

24th February, 1933

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
(Official Report)

Volume II, 1933

(23rd February to 10th March, 1933)

FIFTH SESSION
OF THE
FOURTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
1933



SIMLA
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS

1933

M97LAD

Legislative Assembly

President :

THE HONOURABLE SIR IBRAHIM RAHIMTOOLA, K.C.S.I., C.I.E. (Upto 7th March, 1933.)

THE HONOURABLE MR. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTY. (From 14th March, 1933.)

Deputy President :

MR. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTY, M.L.A. (Upto 13th March, 1933.)

MR. ABDUL MATIN CHAUDHURY, M.L.A. (From 22nd March, 1933.)

Panel of Chairmen :

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

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

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

MR. MUHAMMAD YAMIN KHAN, C.I.E., M.L.A.

Secretary :

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

Assistants of the Secretary :

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.

Marshal :

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

Committee on Public Petitions :

MR. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTY, M.L.A., *Chairman*. (Upto 13th March, 1933.)

MR. ABDUL MATIN CHAUDHURY, M.L.A., *Chairman*. (From 22nd March, 1933.)

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

SIR ABDULLA-AL-MAMÜN SUHRAWARDY, Kt., M.L.A.

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

MR. C. S. RANGA IYER, M.L.A.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME II.—23rd February to 10th March, 1933.

PAGES.	PAGES.
THURSDAY, 23RD FEBRUARY, 1933—	
Questions and Answers ..	977—97
The Indian Wireless Telegraphy Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee ..	997
Statement of Business ..	997
The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i> ..	998—1049
Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>concl'd.</i> ..	998—1049
General Policy and Administration of the Railway Board ..	998—1049
FRIDAY, 24TH FEBRUARY, 1933—	
The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i> ..	1051—95
Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>concl'd.</i> ..	1051—95
Reduction in the number of Members of the Railway Board and in the pay of the Superior Officers of the Railway Board ..	1051—80
Retrenchment in the Railway Board ..	1080—85
Directors and Deputy Directors ..	1085—93
Paucity of Muslims in the Railway Services ..	1093—95
SATURDAY, 25TH FEBRUARY, 1933—	
Questions and Answers ..	1097—1137
Unstarred Questions and Answers ..	1137—58
Statement <i>re</i> Voters' Lists of the Central and Provincial Legislatures ..	1158
The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i> ..	1159—1207
Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>concl'd.</i> ..	1159—1205
Paucity of Muslims in the Railway Services— <i>concl'd.</i> ..	1159—1205
Demand No. 2—Inspection ..	1205
Demand No. 3—Audit ..	1205
Demand No. 4—Working Expenses : Administration ..	1205
Demand No. 5—Working Expenses : Repairs and Maintenance and Operation ..	1206
Demand No. 6.—Companies' and Indian States' Share of Surplus Profits and Net Earnings ..	1206
Demand No. 9—Appropriation to Depreciation Fund ..	1206
SATURDAY, 25TH FEBRUARY, 1933—<i>concl'd.</i>	
Demand No. 11—Miscellaneous Expenditure ..	1206
Demand No. 14—Interest Charges ..	1206
Demand No. 7—New Construction ..	1207
Demand No. 8—Open Line Works ..	1207
Demand No. 10—Appropriation from Depreciation Fund ..	1207
MONDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 1933—	
Members Sworn ..	1209
Questions and Answers ..	1209—49
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Ban on the holding of the Indian National Congress in Calcutta—Leave refused ..	1250—52
Statement laid on the Table ..	1252—55
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Consideration postponed ..	1255—60
The Special Marriage (Amendment) Repealing Bill—Motion to consider negatived ..	1260—83
The Child Marriage Restraint (Amendment) Bill—Discussion not concluded ..	1284—1300
TUESDAY, 28TH FEBRUARY, 1933—	
Statements laid on the Table ..	1301—02
Demands for Supplementary Grants in respect of Railways ..	1302—40
Presentation of the General Budget for 1933-34 ..	1341—80
The Indian Finance Bill—Introduced ..	1380
WEDNESDAY, 1ST MARCH, 1933—	
Short Notice Questions and Answers ..	1381—95
Resolution <i>re</i> Release of Mr. Gandhi, Mufti Kifaetullah and other Political Prisoners—Consideration postponed ..	1396—1406
Resolution <i>re</i> Debentures of the Central Land Mortgage Bank of Madras—Withdrawn ..	1407—21
Resolution <i>re</i> Indian Film Industry—Withdrawn ..	1421—43

	PAGES.		PAGES.
THURSDAY, 2ND MARCH, 1933—		WEDNESDAY, 8TH MARCH, 1933—	
Questions and Answers ..	1445—59	Questions and Answers ..	1721—35
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1459—64	Unstarred Questions and Answers	1735—49
General Discussion of the General Budget	1464—1509	Message from H. E. the Viceroy and Governor General	1750
FRIDAY, 3RD MARCH, 1933—		Expressions of regret at the Resignation of the Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola	1750—54
Questions and Answers ..	1511—27	Election of the President	1754
Statement of Business ..	1527	The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i> ..	1754—1805
General Discussion of the General Budget— <i>concl'd.</i> ..	1527—77	Demand No. 39.—Army Department— <i>concl'd.</i> ..	1754—88
MONDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1933—		Military Expenditure	1754—88
Questions and Answers ..	1579—89	Demand No. 31.—Foreign and Political Department—	1788—1805
Message from His Excellency the Governor General—Extension of the Term of the Legislative Assembly	1589	Retrenchment of Expenditure controlled by the Foreign and Political Department and Indianisation	1788—1805
The General Budget—List of Demands	1590—1644	THURSDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1933—	
Demand No. 16.—Customs—	1592—1615	The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i> ..	1807—61
Dumping of Goods into India by Countries with Depreciated Currencies ..	1592—1615	Demand No. 86.—Expenditure in England—Secretary of State for India— ..	1807—32
Demand No. 17.—Taxes on Income—	1615—44	Safeguarding the Interests of Agriculturists and Landholders in the matter of Representation and Taxation in the New Constitution	1807—32
Removal of Surcharge and Restoration of old Exemption of Taxable Minimum	1615—44	Demand No. 40.—Department of Industries and Labour—	1832—62
TUESDAY, 7TH MARCH, 1933—		Labour Legislation and Labour Welfare including Government Employees ..	1832—62
Questions and Answers ..	1645—68	FRIDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1933—	
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i> ..	1666—1715	Statement of Business	1863
Demand No. 28.—Executive Council—	1666—87	The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i> ..	1863—1932
Retrenchment and Indianisation of Services and Reduction of Pay for Future Entrants ..	1667—87	Demand No. 18.—Salt ..	1863—65
Demand No. 39.—Army Department—	1687—1715	Undesirability of the continuance of the Salt Tax	1864—65
Indianisation of the Indian Army	1687—1715	Demand No. 19.—Opium ..	1865
Appendix	1717—19	Demand No. 19A.—Excise	1866
		Demand No. 20.—Stamps	1866
		Demand No. 21.—Forest ..	1866

	PAGES.
FRIDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1933—contd.	
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 22—Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works	1866
Demand No. 23—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses) 1866—99	
Position of the Posts and Telegraphs Department in Bengal and Assam Circle 1867—73	
Grant of Special Allowance to the postal subordinates employed in the Wynad-Malabar	1873—76
Policy of the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department 1876—95	
Equitable Apportionment of Revenue between Postal and Telegraph Branches 1895—96	
Grievances of Ex-Approved Candidates in the Calcutta General Post Office 1896—99	
Demand No. 25—Interest on Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt 1899—1900, 1901—03	
Demand No. 26—Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations ..	1900
Demand No. 27—Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor General	1900
Demand No. 29—Council of State 1900	
Demand No. 30—Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department	1904
Demand No. 32—Home Department	1904—19
Classification of Political Prisoners	1904—19
Demand No. 33—Public Service Commission	1919
Demand No. 34—Legislative Department—	1919
Demand No. 35—Department of Education, Health and Lands 1919	
Demand No. 36.—Finance Department	1920
Demand No. 38—Commerce Department	1920
Demand No. 41—Central Board of Revenue	1920

	PAGES.
FRIDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1933—contd.	
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 42—Payments to Provincial Governments on account of Administration of Agency subjects	1920
Demand No. 43—Audit	1920
Demand No. 44—Administration of Justice	1921
Demand No. 45—Police	1921
Demand No. 46—Ports and Pilotage	1921
Demand No. 47—Lighthouses and Lightships	1921
Demand No. 48—Survey of India	1921
Demand No. 49—Meteorology	1922
Demand No. 50—Geological Survey	1922
Demand No. 51—Botanical Survey	1922
Demand No. 52—Zoological Survey	1922
Demand No. 53—Archæology	1922
Demand No. 54—Mines	1923
Demand No. 55—Other Scientific Departments	1923
Demand No. 56—Education	1923
Demand No. 57—Medical Services 1923	
Demand No. 58—Public Health 1923	
Demand No. 59—Agriculture	1924
Demand No. 60—Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department	1924
Demand No. 61—Civil Veterinary Services	1924
Demand No. 62—Industries	1924
Demand No. 63—Aviation	1924
Demand No. 64—Commercial Intelligence and Statistics	1925
Demand No. 65—Census	1925
Demand No. 66—Emigration—Internal	1925
Demand No. 67—Emigration—External	1925
Demand No. 68—Joint Stock Companies	1925
Demand No. 69—Miscellaneous Departments	1926

	PAGES.
FRIDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1933— <i>concl.</i>	
Demand No. 70—Indian Stores Department	1926
Demand No. 71—Currency	1926
Demand No. 72—Mint	1926
Demand No. 73—Civil Works	1926
Demand No. 74—Superannuation Allowances and Pensions	1927
Demand No. 75—Stationery and Printing	1927
Demand No. 76—Miscellaneous	1927
Demand No. 76A.—Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel charged to Revenue	1927
Demand No. 77—Refunds	1927
Demand No. 79—Baluchistan	1928
Demand No. 80—Delhi	1928
Demand No. 81—Ajmer-Merwara	1928
Demand No. 82—Andaman and Nicobar Islands	1928
Demand No. 83—Rajputana	1928
Demand No. 84—Central India	1929
Demand No. 85—Hyderabad	1929

	PAGES.
FRIDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1933— <i>concl.</i>	
Demand No. 85A—Aden	1929
Demand No. 87—Expenditure in England—High Commissioner for India	1929
Demand No. 88—Capital Outlay on Security Printing	1929
Demand No. 89—Forest Capital Outlay	1930
Demand No. 90—Irrigation	1930
Demand No. 91—Indian Posts and Telegraphs	1930
Demand No. 93—Capital Outlay on Currency Note Press	1930
Demand No. 94—Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour	1930
Demand No. 95—Capital Outlay on Lighthouses and Lightships	1931
Demand No. 96—Commuted value of Pensions	1931
Demand No. 96A.—Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel charged to Capital	1931
Demand No. 98—Interest-free Advances	1931
Demand No. 99—Loans and Advances bearing Interest	1931—32

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 24th February, 1933.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour) in the Chair.

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

SECOND STAGE—*contd.*

DEMAND No. 1—RAILWAY BOARD—*contd.*

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Mr. S. C. Mitra.

Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen (Presidency Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): May I know what is your point of order?

Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen: Rule 30 of the Manual of Business and Procedure says that the first hour of every meeting shall be available for the asking and answering of questions. The reference is to Standing Order No. 10. Some questions have been specifically fixed for today. This is the list. These are not remainders of questions of any previous list. Therefore, there is no option for the Chair in this matter, as this rule is not qualified by any such clause as "unless the President otherwise directs" and so forth. The only sections which deal with suspension of Standing Orders are 76, 77, 84, 86, 89 and 142. All these deal with Bills, except the last section which deals with Resolutions. I think, therefore, Sir, that we will not be in order if we do not discuss the questions.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): The Chair has exercised no discretion, but the Chair left it yesterday to the House, and it is the privilege of the House to waive the Standing Order made for their benefit. It was unanimously decided by the consensus of opinion in the House that the question hour be utilised for the discussion of the Railway Budget.

Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen: Not unanimously, Sir.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Mr. S. C. Mitra.

Reduction in the number of Members of the Railway Board and in the Pay of the Superior Officers of the Railway Board.

Mr. S. O. Mitra (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I move:

"That the demand under the head 'Railway Board' be reduced by Rs. 1,50,000."

Before I could move my motion, and before it was even known to the House whether it was a question that was to be asked and answered or whether it was a cut motion to be moved on the Railway Budget, a point of order was raised. Sir, I think, the House will get only very few chances to discuss, and, if necessary, to divide on, any substantive cut or, what we here call, economy cut. I find that later on a crowd of motions on token cuts dealing with grievances will be discussed in this House. So, I think, the House will do full justice to the point that I raise about a substantive cut in this motion. My motion is for reduction in the number of Members of the Railway Board and in the pay of the Superior Officers of the Railway Board.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Order, order. The Honourable Member has to say whether he wishes to move cut No. 2* which stands in his name.

Mr. S. O. Mitra: I think that is covered by the previous motion of my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, that has already been disposed of.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Cut motions 1 to 6 traverse the same ground. I called upon the Honourable Member to speak, as I have no option but to put each motion separately as required by Standing Orders.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt (Burdwan Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I have a cut motion, No. 125, in my name:

"That the demand under the head 'Railway Board' be reduced to Re. 1."

So I think I may be allowed to move.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Sir Abdulla Suhrawardy.

Sir Abdulla-al-Mámûn Suhrawardy (Burdwan and Presidency Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I do not move my motion.*

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I have already spoken on this motion, and I do not move my motion.*

*"That the demand under the head 'Railway Board' be reduced to Re. 1."

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad (Patna and Chota Nagpur *cum* Orissa: Muhammadan): Sir, I would request you kindly to see the late lists as well where you will find bigger cuts. Under the Standing Orders, the biggest cuts should be taken first. So all the cuts which are for more than Rupees one lakh and 50 thousand should be given preference. As far as I remember, that is what the Standing Order says. There are many cuts in this list and the other late lists which are for more than Rupees one lakh and 50 thousand.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): The general procedure is that in discussing the Railway or the General Budget, the Chair has to take all the cuts in the order in which they appear on the agenda, and as Mr. S. C. Mitra's cut No. 8 has precedence over other cuts, he is in order.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: May I ask how this cut No. 125 came to be placed so low? I beg to draw your special attention to that. Should it not have come before?

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): The Honourable Member can raise that question at the proper time. This is the time for cut No. 8. Does the Honourable Member claim precedence over cut No. 8?

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: My motion is to reduce the demand under the Railway Board to Re. 1. It is No. 125.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): The Honourable Member's cut is out of time. Notice was received on the 20th February, and the Standing Order requires that there shall be two clear days' notice before the day on which the demand is under consideration and any Member may object and such objection shall prevail, unless the President, in the exercise of his powers, waives that condition. That question cannot be disposed of just now. Notice of this motion was received on the 20th. Mr. S. C. Mitra.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: Sir, my purpose in moving this motion is to show that

Mr. O. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, may I take it that notices of motions which were given on the 20th February are out of order for discussion during this Railway Budget? We ought to know this clearly, as there are a large number of these motions which are shown as having been received on the 20th?

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): The Chair will consider that point when the proper time comes, that is when a motion given on the 20th is sought to be moved. Mr. S. C. Mitra.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: Sir, I am afraid, the Honourable the Commerce Member did not appreciate the spirit in which I spoke on the last motion. It was never my intention that the Honourable the Commerce Member should have no assistance from any technical expert or financial expert in the discharge of his duties. What I said was that like other Departments of the Government of India there should not be a Board at his back so far as the administration of Railways is concerned. He will

[Mr. S. C. Mitra.]

certainly have the advice of the Chief Commissioner and the Financial Commissioner as well as a whole horde of Directors and Deputy Directors to help him. And, really, in the Government of India it is not only this particular Department that has other big branches to deal with. For example, the Industries Department has the big Department of Posts and Telegraphs under it. There is the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs with his financial experts who help him in carrying on the administration of that Department. Take again, the Department of Education, Health and Lands. They have to deal with the Medical Department; there also you have a Director General of Indian Medical Service and a Director of Public Health, and all these people to help him. So it will not be correct to say that I do not want a Railway Board to help the Honourable the Commerce Member in carrying out his duties in the Railway Department. In my speech I made it clear that the Chief Commissioner of Railways, who was a very experienced and expert Engineer, was there to help him. I further said that the ordinary day to day administration was actually carried on by the Agents of the different Railways, and that the main duty here of the present Railway Board was more or less to co-ordinate their work. Some of our friends here were very much afraid that if Mr. Colvin went away, then there would be none to answer their questions

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-official): Who were afraid? We were not.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: Mr. Yamin Khan was one. You are not the only Member; there are other Members also. To them I say, that even now it is not the Members of the Railway Board who answer all these questions, but it is the Financial Commissioner, who is an *ex-officio* Member of the Railway Board. Of course there was anxiety on the part of some of the Members that all appointments below Rs. 100 should be at the disposal of a Railway Member who may have a very large patronage, and it may suit many people to go round him and secure his patronage. But I do not support such strange views that the Agents of the Railways should be denuded of all the powers of appointments, and all these powers of patronage should be vested in one man who may be easily approachable by some.

As I said the other day, I maintain that the Acworth Committee in 1921 suggested a similar thing as I propose for this Board today. They said that there should be a Chief Commissioner and four Commissioners of whom one should be a Financial Commissioner, and three other Members whose duty will be to look after three respective Divisions, Western, Eastern and Southern Divisions. What they wanted to impress by that suggestion was that the Railway Chief Commissioner will be an expert as our friend, the Honourable the Commerce Member, wants a very efficient expert to be by his side. On financial matters he will have the advice of the Financial Commissioner; but, for the administration of the individual Railway systems, they should be divided into three Divisions, and there should be a Member responsible for each; but here, under the present system, that very thing is carried out by the Agents of these respective Railways. I do not say that the Chief Commissioner should

be the only expert. There are provisions even in this Budget for five Directors who carry a salary of Rs. 3,180 each, five Deputy Directors who carry a salary of Rs. 2,180 *plus* a special pay of Rs. 250 each. So it will not lie with my friend, the Commerce Member, to say that if the so-called Railway Board, by which I meant merely the abolition of one post at present, is done away with, he will be denied the opportunities of consulting any expert. Why should there be so many Directors, who I understand, are experts in their different branches? There are not only Directors, but there are also Deputy Directors. I find this year another post of Director has been added. It is in Demand No. 1. Last year there was provision for four: now, in 1933-34, there is provision for five. When they take away a Member from the Railway Board, they add another to the Board of Directors. In the latest Administration Report for 1931-32, supplied to us, I find the following:

“The reorganisation was complete in May, 1932, and then the superior staff in the office of the Railway Board consisted of the Chief Commissioner, Financial Commissioner, one Member, three Directors, six Deputy Directors and one Secretary.”

* So I find that in the complete re-organisation scheme of 1932, there was provision for four of these super experts, that is a Member and three Directors and six Deputy Directors. My present suggestion is the same. I do not want a Member to be there; instead of three Directors, let there be four; and, I think, in that case, even in case of necessity, the Honourable the Commerce Member will not fail to have expert advice as he desires. In giving effect to the Acworth Committee's scheme, as I have said, the Government decided that, in addition to the Chief Commissioner and the Financial Commissioner, there should be two Members, one dealing with technical subjects and another with general administration. I say that the duties of the technical expert and the general administration work might be done by a few of these Directors and Deputy Directors; and the present post, that is held by Mr. Colvin, that is, for staff and labour, might be done away with as it was never contemplated in either of these schemes. I am glad that Mr. Colvin is here, and that I am not speaking about him at his back; he is present here to reply to my remarks. I maintain that the expert information or the questions about the general administration may be dealt with by the Directorate, and that Directorate, if necessary, may be enlarged; it was three in 1932; under the present scheme, I find, it is five. So, one may say that Government have diminished the number of Members and increased the number of the Directors from three to five, and have only appointed one or two men on a lesser scale of pay; but I shall presently show that these also are very highly paid posts for a poor country like India. I further urge that the whole of the Railway Administration should be run by officers who should carry a lesser scale of pay. I know the usual answer of the Honourable the Commerce Member is that in connection with the scale of pay there should be no differentiation between this Department of Government and other Departments. But I would contend that this is not correct. Even Government think that Railways should work on a commercial basis. And as was pointed out by the Honourable the Commerce Member yesterday that even in regard to cuts in salaries. Government did not make a distinction between the lower scale officers of the Railway Department and those of the other departments of the Government of India. They have made a distinction only in the case of the officers of the Posts and Telegraphs Department which, though it is not worked on strictly commercial lines, maintains accounts on a

[Mr. S. C. Mitra.]

commercial basis, and in this case the distinction is that officers drawing Rs. 30 or less have to pay half an anna in the rupee, and those who draw Rs. 85-5-8 have to pay only one anna in the rupee towards the cut in their salaries. Therefore a distinction has been made between Government servants on the general side and those working in Departments which have been commercialised or the accounts of which have been maintained on commercial principles. If it is further necessary to show that a distinction does exist, I may say that Government servants always enjoy pensions, while there is no provision of pensions for railway servants, but there is provision for provident fund alone. If it is contended that Railway servants are like other Government servants, I would like to know why Government servants are not granted railway passes as freely as the railway officers are given. Therefore, I maintain that there is a clear distinction between the Railway Department and other Departments of the Government of India, and that on that ground alone there can be no justification for maintaining the same scales of pay. I feel that a sum of one lakh 50,000 can be easily saved by removing one Member whose salary is Rs. 4,000 a month and two Directors and an Assistant Secretary. The last post, I find, has been only recently added in the new Budget. Here I would like to deal with the question of Indianisation, because, by having Indianisation in its true sense, considerable economies can be effected. My point is that we should fix lower scales of pay for Indians who will occupy these high posts in future. Apart from the general argument of Indians to claim 100 per cent. of the posts in India, I think there is a further argument that by Indianisation we can have greater economy. I maintain that the pay for Indians, who will occupy these posts, should be fixed on a much lower scale, and that will certainly be acceptable to Indians.

Now, I would like to point out that on account of keeping the Staff Officer here, it will be impossible to have real Indianisation in this country. The Honourable the Commerce Member yesterday gave the percentage of Indianisation, but I maintain that that percentage, though apparently correct, does not show the true position. I have collected some figures from Railway Reports for 1931. There I find that in the Agency Department, out of a total of 81, Europeans get 61 posts, Anglo-Indians and Domiciled Christians 7, or, rather, out of 81 posts, 68 posts go to Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Domiciled Christians, while the Hindus get ten, Muslims one and others, including Sikhs, get 16 per cent.

Then, the next Department is the Accounts Department, where the total is 125. In this Department, Europeans get 54, Domiciled Europeans and Anglo-Indians 16, that is 70 out of 125 or rather 56 per cent goes to Europeans and Domiciled Christians, while the Hindus get 48, Muslims only two and others about 44 per cent. In the Engineering Department also, there is a total of 781

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): On a point of order, Sir. I do not wish to interrupt my friend who belongs to my Party but surely this is not relevant to the main motion he has moved.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): It is not relevant.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: Have you given your decision on the point of order, Sir, or I can make my point clear as to why I am raising this question?

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): The Honourable Member can defend himself, but it seems to me that he is obviously irrelevant.

Mr. S. O. Mitra: Sir, I would like to show that obvious things are not always correct. I maintain that reduction of expenditure is only possible by adopting definitely the policy of Indianisation, and when the Commerce Member says that proper effect has been given to the policy of Indianisation, I say, that is incorrect, and I want to show by figures how it is possible to effect economy in the Railway Department by adopting the policy of Indianisation in its true sense and not by the so-called process

Mr. N. M. Joshi: We are not discussing Indianisation: we are discussing economy.

Mr. S. O. Mitra: As regards the Engineering Department

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour). Order, order. Have you heard the Honourable Member? I feel that the Honourable Member is irrelevant, because he has to deal in this cut with the question of economy apart from the question of communal representation as such.

Mr. S. O. Mitra: I bow to your ruling, Sir, though I do not agree with it. I do not know whether I shall be relevant in showing that by maintaining a Staff Officer here, the process of Indianisation is really impeded. If I am permitted to do so, I can prove that instead of giving facilities to Indians to occupy some of the higher posts, all kinds of tactics are employed to put a stop to a rapid process of Indianisation. That is the case not only in the Railway Department, but in the other Departments of the Government of India as well. Whenever there are suitable Indians occupying high positions and when their turn comes to occupy still higher positions, then some sort of flimsy grounds are urged and they are not given the chances on the plea that, though the officer is clever and diligent, he is lacking in administrative qualities. That is why we find some of the most eminent Indians belonging to the Indian Civil Service occupying the back benches of this House. Now that the Railway Board will become a Statutory Body and will pass from our control, that is why the Government have placed the portfolio of Commerce in the hands of an Indian, so that all the faults may be thrown on the shoulders of an Indian. This is how, from the very beginning, in a very systematic and scientific manner attempt has been made to see that Indians do not at any time occupy higher positions in the Railway Department. In this connection I will refer to one small matter . .

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: On a point of order. Sir. I would draw your attention to the fact that the motion is for a reduction of Rupees one lakh and 50,000 and the question that is dealt with is the reduction in the number of Members of the Railway Board and in the pay of Superior Officers. There is no such demand in the demand list. There is only Rs. 32,000 voted amount and another Rs. 27,000 voted amount for a Deputy Director, and so this is much less than Rupees one lakh and fifty thousands. I do not know if this motion can be moved when it is not at all mentioned in the demand list.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: Do you like to hear me, Sir, on the point of order? I would have been the last person even to move this motion. It was the attempt of my Honourable friend who put 50 or 60 questions obstructing the discussion of all other questions that has made me move this motion, because, regretfully, I find that you, in your wider power, decided to permit only the persons who had put down lump sum cuts to move their motions, obstructing the others from having their chance. I would certainly not have moved it, if there was any chance of any economy cut or any substantial cut being discussed in this House.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): The Honourable Member is no doubt aware that the Chair has no discretion in the matter, but is bound by rule 41 which says:

“Where several motions relating to the same demand are offered, they shall be discussed in the order in which the heads to which they relate appear in the Budget”.

Consequently, these motions can only be discussed in the order in which they have been set out in the agenda. As regards the Honourable Member's complaint that because some other Member has raised certain questions, therefore, what was irrelevant, become relevant, is wide of the mark. If the Honourable Member would confine his remarks to the reduction of the Members of the Railway Board and in the pay of the Superior Officers of the Railway Board, there will be no cause for complaint.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: Even on the narrow issue that has been raised by Mr. Maswood Ahmad, I find

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: If you take the voted demand, you find . .

Mr. S. C. Mitra: I do not like to give way if it is not a point of order.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: The point of order is that the demand is only for one lakh 47 thousand, while the cut exceeds that figure.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: The demand is for two lakhs 48 thousand.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: The Budget Estimate for 1933-34 is for one lakh 47 thousand. The point of order is whether the Honourable Member is in order who asks for a cut of one lakh 50 thousand, while the demand is only for one lakh 47 thousand. That is the point of order.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: If the Honourable Member will refer to page 2 of the Demands for Grants, he will find that the non-voted is four lakhs 19 thousand. That is the last figure.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: The Honourable Member wants to reduce the number of Members and higher officers.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): The Honourable Member is perfectly in order. He wants that out of the lump sum grant a sum of one lakh 50 thousand be deducted and that the rest of the amount be distributed between voted and non-voted at the discretion of Government.

Mr. S. O. Mitra: I am grateful to you. I am sorry that the Honourable Member, without going through the demand, has raised unnecessary points of order. My main point is that the post of one Member of the Railway Board should be reduced and that there should be revised scales of pay and that the reduction should be distributed in a way that from the whole grant there may be an economy of one lakh 50 thousand. For the last two or three years, I find there is a large reduction for the Railway Board. I find that, in the year 1980-81, there was expenditure of 16.97 lakhs. In 1981-82, it was 14.65 lakhs. Then, in the current year, it is 12 lakhs 50 thousand. So there has been a continuous progressive reduction of about nearly 2 lakhs in this grant. I was not hoping that it may be zero after six years, but there is still enough scope for reduction this year also. I was developing the point as to how the scale of the salaries of these officers may be reduced. When I was interrupted by Mr. Maswood Ahmad, who is very anxious for all kinds of Muslimisation, I was really helping him with my figures. I was developing the point that it is always said that there are not qualified Indians for the higher posts. I fully agree with the Honourable the Commerce Member when he said that in cases of promotion or filling up the higher posts, it is not desirable that officers, who have legitimate and real claims to those posts, should be superseded, but my point is that in the process of getting qualified Indians there are deliberate impediments put by the Railway Board. I ask my friend, the Commerce Member, to say why the service of so many Europeans on contract is extended after the completion of each term. If I understand the position, they were brought out on contract on a higher salary on the principle that they will train Indians to occupy these posts or if, in the meantime, it is possible to get trained Indians, trained in India or in England, they may fill these posts. I should like to have a positive reply from the Commerce Member why, year after year, when there are any number of qualified Indians who have their training both in India and in England, the posts are filled by Europeans. If he will only care to write to the Public Service Commission, he will find that there are dozens of Indians fully qualified, trained in England and in India, who can fill these posts. There are a large number of fully qualified Muslims also. I do not omit Anglo-Indians. If they are qualified, they should certainly be given weightage, but nobody should monopolise these higher posts. I could show from the figures that the percentage as regards higher posts even now is only 28. There are now in the higher grades 2,064 (?) posts of which Europeans fill 1,847, Anglo-Indians and domiciled Europeans 143 out of a total of 2,064 (?), 72 are held by Hindus, 6 by Muslims and only 68 for all the other communities, including Sikhs, Parsis, Christians, etc.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): The Honourable Member is referring back to the subject which has been already disposed of by the Chair. He should confine himself to the reduction of the Members of the Railway Board and in the pay of the Superior Officers of the Railway Board and not introduce extraneous matter.

Mr. S. O. Mitra: I bow to your ruling, although I do not agree with it or accept it as correct. That is quite a different thing altogether. The only arrangement for the enlistment of Indians in the higher service was by a class of special apprentices. What have they done now? They recruited six men on the mechanical side and six men of the transportation

[Mr. S. C. Mitra.]

(power) side throughout the whole of India on the provincial quota basis. Now, of these 12 men, two were found to be not quite up to the mark and they were discarded and ten were found qualified after four years' training in India, this year. Now, the Government in their wisdom have thought fit to decide that there shall be provision for only six being sent out for further training in England. Now see the acuteness of this situation. There are more vacancies on the mechanical side. They have decided to take out of these six, four from the transportation (power) side and only two from the mechanical side, and they will send out these six for training in England. When these boys will come back, it will be said that there is no vacancy for four transportation (power) side trained apprentices while, when there are more vacancies on the mechanical side, there will be found only two qualified probationers. So there are many subtle ways of defeating our purpose. Sir, I do not like to be interrupted every time, so I shall close my speech by saying that there appears to be a systematic and scientific way by which the Indianisation of the higher services is being prevented by these great experts who are here to help Indians in carrying on the Railway Administration in India! Sir, with these words, I commend my motion to the acceptance of the House and hope that the cut of Rs. 1,50,000—which is the only substantial cut that the House may reasonably expect to discuss and vote upon—will be accepted by this House.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Railway Board' be reduced by Rs. 1,50,000."

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: Sir, if I rise to speak on this motion, it is not that I agree with my friend, Mr. Mitra, on all the points, but I agree with him substantially. Sir, my friend has shown how this amount of Rs. 1,50,000 can be reduced by the reduction of some Members of the Railway Board and some Superior Officers. Sir, if one compares the salaries that are now paid to the Superior Officers in the Railway Department as also in the other Departments of the Government, he will find that there has been an enormous increase in the amount of the salaries. Sir, formerly in the Public Works Department the Engineers' salaries were almost one-half of what they are getting now, though not exactly that, but I say almost half. There was a rise in the salaries owing to the rise of prices after the war, but for the last two or three years the prices have gone down to such an extent that not only a reversion to the original rate of salary, which was prevalent amongst officers of the Public Works Department, should be resorted to, but the salaries should come down still lower. Sir, I believe that where we can get the flowers of Universities—Ph. D.s and P. R. S.s—for Rs. 400 or Rs. 500 a month with the prospect of rising to Rs. 1,000 or Rs. 1,200 only, I think the maximum salary of any appointment should not be more than that. I know I will not have the support of those officers of the Government whose salaries are over that amount, but I challenge anyone to say that they possess that intellectual asset which these flowers of our Universities possess and who are satisfied with an ultimate prospect of reaching only Rs. 1,000 or Rs. 1,200 per month. Sir, it is preposterous that an ordinary graduate of a University should get Rs. 64,000 and even Rs. 80,000 a year under the present system of Government. I ask, how does that

compare with the salaries that are obtained, as I have said, by very brilliant graduates of our Universities! Similarly in the case of those who, after taking an engineering degree, choose to join the Public Works Department, from which the Railways have been separated since the year 1905, but which formerly formed part of that Department; and since my Honourable friend over there threatened us that he would not accept the post of Membership of this Department if he were to be saddled with the onerous duties that he thought would fall upon his shoulders, I may be permitted to remind him that his great predecessors before the year 1905—I mean the Member of the Governor General's Executive Council in charge of the Public Works Department—not only discharged the functions appertaining to the headship of the Public Works Department, but also other duties, and the Public Works Department consisted of several other sub-Departments, namely, Railways, Provincial Irrigation, Military, etc., all of which were in charge of the Member for Public Works Department in those days, and an Under Secretary with a Director-General of Railways and three Consulting Engineers were considered to be quite sufficient.

Sir, it is said that the mileage of the State-managed Railways has increased, but I would point out that the cost of the connected Secretariat has increased much more in proportion to the increase in the mileage, and certainly nobody would claim that as the mileage has increased, the number of officers will increase in the same proportion. That cannot be laid down as a sound proposition in the administration of the Department which is to a certain extent a commercial Department.

Sir, in this cut, I am sure, my Honourable friend, Mr. Mitra, does not mean any reflection on the present Members of the Railway Board or for the matter of that, on the Honourable Member in charge of the Department, but, it being an economy cut, he only wants to point out the direction in which economy can be observed. Sir, I believe that since some time past we have been relieved of a certain type of answers which used formerly to be given to our questions in certain matters. Whenever we wanted to point out certain grievances in the form of questions, the invariable answer formerly was that the Agent was competent to deal with the matter, and either the Railway Board or the Member in charge of the Department replied in such a way that one could gather that they had anything to do at all with it. I am glad, Sir, that since some time past, since when my Honourable friend, Mr. Rau, and my Honourable friend, Sir Joseph Bhore, assumed charge of this Department, that that objectionable practice has ceased and in every matter we find we have reasons to be grateful to them, because we find that they have not only given answers, but also have taken the trouble to collect information which go a long way towards the removal of grievances. So I beg to submit that though my Honourable friend has moved this economy cut, he does not mean to cast any reflection on the present Member in charge of the Department or on the Financial Commissioner or the Members of the Railway Board. But what he wanted to point out was that the expenses could be curtailed. Sir, if my friend has only put this cut to show how the expenses can be curtailed, I think there are other matters to which their attention can be drawn in the same way as he has done and much of the expenses of the Railway Administration can be reduced in that way. It may be that the Honourable Member in charge and his Financial Commissioner will catch hold of every opportunity of effecting such economy, but at times it may be necessary for us to point out what

[Mr. Amar Nath Dutt.]

we think. It may be that we are not offering any expert advice, for it is impossible for us to offer any expert advice on these matters. But we point out what ordinarily appears on the surface to a layman, and some economy can certainly be made. Even if it is to the extent of Rs. 50,000, we shall be satisfied.

In this connection I may also draw attention to the fact that economy can be effected by attempting to make the guaranteed lines, which do not pay, more paying by extending them to certain places. For example, I can give the example of a particular line for which a guarantee of four per cent. has been given, but which is run at a loss at the present moment and formerly did not yield more than two per cent., I mean the Bankura Damodar River Railway. If the Railway Board had taken the trouble to visit this line, even laymen like ourselves would have advised them not to construct this line or to construct it in such a way that it may be paying, namely, by connecting it with some principal district town or sub-divisional town, so that the line may be paying. But 60 miles of line has been constructed with a guarantee of four per cent., and, if only 20 more miles had been constructed, there would have been no loss. In these small matters we formerly drew the attention of the Railway Administration, but no heed was paid to it. I submit that they may enquire about it with profit. It may be that we are not correct, and we will be satisfied if it is shown that we are not correct, but to an ordinary layman it appears that such economies can be made if they make inquiries about these things. With these words, I support this motion.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I do not as a rule agree with my Honourable friend, Mr. Mitra, in his attacks on Government, but I am glad to take this opportunity of joining him in the criticisms he has offered on the floor of this House against the Railway Board. I do this not in a carping spirit. In doing so, I am not sure what position I occupy, as remarked yesterday by the Commerce Member,—that of the lion, the lamb or the child. I am merely a seeker of economy, but I do not know what I should offer as my sacrifice on the altar of economy or expediency: a B(h)oar's head or a "Rau": Colvinised or galvanized!

My Honourable friend, Mr. Mitra, criticised the Railway Board in that it did not act upon the recommendations of the Acworth Committee. I have no doubt the Railway Board can adduce reasons why it replaced its Members by Directors and aided its Directors by Deputy Directors to the extent it has done. But it seems to me that whatever be the composition of this Board, its energies are entirely centred on wealth and nothing on the health of its employees.

I desire to ask why the Board has no Director in charge of its Medical Department while all other Departments are represented on the Board whose members draw salaries more than those of the Prime Minister of England, because, if you deduct income-tax from the Prime Minister's salary, you will find that a Member of the Railway Board receives a higher salary than he does. To my mind, the Railway Board has neglected the Medical Department on the Directorate. Now, Sir, how is the Medical Department on Railways administered? We find scattered over the State Railways five Chief Medical Officers controlling 88 District Medical Officers. The total pay of these five Chief Medical Officers comes to about Rs. 12,000

a month excluding their other allowances, cost of their saloons and excluding other expenses incidental to their appointments. Now, Sir, the posts of these Chief Medical Officers, as I said the other day, in some cases, are sinecures; they are nothing else but post offices for their District Medical Officers; the people who do the real work are the District Medical Officers, but the Chief Medical Officers draw in comparison fat salaries.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, on a point of order. May I ask you whether this is really an economy speech? We are now discussing the Railway Board.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): It is an economy speech, but has nothing to do with the motion in hand.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I hope I will prove to you, Sir, that it has more to do with economy than mathematical calculations, stressed before this House yesterday by Mr. Joshi, about the accommodation and size of first-class carriages. Sir, I desire to point out to you, and I hope to this House, that it has a very close bearing on the motion before the House in that the Railway Board should reduce its number of Directors or replace one of these Directors by one Director in charge of Health. Moreover, Sir, it is camouflaged economy to reduce the number of their Members and increase the Directors and Deputy Directors. It is taking or retrenching with one hand and giving or spending with the other. Sir, I submit that, if the Railway Board is really anxious to economise, it will economise more by closer attention to the Health Department by appointing a Health Director and abolishing all C. M. officers than by squandering their wealth, in increasing their Directorate in other unnecessary directions. My advice is to do away with all the Chief Medical Officers on State Railways, and replace them by one Director of Health responsible to the Railway Board for the medical administration, just as is done in the civil administration of this country. This is one of the many reasons why I support this motion, though not to the extent of Rs. 1,50,000. I do hope my suggestion will receive the serious consideration of the Honourable Member in charge of this Department and that he will inquire into this matter. Despite what their Agents may say, despite what anybody else may say, there is not the slightest doubt that they can reduce their Directors and replace at least one of them more profitably and economically by creating a Director of Health on the Board, who could surely control 38 officers and the entire Railway Medical Service and so save lakhs of rupees annually.

Kunwar Raghubir Singh (Agra Division: Non-Mukhammadan Rural):

Several Honourable Members have criticised the Railway administration and shown that it is not ideal. Sir, I will go a step further and say that it is not satisfactory. I say, as pointed out by Mr. S. C. Mitra, that Indianisation has not received that consideration which it deserves, even though the Honourable the Railway and Commerce Member and the Financial Commissioner, Railways, are Indians. I do not agree with the wording of the amendment as proposed by Mr. Mitra. He says "Reduction in the number of Members of the Railway Board". If this reduction were to be in the same manner as in other Departments and in other offices, then, Sir, I am afraid, Mr. Rau will have to go because reduction always falls on Indians and, as he is an Indian, he will be reduced. Therefore, it will not be in the interest of us, Indians, to have reduction in the Railway Board.

[Kunwar Raghbir Singh.]

The administration of the Railways is very costly. Top posts are highly paid. When Government say that the income of the Railways has been falling, I say the expenses should be according to the income. When the income has fallen, there is no reason why the expenses should not be curtailed. Then, Sir, public convenience has not been paid attention to in spite of the fact that we have been impressing upon the Government and the Railway Board to provide more conveniences to passengers to make the railway travel more attractive, but they have not done so. The condition of third class passengers continues to be the same as it was many years before. There is not the slightest betterment in their condition. The overcrowding in third class also continues as it did before

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): I hope the Honourable Member will now confine himself strictly to the matter germane to the present motion.

Kunwar Raghbir Singh: I was showing the lack of good management by the Railway Board in connection with this motion. I laid last year great stress on the cleanliness of railway carriages and it has not received any attention whatever. Moreover, Sir, the education of the children of the Indian railway employees has not received any attention during the year under review. Last year I said that the Railway Board did a wrong thing in bringing the old O. R. R. stock on the E. I. R. main line and it continues. Therefore the trouble can be imagined by those who were living on the main line. The question of return tickets has been engaging the attention of every Honourable Member and the Railway Board has failed to remove this grievance. On the G. I. P., which runs in a part of my constituency, there are no return tickets; so also in the B. B., and C. I. Even on the E. I. R., it has been restricted considerably to week-end return tickets. There were formerly, Sir, eight monthly return tickets and monthly return tickets, but they have been done away with. Sir, in my constituency there is a district, Etah, where there is no Railway. In provinces where there are so many lines, new constructions are taken in hand, but where there is no railway, they do not look to their need.

Sometime ago, I put a question about the discharge of railway employees and the answer given was that "it was not in public interest to give the reasons of discharge

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Order, order. Honourable Members are aware that we have already had a censure motion discussed and the general grievances connected with the Railway Board. This is not a censure motion, but a pure economy cut, and Honourable Members have, therefore, to give reasons for effecting economy apart from any grievances which have already been the subject of two days' debate.

Kunwar Raghbir Singh: Sir, the grievance against the Railway Board is that they are a *purdhanashin* body. (Laughter.) They are unapproachable to the layman, but, if the House won't mind, I will tell them my own personal experience. When I was going to Simla, I was walking over the platform as there was some time left for the train to leave for Simla. There were some policemen standing on the platform to check my progress. They said that the Railway Board Members were in the saloon there and

so nobody could go that side. So, Sir, they should be more amenable to the public than they had hitherto been. Sir, the House honoured me by electing me to the Railway Advisory Council last year, but it has never met, while the Provincial Committees have met

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): With the utmost desire of giving the widest limit to Honourable Members, I feel constrained once more to remind the Honourable Member that all these points have already been the subject of the general discussion on the Railway Budget debate. We must now strictly limit this discussion to economy cut.

Kunwar Raghubir Singh: I have nothing more to say, Sir. I only wanted to give vent to the grievances that are existing, and to show why economy is necessary.

Mr. O. S. Ranga Iyer: Sir, I am grateful to you for your ruling that the debate should be definitely confined to the economy aspect and that the cut should be treated as an economy cut. If this policy is pursued, it may be that the wrong done to certain Members on my side, who did not have an opportunity to talk on the general policy and administration under the extraordinary cut yesterday, may be remedied and it may be that they may have an opportunity to raise a discussion which they wanted to raise under the token cut of which they had given notice. This ruling of yours, Sir, will prevent the tyranny of the majority acting adversely against the gentlemen who wanted to speak yesterday. (Hear, hear.) I need only say that my friend, the General Secretary of the Independent Party, who has moved this motion on behalf of his Party, will not press it to a division if the spirit of his motion is appreciated by Honourable the Commerce Member and that spirit is nothing less and nothing more than the ruling that you gave, namely, that an economy cut expects the Government to work economically in the direction of introducing economy so far as it is possible for them to introduce it

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Mukhammadan Urban): And also economy in time.

Mr. O. S. Ranga Iyer: and my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, rightly says, economy in regard to spending the time of the House. If he insinuates that I am uneconomical I may tell him that I did not take part in the general discussion on the Railway Budget, and I may also say that I did not take even ten minutes in the only speech that I have delivered so far in this Budget discussion, because I was animated by the aspiration that others to whom he denied the opportunity to speak yesterday by the vote that he gave should have today their opportunity. I was only going to mention one fact and that is a fact which I brought before this House as early as 1926, when Sir Clement Hindley interrupted me in regard to my observations. Then I showed that there is a great disparity, a great disproportion in the wages of the higher officers in the Railways in India and of the lower paid people, a disparity unknown in any other part of the civilised world

Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar (Nominated Non-Official): There was no ten per cent. cut at that time.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: My Honourable and gallant friend from the Punjab rightly says, there was no ten per cent. cut, but if he calculates the figures that I give even in the light of the ten per cent. cut, he will find that the disparity does exist. This is how the disparity works. In Holland it is 1 to 7; in Italy it is 1 to 6; in France it is 1 to 18; in Japan it is 1 to 22. In India it is 1 to 400. It is time that the Government realised that things are done in the direction of economy. Mahatma Gandhi two years ago indicated that he looked forward to the day when the highest official in the land will get only Rs. 500. (Hear, hear.) He made an exception in regard to technical officers and technical men; men associated with the Railway Board have technical knowledge or are expected to have technical knowledge; but, at the same time, while Mahatmaji himself may not enforce his Rs. 500 in regard to these experts still it is time that the Government visualised the future and did something in that direction—if not of enforcing economy—for I realise the Honourable the Commerce Member cannot enforce economy straightaway when the whole of the constitution is in the melting pot and I know the difficulty that he has in giving a straight 'yes' to what we want on this side of the House. Our object, however, is to make him visualise the future and I hope he will visualise the future when he replies. (Applause.)

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, the Honourable Sir George Schuster, while discussing the Army demand last year, clearly mentioned that there were two kinds of economy, the economy due to economic administration and the economy due to change of policy. As regards the economy due to economic administration, I am afraid, that there is nothing more to be done so far as the Railway Board is concerned. The Railway Retrenchment Committee went very deeply into this question and they expressed their opinion and made certain suggestions. No doubt all their suggestions were not carried out, but most of them were accepted by the Railway Board; and as far as I can see, it is not possible to have further economy in the case of the Railway Board simply by economic administration. But when we come to have change in the policy, it may be possible to have some kind of economy in the Railway Board. But really speaking, if economy of administration is possible, it is in the operation and administration—Demands Nos. 4 and 5, and not in the Railway Board. We are very sorry that we will not have an opportunity to discuss the administration and operation in this Assembly on account of the peculiar way in which the Government allotted days for the discussion of the Railway Budget in this House, with the result that Demands Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5 are reached only at the guillotine stage. Had the Governor General in Council fixed definitely one or two days for Demand No. 1, we would have been able to discuss on the third and fourth day other demands; but the way in which the whole thing is now planned for us, it will not be possible for us to discuss the administration and operation; and under this head certainly we can have a very big and substantial saving by economic administration. But so far as the Railway Board is concerned, I am sorry we have done all that we could possibly do and no further economy is possible. We may have any number of token cuts to emphasise our grievances, but by economic administration, I am sorry, no further saving can be effected, although by a change in the policy it is quite possible that we may have further economy; and it is this point which my Honourable friend, Mr. Mitra, has brought out and which I want to take a few minutes to discuss.

Take the question of scales of salary first. The Honourable Sir Harry Haig, the Home Member, on the floor of this House said that a special officer was looking into the revision of the scales of salaries of the Railway Department as well. I do not know how far it is true; but I believe that the scale of salaries of new entrants is being considered by the same or another officer, and I would like a clear pronouncement from the Honourable Member in charge of Railways on this particular point. The one mistake we made and which was unavoidable in earlier stages was that in the case of the higher posts the salaries were fixed by the consideration of the market value of officers of the required ability and requisite qualifications. It was found that we cannot get a man of the requisite qualifications under specified pay and that is fixed as unity: and on that unit the salaries of other officers were calculated. That may have been found workable in the old days when the number of Indians were very few; but now on account of Indianisation of services and when more Indians are available, the case is very different and I think we should now change the policy and fix the scale of salaries, not on the standard on which you can get Europeans, but on the standard on which you can get Indians. Of course I do not advocate that we should not have Europeans. Have as many Europeans as you like and give them special allowances under the name of—personal allowances or overseas allowances—an allowance of 500 to 1,000 or even an allowance of 2,000 as personal allowances in addition to the ordinary salary—I would not grudge it; but what I would like is that the ordinary scale of salary should be fixed on the Indian requirements, and the special allowances may be given to the Europeans. The result of fixing the salaries on the European scale, as I have described above, is that on one side you pay high salaries to Indians and on the other side you increase the ratio of maximum and minimum to a very high figure. My Honourable and gallant friend has given the figures of disparity between the two

An Honourable Member: He is not gallant: he may be learned.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I shall not challenge that: I am concerned with facts, but I do not challenge the words: he gave to the House the figures and showed that there was a great disparity about the scale of salaries paid to higher officers and to the servants in the lowest grade. This is not only so in the Railway Department, but in other Departments as well. Some time ago I got the figures for the Education Department. The ratio between maximum to minimum is about 20 in England, 10 in Germany and France and one to 300 in India. I noticed that the ratio was approximately the same in Railway as it is in education; and this abnormal discrepancy is due only to this reason that in the case of the higher posts, the unit in the scale of salaries is fixed by the amount of pay on which a European of the requisite qualifications can be recruited. I am sure, if the salaries are revised in the manner already suggested by the Government of India for other Departments, and if my friend, Mr. S. C. Mitra's suggestion is accepted, it will then be possible to reduce the expenditure in the Railway Board. I am afraid that unless we have a change in the policy, there can be no room whatsoever to effect any substantial reduction in the expenditure of the Railway Board. We may move any number of token cuts and urge our grievances, but a substantial cut is not possible at present unless there is a change in policy. I was a Member of the Retrenchment Committee, and with Mr. Rau I went very

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

closely into all expenditure in the Railway Board, and we did what we could possibly do, but in certain matters like the running lines, operation and administration, where there is an enormous amount of expenditure we could not do anything, because the Railway Department considers this to be a preserve. They take it for granted that none but railway men can understand the questions relating to operation and administration, and they never allow any non-railway man to go anywhere near these items. When the Retrenchment Committee was appointed, it was not permitted to go and examine the expenditure in the administration and operation

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh (Muzaffarpur *cum* Champaran: Non-Muham-madan): Why did you not protest as Members and come away?

Diwan Bahadur Harbilas Sarda (Ajmer-Merwara: General): Who prevented you from going into those matters? Who refused you to look into those matters?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Some Honourable Members want me to explain the point. I am afraid I must discuss only the result and not deal with all that passed in the committee.

Diwan Bahadur Harbilas Sarda: Who did not allow you?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: In any case, the Committee, for certain considerations, itself decided

Mr. F. E. James (Madras European). What consideration?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I am sorry I cannot discuss the details of the proceedings of the Committee. What happened was this. The members of the Committee, appointed by the Retrenchment Committee, resigned one after another, and their places were not filled up. My point is that the Railway Department considers that the question of operation and administration could only be understood by railway men and not by laymen. This is a proposition which I for my part cannot admit for a moment, and I think that non-railway people should also have an opportunity to find out what may be called the eccentricities of railway experts, because, as I said before, all experts are eccentrics and I do not exclude the railway men

Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar: The Honourable Member in charge of the Railway Department is not a railway man.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: He is concentric.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: He was not then in charge of the Railway Department. Therefore, my conclusion is that as far as the Railway Board is concerned, there is no room for further economy unless the policy is changed, but there is substantial room for economy by economical administration in the administration and operation of the railway lines.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon (Sind: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I have seen the cut moved by my friend, Mr. S. C. Mitra, and I whole-heartedly support it. Unfortunately, I find that in the demands there are some amounts which are voted and others which are non-voted. It is not my purpose on the present occasion to oppose the Railway Board's demand, nor is it my desire to speak on the question of Indianisation or to support the claims of Mussalmans in the service of the Railway Board, but I support this motion, because I feel that the Railway Board is not managed on business lines. If Honourable Members will go through the Memorandum which has been supplied to us by the Railway Board, they will see how they are conducting the affairs of the Railway Board. If this Railway Board had been working under the auspices of any public or private limited Company or any such body, I think the Members, who are responsible for presenting this memorandum, would have been called upon to resign their offices, or at least the shareholders would have compelled the authors of this memorandum to resign their posts. A glance at page 1 of this memorandum will show the results of the working of the Railway Board from 1924-25 to 1933-34. In 1924-25, the Railway Board were managing about 27,000 miles running line, whereas today they have to look after a total mileage of 31,800. And what are the financial results? In 1924-25, deducting the ordinary working expenses, the net traffic receipts were 38 crores and one lakh, whereas in 1932-33, the traffic receipts are 25 crores and odd,—or rather the net receipts went down by about 50 per cent. Then, again, if you will go through the working expenses, you will find that in 1924-25, the expenditure on account of working expenses came to 51 crores and odd, whereas today it is 49 crores. It will thus be seen that when the income went down from 38 crores to 25 crores, they were able to reduce expenditure to the extent of two crores only. I do not think, as a business man, I can say that the Railway Board is conducting the administration on strictly commercial principles. I am sorry to find that the Railway Board are merely giving figures and they are not explaining any details in the memorandum sent to us as to how the income has gone down, nor do they point out as to what they propose to do to manage the affairs of the Board more economically. Then, again, I find that in 1924-25 we had to pay 23 crores and odd rupees as interest, whereas we are paying now 32 crores. If things are managed in this manner, I do not know how we will be able to get on. With these observations, I support the cut motion of my friend, Mr. Mitra.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): The motion before us is for a reduction in the number of Members of the Railway Board and in the pay of the Superior Officers of the Railway Board. A lakh and 50 thousand is asked to be retrenched from these two items. At present I find that the Salary of Members of the Railway Board is non-voted and cannot be put to the vote of the House. The result is that this lakh and 50 thousand will be taken away from the Superior Officers of the Railway Board. It is only a lakh and 47 thousand that can be voted upon, and I cannot see how my friend wants to reduce one lakh and 50 thousand. I do not see how this can be justified or how it can be entertained by any man who has got any idea that the Railway Board has to run at all.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: So you support Government?

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: You wait and see. I cannot support a non-sense motion.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: On a point of order. Is any Honourable Member entitled to speak about the motion or Resolution of a Member of this Honourable House as silly or non-sense, and so on

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: Every motion which has got no sense in it is a non-sense motion. Here is one which, I find, has got no sense at all. If the Superior Officers are to be abolished, I cannot see how the work can go on. Last year we had the similar cut of a lakh of rupees and the result was that the inferior staff was abolished and no harm was done to the people who enjoyed the privilege of having their salaries not voted by this House. I think it is very desirable that Honourable Members should investigate beforehand what they are going to move and whether it will have the desired effect. Here is a motion which can never achieve the desired object. On the other hand it will directly negative their very object. I think Honourable Members are not serious when they move or support this motion. So, I oppose this motion and I hope that the Honourable Member who moved it will withdraw it and will not waste the time of the House on a thing which is impracticable.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to intervene in this debate, but the speech of the Honourable the Leader of the United India Party, shows such little realisation of Parliamentary procedure and particularly of procedure relating to demands for grants that I think a little light on these subjects may help any Member situated as he may be in this House to understand the need for such motions. I may at once say that I am not supporting this motion. But, I think it is only fair to my friend, Mr. Mitra, to say that there is nothing un-Parliamentary, nothing objectionable, nothing wanting in sense in the motion that he has made. My Honourable friend referred to a cut of one lakh that was moved last year and was carried. What was the result of that cut? The result was that one of the non-votable posts was abolished. It is a very common expedient which has been resorted to both in the Provincial Legislatures and in this Legislature—that when you do want to attack a non-voted post and have it abolished, the only method resorted to by Honourable Members is to give the cut under the voted item. It is clearly understood by the Government, it is certainly intended by those Members who make the motion that the whole of this amount should not be found from the voted list, but it should really be found from the non-voted list. This elementary fact the Honourable the Leader of the United India Party has not been able to realise after several years of experience as a Member of the Legislature. I do not want to carry on this discussion. I just wanted to intervene, so that a little light may be thrown on questions like these.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I have a similar motion and, according to Mr. Yamin Khan's test of sense, it is a question whether I have got the sense to put such a motion or not. But after the speech of Sir Mudaliar (Laughter), I think it must have been a very clear lesson to the Honourable Member from Meerut to distinguish between what is sense and

what is not sense. He should judge for himself and I will not use any unparliamentary word towards him. Anyway, it will be clear to the House that this is really an economy cut. For the last two days we have been asking for the whole loaf for economy by the total abolition of the Railway Board. However, we did not get it and so let us now try for half a loaf. (*A Voice*: "Quarter of a loaf.") We shall be satisfied even with a quarter of a loaf. Where there is a will, there is a way. I know, under the present constitution, the Treasury Benches have got the upper hand and we can only criticise and make our suggestions. I hope sense will prevail and the suggestions that have been made in this House will be taken advantage of.

In connection with this economy cut, the first thing I will suggest is that the office of the Chief Commissioner for Railways should be abolished. That is a serious question which the House should consider. I for myself would like that the Chief Commissioner's post should be abolished. I will explain. My humble submission is that the post is more or less a channel through which mostly papers only pass. I know of a particular case with which I had to deal in the Railway Board. There was the case of one Assistant Engineer who had been retrenched. He was one Mr. J. N. Mehta. I considered his case to be very hard and I had to approach the Chief Commissioner with regard to this question. The Chief Commissioner sent on the papers to the Member of the Board in charge. They came down to the Director who returned them to the Member who eventually returned the memorial with his remarks to the Chief Commissioner for submission to the Honourable Member in charge of the Railways to whom the memorial was addressed. Now, I know what was done in the office of the Chief Commissioner. When the papers went to him, he simply forwarded them on to the Member in charge of Railways. Is this procedure not a channel or a post office business, I understand that there is one objection that has been raised by the Member in charge of Railways that this gentleman is also an Engineer and an expert. May, I not ask, if that is the objection, then, that objection can be met in one way if there is an agreement

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Order, order. The House will now adjourn for Lunch till Two of the Clock.

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

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Two of the Clock, Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour) in the Chair.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Sir, I have no desire to lengthen my speech unnecessarily and I have also no idea of standing in the way of the token cuts being discussed, for I am waiting to hear the fair and unfair remarks of my Honourable friend, Mr. Maswood Ahmad, on the several token cuts with regard to the paucity of Muslims in the services. Therefore, Sir, I will take the advice of Sir Cowasji Jehangir and observe economy of time, and lay down an example for the Railway Board to

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

observe economy in expenditure. But, before I proceed, I owe a word of explanation to Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar. Sir, in the early part of my speech, referring to his exposition of the procedure of the House, I unconsciously did not address him properly. I have good intentions towards him and the wish is the father to my thought and my "Sirring" him may be a precursor to that title. Now, Sir, I was submitting before the House that the first economy that should be made in the Railway Board staff is the abolition of the Chief Commissioner's post and I say that if the place of the Chief Commissioner is indispensable, the alternative is that one Member should be reduced. If that is also not possible, then the question of Indianisation comes in. By Indianisation I do not mean Anglo-Indianisation, because Anglo-Indians are there already in an overwhelming majority in the Railway services. What I mean is that if the Chief Commissioner's post is retained, there ought to be an Indian there. It cannot be said that there are no expert Engineers in India. It may be said that I am making no economy in that; but I do say that if an Indian is placed in that post, he can be secured on a smaller salary than is now paid to the Chief Commissioner. I should make it clear that I have no objection to Sir Guthrie Russell personally; on the contrary, I have some regard for him for the courtesy he always shows to those who go and place matters before him. So I submit that the place which now carries a salary of Rs. 5,000 should carry Rs. 4,000, and thus we can save Rs. 1,000. If one of the Members who are drawing Rs. 4,000 is retrenched, that will be a saving of Rs. 4,000 more. Then we have at present five Directors drawing Rs. 2,500 to Rs. 3,180. I myself personally think that if the work of certain Departments is amalgamated, and given to these Directors, the number can be reduced. I am not an expert in these matters, but I think we should have an explanation from the Railway Member to show that without these five Directors in the Board the work cannot be carried on. It should be shown what work they have been doing and whether the work of two cannot be amalgamated and go to one. Then a suggestion was made that the number should be reduced from five to four. The suggestion that I have made will reduce them to three. So there will be a saving of Rs. 5,000 from that too. Consequently there will be a change in the five Deputy Directors also.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Order, order. The Chair does not think the details are very relevant.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I will not go into the details, Sir. I make a passing remark with regard to the establishment in the working lines though it does not come under this head of demand No. 1 and comes under demand No. 4. But in relation to the Railway Board, I would refer to it and make some suggestions. Sir, when I say that it would be in relation to the Railway Board reduction, I submit that at present the working in the Agents Offices and Divisional Offices is being carried on separately by several officers whose posts can be amalgamated and the work done by one officer instead of two. First of all, I should say, if the work of the Medical Department is amalgamated with that of the Civil Department, as it was before, there will be lesser work in the Board, as also there will be economy.

Sir, then let me first of all take the question of the Medical Department. We know that the Medical Department of the Railways formerly was in the hands of the Civil Department

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Order, order. The Chair already warned Honourable Members that the questions of different cuts, retrenchments to be effected and Indianisation are not material to this issue and that Honourable Members should confine their remarks to the economy cut as such.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I submit to your ruling, Sir. But the question that I am dealing with at present is nothing but one of economy. So I have said that if the Medical Department is joined with the Civil Department, there will be much economy even in the Railway Board, and it is from that point of view that I referred to it. I am not referring to any particular grievance, although I have a particular grievance, i.e., that there are no Sindhi Medical Officers, in the higher Railway Medical Service in Sind, but that is a question which will come under other head. What I am at present submitting is that the Medical Department should be reverted to the old system of carrying on with the help of the people borrowed from the Civil Department in which way the work went on very well. Then, Sir, one word more in regard to the amalgamation of other officers. At present I submit that the Traffic Department and the Commerce Department may easily be joined and given in charge of one officer. Sir, I know personally—I am not talking only on hearsay information—how the work is going on in the Agent's office, and I submit, therefore

Mr. N. M. Joshi: We are not discussing that

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: No. This is only to support the economy measure. I am not coming in the way of your getting up to speak, and I am not touching the question of the railway third class passengers for whom I have also my sympathy, because there are not even lights provided in the latrines of their carriages. Sir, what I submit is that if the Railway Member is sincere in effecting economy, the amalgamation of the working administration with departments on the lines will give us a good reduction both in the number as well as in the expenditure. Sir, I close.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to speak at length at all. I have risen just to say that although I have great sympathy with the objects the Honourable the Mover of this motion has in view, namely, that the salaries of the high officers should be cut down, I really cannot vote for his motion. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the motion which he has made is like an aeroplane stunt, full of dangerous possibilities. His object is that the Government of India should cut down the highly paid posts. My experience has shown that whatever may be our object, when we propose cuts of this kind, the Government of India take advantage of this and they do not reduce the number of highly paid posts, but they reduce the number of clerks and Superintendents.

You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that some years ago a similar cut was made with the result that the Government of India did not reduce even one single post of an Officer, but reduced the Superintendents and

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

clerks by dozens. I, therefore, feel that the motion which he has made is not a proper motion and is full of dangerous possibilities. One word more as regards the proposals which my friend, Mr. S. C. Mitra, has made. He suggested that the number of Members of the Board should be reduced, but he has no objection to the number of Directors being increased. My own feeling in this matter is that it is much better to reduce the number of Directors who are after all subordinate to the Members of the Railway Board, instead of reducing the number of the Members of the Railway Board. The Members of the Railway Board have got greater authority to dispose of business than the Directors. From the point of view of the public, therefore, it is much better that there should be a larger number of officers who are authorised to transact business without making reference to higher authority. Our own experience is that on account of the reduction which has already been made it is difficult to receive replies from the Railway Board in time and, if we still further reduce the number of Members of the Railway Board, the business will accumulate and the public will suffer. I, therefore, appeal that it is much better to reduce the number of the Directors who, after all, will possess much less authority to dispose of business on their own responsibility than the Members of the Railway Board. I, therefore, appeal that if any economy is to be made, it is much better that the economy should be made by reducing the number of Directors than the number of Members of the Railway Board.

Mr. S. G. Jog (Berar Representative): I am very grateful to the Chair for the opportunity given to me. When there was the general discussion on the Railway Budget, I did not seek myself any opportunity to offer any observation, as I, for one, think that a desultory and rambling discussion on general lines leads nobody anywhere. The Member-in-charge takes very little notice of the observations and the Members themselves do not stick to any particular point, with the result that no attention is paid to general observations. I also paid attention to the remarks made by my friend, Mr. Yamin Khan, that people have taken unnecessary time and have not said anything to the point. So I did not take the opportunity of saying anything when the general discussion was going on. Then, later on, when the first cut motion was made and heat was radiated on account of the coal trouble, which probably in today's weather might have been more welcome, the Honourable the Commerce Member, I think, is in a better mood when he found that confidence has been established owing to the rejection of yesterday's cut motion, may I bring to the notice of this House what is the essential for the time being, so far as the administration is concerned?

If you take the whole thing into consideration, you find economy, economy and economy everywhere: economy in the Railway Board, economy in the Superior Services, economy in all the Departments. I do not restrict myself only to the Railway Board, I do not restrict myself to the Superior Services or to the other Departments. What we have to do and the most important thing is not only to preach, but to practise economy and make all possible efforts in that direction. It is no doubt true that the Commerce Member is working under a great handicap. He has got the legacy of old debts, when the Railway people and the people in charge of the administration had extravagant ways and indulged in extravagance;

he has now to pay the penalty and to see that the whole house is kept in order. The only remedy now left for him, if he wants to have a balanced Budget and a good Budget for the next year, is to have economy in all the Departments and in all the branches of the Departments.

Now, take, for instance, the Railway Board. When the pay of Members was fixed and when their number was fixed, those were days of plenty, and when probably you had no idea that in all possibility a day of difficulty might come. It is immaterial, as to whether it is due to depression or whether it is due to political circumstances, but the fact remains that there is depression year after year. Year after year we are having deficit Budgets. You have already got rid of the sinking fund; you are already encroaching upon the depreciation fund; but how long all these funds will save you, I cannot say. They are practically leading to bankruptcy; they are leading towards disaster. But how long will you continue under these circumstances? Is it not necessary for the first Indian Member for Railways particularly to think of the situation from the Indian point of view, and has not the time come that you must take courage in both hands and take bold measures and effect economy in all Departments? That is the only way of doing things. Show it by your own example and by reducing the pay of the Officers of the Railway Board to start with and setting an example to the other Departments also.

As regards the Superior Officers, a cry has been raised, I think, since the time when the late Mr. Gokhale was here, that the Railway Administration is a peculiar instance of extravagance. Complaints have been made from year to year, but no proper heed has been given. Now, we have reached a stage, we have reached a critical moment, we have reached a crisis, when not only this side of the House, but even the Commerce Member and his Department have to take stock of the whole thing and apply their minds very seriously. It is no doubt true that we have not passed a censure motion against the Commerce Member on the understanding that he is now in his first year of office and we must give him sufficient time and trial as to how he exerts himself during his tenure of office. Probably, next year, if he comes with the same tale, he will have to face an ordeal. Of course he has guaranteed or said that whatever criticism or comments have been passed in this House will receive his careful attention and that next year he hopes to bring in a balanced and good Budget before the House. This year will, therefore, be a critical year for him. The scale of pay for these Officers was fixed at a time when there was no public criticism, and they fixed the scales according to their own ideas. But the time has come now when India and, especially, the Railways, if they are to be run on commercial lines, cannot afford to bear the burden of this high rate of pay. It is absolutely necessary that the pay of these Superior Officials must be reduced. I for one have no mind at present to give any constructive proposals as to what should be done. It is for the Department to find out as to how much is necessary if you want to carry on the Railway Administration on really economic lines: it is for you to sit together and put your heads together and find out as to how much economy can be effected.

Another line of economy, which I might suggest, is this: if you really make an effort and train Indians for these Superior posts, I think Indians will remain content with even 2/3rds or even one-half of the pay just now given to these Superior Officers. The style of living of an Indian is entirely different from that of European officers: European officers

[Mr. S. G. Jog.]

probably may not remain content: according to their ideas of living,—they may require much more pay; but we, Indians, will not require so much pay, and, on this side of the House, we can give you an assurance that Indians of the same quality and with the same efficiency will be prepared to work on much less pay and that is a direction in which economy can be effected. But what are the facilities given for the training of Indians? What have you done for them? I know the Commerce Member may give me a reply that so many Indians have been trained; but is that sufficient progress? It is not sufficient progress. Again, I may bring to the notice of this House that even in cases, where you have trained people, you have not been able to accommodate them in the services. I have got a few cases in my pocket and I hope they will soon come out of my pocket and I will show that in many cases people, who were taken as apprentices and who have finished their courses, have not been accommodated. I myself have been trying for a case—I do not want to give the name—and I have sufficiently spoken about it to my friend, Mr. Rau, and I hope he will redress my grievances. My friend, Mr. Lalchand Navalrai's grievances have been redressed to a considerable extent, but mine have not been redressed even to the extent of ten per cent. I have no mind to go into details. My friend, Mr. P. R. Rau, sufficiently understands what I mean. I still hope that within a short time he will see that my wrong is redressed. What I mean to say is that Members in charge of the Railway must see that more facilities are given for training to Indians and they must also see that they are accommodated in the Railways.

There are many other directions in which economy can be practised. I have given a few cuts as suggestions for giving the Railway Administration more income. I have no mind to go into details: I would like to draw the attention of the Honourable Member to the several cuts which are not cuts with a view to bringing any censure motion or with a view to offering criticism or comment, but if he goes through all those cuts, he will find that they are more or less of a constructive nature. If he follows those instructions, I think they will go a great way in improving the revenue of the Railways. In my own province at Amraoti, the place of my residence, there is a small station at Badnera and there is a motor bus service between Badnera and Amraoti during the last so many years on account of not giving proper facilities to the people going from Amraoti; a lot of difficulties is put in their way. I have made several constructive suggestions and, if you will follow them, I think it will considerably improve the revenue of the Railways. I have no mind to detain the House any longer, but I will earnestly request the Member in charge to pay proper attention to all these things and see that they are remedied.

Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): The question is that the question be now put.

The motion was adopted.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore (Member for Commerce and Railways): Sir, my Honourable friend, who moved this motion, left, if I may say so, many crevices in his armour. But I wish to avoid taking advantage of those crevices. I wish to raise no debating point, because,

If I did so, it might give the House an erroneous idea that I was against economy or that I resented any suggestion that economy might and ought to be made. I think Honourable Members will do me the justice of believing that that is very far from my thoughts. My Honourable friend, Mr. Mitra, and I are on common ground; for, what we are both striving to do, I think, is to secure economy in the interests of the country. I have already expressed the view in this House that what we all need, not merely in the Railway Department, but in every Department of Government, is relentless pressure to secure economy, but economy that will not sacrifice efficiency. Now, if I deliberately refrain from, as I said, making debating points and giving answers which might be conclusive on minor points that have been raised, I do hope that the House will not really mistake my position. May I point out that my Honourable friend was perhaps under a misapprehension when he referred to the recommendations of the Acworth Committee in respect of the central organisation. What I say is from a rather hazy recollection, and I am, therefore, open to correction,—but my belief is that what they generally suggested was a Chief Commissioner, a Financial Commissioner and three officers who would deal with railway matters on a geographical or a territorial basis. I do not see very much difference between that organization and the organization we have, namely, the Chief Commissioner, the Financial Commissioner and three Members. The only difference, as far as I can make out, is that we have divided the work among them according to subjects and not according to areas. As a matter of fact, as the House is well aware, we have gone far beyond that, and we have now only the Chief Commissioner, the Financial Commissioner and one Member.

Then, Sir, I would like to correct the impression that the Board is only a co-ordinating body. That, I think, is one of the least of its functions. It has to deal with all large questions of policy, and my Honourable friends will believe me when I say that—thanks to my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, and those who work with him in the labour field,—questions of policy relating to labour take up an enormous amount of our attention and time.

In addition to that, the Board has to attend to the scrutiny of all projects, disposal of all appeals and general direction and supervision over all the Railway Administrations. May I point out to my Honourable friend that if his suggestion were adopted, namely, of reducing the strength of the central organization, then, Sir, there would have to be far greater decentralisation, and I am afraid that that would not be in accordance with the views which have been expressed in this House so vehemently, that there should be a tighter rein upon the Railway Administrations.

Then, Sir, my friend,—coming to a matter of detail,—pointed out that we were having another Director. I would just like to explain that point. We had provided for a Deputy Director in place of a Director. But when we found it possible to hold in abeyance the post of a Member when the Chief Commissioner had himself to do, in addition to his own duties, the duties of an engineering Member, it was found necessary that he should have the assistance and advice of a much more senior officer than a Deputy Director. We, therefore, have substituted a Director for a Deputy Director. On the balance, therefore, it works out like this that, whereas our original idea was generally a Member and a Deputy Director, we have got rid of both the Member and the Deputy Director and we have substituted therefor a Director. Those are the general

[Sir Joseph Bhore.]

lines of the substitution. I ought also to say in passing that the substitution of a Director for a Deputy Director does not mean any very large extra expenditure. If my recollection is correct, it is not more than Rs. 300 or so a month.

Now, my friend, Sir Henry Gidney, made the suggestion that there should be at the Centre a Director to deal with health matters. I am not quite sure whether he suggested that this Director should be in substitution of one of the existing Directors. Was that the idea?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: If that is the only remedy, then I should suggest a substitution. I think a Director of Health would be more useful than one of the present many Directors.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Well, Sir, I do not propose to enter into the merits of the proposal. I would suggest to him that if Rs. 1,50,000 is cut from my Budget under this head, surely it will not be possible to make the substitution that he desires, and even if the substitution were made, I do not see how any actual economy, so far as money goes, could be effected. It might perhaps result in greater efficiency,—I don't question that point at present,—because I am not in a position with the information I have, to do so

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Then do away with one of the Directors.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I am grateful to my friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, for once again intervening with suggestions of real importance. As a Member of the Railway Retrenchment Sub-Committee, I venture to submit to this House, that he speaks with an authority which is denied to those Members who were not in touch with the work of that Committee. I would ask the House to accept the statement which he has made today, a statement which he has made after having gone most carefully and at great length into all the considerations which affect the question of economy,—and the statement that he made was that he was quite satisfied that there could be no further economy in the Board's expenditure

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Unless there was a change of policy.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: That is quite a different matter. I would like to point out that in certain matters we have gone even beyond the recommendations of the Retrenchment Sub-Committee. We are, for instance, now working with three Members, whereas the Committee suggested four. Now, my friend, Mr. Mitra, himself acknowledged that we have from year to year made very substantial and progressive reductions in the expenditure of the Board, and I think, if I may say so, he furnished the reply that I was going to make myself when he suggested that this process could not be carried on *ad infinitum*.

There is one point of importance which my friend, Dr. Ziauddin, raised, and I think the House will expect me to say something on it. It is a matter of real importance, and that is the question of salaries for future entrants into the service. Now, Sir, we have completed our proposals in that respect, and I do not think that the promulgation of

the results of our examination should be very long delayed. When those results are made known, I venture to think that the principles which my friend, Dr. Ziauddin, has enunciated will not be found to differ very greatly from the principles which we have adopted. I would also emphasise a point which has already been made, I think, in the course of the debate, or certainly in the course of a reply to a question which was put in this House, namely, that we have warned all new entrants that they will have to be prepared to come under the new rates when these are given effect to, so that a slight delay in the application of these new rates will not result in any serious enlargement of expenditure.

Now, there are points, such as questions of salary, questions of work to be done by the staff which I might go into in some detail, but I very much doubt whether it is essential for me to do so. I think the real point is that my friends wish to impress upon the Government and upon the Railway Board the necessity for seeing that from time to time and as far as they possibly can, every economy, that is possible, is ensured. Sir, I entirely agree with my Honourable friend in regard to the overriding need for economy and I can assure him that the intention to pursue it and to give effect to it is not only in my mind, but that of every Member of the Railway Board. I hope, Sir, with this general assurance, he will not press his motion today.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: In reply to what the Honourable the Commerce Member has said, I can only say that the real purpose of my motion was what he agrees with me to be, but I think there is some misapprehension in his mind about my suggestion in regard to the Railway Member. What I tried to impress was as to why the Commerce Department like other Departments of the Government of India could not treat their chief Expert, the Railway Chief Commissioner as a Secretary in the Department and the Financial Commissioner as the Financial Expert as in other Departments. It is not still clear to me why the Commerce Member cannot accept the suggestion. The Railway Board really consists of one Member, the other Members are *ex-officio*, and nobody grudges their position. We on this side of the House all agree that the Railway Chief Commissioner, as an expert, should be maintained and also the Financial Adviser. But why the other Member? Why could he not be included in the Directorate? There is a Directorate which consists of five, formerly it was three. Why this one Member of the Railway Board, whose position is very anomalous? There is the Chief Commissioner above him. There are the Directors. Why this post is not classed with the Directorate, I cannot understand.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: May I explain that he is in exactly the same position as the Financial Commissioner so far as status goes.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: I suggested that the Department should have an expert who should be more or less in the position of a Secretary and a Financial Adviser and then a Directorate which should look after the co-ordination or expert knowledge of labour or any other portfolio. What is the necessity for one Member only on a particular head, say, Staff, and Labour? There is in the very Department also a Director and Deputy Director. Why a Director should not suffice as in all other branches of the Railway Administration? I think the Government will still justify the special necessity for a particular Member apart from the Chief Commissioner and the Financial Adviser. What is the necessity for it? However, our

[Mr. S. C. Mitra.]

duty in this House is to make suggestions. We are more or less an irresponsible body. The Commerce Member has responsibility to the Secretary of State and the British Parliament. My friend says we are an advisory body. I feel grateful to the Commerce Member for accepting the position that every effort will be made to provide for economy, of course not at the cost of efficiency. There we all agree. Further he had no opportunity this year while preparing this Budget to apply his whole mind to the question of economy. Therefore, I do not think I shall be well advised in pressing this motion for division.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): If the Honourable Member is going to withdraw his motion, a long speech is out of place.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: The leader of the United India Party said something this morning. Unfortunately I find here no Member present of that august group. I do not know whether he is acquainted with good sense, but when you, Sir, have allowed the motion, that shows that there was some sense in it. If Providence has denied Mr. Yamin Khan power to understand arguments, I cannot help it. In view of the spirit in which the Commerce Member has replied to my motion, I beg leave of the House to withdraw it.

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

Retrenchment in the Railway Board.

Ident.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Sir, I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Railway Board’ be reduced by Rs. 48,000.”

I have a specific object in moving my motion and I trust the House will, if necessary, move it to a successful issue. My specific object is in regard to a matter in connection with the Railway Board. When the Railway Retrenchment Committee submitted its report, it suggested the retrenchment of the Railway Board by one Member. That Member left the Board. In other words, he was retrenched. I suppose that, in doing this, the Railway Board was guided by the priority procedure in force in regard to its retrenchment policy, that is to retrench the least efficient of its Members. If that is so, in this case they retrenched a Member who, they thought, was the least efficient, and, by doing so, they saved Rs. 48,000. Now, what happened to that Member? When he was retrenched, he was not retired, nor sent on leave preparatory to retirement as is done with a subordinate, but he was appointed as Agent of the East Indian Railway to fill a vacancy which existed then, owing to the permanent incumbent being on furlough and, on return of that permanent incumbent, he was appointed Agent of the Eastern Bengal Railway. I ask the House to take note of that fact. Now, when a subordinate is demoted with less pay as was this *ex-Member*, it is done according to certain rules, *i.e.*, Fundamental Rule 15 which lays down that no confirmed servant can have his salary reduced except for the following reasons: misconduct, inefficiency or abolition of the post. The post of this Member of the Railway Board was abolished and yet he was sent as Agent to these two Railways and given a higher pay than the pay of these posts.

Mr. K. Ahmed (Rajshahi Division: Muhammadan Rural): Where do you think he could go to?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I am not criticizing the utilisation of this officer. I am coming to that point later on. Now, Sir, what is the salary attached to the pay of these two Agents? The salaries of the Agent, East Indian Railway, and the Agent, Eastern Bengal Railway, is Rs. 3,500. I am aware, and the Railway Board is aware, and I ask them to accept my criticisms in no carping or personal spirit, but in a spirit of wishing to come to some understanding of the matter. I may be wrong, I am prepared to be corrected, but I think the pay of the Agent, East Indian Railway, is Rs. 3,500, but that by a special arrangement with the Company's Board when that Railway was a Company Railway, the Agent was given Rs. 1,000 or Rs. 500 extra and that the pay of the Agent, Eastern Bengal Railway, is Rs. 3,500 and no more. Now, the extraordinary point is that not only was this *ex-Member* of the Railway Board appointed as Agent of a very important Railway, but he was, by some extraordinary process of reasoning and against Railway Board's Rules, given the favoured treatment of 12 months' extension of service after he reached 55 years of age. I may be wrong in this statement. I am open to correction by the Railway Board and I shall sit down for correction if you like.

Mr. P. R. Rau (Financial Commissioner, Railways): He is not yet fifty-five.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Thank you. I know that this officer will be fifty-five in May, 1933. Now, by this, what has happened? Senior British Officers and senior Indian Officers of both these Railways have been deprived of their ambition of their lives, *viz.*, to secure the posts of the Agents of these two Railways. There is one senior Indian officer, Mr. Singh, of the Eastern Bengal Railway with a most exceptionally good record of service—who has been deprived of this for the time being. (Hear, hear.) These Officers were thus denied this opportunity of seeing their ambition fulfilled by this favoured treatment to this *ex-Member* of the Railway Board. Furthermore—and, I repeat, if what I say is incorrect I shall sit down to be corrected—I understand that the present Agent of the E. I. R. is due to retire very soon, that is, in March, and I understand this *ex-Member* of the Railway Board is to be appointed as permanent Agent of that Railway, and fulfil the extended term of service he has been given, *i.e.*, a year's extension—a point which I shall touch upon in detail later on. Now, no doubt when he becomes Agent of the E. I. Railway, he will continue to draw his pay of Rs. 4,000, the pay of a Member of the Railway Board, that is, Rs. 500 more than the pay of the Agent, East Indian Railway. (*Voices:* "He may be a very able man.") I do not doubt his abilities. I am attacking the principle involved. Now, while this excellent *ex-Member* of the Railway Board was kept on as Agent of the East Indian Railway, another senior Officer, an Indian, acted as Agent of the Eastern Bengal Railway. But when the permanent incumbent of the East Indian Railway returned, this *ex-Member* of the Railway Board, who was still drawing Rs. 4,000, relieved the Indian Agent of the Eastern Bengal Railway and was appointed officiating Agent of the Eastern Bengal Railway, and this Indian Agent had perforce

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

to go on leave in order to suit the convenience of the Railway Board or of this *ex-Member* of the Railway Board and is still on leave pending the retirement of the present Agent of the East Indian Railway when the present *ex-Member* of the Railway Board will then resume the Agency of the East Indian Railway. (*A Voice*: "Was leave on full pay granted?") Sir, as to the fitness or otherwise of the *ex-Railway Board Member*, I am not in a position to give an opinion.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: Sir, on a point of order. May I know whether what my friend, the Honourable Member, has been saying has any relevance to the cut which he has moved, namely, an economy cut of Rs. 48,000?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: May I explain that to the Honourable Member? I will try to explain it. As to the fitness of this officer . . .

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Order, order. The objection raised has first to be met, namely, in what way is the Honourable Member's speech relevant to the cut of Rs. 48,000, which is a purely economy cut?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Well, Sir, it is a difficult thing to put the value of rupees, annas and pies to any speech on the Railway Board as it is constituted today, but if . . .

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Order, order. It is a difficult thing to make an irrelevant matter relevant. The Honourable Member must strictly confine himself to the motion which he has moved.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Well, Sir, I submit, if this motion is to be taken as an economy cut motion, the pay of one Member of the Railway Board should be reduced from the total Budget demands for the Board and if, what I say, is correct, the Railway Board is responsible for this waste of money and they should be penalized. How exactly they will be penalized, I do not know of course.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Order, order. This is a purely economy cut and it cannot be converted into a vote of censure. Honourable Members have been warned since this morning that these are all economy cuts and the vote of censure has already been discussed and disposed of. These cuts must, therefore, be supported on the sheer ground of economy.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Well, Sir, if that is your ruling, I bow to it, and I am quite prepared, if the House gives me their permission, to convert this into an economy cut. (*Voices*: "Token cut, token cut.") I mean a token cut. I do not know why the Railway Board should feel so nervous about this matter. I am prepared to treat this as a token cut of Rs. 100 if the House so desires and move for a division.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: No, Sir. I object that this should be converted into a token cut.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Sir, that objection ties my hands and pins me down to a question of relevancy, but this *ex*-Member of the Railway Board, for whom I hold great regard and esteem, was 54 years of age when he was granted a year's extension, an age when Government servants, tired out, are packing up to go to Blighty. If this *ex*-Member was considered so exceptionally competent and indispensable, he would have been retained on this Railway Board, but the Railway Board, at that time, was encouraging the voluntary retirement of its servants of all grades.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: May I ask the Honourable Member one point? Does he mean to argue that this extension, that was given to one of the *ex*-Members of the Railway Board who is now holding the position of an Agent, is costing Government Rs. 40,000, due to another officer having gone on leave? If that is his point, is it possible for Government to cancel that extension and save this money? Then, I suggest, he will be in order.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I am coming to that point; and, I am sure, the Honourable Member will agree with me that this *ex*-Member of the Railway Board is still receiving a Member's pay, while one permanent Agent is on furlough. Not only is he receiving the pay of a Railway Board Member, but, by his retention, two Officers are being retained also on furlough pay and otherwise. Now, all this comes to more than Rs. 48,000. If this Officer had been retired, as every other Officer would have been retired, instead of being conveniently employed in this way, the Railway Board and the Government would have been saved Rs. 48,000. That is my point. Remember, Sir, the Railway Board was hard pressed for money and was retrenching and encouraging voluntary retirement at that time. Now, Sir, the Murphy Enquiry Report ascertained and reported that superannuation was being effected in all Railway grades, chiefly subordinate, from 52 years and upwards. Here was an officer who was 54 years of age, but in his case what happened? A retrenched Member of the Railway Board at fifty-four years of age was not only kept on in service and given Rs. 500 extra in addition to the proper pay of his new appointment, but was also given an extension of a year's service after the age of fifty-five; that is to say, he is allowed to remain as Agent of the East Indian Railway till May, 1934. But above and beyond all this is the fact that the Railway Board themselves issued a Circular No. 427-L., dated the 26th September, 1932, in which it emphatically lays down that extensions of service, after the age of fifty-five, should not be granted to railway employees, whether ministerial or non-ministerial, unless in individual cases it is found impossible to replace them. Here was an *ex*-Member of the

3 P.M. Railway Board who was found superfluous to staff and retrenched and given exceptional treatment contrary to rules while there were other senior and efficient Officers dying to be made Agents of their Railways. But this *ex*-Member of the Railway Board was chosen to replace them on the East Indian Railway on a par as a Railway Board Member, and yet two other Officers . .

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Order, order. The Honourable Member knows too well that he is dealing with a specific grievance; he is not dealing with the question of economy.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Sir, if you consider maladministration is a specific grievance and unconnected with economy, I bow to your ruling. Sir, I offer an opportunity to the Railway Board to prove that my facts are not correct. If they are able to prove that I am not correct, I am prepared to withdraw my motion and I do not care what happens to it. But if my facts are correct, and if the House carries the cut and the Railway Board are compelled to operate the cut, I do not want it to be operated on the subordinate staff. In that case, I would ask the House to consider my cut as a token cut. Sir, I move my motion.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: The point is, can any action of Government now save this money?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: The money is gone for good.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Then it is finished.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Railway Board' be reduced by Rs. 48,000."

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Sir, I venture to submit that this motion that has been moved, or rather this speech which has been made in support of the motion, is totally irrelevant, and my Honourable friend who has been long enough a Member of this House must, I am sure, realise that it was a totally irrelevant speech. All that it is necessary for me to do, Sir, is to refer to a matter which is not within my personal cognisance, but of which I have some recollection. All I think I need do is to repudiate most emphatically the suggestions that my friend has made. He has suggested that one Officer of the Railway Board, who had to leave the Railway Board because we retrenched or rather held in abeyance one of these posts, was retrenched, because he was inefficient. I would like to say here publicly that there is absolutely no ground whatsoever for that insinuation; and I think, Sir, that such an insinuation should not have been made against an officer who has done very splendid service without his being in a position to give a reply to my Honourable friend.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Has he not been retrenched?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: The post has been retrenched, not the Officer.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Has he got the same pay?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: As regards pay, my Honourable friend pointed out that the pay of the Agent of the Eastern Bengal Railway is normally Rs. 8,500, but, I understand, that it is always open to Government to increase that salary in the case of an Officer who has special experience or qualifications. My information is that Mr. Hannay was considered to be an officer fulfilling those requirements. He was an officer of great experience and great ability, and it was for these reasons that an extra Rs. 500 was sanctioned during his tenure of the post to which he was appointed.

Sir, I have no further information to give to the House, but I do submit that the matters that have been raised are totally irrelevant to this economy cut.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Railway Board' be reduced by Rs. 48,000."

The motion was negatived.

Directors and Deputy Directors.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Railway Board' be reduced by Rs. 20,000."

This is a pure economy cut and I will not talk on the merits or the policy of the Railway Board.

I find since I left this House four months ago, some Honourable Members do not want to press a motion to vote. They are carried away by the soft persuasions of my Honourable friend, Sir Joseph Bhore. My Honourable friend, Sir Joseph Bhore, may take it to be logical or illogical, I do not know in what way he is taking it, but, in the reply he gave to Colonel Sir Henry Gidney, he said that the Railway Board was practising so much economy that there were still men with qualifications who should have got Rs. 500 extra. There are experts in the cupboard of the Railway Board who receive not only Rs. 500 as monthly allowance, but also to the extent of Rs. 1,500 per mensem.

This 20,000 rupees economy cut is a very modest one, and I ask Honourable Members to open their Demands for Grants if they have got a copy on their table. I find that they have three Members of the Railway Board, they have a Secretary and five Directors and five Deputy Directors. My friend is probably thinking that he is living in the extravagant days of his predecessors, but if the Government mean to effect economy, then two of the Directors should be done away with. In reply to my friend, Mr. Mitra's preceding motion, the Railway Member argued that a very responsible post was that of the third Railway Member and so it should not be retrenched. Well, I agree with that view. But, what is the use of paying two extra Directors and two extra Deputy Directors?

My submission to my friend, Sir Joseph Bhore, is that he should not be guided by the sweet whisperings of the three Members of the Railway Board, but he should cut out the two Directors and effect economy and retrenchment. What a Director can do, a Deputy Director also can do. It is only the matter of salary that this Deputy Director gets which is from Rs. 550 to Rs. 2,180, with of course special allowances and special privileges. They all get special allowances in these days of economic depression in the country. The Directors get from Rs. 2,500 to Rs. 3,180 and one senior Deputy Director can go on with the work if you really think that a Director is necessary to do that work. But what I mean to say is that up to now the Railway Board, including the Chief Commissioner or the Financial Commissioner, have not really applied themselves to the task of bringing economy in the Railway Board. I may make it clear to my friend that I am not going to withdraw this motion even by the soft persuasion of my friend, Sir Joseph Bhore, or any one on this side of the House. Let there be a test of strength, so that we might see whether we are a stronger party or the Government. In any case, I think, the victory will be ours.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Railway Board' be reduced by Rs. 20,000."

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take part in this debate and, for the last four days, I was silent. Perhaps I did not catch your eye during the general discussion and I did not get an opportunity then. With respect to this particular cut, I support Mr. B. Das to a very great extent. You will find, Sir, that my Honourable friend on the Treasury Benches has said just now that the Government have decreased the number of Railway Board Members *cum* Commissioners from four to three. That four was the recommendation of the Retrenchment Committee. But, Sir, I find they have increased the number of Directors from four to five, and one thing more here I will say that though they have reduced the number of Members to three, the pay of a Director is Rs. 4,000 a month just like the pay of a Member. My information is that one Director is there getting Rs. 4,000 a month; Rs. 2,000 from the Railway Board as Director, and Rs. 2,000 from some other source, *i.e.*, as Chief Controller or something like that. That is my information, and I will be very glad if the Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore will kindly correct me on that point, and if that is the case that one of the Directors gets his pay from two branches or from two sources, certainly it is very objectionable. I will suggest that one Director should be reduced and that the work of one Department should be entrusted to him and he must get his pay from that Department. In this way, this reduction of Rs. 20,000, suggested by Mr. Das, will be very easy. With these words, I support it.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: I am afraid I have not been able to follow this discussion at all. On what, and for what are we seeking to pass a cut of Rs. 20,000? We have not been told what that Rs. 20,000 cut is going to effect. At one time it is proposed to retrench one Director and at another time it is proposed to retrench two Directors.

Mr. B. Das: I want to retrench two Deputy Directors and two Directors, and the voted salary comes to Rs. 20,000.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: But even if you do pass this reduction of Rs. 20,000, that will not cover two Directors' pay. The pay of two Directors is much more than Rs. 20,000 a year. I do not exactly understand what it is intended to effect. If two Directors are to be retrenched, and if this is a token cut, and if this motion is to be taken seriously, then I think we are at least entitled to have more facts and figures placed before us. I can understand my friend, Mr. Das, saying that he wants to cut off certain allowances and those allowances come to Rs. 20,000.

Mr. B. Das: I want to cut off four officers.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: If that is so, what figures has he given us to prove that that is so? I do, Sir, beg all Honourable Members to take this motion a little more seriously. At least credit is due to Colonel Sir Henry Gidney for the way in which he put his case—he may have been out of order—at any rate, he gave us facts and he gave us something on which we did reflect.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Relevant or irrelevant.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: At any rate he has made his speech, whether it is relevant or irrelevant. When he finished his speech, at all events he gave us material to think about, whereas Mr. Das has given no material whatsoever, and we should take this case more seriously than we have been doing up to now.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: Sir, my friend has asked for the reduction of Rs. 20,000 in the Railway Board, that is, for Directors and Deputy Directors. For this my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, has found fault with the Mover and he has asked us to take things more seriously. I think we are all here seriously trying to see that the Railway Finances are sound and any one offering any advice, especially one of retrenchment, should be welcome to every one of us. I do not know what are the qualifications of these Directors and Deputy Directors. I am told that there is a Deputy Director who has the qualification of being a matriculate and, by dint of merit, he has risen to this high post, with Rs. 250 per month as allowance, which is the pay of a Deputy Magistrate to begin with; and these are the allowances of a matriculate. He must be a very brilliant matriculate, unless it be that he belongs to that favoured class of the Government which was described by a certain Lieut.-Governor as "the favourite wife". If really Directors and Deputy Directors are needed, I do not think such high salaries are needed for them; and, as regards their number, I also agree with my Honourable friend who moved this cut that a reduction should be made, considering the state of the finances. Five Deputy Directors on Rs. 550 to Rs. 2,130. Even the members of the Heaven born service do not begin with Rs. 550. I do not know whether, being a matriculate of a particular favoured community, one has a right to begin on Rs. 550 and go up to Rs. 2,130. Then the next lift is probably Rs. 2,500 to Rs. 3,180. I shall be quite satisfied with the present staff of the Railway Board and the reduced number of Members, and I would request them for the high salary they get not to have a large number of Deputy Directors or Directors to help them in these matters. I do not know whom they help; their work should fall on the shoulders of the Members of the Railway Board and, therefore, it seems to me that so many Deputy Directors and Directors are not necessary and a lesser number of them will be sufficient. That being so, I have great pleasure in supporting the motion of my friend, Mr. Das.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: I feel that there is a great deal of justification in the complaint which my friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, has put forward, that the House is somewhat muddled again by the course which the discussion has taken on this motion. But I venture to think at the same time that Mr. Das has a better case than he has chosen to explain to this House. Let us take the question of Demand No. 1—Railway Board, and see what are the facts and figures with reference to the appointment of these Directors and Deputy Directors. In parallel columns the strength of these Officers is given for the year 1932-33 and for year 1933-34. Let the House concentrate its attention first on the number of Directors. We find that whereas in the last Budget year there were four Directors, in the present Budget year there are five Directors. I should like to know from the Honourable Member in charge of the Department what is the justification for increasing the number from four to five

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I have explained it very fully. If my Honourable friend had done me the honour of listening to my speech, he would have realised the explanation that I gave.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: He has reduced one Member and one Deputy Director and increased one Director.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: I was just coming to that. (Laughter from the European Group Benches.) My Honourable friends of the European Group may just wait and see when I come to it. I know that the number of Deputy Directors has been reduced and the number of Directors has been similarly increased, and if you take the total number of Directors and Deputy Directors, it was ten last year and it is ten this year. But any man will tell you that if you abolish one post of a Deputy Director and create the superior post of a Director, that is not exactly the path of economy. I want to know why a Deputy Director was replaced by a Director and why there are only five Deputy Directors while there is one more Director

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I do not want to interrupt my Honourable friend, but I endeavoured to give a detailed explanation for that. I pointed out that on the balance, whereas originally there was a Member and a Deputy Director, we have now in place of that one appointment, namely, that of a Director.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: I can only go by the printed figures, and I must candidly confess that I am not as conversant in these matters as my Honourable friend is. I take the numbers given here. There was one Chief Commissioner last year; there is one Chief Commissioner this year; there was one Financial Commissioner last year; there is one Financial Commissioner this year; there was one Member last year; there is one Member this year. Taking the parallel columns. I see no modification anywhere. Then we come to the next figure: there were four Directors last year—there are five Directors this year, that is, one more than last year. There was one Secretary last year; there is one Secretary this year. There were six Deputy Directors last year; and there are five this year. Coming further down, you will find a new post of Assistant Secretary created for the first time. You will see there were seven Superintendents last year, there are six Superintendents this year. The path of economy seems to be to reduce the number of lower posts and increase the number of superior posts. That is a fact regarding which my friends of the European Group may try to find out an explanation. I am only taking the figures of last year and this year. I am not putting the blame on my Honourable friend at all. I look at the revised estimate and I see that these things have crept in in the revised estimate: that is to say, these things were given effect to during the current year. It is not a thing that is going to come into effect in the next financial year. The evil crept in during the revised estimate. My Honourable friend, Mr. Das, has been very lavish in his praise of the previous Commerce Member. I do not want to make any comparisons. But I venture to have a shrewd suspicion that this is one of the legacies of the past which my friend has inherited. These changes have been probably made by the Commerce Member who left last year and they have come into effect in the course of the current year and they have been repeated necessarily in the Budget of the next year. A Superintendent draws a salary of Rs. 550 to Rs. 800.

The Assistant Secretary draws a salary of Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 1,250. If you change a Superintendent to an Assistant Secretary, does that conduce to the cause of economy to pay a thousand rupees to start with to this gentleman to whom you paid Rs. 550 as a Superintendent? And these Deputy Directors who draw Rs. 550 to Rs. 2,130, why did you decrease their number and increase the number of Directors who draw Rs. 2,500 to Rs. 3,180? I say that these are facts which will require some explanation at least and I take it that this motion is merely an attempt to get that explanation from the Honourable Member and nothing more.

Mr. P. R. Rau: Mr. Chairman, I think the documents that have been placed before the House do not explain quite fully the changes introduced during the year, and my Honourable friend, who has just spoken, has quite legitimate grounds for his misunderstanding of the position.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: That is not our fault.

Mr. P. R. Rau: In the first place I would ask the House to refer to the statement placed before it last year showing the action proposed by the Railway Board on the Railway Retrenchment Sub-Committee's recommendations. It was said there: "It will be necessary to retain the present number of Directors,—that is Finance, Establishment, Traffic and Engineering, that is four Directors. The Railway Board came later to the conclusion that they would try to carry on without the Director of Civil Engineering and, in his place, have a Deputy Director, and in the first half of the year that was the position. But it happened that without a Member for Engineering and without a Director of Civil Engineering, the work of the Civil Engineering branch had to go to the Chief Commissioner, and it was considered that his time was much too valuable to permit him to attend to all sorts of routine matters. Consequently it was decided in October last to go back to the original proposals and to have a more senior officer as Director of Civil Engineering and to abolish the Deputy Director. Now, Sir, before the Retrenchment Committee made their proposals, on the Civil Engineering side there was a Member for Engineering, there was a Director of Civil Engineering and there was also a Deputy Director of Civil Engineering. Now, there is only one Director of Civil Engineering, and so from three officers we have reduced the number to one.

Then, my friend raised the question of the post of Assistant Secretary. Here, again, in accordance with the recommendations of the Retrenchment Sub-Committee, the post of the Deputy Secretary was abolished. There was a Chief Superintendent who was drawing Rs. 1,000 at the time, and this post was, with the approval of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, converted to the post of Assistant Secretary in place of the two posts of Deputy Secretary and Chief Superintendent, and the extra cost during the current year is nil, though the maximum salary of the Assistant Secretary will be Rs. 1,250 instead of Rs. 1,000.

Then, Sir, with reference to what my friend, Mr. Maswood Ahmad, said that one of the Directors is drawing Rs. 4,000 a month and that part of his salary is charged to the Central Standards Office, I might explain that it was one of the recommendations of the Retrenchment Sub-Committee that the post of the Controller of Standards should be amalgamated with that of the Director of Mechanical Engineering. This has been done, and half the pay of the occupant of that post is charged to the Railway Board and the other half to the Central Standards Office which

[Mr. P. R. Rau.]

comes under Demand No. 11, and there has been no increase in the pay of the Controller of Standards. Consequently, my friend is mistaken in the inference he wishes to draw from it.

Finally, Sir, I would like to point out that in 1930 before the retrenchments took place, the total number of Officers on the Railway Board, excluding the Superintendents, was 19 and the cost was about six lakhs and nine thousand rupees. The recommendations of the Retrenchment Sub-Committee were that we should reduce them to 13 at a cost of about Rs. 4,38,000. In 1933-34, their number will be 14, just one more than what the Retrenchment Sub-Committee have recommended, and the cost would be under Rs. 4,48,000, or Rs. 10,000 more than what the Retrenchment Sub-Committee recommended. In giving effect to their proposals, we have reduced one more Member than they recommended, and at present we have one more Director than they recommended. So the total number of Members and Directors is the same as was recommended by the Retrenchment Sub-Committee, but we have gone further in reducing a more highly paid post and retaining a less highly paid one

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: I would like to know one thing, Sir. What was the pay of the Chief Controller of Standards before the amalgamation took place, and of the Director of Mechanical Engineering before the amalgamation, and whether by this amalgamation the Railway Board have saved something or not.

Mr. P. R. Rau: The pay of the Controller of Standards was Rs. 4,000 and the pay of Director of Engineering was between Rs. 2,500 and Rs. 3,000—I do not know the exact figure, but now one officer is performing both the duties and is drawing only Rs. 4,000.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Is it not a fact, Sir, that the Assistant Secretary, whom you have shown in your establishment list, is merely the Chief Superintendent under a different name and who is still on the same pay?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The pay is slightly different as I have just shown. It is the same pay as is paid to Assistant Secretaries in other Departments of the Government of India, that is, Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 1,250.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: Referring to the Report of the Retrenchment Committee, last column. I find that the Retrenchment Sub-Committee recommended for Members, Directors, Deputy Directors two, three, and four—the number becomes nine,—I think I am correct.

Mr. P. R. Rau: What page please?

Mr. S. C. Mitra: Page 12, last column.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Is the Honourable Member putting a question?

Mr. S. C. Mitra: No, Sir; I am making my speech. I find under the heads Members, Directors and Deputy Directors, the recommendations were two, three and four which makes in all nine when comparing the Demand for Grants for 1932-33 and 1933-34. My friend, Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar, was quoting correctly, because in the previous year also looking to 1932-33 figures, I find one Member. I refer to the Demand for Grants for expenditure of the Central Government on the Railways for 1932-33, and there also one Member is mentioned. The number of Members was reduced from three in 1931-33 to one, and Directors from five to four, and, as regards the Deputy Directors, their number was increased from five to six. So if the Railway Department publishes their books in such a way as to puzzle and mislead the public, and they think that we are hopelessly muddled and we cannot follow anything, the responsibility for it must be on the Railway Department itself. We would like to know positively how retrenchment has been effected, so that we can understand everything without referring to these books, or it might be shown in the Budget, and the claim that is now made is that not only have the Railway Board carried out all the recommendations of the Retrenchment Sub-Committee, but that the Railway Board have gone far beyond those recommendations, but I cannot see where they have gone beyond the recommendations of the Retrenchment Sub-Committee. Now, the suggestion of my friend, Mr. Das, was that instead of increasing the number of these Directors, the two posts might be filled up by the Deputy Directors who also carry fairly high salaries like Rs. 2,130 with special pay of Rs. 250, and thus there might be effected a slight retrenchment to the tune of Rs. 20,000. My friend has suggested only Rs. 20,000, because he finds that the votable grant in this connection is only Rs. 20,000, and so he is helpless, he cannot put any other figure. Therefore, I support this motion for reduction.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: May I just explain my friend, Mr. B. Das's position?

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Is the Honourable Member going to make a speech?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Yes, Sir. I understand Mr. Das's position is this, that he has got the demands for this year and the demands for last year, and comparing the two figures he finds that the post of one Director has been increased and the post of one Deputy Director has been reduced. This really means that the Deputy Director has become the Director. He wants to follow the practice of last year and reduce this.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I do not think, Sir, a long speech is necessary from me on this matter. I am grateful to the three Honourable Members who spoke for explaining the position of my friend, Mr. Das

Mr. S. C. Mitra: It is all due to the figures supplied by the Railway Board.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: The essential figures in this case have been supplied by my Honourable friend, Mr. Rau. Before I turn to that, I would merely ask the House to consider one aspect of this case.

[Sir Joseph Bhore.]

My Honourable friend, Mr. Das, says "you can reduce your existing staff". I listened with great care to see whether he would adduce any grounds upon which he would base that recommendation or suggestion for retrenchment. Mere iteration, as I have said, is not a substitute for proof. I can understand if my Honourable friend says, that having regard to the work, its quantum, its character, its complexity, you do not need as many as four people. Two people are quite sufficient. But my Honourable friend did not proceed on those lines. I am quite willing to be convinced and I am only waiting for evidence to be convinced that, say, two officers can do the work of four, but up to the present no evidence, no suggestion on those lines has been adduced by any Honourable Member who has spoken. The real, salient and intrinsic facts are these, namely, that whereas in 1930, that is just before retrenchment, we had 19 Superior Officers, the Retrenchment Sub-Committee recommended their reduction to 13 at a cost of Rs. 448,000 against a cost of Rs. 609,000. We have now brought the total down from 19 to 14 and reduced the cost to Rs. 448,000. That is, we have saved nearly a lakh and 60,000 on the pay of Superior Officers alone in the Railway Board. I do submit that in these circumstances we have gone a very considerable way to meet the recommendations of the Retrenchment Sub-Committee and, I do hope, my Honourable friend will not press his motion.

Mr. B. Das: After listening to the two speeches delivered on the Government side I feel that the mentality of Government and the mentality of the non-official side are so very different that it has been very difficult for the Government side to appreciate the suggestions put forward by us. My friend, Mr. Rau, made a speech which was nothing but a camouflage. He said that the Controller of the Standards Office has become the Director of the Mechanical Department and is, therefore, drawing the same salary, namely, Rs. 4,000. That is our grievance, that there is a system of extravagance in the Railway Board and Officials get special allowances and too high salaries. They are not there for the efficient management of the Railway Board. But they cannot be thrown out. My friend, the Railway Member, said that the Retrenchment Committee recommended 13 and they have got 14. Why that one officer has not been axed?

Mr. S. C. Mitra: The Retrenchment Committee suggested 19 higher posts. The Railway Board retains 22. The Honourable the Commerce Member is not correct in saying that it is 14.

Mr. B. Das: I am glad to have that correction from Mr. Mitra. What I wanted to convey in my original speech is that there is no new construction now. There is less work inside and outside the Railway Board. The Railway Board can do some little hard work in these hard times and numbers could be reduced. Instead of that, one Member of the Railway Board goes as the Agent of the Eastern Bengal Railway. Another gets Rs. 4,000 as an extra official. This is a thing which we cannot tolerate. I am very sorry to differ from my friend and I wish to press this motion as the first division on the Railways.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): The question is:

“That the demand under the head ‘Railway Board’ be reduced by Rs. 20,000.”

The Assembly divided:

AYES—18.

Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
Das, Mr. B.
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
Jog, Mr. S. G.
Kyaw Myint, U
Lalchand Navarai, Mr.
Maswood Ahmad, Mr. M.
Misra, Mr. B. N.
Mitra, Mr. S. C.

Murtuza Saheb Bahadur, Maulvi
Sayyid.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Roy, Kumar G. R.
Sant Singh, Sardar.
Sen, Mr. S. C.
Sen, Pandit Satyendra Nath.
Thampan, Mr. K. P.
Uppi Saheb Bahadur, Mr.

NOES—48.

Abdul Hye, Khan Bahadur Abul
Hasnat Muhammad.
Acott, Mr. A. S. V.
Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.
Ahmed, Mr. K.
Allah Baksh Khan Tiwana, Khan
Bahadur Malik.
Amir Hussain, Khan Bahadur Saiyid.
Bajpai, Mr. G. S.
Bhore, The Honourable Sir Joseph.
Clow, Mr. A. G.
Colvin, Mr. C. P.
Dalal, Dr. R. D.
Dutt, Mr. G. S.
Dutt, Mr. P. C.
Fox, Mr. H. B.
Grant, Mr. C. F.
Haig, The Honourable Sir Harry.
Hazlett, Mr. J.
Hudson, Sir Leslie.
Ishwarsingji, Nawab Naharsingji.
Ismail Ali Khan, Kunwar Hajee.
James, Mr. F. E.
Lal Chand, Hony. Captain Rao
Bahadur Chaudhri.
Leach, Mr. A. G.
Mackenzie, Mr. R. T. H.

Metcalfe, Mr. H. A. F.
Miller, Mr. E. S.
Mitchell, Mr. D. G.
Mitter, The Honourable Sir
Brojendra.
Moore, Mr. Arthur.
Morgan, Mr. G.
Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur S. C.
Nihal Singh, Sardar.
Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Rau, Mr. P. R.
Ryan, Sir Thomas.
Schuster, The Honourable Sir George.
Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
Seaman, Mr. C. K.
Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar,
Captain.
Singh, Kumar Gupteshwar Prasad.
Singh, Mr. Pradyumna Prashad.
Smart, Mr. W. W.
Smith, Mr. R.
Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.
Vachha, Khan Bahadur J. B.
Wajihuddin, Khan Bahadur Haji.
Yamin Khan, Mr. Muhammad.

The motion was negatived:

Paucity of Muslims in the Railway Services.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad (Patna and Chota Nagpur cum Orissa: Muhammadan): Sir, I move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Railway Board’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Government in this connection that it is a very important question, namely, the paucity of Muslims in the railway services, and the Member in charge of the Home Department and the Member in charge of the Railway Department must be in their seats and must hear very carefully when we are discussing this point.

[Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad.]

(Hear, hear.) You remember, Mr. Chairman, that many suggestions, which have been recommended by the Railway Board on previous occasions, have been circulated to other Departments of the Government as well, and so it is necessary that they should know what is the real situation. To-day, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to detain my Honourable friends and I will not discuss the figures that will show the situation.

Today I shall take only the side-issue that was raised by my Honourable friend, Bhai Parma Nand. I am very sorry, Sir, that he also is not here.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Why not postpone that till he comes?

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Very well, on the suggestion of my friend, Mr. Lalchand Navalrai, I postpone that issue as well.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this important question of the representation of my community in the railway services is being discussed on the floor of this House for the third time in the life of the present Assembly. Sir, it is very painful that I have to repeat before the House today our grievances that have already been repeated *ad nauseam* on the floor of this House. It is still more painful, Sir, that in spite of so many solemn promises given by Mr. Hayman, an ex-Member of the Railway Board, on the floor of this House, I do not see any progress in the matter. Not only this, Sir, but when I come to deal with the figures, you will find that instead of there being any increases, the percentage of Muslims in the railway services has decreased year by year since the last three years. This is definitely the case, and I inform the Department concerned, I inform the Honourable the Indian Railway Member, I inform the Staff Member of the Railway Board, I inform the Indian Financial Commissioner and I give all of them due time to prepare and to reply adequately to that point, namely, that since the last three years our percentage has gone down year by year. (Applause.) I shall make my point clear from the figures and from the reports which I have got from the Department. I will not go into the figures that have been supplied by Mr. Hasan in this connection; that is an old document; we have discussed that document fully; but tomorrow I shall bring out and compare the results of three different years on the basis of the latest facts and figures. Sir, I very much regret that Mr. Hayman is not today with us to render an account of what the authorities did to improve the position of the Muslim community in the Railway Department and to explain why no improvement could at all be made.

Sir, an increase of .1 or .2 in any particular Railway here and there cannot be said to be an improvement at all in favour of Muslims. But if this variation of decimal one per cent. or even decimal two per cent. affects the Muslim community at large adversely, if it affects a minority community adversely, if it affects a community, which had got two, three or four per cent. in the railway services, adversely, and a community which has got 25 per cent. in population, then of course it is a very very painful matter.

Mr. Chairman, in this connection

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Why do you not base your claim on efficiency?

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: I have explained that last year, Sir, that if you want the test of efficiency, I am prepared to put forth heaps of men with qualifications of M.A.s and B.A.s even for your ordinary clerkships. I am ready to compete with you there. I do not want any competition for services where men of your community and type are already in very large numbers as examiners. (*A Voice:* "Do not ask for favours.")

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: On a point of order, Sir, is it proper for one Honourable Member to go on talking to another Member in this way and address him in this way,—“your community” and so on? I want your ruling so that we may have a peaceful discussion on this very controversial subject.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): The Honourable Member, strictly speaking, was out of order. He should address the Chair.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Mr. Chairman, I was addressing the Chair, but when the other Member, instead of addressing the Chair, addresses another Member, then that Member has no alternative but to reply to him directly.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): Another alternative is to ignore that interruption.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Mr. Chairman, I shall ignore all these remarks in future.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): How long is the Honourable Member likely to take?

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: About an hour, Sir

Mr. Chairman (Sir Hari Singh Gour): The House is adjourned till tomorrow.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Saturday the 25th February, 1933.