of April, that is, next month. When Provincial Autonomy comes into operation on that date, this subject will cease to be the concern of the Central Government except in so far as they are able to legislate concurrently.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it not possible for the Central Government either to carry on inquiries or supplement the provincial resources or to do both?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: As I explained, from the 1st of April the Central Government will have nothing to do with this question beyond being able to legislate for it concurrently. The executive power will rest with the Local Governments, and it will be they who will have to find the money for any schemes of this character. That has been my position for the last five years. I, at any rate, have, if my Honourable friends have not, realised what was coming and that it would have been unfair to put a burden on the Local Governments, which are about to come into being, a burden which they would find entirely beyond their capacity. It will not be the Government of India, but it will be the Governments composed very possibly of members of the Party of my Honourable friends opposite which will be pressed to undertake these schemes and to put them into operation. I may, however, offer a crumb of comfort to my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, who has told us on more than one occasion that he had rather more confidence in the Government of India than he had in some other possible alternatives

Mr. N. M. Joshi: In the future Federal Government.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: In the future Federal Government than in some Provincial Governments. Sir, I will read to the House an extract from the debate which took place on the 13th of February, 1935, on the question of unemployment insurance. I said, then, Sir, that a point on which I wished to lay stress was this. It was very easy for us here to make a gesture towards labour; it was easy then and it is just as easy today, but who is going to foot the bill? This is how the report of the debate goes:

"An Honourable Member : We.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce : I rather think an Honourable Member said 'we'.

An Honourable Member : Yes.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce : But who are we?

Mr. S. Satyamurti : The people of this country."

I would suggest to my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, that this time next year he should get the representatives of labour—there will, I think, be several of them—in the Madras Assembly to get up in that Assembly and ask the Government of the day what they have done towards the establishment of insurance schemes for old age pensions, widows' and orphans' pensions, invalidity pensions, unemployment insurance and health insurance. I shall be very interested, Sir, in a distant country, to know what the answer is; and I can assure Mr. Joshi and I can assure the House that if my Honourable friends opposite, when the time comes for them to be in a position to formulate and implement the schemes on which Mr. Joshi sets such store, have better luck than I have had, I shall not grudge it them, I shall be prepared unreservedly to give them the credit for anything they can do in the directions that Mr. Joshi has so much at heart. I can assure him that I have every sympathy with him in his desire for the establishment of insurance schemes in this country. We all know that there is nothing so conducive to discontent as uncertainty,—uncertainty in regard to health, uncertainty in regard to death, uncertainty in regard to one's future in one's old age, uncertainty in regard to the duration of one's job. I very much hope that it will be possible in the days to come to get on with these schemes. I will only add an expression of my personal opinion about one of them—the one which will, I think, be the first to come and the one which is most urgently desirable, and that is health insurance. I think that, there, the most feasible way of proceeding will be by encouraging employers to start schemes of this character, and possibly the time will come when it will be found that it is necessary to compel them to adopt them. What prevents progress at present is the lack of any real demand or support for these schemes on the part of any of the three parties concerned,—the Provincial Governments, employers and labour. I am quite prepared to admit that the opposition of employers is not a strong argument; one knows that they are bound to dislike schemes of this character as they obviously mean an

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

addition to wages in some form or other and an increase in costs; one can discount their opposition accordingly. The apathy or opposition of the workers is a strong argument but it is not as strong an argument as it looks at first sight. Even in England, as I think Mr. Joshi reminded us, only a section of the workers, before the compulsory insurance came in, would have joined any voluntary schemes. But the fact is—and one cannot get away from it—that employers and Local Governments can point to straitened finances at present and this is a consideration from the workers' point of view also.

To sum up, progress will require much more public opinion behind it than is afforded by labour leaders, even labour leaders as well intentioned as my Honourable friends, Mr. Joshi and Mr. Giri. It is for them to educate public opinion. When that opinion becomes stronger, one can only hope that the difficulties will be found to be less formidable than the replies that we have had from Local Governments in regard to the matter of health insurance would suggest. They say that constant dripping wears away the hardest stone. I can assure Mr. Joshi that it is not I who am the stone in this case. It is now for him to continue the dripping process on the Local Governments. They, Sir, are the stone, not the Government of India. There are two small points which I might mention before I sit down. My Honourable friend, Mr. Giri, thinks that this question can only be solved by Russian methods.

Mr. V. V. Giri: By any just methods.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Well, he held up Russia to us as an example, and I gathered that he suggested that the methods adopted in Russia to deal with this problem should also be adopted here. (Interruption by Mr. K. Santhanam.)—I am not giving way except to the Honourable Member to whom I am replying, and that is Mr. Giri. I would remind him that Russian methods in this respect would also mean Russian methods in other respects, and I doubt, if he and I were in Russia, whether either of us would be in this House amicably discussing this question. (Hear, hear.) Both he and Prof. Ranga wandered into the question of unemployment generally and the efforts made to deal with it. I am not going to follow them in that discussion as it is not relevant to the purpose of the motion: I only wish to correct one statement by Prof. Ranga who accused me, if I remember correctly, of admitting that the only thing the Government of India had done for unemployment was the Delhi construction scheme. That, Sir, is very far from being what I said. What I actually said was that the Government of India could not do very much to relieve unemployment directly except in the central areas and central services, and I did point out that we had embarked on a considerable building scheme in Delhi,—not the original construction scheme, but the recent extensions—and also that we had spent a good deal of money on civil aviation. What I also pointed out was that the Government of India had done their best in regard to unemployment generally by their policy of discriminating protection, of revenue duties which had reached a high level, and by the direct encouragement they had given to small industries through the Stores Department. My friend, Prof. Ranga, quoted only half a sentence and left out the rest of a whole paragraph.

I trust, Sir, that if this motion was brought forward with a view to eliciting information, my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, will think that it has served its purpose; if it was brought forward to elicit an expression of sympathy from me, he has had that; and if it was brought forward as a censure on Government, I have, I hope, convinced the House that it is entirely unjustified. (Applause.)

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

“That the demand under the head ‘Executive Council’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

The motion was negatived.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 8th March, 1937.