

12th February 1937

**THE  
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES**

**(Official Report)**

---

**Volume I, 1937**

*(25th January to 19th February, 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**

**M89LAD**

# 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 SARDAR 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.

# CONTENTS.

VOLUME I.—25th January to 19th February, 1937.

	PAGES.		PAGES.
<b>MONDAY, 25TH JANUARY, 1937,—</b>		<b>MONDAY, 25TH JANUARY, 1937,—<i>contd.</i></b>	
Members Sworn . . . . .	1	The Land Customs (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	184
Questions and Answers . . . . .	2—117	The Code of Civil Procedure (Second Amendment) Bill (Insertion of new section 44-A)—Recommitted to Select Committee . . . . .	184—85
Unstarred Questions and Answers . . . . .	117—25	The Arbitration (Protocol and Convention) Bill—Referred to Select Committee . . . . .	185
Statements laid on the Table . . . . .	125—57	The Indian Lac Cess (Second Amendment) Bill—Passed . . . . .	185—86
Deaths of Maulvi Badi-uz-Zaman and U Ba Si . . . . .	157—58	The Hindu Women's Rights to Property Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee . . . . .	186
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Official interference in elections at Moradabad—Ruled out of order . . . . .	158—59		
Report of the Government Delegates at the twentieth session of the International Labour Conference, laid on the table . . . . .	159—81	<b>TUESDAY, 26TH JANUARY, 1937,—</b>	
Panel of chairmen . . . . .	182	Questions and Answers . . . . .	187—226
The Durgah Khawaja Saheb Bill . . . . .	182	Unstarred Questions and Answers . . . . .	226—31
Loyal congratulations to His Majesty King George VI, Emperor of India, upon His accession and an assurance of devotion to His Royal Person . . . . .	182	The Insurance Bill—Introduced . . . . .	232
Motion <i>re</i> Election of the Standing Committee for the Department of Commerce—Adopted . . . . .	182—83	Resolution <i>re</i> —	
The Repealing and Amending Bill—Withdrawn . . . . .	183	Draft Convention of the International Labour Conference <i>re</i> maintenance of rights under invalidity, old-age and widows' and orphans' Insurance—Adopted . . . . .	232—33
The Indian Boilers (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	183	Draft Convention of the International Labour Conference <i>re</i> annual holidays with pay—Adopted . . . . .	233—49
The Indian Electricity (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	183		

	PAGES.		PAGES.
<b>WEDNESDAY, 27TH JANUARY, 1937,—</b>		<b>MONDAY, 1st FEBRUARY, 1937,—<i>contd.</i></b>	
Statements laid on the table . . . . .	251—52	The Contempt of Courts (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	340
Demands for Supplementary Grants . . . . .	252—64	The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	340
<b>THURSDAY, 28TH JANUARY, 1937,—</b>		Amendment of Indian Legislative Rules—Referred to a Committee . . . . .	341—87
Short Notice Question and Answer . . . . .	265—68	The Land Customs (Amendment) Bill—Passed . . . . .	387—92
The Arya Marriage Validation Bill—Postponed . . . . .	268—70	The Indian Boilers (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee . . . . .	392—94
The Hindu Marriage Validity Bill—Discussion on the motion to refer to Select Committee not concluded . . . . .	270—320	The Indian Electricity (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee . . . . .	394—96
<b>FRIDAY, 29TH JANUARY, 1937,—</b>		<b>TUESDAY, 2ND FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>	
Short Notice Question and Answer . . . . .	321	Members Sworn . . . . .	397
Governor General's assent to Bills . . . . .	321—22	Questions and Answers . . . . .	397—402
The Code of Civil Procedure (Second Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the report of the Select Committee . . . . .	322	The Insurance Bill—Referred to Select Committee . . . . .	402—16
The Arbitration (Protocol and Convention) Bill—Presentation of the report of the Select Committee . . . . .	322	The Indian Railways (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee . . . . .	416—28
Resolution <i>re</i> interference from Public Servants in the ensuing Elections—Adopted, as amended . . . . .	322—23	<b>WEDNESDAY, 3RD FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>	
Statement of Business . . . . .	323—25	Questions and Answers . . . . .	429—39
<b>MONDAY, 1ST FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>		Demands for Supplementary Grants in respect of Railways . . . . .	437—66
Member Sworn . . . . .	327	<b>THURSDAY, 4TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>	
Message from H. E. The Governor General . . . . .	327	Members Sworn . . . . .	467
Questions and Answers . . . . .	327—37	Amendment of Indian Legislative Rules—Presentation of the Report of the Assembly Committee . . . . .	467
Statements laid on the Table . . . . .	337—38	The Hindu Marriage Validity Bill—Motion to refer to Select Committee, negatived . . . . .	467—85
Election of the Standing Committee for the Department of Education, Health and Lands . . . . .	338—40		

	PAGES.
<b>THURSDAY, 4TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—contd.</b>	
The Hindu Women's Rights to Property Bill—Passed . . . . .	485—515
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill (Amendment of sections 30, 34, 34A and 35)—Discussion on the motion to refer to Select Committee not concluded . . . . .	515—20
Appendix "A" . . . . .	521—28
<b>FRIDAY, 5TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>	
Questions and Answers . . . . .	529—33
Statements laid on the table . . . . .	533—46
Message from H. E. the Governor General . . . . .	547
Statement of Business . . . . .	547—48
<b>MONDAY, 8TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>	
Member Sworn . . . . .	549
Questions and Answers . . . . .	549—50
The Indian Naval Armament (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	550
Amendment of the Indian Legislative rules . . . . .	551—607
<b>TUESDAY, 9TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>	
Members Sworn . . . . .	609
Questions and Answers . . . . .	609—12
The Indian Boilers (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee . . . . .	612
The Indian Electricity (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee . . . . .	612
Amendment of the Indian Legislative Rules . . . . .	612—16
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Passed as Amended . . . . .	617—38
The Contempt of Courts (Amendment) Bill—Passed . . . . .	638—41

	PAGES.
<b>TUESDAY, 9TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—contd.</b>	
The Code of Civil Procedure (Second Amendment) Bill—Insertion of new section 44A—Passed as amended . . . . .	641—47
The Arbitration (Protocol and Convention) Bill—Passed . . . . .	647—60
The Code of Civil Procedure (Third Amendment) Bill—Amendment of section 60—Passed as amended . . . . .	650—58
<b>WEDNESDAY, 10TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>	
Member Sworn . . . . .	659
Message from H. E. the Governor General . . . . .	659
Election of Members to the Standing Committee on Emigration . . . . .	659—60
The Repealing and Amending Bill—Introduced . . . . .	660
The Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	660
Resolution <i>re</i> creation of a separate Road Fund for the purposes of Road Development—Adopted as amended . . . . .	660—714
The Manœuvres Field Firing and Artillery Practice Bill—Referred to Select Committee . . . . .	714—15
<b>THURSDAY, 11TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>	
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill (Amendment of sections 30, 34, 34A and 35)—Motion to refer to Select Committee, negatived . . . . .	717—56
The Indian Arms (Amendment) Bill—Discussion on the motion to refer to Select Committee not concluded . . . . .	757—66

	PAGES.		PAGES.
<b>FRIDAY, 12TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>		<b>FRIDAY, 19TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>	
Questions and Answers . . . . .	767—72	Questions and Answers . . . . .	879—86
Statements laid on the Table . . . . .	772—74	Unstarred Questions and Answers . . . . .	886—91
Message from H. E. the Governor General . . . . .	774	Notification referred to in the Resolution <i>re</i> Emigration to Burma . . . . .	891
Statement of Business . . . . .	774—75	Statement of Business . . . . .	891
Resolution <i>re</i> Revision of Pension Rules for Inferior Services—Withdrawn . . . . .	775—87	The Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	891
<b>TUESDAY, 16TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>		The Indian Tea Cess (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	891—92
Member Sworn . . . . .	789	The Indian Army (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	892
Questions and Answers . . . . .	789—801	The Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking) Bill—Passed as amended . . . . .	892—97
Unstarred Questions and Answers . . . . .	801—03	The Indian Boilers (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended . . . . .	898—99
Message from H. E. the Governor General . . . . .	803	The Indian Electricity (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended . . . . .	899—900
Presentation of the Railway Budget for 1937-38 . . . . .	804—12	The Indian Naval Armament (Amendment) Bill—Passed . . . . .	900—02
Committee on Petitions . . . . .	812—13	The Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Bill—Passed . . . . .	902—03
Election of the Standing Committee for the Department of Industries and Labour . . . . .	813—14	Resolution <i>re</i> Emigration to Burma—Adopted . . . . .	903—04
The Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking) Bill—Introduced . . . . .	814		
<b>THURSDAY, 18TH FEBRUARY, 1937,—</b>			
Statements laid on the Table . . . . .	815—16		
The Railway Budget—General Discussion . . . . .	816—78		

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 12th February, 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.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

### THIRD CLASS TOURING CARS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

390. \***Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta** (on behalf of Babu Baijnath Bajoria):

(a) Is it a fact that there are only three third class touring cars on the East Indian Railway? If not, what is the number of such cars?

(b) Is it a fact that several times these touring cars could not be supplied as the number was too small to meet the public demand?

(c) Are Government prepared to take steps to increase the number of such touring cars on the East Indian Railway at an early date?

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

(c) The question of constructing additional third class tourist cars is being looked into.

### RESERVATION OF INTERMEDIATE AND THIRD CLASS SEATS ON RAILWAYS.

391. \***Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta** (on behalf of Babu Baijnath Bajoria).

(a) Will Government state the names of the stations at which the system of reservation of seats for intermediate and third class passengers is in force?

(b) What has been the income to railways from such reservation fees at different stations since this system was introduced?

(c) Are Government aware that there is a widespread feeling of resentment that the reservation fee of four annas per seat is far too excessive?

(d) Do Government intend to reduce this reservation fee to two annas per seat at an early date? If not, why not?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** (a) So far as Government are aware, the system is in force, in some cases only for third class, at Howrah, Dehra Dun, Hardwar, Rikhikesh and Sealdah.

(b) The only information available is in regard to reservations at Howrah for the months of April and May, 1936, the amount recovered being approximately Rs. 2,900.

(c) No.

(d) This is a matter which Government must leave to Railway Administrations to decide. It is believed that on certain Railways the question has been discussed at meetings of the Advisory Committee.

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta:** May I know what is the reservation fee for the first and second classes?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** I could not say definitely without notice. I think it is eight annas.

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta:** Does not the Honourable Member think that if this is the fee for the first and second classes, then proportionately the reservation fee for the third class is too excessive?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** No, I do not think the proportion could be worked out on the proportionate fares.

#### IMPORT OF VEGETABLE OIL AND ITS ADULTERATION WITH GHEE.

392. **\*Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta** (on behalf of Babu Baijnath Bajoria):  
(a) Will Government lay on the table a statement showing the quantities and value of foreign vegetable oil imported into this country during each of the last five years?

(b) Are Government aware that such imported vegetable oil is sold as *ghee*, or in adulteration with *ghee*?

(c) Are Government aware that such passing off as, or adulteration with, *ghee* is detrimental to human health?

(d) What steps Government have taken to prevent such passing off, or adulteration?

(e) What are the nutritious properties of this vegetable oil as compared with those of *ghee*?

(f) Are Government prepared to take steps to prohibit the import of this vegetable oil in the interest of public health?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** (a) A statement is laid on the table.

(b) to (f). The Honourable Member is referred to the information supplied in connection with Mr. Sri Prakasa's starred question No. 532 on the 22nd September, 1936, and Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant's starred question No. 1285 on the 15th October, 1936.

*Statement showing the imports of "vegetable products" (vegetable ghee, vegetable fat, etc.) into British India by sea during the last five years.*

Year.	Quantity.		Value.
		Cwts.	Rs.
1931-32	.	116,849	42,41,637
1932-33	.	36,659	13,45,725
1933-34	.	2,649	1,03,168
1934-35	.	4,772	1,35,924
1935-36	.	5,144	1,64,873

**RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF INDIAN GOODS.**

398. \***Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta** (on behalf of Babu Baijnath Bajoria):  
 (a) Will Government state in detail the restrictions imposed by various foreign countries against exports of Indian goods to those countries during each of the last three years?

(b) What has been the effect of such restrictions on Indian exports to those countries during the same period?

(c) Have Government imposed any counter restrictions on imports to India from such countries? If so, what are they? If not, why not?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** (a) The Honourable Member is referred to the list of restrictive measures mentioned in the reply given to Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar's starred question No. 1003 on the 9th March, 1936, which contains information up to 1935. The list is being brought up to date and will be placed in the Library when ready. The restrictions are of a general nature and are not imposed against India alone.

(b) Such restrictions hamper trade, but it is impossible to give a comprehensive reply in the form of an answer to a question asked on the floor of the House.

(c) The reply to the first portion is in the negative. As regards the second portion, the attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given by me to the supplementary question of Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar arising out of Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar's starred question No. 186 during the autumn Session of 1935.

**DISASTERS IN COAL MINES IN INDIA.**

394. \***Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta** (on behalf of Babu Baijnath Bajoria):  
 (a) Will Government give the following details regarding disasters in the coal mines in India during the last three years:

- (i) the number of such disasters;
- (ii) the names of the collieries where such disasters took place;
- (iii) the number of persons (males, females and children, separately) killed and wounded in each of such disasters; and
- (iv) which of these collieries were under European management and which under Indian management?

(b) What steps have Government taken to prevent such disasters in future?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) So far as the years 1935 and 1936 are concerned, I would refer the Honourable Member to the replies given by me on the 25th January, 1937, to parts (a) to (c) of Mr. Amarendra Nath. Chattopadhyaya's question No. 216, Particulars for 1934 will be found in the report of the Chief Inspector of Mines for that year. Particulars of the number of persons seriously injured in each accident are not readily available, but the following figures give the total number of persons killed and injured during 1934:

	Men.	Women.
Killed . . . . .	193	16
Injured . . . . .	630	62

The employment and the presence underground of children (*i.e.*, persons below 15 years of age) are prohibited under the Mines Act.

(b) The greater part of the Coal Mines Regulations is designed with a view to minimising the risk of accidents in collieries, and a large part of the work of the Mines Inspectorate is devoted to this task. So far as recent action is concerned, the Indian Mines Act was amended during the last Delhi Session in order to enable further emergency measures to be taken to ensure safety in coal mines. Three sets of temporary regulations have been issued under the Act as amended. The whole question of safety in coal mines is now under investigation by an expert committee.

#### REDUCTION OF THE RATE FOR TRANSPORT OF DRY CATTLE ON RAILWAYS.

395. \***Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta** (on behalf of Babu Baijnath Bajoria):

(a) Will Government state which of the Railways have reduced the rate for transport of dry cattle, and to what extent?

(b) Is it a fact that some Railways have refused to make any reduction for this traffic? If so, why?

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan:** (a) and (b). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar's starred question No. 15 and Mr. Ghansham Singh Gupta's starred question No. 41 on the 25th January, 1937.

#### SLAUGHTER OF COWS AND CALVES IN INDIA.

396. \***Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta** (on behalf of Babu Baijnath Bajoria):

(a) Will Government state the numbers of cows and calves slaughtered in India during each of the last three years?

(b) Is it not a fact that a large number of prime and milch cows and calves are slaughtered in India every year?

(c) What steps have Government taken to prevent the indiscriminate slaughter of the cattle wealth of this country?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** (a) It is regretted that the information is not available.

(b) Enquiries recently made in the Presidency Towns do not bear out such a conclusion.

(c) The Animal Husbandry Expert, Imperial Council of Agricultural Research, recently visited the Presidency Towns and studied the problem of the protection and salvage of prime milch cows. The question has also been examined since by the Board of Agriculture and Animal Husbandry and by a Committee of the Advisory Board of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research. The conclusion of the experts is that the only permanent solution lies in the production of milk outside cities. The Committee's recommendations in this behalf are under consideration.

**Mr. Balchand Navalrai:** May I know from the Honourable Member if there are any orders for not slaughtering the prime milch cows, or any fresh orders have been issued after the advent of the new Viceroy?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** I am not aware of any orders having been issued either since the advent of His Excellency the Viceroy or before. The position is as I have explained in answer to the question.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** May I know, then, that people are allowed to slaughter these prime milch cows at their own free will without any restriction whatsoever?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** As far as I know, there is no legal restriction on any such act.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** Has not the new Viceroy been in favour of not slaughtering these prime milch cows? Have any instructions been given . . . .

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** On a point of order, Sir. I do not think that my Honourable friend can refer to the personal opinion of His Excellency the Viceroy.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is quite so.

EXPORT OF BEEF FROM INDIA.

397. **\*Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta** (on behalf of Babu Baijnath Bajoria): (a) What is the total quantity of beef exported from India during each of the last three years?

(b) Do Government intend to take any steps to prohibit such exports? If not, why not?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** (a) A statement is laid on the table.

(b) The action proposed by the Honourable Member is not necessary.

*Statement showing the quantity of beef—dried or otherwise—exported from India during 1934-35, 1935-36 and 1936-37 (upto December, 1936).*

Year.	Beef exported. Cwts.
1934-35 . . . . .	85,997
1935-36 . . . . .	40,897
1936-37 (upto December, 1936) . . . . .	16,796

REPORT OF THE OFFICER DEPUTED TO ENGLAND TO STUDY THE PROCESSING AND HANDLING OF MILK IN DAIRY FARMS.

398. **\*Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta** (on behalf of Babu Baijnath Bajoria): (a) Is it a fact that an officer was deputed to England to study the processing and handling of milk in dairy farms in that country?

(b) Has that officer returned to India and submitted his report? If so, has this report been published?

(c) What steps are Government taking on his report?

**Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai:** (a) An officer, on leave in England, was given a grant by the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research to study the handling and processing of milk and other dairy products at dairy farms, creameries and factories in the United Kingdom and on the Continent.

(b) and (c). The officer has submitted his report, which is an account of the training he received and not of sufficient general interest to justify publication. Government propose to utilise the experience gained by this officer in training and research work at Bangalore.

### STATEMENTS LAID ON THE TABLE.

*Information promised in reply to starred questions Nos. 939, 941 and 942 asked by Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra on the 9th October, 1936.*

#### READYMIXED RED OXIDE PAINT PURCHASED BY THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

*Question No. 939.*—(a) Yes.

(b) and (d). Cheaper prices have been quoted for certain varieties of readymixed red oxide paints, but those paints differ in composition from that mixed by the North Western Railway and it was decided to adhere to the existing practice until trials had shown whether any change would give more satisfactory results.

(c) Rs. 2-5-0 per gallon, approximately.

(e) and (f). Figures of covering capacities of these paints are not available.

(g) No. The Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway usually purchase red oxide in the dry condition.

(h) The cost ready for use is approximately Rs. 2-4-0 per gallon.

#### TESTING OF READYMIXED BLACK PAINT.

*Question No. 941.*—(a) It is not a fact that, as a general rule, readymixed paints are not tested at the Government Test House, although, with a view to reducing the work of testing standard sample, readymixed paints are not tested in cases in which standard samples of corresponding stiff paint have been submitted. The samples reported in test certificate No. 721-C., dated the 5th June, 1930, were not standard samples. There was, therefore, nothing unusual in these samples being tested by the Government Test House.

(b) Samples representing supplies of readymixed paints are analysed to ascertain whether the pigment corresponds with that of the standard samples of stiff paints. Where an item of readymixed paint in Indian Stores Department contracts has no corresponding item of stiff paints, standard samples of the readymixed paints are registered and tested for comparison with supplies.

(c) Presumably "Messrs. Jenson and Nicholson's 3 per cent. carbon black readymixed black paint" refers to the firm's "Paint black special readymixed for underframes and wagon bodies." The composition of the pigment of this paint is similar to that of the firm's "Paint black stiff for underframes and wagon bodies" supplied at Rs. 9-7-0 per cwt. on rate contract basis against I. S. D. Tender No. 0-4/M. for 1932-33.

(d) Yes.

(e) It is not a fact that Jenson and Nicholson's readymixed black paint was purchased because the East Indian Railway was not satisfied with Jenson and Nicholson's stiff or moist black paint. The 50 gallons of readymixed paint were purchased for test purposes.

The figure quoted by the Honourable Member in respect of the area covered by this paint is not considered reliable, as there is some doubt as to whether the wagons on which this paint was applied, were painted only externally or both inside and out.

(f) Three and not four lots of Jenson and Nicholson's readymixed black paint were purchased by the East Indian Railway for test purposes, viz., two lots for covering capacity tests and a third lot for an endurance test.

As regards the first test for a covering capacity the Honourable Member's attention is drawn to the reply to the latter part of part (e) of this question. The results of the 2nd covering capacity test were duly recorded. The results of the endurance test which are now available, as the wagons dealt with are passing through shops, indicate that the paint in question is satisfactory.

The reason why Messrs. Jenson and Nicholson's readymixed paint was purchased before the results of the endurance test were available was because the Government Test House, Alipore, found on examination, that this paint corresponded with the standard sample of stiff black paint for wagons and this firm's stiff black paint had given satisfactory results. Also, the Eastern Bengal Railway reported that after 3 years' trial under everyday service conditions, Jenson and Nicholson's ready mixed black paint had proved satisfactory. No preference has been given to any firm.

(g) Yes. The wagons are inspected as they pass through workshops.

(h) Yes, in the case of standard type wagons.

---

#### REFUSAL BY THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY TO ACCEPT BLACK PAINT OF A CERTAIN FIRM.

*Question No. 942.*—(a) As the test referred to by the Honourable Member, was an endurance test, a detailed record was not kept of the number of gallons used on the 105 wagons painted.

(b) No.

(c) Yes, but prior to the receipt of the letter referred to by the Honourable Member, the Deputy Chief Mechanical Engineer was under the impression that he was being supplied with 20 per cent. lamp black moist paint which he had asked for during 1930.

(d) The Deputy Chief Mechanical Engineer, East Indian Railway, Lillooah, refused to accept Murarka's 3 per cent. stiff black paint as he preferred their special readymixed black paint.

(e) The Honourable Member's attention is drawn to the 'Rules for the supply of articles required to be purchased for the Public Service,' promulgated with Industries and Labour Department Resolution No. S-217, dated 12th December, 1929, a copy of which is available in the Library of the House.

---

*Information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 182 asked by Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya on the 16th October, 1936.*

#### GRANT OF AN ALLOWANCE TO THE CLERKS IN THE CITY BOOKING-OFFICES.

(a) It is presumed that the question refers to local allowances. If so, office staff, such as draftsmen, clerks, typists and stenographers employed at Calcutta, Howrah and Lillooah who draw pay in the scales of pay introduced in 1928 or the revised scales of pay introduced in 1934 draw local allowance at 10 per cent. of their actual pay.

(b) The staff employed in the city booking offices are not office staff and are therefore not entitled to the local allowance in question.

(c) Since the considerations which have led to the grant of a local allowance to office staff at Calcutta, Howrah and Lillooah, do not hold good in the case of the other staff on the East Indian Railway, there seems to be no inequity in the treatment accorded to the latter in this respect.

Information promised in reply to parts (c) and (d) of unstarred question No. 1 asked by Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena on the 25th January, 1937.

**FIRST AND INTERMEDIATE CLASS WAITING ROOMS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

(c) The respective number of stations where separate waiting rooms for first and intermediate class passengers exist at present are :

- |   |    |
|---|----|
| (i) First Class (excluding those for ladies only)         | 11 |
| (ii) Intermediate Class (excluding those for ladies only) | 41 |

(d) The number of stations where no arrangements exist at present for intermediate class passengers excepting third class passenger halls is . 519

**MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.**

**DATE FOR GENERAL DISCUSSION OF THE RAILWAY BUDGET.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The following Message has been received from His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor General:

*"With reference to my Message, dated the 30th January, 1937, appointing Friday, the 19th February, for the general discussion in the Legislative Assembly of the statement of the estimated annual expenditure and revenue of the Governor General in Council in respect of Railways, I, Victor Alexander John, Marquess of Linlithgow, hereby direct that the said general discussion shall take place on Thursday, the 18th February, in place of Friday, the 19th February, 1937.*

**LINLITHGOW,**  
Viceroy and Governor General."

**NEW DELHI;**  
The 10th February, 1937.

**STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.**

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** (Leader of the House): Sir, the Assembly will not sit on Monday, the 15th, on account of Basant Panchami. On Tuesday, after the presentation of the Railway Budget, a motion will be moved for the election of Members to the Standing Committee of the Department of Industries and Labour. Thereafter, a motion will be made for the introduction of a Bill to provide for the grading and marking of agricultural produce. No other business will be brought forward on that day. Thursday, the 18th, has been allotted for the general discussion of the Railway Budget, and Wednesday, the 17th, has been left free for study of the Budget papers. On Friday, the 19th, motions will be made for taking into consideration and passing the following Bills:

The Bill to provide for the grading and marking of agricultural produce,

The Indian Boilers (Amendment) Bill as reported by the Select Committee,

The Indian Electricity (Amendment) Bill as reported by the Select Committee,

The Indian Naval Armament (Amendment) Bill, and

The Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Bill.

Thereafter, the Resolution regarding the emigration of labour to Burma will be discussed.

## RESOLUTION *RE* REVISION OF PENSION RULES FOR INFERIOR SERVICES.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi** (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I move:

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council the urgency and necessity of so revising the new (revised) pension rules applicable to the inferior services recently sanctioned by the Government of India as to secure rates of pension to the members of those services on the lines of the rates sanctioned for the inferior services of the Bombay Government."

Sir, two days ago, my Honourable friend, the Deputy Whip of the Government Party, came to me and asked me whether I proposed to move my Resolution this morning. I thought he was wondering that in view of the fact that the Congressmen and some other non-official Members of this Legislature are not present today, I might not move my Resolution. But, Sir, I decided to move this Resolution even in this thin House even when the Congressmen were absent, and my Honourable friends of the Independent Party were absent and even though the weather today was not very favourable. I decided to move my Resolution, because I felt that in this Resolution I am making a proposal which deserves to be supported not only by the Congressmen and by the Independents and by those who are absent, but by all, not only the non-official Members, but by Members sitting on the Government Benches sitting behind the Honourable the Finance Member. The people about whom I propose to talk this morning are those people who render loyal and even meritorious service to the people who sit behind the Honourable the Finance Member, and I have absolutely no doubt that those people who are sitting on the Government Benches, if given freedom, will not only vote for my Resolution, but even will speak in support of it.

Mr. President, two years ago, during the budget discussion, I moved a token cut on this subject. The same year in the other place, a Resolution was moved, and as a result the Government of India promised to revise the rates of pension and the rules for pension for the subordinate inferior services. The revision was made, but unfortunately the rules framed and the conditions of pensions proposed were so inadequate—I may say very niggardly—that I felt that I am justified today in occupying the time of the House in asking it and asking the Government of India to revise those rules again. Moreover, I felt that at present we have a Finance Member who is not, if I may say so, very conventionally hidebound by red tape, and, I am sure, he will not refuse to revise his decision only on the ground that he had decided the matter only a year ago. I feel that if this House convinces him and if the Honourable Members who are sitting behind him also convince him if not by speech made on the floor of the House but by some other tokens that the cause I am putting before this House is a just one, I have no doubt that he will be ready to revise his decision even though his last decision was taken only a year ago. This

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

question has a long history. Originally, the pensions of these subordinate inferior servants were fixed at Rs. 4 per month. Perhaps this low rate of pension was fixed, because the average salaries paid to the men belonging to the inferior service were in those days about Rs. 6, Rs. 7, or Rs. 8. The salaries rose as the cost of living rose year after year. The climax was reached during the war and sometime after the war. The Government of India revised the pension rules as applicable to the subordinate inferior service and some other services also. But the Government of India at that time was either too busy or felt the stringency of money only for revising the pensions of the inferior services and at that time sanctioned only a temporary increase from one rupee to two rupees for the inferior services. Then during the last 15 years, several Members of this Legislature drew the attention of the Government of India to the fact that the pension rules for the average inferior services required a revision very urgently. The Government replied year after year that the matter was under their consideration. For 15 years the Government of India considered this matter and at last in 1935 they were persuaded to take up this question seriously in hand.

I shall not tire the House by giving details of the pension rules for inferior services. But I shall mention only a few facts and compare them with the rules which the Government of India have made for what are known as subordinate superior services. In the first place, the revised rules, made by the present Finance Member, increased the maximum rate of pension from Rs. 5 or Rs. 6 to the number of years of service of an employee divided by eightieth part of the salary of the employee belonging to the inferior service. They also laid down the maximum, namely, that the pension of these services shall not go beyond Rs. 8 generally. There were some classes of people belonging to the inferior services who were allowed an increased pension, a larger pension than Rs. 8, but generally speaking the maximum was Rs. 8. Sir, if you compare this rate of pension given to the subordinate superior services, you will find that an injustice has been done even after the revised pension rules to the subordinate inferior services. In the case of the subordinate superior services the maximum is one-half of the salary. Not only this. I feel when the Honourable the Finance Member began revising the rules and came to the decision that the pension should be raised from Rs. 6 to Rs. 8 a month, he got alarmed and somehow felt that his generosity had begun to overflow and he must stem the tide of that overflow by laying down certain conditions to the disadvantage of the men belonging to the inferior services. He raised the pension rate from Rs. 6 to Rs. 8, but at the same time he raised the qualifying period of service for the maximum pension from 30 years to 40 years, with the result that those persons belonging to the inferior services who took up service after 20 years of age *i.e.*, at the age of 21 or 25 or 30, could not get the full rate of pension. The Government of India also made another rule to the disadvantage of the men belonging to the inferior services by making this revision. Men belonging to these services could continue in service till the age of 65, but the revised rules provide that they could not serve beyond 60. Now, Sir, it is known not only to me but to most of the people sitting on the Government Benches that those who take up inferior services under the Government of India do not necessarily join at the early age of 16 or even at the early age of 20. Many of them are recruited at a higher age; some of them are taken in service at the age of 25.

Now, if you have a rule that a man cannot be entitled to full pension unless he puts in 40 years' service, and if you make a rule that a man cannot remain in service after 60, then the man who enters service after the age of 20 will never become entitled to full pension. It is in these ways that the Finance Member made conditions on account of which what he proposed to give away with his right hand he took away with his left. Sir, in the case of the superior services not only do the Government of India give one-half pension but they give it after 30 years' service. I do not know why in the case of men belonging to the inferior services the Government of India should insist upon 40 years' qualifying service. Then, Sir, the Government of India have made some other rules regarding people who cannot put in the full period of qualifying service. They give some pension called compensation pension; they give also invalidity pension, and they also give sometimes a superannuation pension, for people who put in more than 25 years' service and who retire either on account of the fact that they are discharged due to reduction of establishment or on account of the fact that they become permanently invalid or on account of the fact that they become superannuated, *i.e.*, whose age goes beyond 60. Even in the case of these people the rate of pension is low. In the case of men belonging to the subordinate superior services, the rate of pension is the number of years of service divided by 60th part of the salary but in the case of men belonging to the inferior services the rate provided is the number of years of service divided by 80th part of the salary, which is a much lower rate. Moreover, Sir, the Government of India were not content with making this discrimination against the inferior services. A man, belonging to the subordinate superior service, is entitled to compensation pension or superannuation pension or the invalidity pension after a service of ten years, but a man belonging to the subordinate inferior service can only get either the compensation pension or the invalidity pension or the superannuation pension after 25 years of service. I do not know why this distinction should be made, why a clerk should get an invalidity pension after 10 years' service and why a chuprassi should have to wait for 25 years to get compensation, invalidity and superannuation pensions.

Then, Sir, the Government of India have made rules for people who are not qualified for pensions. These people get some gratuity and not a pension. Even here in the case of gratuity, the Government of India have made a discrimination against people belonging to the inferior services. A man belonging to the subordinate superior service gets gratuity, if he is not entitled to pension, at the rate of one month's pay for every year of service, but a man belonging to the inferior service gets only one-half month's pay for every year of service. Now, Sir, I do not know again why this discrimination should be made against the inferior services. Sir, there are other rules made by the Government of India providing for a little higher pension for duffries, record sorters and record lifters and some other classes of people. The number of such people is extremely small, and, therefore, Government became a little more generous. But even then the Government of India would not give these duffries and record sorters and record lifters half pension. They have raised the pension a little higher than Rs. 8, but not raised it to the maximum of one-half of the monthly salary. I feel, Sir, that the Government of India should revise these pension rules. There is absolutely no reason why any discrimination should be made as regards the qualifying period of service and as regards the rate of pension. One can understand the Government of India making a discrimination or distinction or difference between the salaries paid to the in-

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

ferior services and to clerks and other members of the subordinate services. But as regards the rate of pension I cannot understand why any discrimination should be made. Similarly, I cannot understand why any discrimination should be made as regards the service necessary for qualifying for full pension and compensation, invalidity and superannuation pensions. I, therefore, suggest to the Government of India that they should give serious consideration to this matter; they should revise their decision although that decision is a very recent one. It is true that the members of the inferior services are not educated; they cannot agitate as the clerks do. The services to which the clerks belong have got their magazines and papers, they have their organisations and they somehow are capable of defending their interests. But these members of the inferior services are generally uneducated people: they have no political influence. Up to very recently, they had no vote, with the result that their case went by default. I, therefore, hope that the Government of India will give serious consideration and a very generous consideration to the proposal which I have made. I have not made the proposal that all the rules of the subordinate superior services regarding pension should be made applicable to the subordinate inferior services. I am an inveterate moderate, and I believe in compromise. I have, therefore, proposed that the Government of India should, as a first step, adopt the pension rules for subordinate inferior services which are made by the Government of Bombay for the inferior servants in the province of Bombay. These rules provide that after 30 years' service a member belonging to the inferior services should get a pension equal to half of his monthly salary. It might be said that the Government of India is a bigger Government is the central Government and will not like to follow the example of a provincial or subordinate Government. I can understand this feeling of the Government of India if they do not follow the examples of the subordinate provincial Governments in matters which are to the disadvantage of the members of the inferior services. Recently, it came to my knowledge that the Government of India have reduced rent allowance given in Bombay by Rs. 2 a month. I asked a friend of mine in Government service—I am not giving out any official secret . . . .

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member):** Was he giving out any official secret?

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** No. I asked him what was the reason for reducing the rent allowance of the postmen in Bombay. He told me "It is not our fault. The Bombay Government has reduced the rent allowance; therefore, we did it". Now, if the Government of India is going to follow the example of the Bombay Government in reducing rent allowances paid to the employees of the Government of India on the ground that the Bombay Government has reduced the rent allowances, may I ask the Honourable the Finance Member whether he will not revise the pension rules of the inferior services working under the Government of India on the ground that the Bombay Government has increased the rates of pension for the inferior services in Bombay, and on the ground that the Bombay Government gives full maximum pension to its inferior services after thirty years' service? I hope the Government of India will follow the noble example of the Government of Bombay. I would say a word to my colleagues on the non-official benches that this is not a matter in which our party politics has any bearing at all. This is a non-political matter. I would, therefore, ask my colleagues on the right as well as on the left . . . .

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta** (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Where are they? Are they present here?

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Wherever they are, to give fair consideration to the proposal which I am making and support me. May I also make an appeal again to the Members on the benches behind the Honourable the Finance Member? My Honourable friend, Sir Leslie Hudson, asks me what is the number of members of the inferior service. I tried to get information on this subject last Simla Session, from the Honourable the Finance Member, by asking questions; but the Honourable the Finance Member thought it was too great a trouble to find information on this subject. But I can give some information which was given in the Council of State by Sir Alan Parsons, the then Secretary in the Finance Department. He said, in the year 1935, that if the pension rates were increased by one rupee, the Government of India would have to spend about a lakh of rupees per year. The pension rates have been raised by Rs. 2. If the Government of India had not put in other conditions, the maximum required by the Government of India for the revision of rates would have been Rs. 2 lakhs; but in view of the fact that the Government of India raised the period of qualifying service from 30 to 40 years, my estimate is that the expenditure required for the revision made by the Government of India will not come to more than a lakh of rupees. I hope the Honourable the Finance Member, when he makes a speech, will give the necessary information to my Honourable friend, Sir Leslie Hudson. I shall not take up any more time of the House. I shall commend my Resolution for the support of the House on all sides.

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

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council the urgency and necessity of so revising the new (revised) pension rules applicable to the inferior services recently sanctioned by the Government of India as to secure rates of pension to the members of those services on the lines of the rates sanctioned for the inferior services of the Bombay Government."

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali** (Lucknow and Fyzabad Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, one has no alternative but to support this Resolution which has been so ably, so strongly and so pathetically moved by my friend, Mr. Joshi, today. His appeal is not only to the Government of India, but individually to every Member of this House to support this humane Resolution which he has so bravely put before the House . . . .

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Just Resolution.

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** . . . . and he is right when he says that it is a just and most appropriate Resolution. One has to see whether this Resolution has any political side to it or any other side except the economic condition of the poor people of this country. It can be very easily argued that inasmuch as the subordinate services have not much to do with the ruling nation, with the ruling community in this country, therefore, not much thought has been given to this side of the question. Sir, the subordinate services, I am perfectly sure, render far greater and far more useful services to the Government and the country at large than any other class of servants. We often find that peons and men of their status go about from door to door even at late hours in the night to deliver letters and messages to the public. I find that even the inferior servants of the Assembly Office

[Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali.]

go about at night time to deliver papers to the Members of the Assembly, and I do really feel for them, because they are not provided with any sort of conveyance, they have no other amenities provided, there is none to look after their homes and families when these people go about doing their duty, and they can't save much money to educate their children. Even Government have not been kind enough to provide free education to the children of these inferior servants. Under these circumstances, when these people render their life-long services to the Government and to the country, it is the greatest hardship, it is the greatest cruelty that the Government are inflicting by not giving them a helping hand even in their old age after all their service to the Government and the country. Sir, those who are in the higher services are able to accumulate and lay by something for their old age; they have also great chances to make money in other directions, but these poor peons have nothing else to fall back upon after their loyal service, extending over 30, 35 and 40 years, except the small pension. Under these circumstances, we have only to appeal to the Government to consider this matter with the sympathy it deserves and do them a good turn. My friend, Mr. Joshi, has put the matter properly when he said that the Members of the Government, especially those in the higher services, should not sit with folded hands thinking that they are quite comfortable in their homes, because, Sir, the day will come when they will find that the sons of these very people who are so poorly paid going on a strike, and then our officer friends will feel the pinch. Sir, Government ought to take a lesson from the strikes which are going on in the country, they must take a lesson from the agitation that is carried on in the country, and they must take time by the forelock and compensate these poor people, otherwise Government themselves will be the losers in the long run. Sir, I support the motion.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I shall not give any threat to the Treasury Benches that any strikes will be launched or anything serious will be done to them, but I will appeal to their generosity on this matter. I find on the business paper today six Resolutions, and I think this is the only Resolution that will be discussed in the House today. I would, therefore, call this day the poor man's day in the House. I see that the Government often profess solicitude and sympathy for the welfare of the poor people, and today is a day of their trial.

Sir, this Resolution merely requests the Government to put the inferior servants in the Imperial Government on the same level as the inferior servants under the Bombay Government. It cannot be denied for a moment that these inferior servants are overworked, and they are not paid in proportion to the amount of work they do. However, they do not grumble now much on that score, though, of course, they would very much like to have an improvement in their salaries, but what they at present do ask is, for a small increase in their pension so that they may live comfortably after all their hard work for years, after their retirement. This Resolution makes a recommendation that the pension rules of the inferior service people should be improved. Now, Sir, in regard to this question, there are one or two matters which require to be cleared up. My friend, Mr. Joshi, said that these people have to put in 40 years service before they are eligible for full pension, but I should like to know if the information that I got is correct, that they have also got to attain the age of 60 years before

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** No, they have to put in 40 years; they cannot serve beyond 60.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** I know that they cannot serve beyond 60, and the Honourable Member wants that they should serve even after 60, but my information is that there is differential treatment in regard to the ministerial services in the Government of India in that they have to serve for 25 years before they can retire . . . . .

**Mr. A. H. Lloyd** (Government of India: Nominated Official): They won't have to retire after 25 years. The question is not when they are required to retire; the question is when they will earn their pension.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** They have to put in 25 years' service before they retire . . . . .

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** No, no; they cannot get full pension after 25 years, they must put in 30 years.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** I am asking about inferior servants.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** They have to put in 40 years.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** The point is that the present rules require revision as they show differential treatment. Their grievance is that they are required to put in 40 years service and not allowed to serve after attaining the age of 60 years, and then their maximum pension is limited to only Rs. 8. On this point again, I would like to know what is the class of inferior servants my friend, Mr. Joshi, was referring to, when he said that they were only paid a maximum of Rs. 8, because I am told that there are inferior servants who get salaries exceeding Rs. 20 or Rs. 30 . . . . .

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** May I tell my friend that these inferior servants are spread over most of the Departments, but the largest number of inferior servants are employed by the Postal Department, and many of them like telegraph messengers get salaries more than Rs. 30 or Rs. 40, and in their case the hardship is the greatest.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** I also find that the personal pay of these inferior servants is not included in calculating the amount of pension. It is further urged that no invalid pension is available to them. They are not allowed to commute any portion of their pension after retirement. Commutation is a great help to these poor people.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** Is it a great help to let them deprive themselves of their support in their old age?

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** But you have it for other services, and why should you differentiate as regards these poor men?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** Everybody has an inalienable right to dissipate his resources in any way he likes?

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** On the contrary, these poor people will preserve instead of dissipating it. The point is the Government is required to be a little more liberal and the Honourable the Finance Member to be not so hard with regard to these poor men. Further, every ministerial servant who serves for 30 years and retires at the age of 55 is entitled to full pension. If these people are given the same privileges by the Bombay Government, I do not see why that different treatment should be given in respect of the inferior servants at the centre. Then, these inferior servants have no right to join any provident fund, but they certainly do need some capital at the time of their retirement. They cannot commute as I have already said. I submit, therefore, that these servants should have revised rules which would be of great help to them. There is always one objection which is raised, and that concerns the pocket of the Finance Member. The Honourable the Finance Member wants to keep his pocket very tight, but in the case of these poor men he ought to have some mercy. The reply that will come from the Government Benches if they are going to oppose us . . . . .

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Don't anticipate. It may be good.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** It would be only on the ground of financial stringency, or no finances, or even bankruptcy. There is no bankruptcy in the Government of India, nor is there any difficulty with regard to the finances, and, as has been explained by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, the improvement in these rules will cost only a lakh of rupees.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** I did not say that. I said the revision has cost them about a lakh of rupees.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** Supposing it costs the Government more, and certainly it will cost them more than what they pay now, I say the question will be, are they misplacing that, or are they giving the money to those men who deserve? If the Government want that there should be any reimbursement in that direction, let there be some cut in the salaries or pensions of the very superior officers or people who get Rs. 7,000 or 8,000 a month. I think some cut may be made there and these people provided with some improvement in the rules. With these words, I support the Resolution most heartily.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural):** I do not think that there was anything in this Resolution which required heated speeches. My Honourable friend, Mr. Azhar Ali, who came this morning from his sick bed at the expense of his health, delivered the sort of speech for which he would certainly have received loud applause if that had been delivered in the Chandni Chowk, but there was no occasion for making a speech like that in this House. This Resolution is, more or less, a sort of petition. The idea of bringing this Resolution in the House is that you plead the cause of the inferior subordinate servants before the Government in order to secure some more facilities for them in the matter of their pensions. But if we start fighting over this Resolution, if a man, who comes with a petition, starts by giving a slap on the face of the man from whom he wants to get something, I am sure, he will do more harm than good to his own cause.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** I hope I have given no slap.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub:** I do not know. The Honourable Member from Sind yesterday said that Sind was not a savage province. I do not know if the speech which he has delivered this morning would prove whether Sind is a savage province or a civilised province. (Laughter.)

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** What about Moradabad?

**Sir Muhammad Yakub:** You get polished vessels, polished things and everything which is nice, from Moradabad.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** You get fine vessels from Sind.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub:** We have got a specimen of it on the floor of this House.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** We have got a specimen of Moradabad here.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub:** I do say that Government have done something to ameliorate the condition of their subordinate servants. It has just been pointed out that the salaries of the postmen were increased from Rs. 10 or Rs. 12 a month up to Rs. 40. In the same way, we have noticed that in other departments also the Government have done a good deal to improve the condition of the subordinate services, but still I do think that the new rules, which have lately been framed, create some invidious distinctions and bring some hardships on the subordinate servants to which we must draw the attention of the Government of India. All these disabilities have been pointed out by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, who has carefully gone through these rules. The great hardships in these rules are that a subordinate employee would be entitled to full pension only after he has served for 40 years. Now, this means that practically these people are deprived of the opportunity of enjoying any pension at all, because the average age of a man in this country, and particularly of a man who lives the hard life of a subordinate official, is less than 60—very few of them live even up to the age of 60; most of them die between the ages of 50 and 55. If a man is required to put in a service of 40 years before he earns full pension, it means—generally it is not expected that a man will enter into service before the age of 20—that a man would retire only at the age of 60, and as soon as he retires he will die the next day or so, and in that way he will not be benefited by the pension. According to the rules, it is said that these subordinate officials will get full pension after they have served for a sufficient period, but the period at which they earn their pension has been put so high that not more than two or three per cent. of them will live to get any pension at all, and that, too, for not more than two or three years.

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** Take care that you do not give a slap lest you should get it back.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub:** The Honourable gentleman has just come from his bed of illness and he puts in his appearance here after a week or so; he knows nothing and still he tries to pass strictures on other Honourable Members. Has he quoted any rules? Does he know what were the old rules and what are the new rules? It is no use standing in this House and making a spirited speech without knowing anything about the subject matter of the Resolution.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** On a point of order. Is it permissible for a  
12 Noon. Member to say that another Member knows nothing at all,  
and that, instead of coming here, he should go to Chandni  
Chowk? He had better go there.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member said that the Honourable Member (Mr. Azhar Ali) did not study the rules on which he was speaking. The Chair does not think there is anything wrong in that.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub:** This is a point which deserves a great deal of consideration, and I hope that Government will see that the age at which subordinate employees earn their full pension is reduced to such a reasonable extent that a man can expect to live to draw his pension for a few years. Another hardship is brought about by this rule which says:

"Compensation pension, invalid pension or superannuation pension of the amount set out in Schedule I may be granted if the qualifying service on discharge or retirement is not less than 25 years."

This period of 25 years is too long. Supposing a man becomes invalid or he is seriously injured during the course of his service on account of some accident and he has not completed his service for 25 years, it would be very hard if he is not allowed any pension or anything as compassionate allowance for the service which he has rendered. So, I think that this rule should also be amended, and this period should be brought down to a more reasonable level. I think the ten years, that has been suggested by Mr. Joshi, are quite reasonable. If a man has put in a service of ten years, and after that he is invalided or in any way he becomes incapable of rendering more service, he should get some pension in order to have his livelihood.

Then, the third point, which I would like to place before the House, is that these people cannot commute their pension. As has already been pointed out, if a man retires at the age of 60, it is not expected that he would live long enough to earn the fruits of his labour, and he certainly requires some money when he retires. Therefore, if he is allowed to commute his pension, I think it will be more beneficial for him, and probably he would be able to pass his last days in a comfortable way, instead of giving him a pension which he has no hope of getting even for a few years. These are a few points which need attention, and I hope that the Honourable Members of the Government will give the matter their serious consideration. I hope that this Resolution will receive attention and care in the spirit in which it has been proposed, and that poor servants of Government will receive some amenity, and these rules will be revised in order to give them some ease and facility. With these words, I support the Resolution.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** The Honourable Member from Sind said that this was "the poor man's day". I have no claim to be a poor man, and it is certainly not my day, because I stand before you and claim that I am the most unfairly treated man in India. Little more than a year ago, we adopted an improvement in the scale of pensions to what we, perhaps somewhat bluntly, call inferior servants. This was in response to a request of Mr. Joshi and a recognition, a partial and very small recognition, of his almost unfailing support of Government. Now, he says that

the improvements are not improvements at all or, if they are, they are inadequate, and that we must adopt the scales applicable to inferior servants in the Bombay Presidency. It has become the custom in this House, more particularly in the last two or three days, to attach names to Honourable Members which are not their own but those of some famous persons whom they are imagined to resemble. For instance, I myself have in the past day or two suffered from being called Hitler.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub:** A very nice cartoon has appeared in the "Hindustan Times" showing Hitler going with his fixed bayonet.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** This fashion is obviously capable of almost unlimited extension, and I think we might start with Mr. Joshi, and there is a very good one for him. Incidentally, before I pass away from that subject if it is in order, I should like to repudiate the name attached to me.

**Mr. F. E. James (Madras: European):** More in sorrow than in anger.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** Having been ill-treated, I might be allowed to indulge in a little ill-treatment in return and attach to Mr. Joshi the label of Oliver Twist in which mould he is obviously cast. Everybody knows of the characteristic of Oliver Twist—he was always asking for more. Having got a pretty good instalment little more than a year ago, not only does he ask for more now, but he proposes to go on asking for more till the end of time or the end of his life.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Why not?

**Sir Muhammad Yakub:** He has been nominated by the Government for this purpose. It is not his fault.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** After these few mildly flippant preliminary observations, I might address myself to the subject of the Resolution. Mr. Joshi has referred to the analogy of Bombay, ignoring the fact that in Bombay standards of expenditure and the cost of living, I think I am right in saying, are probably higher than in any other part of India. I leave this aspect aside and turn to the real implications of Mr. Oliver Twist's demand. I maintain that this demand is in effect a monstrous infringement of the constitutional freedom of the centre. We have been debating constitutional questions a good deal lately particularly in relation to the rights of Provinces, but I say that this demand is a monstrous infringement of the constitutional freedom of the centre. It is in effect a claim that in all service conditions attaching to the people whom he claims to represent, the Government of India should adopt the highest standard set by the highest province. Apart from the fact that what suits Bombay will not necessarily suit Delhi, and apart from the fact that such a plan has wider implications and would be very expensive, it would clearly, over a wide field, amount to a surrender of our freedom and make us the helpless victims of provincial caprice, extravagance or generosity, call it what you like, according to your political views; and not only that, as the Government of India sets the standard for other Provinces—~~I mean sets a minimum standard, it does not necessarily set the~~

[Sir James Grigg.]

maximum standard; otherwise this debate would not have been raised—as the Government of India sets a minimum standard for other Provinces it means that not only do we surrender much freedom by being forced to follow the highest Province but that the other Provinces are also forced to follow that example too. Sir, I feel I must unflinchingly defend the constitutional privileges and prerogatives of my successors; but quite apart from that, I have no hope whatever that Oliver Twist can ever be satisfied.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Give me something—I shall be satisfied today.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** After all, we must remember the poem of Browning:

“Leave now for apes and dogs—man has for ever.”

Sir, I have not the slightest doubt that Mr. Joshi's satisfaction will not last for more than one day,—let alone for ever.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** One year.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** As I say, I have no expectation that Oliver Twist is ever going to be satisfied, and, therefore, I must, on both these grounds, oppose the Resolution. I do not mean to say at all that we refuse for ever to reconsider these scales or the conditions; for example one of the points raised has related to the qualifying minimum period of forty years. I think, in course of time, that particular provision is one which we might reconsider. On the other hand, on the commutation point, I am afraid, possibly mistakenly, that I have no sympathy whatever with the point of view put forward, because it seems to me that if you provide a monthly pension for your servants who *ex hypothesi* have not been able to save anything very much for their old age, to allow them to dissipate it in one burst is really quite contrary to the idea of a pension scheme at all, and on that point I have no sympathy whatever with the demand in that respect; and as long as I am here, you can expect that there will be no alteration.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub:** For two years more.

**Mr. F. E. James:** And then the Flood. (Laughter.)

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** However, as I say, I have no sympathy on that point. I do not, in the least, maintain that there will not come a time when we ought possibly to reconsider some of the points in the new pension scales, but at the moment—it being a little more than a year old—I think it is too early, before we have seen the working out of the scheme, to undertake any revision; and, in any case to put it at its lowest, I think, since the original Oliver Twist was made to wait a bit, I do not see why the Indian Oliver Twist should not be made to wait a bit. Sir, I oppose the Resolution.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Mr. President, I shall only say a few words in reply. The reply given by the Honourable the Finance Member is rather difficult

to be accurately described. I do not mind being described as Oliver Twist or by any other name. What I would like the House to remember is,—if Oliver Twist asks for more and more, we should consider whether he deserves to get more and more or not, and if Oliver Twist does deserve to get more, well, let him have it. (*An Honourable Member*: "Hear, hear.") Sir, the Honourable the Finance Member said that in following the example of Bombay, there was some kind of humiliation for the Government of India. He put it in a different way; he said, this infringement on the constitutional rights of the Central Government was such that the Government of India considered it to be a humiliation to submit to that. But I would suggest to the Honourable the Finance Member not to take it in that light. If the Bombay Government is a good Government,—it is subordinate to the Central Government—and the Government of India should have the aspiration to be a little better than this subordinate Government and I, therefore, hope that the Government of India will try to be at least as good as the Bombay Government. He says that the conditions in Bombay are different. Well, Sir, the conditions in Bombay are different from the conditions in Delhi, that is quite obvious, but a large number of employees, belonging to the inferior services of the Government of India, live in Bombay. So for the people who live in Bombay, the conditions in Bombay are not different. Let the Honourable Member begin by increasing the pensions for those members of the inferior services who serve in Bombay. I have no doubt, Sir, the next stage will be to increase the pensions in other places. Let him make a beginning. However, Sir, although I may be like Oliver Twist, I am an unrepentant moderate.

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** You do not always vote with the Government.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** I am a moderate—I am pleased with a compromise. I am, therefore, quite willing to accept the offer of the Honourable the Finance Member that he would revise at least some of the conditions, some of the rules for pensions provided for the inferior services. He says that the one year is too early, but he knows that he gave me his promise of revising the rules in 1935; that is two years ago, and he took two years' time to revise the rules, but that is not my fault. In March of 1935, he promised to revise the rules. Well, let him promise again now,—it will then take one year more to carry out his promise, I take it that he did make some kind of promise for revising at least the qualifying age limit; and even if that is done immediately, Sir, he will have done some good to the members of the inferior services and my Resolution will have served some purpose. With your permission, Sir, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my Resolution.

The Resolution was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 16th February, 1937.