

11th December, 1933

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

---

Vol. IX, 1933

*(11th December to 22nd December, 1933)*

---

SIXTH SESSION

OF THE

FOURTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
1933



DELHI : MANAGER OF PUBLICATIONS  
1934

# Legislative Assembly.

*President :*

**THE HONOURABLE SIR SHANMUKHAM CHETTY, K.C.I.E.**

*Deputy President :*

**MR. ABDUL MATIN CHAUDHURY, M.L.A.**

*Panel of Chairmen :*

**MR. H. P. MODY, M.L.A.**

**MR. K. C. NEOGY, M.L.A.**

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

**SIR ABDULLA-AL-MAMÜN SUHRAWARDY, KT., M.L.A.**

*Secretary :*

**MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.**

*Assistant of the Secretary :*

**RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.**

*Marshal :*

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

*Committee on Public Petitions :*

**MR. ABDUL MATIN CHAUDHURY, M.L.A., Chairman.**

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

**MR. B. SITA MARAJU, M.L.A.**

**MR. GAYA PRASAD SINGH, M.L.A.**

**KUNWAR HAJÉE ISMAIL ALI KHAN, O.B.E., M.L.A.**

**M335LAD**

# CONTENTS.

VOLUME IX—11th December to 22nd December, 1933.

PAGES.	PAGES.
<b>MONDAY, 11TH DECEMBER, 1933—</b>	<b>SATURDAY, 16TH DECEMBER, 1933—</b>
<p>Questions and Answers .. .. 2905-50</p> <p>Unstarred Questions and Answers 2950-69</p> <p>Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Election of Members to the Calcutta Port Haj Committee—Ruled out of order 2969-71</p> <p>Statements laid on the table .. 2971-77</p> <p>The Reserve Bank of India Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses not concluded .. 2977-3029</p>	<p>Questions and Answers .. .. 3301-13</p> <p>Unstarred Questions and Answers 3313-23</p> <p>Curtailment of the Luncheon Interval .. .. 3324</p> <p>The Reserve Bank of India Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses not concluded .. 3324-85</p> <p>Statement of Business .. .. 3385</p>
<b>TUESDAY, 12TH DECEMBER, 1933—</b>	<b>MONDAY, 18TH DECEMBER, 1933—</b>
<p>Questions and Answers .. .. 3029-38</p> <p>Statements laid on the table .. 3038-51</p> <p>The Indian Tariff (Second Amendment) Bill—Passed .. .. 3051-95</p>	<p>Statements laid on the table .. 3387-92</p> <p>Message from the Council of State 3392</p> <p>The Reserve Bank of India Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses not concluded .. 3393-3456</p>
<b>WEDNESDAY, 13TH DECEMBER, 1933—</b>	<b>TUESDAY, 19TH DECEMBER, 1933—</b>
<p>Statement laid on the table .. 3097-98</p> <p>The Reserve Bank of India Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses not concluded .. 3098-3151</p>	<p>Member Sworn .. .. 3457</p> <p>The Reserve Bank of India Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses not concluded .. 3457-3519</p>
<b>THURSDAY, 14TH DECEMBER, 1933—</b>	<b>WEDNESDAY, 20TH DECEMBER, 1933—</b>
<p>Questions and Answers .. .. 3153-66</p> <p>Unstarred Questions and Answers 3166-78</p> <p>The Reserve Bank of India Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses not concluded .. 3178-3231</p>	<p>Questions and Answers .. .. 3521-40</p> <p>Unstarred Questions and Answers 3540-45</p> <p>The Reserve Bank of India Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses not concluded .. 3545-3604</p>
<b>FRIDAY, 15TH DECEMBER, 1933—</b>	<b>THURSDAY, 21ST DECEMBER, 1933—</b>
<p>Short Notice Question and Answer 3233-34</p> <p>Observance of holidays by the Legislative Assembly .. .. 3234-35</p> <p>The Reserve Bank of India Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses not concluded .. 3235-99</p>	<p>Short Notice Question and Answer 3605</p> <p>Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Alleged punishment of a man for offering his prayers on the Lahore Railway Station platform—Not moved. 3605-07</p>

	PAGES.		PAGES.
THURSDAY 21ST, DECEMBER, 1933— <i>contd.</i>		FRIDAY, 22ND DECEMBER, 1933— <i>contd.</i>	
The Reserve Bank of India Bill— Discussion on the motion to pass not concluded .. ..	3607-62	Message from His Excellency the Governor General <i>re</i> Extension of the life of the Legislative Assembly .. ..	3686
FRIDAY, 22ND DECEMBER, 1933—		The Reserve Bank of India Bill— Passed as amended .. ..	
Questions and Answers .. ..	3663-81		3686- 3703, 3704-34
Unstarred Questions and Answers	3681-85		
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Recommendations of the Capitation Tribunal—Request to move to be renewed .. ..	3686	The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill —Introduced .. ..	3703



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 11th December, 1933.

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

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

### GOLD EXPORTED FROM, AND IMPORTED INTO, INDIA.

1316. **\*Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Will Government be pleased to state the total weight and total value in rupees of gold (i) exported from, and (ii) imported into, India since Great Britain went off the gold standard up to the 31st October, 1933?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** Exports and imports of gold from the 22nd September, 1931, to the 30th September, 1933, the latest date up to which Monthly Sea-borne Trade Accounts have been received, were as follows:

Exports=about 19½ million fine ounces, value about Rs. 154½ crores.

Imports=about 486,224 fine ounces, value about Rs. 3½ crores.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Will Government be pleased to say how long are they going to allow this export of gold without any restriction on it?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** No, Sir. The Government will not be pleased to give any promise in that direction.

### RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WAR PENSIONS COMMITTEE.

1317. **\*Sardar Sant Singh:** Does the recommendation No. XXI of the orders of Government on the recommendation of the War Pensions Committee cover the cases which were disposed of by the Government of India before this recommendation was made by the Committee?

**Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham:** Yes.

### ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE CONTRACTOR OF THE LICENSED COOLIES AT THE LAHORE RAILWAY STATION.

1318. **\*Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that licenced porter (coolie) contractors on the North Western Railway are governed by the contract form No. A. C.-23?

(b) Is it a fact that the provision is made in this contract form that the contractor should not charge more than Rs. 2 per head per mensem on the coolies engaged by him?

(c) Is it a fact that allegations were made by the coolies against the contractor at Lahore that he was charging about eleven rupees a month from each cooly, including 0-2-0 a day, i.e., Rs. 3-12-0 per head per month for smoking fund from all coolies, including Sikh coolies?

(d) Will Government please lay on the table of this House the letter of the Sikh Rights Protection Society, Lahore, protesting against this tax on Sikh coolies, and copies of the questions for the North Western Railway Advisory Committee not admitted by the Agent?

(e) Is it a fact that this question was brought to the notice of the Railway authorities for enquiry and discussion by the North Western Railway Advisory Committee, and that the Agent refused to intervene on the ground that the coolies were not the employees of the railway? Is not the charge of Rs. 11 or so instead of Rs. 2 in contravention of the terms of the agreement of contract? If it is, why did the Agent, North Western Railway, refuse an enquiry?

(f) Is it a fact that about forty or fifty coolies formed a union under the Trade Union Act, and were deprived of the badges by the coolies contractor for this action?

(g) Is it a fact that the matter was referred to the Registrar of Trade Unions, Punjab, by the North Western Railway Porters' Union (Registered) for appointment of a Court of Inquiry under the Trade Disputes Act, and that no action has so far been taken by the Punjab Government, and are Government aware that the poor coolies who were deprived of their badges are starving?

(h) Will Government please state the reasons for not appointing a Court of Inquiry?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** I am obtaining certain information from the Agent, North Western Railway necessary for answering this question and shall lay a reply on the table in due course.

†1319.\*

#### MUSLIM REPRESENTATION IN THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

1920. \***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** (a) When were the Government of India orders regarding communal representation in the Imperial Secretariat Services issued?

(b) How many vacancies have occurred in the Finance Department among (i) Superintendents (ii) Assistants and (iii) Second Division Clerks since the issue of those orders and how have they been filled?

(c) Is it a fact that the Finance Department, while filling the vacancies, have ignored the Government orders in the matter of Muslim representation?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** (a) In 1926.

(b) There have been since 1926, eight vacancies in the Superintendents' grade which have been filled by the promotion of four Hindus, one Muslim, one Indian Christian, one Anglo-Indian and one European Assistant.

†This question was withdrawn by the questioner.

There have been 17 vacancies in the Assistants' grade which have been filled by the recruitment of 11 Hindus and five Muslims, either from other offices or by the Public Service Commission, and by the promotion of one Muslim from the Second Division.

There have been three vacancies in the Second Division which have been filled by the recruitment of two Hindus from other offices and the promotion of one Sikh from the Third Division.

(d) No. Appointments to the grade of Superintendents are made purely by selection from the Assistants irrespective of race or community. In the Assistants' grade Muslims obtained rather more than one-third of the vacancies and in the Second Division, where there have been only three vacancies, one appointment has gone to a Sikh, a member of a minority community.

#### DISCRIMINATION AGAINST INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

1321. \*Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: (a) Are Government aware of the recent judgment of the Supreme Court of South Africa in which the Court held that the Postmaster General had the right to direct that Indians be not served at the Post Office counters where the Europeans are served?

(b) What action do Government propose to take in this matter?

(c) Is discrimination of this kind permissible in the Dominions forming part of the British Empire?

(d) Are Government prepared to take effective measures in this regard to introduce the principle of discrimination?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) Yes.

(b) The Agent of the Government of India in South Africa has already made informal representations to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs.

(c) So far as the Government of India are aware, such discrimination is not practised in any other Dominion.

(d) Government think that the policy which they are now following deserves further trial; but if the Honourable Member has any particular policy in mind, Government will be glad to examine it to see to what extent it can be profitably adopted.

#### LEVY OF WATER METER RENT FROM THE OCCUPIERS OF GOVERNMENT QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI.

1322. \*Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur: (a) Are Government aware that the New Delhi Municipal Committee has decided to levy rent for the water meters which they have recently installed in every Government quarter and bungalow? If so, what necessitated the Municipality doing so?

(b) How much does each water meter cost?

(c) What is the rent that has been fixed by the municipality and on what basis has it been fixed?

(d) Are Government aware that there is a great resentment among the tenants of Government quarters, particularly the low paid clerks, over this rent charge?

(e) Will Government please name the municipalities in India in the centrally administered areas which have installed water meters and charge such exorbitant rent?

(f) Is it a fact that these water meters have been installed by the municipality in its own interests and not in the interests of the tenants? If it is not so, in whose interests have these been installed? If it is in the interest of the tenants, did Government obtain the consent of the tenants before the installation of the meters?

(g) Are Government aware that previously Government clerks used to be charged Annas 8 only for the water supply in orthodox Government quarters and later on this charge was increased from Annas 8 to Rs. 2 per mensem and now an additional rent will bring the charge for water supply to Rs. 3 per mensem? Are Government aware that this charge is too much for a low paid clerk?

(h) Are Government aware that by allowing the municipality to charge such a high rent for the water meters they are creating great dissatisfaction among the tenants of Government quarters who are almost all Government servants?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** (a) to (f) & (h). I would refer the Honourable Member to the replies given to Mr. Maswood Ahmad's starred questions Nos. 1312 and 1313 on the 7th December 1933, and to the connected supplementaries.

(g) Up to the 22nd July, 1926, the charges were annas 8 per mensem per quarter. The subsequent scale of charges will be found in the reply given to part (d) of Mr. Maswood Ahmad's starred question No. 1312 on the 7th December, 1933.

#### PROVISION OF DEMARCATING HEDGES IN THE UNORTHODOX QUARTERS ON THE CANTONMENT ROAD, NEW DELHI.

1323. **\*Mr. Bhuput Sing:** (a) Are Government aware that the tenants of the unorthodox quarters on the Cantonment Road in New Delhi are much inconvenienced and are very often put to loss owing to there being a common entrance gate and a common compound for each of the two adjacent quarters which prevent them from checking unauthorised persons and stray beasts from gaining access to the quarters?

(b) Are Government aware that occasions for friction frequently arise between two tenants of different castes, creeds and temperaments living side by side in the same compound, over which neither of them has complete control?

(c) Do Government propose to put up, as early as possible, inexpensive, demarcating hedges between two contiguous quarters and to provide separate gates for each quarter?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Moyer:** (a) and (b). No.

(c) The partition of the compounds of unorthodox quarters by means of hedges was one of several alterations and improvements suggested by the Imperial Secretariat Association in 1929. The cost of the work required, including the provision of separate fences and gates, would however be considerable and I am not prepared in present financial conditions to make any promise as to its execution.

#### ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE RAILWAY STAFF AT THE DELHI RAILWAY STATION.

1324. **\*Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the press message published in the *Daily Adil* of

Delhi, dated the 20th November, 1933, on page 6 under the heading "Delhi station par zaireen-i-khana Kaba ke saath bad-salooki" "Railway mulazmin zanani gari men ghus gai"?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the true facts of the incident, the names of the persons ill-treated and the action taken against them by the Railway authorities?

(c) If no action has been taken in the matter, why? Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of appointing an independent Enquiry Committee for a thorough investigation of the matter?

(d) Are Government aware that a number of passengers are put to great inconvenience daily by the coolies at Delhi Main Railway Station who generally demand much higher wages than those fixed by the Railway authorities for the carriage of luggage?

(e) With a view to remove this complaint of passengers, do Government propose to arrange adequate supervision by Railway officers in the matter?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) Yes, by the courtesy of the Honourable Member.

(b) and (c). I place on the table a copy of a report from the Divisional Superintendent, Delhi, on the matter. Government do not consider that any special enquiry is necessary.

(d) and (e). I have sent a copy of these questions to the Agent, North Western Railway, for any action he may consider necessary.

---

COPY OF A LETTER NO. N/1, DATED THE 5TH DECEMBER 1933, FROM THE DIVISIONAL SUPERINTENDENT, DELHI, TO THE AGENT, NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY, LAHORE.

Reference your letter No. 97-G/557 of the 4th instant. No report of the alleged occurrence has up to the present been received by me, but on receipt of your letter under reply I obtained a copy of the journal in question and instituted enquiries into the matter. It would appear that on the 23rd November Ticket Collector Fazal Ahmed of Delhi entrained some female members of his family who were proceeding to Mecca in the women's compartment by 61 Up passenger, and that while doing so he had an altercation with some other passengers whose family members were also travelling in the same women's compartment, and that this altercation was apparently fairly serious. The only member of the station staff of Delhi who knows anything about the matter is Ticket Collector Shih Charan who states that while he was on the platform at the time he heard there had been some trouble in connection with passengers in 61 Up, and that he saw Ticket Collector Fazal Ahmed who informed him that he had been assaulted by some passengers in this train. The Station Master and the Assistant Station Master on duty know nothing of the affair, and definitely state that no report whatever was made to them. Enquiries made in the Police Station at Delhi show that no complaint was lodged there. The Police Sergeant A. D. Rushton referred to has been removed from Delhi a few days ago, and his statement cannot therefore be obtained. If as alleged he was present when this affair took place, he made no report in his diary at the Police Station. The Ticket Collector Fazal Ahmed who is concerned in this case is on leave at present and I am therefore unable to obtain his statement.

---

#### PROVISION OF QUARTERS TO THE INSPECTORS OF ACCOUNTS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1325. **Mr. E. H. M. Bower:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the Inspectors of Accounts employed on the East Indian Railway:

(i) under the Company Rules,

(ii) under the Oudh and Rohilkund Railway Rules, and

(iii) those appointed after the 1st January, 1925, are provided with quarters?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the negative, will Government state why they are not provided with quarters like the Inspectors of all other departments?

(c) Do Government propose to issue instructions to have these Inspectors provided with quarters? If not, why not?

**Mr. P. E. Rau:** (a) The Inspectors of Accounts referred to in the question are provided with Government quarters when available. For these they have to pay rent.

(b) and (c). The duty of Inspectors of Accounts is not such that their residence in any particular locality can be considered necessary in the interests of the working of the railways so as to render it necessary for Railway Administration to find accommodation for the staff.

#### RULES FOR THE RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF SUBORDINATE STAFF ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1326. **\*Mr. E. H. M. Bower:** (a) In connection with the reply to Lt.-Col. Sir Henry Gidney's starred question No. 908 (b) given on the 24th March, 1933, will Government state whether the Agent of the East Indian Railway has since decided to publish the rules for the recruitment and training of subordinate staff on the East Indian Railway in the *East Indian Railway Gazette*?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the negative, will Government state why these rules are withheld from the staff concerned?

(c) Do these rules govern the posting of subordinates to officiating appointments?

(d) If the answer to part (c) be in the negative, do Government propose to issue instructions to the railway authorities concerned to frame the necessary rules? If not, why not?

(e) Is it a fact that no provision has been made in these rules for the appointment and promotion of Assistant Trains Examiners and Trains Examiners?

(f) If the answer to part (e) be in the affirmative, do Government propose to issue instructions to the railway authorities concerned to frame the necessary rules? If not, why not?

(g) Is it a fact that in these rules under the caption "Guards and the normal channels of their promotions", mention of Gunner Guards and Pilot Guards has been omitted?

(h) Is it a fact that there are different scales of pay for Gunner Guards, Pilot Guards and Guards?

(i) If the answer to part (h) be in the affirmative, will Government please state the salaries of these posts, Company and State scales separately?

(j) Will Government please state whether vacancies in the Guards' list are filled on Divisions by recruitment:

(i) of outsiders without previous experience, and

(ii) sometimes by railway staff from other departments to the exclusion of Gunner Guards and Pilot Guards? If so, why?

(k) Do Government propose to issue instructions to the railway authorities concerned to frame necessary rules for the promotion of Gunner Guards and Pilot Guards? If not, why not?

**Mr. P. E. Rau:** With your permission, I shall reply to this and the next two questions together. I am calling for certain information and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

**RULES FOR THE RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF SUBORDINATE STAFF  
ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

†1327. **\*Mr. E. H. M. Bower:** (a) Is it a fact that in the rules for the recruitment and training of subordinate staff on the East Indian Railway no mention has been made of Relieving Guards?

(b) Are Relieving Guards utilised principally to relieve Assistant Station Masters, Assistant Yard Masters and Assistant Controllers?

(c) Will Government please state what principles govern the promotion of Guards to the posts of Relieving Guards?

(d) Is it a fact that when Guards, Grade II, and Gunner Guards are promoted to the post of Relieving Guards they are given the maximum salary of Guards in Grade I?

(e) Is it a fact that the post of Relieving Guard is not a 'Selection post'?

(f) Do Government propose to issue instructions to the authorities concerned to frame suitable rules for promotion of subordinates to the post of Relieving Guards? If not, why not?

**RULES FOR THE RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF SUBORDINATE STAFF  
ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

†1328. **\*Mr. E. H. M. Bower:** (a) Is it a fact that in the rules for the recruitment and training of subordinate staff on the East Indian Railway, no mention has been made of Crewmen, Crew-in-charge, Travelling Ticket Inspectors, Travelling Ticket Examiners and Head Ticket Collectors?

(b) Will Government please state the avenue of promotions in these posts?

(c) Are promotions to vacancies in higher appointments in these ratings confined to men serving in the Divisions in which they occur, or are they open to all Divisions?

(d) Do Government propose to issue instructions to the railway authorities concerned to frame rules governing such promotions?

**PASS RULES FRAMED BY THE RAILWAY BOARD.**

1329. **\*Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) Will Government be pleased to enquire and state whether it is a fact that the Railway Board have recently framed pass rules, under which gazetted officers are entitled only to six set of privilege passes?

(b) If so, on what occasion do they use these privilege passes?

---

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 1326.

(c) Are they provided with metal or card passes to travel from any to any station with their wives, children and other family members? If so, what is the sense and meaning of six set of first class privilege passes?

(d) Are they authorised to travel, in addition to their wives and family, with dogs, cats and such other live stock on their metal or card pass, and carry the same in their respective carriages or saloons? If so, why?

(e) Are officers considered to be travelling on duty with metal or card pass and accompanied by their wives? If so, what inspection or duty do their wives perform, and will a copy of their inspection report or note be laid on the table of this House?

(f) Are subordinate staff also permitted to take their wives on card pass when proceeding on duty or inspection? If not, why not?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) Yes, this restriction was introduced on the 1st April, 1933; there was no such limit before.

(b) These passes are intended for use for journeys made otherwise than on duty.

(c) Metal and card passes are intended for journeys on duty. On certain railways they cover an officer's wife and family if travelling with him. The privilege passes are, as I have already explained, intended for journeys made otherwise than on duty.

(d) I understand there is no order prohibiting officers when travelling on a pass from carrying free domestic animals such as dogs or cats.

(e) Whether an officer's wife travels with him or not is irrelevant for the purpose of ascertaining whether he is travelling on duty.

(f) The answer to the first part of this question is, I understand in the negative. I cannot admit that the analogy of the practice with regard to officers is a sufficient justification for extending it to the subordinates.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** What was the answer to part (d)?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** No prohibition.

#### USE OF AN OFFICER'S CARRIAGE FOR JOY RIDES UNDER THE ORDERS OF THE DIVISIONAL SUPERINTENDENT, MORADABAD DIVISION, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1330. **\*Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) Will Government be pleased to inquire and state whether it is a fact that officers of Moradabad (East Indian Railway) frequently use their carriages for joy rides? If not, will they please state for what purpose Carriage No. 2017, under the orders of the Divisional Superintendent, East Indian Railway, Moradabad, was hauled to and from Delhi on the 7th November, 1933?

(b) What were the movements of the officer in question entitled to use the said carriage on that day?

(c) Are the wife or family of an officer entitled to use the carriage by themselves? If so, under what authority?

(d) Is the privilege of such joy rides or to travel without ticket sanctioned for the subordinate staff, specially low paid staff? If not, why not?

(e) What is the result of the inquiry made in starred question No. 910 asked by Bhai Parma Nand, on the 13th September, 1933, relating to the use of an officer's carriage for joy rides under orders of the Divisional Superintendent, Moradabad Division, East Indian Railway?



(f) What action has been taken to prevent further loss of revenue and additional expenditure of haulage on account of the use of official carriages in such a manner?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a), to (d) and (f). I have called for information from the Agent, East Indian Railway, and shall lay a complete reply on the table later.

(e) I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the statement I laid on the table on the 5th December, 1933.

**PERCENTAGE OF FAILURE OF STUDENTS IN THE RAILWAY SCHOOL OF TRANSPORTATION.**

1331. **Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) What is the percentage of failure of students in each course in the Railway school of Transportation during 1931-32, 1932-33 and the half year 1933-34?

(b) How many students after having been declared as passed were considered by the present Superintendent as unfit for the respective appointments? If so, why?

(c) What are the marks obtained by each student during the term of office of the present Superintendent? If no marks are given, why not?

(d) What commercial and transportation experience had the Superintendent and where did he work as Commercial and Transportation Superintendent? If not, how can he judge?

(e) Is the Lecturer and the Examiner of students the same person? If so, why?

(f) What additional staff of Lecturer, Demonstrator, etc., has been engaged since his arrival? Was it essential? If so why was it not considered as such during the last Superintendent's tenure of office?

(g) Was the staff retrenched gazetted as such in the Extraordinary Gazette, dated the 24th June, 1933? If not, why not, and why was it retrenched without a proper notification?

(h) Were the retrenched or voluntarily retired hands recalled and was the period of their relief and return treated as leave without pay? If so, under what authority?

(i) Why should innocent subordinates suffer for the folly of the Superintendent?

(j) Do Government propose to disburse them the pay for the period of their forced absence? If not, why not?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** I have called for certain information and will place a reply on the table of the House in due course.

**EAST INDIAN RAILWAY TRAINING SCHOOL, CHANDAUSI.**

1332. **Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to an article, dated the 15th October, 1933, published in the *Railway Radio* under the caption "East Indian Railway Training School, Chandausi" (Cutting sent to the Railway Department)?

(b) Is the Superintendent, Telegraph Training School, Chandausi required to travel extensively? If so, where and for what purpose?

(c) Is it a fact that the Superintendent is provided with a card pass? If so, why?

(d) What other card passes are issued to the Superintendent and staff and why?

(e) Is there a catering contractor for the School to supply the requirements of the students and the staff? If so, why are provision passes issued to the Superintendent and staff?

(f) Was it considered whether the staff and Superintendent could travel on cheque passes which could be had from the Station Master for purposes of official duty?

(g) Will Government please lay on the table the proceedings of the inquiry on the averted collision of the trolley with the train mentioned in the article referred to in part (a)? If not, will they please state under what circumstances was the trolley used by the Superintendent (Mr. R. F. Wood)? Who is responsible for the trolley in the night time? What are the code numbers exchanged between the two stations for line clear? Why was the driver only punished and not the Superintendent?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) Yes.

(b) to (g). I am making enquiries from the Agent, East Indian Railway, and shall lay a reply on the table in due course.

#### PLACING OF DISTRICT GAZETTEERS OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES IN THE IMPERIAL LIBRARY, CALCUTTA.

1333. **\*Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen:** (a) Is it a fact that District Gazetteers of foreign countries are not available in the Imperial Library, Calcutta?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, do Government propose to take steps to place the District Gazetteers of Great Britain, Ireland, United States of America and Canada in the Imperial Library at Calcutta? If not, why not?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** (a) and (b). Government are not aware whether Foreign Governments have brought out publications like the Indian Gazetteers about their respective countries. But Year Books and similar publications which contain a great deal of general information about most foreign countries are available in the Imperial Library, Calcutta.

#### TRANSFER OF THE RAILWAY RATES ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO CALCUTTA.

1334. **\*Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen:** (a) Is it a fact that the Railway Rates Advisory Committee has been reconstituted under the Chairmanship of Sir Zahid Suhrawardy and Mr. E. A. Sims as Member and Secretary, and that the headquarters of the Committee have been transferred to Calcutta?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state (i) the reasons for the retransfer of the Committee to Calcutta; (ii) the cost incurred due to the retransfer?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) Yes.

(b) (i) The headquarters have been transferred from Vizagapatam to Calcutta for administrative convenience.

(ii) I have called for information and will place a reply on the table in due course.

**SELECTION OF STAFF IN THE OFFICE OF THE RAILWAY RATES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**

**1335. \*Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen:** (a) Were there any promises and "Note of Assurance" left by the late President of the Railway Rates Advisory Committee?

(b) Are those promises and "Note of Assurance" strictly followed in selecting the staff?

**Mr. P. E. Rau:** I am not aware to what promises, etc., my Honourable friend is referring but in any case I do not think he intended to or was in a position to tie the hands of his successor.

**RE-EMPLOYMENT OF THE RETRENCHED STAFF IN THE OFFICE OF THE RAILWAY RATES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**

**1336. \*Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen:** Will Government please state whether the circular letter No. 1635-E. G., of the 30th December, 1932, regarding conditions of re-employment of the retrenched staff, is followed in the office of the Railway Rates Advisory Committee's Office? If not, why not?

**Mr. P. E. Rau:** Government have no reason to presume that their instructions are not being followed by the Railway Rates Advisory Committee.

**RE-EMPLOYMENT OF THE RETRENCHED STAFF IN THE OFFICE OF THE RAILWAY RATES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**

**1337. \*Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen:** (a) Will Government please state whether any staff after retrenchment preferred an appeal to the Government of India?

(b) Is it a fact that some juniors have been kept in the staff of the Railway Rates Advisory Committee's Office, in supersession of the claims of the seniors? If so, who are they and under what circumstances have they been allowed to supersede the claims of their seniors?

**Mr. P. E. Rau:** (a) The Railway Board have received appeals from two members of the staff.

(b) Government have no information. They must leave this to the discretion of the President.

**RE-APPOINTMENT OF RETRENCHED STAFF AFTER THE RECONSTITUTION OF THE RAILWAY RATES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**

**1338. \*Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen:** Has there been any reappointment after retrenchment after the reconstitution of the Railway Rates Advisory Committee? If so who are the men appointed and in what capacities?

**Mr. P. E. Rau:** I have called for information and will place a reply on the table in due course.

**APPOINTMENT OF A REGISTRAR INSTEAD OF A PERSONAL ASSISTANT TO  
THE PRESIDENT OF THE RAILWAY RATES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**

1339. \*Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen: (a) Will Government be pleased to state the reasons for retaining the post of Personal Assistant to President in addition to Member Secretary of the Railway Rates Advisory Committee?

(b) Do Government propose to appoint a Registrar instead of a Personal Assistant to the President, as in the case of the Rates Tribunal in England?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) The post was considered necessary for the due discharge of the work of the Committee.

(b) No.

**APPOINTMENT OF RETRENCHED PERSONS OF THE RAILWAY RATES  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**

1340. \*Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen: Do Government propose to revert the pensionable persons of other departments and arrange appointments from suitable retrenched persons of the Railway Rates Advisory Committee?

Mr. P. B. Rau: No. Government are content to leave matters of detail of this sort to the President.

**ACCIDENT ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY BETWEEN DUMRI AND BURBEE  
STATIONS.**

1341. \*Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen: (a) What was the cause of the accident on the East Indian Railway between Dumri and Burbee on the 2nd May, 1933?

(b) Was there any enquiry about the accident by any committee of responsible officers and non-officers? If so, what was their finding about the cause of the accident?

(c) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a copy of the report of the Enquiry Committee, if any?

(d) Will Government be pleased to state the names, with designation of the members, who formed the Committee of such enquiry, if any?

(e) How many persons were killed and injured in the accident?

(f) How many of the injured persons were treated in the Railway Hospitals and how many of the injured persons have been permanently incapacitated in spite of treatment in the Railway Hospitals?

(g) Is there any complaint against the District Medical Officer of negligence in treatment?

(h) Are there any X-ray arrangements, in the Railway Hospital where the injured were taken and treated? If not, was any injured person, requiring X-ray photograph of his injuries, detained in the hospital? If so, why?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) and (e). I would refer my Honourable friend to the full statement that I made on this subject in reply to question No. 29 by Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh on the 23rd August, 1933.

(b) and (d). A preliminary enquiry was held by Mr. Jones, Superintendent, Watch and Ward Department, Mr. Venables, Chief Engineer,

Mr. D. M. S. Robertson, Chief Operating Superintendent and Mr. D. H. Keelan, Deputy Chief Commercial Manager. Their finding was that the derailment was caused by the deliberate and malicious displacement of a rail from the outer line of the down track. A further enquiry was held by Mr. Sleigh, Senior Government Inspector whose finding I quoted in my reply referred to already.

(c) The preliminary enquiry was a purely departmental enquiry and Government regret that they cannot lay on the table a copy of the report. My Honourable friend will find the detailed report by the Senior Government Inspector of Railways on this accident in the report on railway accidents which occurred during the half year ending 30th September, 1933, which is at present in print and copies of which will shortly be available in the Library of the House.

(f) Five persons were treated in the railway hospital, and from the records available, none of them were incapacitated.

(g) I am not aware of any such complaint.

(h) I am informed there are no X-ray arrangements in the railway hospital to which the injured were taken, but that they got X-ray treatment in the Patna hospital.

#### WATCH AND WARD SQUADS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY FOR CHECKING TICKETS.

1342. \*Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen: (a) Will Government be pleased to state what has been the result of Watch and Ward Squads which operated on the East Indian Railway for the purpose of checking tickets?

(b) What was their total earning?

(c) How many cases were detected by them in respect of the following and the cash and credit earning affected (separately):

- (i) adults travelling without tickets;
- (ii) children travelling without tickets;
- (iii) over-riding with short journey tickets;
- (iv) travelling in higher class;
- (v) travelling with unbooked luggage or live stock or with partially booked luggage?

(d) How many Railway servants and mendicants were detected by them undertaking illicit journey?

(e) Is it a fact that the Watch and Ward authorities as a result of this independent check and on the practical experience gained by them have recommended that the Travelling Ticket Examiners would work better if taken away from Divisional control and placed under Head office?

(f) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table of this House a copy of the said report?

Mr. P. B. Sah: The information has been called for from the Agent, East Indian Railway, and will be placed on the table of the House when received.

**TRAVELLING WITHOUT TICKETS ON RAILWAY TRAINS AND TICKET  
FRAUDS ON RAILWAYS.**

**1343. \*Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen:** With reference to answers to starred questions Nos. 822 and 823, dated the 12th September, 1933, regarding travelling without ticket on railway trains and ticket frauds on railways, will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) if it is not the function of the Accounts Department to find out the causes of the leakage of Railway revenue and to stop it;
- (b) how can the Accounts Department detect people travelling fraudulently from the records and the accounts as claimed in the concluding lines of the reply to part (d) of question No. 823?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) As generally understood by State-managed Railways in India, the function of the Accounts Department is, when any instance of leakage of railway revenues comes to its notice through the accounts or otherwise, to bring it to the notice of the administration and to advise on the measures to stop it. In respect of passenger tickets, this involves a check on the receipt and issue of tickets by stations and on their correct accountal.

(b) My Honourable friend is referring to the views of the Auditor General as expressed to the Public Accounts Committee where he was apparently referring to the principle of the responsibilities of the Accounts Department and not to detection of individual cases of fraud. I may explain that at present the check of passengers travelling without tickets is on all State-managed Railways in India conducted by Ticket Collectors and Travelling Ticket Examiners, who are under the control of the Traffic Department. There is, I know difference of opinion on the question whether Travelling Ticket Examiners should be under the control of the Accounts or of the Traffic Department, but as I explained in reply to question No. 823, the opinion of the Railway Board is that it is desirable to enforce the responsibility of collecting railway dues on the Traffic Department, and that it is not necessarily for the Accounts Department to detect people travelling fraudulently.

**PROVISION OF RUNNING ROOMS FOR THE TRAVELLING TICKET  
EXAMINERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

**1344. \*Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen:** (a) Will Government be pleased to enquire and state whether it is a fact that the Travelling Ticket Examiners on the East Indian Railway are not entitled to occupy the waiting rooms at outstations?

(b) Is it a fact that under the rules they are entitled to running room accommodation like the Guards?

(c) Is it a fact that very often they have to stay for hours at certain stations where no running room accommodation is available?

(d) Is it a fact that Guards under such circumstances are compensated by the grant of running room allowance?

(e) Is it a fact that the Travelling Ticket Examiners despite representations are denied this running room allowance on the ground that consolidated allowance granted to them under Supplementary Rule 22 covers this allowance?

(f) Is it a fact that under Supplementary Rule 22 the grant of any other form of "travelling allowance" is inadmissible in addition to consolidated allowance and that the running room allowance is not travelling allowance?

(g) Are Government prepared to consider the desirability of providing ample running room accommodation for Travelling Ticket Examiners and in the absence of this arrangement to compensate them like the guards by the sanction of their claim for the running room allowance?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

#### GRANT OF COMPENSATORY HILL ALLOWANCE TO THE STAFF STATIONED AT HARDWAR, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1345. \***Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the staff stationed at Hardwar are granted compensatory hill allowance on account of high rate of living there, and also those who are temporarily stationed there?

(b) Is it a fact that for the first few months of the introduction of the Moody-Ward system 1931, Hardwar was the Headquarter of certain Travelling Ticket Examiners who were not paid this compensatory hill allowance?

(c) Is it a fact that this hill allowance is not travelling allowance and that it is not barred under Supplementary Rule 22?

(d) Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of sanctioning this hill allowance to the staff so affected?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I am making enquiries and shall lay a reply on the table in due course.

#### DENIAL OF HILL ALLOWANCE TO THE RAILWAY STAFF STATIONED AT DEHRA DUN.

1346. \***Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) With reference to the reply to starred question No. 964 of the 28th March 1933, will Government be pleased to enquire and state what are the classes of the staff employed at Dehra Dun with their rate of pay and whether the same class of staff on the same scale or rate of pay is employed elsewhere on the East Indian Railway? If so, what is the amount of the hill allowance included in the pay at the two different stations?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to this and the next question together. I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

#### CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ASSISTANT STATION MASTERS WITH STATION MASTERS.

†1347. \***Mr. S. G. Jog:** What was the decision of the Agent, East Indian Railway, regarding the anomalies referred to in the reply to starred question No. 965 of the 28th March, 1933, asked in this House regarding the classification of certain Assistant Station Masters with Station Masters?

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 1346.

### RECOGNITION OF SERVICES RENDERED DURING THE GREAT WAR.

1348. \***Mr. S. G. Jog:** Referring to the starred question No. 966 of the 28th March, 1933, will Government please state whether the services of the recruits who responded to His Majesty's call and rendered service during the Great War on a voluntary footing are to be recognised in a similar manner as those recruited with the approval of the Railway Administration? If not, why not?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** A complete reply to question No. 966 was laid on the table on the 1st September. I regret I have not been able to understand what further information my Honourable friend wants.

### RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE GRANT OF INTERVIEWS TO THE RAILWAY SUBORDINATES.

1349. \***Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) Referring to the reply to starred question No. 1182 of the 10th April, 1933, will Government please state who is to decide whether an interview can serve any useful purpose when asked for against a Divisional Superintendent of a Railway?

(b) What are the rules and regulations for the grant of interviews?

(c) How can an appeal lie to a Divisional Superintendent against his own order as a Divisional Superintendent? Is the Divisional Superintendent an appellate authority? If so, against whose orders and with what powers of disciplinary action are the subordinate officers to Divisional Superintendents vested with?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) In the particular case referred to no appeal lay beyond the Divisional Superintendent.

(b) There are none laid down by the Railway Board.

(c) The first part of this question seems to be a rhetorical question to which an answer seems unnecessary. The reply to the second part is in the affirmative. As regards the third part the reply is that he exercises appellate powers in accordance with the appeal rules over orders passed by his subordinates.

### PUNISHMENT METED OUT TO CERTAIN SUBORDINATES OF THE MORADABAD DIVISION, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1350. \***Mr. S. G. Jog:** Referring to the reply to starred question No. 1183 of 10th April, 1933, and to the reference reproduced below, which is not traceable:

"No. 12/99/27-E, dated Moradabad, the 4th July 1932.

From

The Divisional Superintendent,  
East Indian Railway, Moradabad,

To

The Station Masters,  
Dehra Dun, Hardwar, Rampur bareilly, Moradabad, Roorkee, Nagina.

*Re: Examination of T.Cs. and T. T. Es.*

The following Ticket Collectors and Travelling Ticket Examiners have not come to this office today for the examination. Each of them is fined rupee one for not attending the examination as ordered pending satisfactory explanation. Please submit their explanation with your remarks and also state as to why reliefs were not called for from your respective relief centres if required by you."



Will Government be pleased to state how far is the reply consistent with the reference? Can it be traced now?

**Mr. P. E. Rau:** I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

**ACTION TAKEN ON CERTAIN QUESTIONS BY THE AGENTS OF RAILWAYS.**

1351. **\*Mr. S. G. Jog:** What action has been taken by the Agent on the following questions referred to by the Railway Board?

Starred Question No. 906 of 24th March 1933.

Unstarred question No. 105 of 22nd March 1933, No. 116 of 22nd March 1933.

Starred question No. 960 (c, d and f) and unstarred No. 138 (k) of 27th March 1933.

Starred question Nos. 967, 996 of 28th March 1933.

Unstarred question No. 156 of 31st March 1933.

Starred question No. 1095 and unstarred Nos. 172 and 174 of 1st April, 1933.

Starred question Nos. 1116, 1117 of 3rd April 1933.

Unstarred question No. 186 of 5th April 1933.

Starred question Nos. 1216, 1217, 1218 (b) of 12th April 1933.

Starred question No. 272 of 31st August 1933.

Starred question Nos. 477, 570, 574, 600 of 4th September 1933.

Starred question No. 604 of 5th September 1933.

Starred question No. 670 of 6th September 1933.

Starred question Nos. 721, 723, 745, 746, 758 of 7th September 1933.

Unstarred question Nos. 36, 40, 38, 41, 42, 43, 47 of 11th September 1933.

Starred question No. 824 of 12th September 1933.

Starred question Nos. 902, 903, 909, 911, 912 and unstarred question Nos. 70, 71, 74, 75, 76 of 13th September 1933.

**Mr. P. E. Rau:** I should like in the first place to express my gratitude to my Honourable friend for confining his enquiry to 1933 and not conducting researches into past years. I shall go through these 47 questions, and shall see which of these come within the terms of the ruling given by you, Mr. President, on the 28th November and shall communicate the information regarding those to my Honourable friend as soon as possible.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Are Government aware of another ruling by Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola to the effect that instead of sending this information to the Honourable Member concerned, it should be laid on the table of the House? Does the Honourable Member remember that ruling as well?

**Mr. P. E. Rau:** I confine myself to the latest ruling of the President.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Are Government aware that that ruling of Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola has not been over-ruled by the present President?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I think, Sir, that that question should be addressed to the Chair.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty):** Does the Honourable Member, Mr. Maswood Ahmad, think that the answers to Mr. Jog's questions should be laid on the table?

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Yes, Sir.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty):** If an Honourable Member wants that the answer to a question should be laid on the table and not merely be communicated to the Honourable Member putting the question, that has to be done and Government will have to lay the answer on the table of the House.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** Has the Honourable Member noticed the extent of his default and the series of questions which he has not so far answered?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** No, Sir; it is not a question of default at all. It is in obedience to the recent ruling of the Honourable the President that replies to certain of these questions will be laid on the table of the House.

#### DIFFERENCE IN THE UNIFORMS OF THE INDIAN AND ANGLO-INDIAN TICKET COLLECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1352. **\*Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** (a) Is it a fact that since the introduction of the Moody-Ward Scheme on the East Indian Railway a difference has been introduced in the uniforms of the Indian and the Anglo-Indian Ticket Collectors?

(b) Is it a fact that Indian Ticket Collectors were supplied as the summer uniform, one alpaca coat and two white drill pants, whereas their Anglo-Indian colleagues were supplied with three white drill coats and three pants?

(c) Is it a fact that, for the winter uniforms, the Indian Ticket Collectors were supplied with only one serge coat, whereas the Anglo-Indian Ticket Collectors were supplied with navy blue serge coats and pants?

(d) Do Government propose to discontinue the differential treatment in supplying uniforms to Indians and European *cum* Anglo-Indians?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I have called for information and will place a reply on the table in due course.

#### REPRESENTATION FROM OGALÉ GLASS WORKS.

1353. **\*Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) Will Government please state whether they have received any representation from Ogale Glass Works, manufacturers of lanterns, complaining against the reduction of prices of the American Dietz junior lanterns from Rs. 19 to Rs. 13 a dozen?

(b) Are Government aware that the said reduction is on account of the deflation of the dollar by America?

(c) Are Government aware that it has affected the only industry in India?

(d) Will Government please state as to what steps they propose to take in the matter, and when?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) That is the reason given in the representation.

(c) The representation also conveys that the Ogale Glass Works have been affected by the fall in dollar prices of American lanterns. Government are not aware whether that factory is the only one manufacturing lanterns in India.

(d) The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given by the Honourable the Finance Member to question No. 1315 asked by Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad.

**Mr. S. G. Jog:** May I know whether Government have made any inquiries as to the extent trade has been affected by the recent depreciation of the dollar?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** No, Sir; I do not think Government have gone into the question of how the various industries have been definitely affected by the depreciation of the dollar.

**Mr. S. G. Jog:** Am I to understand that Government do not think it their legitimate business to make inquiries into the matter?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** It is the duty of any industry that finds itself affected to make representations to Government.

**Mr. S. G. Jog:** May I know what is the duty of Government after those representations are received?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** The obvious duty of Government is to inquire into those representations.

#### LEVY OF WATER METER RENT FROM THE OCCUPIERS OF GOVERNMENT QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI.

1354. **\*Sardar G. N. Mujumdar:** (a) Are Government aware that the Secretary, Municipal Committee, New Delhi, has issued a notice on the 10th November, 1933, that the Municipal Committee has decided to charge rent at Re. 1 per meter per month for all water meters installed in buildings belonging to Government with effect from the 1st October, 1933?

(b) Why was it felt advisable now to instal the water meters in Government buildings only in New Delhi?

(c) How are the charges for water supply made from the private house-owners and the residents of New Delhi living on Punch Kun Road and elsewhere?

(d) Have Government or the Municipality received any representation from the Tenants' Association or other Associations against the levy of this rent? If so, from whom, and how were they disposed off?

(e) Are Government aware that almost all the residents of Government buildings, and particularly the clerical staff, feel this charge as exorbitant

and most unreasonable and that by its addition the charges for water supply to a quarter will come to Rs. 3 per mensem and thus increase the total rent?

(f) Are Government prepared to dispense with this rent? If not, why not?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the replies given on the 7th December, 1933, to Mr. Maswood Ahmad's starred questions Nos. 1312 and 1313 and to the connected supplementary questions.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): For the future guidance of the House, the Chair desires to say that when a number of Honourable Members, by some sort of accident, happen to put the same questions, they would do well to verify whether their questions have been asked previously and answered. That will save a considerable amount of time.

**Mr. S. G. Jog:** Is it not the business of the office to inform Members who put these questions that similar questions have been received?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): It is the duty of the Honourable Member asking the question to find out whether the question has been previously asked and answered.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** How can an Honourable Member find out whether other Honourable Members have sent notices of similar questions previously?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): If Honourable Members happen to send simultaneously, it is a different matter,—the Chair is not referring to that. But supposing a question of this nature has been answered now, there have been cases in which, in spite of that answer, notice of a fresh question comes up on the same subject in an identical form three days after. The Chair is referring to those cases.

#### SMUGGLING OF ARMS INTO INDIA FROM AFGHANISTAN.

1355. **\*Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** Has there been any smuggling of arms into India from Afghanistan? If so, since when, and how many arms were discovered to have been smuggled? What steps, if any, have been taken in the matter?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe:** Information has been asked for from the Local Administrations concerned and their replies will be communicated to the House.

#### MAINTENANCE OF SENIORITY LIST ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1356. **\*Mr. E. H. M. Bower:** (a) Is a common seniority list maintained on the East Indian Railway in order that promotions to posts as they fall vacant may be filled by the senior employees instead of by promotion being confined to subordinates in any one particular Division on which the vacancy occurs?

(b) Is it a rule that vacancies in any one Division must be filled by employees in that Division to the exclusion of other suitable employees working on other Divisions and in the Head Office at Calcutta?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the negative, will Government please state which posts are to be filled from employees on the several Divisions and the Head Office staff?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) to (c). The Agent, East Indian Railway, reports that in the case of Senior Subordinates, promotions in different Departments are generally made from amongst the staff of the Department concerned on the entire railway. In the case of Engineering Department inspecting staff separate seniority lists are maintained for the old Oudh and Rohilkund and old East Indian Railway men and the vacancies caused by normal wastage of the former are filled by the promotion of Oudh and Rohilkund Railway men except in the lowest grades which are normally filled by direct recruitment.

In the Mechanical Department and in the case of Senior Subordinates appointed in the Headquarters office of the Commercial Department promotions are made locally and are confined to the staff of the Workshop Division, District of the office in which the vacancy occurs. This also applies to staff of other Departments other than Senior Subordinates attached to divisions.

#### WELFARE SCHEME ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1357. **\*Mr. E. H. M. Bower:** (a) Is there a Welfare Scheme on the East Indian Railway by means of Welfare Committees posted on the Divisions for the benefit of the subordinate staff?

(b) Is it a fact that the subordinate staff of the Calcutta Head Office do not participate in the Welfare Scheme?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, do Government propose to issue instructions to include this category of employees in the Welfare Scheme? If not, why not?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** My Honourable friend put exactly the same question in September last and I gave him a reply to the best of my ability. I would invite his attention to that reply and to the ruling just given by you, Sir, in the matter.

#### CREATION OF TWO NEW POSTS AFTER THE SURRENDER OF THE POST OF TRANSPORTATION INSPECTOR, COMMERCIAL, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1358. **\*Mr. E. H. M. Bower:** (a) Will Government please state whether the Deputy Chief Commercial Manager, Claims and Refunds, of the East Indian Railway, as a measure of economy, surrendered the post of Transportation Inspector, Commercial, Grade Rs. 280—20—500, attached to his office?

(b) Is it a fact that on the recommendation of the same official, the Agent has sanctioned the creation of two new posts, namely:

(i) clerk, Grade I, Rs. 170—218,

(ii) clerk, Grade II, Rs. 160—220?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** I am calling for certain information and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

**RULES FOR THE RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF THE SUBORDINATE STAFF  
ON STATE RAILWAYS.**

1359. \***Mr. E. H. M. Bower:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the Railway Board have issued rules for the recruitment and training of the subordinate staff on State-managed Railways in which provision has been made for the employment of educated lads for training as Drivers?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, has any recruitment been made on the East Indian, Eastern Bengal, Great Indian Peninsula and North Western Railways?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, will Government please state separately the number of Europeans, Anglo-Indians, Hindus, Moslems and other classes that have been appointed on each of the above four Railways?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). I am calling for information and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

**EXTENSIONS GRANTED TO SOME OFFICERS OF THE INCOME-TAX  
DEPARTMENT.**

1360. \***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if extension beyond the ordinary term of service has been granted to some officers of the Income-tax Department, and if so, why? Are Government aware that this is to the detriment of the interests of junior officers?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** Extensions of service have been granted to certain officers of the Income-tax Department when the condition laid down in Fundamental Rule 56 has been satisfied. This condition is that there must be public grounds for the officer's retention in service. Government recognise that such extensions may have the effect of delaying the promotion of junior officers, and this consideration is always taken into account.

**Mr. Lalchand Navarai:** May I know whether the Central Board of Revenue is consulted in giving extensions?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** Yes, Sir.

**ALLOWANCE GRANTED TO A TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINER.**

1361. \***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that according to paragraph 362 of the State Railway Open Line Code, Volume II, the nature of allowance to be granted to a Travelling Ticket Examiner is to be determined at the time when the person is engaged?

(b) Is it a fact that it was determined to grant mileage allowance to the old Travelling Ticket Examiners, now classed as special ticket examiners, at the time when they were engaged? If so, why are they now being paid daily allowance instead of mileage allowance, especially so far as their work on running trains is concerned?

(c) Are Government aware that the mileage allowance of a Travelling Ticket Examiner was treated as part of their pay for practically all purposes which count?

(d) If so, are Government aware that the substitution of daily allowance for mileage allowance has caused a reduction in their pay by 50 to 70 per cent.?

(e) If the reduction is not to this extent, will Government give the precise percentage by which the emoluments of these Travelling Ticket Examiners have been cut down by the withdrawal of their mileage allowance for all purposes, viz., leave on average pay, provident fund, gratuity and passes?

(f) Will Government please state what is the average permanent percentage of reduction effected in regard to other employees of the Railway whose salaries have been retrenched?

(g) Are Government aware that in addition to this reduction of their emoluments the Travelling Ticket Examiners have been subjected to a further cut of ten and five per cent. in their salaries?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) Yes; but I do not think this implies that the Administration has no right to reconsider the matter or that the Government of India cannot amend any paragraphs in the Code issued under their authority.

(b) As I have already explained more than once, it has been decided that running allowances should be granted only to staff directly connected with the charge of a moving train.

(c) Yes, to a certain extent.

(d) Government are aware that the substitution of daily allowance for mileage allowance has caused a certain reduction in the emoluments of the staff but cannot say what the percentage of reduction is without investigating each particular case which they are not prepared to do.

(e) and (f). It will not be possible to obtain this information without the expenditure of an amount of time and labour which Government do not consider they would be justified in incurring.

(g) Travelling Ticket Examiners have, like all other railway staff, been made subject to the general cut in their salaries.

**Sardar Sant Singh.** May I know if the terms of agreement on which a person is engaged can be changed later on by the employer?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** That question, Sir, contains an assumption that the terms of agreement contain this particular clause.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** May I know whether or not the particular rule quoted in the question makes it obligatory that the rate of allowance, whether it is to be granted or not, is to be decided at the time when the engagement of the particular individual takes place?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** As I have already explained in reply to the main question, I do not admit that that implies that the Government of India cannot amend any paragraphs in the Code issued under their authority.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** Can they do so to the prejudice of the employee?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** My Honourable friend is welcome to his opinion and, as a lawyer, I daresay it is entitled to great weight.

**Mr. Lalchand Navarai:** May I know whether, in view of the representations made since the mileage allowance has been taken away, the Railway Board or the Agents have further inquired into the matter and found out whether there is any reason to increase the allowance now?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** Government have been inquiring into this matter and have been answering questions on the floor of this House for the last two years.

**Mr. Lalchand Navarai:** That only refers to answering questions. I am asking whether the matter has been investigated further.

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** Certainly, Sir.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** May I know if the Department is prepared to consult the Law Department of the Government of India if they are not infringing the legal aspect of the case by withdrawing from the terms of engagement?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** Certain memorials have been, I understand, recently received by the Railway Board on the question, and, in considering those memorials, all aspects of the case will be taken into consideration.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** Are these Travelling Ticket Examiners included in the running staff or the stationary staff?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** They are not included in the running staff.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** In spite of the fact that they travel in the trains all the time?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** A great number of people travel in the trains and they are not included in the running staff.

#### REDUCTION OF THE EMOLUMENTS OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS.

1362. **\*Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Are Government aware that members of the Travelling Ticket Examiners cadre in the course of their duty:

- (i) have met with accidents, including fatal accidents,
- (ii) have been assaulted, including fatal assaults;
- (iii) have been subjected to false criminal prosecutions by members of the travelling public?

(b) Will Government please state how they justify reducing their emoluments heavily by withdrawing their mileage allowance?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) No statistics on the subject are available.

(b) I have explained more than once to this House the reason for the action taken by the Railway in this matter and I have nothing new to add on this subject.



**GRANT OF MILEAGE ALLOWANCE TO RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.**

1363. \*Sardar Sant Singh: (a) What kind of work entitles a railway employee to the grant of mileage allowance and what posts carry this allowance?

(b) Is there any staff employed on Railways who do active duties on the running trains and are paid daily allowance?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) The mileage allowance is intended for, and is now restricted to, staff directly connected with the charge of a moving train.

(b) I shall be glad if my Honourable friend will define exactly what he means by the expression "active duties on the running trains" before I attempt to reply to him.

Sardar Sant Singh: Are they not performing the same duties which they used to do before they were transferred to be traffic examiners?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I think that is a question I have answered already and, if I remember aright, I am going to answer again in the course of the next few questions.

**INTRODUCTION OF THE PREVENTIVE SYSTEM OF CHECK BY POSTING GROUPS OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS.**

1364. \*Sardar Sant Singh: (a) Is it a fact that the Railway Administration abolished the cadre of Travelling Ticket Examiners on the 1st June, 1931, to introduce the preventive system of check by posting groups of Ticket Examiners at stations to prevent passengers from entraining without tickets?

(b) Were these groups intended to check tickets in train while moving from one station to the other, as in the case of flying group sanctioned by the Railway Board in 1926 to check at stations for not less than two days each?

(c) Is it a fact that some time after, the Railway Administration introduced in 1932 the system of two men on each train by giving them programmes like old Travelling Ticket Examiners to check on running trains?

(d) Will Government state why the group system was abandoned?

(e) Is it a fact that after some experience of the two-men system, the Administration allowed one man to check on running trains as in the case of old Travelling Ticket Examiners? If so, why?

(f) Is it a fact that on submission of memorials by old Travelling Ticket Examiners, mentioning this gradual splitting up of the group system of checking at stations and steady reversion to the old system of Travelling Ticket Examiners checking singly on trains, the North Western Railway again reverted to the intermediary stage of putting two men on main line trains and one man on branch line trains?

(g) Is it a fact that these two men on the main line trains are working independently of each other and dealing and excess-charging their own cases separately, and that each man has been supplied with Excess Fare Ticket Books for this purpose?

(h) Is it a fact that previous to the abolition of the Travelling Ticket Examiner's cadre the Travelling Ticket Examiners were also running on important main line trains in batches of two or more on each train?

(i) Is it a fact that the present programmes of most of the Special Ticket Examiners are just the same as of the old Travelling Ticket Examiners, *vis.*, working in running trains only?

(j) If so, will Government please state why mileage allowance is not being paid to them?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) and (b). If, as I presume, my Honourable friend is referring to the North Western Railway, the answer is in the affirmative.

(c) to (h). I am calling for the information required and will place a reply on the table of the House in due course.

(i) The Agent of the North Western Railway has reported to the Railway Board that the statement that the duties of the former Travelling Ticket Examiner and the present Special Ticket Examiners are the same is not correct.

(j) Does not arise.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** I think it will save the time of the House and of the Honourable gentleman as well if he settles this question definitely: there are only two or three points left: the others have been settled already.

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** So far as Government are concerned, the question must be considered as finally settled.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE PREVENTIVE SYSTEM OF CHECK BY POSTING GROUPS OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS.

1365. **\*Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Will Government please state whether the preventive system of ticket checking at stations requires more staff at stations instead of in trains?

(b) Will Government please place on the table a statement showing the strength of Ticket Collectors on the North Western Railway on the following dates to judge how far the station check has been strengthened:

1st October, 1930.

1st January, 1931.

1st March, 1931.

1st June, 1931.

1st June, 1933?

(c) Is it a fact that there has been a progressive reduction in the Ticket Checking staff at stations since October, 1930, and, if so, will Government please state how far it has helped the preventive system of checking tickets at stations?

(d) Will Government please state what precautions have been taken to adopt the preventive system at road-side stations on the line, which, are mostly unfenced and where there are no Ticket Collectors, and where the Station Master on duty has got to attend to line-clear work, Guards and loading and unloading of packages, etc.?

(e) Will Government please state the strength of the staff employed on checking tickets on running trains on the 31st May, 1931, and the 31st August, 1933?

(f) Has there been a reduction in the staff of Ticket Collectors at stations and increase in the staff of ticket checking on running trains? If so, will Government please state if they still prefer to concentrate on the preventive system in comparison to the checking in trains by the Travelling Ticket Examiners?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) It is obvious that the strength of ticket checking staff at stations depends on the intensity of the check applied.

(b) to (f). I am collecting whatever information is readily available and shall lay a statement on the table of the House in due course.

#### PREVENTION OF ILLICIT TRAVELLING ON RAILWAY TRAINS.

1366. \***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Is the policy of the Administration to prevent illicit travelling on trains?

(b) Will Government please state whether the work of a Special Ticket Examiner is judged by his earnings and larger number of detections or by the absence of ticketless passengers on his trains?

(c) If the latter, will Government please state whether two Special Ticket Examiners have recently been reverted in Rawalpindi Division from class III to class II for poor earnings? If so, why?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) The policy of Railway Administrations is to endeavour to prevent travelling without tickets.

(b) I am not aware of any single criterion by which the efficiency of a Ticket Examiner can be judged; but the so-called earnings of ticket examining staff do not furnish a true or certain measure of the efficiency either of the system or of the particular examiner.

(c) Government are enquiring into this allegation and will place a statement on the table in due course.

#### FUNCTIONS OF THE TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS.

1367. \***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that one of the functions of the Travelling Ticket Examiners was to detect cases of fraud of serious nature with regard to the misuse of tickets and passes?

(b) If so, is it a fact that since the abolition of the Travelling Ticket Examiner's cadre and introduction of group system very few cases of this nature have been brought to light?

(c) If not, will Government please place on the table a statement showing the number of prosecutions made by the ticket checking staff and the strength of such staff for the last five years separately?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) Yes.

(b) Government have no information; but obviously even if this were true, it would prove nothing.

(c) The collection of the information required will involve a considerable amount of time and labour, which Government do not consider would be justified by the results.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** Is the efficiency judged by the earnings or by the avoidance of persons travelling without tickets?

**Mr. P. B. Ban:** I said in reply to the previous question that I was not aware of any single criterion by which the efficiency of a Ticket Examiner could be judged.

#### COMMUNAL ACTIVITIES IN THE PATNA TELEGRAPH SUB-DIVISION.

1368. **\*Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Are Government aware that communalism has become the order of the day in the Patna Telegraph Sub-division and that Hindu staff is discontented? If so, is it a fact that the officer in charge of the Patna Telegraph Sub-division belongs to any communal Union?

(b) If so, what steps have Government taken to check such activities in that Sub-division?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) No instance of communal difficulty in the Patna Engineering Sub-division has come to the notice either of Government or of the local authorities concerned nor is there any reason to suppose that the Hindu staff employed in the Sub-division are discontented. If any member of the staff has grounds for discontent, it is of course open to him to make a suitable representation. I am informed that Mr. M. N. Mirza, Assistant Divisional Engineer, who is in charge of the Sub-division does not belong to any communal Union though I may remark that an official is free to be a member of any such body so long as the Government Servants' Conduct Rules are not infringed.

(b) Does not arise.

**Mr. S. G. Jog:** May I know whether there has recently been any change in the attitude of the Government so far as the prevention of these unions with communal tendencies in this Department is concerned?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** No.

#### ALLOWANCES OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

1369. **\*Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) With reference to the reply to starred question No. 476, dated 4th September, 1933, asked by me in this House, will Government be pleased to state whether classification of employees as "running staff" or "stationary staff" is done on reports by departmental officers, or is it done on the actual nature of their duty?

(b) What are the reasons that these very same employees upto June, 1931 were treated as "running staff" and are "not treated as running staff", after June, 1931?

(c) Since how long prior to June, 1931 were these men (Travelling Ticket Examiners or Travelling Ticket Inspectors) treated as "running staff"?

(d) If they are not treated as running staff then under what category are they classed now?

(e) Is it a fact that they (Travelling Ticket Examiners or Travelling Ticket Inspectors) actually check the tickets in running trains, detect irregularities in running trains, and realise money in running trains?

(f) Is it a fact that when the train stops, they perform a check on the platform and make over to the station staff those defaulters whom they had detected in the running train and who had declined to pay the demanded dues, and also they change the compartment to start a check in the running train?

(g) Is it a fact that Inspectors, pay clerks, and other staff entitled to daily allowance, have nothing to do when the train is running whereas Travelling or Special Ticket Examiners start their duty when the train moves, and continue when they reach their destination?

(h) Will Government be pleased to state what class of employees exist on the Railway who actually perform duty in the running train and are not treated as running staff like the Travelling Ticket Examiners or the Special Ticket Examiners?

(i) Is it a fact that the Guard who is classed as running staff has practically nothing to do in the running train as compared with the duty of a Travelling Ticket Examiner or Special Ticket Examiner?

(j) If the reply to part (i) be in the negative, are Government prepared to classify the duties of a Travelling Ticket Examiner or Special Ticket Examiner, a Guard, and a Driver, as performed by them in the "running train"?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) The classification of employees is determined on the nature of their duties.

(b) The reasons have been given fully in previous replies in this House, the latest of which is the reply given by me just now to question No. 1361

(c) Government have no information; but the length of the period does not confer any prescriptive right to the staff to obtain these allowances.

(d) If my Honourable friend insists on these being put in a special category, I can only say they come under the category of non-running staff.

(e) and (f). They are expected to do so.

(g) I cannot subscribe to the accuracy of the first part of this question.

(h) As I have already explained to the House, it has been decided that in order to be entitled to mileage allowances, the staff should be directly connected with the charge of moving trains.

(i) No. For the list of duties of a Guard I would refer my Honourable friend to the General Rules for Open Line Railways in British India administered by the Government, of which copies are in the Library of the House.

(j) I am sorry I cannot compress the list of these duties sufficiently to enable me to give a reply on the floor of the House to this question. But if the Honourable Member is very interested, I would suggest his seeing me some time in my office when I shall be glad to put him in communication with officers in the Railway Board who will be able to give him the fullest information on the subject.

**Mr. B. S. Sarma:** In view of the fact that the floor of the House has become the chief venue nowadays for the ventilation of grievances of subordinate members of the staff in all the Railways in this country and in view of the fact that this has entailed additional work on the Railway Department, is the Financial Commissioner contemplating additional staff for coping with this work, or has he received any request from Government Railways asking for such additional staff to cope with answers to be given to questions of Members of this Assembly?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I am afraid the contingency referred to by my Honourable friend is likely to arise: I have already received representations on this subject.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** The Honourable Member's budget for contingency is such a wide one that he could pay the entire expenses of a committee of inquiry and this is a very small matter.

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** The budget of the Railway Board is, I think, discussed annually on the floor of the House.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** The Honourable Member said on the floor of the House that all the expenses incurred in connection with the Pope Inquiry Committee were incurred from the contingency charges and that there was no need to ask for supplementary grant from the House.

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I think my Honourable friend is, as usual, mistaken in his quotation.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** I am not mistaken: I will show the reply and the question from the Legislative Assembly Debates.

**Mr. B. V. Jadhav:** May I know from the Honourable Member, Mr. Sarma, if his question was inspired?

**Mr. R. S. Sarma:** No: not a bit of it: I have not been an ex-Minister in a province.

#### CONSOLIDATED ALLOWANCE OF TRAVELLING OR SPECIAL TICKET EXAMINERS.

1370. **\*Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that consolidated allowance, i.e., the permanent travelling allowance allowed to the Travelling or Special Ticket Examiners, is admissible to those persons only whose duties require them to "travel extensively" as per Government of India Supplementary Rule No. 22?

(b) Is it a fact that in view of this "extensive running duty" they are still not treated as running staff?

(c) With reference to the reply to starred question No. 694 (b), (c) and (d), dated the 6th September, 1933, will Government be pleased to state if they are prepared to consider the payment of enhanced consolidated allowance with retrospective effect or to compensate them by any other means for the loss they have suffered between the 1st June, 1931 and the 1st December, 1932?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) Yes.

(b) The fact of travelling extensively is not a sufficient qualification to be classed as running staff.

(c) Government have carefully considered the matter and regret that they cannot consider the payment of the enhanced consolidated allowance with retrospective effect.

**Mr. Lalchand Navarai:** I suggest that the Honourable Member will consider that these Ticket Examiners might also be put on the duty of

collecting tickets in the running trains and then there will be certain staff which can be done away with and the mileage allowance increased.

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I do not quite understand what my Honourable friend means by collecting tickets on railway trains, because if you collect tickets on running trains, the passengers will be charged on reaching the destination.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** I think the Honourable Member knows that on some Railways there is a practice of collecting tickets before the people get down on the platforms; and that does include two duties, one of checking and the other of collecting tickets relieving the ticket collectors at the doors of stations.

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I think that happens only in stations just before the important termini of trains.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** I want the Railway Board to consider this question: whether they cannot make some economy and remove the grievances of these people who have been crying for a long time.

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** If effect is given to my Honourable friend's suggestion, I think it will mean that more people would be discharged; and I do not think that would remove the grievance of anybody.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** Everybody would not be discharged.

#### LEVY OF WATER METER RENT FROM THE OCCUPIERS OF GOVERNMENT QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI.

1871. \***Maulvi Badi-uz-Zaman:** (a) Will Government please state whether the New Delhi Municipal Committee circulated their decision to charge meter rent with retrospective effect from Government servants in the Departments after about two months, viz., on the 17th November, 1933? If so, why?

(b) Will Government please state the name of the officer who suggested the installation of water meters in New Delhi Government buildings, and on what grounds he so recommended?

(c) How much each of the water meter costs?

(d) How were these purchased, and from which firm?

(e) Were tenders for the supply of these meters to the New Delhi Municipal Committee invited? If so, how and in what manner?

(f) What were the prices quoted by different companies, and whose was the lowest quotation?

(g) Is it a fact that the Municipal Committee or the Government decided to purchase these water meters in order to minimise the wastage of water by the tenants of the Government buildings?

(h) If so, why should the tenants be charged the rent or the price of the meters?

(i) Did Government or the Municipality ever consult the Tenants Association or other Associations as to whether they would be prepared to have the meters installed on payment or prefer to minimise the use of water in the quarters? If not, why not?

(j) Are Government aware of the great feeling of concern and resentment over this charge among the low paid Government clerks and others, and are they prepared to stop this rent? If not, why not?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** (a) to (c) and (g) to (j). I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the replies given on the 7th December, 1933, to Mr. Maswood Ahmad's starred questions Nos. 1312 and 1313.

(d), (e) and (f). The meters were purchased through the Indian Stores Department who invited tenders from the holders of that Department's annual rate contracts, who had been selected after consideration of tenders submitted in response to public advertisement. I place on the table a statement showing the names of the firms who quoted for the order and their respective quotations.

*Statement showing the quotations received for Water Meters.*

	Glenfield & Kennedy, Ltd., Bombay.	Turner Hoare & Co., Ltd., Bombay.	John Fleming & Co., Bombay.		Siemens (India) Ltd., Calcutta.
			Rotor.	Minor.	
	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
(i) If 1,500 or more are ordered at one time.	30 0 0 each.	29 0 0*	31 12 0*	20 6 0*	23 0 0*
	28 13 0 each. F.O.R. Calcutta & Bombay.	28 0 0 each. F.O.R. Bombay.	30 8 0	19 10 0	24 0 0
(ii) If 1,000 Nos. or more are ordered at one time.	..	..	32 7 0*	20 13 0*	23 0 0*
(iii) Do. 750 do .			31 5 0 each.	20 0 0	24 0 0
			34 0 0*	21 11 0*	23 0 0*
(iv) Do. 500 do .			32 11 0 each.	20 13 0	24 0 0
			34 0 0*	21 11 0*	23 0 0*
(v) Do. 250 do .			22 11 0 each.	20 13 0	24 0 0
			37 9 0*	22 10 0*	24 4 0*
(vi) Do. 100 do .			36 2 0 each.	21 12 0	25 4 0
			38 0 0*	22 10 0*	24 4 0*
			36 8 0 each. F.O.R. Bombay.	21 12 0 each. F.O.R. Bombay.	25 4 0 each. F.O.R. Calcutta and Bombay.

*Note.*—Figures marked with an asterisk are based on customs duty under the old Tariff. Those which are not marked with an asterisk are based on preferential duty under the Indian (Ottawa Trade Agreement) Amendment Act 1932 which came into effect from the 1st January 1933.



**DISTINCTION BETWEEN FIRST AND SECOND CLASS PRIVILEGE TRAVELLING ORDER HOLDERS IN THE MATTER OF TRAVELLING BY MAIL TRAINS ON FOREIGN RAILWAYS.**

1372. \***Maulvi Badi-uz-Zaman:** (a) Is it a fact that persons holding Second Class Privilege Travelling Orders are not allowed to travel by mail trains on foreign railways?

(b) Is it also a fact that holders of First Class Privilege Travelling Orders are allowed to travel by mail trains on foreign railways?

(c) Do Government propose to issue instructions that there should be no distinction between the two classes of Privilege Travelling Order holders? If not, why not?

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

(c) The issue by one railway of P. T. O.'s admissible over other railways is a matter for mutual agreement and is governed by rules framed by the Indian Railway Conference Association. Government are not prepared to intervene in this matter.

**TRANSFER OF ASSISTANT CONTROLLERS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY FROM SIMLA TO DELHI.**

1373. \***Maulvi Badi-uz-Zaman:** (a) Is it a fact that Assistant Controllers on the North Western Railway are transferred for six months to Simla and thereafter they come back to Delhi for the winter?

(b) Is it a fact that on their return to Delhi these Assistant Train Controllers are unable to secure Railway quarters?

(c) Is it a fact that one such Assistant Controller died of pneumonia after return to Delhi when he was unable to secure a quarter to live in?

(d) Do Government intend to stop these transfers and post these men permanently in Simla and thereby save allowances, etc.? If not, why not?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** I am calling for certain information and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

**PUBLICATION OF THE REVISED RATES OF PAY FOR THE ARMY HEADQUARTERS.**

1374. \***Maulvi Badi-uz-Zaman:** (a) With reference to the reply to starred question No. 1068 of the 21st November, 1933, will Government be pleased to state:

(a) when will the revised rates of pay for the Army Headquarters be published;

(b) when will the embargo on confirmation in Army Headquarters in the case of posts held by those routine division clerks who qualified in the 1931 examination and whose period of probation has expired, be removed?

**Mr. G. R. N. Tottenham:** (a) The matter is still under consideration.

(b) The embargo will be removed as soon as the new scales are introduced.

**CLOSING OF THE GATE USED BY LADIES AT THE UNAO RAILWAY STATION.**

1375. **\*Mr. S. G. Jog** (on behalf of Rai Bahadur Lala Brij Kishore): (a) Will Government please state if it is a fact that there used to be a gate for the use of ladies only at Unao junction, and the same has been closed now?

(b) If the reply to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the reason for the closing of the gate?

(c) Do Government propose to consider the feasibility of re-opening this gate? Are not Government aware that *purdah-nashin* ladies experience great inconvenience for want of the same?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** Government have no information, but I am sending a copy of the question to the Agent, East Indian Railway, for such action as may be considered necessary.

**DIFFERENT RATES CHARGED FOR ELECTRIC CURRENT BY THE CALCUTTA ELECTRIC SUPPLY CORPORATION.**

1376. **\*Mr. K. C. Neogy:** (a) Are Government aware that there exists with the Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation an agreement whereby electric current is supplied to the Government of Bengal buildings, as also to the Government of India buildings in Calcutta and suburbs, at 1·8 annas per unit for lights and fans?

(b) Is it a fact that the Government of India are a party to this agreement?

(c) Are Government aware that the public in Calcutta are required to pay to the Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation four annas and six pies, less a rebate of one anna nine pies, per unit for electricity when used for lights and fans?

(d) Are Government aware that there exists an enormous difference between the price paid by the Government of Bengal as compared to the rate normally paid by schools, colleges, universities, churches and charitable hospitals, etc?

(e) Has there been any reference on the subject from the Government of Bengal, and has any inquiry been made as to the legality of such differential rates?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a), (c), (d) and (e). The answer is in the negative.

(b) Not so far as I am aware.

**MEETING OF THE ALL-INDIA CONGRESS COMMITTEE.**

- |       |   |   |   |
|-------|---|---|---|
| 1377. | { | <p><b>*Sarda: Sant Singh:</b></p> <p><b>*Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:</b></p> <p><b>*Mr. S. C. Mitra:</b></p> | <p>(a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the news published in the <i>Hindustan Times</i> of the 29th November, 1933 that the Government of India have decided not to allow a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee to be held,</p> |
|-------|---|---|---|

(b) Is it a fact that the All-India Congress Committee has never been declared as an unlawful Association?

(c) What is the attitude of Government in regard to the All-India Congress Committee meetings?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) Government see no reason why the All-India Congress Committee should be differentiated from any other Committee of the Congress.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** Have Government issued any orders with regard to the prevention of any meeting of the All-India Congress Committee meeting which may be held in the near future?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** No orders have been issued.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** Is the All-India Congress Committee declared illegal?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** I have said in answer to part (b) of this question that it has not been declared unlawful.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** It has not been declared unlawful?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** It is not at the moment an unlawful association.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** If it is not an unlawful association, and if a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee is held, will it be an illegal meeting? What is the position?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** The position is that the Government see no reason to differentiate the All-India Congress Committee from any other Committee of the Congress. It is perfectly true that, at the present moment, the All-India Congress Committee is not an unlawful association, but that is really an accident owing to the fact that during the last few years the All-India Congress Committee has made no effort to meet.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** No effort to do what?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** It has made no effort to meet or function in any way.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** It follows from that, that if they had tried to meet, Government would have considered the position, and now that they are trying to meet, Government will consider the position?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** That is certainly so.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** Therefore, the Honourable Member has not given any definite reply as to what action Government will take if they did try to meet?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** That, I think, is going into the realms of hypothesis.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** The question is that they want to meet. We know that. What action do Government propose to take in the matter? It is for the enlightenment of the public as well as for everybody else. If the Congress Committee want to meet, what action do Government propose to take?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** That, Sir, is, as I have said, a hypothetical question. I was asked what is the attitude of Government. I think I have given a very fair and clear answer that the Government see no reason to differentiate the All-India Congress Committee from other Congress Committees, and the House is perfectly aware what the general policy of the Government is towards the Congress organizations and the its various Committees.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** May I know if the Congress has been declared an unlawful association?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** No, Sir; I went into that question last March.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy:** Do I take it that the Congress is a perfectly legal organisation and that no attempt will be made to stop its general meeting, whereas a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee may be stopped?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** No, Sir; I don't think the Honourable Member should presume that. He will remember that last year this question came up in connection with the proposal to hold a meeting of the Congress and the Government had to prohibit the holding of that meeting.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy:** In what sense then is the Congress not an unlawful body?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** In the technical sense.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy:** Will the Honourable Member then be pleased to explain the technical aspect of the question?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** The technical aspect is that under a particular law particular associations can be declared as unlawful, and, under that law, neither the Congress, nor as a matter of fact by accident, the All-India Congress Committee has been declared unlawful.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy:** That is to say, the fact that the Congress itself is not an unlawful body is due to the same accident, as a result of which the All-India Congress Committee has not been declared to be unlawful?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** Not exactly an accident, Sir. I explained last year that the reason was that to declare the Congress an unlawful association would be going far beyond the requirements of the situation.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy:** What is the practical effect then, may I inquire, of this distinction between the Congress and the All-India Congress Committee in regard to its lawful or unlawful character?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** There is no distinction between them at the moment. Neither of them, as I have explained, have so far been declared unlawful.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** Is it a fact that the Working Committee has been declared an unlawful association?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** That is so.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** And the All-India Congress Committee has not been declared unlawful. . . . ?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): That has been answered.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** Then, my next question is, why are the Government contemplating to ban the meeting of the All-India Congress Committee which has not been declared an unlawful association?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** I have said that the Government see no reason to differentiate one Committee from another. It was not, as a result of any policy on the part of Government, that the All-India Congress Committee was not declared unlawful, but purely through the accident of its making no effort to function.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** Have not the Government already declared the one unlawful, while the other is lawful?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** That represents no decision of policy.

**Mr. H. P. Mody:** Is it the practice of Government to prohibit meetings of bodies which have not been declared unlawful?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** No, Sir; if it were considered that the All-India Congress Committee should not be allowed to meet, then the necessary action would be taken.

**Mr. H. P. Mody:** Would it not be a more straightforward course that the All-India Congress Committee should be declared as an unlawful Committee?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** So far action has not been taken in advance of the requirements of the situation.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** The situation has now arisen.

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** I must ask my friend to explain how the situation has arisen.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** We have heard, and we know, that attempts are being made to call off the Civil Disobedience Movement by calling an All-India Congress Committee. That is an absolute fact, and in view of these attempts to call off the Civil Disobedience Movement, which can only be done by calling a meeting of an All-India Congress Committee, I

would ask the Honourable the Home Member to state whether Government are going to declare a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee illegal?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** I must express my complete disagreement with the Honourable Member's assumption that, if the Congress, wish to call off the Civil Disobedience Movement, they can do it only by holding a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** What is the other method for calling off the Civil Disobedience Movement?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** The Congress, Sir, have had not the slightest difficulty in changing their policy without a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee or any other particular organization.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** What is the other procedure that the Congress can adopt for calling off the Civil Disobedience Movement?

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** Is the Honourable Member who speaks with such authority a Member of the All-India Congress Committee?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** No, Sir, but I read my papers, and perhaps it is within the recollection of the Honourable Member that the policy of the Congress was changed last July, without a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee.

**Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Have Government in their possession any evidence to anticipate that the All-India Congress Committee is going to pass resolutions which are likely to be illegal or unconstitutional?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** The Government, Sir, apart from what my friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, said, have no information in their possession showing that the Congress desire to hold a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee.

**Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Is it the policy of the Government always to anticipate and punish people and prohibit meetings without ascertaining whether those meetings will pass Resolutions either supporting or opposing the Civil Disobedience Movement, individual or mass?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** We must treat the Congress organization as a whole. We cannot pick out one part of the Congress organization and say that can meet and another part cannot meet.

**Mr. S. C. Mitra:** The Honourable Member knows that the Congress, according to its constitution, can always change its policy and principles and even its creed. Why then are Government so anxious that the Congress should not meet and prove itself whether it is constitutional or unconstitutional? Government can take steps afterwards, and not before?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** I have already explained that the Congress has found not the slightest difficulty in changing their policy without these formal meetings. They declared the inauguration of the

Civil Disobedience movement without a meeting of the Congress or of the All-India Congress Committee. They modified their policy substantially in July without any formal meeting of any Congress body.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** May I know what the reply of the Government is to part (a) wherein it is asked whether, as stated by the *Hindustan Times*, the Government of India have decided not to allow a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee to be held? Is that a fact?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** The question asked in part (a) is whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to the article. I am afraid, I am not prepared to state what decision at what particular time the Government of India may have taken, but I hope the Honourable Member will take it from me when I say that the view of the Government of India is so and so, that it is in fact so.

**Mr. S. G. Jog:** Are Government aware that there is a strong feeling amongst many members of the All-India Congress Committee that there should be a change in the programme and creed of the Congress as such, and would it not be proper for Government to give facilities to the All-India Congress Committee to meet and come to a decision?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** I believe it is a fact that a section, and I hope a growing section, of the Congress are realising the futility of the Civil Disobedience Movement, but, at the same time, what prevents them from making their opinion effective is not the question of whether any particular meeting can or cannot be held, but the fact that the leaders whose policy really dominates the Congress are still opposed to any change.

**Mr. S. G. Jog:** May I know, if about 15 or 20 members of the All-India Congress Committee meet in their individual capacity and discuss matters, whether still the Government will take objection to their meeting?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** We have been careful not to interfere unnecessarily with any kind of informal meeting of the members of the Congress who wish to discuss these questions amongst themselves.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** In view of the fact that nobody knows what the decision of these people will be, will the Government allow them opportunity to express their own opinion so that they may see their own position and then inform the Government that they are not meeting with any illegal object?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** I think I have made sufficiently clear the general position of the Government with regard to this matter.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** May I ask one more question? The Honourable Member said that it was not the policy of the Government to differentiate between one part of the Congress and another. In view of that, will Government now declare the All-India Congress Committee illegal to prevent this liquid state of affairs in political life? It is quite logical when my Honourable friend says that there should be no differentiation between one part of the Congress and another. Then, why continue this liquid

state of affairs? Will the Honourable Member consider and declare this All-India Congress Committee illegal and thus prevent this liquid state of affairs where nobody knows what to do?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig:** I am glad that my Honourable friend appreciates the position of the Government, but having gone on so long, as I said, accidentally, without having declared the All-India Congress Committee unlawful, it seems unnecessary to take any action unless some practical result is going to be achieved, and at the present moment I have no information to the effect that it is intended to call a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Order, order. Sardar Sant Singh, Question No. 1378.

#### ALLOWANCES OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS.

**1378. \*Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) With reference to their reply on the 23rd March, 1932, to question No. 889 (c), will Government please state if it is not a fact that Travelling Ticket Examiners, while under the Chief Auditor, were employed for checking at stations during the occasions of fairs, etc., and were granted mileage allowance at the rate of 200 miles for eight hours work, or average mileage of the previous month as in the case of guards when employed on station duty?

(b) If the reply to the above be in the affirmative, why are the old Travelling Ticket Examiners, now classed as Special Ticket Examiners, not paid similarly when employed at stations, viz., eight hours equal to 200 miles or average mileage of the previous month for those days?

(c) Will Government please state the proportion of checking at stations to checking in running trains by the Special Ticket Examiners at present, for instance with regard to the Special Ticket Examiners' check in Rawalpindi, Quetta, Lahore and Multan Divisions, from July to October, 1933?

(d) Will Government please state whether there is any difference in the nature of the work so far as the check in running trains by the old Travelling Ticket Examiners and present Special Ticket Examiners is concerned?

(e) If the reply to part (d) be in the negative, why are not the old Travelling Ticket Examiners, now classed as Special Ticket Examiners, paid mileage allowance for their duty in running trains?

(f) With reference to their reply on the 23rd March, 1932, to question No. 889 (b) regarding allowances to Travelling Ticket Examiners, will Government please state whether the information has since been obtained, and, if so, will they place it on the table of this House?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) I daresay my Honourable friend is right, but I have no precise information on the subject.

(b) and (e). Government do not consider that even if the assumptions made by the Honourable Member are correct they are an adequate reason for granting the same terms to the present Special Ticket Examiners.

(c) I shall ascertain whether this information is readily available, and if so, will place it on the table of the House in due course.



(d) I presume the actual check will be the same whatever the agency that is employed for the purpose.

(f) The information referred to was placed on the table of the House over 15 months ago—on the 8th September, 1932, to be accurate.

**NON-PAYMENT OF HOUSE RENT BY RAILWAYS TO EMPLOYEES APPOINTED AFTER THE 1ST AUGUST, 1928.**

1379. **\*Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Are Government aware that house rent is not paid by Railways to employees appointed after the 1st August, 1928?

(b) Is it continued to be paid to those who were drawing the same prior to the 1st August, 1928?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) Yes.

(b) Yes, when holding a post which carried the concession prior to that date.

**ALLOWANCES OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS.**

1380. **\*Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) With reference to their reply on the 23rd March, 1932, to question No. 889 (j), viz., that "the allowance of other running staff, e.g., Guards, etc., have not been reduced as their duties remain the same", will Government please state if it is a fact that the duties of the old Travelling Ticket Examiners, now classed as Special Ticket Examiners, have for the most part remained the same?

(b) If the reply to part (a) be in the negative, will Government please state to what percentage their duties have remained the same?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) Government have been informed that this is not so.

(b) I am afraid it is impossible to compare their old duties with their present duties in terms of percentages.

**PAYMENT OF MILEAGE ALLOWANCE TO GUARDS WORKING AS CONDUCTORS.**

1381. **\*Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that some of the Guards, on receipt of mileage allowance, have been put to work as Conductors?

(b) Is there any difference in duties of a Conductor and a Train Guard? If so, what?

(c) If the duties of a Conductor and Train Guard are not the same, why have the Conductors been paid mileage allowance?

(d) Is it a fact that Guards are still being paid mileage allowance for working as Conductors, although their duties for this work are changed? If so, why?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) I am informed that on certain important passenger trains on the North Western Railway, Guards are put to work as Conductor Guards.

(b) The Conductor Guard relieves the Train Guard of part of the duties of a Guard assisting the Train Guard in attending to the comfort and needs of passengers of all classes.

(c) and (d). The mileage allowance is paid because these continue to do Guards' duties.

### ALLOWANCES OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS.

1382. \***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) With reference to their reply on the 23rd March, 1932, to question No. 890(f), will Government please state if it is a fact that the Chief Accounts Officer, North Western Railway, sent a statement of the allowance admissible to the Travelling Ticket Examiners on their transfer to the Traffic Department in 1928, to the various Divisional Superintendents about the grant of 200 miles for eight hours duty or the average mileage of the previous month for days when employed to check at stations?

(b) If the reply to part (a) above be in the affirmative, will Government please state why the old Travelling Ticket Examiners, now classed as Special Ticket Examiners, are not paid mileage allowance for check in running trains at the rate of 200 miles or average mileage of the previous month for every eight hours for checking at stations according to that letter as previously?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) Possibly: but I have no information on the matter.

(b) I have dealt with this suggestion in replying to question No. 1378.

### DEVELOPMENT OF THE DAIRY INDUSTRY IN INDIA.

1383. \***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the two articles which appeared in the special supplement to the *Times of India* of the 16th September, 1933, which indicated the money value of the agricultural and the live stock and animal products and the importance of these industries, more especially of the dairy industry, in their relation to the economical and physical well-being of the people of India?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state:

- (i) what is the existing cattle breeding and dairy organisation under them;
- (ii) what the amount of money spent on it at present is and what it was before retrenchment was effected;
- (iii) what was the staff retrenched from it and the institutes or farms closed down due to retrenchment?

(c) In what way is help given by this organisation for the development of the dairy industry in the country and who is directly responsible for giving such help?

(d) What facilities are available at present for developing industrial dairying? Do Government contemplate increasing these facilities?

(e) Are Government aware that various dairy products are imported in large quantities from abroad every year and this importation is on an increase?

(f) Are Government aware that there is a great wastage of milk produced in rural areas in this country due to want of knowledge of the process of manufacturing dairy products?

(g) Will Government please state if facilities exist at present for experimenting on the manufacture of these products and if efforts have been made in this direction? If so, with what results?

(h) Will Government please indicate the nature, quantity and value of such dairy products imported into India during the last three years?

(i) Are Government aware of the public feeling that the present state of the cattle breeding and dairying industries in India is very unsatisfactory and that these are nation building industries?

(j) Do Government propose to give their immediate and earnest attention to the further development of the cattle dairy department with a view to developing these industries on proper lines in the country?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpal:** I lay on the table a statement giving the information asked for by the Honourable Member.

*Statement.*

(a) Yes.

(b) (i). The organisation consists of the Imperial Dairy Expert, farms for cattle breeding and instruction in dairying at Karnal and Bangalore, and a small section for animal nutrition research at Bangalore. Cattle breeding and dairying operations are also carried out at the Imperial Institute of Agricultural Research, Pusa.

(ii). The amount of money actually spent by the Government of India on this organisation was Rs. 6,34,950 in 1930-31 before retrenchment and the expenditure in 1933-34 after retrenchment is estimated at Rs. 3,05,900.

This is exclusive of the cost of the cattle breeding and dairying operations at the Imperial Institute of Agricultural Research, Pusa.

(iii). One post of Assistant to the Imperial Dairy Expert, one of Superintendent of Dairy Farms and four posts of clerks have been retrenched; the Anand Creamery has been closed and the Wellington Farm has been converted into a milk depot.

(c) Courses in Dairying are given at the Imperial Institute of Animal Husbandry and Dairying, Bangalore, by the Imperial Dairy Expert. The Imperial Dairy Expert also gives advice to Local Governments, municipalities and privately owned dairy organizations regarding the organization and improvement of dairying.

(d) The Creamery at Anand was formerly maintained as an experimental and educational dairy factory in India, where the manufacture of milk products could be studied on a factory scale and where the treatment of milk for the manufacture of milk factory products could be taught on practical lines. Students from the Bangalore Dairy Institute were trained there, in factory methods of handling milk and cream and in the manufacture of butter, ghee and other dairy products and by-products. This institution had to be closed as a measure of economy but the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research has since sanctioned a grant of Rs. 1,10,698 spread over three years to carry on industrial research at this Creamery and the training of students on the same lines as before.

(e) The statistics for the last five years show that, except in regard to butter, there has been a steady decline in the importation of dairy products as a whole.

(f) There is little doubt that large quantities of milk produced in remote villages throughout India find no remunerative market at present owing mainly to the prohibitive cost of transportation and to the lack of a suitable organization for collecting, processing and marketing.

(g) The Honourable Member is referred to the answer I have given to part (d) of this question.

(h) The information is published in the Sea-Borne Trade Returns, to which the Honourable Member's attention is invited.

(i) and (j). The Government of India realize that the cattle breeding and dairying industries of India are susceptible of improvement and consistently with their financial resources they have done what they could to help these industries. As the Honourable Member is aware, the subject is now primarily the concern of Local Governments and it is hoped that as finances improve, the claims of cattle breeding and dairying will receive sympathetic attention from all those authorities who are in a position to help.

(

### RECRUITMENT OF MOPLAHS IN THE ARMY.

**1384. \*Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** (a) Have Government seen the text of the resolution passed by the Kerala Muslim Majlis held at Himayatul Islam Sabha Hall at Calicut in connection with the recruitment of Moplahs in the Army?

(b) Is there any ban to their enlistment in the army of the country?

(c) Are Moplahs considered a martial race? If not, why not?

(d) Will Government kindly lay a list of the races which are classed as martial on the table of this House?

(e) Have Moplahs ever been tried as soldiers, and with what result?

(f) Are Moplahs not entitled to have the same opportunity of serving Government and the country, as other communities in India have?

(g) Are Government prepared to consider the desirability of removing the ban which at present seems to exist for the recruitment of Moplahs in the army?

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

(b), (c), (e), (f) and (g). The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the answer I gave on the 7th November, 1932, to starred question No. 902, asked by Mr. Uppi Saheb Bahadur.

Government have since decided to open recruitment for Moplahs in the Indian Territorial Force as an experimental measure.

(d) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the answer to starred question No. 888, asked by Mr. Ram Narayan Singh on the 6th September, 1927.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** May I know from Government what is the criterion for deciding the question as to whether a particular race is a martial race or not?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I have already referred the Honourable Member to the answer to a question put in 1927 on that subject. If the Honourable Member wishes, I will repeat that answer now:

"No particular caste, class or community is officially recognised by Government as martial or otherwise, but units of the Indian Army have always been organized on a class basis; and, as there are limits to the size of that army, only a limited number of classes can ordinarily find a place in it. The classes selected are those which, from the point of view of military efficiency alone, the military authorities prefer to enlist."

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** Are Muslims from the United Provinces included among the martial races?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I must ask for notice of that question. A good many of them are, I am sure.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** Is it not a fact that, like the Madrassis, they have always been excluded from recruitment in the army?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I do not know which particular class my Honourable friend is referring to; but, if he will put a question on the paper, I will answer that question.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Do Government propose to give a trial to the Moplahs?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** The Moplahs have already been given a crumb of comfort by being enlisted in the Territorial Force. I suggest that they should swallow that crumb and endeavour to digest it before asking for more.

**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar:** May I ask the Army Secretary whether there is any technical difficulty from the army point of view in organising a cosmopolitan unit composed of more than one class?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** All over India?

**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar:** The Army Secretary said that the organisation of the army is based on forming units of classes and, as there can be only a limited number of units, there can be only a limited number of classes. Agreeing that there should be a limited number of units, is there any technical difficulty, from the military point of view, in reserving a few units for cosmopolitan recruitment, so that this grievance about martial and non-martial races may be removed?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I think there would be considerable practical difficulties in organising units which would be entirely composed of cosmopolitan classes. Most of the units of the Indian army contain more than one class even now, but the companies in each battalion are generally of a single class. There would be considerable difficulties in breaking up those companies and allowing them to consist of a large number of different classes.

**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar:** Then how does the Honourable Member propose to give a chance to those classes who have not already been recruited to the army, to have a military training and a military career?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** The only opportunity they have at present is to join the Territorial Force.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Do Government wish that those Moplahs should take up arms in their hands to prove that they are a martial race?

**Mr. R. S. Sarma:** Have they not done it?

#### REPRESENTATION OF THE TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1985. **Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** (a) Will Government kindly state whether they have received any representation from the Travelling Ticket Examiners of the East Indian Railway?

(b) If so, what action have Government taken on it and how long will they take to arrive at a decision on it?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** A memorial was received from the Travelling Ticket Examiners of the East Indian Railway in March last and orders have been issued on it.

## RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WAR PENSIONS COMMITTEE.

1386. \***Lala Rameshwar Prasad Bagla:** (a) Is it a fact that according to Government orders on recommendation No. 9 of the War Pensions Committee held at Simla in June, 1933, regarding pension of non-combatant military employees invalidated on account of disability and disease contracted during the Great War 1914-18, Government have no objection in allowing the old rules and rates to be applied in those cases, if any, where they would be more favourable to an individual?

(b) Will Government kindly state the date from which the current rates came into force?

(c) Is it a fact that copies of questions Nos. 591 to 596 and their replies given on the 4th September, 1933, in this House, have been forwarded to the Controller of Military Pensions, Lahore? If not, do Government now propose to forward copies of those questions and answers, together with those of this question and its answer to the Controller, Military Pensions, Lahore, for information and favour of action accordingly?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** (a) Yes, but the decision requires the confirmation of the Secretary of State whose sanction has been applied for.

(b) 1st January, 1922.

(c) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the answer I gave on the 1st December, 1933, to starred question No. 1263.

## UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

## SALARIES PAID IN THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF COMMERCIAL INTELLIGENCE IN INDIA.

267. **Shaikh Sadiq Hasan:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the amount of salaries paid monthly in the department of the Director of Commercial Intelligence in India?

(b) How much out of that amount is drawn by Muslims?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** (a) The salaries paid in the month of October, 1933, amounted to Rs. 7,068-10, in the case of officers and Rs. 17,822 in the case of the staff, including inferior servants.

(b) Rs. 1,434-6 out of Rs. 17,822 mentioned above.

## CLERKS IN THE CLOTHING FACTORY, SHAHJAHANPUR.

268. **Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of clerks (of all grades) working on the 1st September, 1933, in the Clothing Factory, Shahjahanpur, separately in:

- (i) Main Office,
- (ii) Provision Office,
- (iii) Production Office;

- (b) the total number of Muslim clerks in each one of the above offices;
- (c) the percentage of Muslim clerks in the entire Factory (all Branches) during 1930, 1931 and 1932?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** The information asked for is being collected and will be laid on the table.

**CLERKS DISCHARGED IN THE CLOTHING FACTORY, SHAHJAHANPUR.**

**269. Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Will Government be pleased to enquire and state:

- (a) how many Muslim clerks were discharged during 1930, 1931 and 1932 in the Clothing Factory, Shahjahanpur;
- (b) how many non-Muslim clerks were discharged during 1930, 1931 and 1932?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** The information asked for is being collected and will be laid on the table.

**CLERKS APPOINTED, RE-INSTATED OR RE-ENGAGED IN THE CLOTHING FACTORY, SHAHJAHANPUR.**

**270. Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Will Government be pleased to enquire and state how many Muslim and non-Muslim clerks have been appointed, re-instated, or re-engaged in the Clothing Factory, Shahjahanpur, during September and October, 1933?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** The information asked for is being collected and will be laid on the table.

**DENIAL OF CERTAIN BENEFITS TO THE INDUSTRIAL HANDS OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS.**

**271. Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that the compositors, binders and distributors of the Government of India Presses are in the superior service and they enjoy all the benefits such as pensions, etc., like the clerical staff?

(b) Is it a fact that the industrial hands, in the superior service of the East Indian Railway Press are not allowed benefits like the clerical staff of the press? If so, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for the same?

(c) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for placing the superior industrial hands of the East Indian Railway Press, Calcutta, in the category of the "workshop staff"?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) I understand that the compositors, binders and distributors in the Government of India Presses are treated as superior staff and are eligible to the benefits of pension or contributory provident fund in the same way as clerks.

(b) and (c). I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table in due course. |

**LEAVE, HOLIDAYS, ETC., FOR THE INDUSTRIAL HANDS OF THE EAST  
INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS.**

**272. Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that the industrial hands such as compositors, etc., of the Government of India Presses are all equally treated in matters of leave, holidays, etc., irrespective of grades or earnings?

(b) Is it a fact that the industrial hands such as compositors, binders, etc., of the East Indian Railway Press, Calcutta, are not treated equally in matters of granting leave?

(c) If the answers to parts (a) and (b) be in the affirmative, will the Honourable Member in charge, Railways and Commerce, be pleased to state the reasons for the differential treatment as mentioned in part (b)?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) The reply is in the negative.

(b) Government have no reason to think that this is correct.

(c) Does not arise.

**ACTION TAKEN ON CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE PRESS  
EMPLOYEES' ASSOCIATION, CALCUTTA.**

**273. Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that the Honourable Member in charge, Railways and Commerce, has received the copies of the Annual Report and Resolutions passed at the Annual General Meeting of the Press Employees Association, Calcutta, a registered and recognised body, held on the 19th August, 1933, under the presidency of Mr. Fazlul Huq, M.A., B.L., ex-Minister, Government of Bengal?

(b) Has the attention of the Honourable Member been drawn to Resolution Nos. 5 and 19 to 24? If so, will the Honourable Member be pleased to state the action taken or intended to be taken in the matters? If not, why not?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) and (b). A copy of the Annual Report and Resolutions passed at the Annual General Meeting of the Press Employees' Association, Calcutta, held on the 19th August, 1933, was received by the Railway Board. But the Association is not recognised by the Government of India and no action is, therefore, proposed to be taken on the Resolutions.

**APPOINTMENT OF THE PRESENT OVERSEER, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS,  
AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT A MEETING OF THE PRESS EMPLOYEES  
OF THE EAST INDIAN AND EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAYS PRESSES.**

**274. Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that under the rules a Government servant found to be incompetent to hold his office under a Provincial Government cannot be employed in any other Government office—Provincial or Imperial?

(b) Is it a fact that the present overseer, East Indian Railway Press, Riverside Shed, was employed in the Bengal Government Press just previous to his appointment in the present post?

(c) Is it a fact that serious allegations were made in the Bengal Legislative Council in August, 1928, by Babu Nagendra Nath Sen, M.L.C., against the present overseer, East Indian Railway Press, Howrah, while employed in the Bengal Government Press, Calcutta?



(d) Is it a fact that the present overseer, East Indian Railway Press, Howrah, lost his appointment in the Bengal Government Press and was subsequently employed in the East Indian Railway Press in 1928?

(e) If the answers to parts (a) to (d) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state how the present overseer, East Indian Railway Press, Howrah, has been appointed to the post?

(f) Is it a fact that the Honourable Member in charge, Railways and Commerce, has received a letter, dated the 31st July, 1933, from the Secretary, Press Employees' Association, Calcutta—a registered and recognised body—sending a copy of the resolutions passed at a public meeting of the press employees of the East Indian and Eastern Bengal Railway Presses, held on 29th July, 1933? If so, has the attention of the Honourable Member been drawn to resolution No. 7? If so, what action has been taken in the matter? If not, why not?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) No.

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

(e) Does not arise.

(f) The reply to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. The letter was forwarded to the Agent, East Indian Railway who was competent to deal with the matters contained therein.

#### RETRENCHMENTS AND DEMOTIONS OF THE INDUSTRIAL STAFF OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS.

275. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that drastic retrenchments and demotions in the industrial staff of the East Indian Railway Press, Calcutta, have recently been carried out on economic grounds?

(b) Is it a fact that the present Superintendent, East Indian Railway Press has been allowed an increment of Rs. 30 on and from the 20th October, 1933?

(c) If the answer to parts (a) and (b) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for the action mentioned in part (b)?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) Retrenchments and demotions have been made in the East Indian Railway Press on grounds of economy.

(b) and (c). The pay of the Superintendent, East Indian Railway Press before its amalgamation with the Eastern Bengal Railway Press was Rs. 950. After the amalgamation the pay of the post of Superintendent was fixed in the scale, Rs. 600—1,000 and in view of the fact that the present Superintendent was drawing Rs. 950 for the last four years, his pay was fixed at Rs. 1,000.

#### INTRODUCTION OF NEW CONDITIONS OF SERVICE IN THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY PRESS.

276. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that in 1930 new conditions of service were introduced in the Eastern Bengal Railway Press, Sealdah, and an agreement was entered into between the staff of the Press and Government?

(b) Is it a fact that before entering into the agreement the salaried staff was allowed to exercise their option to elect themselves to remain under the old leave rules?

(c) Is it a fact that the salaried compositors and the distributors elected themselves to remain under the old leave rules by signing the printed forms supplied to each of them by the authorities for the purpose?

(d) Is it a fact that the Agent, Eastern Bengal Railway, issued, in his letter No. 313/O/E IV, dated the 17th December, 1931, orders regarding leave and holidays for the press staff?

(e) Is it a fact that the staff of the press were divided into four categories in the Agent's circular, and the compositors and distributors were placed in category IV (a) (Industrial Superior Establishment)?

(f) Is it a fact that in accordance with Railway Board's letter No. 229-E. G., dated the 20th February, 1931, it was declared that 20 days' holidays with full pay would be granted to all the press staff and the persons of category IV who elected to remain under the old leave rules would be allowed full pay on closed holidays?

(g) Is it a fact that the compositors and the distributors enjoyed the holidays according to the said rules framed for the purpose till the date of amalgamation with the East Indian Railway Press?

(h) Is it a fact that the services of the Eastern Bengal Railway Press staff were transferred to the East Indian Railway Press with the conditions of services remaining in tact?

(i) Is it a fact that after the amalgamation the Superintendent, East Indian Railway Press issued a circular to the effect that the salaried compositors and distributors of the Eastern Bengal Railway Press, would not be granted holidays according to the Agent's (Eastern Bengal Railway) circular mentioned in part (d)?

(j) Is it a fact that the readers, copyholders, timekeepers, etc., of the Eastern Bengal Railway Press, were of the same category as the compositors and distributors, viz., Industrial Superior Establishment, before the amalgamation?

(k) Is it a fact that the readers, copyholders and timekeepers, have been allowed to enjoy the holidays as per Eastern Bengal Railway Agent's circular even after the amalgamation?

(l) If the answers to parts (a) to (k) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state:

(i) the reasons for the issue of the circular mentioned in part (i) above, and

(ii) whether the order of the Printing Superintendent as mentioned in part (i) is tantamount to the violation of the agreement entered into between the Eastern Bengal Railway Press staff and the authorities regarding the conditions of service? If not, why not?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

#### MEMORIAL OF INKMEN OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, CALCUTTA.

277. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that in reply to the unstarred question No. 125, asked in this House by Mr. Bhuput Sing the Honourable Member in charge, Department of Industries and Labour stated on 20th September, 1933, that the memorial of inkmen of the Government of India Press, Calcutta, was engaging the attention of the Controller of

Printing and Stationery and would be considered by Government when his proposals were received?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether the proposals of the Controller of Printing and Stationery have been received by them? If so, have Government considered the proposals? If not, when do they expect to receive the same?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) Yes.

(b) The memorial has been considered by Government who have decided not to grant the request made in it.

#### MEMORIAL OF TEMPORARY BINDERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, CALCUTTA.

278. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that in reply to the unstarred question No. 126 asked in this House by Mr. Bhuput Sing the Honourable Member in charge, Department of Industries and Labour, stated on the 20th September, 1933, that the memorial of the temporary binders of the Government of India Press, Calcutta, was engaging the attention of the Controller and would be considered by Government when his proposals were received?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state, whether proposals of the Controller have been received by them? If so, have Government considered the proposals? If not, when do they expect to receive the same?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) Yes.

(b) The answer to the first part is in the negative. It is not possible to say at present when the Controller's proposals will be received.

#### PRINTING OF POST AND TELEGRAPH FORMS.

279. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that in reply to question No. 127, dated the 20th September, 1933, Government stated that the printing of Post and Telegraph forms, whose value is about Rs. 2,20,000, could not be managed by the Government of India Press, Calcutta?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state:

- (i) whether the opinion of the Manager of the Government of India Press, Calcutta, was obtained in this respect;
- (ii) if so, whether Government will be pleased to lay on the table a copy of the opinion of the Manager;
- (iii) if the opinion had not been obtained, whether Government will be pleased to state the reasons for the same?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) The reply to part (f) of unstarred question No. 127 given in the Legislative Assembly on the 20th September, 1933, was "No".

(b) The question was not referred to the Manager because Government had sufficient information in their possession.

**AMOUNT PAID BY GOVERNMENT TO CONTRACTORS FOR OUTSIDE PRINTING WORK.**

**280. Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that in reply to question No. 52, dated the 6th September, 1922, the Honourable Mr. H. A. F. Lindsay, stated in the Council of State that the Contractors were paid Rs. 7,16,510 in 1920-21 for outside printing work?

(b) Is it a fact that in reply to question No. 72, dated 23rd August, 1926, the Honourable Mr. A. H. Ley stated in the Council of State that the contractors were paid in 1920-21, the sum of Rs. 6,23,564 for printing work?

(c) Is it a fact that in reply to starred question No. 248, dated the 2nd February, 1931, Mr. J. A. Shillidy stated in this House that the amount paid to the Contractors for printing work in the year 1929-30 was Rs. 4,02,000?

(d) Is it a fact that the Controller of Printing and Stationery, when forwarding to Government the annual statistical return showing the working of the Government of India Presses made a statement to the effect that during 1929-30, the payments for outside printing reached up to Rs. 12,93,697?

(e) If the answers to parts (a) to (d) be in the affirmative, are Government aware, on reference to different statements, that huge amounts of public money have been wasted in payment to the Contractors? If so, do Government propose to stop the placing of printing work with Contractors? If not, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for the different statements mentioned in parts (a), (b), (c) and (d)?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) No. What the Honourable Mr. Lindsay stated was that the total amount paid to Messrs. Lal Chand and Sons in 1920-21 was Rs. 7,16,510. This sum included, besides the charges for outside printing work, the charges for storage and distribution of forms.

(b) and (c). Yes.

(d) Yes. But the amount of Rs. 12,93,697 includes, besides charges for printing work, the cost of paper and materials supplied to contractors on behalf of Departments.

(e) This does not strictly arise, but I would add that public money is not wasted when adequate services are secured in return and that the reasons for the differences between the figures will be evident from the previous replies.

**CONCESSIONS TO TEMPORARY PRESS EMPLOYEES OBLIGED TO RETIRE BEFORE THE COMPLETION OF THE 25 YEARS' SERVICE.**

**281. Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it not a fact that according to Government Resolution No. A-31, dated the 15th July, 1920, the piece employees of the Government of India Presses, who were appointed on the 15th July, 1920 and were not made permanent, were entitled to pensions after the completion of 25 years' service?

(b) Is it a fact that in reply to question No. 356(a), dated the 21st March, 1931, Mr. J. A. Shillidy stated in this House that, according to Government's circular, the employees of the Government of India Presses, who were appointed before the 15th July, 1920, and were not made permanent, would be entitled to a bonus in case they were obliged to retire before completion of their 25 years' service?

(c) Is it not a fact that several employees of the Government of India Presses, who were appointed before the 15th July, 1920, and have rendered 15 to 18 years' service and who have not been made permanent, have recently been obliged to retire before the completion of 25 years' service?

(d) If the answers to parts (a) to (c) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state what consideration has been shown with regard to the employees mentioned in part (c)? If none, why not?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) No; but by subsequent modifications of the orders then passed, pieceworkers of the Government of India Presses who were in employment in the regular establishment on the 15th July, 1920, and were not made permanent were given the right to pensions after the completion of 25 years' service.

(b) Yes.

(c) I am not clear for which period the information is required but if the Honourable Member refers to the recent discharge from service of certain employees of the Government of India Press, Calcutta, the reply is in the negative.

(d) Does not arise.

#### DISCHARGE WITHOUT DUE NOTICE OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, CALCUTTA.

**282. Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it not a fact that it is imperative on the part of Government to give a month's notice to employees before they are discharged from service?

(b) Is it not a fact that in lieu of a month's notice the discharged employees are entitled to a month's pay in case their services are suddenly dispensed with?

(c) Is it not a fact that several employees of the Government of India Press, Calcutta, have recently been discharged without giving them a month's notice on the ground of their being on the "Fluctuating staff"?

(d) Is it not a fact that the discharged employees were entitled to contribute to the Provident Fund and deductions were made accordingly?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) and (b). No: it depends on the conditions on which the employees are engaged.

(c) Yes.

(d) No deductions are made from the pay of employees on this account so long as they are paid as members of the fluctuating staff. I cannot say whether contributions were made while any of them were acting in other appointments.

#### HANDICAPS OF PIECE-RATED EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, CALCUTTA.

**283. Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Are Government aware that whenever any retrenchment is made in the Government of India Press, Calcutta, the "axe" falls only on the piece employees of the said Press?

(b) Is it a fact that the emergency cut of 5 per cent. has equally been applied to the salaried as well as piece-rated employees of the Government of India Press, Calcutta?

(c) Is it a fact that the earnings of the piece-workers of the Government of India Press, Calcutta, are daily decreasing and those of the salaried hands like Cashiers, Computers, Accountants, Clerks, Readers, etc., are increasing?

(d) Are Government aware that the decrease in the earnings of the piece-workers would adversely affect their pension?

(e) Is it a fact that with the introduction of the system of work as laid down in Government Resolution No. A.-31 dated the 15th July, 1920, trouble broke out in the Government Presses, the piece-rated employees apprehending a further decrease in their earnings with the introduction of the new system?

(f) Is it a fact that on the 14th September, 1920, a Resolution was moved by the Honourable Mr. G. S. Khaparde in the old Indian Legislative Council demanding a mixed-Committee to investigate and report on the causes of the trouble in the Government Presses and to propose remedial measures?

(g) Is it not a fact that during the debate on this Resolution Sir Thomas Holland, the President, Board of Industries and Munition, added "I promise the men (pieceworkers) that I will tear up the Government Resolution, if they do not get better income for shorter hours of work". "I am quite willing to lay the whole result before a Committee of the Council to allow that Committee to judge whether I have been fair to the workers"?

(h) Is it not a fact that the Government of India Resolution No. A.-31, dated the 15th July, 1920, stated that the compositors of the Government of India Presses used to earn Rs. 35 to Rs. 90 according to old class rates?

(i) Is it not a fact that by the said Resolution an increment of 40 per cent. was given to all workers and accordingly the earnings of the compositors worked out at from Rs. 49 to Rs. 126?

(j) Is it not a fact that in course of the debate on the abolition of piece-work system in Government Presses the Honourable Mr. A. H. Ley stated in the Council of State on the 23rd August, 1926, that a compositor in Calcutta got Rs. 122?

(k) Is it not a fact that the Honourable Member in charge, Department of Industries, stated in this House on the 20th September, 1933, that the maximum and minimum earnings of the compositors in Calcutta for 1931-32 were Rs. 82 and Rs. 41 respectively?

(l) If the answers to parts (e) to (k) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state:

(i) whether the earnings of the compositors of the Government of India Press, Calcutta, are decreasing and if so, the reasons for the same;

(ii) whether they are willing to lay the whole result of the working of the Government Resolution No. A.-31, dated the 15th July, 1920; before a Committee of this House as promised by Sir Thomas Holland; if not, why not?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Moyce:** (a) No.

(b) Yes.

(c) I have no reason to suppose that the earnings of pieceworkers for normal hours of work are decreasing daily. The pieceworkers receive biennial increments in class rates just as the salaried hands on time scales of pay who receive annual increments.

(d) A decrease in the earnings of pieceworkers affects their pension only if it occurred during the last 72 months of their superior service.

(e) No: there was trouble prior to the Resolution.

(f) and (g). Yes.

(h) and (i). The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given on the 20th September, 1933, to parts (b) and (d) of unstarred question No. 129 in the Legislative Assembly.

(j) No. The Honourable Mr. Ley stated that a compositor in Calcutta in the month he examined, i.e., April, 1926, got Rs. 122 in that month.

(k) Yes. The figures given represent the average monthly earnings during 1931-32.

(l) (i) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply to part (c) above.

(ii) The result of the working of the terms sanctioned for pieceworkers in the Resolution of 1920 was laid before the Pieceworkers' Committee in 1922 and I invite the attention of the Honourable Member to paragraph 14 on pages 12 and 15 of that Committee's Report, which is available in the Library.

To avoid the possibility of misunderstanding I should add that Sir Thomas Holland's statement related to the effect of the changes made in 1920 and should not be regarded as a guarantee to pieceworkers for all time of the earnings they got in 1920, irrespective of changes in the work available and other factors.

#### EARNINGS OF THE DISTRIBUTORS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESSES, CALCUTTA AND SIMLA.

284. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it not a fact that the earnings of the distributors of the Government of India Presses, Calcutta and Simla are daily decreasing?

(b) Is it not a fact that the decrease in earnings will affect the pensions of the distributors?

(c) Is it not a fact that the distributors used to get the same class rates as the compositors before 1928?

(d) Is it not a fact that the class rates of the distributors were lowered after 1928?

(e) If the answers to parts (a) to (d) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for the action mentioned in part (d)?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Moyce:** (a) and (b). No distributors are employed in the Simla Press. As regards distributors in the Calcutta Press, the attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the replies given by me today to parts (c) and (d) of his unstarred question No. 55.

(c), (d) and (e). The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given by the Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra to his starred question No. 794, dated the 21st March, 1930.

**STOPPAGE OF PROMOTION OR INCREMENT OF PIECE-EMPLOYEES OF THE  
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESSES FOR LEAVE ON MEDICAL GROUND.**

235. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that 40 per cent. increment was granted to both salaried hands and piece-employees of the Government of India Presses at Calcutta and Delhi as per Resolution No. A-31, dated the 15th July, 1920? |

(b) Will Government be pleased to give a statement showing the pay or earnings of the following staff of the Government of India Presses, drawn by each of them before the 15th July, 1920, and after the general increment in July, 1920, and also the present pay of:

- (i) Accountant, (ii) Cashier, (iii) Assistant Cashier, (iv) Head Assistant, (v) Head Computer, (vi) Head Reader, (vii) three clerks, three computers, three Readers (Junior and Senior), three Revisors (with names)?

(c) Is it a fact that no promotion or increment of the salaried hands in the Government of India Press, Calcutta, is stopped for leave on medical grounds?

(d) Is it a fact that promotion or increment is stopped in cases of piece-employees for leave on medical ground?

(e) If the answers to parts (c) and (d) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for the stoppage of promotion or increment in cases of piece-employees for leave on medical ground?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) The piece rates for the presses at Calcutta and Delhi were increased by 40 per cent. The salaried hands were granted approximately an increase of ten per cent. on earnings up to Rs. 70 a month and 5 per cent. on earnings over Rs. 70.

(b) The information is not available and its collection would involve an amount of time and trouble disproportionate to the result.

(c) and (d). Leave on pay whether granted on medical grounds or for other reasons counts for increments for salaried hands and piece-workers alike.

(e) Does not arise.

**ACTION TAKEN ON CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE PRESS  
EMPLOYEES' ASSOCIATION, CALCUTTA.**

286. **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that the Honourable Member in charge, Department of Industries and Labour has received copies of Annual Report and Resolutions passed at the Annual General Meeting of the Press Employees' Association, Calcutta, a registered and recognised body, held on the 19th August, 1933, at Calcutta under the presidentship of Mr. Fazlul Huq, M.A., B.L., ex-Minister under the Government of Bengal?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, has the attention of Government been drawn to the Resolutions Nos. 8 to 18? If so,—

(i) will Government be pleased to place on the table of this House a copy of the same;

(ii) will Government be pleased to state what action has been taken or intended to be taken in the matter? If not, why not?



**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) and (b). Government have received a copy of the Report and of the Resolutions. But as the Honourable Member was informed in reply to his starred question No. 258 of 2nd February, 1931, the Association is not recognized by the Government of India. No action has, therefore, been taken on the Resolutions now received, and Government do not propose to lay a copy of Resolutions 8 to 18 on the table of the House.

**INCREASE OF THE PAY OF THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY TICKET  
PRINTING STAFF.**

**287. Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that on the introduction of new conditions of services in November, 1930, as sanctioned by the Railway Board, in the Eastern Bengal Railway Press, Sealdah, an increment of 40 per cent. to all employees of the Press was allowed along with the increase of working hours?

(b) Is it a fact that the Ticket Printing Section of the Eastern Bengal Railway Press remained unaffected, even with the introduction of the new system, both with regard to the increase in working hours as well as increment in pay?

(c) Is it a fact that with the amalgamation of the Eastern Bengal Railway Press with the East Indian Railway Press the services of the Ticket Printing employees were transferred to the East Indian Railway Press, their condition of services remaining the same as before?

(d) Is it a fact that the staff of the Ticket Printing Section, Eastern Bengal Railway, worked till October, 1933, on the old basis of working hours?

(e) Is it a fact that on and from the 1st November, 1933, the working hours of the staff of the Eastern Bengal Railway Ticket Printing Section have been increased by orders of the Agent, East Indian Railway, bringing them under the orders of the Railway Board as regards working hours of the Press?

(f) Is it a fact that simultaneously with the increase of working hours no increment in pay has been allowed to the Ticket Printing staff, Eastern Bengal Railway?

(g) If the answers to parts (a) to (f) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether they intend to increase the pay of the Eastern Bengal Railway Ticket Printing staff proportionately with the increase of working hours?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

**REDUCTION IN THE NUMBER OF POSTAL BEATS IN THE SANKARPUR  
VILLAGE, JESSORE DISTRICT.**

**288. Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that the villagers of Sankarpur under the Naldi Post Office in the district of Jessore submitted three memorials to the Honourable Member-in-charge, Department of Industries and Labour, Government of India, through the Divisional Superintendent, in the months of January, May and July, 1933, praying for the daily beat in their village?

(b) Is it a fact that no reply was given to any of these memorials?

(c) Is it a fact that the number of beats in the village of Sankarpur under the Naldi Post Office in the district of Jessore has been reduced to three in place of five?

(d) Is it a fact that the number of beats in the village Habakhali under the Post Office Naldi has been increased from two to six?

(e) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table of this House, a comparative statement showing the number of registered letters, money orders, insurance, newspapers and ordinary letters delivered during the last two years, 1931 and 1932, respectively, in the village of Sankarpur and Habakhali under the Naldi Post Office in the district of Jessore?

(f) If the answer to parts (a) to (d) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the reasons therefor? If not, why not?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) to (f). Government have not been able to trace the receipt of any such memorials as those referred to by the Honourable Member; a reference is, however, being made to the Postmaster-General concerned and a reply to the Honourable Member's questions will be placed on the table in due course.

#### INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF PEONS AND INTRODUCTION OF THE SYSTEM OF DAILY BEATS IN THE NALDI POST OFFICE, JESSORE.

289. **Mr. S. G. Mitra:** (a) Is it not a fact that the income from the Post Office, Naldi, in the district of Jessore is more than that from the Post Office, Nawhatta in the same district?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the number of peons employed in the Post Offices of Naldi and Nawhatta, respectively, in the district of Jessore?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state whether they contemplate increasing the number of peons and introducing the system of daily beat in the Naldi Post Office?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) to (c). The information is being obtained and a reply will be placed on the table in due course.

#### ANNUAL REPAIRS TO THE TELEGRAPH QUARTERS AT BAIRD ROAD, NEW DELHI.

290. **Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the annual repairs to the telegraph quarters at Baird Road have not been completed as yet, while repairs to all other quarters under the Public Works Department were completed long ago?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government please state what is the cause of this delay and when the repairs to the telegraph quarters are likely to be completed?

(c) Who is the local officer in charge of maintenance and repairs to these telegraph quarters? Did he visit these quarters any time during the last five years? If so, when? If not, why not?

(d) Is it a fact that the Telegraph Department makes the payments to the contractors without verifying the nature of work done by them or without obtaining any completion certificate from the occupants of these quarters?

(a) Do Government propose to bring about any improvement in the present state of things?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) No: the annual repairs of the Baird Road telegraph quarters have been completed. Attention is being paid to some remaining defects and to some additional items of work desired by the occupants.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) The Central Public Works Department had charge up to July, 1933, and subsequently the Divisional Engineer, Telegraphs, Delhi. The quarters were duly visited and inspected by the appropriate officers from time to time.

(d) All repair work is inspected and measurements are recorded and checked before payments to contractors are made. Completion certificates from occupants are not obtained.

(e) Government do not consider that any action beyond that indicated in the reply to part (a) of the question is necessary.

#### REPAIRS TO PATHS IN FRONT AND SIDES OF THE TELEGRAPH QUARTERS ON BAIRD ROAD, NEW DELHI.

291. **Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether they are aware that the paths in front and sides of telegraph quarters on Baird Road have not been repaired for the last few years and whether these paths are full of ditches?

(b) Are Government aware that the telegraph employees putting up in these quarters have to pass through these paths during all parts of the day and night to attend to their duties at a great personal risk and inconvenience?

(c) Do these paths belong to the Telegraph Department? If so, who is the officer in charge to look after these paths? When were these paths last visited by this officer?

(d) Do Government propose to have these paths repaired at an early date? If so, when? If not, why not?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) No. Such repairs as were necessary were duly carried out from time to time. There are some shallow depressions in some of the paths, caused by the recent heavy rains and these are receiving attention.

(b) Telegraph employees have to use these paths but no personal risk or appreciable inconvenience is involved.

(c) The paths in front of the telegraph quarters are the property of the Posts and Telegraphs Department. The Divisional Engineer, Telegraphs, Delhi is in charge of them at present, and last visited them on the 23rd November, 1933.

(d) The repairs to the paths are being attended to.

#### RULES FOR THE RECRUITMENT OF TELEPHONE OPERATORS.

292. **Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Will Government please state whether there are any rules or system of recruitment to the posts of

telephone operators, or whether it is within the absolute discretion of the Divisional Engineers concerned to appoint whomsoever they like?

(b) If the reply to the first portion of part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government lay on the table a copy of the rules or state the system of recruitment?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) and (b). There are at present no definite rules and recruitment is made by the local Divisional Engineers, Telegraphs, at their discretion. I may, however, inform the Honourable Member that the question of prescribing definite rules for such recruitment is under the consideration of the Director-General.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CHRISTIAN GIRLS AS TELEPHONE OPERATORS IN THE AGRA TELEGRAPH SUB-DIVISION.

293. **Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that Government have issued orders to the effect that in the United Provinces Circle one-third of the vacancies in the Posts and Telegraphs Department should be reserved for minority communities and the remaining two-thirds for the Hindus?

(b) Is it a fact that recently the Divisional Engineer, Telegraphs, Agra Division, filled up all the six permanent posts by the appointment of Christian girls who never appeared at the 1930 examination and were not on the approved list?

(c) Is it a fact that at the time of appointment of these Christian girls, there were many candidates whose work was satisfactory, and who had been working in officiating vacancies from time to time as a result of the 1930 examination?

(d) Will Government please state why the 1933 examination was held?

(e) If the replies to parts (a), (b) and/or (c) be in the affirmative, will Government please state why the claims of the 1930 examination candidates were overlooked in filling up the six permanent posts and why all the six vacancies were filled up by members of minority communities?

(f) Are Government prepared to place these girls on the officiating list and fill up the permanent posts at the Cawnpore, Hapur, Mussoorie and Saharanpur Exchanges by officiating men who passed the 1930 examination or in the alternative, are they prepared to see that the 1930 candidates are given permanent vacancies as soon as they occur, without their being subjected to any further recruitment examination? If not, why not?

(g) Will Government please state whether these girl operators worked at any Exchange office before appointment and whether they were senior to all the officiating operators?

(h) Will Government please state whether any educational qualifications have been laid down for the appointment of telephone operators? If so, what are they?

(i) Is it a fact that matriculated operators have been superseded in the matter of permanent appointments by non-matriculates, whether males or females? If so, why?

(j) Is it a fact that non-matriculates are still kept on the list of approved candidates for telephone operatorships in the Agra Division in spite of the fact that approved matriculates are available? If so, why?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) The reply is in the negative.  
 (b) to (j). Information has been called for and will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

**TRANSFER OF THE COMPANY MANAGEMENT OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY  
 TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.**

**294. Mr. S. G. Jog:** Will Government be pleased to state the date on which the actual transfer of the Company management of the East Indian Railway to the Government of India was effected?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** The East Indian Railway has been under State management since the 1st January, 1925.

**STRENGTH OF CERTAIN STAFF BEFORE AND AFTER THE TRANSFER OF THE  
 EAST INDIAN RAILWAY TO STATE MANAGEMENT.**

**295. Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the actual strength against the sanctioned strength of the old East Indian Railway (Company managed), Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway (State managed) and the East Indian Railway (State-managed) as on the 1st April, 1924, 1st April 1925 (the date on which the actual transfer took place) and on the 1st November, 1933, of the following posts:—

**Transportation (Traffic) Group:—**

Inspectors, Station Superintendents; Station Masters, Controllers, Yard Masters, Assistant Station Masters (Higher Grade), Assistant Yard Masters, Assistant Controllers; Station Masters (Lower Grade), Goods or Passenger Guards, Assistant Station Masters (Lower Grade), Probationer Guards, Signallers, Signaller-in-Charge, Head Signaller, etc., etc., Platform Inspectors, Conductor Guards, Brakesman, Pilot Guard, etc., etc.;

**Transportation (Commercial) Group:—**

Inspectors, Conductors, Travelling Ticket Inspectors, Travelling Ticket Examiners, Head Ticket Collectors, Ticket Collectors, Assistant Head Ticket Collectors, etc., etc.; Coaching and Booking Clerks, Assistant Booking and Parcel Clerks, Head Booking and Parcel Clerks, etc.; Chief Goods Clerk, Head Goods Clerk, Goods Clerk, Transhipment Clerks, Dealing Clerks, Assistant Goods Clerks, etc., etc.; Station Master's Clerks, Train Clerk, etc.;

**Transportation (Power) Group:—**

Inspectors, Running Shed Foreman, Assistant Running Shed Foreman, Shedman in charge, Head Fitter, Fitter, Fuel Inspectors, Assistant Fuel Inspector, Pump Inspector, Cinder Inspector, etc., etc.; Drivers (respective Grade), Shunters (respective Grade), Fireman (respective Grade), Cleaners, etc., etc.?

(b) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the classes of employees entitled to free house or in lieu thereof house rent before 1928 and after 1928, respectively?

## ENFORCEMENT OF THE NEW GRADES OF THE SUBORDINATE STAFF OF THE STATE RAILWAYS.

(c) Do Government propose to instruct the Agents of the State Railways that in fixing the gradation of each station yard and goods shed in the new grades, care be taken that if the Station Master or Yard Master of a station or yard is placed in the highest grade, the staff employed under him, such as Assistant Station Master, Assistant Yard Master and Head Trains Clerk, is also placed in the highest grade applicable to such staff?

## PROVISION OF FACILITIES FOR TRANSFER TO THE STAFF OF THE OLD OUDH AND ROHILKUND RAILWAY.

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** I have sent a copy of the question to the Agent, East Indian Railway for consideration of the suggestion made by the Honourable Member.

## ALLOWANCES OF THE TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

Rs. 50 . . . . .	12 annas a day ;
between Rs. 50 and Rs. 100 . . . . .	Rs. 1 a day ?

Old Travelling Ticket Examiners drawing below Rs. 100	Rs. 35	per mensem.
New Travelling Ticket Examiners grade I (Rs. 70—5—95)	Rs. 20	
" " " " " II (Rs. 55—3—64)	Rs. 15	"

(c) If the replies to parts (a) and (b) be in the affirmative, will Government please state the reasons why staff drawing salaries between Rs. 50 and 100 per mensem are not granted allowance at uniform rates and whether they are now prepared to grant them the same allowance?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) and (b). My Honourable friend's information is substantially correct.

(c) The reasons for granting a higher scale of consolidated travelling allowance to Travelling Ticket Examiners who, prior to the Crew System, had held permanent posts of Travelling Ticket Inspectors in a substantive capacity and drawn a mileage and running allowance were explained by me in reply to question No. 476 asked by my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh, on the 4th September, 1933, to which I would draw my Honourable friend's attention.

#### UNIFORMS OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS AND TICKET COLLECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

299. **Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury:** Will Government please state the cost of uniform clothing of Travelling Ticket Examiners and Ticket Collectors on the East Indian Railway separately per head, and whether Government are prepared to enforce the same uniform for Travelling Ticket Examiners given as to Ticket Collectors? Is it a fact that the uniform clothing for Ticket Collectors costs less than the uniform clothing of Travelling Ticket Examiners?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** Government have no information, but I shall convey the suggestion in the question to the Agent of the East Indian Railway.

#### REVISION OF THE GRADES OF THE TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

300. **Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury:** Will Government please state whether they propose revising the grades of the Travelling Ticket Examiners of the East Indian Railway on the lines similar to those prevailing on the North Western Railway as follows:

Rs. 66—4—90;

Rs. 105—5—140;

Rs. 150—10—190?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** No.

#### DEDUCTION OF SUBSCRIPTION FOR PARTIES FROM THE PAY OF THE EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, SIMLA.

301. **Sardar Sant Singh:** Are Government aware that whenever any party is arranged by the Government of India Press, Simla, the Cashier deducts the necessary amount from the pay of the employees, when he disburses it? If so, do Government propose to instruct the Manager of the said Press to ask the Cashier to stop this practice in future, and to collect the subscriptions (if voluntarily offered) afterwards?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Moyce:** I am informed that subscriptions were given voluntarily to the Cashier by the employees at the time of disbursement of pay; but I agree that the collection of subscriptions in this manner is undesirable and the Manager will be asked to see that the practice is discontinued.

**ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE HEAD CLERK OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, SIMLA.**

**302. Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Are Government aware that the treatment and behaviour of the Head Clerk of the Government of India Press, Simla towards his subordinates is very harsh and unbecoming?

(b) Is it a fact that the employees of the Government of India Press, Aligarh, made similar complaints against him during his term of office there?

(c) Is it a fact that while he was in the Aligarh Press the Manager of the Press had to call upon the police to take the Head Clerk to his residence under their guard on many occasions? If so, what were the reasons for seeking police help?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) No; no complaint has been received against the conduct of the Head Clerk either by the Manager or the Works Committee of the Simla Press.

(b) and (c). The present management have no knowledge of these matters and there is nothing on record in the Press.

**USE OF A EURASIAN COMPANY OF ARTILLERY IN THE BHUTAN WAR.**

**303. Mr. E. H. M. Bower:** (a) Was a Eurasian Company of Artillery used in the Bhutan war of 1864—66?

(b) When was that unit formed, and when was it disbanded?

(c) What was its sanctioned strength?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** The records are being examined and a reply will be laid on the table in due course.

**EURASIAN COMPANY OF ARTIFICERS.**

**304. Mr. E. H. M. Bower:** (a) Was a Eurasian Company of Artificers in existence in Madras between the years 1890 and 1895?

(b) When was that unit formed, and when was it disbanded?

(c) What was its sanctioned strength?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** The records are being examined and a reply will be laid on the table in due course.

**GRANT OF INCREMENTS TO THE OFFICIALS OF THE MADRAS GENERAL POST OFFICE.**

**305. Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah:** (a) With reference to their reply to question No. 137 on the 20th September, 1933, regarding grant of increments to the officials of the Sorting Office, Madras General Post Office, will Government be pleased to state whether any decision has yet been arrived at in the matter?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the nature of the decision?

(c) If the answer to part (a) be in the negative, do Government propose to decide the case early? Are Government aware that it is pending for a considerably long time, causing a good deal of anxiety and hardship to the persons affected?



**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) The reply is in the negative.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) Government are aware of the facts mentioned by the Honourable Member in the second part of this question and are taking steps to expedite a decision.

**UNIFORMS SUPPLIED TO INDIAN AND ANGLO-INDIAN TICKET COLLECTORS OF THE HOWRAH DIVISION, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

306. **Mr. S. O. Mitra:** Is it a fact that the Indian Ticket Collectors of the Howrah Division, East Indian Railway, were given two pants and one alpaca coat as uniform in summer while the Anglo-Indian Ticket Collectors were given three coats and three pants? If so, will Government be pleased to state the reason for such racial discrimination?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to this and the following question together. I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

**UNIFORMS SUPPLIED TO INDIAN AND ANGLO-INDIAN TICKET COLLECTORS OF THE HOWRAH DIVISION, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

†307. **Mr. S. O. Mitra:** Is it a fact that Indian Ticket Collectors of the Howrah Division, East Indian Railway, have not been supplied with full uniform, i.e., a coat and a pant, and that the Anglo-Indian Ticket Collectors have been supplied with full uniforms? If so, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for such racial discrimination?

---

**MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.**

**ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE CALCUTTA PORT HAJ COMMITTEE.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Order, order. I have received a notice from Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim that he proposes to ask for leave to make a motion for the adjournment of the House today for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance as follows:

"The denial of facilities to the Bengal Moslem Members of the Central Legislature to exercise their electoral rights in the forthcoming election of members to the Calcutta Port Haj Committee."

I have to enquire whether any Honourable Member has any objection to this motion.

**The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter** (Leader of the House): I take a point of order. My first objection is that this notice is too vague. It does not say what action or inaction constitutes the denial of facilities. Sir, you will appreciate that facilities may be denied by not framing rules under section 7 of the Haj Committee Act. Facilities may be denied by not framing reasonable rules. Facilities may be denied by not following rules which have already been framed. In what particular way facilities have been denied is not stated and, therefore, it is vague. Then, again, the

---

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 306

[Sir Brojendra Mitter.]

notice does not show any urgency. It simply says "exercise their electoral rights in the forthcoming election of members", and so on. What the urgency about it is, is not shown. On these grounds of vagueness and want of urgency, I submit that the notice is not in order.

**Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim** (Chittagong Division: Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President, this was a foregone conclusion. I knew beforehand that Government would raise this objection. I am sorry I have to move this adjournment under the very great shadow of a calamity for my province. We have recently heard that the Home Member of the Government of Bengal is dead. That is a very great calamity, but still I hope that I shall be pardoned if I move this adjournment motion. Before Government knew what was the urgency and whether my grievance was sufficiently covered by my statement, I am certain it is not right on the part of my learned friend the Law Member to take these objections. What are the facts? By this very House, as late as March 1933. . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member must state briefly how the motion is in order and answer the points which have been raised by the Honourable the Law Member.

**Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim**: With regard to the first objection that it is vague, you will consider from what I have said in the body of the motion that I want the adjournment of the House to discuss a definite urgent matter of public importance. I have been in this House seven years and I think it is really not necessary to specifically mention in the body of the Resolution as to how it is a definite matter. The position is this. The Moslem Members, who come from the province of Bengal, have been denied the privilege of taking part in the election of the Port Haj Committee at Calcutta. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, you know that these electors were apprised of this election only on the 9th. It was the day fixed for sending in the nomination papers personally to the returning officer at Calcutta and, if that is not an urgent matter and a definite matter, I do not know what else could be. The Central Government exercise control at various ports and, as such, I think it is a very urgent matter and a definite matter and facilities in this matter of our electoral rights have been denied by the arbitrary action of the Government of Bengal.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): May I ask one question? The Honourable gentleman said that on the 9th December the nomination paper was to be handed over. What day is the voting to take place, because the nomination paper could be handed over by somebody else.

**Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim**: You will kindly realise that the papers are to be personally handed over to the returning officer. That is to be done in the Writers' Buildings, Calcutta. The electors are spread all over India and, as a matter of fact, there is no date on that letter sent to us and I am supposed to send these papers filled up to reach the Calcutta authorities on the 9th and it seems to me there must have been some undue hurry on the part of the Government of Bengal which has deprived Members of the Assembly from taking part in this election.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** (Patna and Chota Nagpur *cum* Orissa: Muhammadan): If this matter is not discussed, there will be no other chance for Members of the Indian Legislature to discuss it. This question was raised when the Bill was under discussion. They said that sufficient chance would be given to the Members, so that they may be represented in these Committees. So in this way the matter is urgent as well, because the elections are going to take place very soon.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Chair understands that the election referred to in this motion is conducted by the Government of Bengal and that it is not a matter with which the Government of India is concerned. The Chair cannot overrule an adjournment motion on the ground that it is a matter which concerns primarily a Local Government and, in that respect, the Chair considers that there is a serious lacuna in the Legislative Rules which govern the procedure. Apart from that, this motion is not definite in the sense in which the word is used in the rule relating to adjournment motions. It is too vague. The Chair relies also for this on a definite ruling given in the House of Commons. Viscount Curzon wanted to move:

"An adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the failure of the Government to provide adequate facilities for the protection and removal of disbanded members of the Royal Irish Constabulary and their families to England."

"The failure of the Government to provide adequate facilities", and, on that, Mr. Speaker said:

"I think the Noble Lord must submit a more definite motion than that,"

and then he said he could not accept the motion that had been put forward. On the same analogy, the Chair holds that this motion is too vague and not definite in the sense in which the word is used in the Rules. The Chair, therefore, holds that this motion is not in order.

---

## STATEMENTS LAID ON THE TABLE.

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore** (Member for Commerce and Railways): Sir, I lay on the table the information promised in reply to starred question No. 678 asked by Mr. Bhuput Sing on the 6th September, 1933.

---

## RETRENCHMENT IN THE OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR INDIA, LONDON.

\*673. (a) The present number is 62.

(b), (c), (d) and (e). No retrenchment committee was appointed in London for the office of the High Commissioner for India. The question of possible economies was very carefully examined departmentally in the light of the report of the General Purposes Sub-Committee of the Retrenchment Advisory Committee, and the High Commissioner thereafter submitted to the Government of India his detailed survey and recommendations on which they issued their orders. In the case of his Store Department, the High Commissioner conducted his preliminary investigations through a Departmental Committee, consisting of his Deputy, Mr. A. M. Green, C.I.E., I.C.S.,

as Chairman, the Director-General, India Store Department, Sir Stanley Padden, C.I.E., and the Auditor of Home Accounts, Mr. W. A. Sturdy, C.B.E., as Members, with Mr. K. R. Menon, I.C.S., as Secretary.

(f) Present number	{	Officers	79
		Others	498
Total	..		577

Number on 1st April 1931, i.e., prior to retrenchment.	{	Officers	87
		Others	562
Total	..		649

(g) Officers	..	7
Others	..	66
Total	..	73

(h) Officers	..	7
Others	..	55
Total	..	62

(i) Officers	..	None
Others	..	9 retrenched, all on temporary tenure.
		2 resigned and places not filled.
Total	..	11

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig** (Home Member): Sir, I lay on the table the information promised in reply to starred question No. 817 asked by Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad on the 12th September, 1933.

#### RELEASE OF MEMBERS OF THE WORKING COMMITTEE OF THE JAM'AT-UL-ULEMA-I-HIND.

\*817. (a) and (d). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to Maulvi Sayyid Murtaza Saheb Bahadur's starred question No. 969 on the 16th September, 1933.

(b) So far as I am aware there are none in jail at present.

(c) Five have been prohibited from entering Delhi.

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai** (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): Sir, I lay on the table:

- (i) the information promised in reply to starred question No. 1165 asked by Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur on the 10th April, 1933, and
- (ii) the information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 151 asked by Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad on the 20th September, 1933.

#### CAUSES OF THE DEATH OF ONE HAJEE VAJEEHUDDIN.

\*1165. His Majesty's Minister at Jedda, from whom an enquiry was made, has reported that only two cases were known to the Legation of accidental death of pilgrims at sea in the two preceding years and that they had received no report of the death of a pilgrim named Hajee Vajeehuddin.

#### FREE OCCUPATION OF GOVERNMENT QUARTERS BY CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL DEPARTMENT.

151. (a) A statement is given below.

(b) The basis of the concession is that the officers are required, for the efficient discharge of their duties, to reside within or in the immediate neighbourhood of the areas under their charge.

(c) The matter is under consideration.

*Statement showing the names of the subordinates in the Archaeological Department, excluding inferior servants, who are provided with rent-free quarters.*

1. Mr. K. N. Puri, Custodian Archaeological Area and Museum at Mohenjodaro (Sind).
2. Mr. W. J. Brosnan, Custodian, Agra Fort.
3. Mr. G. Tanner, Custodian, Historical Area, Delhi Fort.
4. Mr. Trow, Caretaker, Residency Buildings, Lucknow.
5. Mr. M. M. Nagar, Custodian, Archaeological Museum, Sarnath, Benares District.
6. Mr. Mata Prasad Varma, Conservation Assistant, Qutb Buildings, Delhi.
7. Mr. A. C. Webb, Custodian, Archaeological Area, Lahore Fort.
8. Mr. D. K. Sen, Custodian, Elephanta Caves (Bombay Presidency).
9. Mr. Patankar, Assistant Custodian, Elephanta Caves (Bombay Presidency).
10. Mr. Chowkar, Custodian, Karla Caves.

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham** (Army Secretary): Sir, I lay on the table the information promised in reply to starred question No. 917 asked by Sardar Sant Singh on the 13th September, 1933.

#### ARMY HEADQUARTERS SPECIAL TRAIN BETWEEN SUMMER HILL AND SIMLA.

917. (a) The number of military technical clerks now actually residing in quarters allotted to them by Government at Summer Hill, and entitled under military rules to free conveyance on account of living at a place more than two miles (not half a mile which applies to children only) away from office is 13. This number is however liable to fluctuation, and as there are altogether 24 technical clerks employed in Army and R. A. F. Headquarters, there is a potential liability to provide free conveyance for that number. A copy of the rule is appended.

(b) The cost of 2nd class railway fares to 24 clerks and 12 children is Rs. 2,700 per annum. The cost for 13 clerks and 12 children would be only Rs. 1,710 per annum.

*Copy of paragraph 155-II, Passage Regulations, India.*

"Individuals who are entitled to free accommodation and reside in quarters allotted to them free by the State situated more than two miles from their place of work are entitled to draw conveyance allowance at the following rates, provided they are not in receipt of horse, pony or other allowance intended to cover expenses of transit and suitable Government transport cannot be supplied :

Pedal cycle, or other privately owned conveyance,	$\frac{1}{4}$ anna a mile or part of a mile, subject to a maximum of Rs. 10 per mensem.
---	---

Public conveyances, e.g., motor bus, tram cars, &c.	Actual expenses not exceeding one anna a mile or part of a mile and limited to a maximum of Rs. 10 per mensem."
---	---

---

**Mr. P. B. Rau** (Financial Commissioner, Railways): Sir, I lay on the table:

- (i) the information promised in reply to starred question No. 250 asked by Sheikh Sadiq Hassan on the 31st August, 1933;
- (ii) the information promised in reply to starred questions Nos. 473 and 474 asked by Sardar Sant Singh on the 4th September, 1933;
- (iii) the information promised in reply to starred question No. 908 asked by Bhai Parma Nand on the 13th September, 1933;
- (iv) the information promised in reply to parts (a) to (d) of starred question No. 1034 asked by Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen on the 20th September, 1933; and
- (v) the information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 159 asked by Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi, on the 20th September, 1933.

---

**APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN TICKET COLLECTORS AS SPECIAL TICKET EXAMINERS IN THE LAHORE DIVISION OF THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.**

\*250. The Agent, North Western Railway reports as follows :

(a) Yes, as a temporary measure.

(b), (c), (d), (f), (g), (h) and (i). These appointments were in the first instance filled by a Selection Board held on the 26th June, 1933, but as amongst those appointed some junior men had been selected, a fresh Selection Board was ordered, and when held on the 25th July, 1933, made selection from the most senior and suitable Ticket Collectors; hence these questions do not now arise.

(e) Seniority and suitability were the chief criteria in the selection that took place on the 25th July, 1933; experience of having worked in the Flying Squad being considered an asset.

---

**DENIAL OF CERTAIN CONCESSIONS TO TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.**

\*473. All Special Ticket Examiners including those who were previously called Travelling Ticket Examiners have to check tickets both on running trains and at stations. Their programme is fixed from time to time by the Head Special Ticket Examiner after approval by the Divisional Commercial Officer.

(a) and (b). They do not perform duties directly connected with the charge of running trains and as such do not come under the definition of running staff and are not given the mileage allowance which is admissible to running staff only.

#### REDUCTION OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

\*474. On 1st June, 1931, when the North Western Railway decided to abolish the posts of Travelling Ticket Examiners, the staff concerned were asked whether they would accept posts of Special Ticket Examiners or not. All the men to whom the offer was made accepted it.

(a) and (b) Travelling Ticket Examiners not being running staff, the orders applicable to running staff, when appointed to stationary posts, permanently or temporarily, do not apply to them.

(c) In view of the reduction in their emoluments caused by their being brought on the scales of pay for Special Ticket Examiners, Government decided to give them the option to retain their old scales of pay with increments accruing therein and to give them as an *ex gratia* measure consolidated travelling allowance from December, 1932. Government are not prepared to go beyond this.

(d) Government are not aware of any cases in which the reduction was so high as 50 per cent.

#### CIRCULATION OF A PROPOSAL FOR PURCHASE OF DERBY SWEEP TICKETS BY THE DIVISIONAL SUPERINTENDENT, MORADABAD DIVISION, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

\*908. The Agent, East Indian Railway reports that at the request of the staff they were advised that Derby Sweep tickets would be purchased for them if they so desired, it being a privilege that is appreciated by them, and that the money was sent through a person who was proceeding to Calcutta on official business.

The expenditure incurred by the administration in this connection was negligible. It may be added that the Agent has taken measures to stop such a practice in future.

#### DISCHARGE OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES IN CERTAIN DEPARTMENTS IN THE DINAPORE DIVISION.

\*1034. (a) and (b) The number of men discharged during 1932 and 1933 in the different departments is given below :—

Department.	1932.		1933.	
	Medical unfitness.	Offences.	Medical unfitness.	Offences.
Engineering . . . . .	124	..	108	..
Transportation . . . . .	60	11	39	9
Power . . . . .	23	6	23	8
Rolling Stock . . . . .	15	..	41	5
Total . . . . .	222	17	211	22

(c) Two.

(d) No one had been discharged on suspicion.

# STAFF OF THE CHOLA POWER HOUSE, GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY.

159. (a) A statement is attached showing the scales of pay and number of all grades of staff employed in the Chola Power House, Great Indian Peninsula Railway.

There being no other Power stations of equal capacity on Indian Railways, which generate power for traction purposes, it is not possible to furnish any comparative figures asked for by the Honourable Member.

(b) The superior cadre has now been reduced from nine to four effecting an ultimate saving of Rs. 82,500 per annum and it is not considered possible to effect any further reduction.

## KALYAN POWER HOUSE.

### Staff Cadre—Officers.

No.	Designation.	Grade.
		Rs.
1	Power House Superintendent	1,375 + £30
1	Assistant Engineer (Elec.)	975 + £30
1	" " (Steam)	975 + £30
1	" " (Mech.)	975

### Staff Cadre—Subordinates.

		Rs.
1	Head Clerk	160—10—200
1	Assistant Clerk	80—8—120
1	" "	60—5—80
1	Store Keeper	120—8—160
1	Stores Tallyman	40—5—60
1	Time Keeper	60—5—80
1	Stenographer	80—8—120
1	Typist	60—5—80
1	Draughtsman	120—8—160
1	Coal Clerk	60—5—80
1	Relieving Clerk	40—5—60
3	Sepoys	20—1—26 each.
1	Naik	20—1—27
10	Ramosees	20—1—25 each.
3	Office Hamals	20—1—26 "
1	Waterman	18—1—23
4	Shift Assistants	400—25—600 each.
1	Chemist	300—15—375
4	S. B. Attendants (Senior)	200—10—240 each.
1	" " (A)	160—10—200
1	Elec. Inspector	160—10—200
3	S. B. Attendants "B"	120—8—160 each.
1	S. B. Attendant "C"	80—8—120
4	Turbine Drivers (Senior)	200—10—240—15—300 each.
1	" " Driver "A"	160—10—200
4	" " Drivers "B"	120—8—160 each.
1	Aux. Plant Attendant "A"	120—8—160
3	" " Attendants "A"	80—8—120 each.
3	" " " "C"	60—5—80
17	Coolies	22—1—27 "
4	Shift Leading Stokers	200—10—240—15—300 "
1	Stoker "A"	160—10—200
6	Stokers "B"	120—8—160 each.
1	Stoker "C"	80—8—120
5	Serangs	45—5—60 each.
22	Coolies	22—1—27 "
2	Conveyor Attendants	80—8—120 "
1	Crane Driver	70
12	Coolies	22—1—27 "



No.	Designation.	Grade.
		Rs.
1	Chief Foreman . . . . .	650—700
1	Asstt. Foreman (Mech.) . . . . .	300—15—10—385
1	" " (Steam) . . . . .	300—15—10—385
1	" " (Elec.) . . . . .	300—15—10—385
1	Head Mistry . . . . .	112—8—4—140
1	Engineer room fitter . . . . .	86
2	" " fitters . . . . .	69 each.
3	Boiler House . . . . .	86 "
2	Electric Fitters . . . . .	100 "
2	Wiremen . . . . .	75 "
2	Crane Drivers . . . . .	50 "
1	Blacksmith . . . . .	93
1	Machineman . . . . .	86
1	" . . . . .	112
2	Painters . . . . .	69 "
1	Carpenter . . . . .	66 "
1	Bricklayer . . . . .	60
2	Asstt. Fitters . . . . .	39 "
1	Hammerman . . . . .	24—1—30
41	Coolies . . . . .	22—1—27 "

## THE RESERVE BANK OF INDIA BILL.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The House will now resume consideration of clause 8 of the Reserve Bank of India Bill.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, as both Nos. 78 and 79 relate to the same purpose and No. 79 is better drafted, if you will permit me I shall not move my amendment and Mr. Sitaramaraju may be allowed to move his amendment.

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju** (Ganjam cum Vizagapatam: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, I move:

"That in sub-clause (1) (a) of clause 8 of the Bill, after the words 'the Governor General in Council' the words 'of whom two shall be Indians' be inserted."

Sir, in moving this amendment, my object is two-fold. One is very obvious, namely, that to these very important offices of this Bank there should be a predominant number of Indians appointed, and the other is to record my protest against the view held by some Honourable Members of the Joint Committee who thought that, if one of the appointments were for Indians, that would satisfy them. Sir, even this Government, however irresponsible, I do not think, would ever try to exclude totally all Indians from these important offices, and, therefore, there is no meaning in saying that at least one of those offices must be held by Indians. Those Honourable Members were betraying a sense of inferiority complex which most of us on this side of the House cannot share. It may also be said in this connection that the Governor General in Council is given discretion in this matter and that we should not ask now how that discretion should be exercised. Sir, this is no reflection upon the Governor General in Council. We merely want to ensure for our own satisfaction that Indians should have a predominant voice in it and, to secure that end, we want that two out of the three appointments should go to Indians. With these words, Sir, I move my amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Amendment moved:

"That in sub-clause (1) (a) of clause 8 of the Bill, after the words 'the Governor General in Council' the words 'of whom two shall be Indians' be inserted."

Mr. Thampan has got a similar amendment, but with a slight difference. Does he want to move it?

**Mr. K. P. Thampan** (West Coast and Nilgiris: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Yes, Sir. I beg to move:

"That to sub-clause (1) (a) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following proviso be added :

'Provided that of the Governor and two Deputy Governors two at least shall be Indians'."

Sir, the House turned down yesterday the proposal to have only one Deputy Governor and decided that there should be two Deputy Governors. Now I propose that both of them should be Indians. Otherwise, the chances would be that the Governor General would appoint one Englishman and an Indian with the result that the Governor would take the former into his confidence and put the Indian Deputy Governor only in charge of the ordinary routine work and day to day transactions. We want the Indian Deputy Governor to rise to be the Governor at the next vacancy. Of course it might be urged by my friends of the European Group that this kind of discrimination ought not to be made in specific terms in the Statute, but I do want to say that the Europeans are taking pretty good care to see that provisions for safeguarding their interests are made wherever possible in the Constitution Act, and it is an irony fate that in this country the Indians are prevented from coming into their own. Therefore, I urge that both of the Deputy Governors should be Indians. It is a matter to which we attach great importance and we on this side of the House feel that we cannot agree to any compromise on this matter.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Further amendment moved:

"That to sub-clause (1) (a) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following proviso be added :

'Provided that of the Governor and two Deputy Governors two at least shall be Indians'."

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju**: Sir, I ask leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

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

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar** (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, there is an amendment standing in my name practically to the same effect and that was unfortunately drawn up with the certain conviction that there was going to be only one Deputy Governor appointed. So, if you will kindly allow me to say, "or the two Deputy Governors"—instead of the word "Deputy-Governor" being in the singular, my amendment will be the same as Mr. Thampan's . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Then why not have Mr. Thampan's amendment?

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar**: I could support that without moving my amendment. Sir, I know I am at some disadvantage, because the Honourable the Finance Member, if I mistake not, said he was in sympathy with the object of this amendment when he said distinctly—I hope I am not misquoting him,—I am speaking from memory—he said that if he were an Indian, he would not be satisfied with asking for one Indian to be appointed a Deputy Governor, but that all the officials should be Indians, or at least both the Deputy Governors should be Indians. Sir . . . .

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster** (Finance Member): Sir, my Honourable friend has distinctly misrepresented what I said. What I said was that if I were an Indian, I would not ask for these Statutory provisions at all. I should rely on the merits of my countrymen to assert themselves.

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar**: It is no use wrangling over this small matter, I know, but he also said, I think, that it shows a mistrust of ourselves, or something like that; but, Sir, I submit in the first instance, that so far as one Deputy Governor is concerned, no such consideration seems to have entered into the head of the Government when they said that out of the two Deputy Governors one should be an Indian. They did give us that assurance, and, even from their point of view, if they consider that both these Deputy Governors may be Indians, will they give an assurance to the effect that both of them shall be Indians? I do not know why, if the idea is to provide as many appointments as could be efficiently filled by Indians for Indians, and if the attitude of the Government is not to find out how to exclude Indians, I do not know why there should be any difficulty. But I proceed further. I want that there should be a Statutory declaration and I say that for two reasons. In the first place, it is not tantamount to discrimination of any sort. There have been discriminations in every walk of life, and the most flagrant one is that, even after nearly 50 years' agitation, the European British subjects do not want to be tried by Indians. Is that or is that not discrimination? Sir, I believe—I have not yet had time to look up the Air Force or the Naval Force Act, but I believe there is discrimination specifically recognized. There is discrimination, for instance, in the matter of the appointments open to the Indian Civil Service; there is discrimination unfortunately even amongst ourselves that there should be so many Hindus, so many Muhammadans, so many Brahmins, so many non-Brahmins and all that sort of thing. Therefore, if you look at this matter and judge the system of government that obtains in this country, it teems with discrimination. So, I do not understand why there should be any objection with regard to this and I submit that it is purely a case of straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. But I do not stop at that. I happen to know a gentleman of the name of Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty who is now, by the grace of God, the Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty. At one time he has been a valiant fighter of our cause and, unfortunately for us, he has been lost to us when our need is the sorest, although he occupies a more distinguished position where he would be of

[Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar.]

some use to us some day. That gentleman, while he was talking on the old Reserve Bank Bill regarding the provision in the Statute of an exactly similar nature, said the following. The reason why I am quoting his words is that it is impossible for me, however much I may try to put it in such a vigorous language and in such eloquent terms. This is what he said:

"By bitter experience we have realised that there is no more use pinning our faith even to solemn declarations made on the floor of this House."

That, I think, is a sufficient answer to the appeal made to me by my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, that he gave a promise in the Select Committee which he has repeated in this House:

"Nothing short of a Statutory provision (*I would request my Honourable friends on this side as well as my Honourable friend on the other side to note this*) of this nature will satisfy the Honourable Members on this side of the House."

You were then standing, Sir, on this side and not on the other side of the House:

"I want the House to bear this in mind that if the first Governor or Deputy Governor is not to be an Indian for 15 years, you may not have an Indian for this post."

Now, it shall be for 25 years:

"If the first Governor and the Deputy Governor happen to be non-Indians, we may have to wait for 15 or 20 years to get an Indian Deputy Governor on the Board and I, therefore, implore the House to bear the importance of this provision in mind."

And so respectfully I would.

Sir, it is not the statement of an inexperienced man, nor is it the statement on a Congress platform or one of an agitator. It is the statement of a Member of this House who spoke with the full sense of responsibility and especially of a man who knew what he was talking about. If any authority was wanted, this statement alone would suffice. Upon that one statement, I would ask my Honourable friends on this side of the House to support this amendment as I do whole-heartedly. But I do not stop there. People who have read the famous or the notorious Ilbert Bill agitation and the proceedings of the then Imperial Legislative Council would probably remember one important fact. There was a gentleman of the name of Mr. H. S. Thomas, who unfortunately came from my district in the Madras Presidency. He was called Processional Thomas. He came here and he said about the Queen's Proclamation that it was nothing at all and that it need not be given any weight. In support of his statement, he quoted the authority of Sir James Fitz-James Stephen, who was at that time one of Her Majesty's Judges in England, but prior to that he had been a distinguished Law Member of the Government of India. He said that the Queen's Proclamation was not part of the Statute of the Law of England and, therefore, it was not binding. Now, the Marquess of Ripon, who was then the Viceroy, pulled himself six feet high and in the predecessor of this Assembly said:

"We do not want one of Her Majesty's Judges to tell us that the Queen's Proclamation does not form the Statutory law of England and, therefore, the argument of Mr. Thomas that this provision was not being included in the Statute was of no binding force whatsoever."

Now, I want to cling to that position. It may not be said hereafter, in view of the long dismal story, that pledges are made and very frequently broken. I have already quoted as my authority on a similar question one of the distinguished Viceroys of India, the late Lord Lytton, when he said, with regard to a pledge of giving encouragement to the Statutory Civil Servants after he laid down his office, that "we have cheated the Indian nation". That is the story of pledges of this sort. And have we not had unfortunate statements made with regard to pledges even within the last two years by those gentlemen who profess to have great authority and influence in England? Therefore, without casting any aspersions upon the pledges made by the Government of India which I know they want to respect, circumstances may happen when even the Government of India may not be able to fulfil them. Sir, in the year 1931, when England went off the gold standard, there was an Ordinance or something like that passed here and within 24 hours it had to be repealed. Did or did not the Government of India believe that that Ordinance was in the interests of India? Why had it to be repealed? Because, in that felicitous phrase of the Right Honourable John Morley, I must say that the Government of India are only a subordinate branch of the British Government. It is somewhat difficult for us, having had experience of all these things for the last 150 years, when even the Queen's Proclamation was attacked upon the ground that it was not a Statutory enactment, to be satisfied unless there is a provision in the Statute-book of these things. So, I ask that this be entered in the Statute-book so that, hereafter, when these appointments come to be made, it may not be said that, although it is perfectly true that a pledge was made, yet the circumstances have changed, the circumstances have so conspired themselves that it is impossible, inadvisable and undesirable to give effect to those pledges and upon that ground they may now be set aside. That is the reason why I say that this provision should find its place on the Statute-book; and there is another reason why this should be so. I have been told that an amendment of this sort will strengthen the hands of the diehards in England who may say: "Here you are: Do they not suspect us?" My answer to that is that those who have read the newspaper report of the interview given by the Honourable Sir Phiroze Sethna, who is not an agitator, but a hard-headed businessman, wherein he said that, after an experience of two or three years in England of these Round Table Conference meetings, he had come to the conclusion that there was a great deal of suspicion about Indians in England and unfortunately it was growing every day. So, I say that probably the same thing exists here. Suspicion breeds suspicion. I do not know who started the whole thing. The reason why I say that it will not give a handle to the diehards but, on the other hand, it will support the hands of the Government is that, if there is this provision now on the Statute-book, Government may hereafter say: "We cannot help it; there is the Statute, and the Indian Legislature has passed it; it is still in force and, therefore, we must appoint two Indians." Consequently, I submit that there is greater benefit and there is a greater chance of these pledges being fulfilled to the very letter if this provision is made in the Statute-book and I, therefore, respectfully ask this House to support this amendment and to pass it.

**Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi** (Madras ceded Districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting this amendment. The Honourable the Finance Member has just now stated

[Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi.]

that if he were an Indian, he would not require such a provision to be made in this Act, because the implication of what he says is that Indians are capable persons and that they do not stand in need of any such safeguard or provision in the Statute. That shows that he has got much confidence in the ability of Indians. Yesterday, when my Honourable friend, Mr. B. Das, moved his amendment for reducing the posts of Deputy Governors to one, the Honourable the Finance Member said that he could not take any such risks. That means if there was only one post of Deputy Governor, he would find it difficult to fill that post with an Indian. He meant that if there were two posts of Deputy Governors and one post of Governor, there would be two Englishmen and one Indian, and so he could take the risk of appointing one Indian against two Englishmen. But if there was only one post of Deputy Governor, he could not find a capable Indian to hold that post. There seems to be a little contradiction in these two statements. Indians have distinguished themselves wherever opportunity occurred to them. In the recent Ottawa Conference, the Indian representatives have distinguished themselves, whatever was the result of the Conference, there is absolutely no doubt with regard to the capacity of the Indian representatives who went there. So also in the various Conferences at Geneva and other places, the Indian representatives have acquitted themselves creditably well. It is not lack of intelligence, but it is only lack of opportunities for Indians to distinguish themselves that is responsible and this amendment only creates such opportunities so that there might be two Indians working in this important Reserve Bank. For these reasons, I have no hesitation in supporting this motion.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** (Muzaffarpur *cum* Champaran: Non-Muhamadan): Sir, I have full sympathy with the object which this amendment seeks to achieve. As a member of the Select Committee, I myself urged the claims of two Indians for appointment out of these three posts, but it was as a result of agreement arrived at between us that we did not press for its inclusion in the Act itself. Of course, it is quite open for this House to press this amendment and to have a statutory recognition embodied in the Act itself. I should like to clear one misapprehension to which expression was given by my Honourable friend, Mr. Raju, when he said that the members of the Select Committee were quite satisfied with having one Indian out of three. That is not so.

**An Honourable Member:** He said some of the members.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** My Honourable friend, the Finance Member, has said that merit should be the sole criterion in this case, but may I ask whether merit has been the sole criterion always in the conferment of high appointments on Indians in this country? As was pointed out the other day, not a single Governor has been appointed during this long period in any of the provinces, except one, Lord Sinha, who was holding the post of the Governor of my province for a short period.

**Sardar Sant Singh** (West Punjab: Sikh): Was not Lord Sinha forced out of office?

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** That is a different matter. Is it to be said that no Indian, since the days of Lord Sinha, has been found capable of holding the permanent post of a Governor in this country? There are certain Departments in the Government of India itself from which Indians have been

rigorously excluded. I might mention the case of only one section from which Indians have been kept out, I refer to the Cypher Bureau of the Foreign and Political Department, and I myself was responsible for bringing this question repeatedly both in the Standing Finance Committee as well as on the floor of the House. But it was stated that there were some objections because the British Government in England did not want to have Indians to handle these Cypher Codes. But the position of a Britisher in this country is singularly advantageous. A Britisher in India, if he is ignorant, is said to be impartial, and if he is perverse, he is said to be an expert. (Laughter.) Now, I am going to refer to a Statutory recognition of racial-discrimination even in the Bank of England itself. In the Bank of England, it is stated "the members of the Court must be natural born or naturalised British subjects". This is given on page 262 of the "Central Banks" by Kisch. It is thus quite apparent that even in the Bank of England some sort of racial-discrimination is embodied in the Statute itself. I, therefore, think that it is not unreasonable on our part to claim that at least two out of three important posts at the head should be held by Indians, and I do not think that Government, unless they are dictated to by Whitehall, should be eager to oppose this amendment. Sir, I support the motion.

**Mr. N. N. Anklesaria** (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I yield to none in my desire to see my countrymen employed in responsible posts in this country. But my Honourable friends who have preceded me have failed to recognise that the object of this Bill is not to get Indians employed as Governors and Deputy Governors on the proposed Reserve Bank. Its sole object is to create a Reserve Bank for India which would function successfully.

**Sardar Sant Singh**: Without men.

**Mr. N. N. Anklesaria**: I submit that, situated as we are with our connections with the financial world of England, it is absolutely necessary for the success of the proposed Reserve Bank that it should command the confidence of the financial world of England. Discrimination of the sort proposed will be the least likely to achieve such an object.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi** (Nominated Non-Official): May I ask the Honourable Member if the Reserve Bank should have the confidence of the people of this country?

**Mr. N. N. Anklesaria**: Yes. The Reserve Bank should have the confidence both of my countrymen as well as of the English financial world with which the Bank will have a lot to do if it is to function successfully. Then, Sir, the clause does not put a ban on the employment of Indians. It does not say that only Europeans will be employed as Deputy Governors. It simply removes a cause of complaint from people whose susceptibilities have got to be respected, as I said before, if this Reserve Bank is to function successfully. The other day I made it clear in this House that the powers of the Governor General will be exercised primarily in the interests of India, so far as this Reserve Bank scheme is concerned. My Honourable friend, the Finance Member, even went further than myself and said that the powers of the Governor General would be solely exercised in the interests of India. I submit, therefore, that there is no reason for this amendment, and I would vote for its rejection.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I wish to subscribe on this point only a few words. The object of this amendment is that Indians should be associated in the higher posts of the Reserve Bank. I do not agree that there are no Indians who can occupy with ability these two posts that are being asked to be reserved for Indians. It cannot be denied that Indians do possess the intellect, and it requires only a little training to make them come to the same level or even more than that of the European. Therefore, Sir, there should be no objection with regard to Indians being associated on the ground that they will be inefficient.

Then the second question which appears to be agitating the mind of the Honourable the Finance Member is this. He says, we should not do anything which may savour of racial discrimination. Now, Sir, it is not racial discrimination that we want; we are asking for Indianisation which is a principle accepted by Government. We are not saying that, because we are Indians, we should be taken and, because they are Europeans, they should be shut out. We say that Indians are not sufficiently associated with the Government business and mercantile business as much as they ought to be and we have asked that there should be actually a proportion kept for Indians. What we are asking here is that there are three places, and why should not two be given to Indians. I also hope that they would give a chance to Indians to show ~~their usefulness~~ <sup>their worthiness</sup> to carry on the business. Many Europeans come here as experts, but at first they are quite raw and inexperienced in the business to which they are attached. But soon they receive training and come up to the mark. In like manner, Indians also could come up to the mark; but if you always say that Indians cannot be taken, because they are not up to the mark, then you will always be excluding them. Then where is the desire to give dominion status or self-Government to Indians.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** Have you any hope for it?

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** I am not so pessimistic as my Honourable friend, but certainly there are doubts as to its coming in the near future. What I submit, therefore, is this that these are amendments in which Government should come forward and join hands and give an opportunity to Indians of learning the knowledge and help required to carry on this business and come up to the mark. Sir, I support the motion.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** Sir, I very much appreciate the assurance given on the floor of the House and I hope the time will come when not only two but all the three will be Indians. But unfortunately our problem is somewhat different. Had these appointments been left in the hands of the Government of India where every interest is represented, there would have been probably no necessity to ask for a Statutory provision. But, as it happens, the appointments will be made by the Governor General at his discretion and we are afraid . . . . .

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** May I interrupt my Honourable friend? The provision in the Bill is "the Governor General in Council", and that is the Government of India.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** I quite understand that. I have been thinking of the future when the duties of the Governor General in Council will be



split up, and I have in my mind the report of the London Committee. On account of that, I am reminded of the way in which an elder brother divided the property left by his father between himself and his younger brother. When the father died, he left a camel, a cat and a house. The elder brother said: "You know I am a very benevolent brother of yours and I do everything in your interest and for your benefit. You are my beloved younger brother, so you should have perfect confidence in me and I will do exactly what is in your best interests". The younger brother agreed and this is how the elder brother divided the property which, as I said before, consisted of a camel, a cat and a house:

*"In shutar-i-lakad zan-i-Bábá azán-i-man  
An gurbá náz parvar-i-Bábá azán-i-to."*

"This cat which was a pet of our father may be taken by you and this kicking camel which really kicked my father may be given to me."

That is about the animals. Now, coming to the house,

*"Az sahn-i-kháná tá bah lab-i-bám azán-i-man  
Waz sahf-i-kháná tá bah nurrayyá azán-i-to."*

"As regards the house, from the ground to the top of the roof it is mine, and from the top of the roof to the highest point in heaven all belongs to you."

(Laughter.)

This is the way in which this division was made, and I am afraid that out of these posts the chuprassies and the lower clerks, etc., will be all Indians and the higher posts, including the posts of Governor and Deputy Governors will be distributed according to the couplet I have just quoted, a pet cat may possibly be given. Sir, I said before,—and I will take some other opportunity to press it again,—that we are bringing forward various measures in the name of indiscrimination, but the real solution of all this bogie is that we should boldly recognise that the Englishmen in India have the same privileges as the Indians, and the Indians temporarily residing in England should have the same privileges as Britishers. In that case, all these troubles would end and then we could exercise the same thing about colonials. If the colonials are willing to give us the same privileges in their countries, then we will extend all our privileges to those colonials. That is the way in which all these back-doors would be closed and plastered and there will be an end to building up the *chor durwaza* in any Constitution whatsoever. But that is not the principle we have to discuss here, and I will discuss it on some other occasion. On these grounds, I support the motion of Mr. Thampan.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy** (Dacca Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I am always an admirer of the blunt sincerity and honesty which are patent in every speech that my Honourable friend, Mr. Anklesaria, makes and I must congratulate him on the utter frankness with which he has told this House what at least he had in mind when he, as a member of the London Committee, devised this scheme. It is exactly the point that has been urged so far from this side of the House that the scheme is conceived with the object of inspiring the confidence of our creditors in England rather than the confidence of the Indians; and that is exactly the reason why some of us thought that we could not possibly accept this scheme of a Shareholders' Bank and that we must have a genuine State Bank. My Honourable friend, as a member of the London Committee,

[Mr. K. C. Neogy.]

has let us into the secret at least of the working of his own mind in London and I very much wish that the same sincerity had inspired the statements of my Honourable friend, the Finance Member. For the merit that he claims for this scheme is that it is so devised that it should command the confidence of the Indian public. And he recognises the fact that unless the Reserve Bank that we propose to set up commands the confidence of the Indian public, it is bound to break down in actual working. Now, Sir, which of the two Honourable Members of the London Committee are we to believe? Was this scheme conceived with the object of making it attractive to our creditors in London or was it intended to be attractive to the Indian people? I would like my Honourable friends to give us a solution of this problem.

A good deal has been said with regard to the claims of Indians and the merits of Indians. I remember on one occasion Pandit Motilal Nehru expressing his utter disapproval of the word "Indianisation". He said that he detested the very word "Indianisation", because it hurt his self-respect: Indians have an inherent right to hold all important offices in this country. My feelings are akin to those of Pandit Motilal in this particular matter. It hurts my self-respect to get up and ask for the reservation of certain appointments for Indians. But we are in an absolutely helpless position, although we should like to see every appointment of importance held by Indians: we have been reduced to such a position that we have to beg for Statutory guarantees and assurances. We are deeply grateful to the Honourable the Finance Member for his sympathy as expressed the other day; but I am told—and I speak subject to correction—that, so far as my Honourable friend's own Department is concerned, the Indians that were holding appointments of responsibility in the officers' grades have been turned out of late and—again I speak subject to correction—that it is the intention of Government to remove the condition of what is called tenure appointments from the appointments in the Finance Department, that is to say, the officers in the Finance Department will not be required to relinquish office after a particular period, say three years, which is generally fixed for similar officers in other Departments, the object being—and here again I speak subject to correction—to leave a legacy of British officers to the future Finance Minister of the Federal Government. So that when we have that high and mighty Financial Adviser installed as a representative, as the super-spy, as he was described, of the Governor General, on the top, the officers in the Finance Department will also be all Britishers belonging to the Indian Civil Service, and the Indian Minister of Finance of the future will be a kind of a prisoner, a kind of hostage in the hands of these persons. I should very much like my Honourable friend to tell this House what practical proof of his sincerity he is prepared to give in this matter before we can agree to withdraw these amendments merely on his assurances.

**Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim** (Chittagong Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, it is not my intention to keep the House for more than a few minutes. It seems that my friends to the right, including Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh, and his Group have not fully realised the implications of this amendment with regard to the appointment of two Indians as the Governor, etc. It might look very simple on the face of it and it might be said by my friends to my right that it would be rather ungenerous of any Indian to stand up in this House and not support this amendment.

"So far as it goes, it is quite right; but if my friends take a little longer view and try to face facts as they stand now in this year of grace 1933. I am certain, they would not press for this motion, because, I feel, this is hardly the time when we should do anything to jeopardise our position in the country or add any more to the links of this distrust in our dealings with England. I am not here to make any special pleading on behalf of the Government of England, but my friends must realise that the successful administration of the Reserve Bank, certainly depends upon not creating an atmosphere of uneasiness at home in the minds of the British people; as my friend, Mr. Anklesaria, was just pointing out, do my friends on the right realise that it will be necessary for them to raise money from other countries including England? They must realise that their country is not shut up within the four corners of the Himalayas and the seas; if they are to have trade connections with other countries including the British Empire, and if they are not to shut themselves off from carrying international trade, and if they also feel that they would like to have some connection with the British markets, I am sure, they will realise that this is a very inopportune thing to do by way of discrimination: just as saying that we may have a Viceroy on Rs. 500 a month or that we shall repudiate our debts if this particular thing is not annulled. My apprehension as a humble citizen is this: if these irritating things are brought in in the body of the Bill, I am certain, they will cause some disturbances outside this country and in the international money market. It is far from me to suggest that the Indianisation should not go on more rapidly than in the past; but to say that we have got a sufficiently large number of people for the administration of concerns like the Reserve Bank is to talk of things which do not exist. My esteemed friend, the Leader of the Democratic Party, whom I love and respect, said: "Why should we not take into consideration the condition of the taxpayers here?" If I may very pertinently ask him: "What happens if this Reserve Bank goes into liquidation on the third day of its existence? Will the taxpayers think of any attempt to put this amendment on the Statute-book?" . . .

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** Is it the contention of my Honourable friend that the appointment of Indians will lead to that catastrophe?

**Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim:** That is not my contention. My contention is this: we must keep our relations with the Government of England in close friendship and above suspicion. My information is that in the past these little things have been given big head lines in papers like the *Star* and they create a sort of apprehension and consternation in the minds of the British people at home. I think, therefore, it will be better if we let the Governor General in Council and the future Finance Minister function properly: it is nowhere laid down in the Bill that the future Assemblies or Councils will be debarred from bringing changes with the permission of the Governor General in Council. If it appears that, by the one-sided or ostrich policy of the Government, the Indians are being antagonised, so far as the administration of this Bank is concerned, I am certain, public opinion will be quite strong to make the Governor General in Council realise the far-reaching consequences of this antagonism before they think of refusing sanction to any measure which will be introduced in this behalf. Secondly, Sir, when I was speaking, a few days ago, on a small motion, I suggested that this

[Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim.]

Assembly and the Assembly which will take its place will have the power to move resolutions to move the consciousness of the Governor General in Council, because my friends, who have read the evidence of the Secretary of State, will see that it is clearly stated there that it will be very difficult for any Governor General in Council to refuse sanction about a particular measure if it had the support of a large majority of the Members in the House. That being so, I dare say that this motion is absolutely inopportune.

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt** (Burdwan Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural):

Sir, I am one of those who do not believe in any form of discrimination whatsoever. I stand on my right of being appointed as Governor or Deputy Governor on my merits, and, Sir, if I am obliged to support the amendment before the House, I regretfully admit that it is due to the position which has been created in our unfortunate land since the days of the Morley-Minto Reforms. From that time onwards all sorts of racial discrimination on grounds of religious faith, sub-divisions of castes and other things have come into existence. You will pardon me, Sir, if I place before the House the whole history of the case. When it was found that a certain class of our fellow subjects were demanding political rights for Indians and the situation for those who were then in power was growing very uncomfortable, they devised a means of getting hold of men in high positions and in society.—I do not mean those men were selected by virtue of their high intellectual attainments or character qualifications which go to make real men.—but they caught hold of some men in high social position and advised them to wait in deputation on those in authority and ask for reservations of seats. That advice was followed, a deputation was received, and the result was the communal electorates of the Minto-Morley scheme. Unfortunately, 10 years later, when the situation became intolerable owing to communal wrangle, the Congress was obliged in 1916 to come to some sort of a pact with communalists, and, Sir, whenever we asked that there should be no discrimination between class and class, between men of one religious persuasion and another, we were always reminded of the Lucknow Pact of 1916, quite suppressing the fact that it owed its origin to that unholy invitation of the members of a particular community to wait in deputation . . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Order, order. All these observations are absolutely irrelevant to this amendment.

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** The reason why I was saying that I was against discrimination whatsoever on racial grounds was this, that in every appointment of State, efficiency should be the sole test, be he a European, be he an Indian, be he a Hindu, or a Muhammadan or a Sikh or a Parsi. That is my idea, but, situated as we are in this country, where all sorts of discriminations are being made, and when you find the over-zealous members of a particular community asking the Government to do certain things in their favour, I think my friends who have put in this amendment were not far wrong in the present position of the country in asking that two officers out of the three should be Indians.

My Honourable friend, Mr. Neogy, has referred to my friend, Mr. Anklesaria's very valuable work in the London Committee, but, Sir, this

London trip in some cases at least resembles Jesus' donkey going to Mecca, but coming back the same donkey . . . .

**Several Honourable Members:** What is the couplet?

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** I do not know the exact Urdu couplet, I think my friend, Sardar Sant Singh, over there may be able to give the Urdu couplet for the delectation of this House. Sir, my plea is that even a visit to London has not improved the patriotism or the intelligence of some.

We have been asked by my friend from Chittagong to face facts. I do not know what facts we are called upon to face. We are accustomed to face several facts in the country, but we are not accustomed to face facts like those which my friend has enumerated, namely, our relationship with the British Government. What is the relationship, I do not exactly know. Of course, if he has in mind the statement of a particular zamindar of my province that his relation with the British Raj continues to be friendly, that is another thing. And, Sir, as a loyal talukdar under him, I am not going to utter those statements again . . . . .

**An Honourable Member:** You are his tenant.

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** I am a talukdar under that great zamindar . . .

**An Honourable Member:** Are you a *Shuja Mota* talukdar under a bogus zamindar?

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** I cannot go so far as that. I do not wish to say anything about the subject introduced by my friend from Orissa. Be that as it may, I submit, that the question of relationship hardly arises in this case.

Then, it has been said that it will create consternation at Home. Certainly if appointments of two Indians will create consternation at Home,—I understand by the word "Home" my friend means India and not England,—if the appointment of two Indians will create consternation at Home . . . . .

**Mr. N. N. Anklesaria:** I don't think he said that. He said only discrimination.

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** No, he used the word consternation; I can assure my friend, Mr. Anwar-ul-Azim, that it is not likely to create any consternation in India. Am I to believe that in a population of 35 crores there are not to be found even three Indians fit enough to carry on the business of a Bank? If that be the state, the country in spite of more than 100 years of English education according to British system and British ideals, it hardly redounds to the credit of our rulers. On the other hand, I am bold enough to say that amongst a population of 33 crores . . . . .

**The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter** (Law Member): 35 crores.

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Very well, 35 crores. I stand corrected. My friend keeps more up-to-date information than I do. Sir, I believe that out of a population of 85 crores, there is at least a lakh of people who can

[Mr. Amar Nath Dutt.]

be found fit to hold the posts of Governor and Deputy Governor of this Bank, and I would certainly have welcomed an amendment like that . . . .

**Mr. R. S. Sarma** (Nominated Non-Official): I hope Members of this House are included in that one lakh?

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Certainly every one of us, including my friend, Mr. Sarma. Whenever an opportunity has been given to an Indian, he has never been found to be wanting in the discharge of his duties.

**An Honourable Member:** The Bengal National Bank!

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Take, for example, the case of an Indian Governor. A quarter of a century before, it was hardly within our dream . . . .

**Mr. N. N. Anklesaria:** May I know how all this is relevant? Nobody has said that Indians are not to be employed.

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Therefore, I do say that every one of them ought to be an Indian. That ought to have been the amendment. When there is no such amendment on the paper, I have to support this smaller amendment. If the Honourable Member will have a little patience, he will see if I am relevant or not. If I am irrelevant, the Chair is there to remind me of it and I shall certainly obey. As I was submitting, wherever an Indian has been tried, he has not been found wanting. I have already cited the case of an Indian Governor. There is also the case of the first Indian Member of the Executive Council. It was at one time held that the exalted Chair which you occupy at the present moment no Indian could occupy, and a gentleman was brought out from overseas. But within four years it was found that there were capable Indians, not one or two, but more than two at least who could occupy that Chair. So, in every sphere I think Indians can do their duty as well and with as much ability as people of any other race. I think nobody will doubt the intellectual capacity of a race, which produced the Vedanta system of philosophy, which produced a religion like ours and which produced a philosophy and culture of which the world is proud. That being so, I submit, it cannot be said that amongst Indians people cannot be found who can occupy the position of Governor or Deputy Governor of the Reserve Bank. With these few words, I give my support to the amendment, though I should have been very glad to have a clause to the effect that the Governor and Deputy Governors should be Indians. If it is said that there should not be any Statutory discriminatory provision like that, I invite the attention of Honourable Members on the other side to this enactment which I hold in my hand which was only recently amended in the year 1923—I mean the Criminal Procedure Code. There I find discrimination still retained in spite of our agitation since the days of the Ilbert Bill. So long as things continue like this, I may say, we shall be justified in asking for such reservation for Indians. With these words, I support the motion.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** This is doubtless a very important subject, but it has already been very fully discussed in the House. The House is fully acquainted with my views upon it and the arguments which I have to advance, and, therefore, if I am brief it is not because I disregard its importance, but merely because I wish to avoid repetition.

And indeed, if I have anything to say today that is at all new, it is as a result of certain—I think I may call them—irrelevant remarks which have been made by various speakers in the course of this discussion which I desire to take an opportunity to answer. I refer in particular to certain remarks made by my Honourable friend from Bengal, Mr. Neogy. He sought to cast doubt on the position and the value of the assurance which I have given in the House, on the ground that my own record in the Finance Department was such as to command very little confidence. My Honourable friend has referred to certain minor appointments, and I should be very pleased to discuss with him the policy that has been pursued in the Finance Department recently on another occasion. But I would remind my Honourable friend if he wishes to make any reference to my own record of two important facts. Among the posts with which I am particularly concerned and over which I have myself some say, there are two of the highest importance which, when I took over, were filled by Englishmen and are now filled by Indians. I refer to the post of Financial Commissioner for Railways and the post of Financial Adviser to the Posts and Telegraphs Department. It has been a very great pleasure to me to be able to support the appointment of Indians to those two posts, and I think if my Honourable friend wishes to refer to my own personal record in the matter, that is a sufficient answer to him.

But, Sir, the criticism is irrelevant, because the assurance which I have given is not a personal assurance; it is an assurance given by the Government of India with, I may say, the full authority of the Secretary of State.

Now, Sir, I must express considerable regret that this amendment has been moved. I feel regret, because, I think, when we come to discuss proposals of this kind, it puts everybody in a false position. Our primary object is to get a good Bank, and whether one stresses the importance of its being able to command confidence in England or in India is a matter of very little moment. It must be a good bank; it must be well managed; and unless it is a good bank and well managed, it will not command confidence in any part of the world, nor will it do its business properly. Subject to that, we agree with Honourable Members in their desire to see Indians filling the highest posts in this Bank. We are all agreed on this, but if Honourable Members come forward and ask for positive assurances, then those who are responsible must safeguard themselves. They must take into account the realities of the situation. They must refuse to give assurances which they are not absolutely certain that they will be able to honour without endangering the good management of this Bank. Therefore, when my Honourable friends opposite ask for assurances, they immediately force us into the position of stating the minimum which we are certain that we can promise. What I submit is most unfortunate is that matters of this kind should be discussed on the basis of the minimum which is possible. In considering realities, surely my Honourable friends will recognise that we are dealing now with a measure which is designed to remain in force for 25 years at least, and, we all hope, for any period that can be foreseen. As that period progresses, conditions will surely change. It may be necessary at the outset to accept certain limitations on the number of Indians that can be put in to fill the highest posts. But we none of us wish to stand on that position. We look forward to the future, and, therefore, I say that to insert now what must be considered as a minimum in the conditions which will prevail at the

[Sir George Schuster.]

outset of the Bank's existence is to convey an entirely misleading impression and to put every one in a false position. That is the first point. I object most strongly to giving any assurances at all, but, in order to meet Honourable Members who sat with me on the Select Committee, I was able to get agreement from the Government and from the Secretary of State to a certain assurance. That has been given and that will be honoured. But when it comes to putting provisions of this kind into the Statute, I have already made it perfectly clear that we must resist that absolutely, as a discriminatory provision.

Honourable Members have said that we are not consistent in our objection to discriminatory provisions. If by that they mean that in this Bill certain discriminatory provisions have been inserted, they are perfectly correct. The Bill is full of discriminatory provisions. We are discriminating against foreigners; we are discriminating against the dominions which discriminate against this country, and that is a position which we frankly recognise. But the one form of discrimination which we have said cannot be inserted into this Bill is discrimination between Indians and United Kingdom British subjects resident in India. And, Sir, if a provision of this kind is inserted, it is a discriminatory provision. If you say "of the three chief posts two shall be filled by Indians", you are saying in other words that, of the three chief posts, not more than one should be filled by a British resident in India. That is discrimination and to that, in principle, we must object. That is a perfectly clear position, and, as I say, I regret very much that this amendment should have been moved. I thought that we had reached a satisfactory understanding. I thought that we were all inspired by a common ideal and working towards a common object. If Honourable Members ask for assurances, which I have always said I regard rather as a sign of weakness than of strength, then unfortunately we on this side have got to take up a definite position and say "so far we can go and no farther". Sir, I submit to the House that it would have been better if no assurance on this point had ever been asked for, but having been asked for, it has been given. It has been given and it will be honoured, but so far as the Bill is concerned, we can agree to inserting no provisions of this kind.

**Mr. K. P. Thampan:** May I ask one question of the Honourable the Finance Member? Though the Imperial Bank has been in existence for the last 13 years and the Presidency Banks, on the amalgamation of which the Imperial Bank came into being, have been in existence for 50 years and though 65 per cent of the capital of the Bank is subscribed by Indians, has there been one Indian Secretary at any of the branches of the Imperial Bank or is there one Indian appointed in that cadre from which a Secretary would be appointed within the next ten years? I want an answer to that.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** My Honourable friend is fully aware of the answer, but his question is entirely irrelevant.

**Mr. President:** The question is:

"That to sub-clause (1) (a) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following proviso be added:

'Provided that of the Governor and two Deputy Governors two at least shall be Indians.'"



The Assembly divided:

AYES—28.

Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.  
Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.  
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.  
Bhuput Sing, Mr.  
Chandi Mal Gola, Bhagat.  
Das, Mr. B.  
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.  
Hoon, Mr. A.  
Isra, Chaudhri.  
Jadhav, Mr. B. V.  
Jog, Mr. S. G.  
Joshi, Mr. N. M.  
Krishnamachariar, Raja Bahadur G.  
Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.

Liladhar Chaudhury, Seth.  
Mahapatra, Mr. Sitakanta.  
Mitra, Mr. S. C.  
Neogy, Mr. K. C.  
Patil, Rao Bahadur B. L.  
Reddi, Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna.  
Sant Singh, Sardar.  
Sen, Mr. S. C.  
Shafee Daoodi, Maulvi Muhammad.  
Singh, Mr. Gava Prasad.  
Sitaramaraju, Mr. B.  
Thampan, Mr. K. P.  
Uppi Saheb Bahadur, Mr.  
Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr.

NOES—53.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian  
Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.  
Anklesaria, Mr. N. N.  
Anwar-ul-Azim, Mr. Muhammad.  
Ayangar, Mr. V. K. A. Aravamudha.  
Bajpai, Mr. G. S.  
Bhore, The Honourable Sir Joseph.  
Bower, Mr. E. H. M.  
Chatarti, Mr. J. M.  
Clow, Mr. A. G.  
Cox, Mr. A. R.  
Dalal, Dr. R. D.  
Dash, Mr. A. J.  
DeSouza, Dr. F. X.  
Dillon, Mr. W.  
Graham, Sir Lancelot.  
Grantham, Mr. S. G.  
Haig, The Honourable Sir Harry.  
Heslett, Mr. J.  
Hudson, Sir Leslie.  
Ismail A'i Khan, Kunwar Hajee.  
James, Mr. F. E.  
Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur  
Sardar.  
Lee, Mr. D. J. N.  
Mackenzie, Mr. R. T. H.  
Macmillan, Mr. A. M.  
McClellan, Mr. H. A. F.  
Millar, Mr. E. S.

Milligan, Mr. J. A.  
Mitter, The Honourable Sir Brojendra.  
Morgan, Mr. G.  
Mujumdar, Sardar G. N.  
Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur S. C.  
Nihal Singh, Sardar.  
Novce, The Honourable Sir Frank.  
O'Sullivan, Mr. D. N.  
Rafiuddin Ahmad, Khan Bahadur  
Maulvi.  
Raghubir Singh, Rai Bahadur  
Kunwar.  
Raisman, Mr. A.  
Ramakrishna, Mr. V.  
Rau, Mr. P. R.  
Schuster, The Honourable Sir George.  
Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.  
Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar,  
Captain.  
Singh, Kumar Gupteshwar Prasad.  
Singh, Mr. Pradyumna Prashad.  
Sinha, Rai Bahadur Madan Mohan.  
Smith, Mr. R.  
Studd, Mr. E.  
Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.  
Trivedi, Mr. C. M.  
Wahiduddin, Khan Bahadur Haji.  
Yakub, Sir Muhammad.

The motion was negatived.

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

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) in the Chair.

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju:** Sir, I beg to move:

"That in sub-clause (1) (a) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the words 'after consideration of' the word 'on' be substituted."

[Mr. B. Sitaramaraju.]

The original provision in the Bill runs as follows :

"A Governor and two Deputy Governors to be appointed by the Governor General in Council after consideration of the recommendations made by the Board in that behalf."

Sir, my amendment seeks to substitute for the words "after consideration of" the word "on". The object of moving this amendment is to emphasise the need to give due weight to the recommendations of the Central Board. I do not for a moment wish to convey any idea that the hands of the Governor General in Council should be completely tied. That is not my intention, but the words which are actually used "after consideration of the recommendations" would not give the necessary importance to the recommendations of the Central Board and my submission is that, if the word "on" is substituted, the recommendations of the Central Board would have greater weight than now. But I understand that the idea was in this regard to follow the practice of the Imperial Bank. Even in the report of the Joint Committee, they have stated that the preliminary consultations would have to be taken between the Government and the Central Board before recommendations are made. That would be a very satisfactory feature if prior consultations had taken place between the Government and the Central Board. Once those prior consultations have taken place and the recommendations have been made, then, I venture to submit, those recommendations must have a great weight and will not be easily rejected. The provision in the Bill, as it stands, does not anticipate any of those prior consultations. It only says, the choice would be after the recommendation and does not indicate the importance of the recommendation made after due consultation. That makes a good deal of difference and, therefore, I thought that if these words were substituted, there could possibly be no room for any objection on the part of the Government since the recommendation is expected to be made after joint consultation. For this purpose, I move this amendment and I trust that it will be accepted by the House.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Amendment moved :

"That in sub-clause (1) (a) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the words 'after consideration of' the word 'on' be substituted."

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster**: Sir, my Honourable friend has correctly stated the position as regards the origin of this clause. The matter was very fully discussed in London and, after a long period of failure to find any form of words which were satisfactory to all concerned, the suggestion was made—and it came from those who had sat on the Board of the Imperial Bank—that we might follow the practice of the Imperial Bank which had been found in every respect satisfactory. The Imperial Bank Act was then sent for and the actual words were read out and it was agreed to recommend those words. That represented a very large concession from the side of those who represented the Secretary of State. The original proposal had been that the appointments should be made by the Governor General in Council without any reference to consultation with, or considering the recommendations of, any other authority. That, in my own view, represents one of the most important points achieved by the discussions in London and one of the most important concessions made as a result of the pressure brought by the

Indian representatives in London. Now, my Honourable friend's suggestion, although he himself does not seem to understand it in that sense, would, I submit, mean that the recommendations of the Board would be operative and the Governor General in Council would be left merely with the formal function of ratifying these recommendations. That, of course, is a position which we could not accept and, as this represents an important matter of agreement, I am afraid I must oppose my Honourable friend's proposal. In that connection, I should like to take this opportunity of taking up a point on which I was questioned at an earlier stage of these discussions. I was asked whether I could give any assurance that the recommendations made by the London Committee would be accepted by the British Government and by Parliament and would be incorporated in the Constitution Act so as that has anything to do with this position. I explained then that I, of course, could give no assurance and that I felt sure that the Secretary of State himself would not be in a position to give any assurance which would tie the hands of Parliament. For, Parliament, after all, remains the final authority. But, I have received a telegram from the Secretary of State, and this is what he authorises me to say. He says: that while, as I myself have already pointed out, he—the Secretary of State—cannot commit Parliament in advance, the views expressed on the point in question by the London Committee, so far as it made definite recommendations, may be regarded as forming part of the proposals put forward by His Majesty's Government in the same way as proposals contained in the White Paper. That, I submit, is a very definite statement and, I am sure, it goes as far as any Honourable Member opposite could expect the Secretary of State to go. In these circumstances, this House would be taking a very questionable step, I may put it, by doing anything to upset the basis reached in London, for it would make it impossible then for the Secretary of State on his side to fulfil or regard himself as bound by his own assurances. Therefore, I submit that we should stick to the words of the original clause as it stands in the Bill which is about as good a description of the position which we all want to attain as could be found in Statutory language. That will provide, I think, due influence to the Central Board in this matter. Moreover, the Joint Select Committee has itself made a recommendation that there should in every case be prior consultation between the Governor General and the Board, which recommendation will without doubt be seriously considered. For my own part, I may say that I think that any such recommendation is unnecessary, because, having regard to the form of words used, there must, if one considers how the thing would work, there must be prior consultation between the Board of the Bank and the Governor General. They could not keep each other at arm's length in this matter. I submit, in these circumstances, that my Honourable friend's point is really met by the wording of the Bill and I would ask him to withdraw his amendment.

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju:** Sir, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

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

**Mr. K. P. Thampan:** Sir, I beg to move:

That to sub-clause (1) (a) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following proviso be added:—  
 "Provided that no member of the English or Indian Civil Service shall be eligible for appointment as a Governor or Deputy Governor."

[Mr. K. P. Thampan.]

Sir, much has been said by the sponsor of the Bill as well as by those who support him that the Reserve Bank should be altogether immune from political influence. We all know what these people mean by political influence. We, on this side of the House, are also equally anxious that the Bank should be free from political influences, but what we mean by political influences is the influences of the Secretary of State and of the commercial community of England. If my motion is not adopted, the chances are that these posts are sure to go to the I. C. S. people. There is no service or no work in the world for which the I. C. S. people are not considered fit. That is the universal impression. The Reserve Bank has to function purely in the economic interests of the country and no experiments can be tried with it. To be free from political influences, we want that the men should be recruited from the banking and commercial classes. As far as we can see, neither an Indian nor an English I. C. S. man can be free from political bias, but he will only be the mouthpiece of the Secretary of State. He cannot be otherwise and it is only natural. That is the reason why we are anxious that the I. C. S. people should be excluded. In this connection I would invite the attention of the House to a paragraph in the memorandum written by Mr. J. M. Keynes on the proposals for the establishment of a State Bank in India which is published as an Annex to the Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Finance and Currency, 1914, in which he says:

"It may be added in this connection that the Governor and Deputy Governor of the Bank should invariably be persons of commercial or banking, not of administrative or official, experience, and should be appointed, so far as may be possible or convenient, from the staffs of the Presidency Offices."

The proposal was that the Presidency Banks should be amalgamated into one and made into a Reserve Bank, and that is why he refers to that aspect. Towards the end, he says:

"It might perhaps increase public confidence in the non-official character of the Bank's management and in the Government's intentions, if it were definitely laid down that members of the English or the Indian Civil Service were ineligible for appointment as officers of the Bank."

This is a very important point and I cannot understand how it escaped the notice of the Select Committee. I am sure, no one can repudiate what Mr. Keynes said in 1914. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Amendment moved:

"That to sub-clause (1) (a) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following proviso be added:

'Provided that no member of the English or Indian Civil Service shall be eligible for appointment as a Governor or Deputy Governor'."

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** Sir, I must oppose what I imagine to be my Honourable friend's intention and I must also point out that his amendment would not fulfil his intention. The wording is "provided that no member of the English or Indian Civil Service shall be eligible . . . ." Well, I am advised that that does not mean that if a man has served for a time either in the Government of England or India, that taint should remain with him for all the rest of his natural life. It

applies only to a serving member. Therefore, if any particular individual is informed that there is some chance of his getting this appointment, he will be able to retire and the very next day, he can get the appointment. On this ground I think my Honourable friend's amendment is ineffective, and, quite apart from that, I feel sure that the House would not support the intention which I imagine he must have in his own mind. I am afraid that my Honourable friend, Mr. Amar Nath Dutt's list of 100,000 suitable Indian candidates for the post of Governor would be very seriously curtailed if all those who ever served the Crown in India were to be disqualified. I think my Honourable friend has only got to think of this for a very short time to realise that it is an undesirable proposal and, therefore, I suggest to him that he might withdraw it.

**Mr. K. P. Thampan** I do not withdraw it.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The question is :

"That to sub-clause (1) (a) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following proviso be added : 'Provided that no member of the English or Indian Civil Service shall be eligible for appointment as a Governor or Deputy Governor.'"

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. B. V. Jadhav** (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I beg to move:

"That in sub-clause (1) (b) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the word 'four' the word 'two' be substituted."

Sir, according to clause 8 of the Bill, out of the 13 voting Directors, eight are to be ultimately elected by the shareholders and four are to be nominated by the Governor General as laid down in the report of the Select Committee. In this no provision has been made for the agricultural interest which, as is well known, is the principal interest in an agricultural country like India. The Reserve Bank is intended to stimulate trade and industry, and agriculture is the widest and most important industry in India and there has been no Statutory provision made for the representation of the advocates of agriculture. It might be urged by the Honourable the Finance Member that when Government would make nominations to the Board, the Governor General in Council would take care to appoint one or two members to that Board who will be eligible for representing agricultural interests. I do not deny that Government will be very careful for those interests. But, at the same time, I may point out that it is better to have elected members than nominated members and the election ought to be made by those co-operative central banks or provincial banks which have been helping agriculture through the district banks and the village co-operative societies. I, therefore, move that two of these posts should be reserved for election by the various provincial banks.

Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Amendment moved:

"That in sub-clause (1) (b) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the word 'four' the word 'two' be substituted."

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Does Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar want to move his amendment now?

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar**: If this amendment is passed, I shall not move it. The reason why I have tabled this amendment which comes later on is that I want two Directors for Madras and I do not know how to get it. Therefore, I put this four into three, and, out of these eight Directors to be elected, I want two to represent agricultural interests.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Then the Honourable Member does not want to move it now?

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar**: No, Sir, not now. I shall see the fate of this amendment first.

**Several Honourable Members**: The fate is well known.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** (Patna and Chota Nagpur *cum* Orissa: Muhammadan): Sir, I support this amendment that from four the number of nominated Directors shall be reduced to two. In this connection I want to say that the number "four" is too much, because there are after all only eight elected members, and if there are four nominated members, then certainly the policy will be guided by Government,—not the Indian Government, but the Government sitting at Whitehall. At the same time, it has been said—though outside of this Assembly—that if there are four Directors, there will be some chance for Muslims to be nominated on the Directorate. But I say that we have a very bad experience of nominated members. My experience is that all the nominated members, though they are not obliged, in black and white, to support Government, they always, as a matter of practice, support Government in all measures. Even in questions of such religious importance as mosques, etc., certain nominated members have opposed us and voted for Government. My experience of all the local bodies also is the same that these nominated members always represent the man who nominates them. It may be all very fair from the point of view of those who nominate them, but we cannot trust the nominated members. Apart from that, when we see that out of 12 Directors, who will have votes, four will be nominated, the number is very high. It is always the case with a nominated member that whenever he is not in a position to attend a meeting, he will submit his resignation from the Board and Government will nominate another member as we find here. But for elected members it is not always possible for them to be replaced by others. There is a provision in the Bill that in certain cases it will be possible for the local board to nominate any one else to attend the meeting; but there is one difficulty. Suppose the local board elected members to attend a meeting and, after that, the member is not in a position to attend the meeting. How can the local board sit and elect another member to attend the meeting? So, in the case of the elected members, it will not be always possible to substitute any other man to attend the Central Board meeting; while for the Government it will be very easy always to substitute others to attend the meeting; and what happens in the Assembly and in the Council of State is . . . . .

**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar** (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Rural): But a nominated Director holds office for five years and,

as nomination is in the hands of Government, his resignation may not be accepted like the resignation of official members which they can get at any time.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** I cannot understand how the Honourable Member says that, if a person is once nominated, his resignation cannot be accepted. Does the Honourable Member suggest that a man, once nominated as Director of the Central Board, cannot vacate office for five years?

**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar:** I am pointing out that the Government cannot request a resignation from a nominated Director. Once he is appointed, he is there for five years, and he can only be removed by a vote of nine Directors. Government cannot call for his resignation at any time.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** But, what happened in the case of Sir Abdul Qaiyum? It was not possible for him to resign when he was once nominated, but when he went to attend the Round Table Conference, he submitted his resignation. They will have to submit their resignations and Government will accept those resignations and nominate some other members. This will not be possible for elected members, because, if an elected member is not able to attend a meeting, he has got no right to nominate any one else to represent him in the meeting. Rather, this power is in the hands of the Local Board, and so it will be very difficult for the Local Board to have a meeting and have a substitute for him. Supposing one or two members are absent, Government members will always have a majority in the Central Board. With these words, I support this amendment of my Honourable friend, Mr. Jadhav, that there should be only two nominated Directors.

**Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar (East Punjab: Sikh):** Sir, if I rise to support this amendment, it is for the one reason that we have to inspire confidence among the British public. The English people, to my mind, are rather superstitious. From the present scheme, it appears that the number of voting Directors would be 13 which is considered to be an unlucky number among the British investing public. I think it will be well by accepting this amendment to reduce the number from 13 to some other odd number which may inspire the confidence of the British public and the British Parliament as the women are in a majority among the voters. As regards the number of nominated Directors, I do not think "four" is a very big number, because Government have to consider the national interests. Commercial and other interests may not be able to predominate at any particular moment and so there has to be a fair number of nominated Directors. Out of 13 I do not think four is too large a number, but I would like the number to be either 11 or 15 if that could have been possible.

**Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan):** I whole-heartedly support the amendment moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jadhav. Throughout my connection with the Reserve Bank Bill, whether this present Bill or the past one, I have held the view that co-operative banks should come in through direct election, and the 1927 Joint Committee brought out such a proposal in their report. I know that the eight Directors that will be elected will only represent a very ~~miscellaneous~~ <sup>miscellaneous</sup> group.

3 P.M.

[Mr. B. Das.]

interest of the Indian public, namely, the capitalist section of the larger towns of India. In spite of their trying to represent the multitudes, their private interest and personal engagement in public life will debar them from looking after the interests of the teeming millions. At present, if one good has come through the British rule it is the co-operative banking system by which the multitudes, the teeming millions, even the interior villages of the country, are connected through an apex bank, a central co-operative bank, and, therefore, we hold that if the provincial co-operative banks are allowed to elect Directors, then a certain system of electoral representation should prevail, and thereby the capitalist section of the Directorate of the Reserve Bank will not always have their own way. Of course, the Finance Member has conceded to us in the Select Committee and certain wording has been introduced to the effect that the Governor General in nomination will look after the interests of the agricultural and co-operative systems. I do not like to leave that power to the Governor General, to act upon the advice of his Finance Minister or the Financial Adviser. I shall cite one instance. In 1931, when I was unlucky to get my Imperial Bank Amendment Bill passed, we were assured by the Finance Member that he will try to nominate a representative of the agricultural interests to the Board of the Imperial Bank. Afterwards I found the name of a certain gentleman from Madras, one Rao Bahadur or Diwan Bahadur Narasimha Raju, as the representative of agricultural interests on the Imperial Bank. I knew him in my old Congress days as a Congressman. Then I suddenly found him blossoming forth as the President of the Madras Legislative Council, but I never knew from his public life and from his activities throughout India that he was very much interested in the agricultural development of this country.

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju:** May I contradict the Honourable Member, that he is speaking about a subject which he does not know?

**Mr. B. Das:** My Honourable friend, Mr. Raju, might know very intimately the gentleman; probably his agricultural activities are confined to that particular district to which he belongs.

**An Honourable Member:** Why should we discuss an individual?

**Mr. B. Das:** I am not discussing, I am citing an instance to show that the nomination may go wrong. If a man like Mr. Ramadas Pantulu or people interested in the millions. . . . .

**Mr. K. P. Thampan:** I protest that Mr. Ramadas Pantulu does not know anything about agriculture.

**Mr. B. Das:** I was thinking of co-operative banking.

**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar:** I suggest that my Honourable friend may confine himself to the people of Orissa whom he may or may not know, and not of Madras.

**Mr. B. Das:** I may assure my Honourable friend, Mr. Mudaliar, that Orissa never fights for nomination. The people of Orissa would be ashamed to come anywhere by the backdoor of nomination. That is



not my purpose. I want to ensure to the people of India direct representation through the method of election so that the backdoor methods of nomination may be put a stop to. I may assure my Honourable friend, Mr. Raju, that I do not mean to say anything personal against that particular gentleman. . . .

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju:** May I inform my Honourable friend that the experience of Mr. Narasimha Raju as an agriculturist and as a man of varied experience in all those matters which concern the particular subject he is representing is unrivalled in Madras.

**Mr. B. Das:** This is the first time I hear of this. Until he was nominated by the Government of India, in my public life of so many years I never knew that the gentleman had taken interest in all-India agricultural problems. I plead guilty of ignorance, but there are certain people whose activities are well known and some people whose activities are not so well known.

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju:** Are you aware that he was representing here on the Sugar Conference?

**Mr. B. Das:** There were so many of us represented on the Sugar Conference! The question is whether the Reserve Bank will be really representative, and I have always said it, and I do not think that the eight elected Directors will ever represent the public. The only direct representation of masses that can come is through the co-operative banks, and, in substance, what we advocate on this side has been agreed to on the other side. They would like to see certain representation granted to the co-operative banks, and it is better that they are given direct electoral representation through the 11 provincial apex banks. Therefore, I wholeheartedly support the amendment of my Honourable friend, Mr. Jadhav.

**Sir Cawasji Jehangir** (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): I have no desire to take up the time of the House, but I desire to raise a question of principle more in the interests of the future than the immediate present. My Honourable friend, the member of the Committee of the Federated Chambers of Commerce, who also represents the teeming masses of this country in this House, and I believe also on the Committee of the Federated Chambers, has been the cause of my having to raise this question of principle. The question of principle is that when this House appoints an Honourable Member to a Select Committee, I think it expects, as every other Legislature expects, that that Member will continue at least to voice the same opinion in the Select Committee and in this House, because the lapse of time is generally very short between the Select Committee and the discussion in this House. I do not think that my Honourable friend disagreed with this provision in the Select Committee, nor has he written a minute of dissent . . . .

**Mr. B. Das:** My memory does not lapse.

**Sir Cawasji Jehangir:** I thought he said that his memory does not last; if so I am inclined to agree with him. But at any rate, there is no minute of dissent. Now, Sir, that is a principle that I should like to make perfectly clear, and I do think that Honourable Members should at least support the

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

report that they have signed or such provisions of it on which they have not written minutes of dissent. Sir, I may mention that it will be a very important principle in the future. Sir, it is of greater importance for the future than it is just now in the present House. At present we often do not take notice of such changes of opinion which are made without giving any reasons at all. I can understand a change of opinion if an Honourable Member has found out new facts or figures or the circumstances have changed, and due to those changes he changes his opinion; but I think that in the future it will be of the greatest importance to this House that we should maintain this principle that members of a Select Committee should at least support the report which they have signed.

**Mr. B. Das:** On a point of order, Sir, I would invite your ruling whether the point raised by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that no Member should speak against the majority report, unless a separate minute of dissent has been written, should be supported. This has never been the practice in this House before; and, if we are all to write minutes of dissent, then the volume of the report will become very large and we will have to give a much larger stone to the Honourable Member for Finance than we are now giving.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy:** What about the Leader of the Opposition always supporting the Government? What about that principle?

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** May I point out to the Honourable Member that whether I am the Leader of the Opposition or not, I will support what I think is right and I will not support anything that I think is wrong, and that is what I expect the Honourable Member to do, to support what he thinks is right and not to support it simply because he thinks public opinion will support him.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** What about the members of your Party?

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** If I rise at all, Sir, it is not to speak about the amendment before the House, but against the principle which has just been enunciated by my friend inviting my friend, Mr. Das, not to support the amendment. It seems that if a man, according to him, signs a Select Committee report, without writing a note of dissent, he is bound by the report for ever . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shaumukham Chetty): Order, order: The Chair does not think there is any practical use in discussing that particular point. As a matter of fact, once it was definitely raised on the floor of this House: a Member asked for a ruling as to whether Members of Select Committees could vote as they liked, on which the President observed:

"I hardly think that is a matter for the Chair to deal with. If the Honourable Member means whether an Honourable Member, who has changed his mind, can vote in a way contrary to that proposed by the Select Committee whose report he has signed, I see no power in the Chair or the Assembly to debar him from doing so."

The Chair does not think there is any use in discussing the point further.

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** I am glad my Honourable friend's position has been vindicated; and, as regards the amendment before the House, I am sorry that I am unable to support the amendment. My experience of nomination has not been what has been related by my friend. I myself entered public life as a nominated member of a certain local body; and after that I had my difference with the very authority which nominated me : . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Was the Honourable Member nominated for a second time?

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Yes, I was. (Laughter.) So I beg to submit that all these tirades against nomination do not apply. I do not know whether circumstances have changed since then, because, since entering the Legislature, I have ceased to have any connection with those local bodies and I do not know how things stand at present and whether the nominating authorities have altered their practice during the past 10 or 12 years. Be that as it may, I beg to submit that if this power of nomination has been kept in hand in order to equalise various interests, I think we should not oppose it.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** Sir, I am afraid I must oppose this amendment, and as I find that I am supported by such a doughty ally as my Honourable friend who has just spoken, I feel there can be little doubt as to the result. This feature of having four nominated members is an essential feature of what I have frequently described as our balanced scheme, and to eliminate this feature or to reduce its importance would upset the balance. I take it that my Honourable friend who moved the amendment was really speaking more on his own subsequent amendment No. 93 than on the amendment actually moved, because one would be incomplete without the other. I would remind the House of what the Select Committee said in its report. They said:

"We do not consider it appropriate to embody in the Statute any specific provision for the fulfilment of this intention, but we consider that in the Instrument of Instructions to the Governor General a passage should be inserted making it clear that this power should be exercised in the general manner indicated above and in particular to secure adequate representation of the interests of agriculture and co-operative banking if these interests had not secured such representation among the elected Directors."

Sir, we intend to call the particular attention of the Secretary of State to that recommendation and I submit that the clause in the Bill read together with the recommendation is really the proper way to deal with this matter. I oppose the amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The question is:

"That in sub-clause (1) (b) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the word 'four' the word 'two' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. K. P. Thampan:** Sir, I move:

"That in sub-clause (1) (b) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the words 'Governor General in Council' the words 'the Finance Member of the Government of India subject to the approval of the Governor General' be substituted."

[Mr. K. P. Thampan.]

The meaning is obvious. I do not propose to waste my lungs by making a speech.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Amendment moved:

"That in sub-clause (1) (b) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the words 'Governor General in Council' the words 'the Finance Member of the Government of India subject to the approval of the Governor General' be substituted."

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** Sir, I must oppose my Honourable friend's amendment on grounds which have already been explained fully to the House in connection with other proposals. I think it would hardly be justifiable for me to take the time of the House in making a long speech in repeating the explanation of my grounds. Sir, I oppose.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The question is:

"That in sub-clause (1) (b) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the words 'Governor General in Council' the words 'the Finance Member of the Government of India subject to the approval of the Governor General' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi:** Sir, I beg to move the amendment which stands in my name, which runs thus:

"That in sub-clause (1) (b) of clause 8 of the Bill, after the words 'Governor General in Council' the words 'to represent agricultural interests of the country' be inserted."

If you see the composition of the Central Board and of the Local Boards, you will find that there is very little chance of the agricultural interests to be represented. Sub-clause (1) of clause 8 says:

"The Central Board shall consist of the following Directors, namely:

- (a) a Governor and two Deputy Governors.....
- (b) four Directors to be nominated.....
- (c) eight Directors to be elected on behalf of the shareholders on the various registers, in the manner provided in section 9 and in the following numbers, namely:  
for the Bombay register—two Directors,  
for the Calcutta register—two Directors etc."

The method of election is also given in clause 9. The Local Boards have to elect eight Directors. In the Local Boards, five out of eight are the elected members from the shareholders: and then three members are to be nominated by the Central Board. The Central Board nominates these three members just to restore any inequity, that is to say, with particular reference to the territorial, economic or agricultural interests. Hence, if at all there is to be any representation of agricultural interests in the Local Boards, it comes only under these nominations made by the Central Board . . . . .

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar:** Unless my amendment which comes later is accepted.

**Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi:** I am speaking about the amendment before the House, which is an amendment to the clause in the Bill as it stands before the House. These Directors are to be elected not by the entire Local Board, but only by the elected members of these Local Boards. Naturally the five elected members will be only from the commercial and capitalist section, and we cannot expect them to represent the agricultural interests. Therefore, if you remove these three nominated members, it is only the five elected members who will have to elect the Directors to the Central Board, and since, as I said, they will represent the commercial and capitalist interests, they cannot be expected to elect two Directors to the Central Board who would represent the agricultural interest. There is, therefore, absolutely no chance for the agricultural interests to be represented on the Central Board and they can come in only through nomination as provided in clause (b) to sub-clause (1). I, therefore, desire that all the Directors . . .

**Mr. Bhuput Sing** (Bihar and Orissa : Landholders): What is the meaning of agricultural interests? Which class will represent them,—landholders or tenants?

**Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi:** I cannot say which class. We expect landholders to represent agricultural interests and also certain other gentlemen who have devoted their time and attention to the agricultural needs of the country. I don't exclude such persons. We can easily distinguish between those who represent the commercial interests and the agricultural interests. Even though some people may not own landed properties, still, by virtue of their having devoted a good amount of time to study the agricultural needs of the country, they can be said to represent the agricultural interests, because, after all, those who possess lands may not in some cases have the requisite ability or knowledge to represent their own interests, and since this is the only means by which agricultural interests can be represented in the Central Board, I request that my amendment be accepted.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Amendment moved:

"That in sub-clause (1) (b) of clause 8 of the Bill, after the words 'Governor General in Council' the words 'to represent agricultural interests of the country' be inserted."

The next amendment in the name of Mr. Mahapatra seems to be more comprehensive having the same object in view. Does Mr. Reddi want that his amendment should stand? Because the next amendment says:

"to represent territorial or economic interests not already represented, and in particular to represent the agricultural interests and the interests of Co-operative Banks."

What does Mr. Reddi say? Would he still desire his amendment to stand, or he would ask for leave to withdraw his amendment and allow Mr. Mahapatra to move his amendment?

**Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi:** If it is the desire of the House that I should withdraw my amendment, I have no objection.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): So he would ask for leave to withdraw his amendment?

**Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi**: Yes, Sir.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Has the Honourable Member the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

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

**Mr. Sitakanta Mahapatra** (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I beg to move:

"That to part (b) of sub-clause (1) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following be added at the end:

'to represent territorial or economic interests not already represented, and in particular to represent the agricultural interests and the interests of Co-operative Banks'."

Sir, I hope by moving this amendment I am not propounding a new theory. The Joint Select Committee have thought it wise to attach a proviso to sub-clause (1) (b) of clause 9 of the Bill giving a Statutory direction to the Central Board how to nominate members to the Local Boards. If you compare this proviso with my amendment, you will see that I have simply intended to place a Statutory direction for the guidance of the Governor General in Council also how to nominate Directors of the Central Board in the same sentiments and in the very same words. The Finance Member is committed to the proviso to sub-clause (1) (b) of clause 9, so far as the Central Board is concerned; but so far as the Governor General in Council is concerned, the clear desire of the Joint Select Committee has been expressed in unmistakable language at page 3 of their Report, and the Finance Member is obviously committed to it. The Joint Select Committee seem to have wished very much to incorporate such a direction for the guidance of the Governor General in Council in making nominations to the Central Board, but have apparently been scared away by the apprehensions of hurting the majesty of the Governor General in Council. The reasons they have advanced in a faltering manner in the paragraph under reference as to why they did not think it proper to lay down in the Statute such a proviso are quite unconvincing and inadequate, and so, apparently, they wanted this House to set things right. Sir, in the Reserve Bank, as it was introduced in 1927 by Sir Basil Blackett, there was Statutory provision for nomination of one Director to represent agriculture, and clear directions were laid down in the Bill for the guidance of the Governor General in Council for making nominations. In clause 8 of that Bill, as was accepted by this House, there was Statutory provision for the representation of Co-operative Banks by one Director and agricultural interests by two Directors through elections. In the 1928 Bill, that Sir Basil Blackett wanted to introduce in this House, there was a clear provision for the election of one Director to represent agriculture and Co-operative Banks, and this Bill he framed, as we all know, after crossing the seas to consult the Secretary of State personally. The natural father of the Bill under discussion is the experts Committee that assembled

in London last year, of which the Honourable the Finance Member himself was a member, and which included six other Honourable and very distinguished Members of this House. I shall read out the directions given by that Committee to the framers of this Bill:

"In view, however, of the fact that in the particular circumstances of India, election may fail to secure the representation of some important elements in the economic life of the country, such as agricultural interests, we recommend that a minority Board should be nominated by the Governor General in Council under the present Constitution and by the Governor General at his discretion under the new Constitution, it being understood that this power would be exercised to redress any such deficiencies."

I presume, Sir, there is a clear indication in this sentence for such a Statutory direction to the Governor General in Council, but as the proverbial ill luck of the Indian cultivator would have it, the framers of this Bill have failed to respect these directions. Now, the laudable sentiments and the pious desire, expressed by the Joint Select Committee in the paragraph above referred to, fully cover my purpose only if I know that they have any guarantee behind it. In the second sentence of the paragraph, it is not clear who it was that assured them anything. In the third sentence also, as I have said already, they don't mention their reasons why they did not consider it proper to lay down directions. But the most important passage is the last portion of it. The Report is before the public for the last three weeks. Has there been any exchange of views between the Finance Member and the London authorities over this question? If I only know that the powers that be have agreed to insert such a passage as recommended by the Joint Select Committee in the Instrument of Instructions to the Governor General, then my purpose of moving this amendment would be served. This House has thought it fit to disagree with the recommendations of the Joint Select Committee on several points. Who knows that the Imperial Government or the Parliament will accept this recommendation of the Joint Select Committee, although the Finance Member seems to be very jealous of the Committee's recommendations? Practically speaking, what is the amendment? Does it fetter the discretion of the Governor General in Council in any way? Even if this amendment is accepted, will there not still remain the widest latitude for the Governor General to exercise his discretion? What I want is simply to give Statutory effect to the very desires expressed by the Joint Select Committee in their report and the qualitative value of such desires, although in the nature of assurances, and a Statutory enactment have been discussed threadbare by the Honourable the Leader of the Centre Party. I cannot improve upon them. But then I tell you frankly echoing the same sentiments that you yourself expressed some years ago that we have no faith in mere wishes or assurances unless there be a Statutory guarantee. I know how helpless I am. All my advocacy on behalf of the ryot will be waste of breath unless I can invoke the sympathetic consideration of the Honourable the Finance Member. On this amendment, I believe the Honourable the Finance Member is one with me, and I hope that sympathetic consideration will be forthcoming. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty):** Amendment moved:

"That to part (b) of sub-clause (f) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following be added at the end:

'to represent territorial or economic interests not already represented, and in particular to represent the agricultural interests and the interests of Co-operative Banks.'"

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** I think the greater part of my Honourable friend's speech is really unnecessary. I have already referred the House to the recommendation in our own Select Committee's report. My Honourable friend has read out to the House the relevant passage from the recommendations of the London Committee and I have already referred to it in this House and stated the authority which the Secretary of State is prepared to give to the recommendations of the London Committee. In these circumstances, I think that my friend's doubts and suspicions are not justified. In fact this is not a matter of controversy at all. There is no reason to have doubts and suspicions about it. Every one, who has examined the position, has approached it in the same way and come to the same general conclusions and the only point is whether anything should actually be included in the Statute. For many reasons we felt it would be better that it should not be included in the Statute, but the substance of my Honourable friend's intention will, I am quite sure, be attained. On these grounds which I have already explained once today to the House, I must oppose my Honourable friend's amendment and take my stand on the Select Committee's report.

**Mr. Sitakanta Mahapatra:** May I put one question? Has the Honourable the Finance Member any information about inserting those recommendations in the Instrument of Instructions to the Governor General from the Secretary of State?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** No, Sir. We have had a great many points to raise and I have not actually asked for an immediate and specific answer about this from the Secretary of State. We have sent him the Joint Select Committee's report and I have not raised the question, because I feel no doubt about it in my own mind.

**Mr. Sitakanta Mahapatra:** In view of the assurance given, I ask leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

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

**Mr. K. P. Thampan:** Sir, I beg to move:

"That after part (b) of sub-clause (1) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following new part be inserted and the subsequent parts be re-lettered accordingly:

'(c) two Directors representing the interests of agriculture to be elected by provincial co-operative banks holding shares to the nominal value of not less than Rs. 5,000'."

The principle of having Directors to represent agricultural interests to be elected by Provincial Co-operative Banks has already been discussed and accepted. As my friend, Mr. Mahapatra, pointed out in connection with his amendment, this is a provision borrowed from Sir Basil Blackett's Bill of 1928. The difference is that in that Bill only one Director is provided, while I have provided for two Directors. Sir, it might be urged that if two extra Directors are appointed, the Directorate will rather become unwieldy. I might mention in this connection that the Bill of 1927 provided for, if my memory is correct, about 23 Directors, while,



in the Bill under discussion, we have provided only for 15. In the Bank of England also there are 24 members in the Directorate. So there is no difficulty in having two extra Directors to represent these special interests. I am sure, the idea will commend itself to the House.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Amendment moved:

"That after part (b) of sub-clause (1) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following new part be inserted and the subsequent parts be re-lettered accordingly :

'(c) two Directors representing the interests of agriculture to be elected by provincial co-operative banks holding shares to the nominal value of not less than Rs. 5,000'."

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt**: I am sorry I cannot support the amendment. I have been connected with these Co-operative Banks for a long time. One was established in my own village in 1907 and I have been the Secretary, Deputy Chairman and Director of the Central Co-operative Bank of my district.

**Mr. K. P. Thampan**: That is why it failed?

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt**: It never failed, but is the premier Central Bank in Bengal. I say that these Co-operative Banks hardly represent agricultural interests. Further, the wording of this amendment is hardly happy. It speaks of Directors representing the interests of agriculture. Certainly the Directors do not represent the interests of agriculture. You advance loans to village societies and thereby make the poor agriculturists more indebted and now-a-days loans cannot be had anywhere save and except through these Co-operative Banks, and if the banks do not withhold their hands, it will work ruin to the agriculturists. So I submit that neither the wording of my friend's amendment is happy nor are the words correct. The Directors certainly do not represent agricultural interests. In the circumstances, I am sorry I am obliged to oppose this amendment.

**Mr. B. V. Jadhav**. Sir, I rise to support the amendment. I am very sorry that my friend from Bengal is not very enthusiastic over the co-operative movement. My friend, as one belonging to the exploiters' class has done his work very well in raising a palatial building for housing the Co-operative Central Bank. He says that the Managers or Directors of the Bank are not much interested in the agriculturists and for that reason the Co-operative Banks are not properly managed. I agree with him there. The exploiter class has taken advantage of the co-operative movement and they have appropriated all the remunerative posts there and, in that way, have contributed their best to the ruin of the co-operative movement. But the movement is a very sound one and, wherever the agriculturists have freed themselves from the thralldom of this exploiter class, they are well able to take care of themselves. It is very necessary that they should have representation on the Directorate of the Reserve Bank and I, therefore, whole-heartedly support this amendment.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster**: Sir, I am afraid I must again oppose this amendment on the same sort of ground that I have taken in the last two discussions, viz., that it upsets the balance of our own carefully-balanced scheme. There appears to us to be no particular reason

[Sir George Schuster.]

for singling out Provincial Co-operative Banks to have the power of directly electing representatives to the Board. So far as it is necessary, we think that they will secure adequate representation either by the ordinary method of election or by virtue of the Governor General's power of nomination. I think, Sir, I need not repeat arguments which I have already used and I oppose this amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The question is:

"That after part (b) of sub-clause (1) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following new part be inserted and the subsequent parts be re-lettered accordingly:

'(c) two Directors representing the interests of agriculture to be elected by provincial co-operative banks holding shares to the nominal value of not less than Rs. 5,000'."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi**: Sir, I move:

"That in sub-clause (1) (c) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the words 'eight Directors' the words 'nine Directors' be substituted."

Sir, let not Government think that my intention is to increase the elected element. It is only intended to restore the equality in the representation of the Directorate. Sir, Madras has been given only one Director. In the matter of the agricultural and commercial importance of the Madras area, it stands on a par with other areas like Calcutta and Bombay, and hence I think Madras also should be given two Directors. I see it has been classed with Rangoon, which has only a small interest to represent. At least as the oldest Presidency and a very important Presidency, I urge that it should be given one more representative on the Directorate, and it is only to restore that equality that I request that there should be nine Directors instead of eight.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Amendment moved:

"That in sub-clause (1) (c) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the words 'eight Directors' the words 'nine Directors' be substituted."

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar**: Sir, I have also tabled a similar amendment and I therefore, support the present amendment. If the House will refer to the minutes of dissent, they will find that all the Madras Members, who were on the Joint Select Committee, have made a complaint that they have not got an equal number of Directors on the Madras List, and really speaking, I take it that this amendment is preliminary to the next amendment which is really a substantial amendment unless we be told to point out where the other Directors should come from and that is why this amendment has been moved. I do not think that it is in any way going to disturb the nicely balanced provisions of the Bill and I do hope that in view of the importance of the Madras Presidency, at any rate in view of the fact that for a long time in the past the Madras Presidency headed the list of provincial contributions and thus made money available to the Government of India, and of the fact that the Madras Presidency is the senior Presidency, whatever people might say about its being benighted, I would request the Honourable the Finance Member to

accept this very very modest request of ours, especially as it is supported by all the Madras Members who sat there in deliberation with him.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** Sir, I find some difficulty in agreeing to this amendment. This has brought out the question of provincial representation on the Directorate of the Bank, and it will be observed that Rangoon has also got only one Director like Madras. Sir, the voice of Madras is vociferous on the floor of this House, while none has made any reference to Rangoon. I think if any Member from Burma had been here, he would have expressed regret at this fact. Sir, I think it would be unfair to disturb the equilibrium which has been arrived at in the Select Committee by increasing the number of Directors for Madras.

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar:** Because Rangoon has not been given one additional Director, therefore Madras should not be given one additional Director?

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** On the merits also I find that the claim of Madras has been over-stated. Madras, Sir, has over-representation from the highest in this House (Laughter) downwards, and I think Madras would do well to exercise some self-restraint and impose a limit on its own ambition. I hope this amendment will be withdrawn.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** Sir, I am finding support this afternoon in most unexpected quarters. (Laughter.) I can quite understand the motives of my Honourable friends who support this amendment and I quite realize that if they do not support it, they run the risk of being greeted with black flags and cries of disapprobation when they return to their constituencies. But I think my Honourable friend, who has just spoken, has really said all that need be said on the matter. We have, after a very careful consideration, arrived at this evenly balanced scheme and I should be very loth to disturb it.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The question is:

“That in sub-clause (1) (c) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the words ‘eight Directors’ the words ‘nine Directors’ be substituted.”

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. K. P. Thampan:** Sir, I move:

“That in sub-clause (1) (c) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the word ‘eight’ the word ‘thirteen’ be substituted.”

Sir, if this amendment is accepted, I propose, as suggested in my amendments Nos. 8 to 10, that the number of Directors from all the provinces may be increased by one more. Sir, the only objection that could be urged against my proposal is that the Directorate will become very unwieldy. I may instance the case of the Bank of England, which has got 24 Directors, and in Sir Basil Blackett's Bill also provision was made for 23 Directors. Eight is too small a number. Sir, the more Directors there are, the more representative the Directorate becomes and, for this large country of diverse interests and large population, with

[Mr. K. P. Thampan.]

agriculture as their staple industry, it is highly desirable to have as large a Directorate as possible. I hope my amendment will be accepted.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Amendment moved:

"That in sub-clause (1) (c) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the word 'eight' the word 'thirteen' be substituted."

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster**: Sir, it has always been an essential feature of this scheme that the Board of Directors should be kept as small as possible. When I say "as small as possible", I mean as small as would be consistent with giving adequate representation to the various areas and the various interests in India. After careful thought, we came to the conclusion that a Board of 12 Directors, apart from the Governor and the Chief Executive Officers of the Bank, would give adequate representation and, on this ground, I must oppose my Honourable friend's amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The question is:

"That in sub-clause (1) (c) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the word 'eight' the word 'thirteen' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad**: Sir, I beg to move:

"That in sub-clause (1) (c) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the words 'eight Directors to be elected on behalf of the shareholders on the various registers in the manner provided in section 9 and in the following numbers, namely :—' the following be substituted :

'eight Directors to be elected by shareholders on the various registers in the following numbers, namely :—'."

Sir, in this motion I am raising one of the most important issues in the Shareholders Bank and that is the question of direct and indirect representation. I hope that my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, will at least in this case appreciate the arguments that I will bring forward and, if he is convinced, he will abide by them, although I have very little hopes. Sir, there are several kinds of intoxications. Some persons suffer from the intoxication of opium which lulls them into sleep and, therefore, they do nothing. Others suffer from the intoxication of *ganja* which makes them think upside down and they feel that they are being raised to the Heaven. Then there are some persons who suffer from the intoxication of wine and they too have a similar kind of feeling. But, in addition to all this, there is another kind of intoxication which is much more damaging than any of these intoxications.

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt**: Sir, I protest against the insinuations of the Honourable Member.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad**: I very much appreciate the remark of the Honourable Member, but I am afraid he has not been able to understand me, because I have not yet come to the conclusion. As I was saying,

in addition to all these three kinds of intoxication, there is another kind of intoxication which is much worse than either of these and that is the intoxication of having the votes of the majority in the pocket. A person who has been intoxicated by having the majority of votes in his pocket loses his judgment and also loses his commonsense.

**Mr. R. S. Sarma:** I hope the Honourable Member will admit that his Party Leader has not got that intoxication.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** I am not entering into personalities. Sir, such a man loses his sense of proportion and tries to stick to every word that he once uttered, because he has got the consolation that, when the votes will be taken, he is certain that he will win the day in spite of his being unreasonable. In this case, however, I appeal to the Honourable the Finance Member that he should carefully consider the arguments which I am going to advance in favour of direct representation. Sir, there are three arguments which I would like to develop. My first argument is that the number of voters is very small and it does not justify the formation of an electoral college. The second argument is that as your electoral college is too small, the election will be a farce. This point I will illustrate later on. My third argument is that you are going to start a novel practice which does not exist either in any company or in any Central Bank and also it did not exist in the Bill which was presented by Sir Basil Blackett in 1927.

Now, let me take up the first argument, namely, that the number of voters is not sufficiently large to justify the formation of an electoral college in the name of the Local Boards. I would not oppose the formation of Local Boards for other purposes, but I am opposing the assignment of the function of an electoral college. After making calculations, I have come to the conclusion that the number of actual voters in every circle will be from 350 to 550 and for this small number it is hardly necessary that we should go in for an electoral college. My friend, the Finance Member, will again say that here I am dealing with a hypothetical case. But I would like to remind him that, in every branch of mathematics, there is the theory of probability, and all problems are solved by means of that theory. He may brush aside the case that I am going to put forward by saying that it is an example of a hypothetical number bringing forward a hypothetical case illustrated in a hypothetical speech, but I submit that all these are mere pleasantries.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury).]

I want this problem to be solved in a particular manner. The other day Mr. Neogy said something about my Honourable friend's Department and I will emphasise it on other occasions. One thing I must say about my Honourable friend's Department is that it possesses all kinds of hooks which really serve the purpose of getting the money from the vest coat pockets, trouser pockets, coat pockets, and I do not know how many thousands of such hooks he possesses. Coming back to my argument, I said that there will be only 350 to 550 voters. Now, we have got a capital of five crores divided into shares of Rs. 100 each; therefore, there will be five lakhs of shares. The number of votes will be one lakh, if no vote is wasted. But the votes of persons who hold one, two, three

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

or four shares will be wasted, also those who hold six, seven, nine or eleven, and so on, will be wasted. The useful votes are those who have shares which are exact multiples of five. I have calculated this from various standpoints and the minimum amount of wastage on account of this fraction will be 20 per cent. Then, any person who holds 50 shares of the value of Rs. 5,000, will be eligible to give ten votes, but the shares of the value of more than Rs. 5,000 will also be wasted. There will be no votes for the holders of these shares for an amount exceeding Rs. 5,000. We insisted that there should be a minimum of this wastage, but by the majority of votes we decided that there should be no limit and the amount of wastage here also will be at least 20 per cent. To my mind, it will be more later on, but, taking the lowest figure, it is bound to be at least 20 per cent. Therefore, the number of available voters by deducting this 40 per cent of this wastage will be only 60,000. This much about the votes.

I now come to the voters. One person can exercise one vote, two votes up to ten votes. Therefore, by the well-known formula of his own Department the average number of votes which a person can have will be seven which figure is obtained thus: Twice the maximum *plus* the minimum divided by three. Therefore, the average number of votes, exercised by each voter, will be seven. Therefore, the actual number of voters will be only 9,000. That will be the number of voters of the shareholders under the scheme which is now before us. Now, these 9,000 voters are divided into five different circles. Therefore, in one circle there will be 1,800 voters. It is the experience of all those persons who have come by election that the number of voters who actually vote is never more than 30 per cent of the actual number, it varies between 20 to 30 per cent. Twenty per cent in ordinary elections and thirty per cent in contested elections. Taking all these into consideration, the actual number of voters available will only be from 350 to 550, it will be 350 when there is not a keen election and 550 when there is a contested election.

**Mr. S. C. Mitra** (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): We do not understand how you have arrived at these figures.

**The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter:** I think the Honourable Member would do well to bring a black-board to explain; because we cannot follow.

**Mr. R. S. Sarma:** I suggest to the Honourable Member the desirability of issuing a memorandum explaining his figures and in the meantime we can take his speech as read.

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury): Honourable Members will please allow Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad to proceed with his speech without interruption.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** I always thought that the Finance Department would work out those figures. I was saying that out of a lakh, 40 per cent. goes in wastage. Then we are left with 60,000. On account of plurality of votes, a man may not exercise up to one or up to ten votes and, therefore, the average will be about 9,000 votes available. Therefore, the number

of actual voters that will be available will only be from 350 to 550. I say, this number is not sufficiently large to justify the establishment of an electoral college.

The second point, a much more important point is that the electoral college is so small that it is certainly not election but jobbery, and I am going to illustrate how the thing will be worked. Though the thing will be worked in camera, yet I am going to explain in the open Assembly how election in the case of the Local Board will be taken up for the Central Board. Supposing, for example, there are two honest persons who are very clever and who are very rich and who have got the best brain and the greatest business ability. Supposing, as against them, there is another man like myself who is the most scheming man and I want to get elected. I will tell you how I will do so. I first approach my friend, Mr. Mitra, and tell him "come along with me, let us both form a group and then if we can get one more man, probably we can defeat these two honest men, who depend on their ability and on their integrity and upon nothing else. Let us combine together and get elected". Both of us approach a fifth man, say, my Honourable friend, Mr. Raju, and put forward to him a bargain, and tell him: "if you vote with us and give us your vote, both of us will promise that we would make you with our votes a substitute Director". I myself will absent from two of the meetings and my friend, Mr. Mitra, will absent from two other meetings alternately, so that Mr. Raju will have four meetings of the Central Board. In addition to this, we make another promise to my friend, Mr. Raju, saying that the three persons who will be nominated for the Local Board by the Central Board will be his friends, Mr. A, Mr. B and Mr. C, and that with these three persons and himself Mr. Raju can rule the Local Board. We ask him in return for these promises that he should join us in getting us elected. I think it will require more than average honesty to say no. Since my friend, Mr. Raju, has agreed to our proposal, those two honest fellows, who are depending on their business ability and who do not know what is going on behind the curtain, will come to the meeting and will find surrounded by an interested plot; and this is the way in which elections will be carried on for the Central Board from the Local Board. Do you call this an election or do you call it a jobbery? The scheming man will get things done in the way he likes and he will manage the election just as I have described. As far as I know, no election on these lines is conducted in any institution.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** Has my Honourable friend got any figures or statistics or theory of probabilities to show how he arrives at his assumption that in all cases 60 per cent. of the elected Directors on the Local Board will be dishonest?

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** I think my Honourable friend's interruption was intended only to stop the effect of what I have been saying. This is really an index of his possessing a majority of votes on his side.

**The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter:** Why does my Honourable friend take himself so very seriously?

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** I am always serious when discussing mathematical problems. In mathematics, there is no room for any joke, it is all a serious thing. As I was saying, this is the way in which the election to the Local Board will be carried on. The electoral college of five persons is quite a misnomer. Really speaking, there will be no proper election and two persons

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

by giving an inducement to a third person can always get a majority of votes in a particular manner. If by chance one man absents himself from a meeting, then there will no necessity to offer any such inducement to my friend, Mr. Raju. One of us may be elected as President and the two honest fellows will never vote for themselves, because if my friend, Mr. Mitra, proposes me as the Chairman of the Committee, then the two persons with the casting vote of the Chairman will always secure election of the two persons whom they want. This thing actually happened in the election of a Master of a College of a particular University. I shall not give out the names of the College and the University. There were four fellows in a College, of whom one man, the Master died, and three persons were required to elect a fellow, one of them was the most competent man and the other a senior man and the third was neutral.

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury): I think the Honourable Member has already made his point sufficiently clear and he need not repeat his point once again.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** I shall cite this story or rather the incident on some other occasion. I took this point and I wanted to illustrate the same by means of one or two examples and this is the way in which these elections are carried on. These elections are always carried on by a small group in this fashion. If you have got five persons for electing two, really speaking that is not election. It is a kind of managed election, like the managed currency, a kind of stage-managed election that is carried on by one or two persons who know how to manœuvre and how to secure votes.

I have said that in the first place the number is not sufficiently large to justify the formation of an electoral college, and in the second place in his electoral college, the number is so small, namely, five that the election will be a mere farce, it will be a manipulated election, it will not be a real election.

My third point is the merit of indirect election. We, in India, have always opposed indirect election. A great controversy has been going on as to whether it is sound to have indirect election for Local Boards, for Municipalities and even for the Legislatures, and the Indian opinion has always been decidedly against the formation of electoral colleges and they always supported direct election. I took some great pains to read the Acts of the various Central Banks in different countries to find out whether there was any example of indirect election for the Directorate of any Central Bank—probably I might have missed out the constitution of some—but of all the banking Statutes that I consulted, I did not find a single constitution in which the Directors of the Central Board were elected by indirect election and not directly by the shareholders. My friend has emphasised on the floor of the House that we should follow the example of civilised countries and that we should not have a State Bank, but we should have a Shareholders Bank in order that the civilised countries may have some more confidence in our scheme. But when we come to this question of direct or indirect election, my Honourable friend will get up and say that the conditions in India are very peculiar, that it is a vast country which is split up into so many provinces and, therefore, we should have an indirect election here. But you cannot have one principle to be used in one case and another principle brought up for another. Now, I come to my own country. When Sir Basil Blackett first produced his scheme of a Shareholders Bank, he provided in clause 9 that "nine Directors are to be elected



by shareholders, each of whom shall be a registered holder in his own right of no less than 20 unencumbered shares in the Bank and of whom two shall be elected to represent business interests, and so forth". That is, indirect election is not provided, and I cannot understand how the question of indirect election has been allowed to creep in our Bill, and it is surprising that nobody has raised his voice against it. My Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, is a great expert in business and the administration of companies; my Honourable friend, Mr. Sen, is an expert in company law. I wish these two gentlemen may get up and say in which companies Directors are elected through an electoral college and not directly by shareholders. I think this is a unique example and we are creating a history in the organisation of Central Banks by introducing the principle of indirect election by means of electoral colleges; and, not only in the history of Central Banks, but in the history of the administration of companies. My friend may perhaps bring forward one example, but really one example cannot wipe out a million other examples.

The next point I should like to bring out is that we have been emphasising the creation of democratic spirit which will be introduced by means of the shareholders, but I find that the position of the shareholders will be like that insect which produces an issue and immediately dies out. I have forgotten the biological name of that insect, but probably some one may enlighten me. That will be exactly the position of the shareholders. They will come forward and elect a member for the electoral college and, afterwards, they have nothing more to say except that they will go on receiving their dividends. I think this is a question of extreme importance. It will not affect the scheme; the Local Boards will remain as they are and everything will remain as it is. But, if my Honourable friend will accept the position that the Directors may be represented direct by shareholders to whom they should directly be responsible and not responsible to the Local Boards, then that will give greater satisfaction and it will not upset any of his schemes. It will require very small modification, that is, sub-clause (9) will have to be omitted and two or three words in another clause will have to be omitted and the whole scheme of the Shareholders Bank will remain in tact. Sir, with these words, I move my amendment.

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury): Amendment moved:

"That in sub-clause (1) (c) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the words 'eight Directors to be elected on behalf of the shareholders on the various registers, in the manner provided in section 9 and in the following numbers, namely:—the following be substituted:

'eight Directors to be elected by shareholders on the various registers in the following numbers, namely:—'."

**Mr. S. C. Sen** (Bengal National Chamber of Commerce: Indian Commerce): Sir, I fully support this amendment. We have had a long discussion as to whether this Bank should be a Shareholders Bank or a State Bank, and this House has, after a good deal of deliberation, come to the conclusion that it ought to be a Shareholders Bank. But the Shareholders Bank ought to have some authority or power given to the shareholders. The only power, as my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, stated, was the right of the shareholders to nominate Directors, but the scheme of the Bill has not even given that vestige of right to the shareholders. What is the right of the shareholders? The shareholders' right, as Dr. Ziauddin pointed out, is only to elect an Electoral Board for the purpose of electing Directors. Why should not, they have the direct right of

[Mr. S. C. Sen.]

appointing Directors? I know the scheme which has been propounded here is a well balanced scheme, but, at the same time, I do not see anything which justifies the introduction of indirect election which has throughout this country been abandoned for many years. Why should that be stuck to? In the Bengal Council, before the introduction of the present reforms,—I do not know whether this was the case in other provinces also,—members came by indirect election from Municipalities or District Boards. But that was abandoned, because it did not accord with the democratic ideas of the time. Why should that antediluvian idea be stuck to in the present legislation, I do not know. If you make a direct representation of the shareholders to nominate the Directors, I do not see that the scheme, as enunciated in the Bill, will be in any way jeopardised or will be changed in any way. A mere verbal alteration here and there will be sufficient and everything will go on all right. Of course the Honourable the Finance Member on a previous occasion stated that there would be practical difficulties in giving the shareholders power over the actions of the Directors, but here nothing of the kind will be done. Only the Directors will be appointed at the same time as they will be called upon to appoint the local bodies.

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

In these circumstances, no extra cost will be incurred, no extra labour will be involved and the whole thing will go on as if it is an ordinary election. In my experience about company matters, I have never come across any company where a similar thing is done. Of course it is not possible to have that thing done, because the shareholders are the owners of the company. But, here, although the shareholders have to pay and to receive a fixed dividend, they have nothing to do with the management. They are not even the owners of the Reserve Bank. That may be the difference, but, at the same time, I do not see why they should not be allowed to have direct election as regards the Directors. With these words, I support the amendment of Dr. Ziauddin.

**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar:** Mr. President, I am anxious that the position should be correctly appreciated by the House. I may say at once that I have a great deal of sympathy with the underlying idea of my friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, but it seems to me that it is a somewhat over-statement of the case to suggest that this is merely an indirect election and that the shareholders have really no voice in electing the Directors to the Central Board. I wish to draw the attention of my friend to this aspect of the case. What happens? The shareholders elect five members to the Local Board. Of these five, two are bound to be the Directors of the Central Board; therefore, the shareholders have really elected two Directors to the Central Board; let there be no mistake about it. I can well understand if there were a power given to the Local Board to elect any two persons—not from among themselves—as Directors to the Central Board: but that is not the case. The power is to choose two of their own men as Directors of the Central Board. Therefore, particularly where the Local Board is asked to elect two Directors to the Central Board, it may be taken without any violence to the imagination that the shareholders have elected two Directors—at any rate they have elected five persons of whom two shall be Directors of the Central Board: I think it

is a little overstating the case to suggest that the shareholders have had no share in the election of the Directors and that the electoral college is ridiculously small. As regards the argument that the electoral college is ridiculously small, if the first statement, that I have just made, is correctly appreciated, Members will realise that it is of importance to narrow down the Local Board; if the shareholders at any rate are going to elect 20 members to the Local Board and these 20 are called upon to elect two Directors, the chances of somebody, of whom the shareholders are really not keen, are very much more than in the other case; and if my friend will apply the theory of probabilities, he will find that at least it is 700 per cent. more if the electoral college is 20 than it will be if it is 5 . . . . .

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** May I just point out one case to him: had there been direct election, then these two honest persons of my story would have been elected and not let down by the intrigue of one man.

**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar:** Had there been a direction, these two gentlemen would never have been elected at all. That is my simple answer to the question, and it is because some of us feel that there is some point in getting proper, able and honest men to this Central Board, which is much more important than a membership of the Local Board, that this idea of a double-distilled election has been thought of. It seems to me that my friend, while, as I say, I am in great sympathy with the idea of direct election—and I should not be understood by anything that I have said to subscribe in any degree to the principle of indirect election,—I suggest that my friend has overstated the case in stating that the shareholders have nothing at all, that they die immediately after their issues are born, and that the Directors of the Central Board have no organic relation at all with the shareholders. I suggest that they do have a very important organic relation. What will happen in practice is merely this: that the Local Board is elected: the President and Vice-President have to be chosen for the Local Board. I do suggest that the President and Vice-President of the Local Board will *ex-officio* be the Directors of the Central Board. There can be no question of election of Directors to the Central Board: that could not really be called indirect election, and the shareholders, when they elect Directors to the Local Board, ought to be considered to have taken into consideration the proper persons to occupy the places of President and Vice-President. In actual practice, I have no doubt that this is how it will work, as it has practically in connection with the Imperial Bank. I, therefore, suggest that it will be not a very correct statement to say that the shareholders have no voice at all in the election of the Directors and that this plan may be accepted.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** I do not know how my Honourable friends opposite have fared, but I think I am entitled to say that of my colleagues here, judging from the comments of the Honourable the Law Member, I certainly was the only man who followed my Honourable and very learned friend's argument. My Honourable friend told us of various kinds of intoxication, but I think his list is incomplete. There is another kind which he did not mention and that is intoxication from one's own intellectual ingenuity. (Laughter.) My Honourable friend very often comes before us in a highly elevated frame of mind. His own intellectual ingenuity so inspires and exhilarates him that he produces sometimes some very frightening pictures. I think that the whole of his

[Sir George Schuster.]

case falls to the ground when I point out that this awful result which is held out before us is based entirely on the assumption that out of five elected Directors only two in all cases and for all time will be honest men. I suggest that that is a very unfair assumption; and even if it were the case, even if two are honest men and three are rogues, I believe—I am not very skilled myself in the working principles of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote—but surely my Honourable friend will bear me out that if, on a Board of five a man receives two first choices, he will be elected. Is that not so? (*An Honourable Member*: “Yes.”) I think that that is so. Now, according to clause 57(2)(a) of this Bill, the holding and conduct of elections will be held on the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote. Therefore, these three wicked men who sit on the front bench—my Honourable friend himself and his two next door neighbours—will succeed in one of the two directorships and the two upright and honest men sitting behind him will also be successful in securing the election of one of them. Therefore, I suggest that my Honourable friend's very pessimistic conclusion is not justified . . . . .

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** May I just know in what part of the Bill the principle of proportional representation in the election of the members of the Central Board by the Local Board is provided?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** Yes, in clause 57(2)(a); that is the principle which is to apply to all elections under this Bill. Now, my Honourable friend, Mr. Sen, said that he had never known of any company where this principle was followed. But, as was pointed out by the last speaker, we are in fact in this proposal merely following the principle which has been followed in practice with great success by the Imperial Bank. The position there is that the Local Boards elect their own President and Vice-President, and the President and Vice-President automatically sit on the Central Board. That was our model for the present scheme: we do not lay claim to any great ingenuity for having devised this . . . . .

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** May I interrupt and say that it is just this example which we should not like to follow because it is such a bad example, as amply illustrated by Mr. Pandya.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** My Honourable friend is entitled to his opinion as I am entitled to mine; and, I submit, that for a company which has to spread its activities over the whole of a vast sub-continent like India, the method which has been evolved in the case of the Imperial Bank is a practical success, and that it would be very difficult to find a practical method which is more likely to be successful than this has been. That is how we arrived at this proposal. I do not go so far as to claim any certainty of success for it: I think he would be a very bold man who could claim that for any feature of this Bill it was an absolute certainty that it was going to be a success. That must be a matter of experience; but, in a very difficult case where it is extremely difficult to devise practical measures which have any chance of success, I submit that the scheme which we have now holds the field and that no other preferable scheme has been put forward. One must remember that there are two things to be

kept in mind. These Local Boards may have, in the course of evolution, some useful functions of their own to perform. That we are providing for in a way which could not possibly be provided for by creating mere electoral colleges; and, secondly, one has to provide for some practical means for securing the attention of the shareholders scattered all over India to this important duty of carrying out the elections of Directors. I submit that this is a scheme which has great chances of success and the whole of my Honourable friend's case in attacking that claim falls to the ground, because his conclusions are only reached after a series of six or seven steps of assumptions, each of which is a very questionable assumption. On these grounds, I oppose the amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The question is:

"That in sub-clause (1) (c) of clause 8 of the Bill, for the words 'eight Directors to be elected on behalf of the shareholders on the various registers, in the manner provided in section 9 and in the following number, namely:—'the following be substituted:

'eight Directors to be elected by shareholders on the various registers in the following numbers, namely:—'."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The next amendment is No. 93 standing in the name of Mr. Jadhav. That has been disposed of already.

Then the next amendment is the one standing in the name of Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar, No. 94. Does the Honourable Member want to move it?

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar**: Yes, Sir; I wish to move it.

Sir, this is the one amendment which does not interfere with what has now become a classic in this discussion of this well balanced Bill. I do not disturb the number "eight", I do not disturb any of the numbers which the Committee and this Bill have provided for the proper working of this Bill. All that I say is, instead of leaving the nomination of Directors, etc., to chance in the case of agricultural interests, I desire that it should be provided . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Chair has got a doubt whether it is in order for this reason. When the whole scheme is that the eight Directors ought to be elected by five different registers, how is he going to make sure that two Directors would represent agricultural interests?

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar**: If the idea is provided for the representation of agricultural interests, then some method must be provided for it.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): But he does not propose the method. He does not seek to impose any obligation on a particular register to elect a certain minimum of agricultural interests.

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar**: We expect the highest only to be two. It seemed to me unfair that one register only should bear the

[Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar.]

responsibility. That is the reason why I said that two out of these eight shall be representatives of agricultural interests, and I would suggest one out of Madras and another out of Bombay. Sir, if you will allow me to make this small alteration, I shall be obliged. I did feel the difficulty a few minutes ago, but I thought we might be able to get over it by the subsidiary clause added to it,—one out of Madras and one out of Bombay.

**An Honourable Member:** Why not Rangoon?

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar:** I do not like to include Rangoon in view of all the *gadbads* that is going on in London, and Burma may go out, and the whole scheme will fail.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member must move it as it is and take his chance.

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar:** But surely, Sir, you might help me.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Chair is prepared to agree if the Honourable Member makes any small verbal alteration; the Chair will not take any objection to that, but there is no use of the Honourable Member saying vaguely what is in his mind. How exactly would he likely to move the amendment, would he just tell the Chair?

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar:**

"Provided, however, that at least two of the eight Directors so elected, one out of the Madras register and one out of the Bombay register, shall be representatives of agricultural interests."

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Very well, the Chair will put one out of the Madras and one out of the Bombay register.

**Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Take one from Bengal.

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar:** Will the Bengal gentlemen agree?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member must make up his mind.

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar:** One out of Madras and one out of Bengal. Sir, I am afraid of going near Bombay, because they are so strong in their industrial interests that I will get my whole thing knocked out if I approach Bombay, but Bengal is fairly agricultural, and Madras is wholly agricultural. Therefore, I beg to move:

"That to sub-clause (1) (c) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following proviso be added:

'Provided that at least two of the eight Directors so elected, namely, the one Madras Director and one of the two out of the Bengal Register, shall be representatives of agricultural interests.'

Sir, I do not want to take up the time of the House by entering into a long argument. It is admitted that agricultural interests should be represented, and, as at present devised, the only arrangement is that it will be provided in the Instrument of Instructions to the Governor General that, in making nominations, he should have these things in view. I have no doubt that these things will be kept in view, but I think it will be far more satisfactory if the verdict comes out of the shareholders' mouth and they say that such and such gentlemen shall represent their interests. I make a special point of it, because, I believe, in clause 53, it is stated that "within a period of three years the Central Board shall lay before the Legislature, if necessary, a scheme for a full course of rural credit, and, in order to devise that, it is absolutely necessary that men, who have had local experience and who come by election, should be on the Board in order that they may give all their experience to the Board and thus make up a rural credit scheme. That, Sir, is my argument.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Amendment moved:

"That to sub-clause (1) (c) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following proviso be added:

'Provided that at least two of the eight Directors so elected, namely, the one Madras Director and one of the two out of the Bengal Register, shall be representatives of agricultural interests'."

**Mr. G. Morgan** (Bengal: European): Sir, I would just like to say one word on this absolutely impracticable amendment of my Honourable friend. First of all, there is no Bengal register.

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar**: I mean Calcutta.

**Mr. G. Morgan**: Very well, it is the Calcutta register. Would my friend take the trouble to read Schedule III and find out what the Eastern area consists of? On that register I would ask him to move another amendment stipulating which part is to represent the agricultural interests and which part to represent the other interests. Sir, I am not going to make a long speech on this subject, because the amendment is so impracticable that all I can do is to oppose it absolutely.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster**: Sir, I must also oppose my friend's amendment. It would mean that we should be laying an obligation on the shareholders on the Madras register and on the Calcutta register, that the Madras register should always appoint a man to represent agricultural interests and that the Calcutta shareholders should always appoint one out of the two. I do not think we are entitled to put that obligation on them, and the result might be to secure considerable over-representation of agricultural interests. I am sure, my friend, on further consideration, will agree to withdraw his amendment.

**Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar**: 95 per cent. of the agricultural population and still over-representation?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The question is:

"That to sub-clause (1) (c) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following proviso be added:

'Provided that at least two of the eight Directors so elected, namely, the one Madras Director and one of the two out of the Calcutta Register, shall be representatives of agricultural interests'."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The next amendment is the one in the name of Mr. Lalchand Navalrai. Does the Honourable Member want to move it?

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai**: Yes, Sir; I want to move it; but on this I should like to bring one matter to the notice of the Chair. This amendment may depend on the fact whether 75 per cent. of the shares would be available for Indians. That question has not yet been settled. It would come under clause 4, and that has been kept in abeyance.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): This need not necessarily depend upon that.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai**: The view of the Government would be clear if that amendment is accepted.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Does the Honourable Member want to move his amendment No. 95?

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai**: Yes, Sir.

I will not take long.

**An Honourable Member**: Five minutes?

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai**: Even less than five minutes.

Sir, I move:

"That to part (d) of sub-clause (1) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following proviso be added:

'Provided that not less than three-fourths of the Directors shall be domiciled Indian subjects of His Majesty'."

Sir, on this point it is quite clear that what we want is that Indian interests should be protected and Indians given a greater hand in this Reserve Bank. I think, instead of giving my own arguments on this point, I would refer to what has been said on this point in the note of dissent on page 17 of the Joint Committee Report. It is said:

"In case our proposal for a State Bank is not accepted by the Legislature, we insist that the following modifications are indispensable:

Not less than three-fourths of the Directors or members of the Local Boards should be native Indian subjects of His Majesty."

This minute of dissent has been signed by no less than nine members. I need not mention their names. They are on page 19. The reply to this is in the report of the Joint Committee itself and that we find on page 4. It is said:

"As regards the general purpose of this sub-clause, the non-official members of the Committee have made it clear that they would not consider anything less than 75 per



cent. of the voting Directors as affording a proper representation of Indians. We have received an assurance on behalf of the Government from the Government members of the Committee that the Governor General in Council will exercise his powers so as to ensure the proper representation of Indians on the first Board."

**Mr. Bhuput Sing:** This is in regard to the first nomination.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** But the principle is the same. What I would emphasize is that the whole thing is left in the hands of the Government. We all know how words and phrases in English are liable to several interpretations and misinterpretations. Besides, it is no assurance at all. I do not think the Government are serious in denying us that right. Then, why should it not be specifically mentioned in the Bill itself and not left to be liable to any distortion later on. It should be clearly stated in the Bill itself that 75 per cent. of the Directors would be Indians. I do not want to take any more time of the House at this fag end of the day. I trust that the House will strongly support my amendment.

**The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter:** On a point of information. What does the Honourable Member mean by Indian subjects of His Majesty? Does he include or exclude subjects of the Indian States?

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** I find there is an amendment, No. 114, by Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar which is more comprehensive, I was conscious of that difference and if I were sure that he would move it this time . . .

**The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter:** My question was whether he intended to include or exclude Indian States.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** If the other amendment is not moved, I would press this.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty):** The Honourable Member has explained it. Amendment moved:

"That to part (d) of sub-clause (f) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following proviso be added:

' Provided that not less than three-fourths of the Directors shall be domiciled Indians subjects of His Majesty '."

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** As regards the general intention of this amendment, I have already given my arguments against it in the speech which I made at the end of the general discussion on this Bill. Apart from that, I think that my Honourable friend's amendment might be unworkable in practice for the same reasons that I pointed out in connection with the last amendment. If in fact, the elections do not produce this result, I do not know how my friend proposes that they should be corrected. Apart from that, it is open to the objection that I have already pointed out on many occasions. We must regard it as technically a discriminatory provision and the furthest that we have been able to go to meet the views of Honourable Members who attach importance to this sort of provision has already been made clear by me in the discussion in the Joint Committee and in the statement which I have already made.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The question is:

"That to part (d) of sub-clause (1) of clause 8 of the Bill, the following proviso be added:

'Provided that not less than three-fourths of the Directors shall be domiciled Indians subjects of His Majesty'."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. V. K. A. Aravamudha Ayangar** (Government of India: Nominated Official): Sir, I rise to move:

"That sub-clause (2) of clause 8 of the Bill be omitted."

Sir, the objections to the retention of this provision in this clause have been stated in the note appended by the Government members in the Joint Committee to that Committee's report. If I may state the objections, they are these. In the first place, the phrase "tested banking experience" is very vague and is likely to give rise to difficulties in interpretation. Who is to conduct this test? What would be a satisfactory test? What is the kind of banking experience in view? Is it experience as a Director of a Bank or is it experience in any executive capacity in the Bank? All these things are so vague that it is not proper to include such a vague provision in a Statute. In the second place, as pointed out by the Government members, if what we have in view is experience of commercial banking, the qualifications and experience required in the head of a central banking institution are not necessarily acquired in commercial banking, and if commercial banking experience is the only kind of experience, the period of five years is too short. I will go further and say that experience as a joint stock banker, whose outlook has been cribbed, cabined and confined by the narrowness of profit-earning pursuits cannot always secure that breadth of vision and that appreciation of broader national interests that are essential in the head of a central banking institution. To sum up, the Government are in entire agreement with the Joint Committee that the Governor, who is chosen as the head of the Bank, should be one who will command the confidence not only of the general public, but also of commercial and banking circles and the best way to achieve this result is not to narrow the field of choice in the way that is proposed to be done by sub-clause (2), but to leave it as wide as possible. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Amendment moved:

"That sub-clause (2) of clause 8 of the Bill be omitted."

**Mr. B. Sitaramaraju**: I rise to oppose this amendment. It comes with refreshing relief to find Honourable Members opposite moving for the omission of a clause under this Bill. There are many on this side of the House who would like to omit a good many clauses of the Bill and what is more, they have got this in their favour. They could advance reasons much more convincing than those advanced by my Honourable friend, the Mover of this amendment, with all respect to him. Here is a case where the members of the Joint Committee have laid very great stress and they have said that you cannot appoint any person and every person to this high office. They said that the person who holds this high office should have some banking experience. The Honourable

the Mover of the amendment asks, what is tested banking experience? Is it practical experience in banking or is it Director's experience? He knows more than anyone else in this House what is meant to be understood by banking experience. We know that the Honourable Members who belong to the Indian Civil Service are said to be qualified to hold many different positions in this country. It may be that they have no special experience or knowledge, but still they are appointed to high offices in matters relating to industries and agriculture, education, and so forth, on no other ground of knowledge and experience, but that they have probably acquired a little bit of Latin and Greek in passing through their examinations. Sir, I should say that in reality if there is one service where the least qualifications for utility have been prescribed, it is that service; and there are the men appointed to all high offices; and with that experience behind us, we are nervous and are anxious to secure that, in the case of an important office like this, there should be given no loophole to the Government to appoint persons to this job who are the least qualified to hold this position. After all, even the dissenting minute of Sir George Schuster and Mr. Taylor does not say that banking experience should *not* be a qualification. They suggest, if I remember their note aright, they said if this were to be a qualification, that is not enough and that is not the only qualification. Sir, it was very difficult for me to find out what they exactly meant. Do they mean to say, or do they mean not to say, that banking experience should or should not be a qualification or even one of the qualifications? If they say that it is not the only qualification and that there must be other qualifications besides that, I for one might agree, but if they mean to deny that the persons holding that high office need not necessarily have the experience of the functions of a banker, I venture to submit that I cannot agree with them. Assuming for the moment that banking experience is considered a necessary qualification for that purpose, inconsistently enough they say that five years' experience of banking is not sufficient. But is not something better than nothing? This is intended to prevent the Government making undesirable appointments, particularly when we feel that the post is one which should command the confidence of the people of India, an appointment which should carry with it the prestige of the great Central Bank that we are going to have. Therefore, is it unreasonable to consider that the Governor of this Bank at least should know something of his job? Without that, it is very difficult to conceive how the Head of the Department is going to control the destinies of this Bank.

Sir, the Honourable Members who have written the majority report have carefully considered the point of view raised by the Finance Member and the others who were speaking for the Government. They carefully weighed their arguments and they think that it is absolutely essential in the interest of India that this Bank should command the confidence of the people and, to that end, the Governor should be a man of at least five years' banking experience. Sir, it is unnecessary for me to speak at any great length at this time of the day, but this much I can say that we on this side of the House attach great importance to the qualifications which should be possessed by the person who holds this high office. It was said that these words, which were added by the majority members of the Joint Committee, are so vague, but I understand, Sir, those are the words which were exactly copied from some Central Bank constitution—I believe it was the South African Central Bank. Do they mean

[Mr. B. Sitaramaraju.]

to suggest that that Bank, when they made a provision like this, did not know what they were providing for, that they did not know that those words were real, definite and in substance intended to prevent a bad choice? Do they mean to say that these words are not intended to give the Government a reasonable latitude? I say that the experience of South Africa affords us a valuable guide, and, nothing being shown to the contrary, I do think that the words, which were inserted in this majority report, should stand, in view of the considerations we have mentioned and in view also of the antecedents of the Government in the matter of selections for high offices.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 12th December, 1933.