

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

WEDNESDAY, 18th JULY, 1934.

Vol. VI—No. 3

## OFFICIAL REPORT



### CONTENTS.

Questions and Answers.

Short Notice Question and Answer.

Unstarred Questions and Answers.

Statements laid on the Table.

Announcement *re* information promised by Government in reply to Questions.

The Factories Bill—Discussion on the motion to pass not concluded.

Statement of Business.

SIMLA : PRINTED BY THE MANAGER  
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS : 1934

*Price Five Annas.*

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 18th July, 1954.

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

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

### FOOD SUPPLIED TO HAJ PILGRIMS ON BOARD SHIPS.

61. \*Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad : (a) Is it a fact that every pilgrim to Mecca is required to pay for his food on the boat ?

(b) Have Government fixed the price and the menu of the food to be given to Hajis ? Have Government also fixed the quantity of meat in the menu ?

(c) What is the menu ?

(d) Are Government aware that this year the Company supplied in the morning nothing but some kind of liquid known as tea without biscuit or toast ?

(e) Are Government aware that most of the Hajis who could afford, did not avail themselves of the food supplied by the Company, and purchased food from hotel which supplied better food ?

(f) Are Government aware that some Irani and Afghan passengers, being dissatisfied, cooked their own meals ?

(g) Have Government fixed the number of servants which the Company should appoint for cooking and serving meals ?

(h) Is it a fact that the service of the morning meal could not be finished before 3 P.M. on account of insufficient staff ?

(i) Are Government aware that the Company uses mostly vegetable ghee in cooking food for Hajis ?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai : Sir, with your permission, I shall answer questions Nos. 61, 62 and 99 together. Pilgrims to the Hedjaz, proceeding by a pilgrim ship, are provided with tickets in which the cost of food is included. The number of meals, which a pilgrim is entitled to receive daily, in return for the compulsory charges for food, and the articles included in the menu, are stated in Rule 80 of the Indian Pilgrim Ships Rules, 1933, a copy of which is available in the Library of the House. Pilgrims, travelling by the higher classes and requiring better food, can obtain their requirements on extra payment according to the tariff prescribed by Rule 81 of the Rules referred to. A number of complaints in regard to the arrangements made for the supply of food to pilgrims have been received and are under examination. Government propose to refer these to the Standing Haj Committee of the Central Legislature as soon as possible and hope that, as a result of their own examination of the matter, and with the advice of the Committee, it may be possible

to remove defects that come to light. The question of the adequacy of the personnel employed on cooking and service will also receive examination. So far as the rules are concerned, these provide that the number of cooks and attendants employed for cooking and serving the pilgrims' food must be such as the Inspector may consider necessary and subject to a maximum of three per 100 pilgrims.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Will Government be pleased to state whether this question will be discussed in the Standing Finance Committee in this Session ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** I think my friend refers to the Standing Haj Committee.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Yes, Sir, I refer to the Standing Haj Committee.

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** Well, Sir, it will be discussed before the end of the present Session.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Will Government be pleased to state whether any tenders were called for the supply of food on board the ship to the pilgrims ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** I answered that question in the last Session and said that the Shipping Company who were responsible in this matter had not considered it necessary to call for tenders.

**Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan :** Have Government received any suggestions from the Bombay Port Haj Committee to improve matters ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** As a matter of fact, the Government, when they received these complaints, invited the two Haj Committees primarily concerned, namely, the Haj Committee in Bombay and the Haj Committee at Karachi, to submit a report on the working of the feeding arrangements at the end of the pilgrim season. As far as I recollect, the Report of the Haj Committee from Bombay has been received, and that from Karachi, and also I believe from Calcutta, are still awaited.

**Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan :** I hope all these reports and the suggestions will be placed before the Standing Haj Committee ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** All relevant papers will be put before the Haj Committee, including the Report which has been received from His Britannic Majesty's Minister at Jeddah.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Is it a fact that the contractor is relative of a member of the Port Haj Committee at Bombay ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** I am afraid I have not investigated the relationship between the contractor and the members of the Port Haj Committee.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Is it a fact that an application was sent to the Government stating that the rate at which food was supplied by the contractor would be lower than the tender given by the present contractor ? Is it also a fact that in the same application it was stated that, if any Hajji purchased food on the ship, the amount would be paid after deduction and Government refused that application and gave the tender to the present contractor ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** I think, Sir, I have made it clear more than once that Government have nothing to do either with the accepting of tenders or the rejecting of tenders. The matter is entirely within the purview and competence of the Shipping Company concerned.

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali :** Are Government prepared to consider the question of breaking up the monopoly of contract which has been given to one person in regard to the feeding arrangements of pilgrims on board the ship, and to substitute the system of opening hotels or some such arrangements for the benefit of the pilgrims, so that they may not be forced to deal with only one contractor ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** Sir, as I stated a little earlier, in replying to one of the supplementary questions, the intention of Government is that the working of the entire system of these feeding arrangements on board the ship should come under review by the Standing Haj Committee, and the question as to whether a monopolistic system is undesirable and there should be several contractors working, would be open to any Member of the Standing Haj Committee to raise.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) :** Order, order. The Chair would point out that when this House has constituted a Standing Haj Committee, detailed questions of this nature must, in the first instance, at any rate, be thoroughly discussed in that Committee. The Chair would like to know whether an opportunity has been given to that Committee to discuss that question.

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** Sir, the position as regards that is this. The intention of Government was to put their proposals as well as the complaints received in regard to the working of these arrangements before the Haj Committee after reports about the Haj had come in. They were not in possession of Government at the time when the Assembly adjourned last. They have come in since. They can only be submitted to the Standing Haj Committee, Sir, during the present Session of the Legislature, and it is our intention to put those matters before the Haj Committee as soon as all the relevant material is available.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Sir, the great trouble is that Government select only those Members whom they like to the Standing Haj Committees and hold conferences with them, and these Members do not take sufficient interest, and that is the reason why we have to put down these questions on the paper, and ask supplementary questions.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** May I know from the Honourable Member whether there are kitchens in the steamers so that the pilgrims can cook for themselves, or are these people bound to take their food from the caterer ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** The basis of the amendment made by this House, a little over a year ago, in the Indian Merchant Shipping Act, was that private cooking should be prohibited.

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi :** Are Government aware of the fact that the numerous complaints received by the Government are due to the fact that the shipping companies have made very bad feeding arrangements through their caterers ? If that is so, then the Gov-

ernment should take very drastic action against the shipping companies for not using proper judgment and discretion in selecting their caterers ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** The complaints began to come in to Government only after the pilgrim season had started. Obviously one could not pay any attention to hypothetical complaints. The question for consideration then was whether each individual complaint should be considered individually or singly or whether there should be a comprehensive review of these complaints at the end of the pilgrim season, and the latter course was the one which commended itself to Government.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Sir, I am not a member of the Haj Committee, but there is one point which I should like the Haj Committee to consider particularly, and it is this, that the same caterer supplies very bad food and at very unpunctual hours to these pilgrims in regular meals, but if they took food in hotels, he supplied them with very good food, and very expeditiously.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : It is a statement which does not require an answer.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Are Government aware that this system has been disapproved by all the Mussalmans in India ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** My friend lost no opportunity, even before the system was introduced, of saying that all the Mussalmans in India had disapproved, were disapproving and would continue to disapprove. In the circumstances, it is not easy for me to subscribe entirely to the partisan statement which he has just made.

#### FOOD SUPPLIED TO HAJ PILGRIMS ON BOARD SHIPS.

†62. \***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin :** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the press reports, published in numerous vernacular papers, with regard to the unsatisfactory arrangement for the provision of food to the Hedjaz pilgrims on steamships carrying Indian pilgrims to Jeddah and back during the last pilgrim season ? If so, are they now prepared to remove the new restrictions for the pilgrims and to amend Indian Merchant Shipping Act accordingly ? Has the attention of Government been drawn to the article published in the bi-weekly vernacular paper, *Al Jamiat* of Delhi, dated the 5th June, 1934, on page 1 under the heading, "*Jahaz men Aziman-i-Hijaz ko takleef*", on behalf of Maulvi Amir Ahmad, M.A., Deputy Collector ?

(b) Are Government prepared to investigate the allegations made in the article referred to in part (a) and state whether they are true, and if so, what action they propose to take in this connection ?

(c) What is the name of the Captain who is guilty of negligence and who failed to discharge his duty on the said steamer ?

(d) With a view to safeguarding the health of the Hedjaz pilgrims on the voyage, what precautionary measures do Government propose to take in future ?

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 61.

**DISTRIBUTION OF THE JUTE EXPORT DUTY AMONG THE JUTE-GROWING PROVINCES.**

63. \***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** : (a) Are Government aware that the amount provided for distribution among the jute-growing provinces as their share of the jute export duty in 1934-35, has been reduced by Rs. 63 lakhs from Rs. 1,89 lakhs to Rs. 1,26 lakhs ?

(b) Is it a fact that half of the jute export duty in 1934-35 will not be paid to the jute-growing province ?

(c) If the reply to part (b) be in the affirmative, in what proportion will the export duty on jute be distributed among the Central Government and the jute-growing provinces ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg** : The Honourable Member has correctly quoted the figures in the estimates. For the rest, his attention is invited to my predecessor's speech on page 4227 of the Legislative Assembly proceedings of the 20th April, 1934.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** : What is the reply to part (b) ? Is it a fact that half of the jute export duty in 1934-35 will not be paid to the jute-growing Provinces ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg** : Yes, that is so. I understand that the Assembly in the last Session postponed the date of operation of the match excise. Therefore, the revenue for financing the grant to Bengal was not available, and so the grant was reduced.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** : Was the reason for this reduction this that the match excise duty had not been passed by the Assembly ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg** : That is so, as the Honourable Member will see if he refers to the passage from my predecessor's speech to which I have already referred.

**AMALGAMATION OF THE DIFFERENT LOCO. SHOPS WITH THAT AT JAMALPUR.**

64. \***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** : (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to an article on page 4 of the *Pilot*, Amritsar, dated the 13th May, 1934, headed "Lucknow Loco. shops" ?

(b) Is it a fact that different Loco. shops are to be amalgamated with that at Jamalpur ?

(c) Do Government propose to take such steps that their experiment may not affect any community adversely and the percentage of different communities in the amalgamated shop may be maintained in the proportion as it now stands ?

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

(b) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to a memorandum placed on the 19th of April, 1934, before the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, which will be found in the proceedings of the Committee, Volume XI, No. 1.

(c) The orders of Government with regard to recruitment will be strictly observed.

**TRANSFER OF THE GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY WORKSHOP FROM  
JHANSI TO BOMBAY.**

55. \***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** : Is it a fact that the transfer of the workshops from Jhansi, Great Indian Peninsula Railway, to Bombay has affected the Muslims adversely ?

**Mr. P. E. Rau** : Government have no information.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** : Did the Government enquire about this from the Agent of the G. I. P. Railway ?

**Mr. P. E. Rau** : No.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** : Are Government aware that these experiments which are made on the different railways have affected the Muslim community adversely ?

**Mr. P. E. Rau** : To what experiments is the Honourable Member referring ?

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** : Sometimes mixing two workshops and sometimes abolishing one workshop.

**Mr. P. E. Rau** : No. Government have no information about that.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** : Has the attention of the Government been drawn about the Paksey workshop ?

**Mr. P. E. Rau** : I think my Honourable friend is anticipating the next question.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** : I want to know whether this fact was referred to the Government and whether the Government have enquired into that matter or not.

**Mr. P. E. Rau** : I am replying to it in the next question.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : I should have thought that Government should say "yes" or "no", and a mere statement that they have no information is not right, and it is merely shirking the responsibility.

**CLOSURE OF THE MARINE SHOP AT PAKSEY, EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.**

66. \***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** : (a) Is it a fact that the marine shop at Paksey, Eastern Bengal Railway, has been closed ?

(b) Is it a fact that the Muslims were in majority in that shop ?

(c) Is it a fact that the shops on Eastern Bengal Railway, where Muslims were in minority, were not closed ?

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

(b) Government have no information.

(c) The decision to close or keep open Railway Workshops is governed by economic and not by communal considerations.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** : Will Government be pleased to say whether they have received any representation in connection with the Paksey workshop or not ?

**Mr. P. B. Rau :** I have not seen any.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Will my Honourable friend in charge of the Department say whether he has received any representation from myself or not ?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore :** I do not remember whether I have or not. If my Honourable friend will put a question down on the notice paper, I will give him a definite reply.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Will Government be pleased to examine the allegations that all these experiments, which are made, especially on the E. B. Railway and the G. I. P. Railway, have affected the Muslim community adversely, and all those workshops where the Muslims were in a majority have been closed down and those workshops, where Muslims were in a minority, have not been closed down ?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore :** As Mr. Rau has explained, these matters are dealt with purely on economic grounds, and I do not think that we can depart from the principle which has been applied in deciding this question.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Do Government propose then to take all the men who are working in those workshops in other workshops ?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore :** I do not think that that would be possible.

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi :** Irrespective of communal considerations, should not Government enquire into the complaints made by the Honourable Member in this question ? He has made a definite complaint as regards a particular community being economically put to more trouble than others. Is it not a matter which requires consideration at the hands of Government ?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore :** I think I have explained the matter. No one would regret it more than myself if, owing to the closure of any particular workshop, any particular community were penalised, but I am afraid that we could not allow the effect that any action like that might have on a particular community to influence our final decision in a matter which must be definitely decided on economic grounds.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Is it not a fact that the Railway Board have issued circulars to the administrations that first opportunity for appointment should be given to persons who have been retrenched ?

**Mr. P. B. Rau :** Retrenched persons are borne on a waiting list, and when vacancies arise, attempts are made to provide them with appointments.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Government will give a similar opportunity to those persons who have been retrenched in this particular case ?

**Mr. P. B. Rau :** Yes.

**Bhai Parma Nand :** Will the Honourable Member tell us whether in those workshops the Muslims were less than 25 per cent., because I find from the new decision of the Government that the Muslims have got a right to get 25 per cent. of the posts ?

**Mr. P. B. Rau :** As I have said, Government have no information on the point, but as my Honourable friend from Bihar has said that they were in a majority, it is obvious that they could not have been less than 25 per cent.

**ARTICLE HEADED "TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS" PUBLISHED IN THE "PILOT."**

67. **\*Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the article "Travelling Ticket Examiners", published on page 7 of the *Pilot*, dated the 13th May, 1934 ?

(b) Is it a fact that the matter is under consideration of the Railway authorities concerned ?

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

(b) Does not arise.

**SEARCH IN THE "SOHO HOUSE" AND THE RESIDENCE OF MR. MUHAMMAD TAHIR KHAN IN BOMBAY.**

68. **\*Sir Muhammad Yakub :** (a) Is it a fact that "Soho House", a firm at Lohar Chawl, Bombay, and the residence of its managing partner, Mr. Muhammad Tahir Khan, were searched by the Bombay Collector of Customs in August 1933, and during the course of the search of the house, even the personal luggage of respectable guests, who happened to be staying with Mr. Tahir Khan, was not spared in spite of a protest on their behalf ?

(b) Is it also a fact that subsequently the Bombay High Court declared that the search made by the Collector of Customs was illegal ?

(c) Is it also a fact that on the strength of certain documents and books seized by the said Collector of Customs during the illegal search of the house mentioned above, the Custom authorities charged Mr. Muhammad Tahir Khan before the Chief Presidency Magistrate, Bombay, under section 420, Indian Penal Code, which resulted in his acquittal on May 15, 1934 ?

(d) What action do Government propose to take against the Collector of Customs, Bombay, who was responsible for carrying out the illegal search in the "Soho House" and the residence of Mr. Muhammad Tahir Khan, and for causing annoyance and insult to him and his guests ?

(e) What compensation is proposed to be given to Mr. Muhammad Tahir Khan for the heavy expenditure which he had to incur to get the search declared illegal and to defend the criminal case against him ? Who will be responsible for the compensation ?

(f) What measures do Government propose to take in order to avoid recurrence of such cases ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** (a) The premises mentioned were searched on a warrant issued by the Chief Presidency Magistrate, Bombay. According to my information no protest in regard to the conduct of the search was made to the Collector of Customs.

(b) and (c). The answer to the next two questions is in the affirmative.

(d) None in view of the fact that the Collector acted on a warrant issued by the Chief Presidency Magistrate.

(e) Government do not consider that this is a case in which they would be justified in awarding compensation.

(f) The attention of Collectors of Customs generally has been drawn to the High Court ruling in regard to the issue of search warrants in such cases.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub :** Is it not a fact that the warrant of search was not issued by the Magistrate of his own accord, but it was issued at the request of the Customs Officer at a time when no criminal case was pending against the firm in any judicial Court ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** I am not quite sure of the exact implications of the legal procedure. My only information is that the premises were searched on a warrant issued by the Chief Presidency Magistrate.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub :** Will Government kindly enquire if the facts stated by me are correct—that the warrant was not issued by the Magistrate of his own accord, but it was issued on the application of the Collector of Customs at a time when no judicial proceedings were pending in any judicial Court ? If so, will Government reconsider their decision about the answer which they have given to part (d) of my question ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** As regards the first part of the supplementary question, the warrant is always issued at the instance of the Collector of Customs. What particular significance the qualification " at a time when no judicial proceedings were pending " has, I could not say without notice. I will certainly look into this matter again, but I am bound to say that I have already gone into it very carefully, and I am pretty convinced that there is no case for any action against the Collector, nor is there a case for compensation to the firm concerned. And, as far as the future is concerned, we have done our best to stop the recurrence of such an incident by calling the attention of Collectors of Customs to the ruling of the High Court in regard to the issue of search warrants.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** May I know from the Honourable Member, if the Collector of Customs does not apply for a warrant, who else can ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** That is what I said in reply to the first part of the supplementary question.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** These facts were communicated to the Members of the Central Board of Revenue at the time when all this was going on and no action was taken by them.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** Is not the Honourable Member making an assertion and not asking a question ?

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** I just want to ask this question, whether when this information was given, any action was taken by the Central Board of Revenue and whether the Central Board of Revenue made any enquiries about when " information " was supplied to them ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** I am not quite sure what information the Honourable Member is referring to. Certainly the answer I

have given is based on information furnished by the Central Board of Revenue. Presumably, they could not have obtained that information without making enquiries.

**TRANSFER OF THE RESEARCH INSTITUTE FROM PUSA TO DELHI.**

69. \***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** : (a) Is it a fact that the Research Institute at Pusa (Bihar) is going to be transferred to Delhi ? If so, when, and why ?

(b) What will be the cost of the transfer ?

(c) What will happen to the lands and buildings in Pusa in the event of the transfer of the Institute to Delhi ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai** : (a) and (b). I would refer the Honourable Member to the memorandum on the subject submitted to the Standing Finance Committee of which he is a member. A copy of the memorandum has also been placed in the Library of the House.

(c) The question will be considered if necessary later in consultation with the Local Government.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** : Is it a fact, as stated in the *Indian Nation* of Patna, dated the 13th July, that the idea of transfer originated long ago with the Imperial Service Officers in charge of the Agricultural Research Institute at Pusa, who envied their colleagues in other services the enjoyment of facilities afforded by the Viceregal headquarters ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai** : That statement is completely devoid of foundation.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** : Is it a fact that the Agricultural Commission of 1928 were appealed to for a redress of this grievance ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai** : Not so far as I am aware of.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** : Has not this matter of transfer been under frequent correspondence since then between the experts and the Government of India and the Secretary of State ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai** : No, Sir.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub** : Is it not a fact that the present buildings of the Pusa Institute have been damaged by the earthquake to such an extent that it would be impossible to repair them and that they can only be demolished and re-built, and what would be the cost of re-building them ? (Hear, hear.)

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai** : Sir, the statement made by my Honourable friend correctly describes the position as regards the Laboratory ; it will cost something like seven lakhs of rupees to re-build.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub** : Is it not a fact that, on account of the recurrence of earthquakes in Darbhanga and its vicinity, the place has become very dangerous for any public institution to be located there ? (Hear, hear.)

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai** : I should not like to express an opinion too definitely on that point ; it is a question for the geologists. I gather, however, that this particular region is supposed now to be more subject to earthquakes than certain other parts of India.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub :** Is it not a fact that the Agricultural Research Institute at Pusa makes it very difficult for the central office at Delhi to exercise such direct supervision as it could do if it were near the headquarters ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** Sir, the inaccessibility of Pusa has been a handicap in more ways than one.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** May I know what will be the cost of the transfer of this Institute to Delhi or elsewhere ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** The figure is stated in the memorandum to which I have already referred ; it is estimated at Rs. 36 lakhs.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Is it the intention of the Government to lay all correspondence on the table of this House before any action is taken in this matter ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** As far as I know, there is no correspondence to lay on the table of the House.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Is it not a fact that the Government of India have obtained the sanction of the Secretary of State behind the back of this House, and will Government be pleased to lay that correspondence on the table of the House at least ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** I did not quite appreciate the allusion to our having obtained the sanction of the Secretary of State behind the back of this House. Government undoubtedly have certain executive responsibility which they discharge in accordance with the established procedure. My Honourable friend would have a grievance if Government had actually proceeded to start the construction of these buildings without the constitutional procedure being followed of placing the proposal before the Standing Finance Committee.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : I take it that the expenditure on the new buildings in the vicinity of Delhi will, in due course of time, come up for the vote of the House ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** It is a votable item of expenditure, Sir. If the decision is proceeded with, undoubtedly the matter will come up before the House.

**Sir Abdur Rahim :** Will it be any loss to the Province of Bihar and Orissa if the Institute is removed from Bihar ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** That undoubtedly is a matter of opinion. Members coming from Bihar and Orissa definitely feel that it would be a loss to the Province if the Institute were removed ; but, considering the functions of the Institute, which has to minister not to the requirements of a particular Province, but to the needs of agricultural research for the whole of India, I am not prepared to admit that it would be a particular loss to Bihar.

**Sir Abdur Rahim :** Is there no other place in Bihar where the Institute could be transferred ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** If it were transferred to any other place in Bihar, the defect of inaccessibility would still exist.

**Sir Abdur Rahim :** You mean all places in Bihar are inaccessible ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** I would not say that places in Bihar are inaccessible from particular points in Bengal or particular points in Bihar, but when we consider accessibility, we have to consider India as a whole.

**Mr. B. Das :** Is it the policy of the Government of India to locate all activities of the Imperial Agricultural Council in Coimbatore, Cawnpore and the neighbourhood of Delhi, and not to locate them in Provinces like Bihar and Orissa, Bengal, or Assam ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** I do not know that there is any consistent policy of the Government of India as regards location of Institutes. Each particular case will have to be considered on its own merits.

**Mr. B. Das :** May I inquire further whether the Government of India consulted in this matter the Government of Bihar and Orissa, and what is the opinion of the Local Government in the matter of the Pusa Institute ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** The Government of India have not consulted the Government of Bihar and Orissa for the reason which would be obvious from the views expressed by the Bihar Members already.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Have the Government of India consulted any other Local Government in the matter of the location of this Institute in the event of its transfer from Pusa ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** Inasmuch as the matter is one for the decision of the Central Government, it is not necessary to consult Local Governments.

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali :** Has the principle on which the Institute was originally started at Pusa been now abrogated, and are the Government of India prepared to consider whether some other place should not be chosen for placing the Institute in the Province of Bihar itself ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** The principle which determined the Government to select the site near Delhi is the one of maximum utility to India as a whole. The circumstances which led to the selection of Pusa, when Pusa was constructed in 1902 or 1903, were somewhat different.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Will Government be pleased to state whether their scheme is designed to close the Pusa Institute and to shift it to some place near Delhi or to keep the Pusa Institute as well ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** No, Sir. When a new Institute is constructed at any other centre, then, when that Institute begins functioning, so far as the Government of India are concerned, Pusa will cease to function.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Will Government be pleased to state what they propose to do under their scheme with regard to the fields in Pusa which are under them and about those buildings which are already there ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** I have already answered that in my reply to part (c) of the question, namely, that the disposal of the land and buildings will be considered later in consultation with the Local Government.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Do Government propose to examine this question as well, that if they keep the Institute at Pusa as well and do not give away the lands on account of that place being in the centre

of North Bihar, it is essential to have such an Institute there? Do Government propose to consider this question also?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** My Honourable friend presumably means to suggest that, in order to tackle the peculiar agricultural problems of Bihar, it is desirable that some facilities for research should exist there. I submit that is primarily a question for the consideration of the Local Government. If the Local Government want the use of these buildings or any portion thereof and of the land for that purpose, Government will undoubtedly consider any such suggestion that they may wish to make in that behalf.

**Sir Abdur Rahim :** I take it that when the Institute was established at Pusa, the Government of India must have obtained and did investigate all the facts which were appropriate and relevant for the establishment of the Institute at Pusa. If that is so, what has happened since then, except the earthquake, which has moved the Government of India to transfer the Institute now?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** According to my information and such researches, as I have been able to make, the primary consideration which influenced the Government of India in 1902-03 to locate the Institute at Pusa was the availability, free of cost, of land. What has happened since to influence the decision of the Government of India, apart from the earthquake which everybody deploras, is the opinion of the Royal Commission on Agriculture in India, and the opinion of Dr. Keen who came out as Director of the Institute—an opinion which has been only recently repeated.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Is it not a fact that the Bihar Government have got no Agricultural College? And if the Institute at Pusa is removed from there, the people of Bihar will go without any agricultural education?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** Bihar, so far as I know, has no Agricultural College.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Do I take it from the Honourable Member's reply to the question put by the Honourable the President that this House will be given an opportunity of discussing this question before any action is taken with regard to the removal of this Institute from Pusa?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** My position as regards that is that the House will have the ordinary constitutional opportunity of discussing the matter when it comes before it in the ordinary way.

**Sir Abdur Rahim :** Does the Honourable Member mean to say that this House will be consulted after the money has been spent and the Government have been committed to the policy?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** I did not say that. I say that the ordinary constitutional procedure in this case is open to the House.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** What is that?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** My Honourable friend need not unnecessarily generate heat. He has been a Member of this House....

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Do not have personal feeling in the matter.

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** Very well, I shall call it provincial feeling. My Honourable friend has been a Member of this House longer than I have been, and he knows perfectly well what the procedure in regard to proposals involving expenditure is. A proposal is put before the Standing Finance Committee. If the Standing Finance Committee, which is representative of this House, approves of a particular proposal, Government consider that they are perfectly justified, on the strength of that approval, to go on with the expenditure. Then, when a vote is needed, they come to the House.

**Mr. B. Das :** May I, Sir, ask your ruling arising out of this particular statement of the Honourable the Secretary of the Department of Education, Health and Lands ? May I enquire if the Government have the power to incur an expenditure if the Standing Finance Committee approves of it ?

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) :** A votable expenditure must ultimately be sanctioned by a vote of this House. If, on the strength of the Standing Finance Committee's approval, Government proceed with the expenditure on a particular item and then come for the vote of the House subsequently, then it is perfectly open to the House to reject that vote. In that case, unless that vote has been legalised by some other section of the Government of India Act, the person who was responsible for the expenditure will be surcharged by the Auditor General.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Do I understand the procedure to be that if the Standing Finance Committee approves of this proposal, it will come up for sanction before this House before the close of this Session ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** I would suggest that that question be addressed to the Honourable the Finance Member who generally moves the demands for grants.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** I am asking the Government to reply. Will the Honourable the Finance Member kindly reply to this question ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** As far as I know, except as provided for by the Government of India Act, no expenditure can be finally sanctioned except by the authority of this House.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Then this question will come up before this House before any action is taken by way of a supplementary grant ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** It is bound to come up before this House. I am not in a position at this moment to give a pledge that no expenditure will be undertaken before the vote of the House is taken. Certainly no expenditure will be undertaken before the decision of the Standing Finance Committee has been taken.

**Mr. H. P. Mody :** May I know, Sir, what happens if a Member incurs expenditure illegally before this House has sanctioned it and then disappears ? (Laughter.)

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) :** Order, order. The House appears to be getting into a debate on this question. Next question, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh.

DEPORTATION OF ONE KARAM SINGH FROM CHINA.

70. \*Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh : (a) Is it a fact that one Karam Singh, who was sentenced to one month's imprisonment and deportation from China, in 1929, on a charge of sedition, was arrested and brought before the police court in Shanghai recently, and that he was awarded the maximum sentence of two months' imprisonment, followed by deportation from China ?

(b) Do Government propose to enquire into the matter and state why he was deported from China and for what offence ?

(c) Is there any representative of the British Government, or of the Government of India, in Shanghai ? If so, what steps, if any, were taken by him in this connection ?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe : (a), (b) and second sentence of (c). Enquiries are being made from His Majesty's Minister, Peking, and the result will be communicated to the House in due course.

(c) There is a British Consul General at Shanghai.

RESERVATION OF THE QUEEN MARY ZENANA GHAT IN PUSHKAR, AJMER, FOR THE EXCLUSIVE USE OF WOMEN.

71. \*Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh : (a) Are Government aware that the Queen Mary Zenana Ghat in Pushkar (Ajmer) was built exclusively for the use of women, and that it is being used by males also, no restriction being enforced in this connection ?

(b) Have Government received any complaints about this from Pandit Sohan Lal Sharma, President, Hindu Sabha, Pushkar, and from certain ladies also ? If so, what steps were taken on these representations ?

(c) What action have Government taken, or propose to take, to reserve the Queen Mary Zenana Ghat for women ?

(d) What amount of money is spent annually on the maintenance and repair of the said ghat, and from what funds ?

(e) Is it a fact that Pandit Sohan Lal Sharma wrote to the Commissioner of Ajmer-Merwara, offering to appoint a woman to enforce the rule reserving the ghat for the exclusive use of women ? If so, what action was taken on the suggestion ?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe : (a) The answer to the first part is in the affirmative. Notices have been put on entrances prohibiting its use by males. Trespassers are liable to prosecution under section 448, Indian Penal Code.

(b) and (c). Yes. Some complaints from Pandit Sohan Lal and one from a lady. Enquiries were made, notices as already stated, were put up and the Police have been asked to take cognizance of such offences as are reported to them. Pandit Sohan Lal has been asked to report specific cases to the Police.

(d) The construction of the ghat having been completed recently there has been no necessity to spend anything yet on its repairs or maintenance. It was built with the amount collected by charitable subscriptions and donations and the Jagir Committee which collected

the funds propose to raise the funds similarly for future maintenance and repairs.

(e) Yes. No action was taken.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** With regard to answer to part (a), will Government take it from me that I myself visited this place in the course of the last two months and found that there was no person to guard it from the trespass of male persons and that male persons were freely going into this particular ghat which is said to be reserved for Zenana ?

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Did the Honourable Member himself also go there ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe :** The answer which I have just read out was only received from the Local Administration within the last few days. Possibly some measures have been taken since the Honourable Member visited the ghat.

#### INCOME OF THE BARAHJEE TEMPLE IN PUSHKAR, AJMER.

72. **\*Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** (a) What is the approximate annual income of the Barahjee temple in Pushkar (Ajmer), and how is this money spent ?

(b) Is it a fact that no part of the income is spent on the maintenance and repairs of the temple ? If so, why ?

(c) Who has got the control over the temple ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe :** (a) No official information is available. The income is reported to be about Rs. 300 per annum. It goes to the general funds of the Shamat Committee. Subscriptions are reported to be raised for repairs from time to time.

(b) Does not arise in view of (a).

(c) The Brahmins of Bari Basti, Pushkar, through their representative committee.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** May I know if that temple is a public temple ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe :** So far as I am aware, it is open to the public if that is what the Honourable Member means.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** With regard to part (b), how is the income spent ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe :** I cannot give the Honourable Member exact information about that, but I think the Honourable Member will get some more information in reply to the next question.

#### INCOME OF THE PUSHKAR JAGIR.

73. **\*Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** (a) Is it a fact that the Pushkar Jagir was conferred by the Mussalman and Hindu Rulers to be utilized towards the repairs and maintenance of the Pushkar ghat, the clearing of water, and the insurance of a constant supply of water in the tank, the maintenance and repair of the temples, the imparting of religious instructions, assistance to Hindu pilgrims, and similar other charitable objects ?

(b) Is it a fact that no part of the proceeds of the Jagir is utilized towards any of the objects mentioned in part (a) above ?

(c) Are Government aware that in civil suit No. 280 of 1925 the Sub-Judge, first class, Ajmer, in his Judgment, dated the 7th February, 1930, has commented that " The accounts were not maintained by the Shamilat Committee properly " ; that " A major portion of the Shamilat income is spent after litigation " ; and that " The members of the Shamilat Committee were not managing the affairs properly, and were not keeping proper accounts " ?

(d) Are Government aware that Mr. Ram Swaroop, Tehsildar, has also condemned the accounts of the Shamilat Committee, or the Jagir Committee, in his note on the resolution book of the Committee in 1932 ?

(e) Are Government aware that in cheques Nos. 102 to 757, from 1930 to 1933, of the Jagir Committee, a number of entries such as expenses over the supply of milk, and sweet-meats, etc., to officials, providing costly garlands to officials, and similar other items have been made ? If so, will Government please state whether such presents were really made to officials ?

(f) Have the accounts of the Shamilat or the Jagir Committee been ever audited by any official, or duly qualified auditor ? If not, why not ?

(g) Do Government propose to appoint a committee to enquire into the accounts and administration of the Jagir Committee ? If not, why not ?

(h) Have Government or local officials received representations from voters, and from some members of the Jagir Committee itself, complaining about the accounts of the Committee, the latest representation to the Assistant Commissioner, Ajmer, being the one dated the 27th March, 1934, signed by a majority of voters of the Jagir Committee and also by two members of the Committee itself ?

(i) What steps do Government propose to take in this matter ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe :** (a) The reply is in the negative. A reference is invited to paragraph 64\* of the report of the Committee on Jagir estates, dated the 16th May, 1874, printed at page 579 of the Ajmer Regulations, Volume II (H-L).

(b) Does not arise.

(c) Yes.

(d) Yes.

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

(f) Yes, by the Revenue Girdawar (Supervisor) half yearly, vide the reply to question No. 89 (c), already given in the Government of India, Foreign and Political Department letter\* No. F-10-I/29, dated the 7th February, 1929, addressed to the Honourable Member.

(g) No. As the accounts are examined in the manner indicated in the reply to part (f) of this question and are exhibited to the public, Government see no necessity for such action.

\*Copy enclosed.

(h) Representations have been received and duly examined. An application dated the 27th March, 1934, is under enquiry.

(i) None.

*Copy of paragraph 64 of the report of the Committee on Jagir estates dated the 16th May, 1874, printed at page 579 of the Ajmer Regulations, Volume II (H-L).*

64. The Jagir of Pushkar is of very ancient date. The oldest Sanad on record is one of the Jahangir, arranging how the rival parties should divide the gifts of pilgrims, and continuing the village "dar wajh madad maash kaum pokhuriya sunnadaran." The land of Pokhur is minutely divided; 418 sharers have been recorded as in possession of land at the present measurement.

No. F-10-I|29.

From

The Deputy Secretary to the Government of India  
in the Foreign and Political Department,

To

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh, M.L.A.,  
12-E., Ferozshah Road,  
New Delhi.

Dated New Delhi, the 7th February, 1929.

Questions regarding Pushkar.

Sir,

At the meeting of the Legislative Assembly on the 28th January, 1929, Sir Deuys Bray informed you that the information asked for by you in questions Nos. 89, 90 and 91, regarding Pushkar was being collected and would be communicated to you in due course. The information has since been obtained and the replies to your questions are as follows :

No. 89.

(a) Government have no definite information on this point.

(b) The Mughal Emperors conferred about 14,000 bighas on the Brahmans of the Bari Basti and in the Sanad granted by the British Government the area is shown as 5,328 acres, viz., 13,320 bighas. In the decennial settlement the area entered in the Shamlat Khata was 6,962 bighas including land under water. Some encroachments have been made by the Brahmans of the Chhoti Basti, who are perpetually quarrelling with the Brahmans of the Bari Basti. Civil litigation is in progress with regard to these encroachments. The revenue papers now show 6,498 bighas as in possession of the Shamlat Committee. It is, however, misleading to compare this figure with the figure entered in the Sanad, as the former figure relates only to common Shamlat land and does not include the land separately owned by the numerous Brahmans, among whom the Jagir is divided.

(c) Accounts are kept by the Shamlat Committee according to rules contained in a decree of the Civil Court. They are checked by the Revenue Girdawar half-yearly and a copy is hung up in a public place in Pushkar for the information of the Jagirdars and copies are sent to the Collector and the Tehsildar.

(d) Under the terms of Sanad permanent alienation of land is not permissible. In some cases the transfer of Biswadari rights may have occurred with the sanction of the Collector under the Ajmer Alienation of Land Regulation, 1914.

(e) It is not understood what is meant by "the Shamlat Committee of the Local Government". The Jagir is divided among about 400 sharers who enjoy and utilise the income from their shares. Income from pilgrims is received and enjoyed by individual Pandas. The Local Government and the Shamlat Committee have nothing to do with either source of income.

No. 90.

P. Sohan Lal and Gopikishen were elected in April, 1924. Under the provisions of the Shamlat Committee Rules the Collector, Ajmer-Merwara has discretion to refuse sanction to the election of any particular persons and this discretion was used in this case. No application or telegram appears to have been received by the Chief Commissioner but it is understood that an application in this connection was made to the Commissioner, Ajmer-Merwara. Enquiries were made by the Commissioner which indicated that many, and probably most of the persons whose signatures were appended to the application had signed at the instance of P. Sohan Lal and Gopikishen without knowing what its purport was and without agreeing with the statements made in the application. No further action was therefore taken on it by the Commissioner.

(b) The Pushkar Jerun Udhar Fund which amounted to Rs. 19,200 has been utilised as follows :

	Rs.
Clerks pay .. .. .	69
Silt removal .. .. .	543
Ghat repairs .. .. .	2,851
Patanki Pol construction .. .. .	11,665
Balance with Alliance Bank .. .. .	3,991
Balance with Imperial Bank .. .. .	81
	19,200

No. 91.

The number of shops existing in Pushkar has not been counted but the number is considerably less than a hundred. The place is a small town with a population of about 3,400 and is of very little importance except as a pilgrimage centre. There is therefore no scope for a Municipality there, nor has any request for its establishment been made. The actual number of pilgrims that visit Pushkar from Ajmer during the year is between 1 and 2 lakhs.

(b) There is no Municipality and no need for one. Special arrangements are made by the District Board during the time of annual fair for sanitation, lighting and other arrangements for the pilgrims. A temporary dispensary is also established there at that time. The question of establishing a permanent dispensary at Pushkar is receiving consideration. The Funds of the District Board and the Shamlat Committee are not sufficient for the construction of metalled roads throughout the town.

(c) The reply is in the negative.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

(Sd.) H. WILBERFORCE-BELL,

*Deputy Secretary to the Government of India.*

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** With regard to the remarks made by the officer as quoted in part (c) of my question, what steps do Government propose to take in order to see that the accounts are kept in a regular way ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe :** I have already explained that the Government do have the accounts examined by the Revenue Girdawar half-yearly, which they consider to be sufficient.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** With regard to part (e), do Government think that it is a justifiable expenditure to supply milk and sweetmeats, etc., to officials and providing costly garlands to them ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe :** Government do not admit for a moment that any of the funds are spent on such purposes.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Have Government taken care to inquire that these items already appear in the account books of the Shariat Committee ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe :** I am informed by the Local Administration that no such items of expenditure have been incurred.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF A MUNICIPALITY AT PUSHKAR, AJMER.

74. **\*Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** (a) Is there any proposal for the establishment of a municipality at Pushkar (Ajmer) ? If not, why not ?

(b) Why has no hospital been yet established in Pushkar (Ajmer) ?

(c) Is it a fact that a tax of one anna per head is levied on all persons who purchase railway tickets for Ajmer ? If so, are Government aware that a good number of such visitors are pilgrims to Pushkar, which is a famous sacred place of the Hindus ?

(d) Is it a fact that the entire proceeds of this tax is spent on Ajmer Municipality, and no part is spent on the improvement of Pushkar ? If so, why ?

(e) Do Government propose to spend a fair portion of the tax for the establishment of a municipality and affording sanitary and other facilities to Pushkar ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe :** (a) No, *vide* the reply to question No. 91 (b), already given in the Government of India, Foreign and Political Department letter No. F-10-I|29, dated the 7th February, 1929, addressed to the Honourable Member.

(b) Owing to financial stringency.

(c) Yes. A fraction only of the persons purchasing tickets for Ajmer are pilgrims to Pushkar.

(d) and (e) Yes. The tax is intended to provide sanitation amenities in Ajmer and as matters stand at present no part of the proceeds can be spent elsewhere, but Government would be prepared to consider the question.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** With regard to part (b), is it not a fact that the Government admitted on the floor of the House that the establishment of a hospital at Pushkar was a necessity ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe :** I am not aware of any such admission, but if the Honourable Member will call my attention to the particular debate in which the admission was made, I will have the matter looked into.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE CROWN LANDS ORDINANCE OF KENYA.

75. **\*Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** (a) Will Government kindly state if the Kenya Government propose to amend the Crown Lands Ordinance, so as to permit transfers of leases of sub-divisions of agricultural lands created for industrial and commercial purposes, from Europeans to Indians,

†See starred question No. 73.

and vice versa, without any restrictions, in view of representation made by the Indian Chamber of Commerce ?

(b) Do Government propose to make an enquiry into this matter, and state what objection there is in removing this restriction in the transfer of lands, based on racial considerations ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** (a) The Honourable Member presumably refers to the representations reported to have been made by the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry of Eastern Africa to a Select Committee appointed by the Legislative Council of the Colony, "to examine the position regarding residential, commercial and industrial development on land leased from the Crown for grazing and upon or agricultural purposes and the alleged change of user incidental to such development and to furnish a report". The representation was to the effect that unrestricted inter-racial transfer of commercial, industrial and residential plots outside townships be permitted. The Committee made no recommendation in the matter as they regarded it as outside their terms of reference. So far as the Government of India are aware, the Government of Kenya have no proposal before them to amend the Crown Lands Ordinance in the sense suggested in the question.

(b) It would appear that within the boundaries of municipalities, townships or trading centres, inter-racial transfers of agricultural lands used for industrial and commercial purposes, may be permitted. Outside such boundaries, transfers are not permitted as a matter of course. Exceptions have, however, been made where the property is, in fact, part of an area used for commercial purposes, whether or not the area has been specifically declared to be a township or trading centre.

PROVISION OF A TERRITORY FOR HIS HIGHNESS THE AGA KHAN.

76. **\*Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** (a) Is there any truth in the report published in the papers that His Highness the Aga Khan has asked Government to provide him with a territory in India over which he may rule, in recognition of the services rendered by him to the Empire ?

(b) Have Government received any communication on the subject ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe :** (a) and (b). A confidential communication was received from His Highness the Aga Khan, but Government are not in a position to disclose its nature.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** May I know from the Honourable Member if His Highness the Aga Khan wanted Sind ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe :** I have already stated that I am not in a position to disclose the nature of the communication received from His Highness and I have nothing more to add.

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali :** Is it a fact that Muzaffarpur, where the house of my Honourable friend, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh, is situated, is to be made the capital of His Highness the Aga Khan ?

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** I shall welcome him.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub :** Will Government please enquire how a confidential communication like this leaked out from the office of the Foreign and Political Department and was published in the papers ?

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** : My Honourable friend is so ignorant that he does not read the papers. It appeared in the newspapers at the time.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub** : I am not more ignorant than my Honourable friend. My question was whether the Government will make an enquiry how such a highly confidential information leaked out from the office of the Foreign and Political Department and appeared in the newspapers ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe** : I am not prepared to admit for a moment that the information leaked out from the office of the Foreign and Political Department. There are a great many other sources from which it might have leaked out.

**Sir Abdur Rahim** : Is it not a fact that the Political Department receives numerous confidential communications ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe** : It certainly is a fact.

**Sir Abdur Rahim** : Is it not the practice of the Department not to reveal the contents of those communications ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe** : That equally is a fact, Sir.

**Mr. B. Das** : Are Government prepared to entertain similar applications from aspiring landholders who want to be feudatory chiefs in Bihar and Orissa and Bengal ?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : That question does not arise.

#### RESTORATION OF THE CUTS IN SALARIES OF THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN BIHAR AND ORISSA WHO SUFFERED FROM EARTHQUAKE.

77. **\*Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** : Do Government propose to restore the salary cuts of those employees of the Central Government in Bihar and Orissa, who may have suffered from the earthquake ? If so, what are their exact proposals ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig** : No such proposal is under the consideration of the Government of India.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** : Will Government be willing to consider this proposal of restoring the salary cuts at least of those officials who are serving in the Province of Bihar and Orissa and who have been adversely affected by the earthquake ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig** : I should not suppose that that would be a convenient way of dealing with any necessity there may be in individual cases for giving assistance.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** : Before I put the next question, I wish to point out that there is a mistake in the question. The special magistrate refers to Allahabad and not to Calcutta.

#### ENFORCEMENT OF THE RULE PROVIDING FOR 24 HOURS BOOKING ON RAILWAYS.

78. **\*Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** : (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the following comment of the Railway Special Magistrate

of Calcutta, Rai Saheb Lal Mohan Banerjee, published in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, dated the 7th June, 1934 (page 6) reading—

“ The Railway authorities ought to insist upon a strict enforcement of the rule providing for 24 hours booking and reduce the chances of congestion ” ?

(b) Are Government aware that in the above case, a pick-pocket was arrested at the counter of the Railway booking office ?

(c) Are Government aware that the rule quoted above is not strictly enforced at all Railway stations ?

(d) Do Government propose to issue any fresh instructions in this matter ?

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

(b) Government have no information beyond that contained in the newspaper report referred to.

(c) The rule referred to applies only in the case of certain large stations as notified by Railways in their tariffs, and Government are not aware that it is not being strictly enforced at such stations.

(d) Government consider this unnecessary. If any instances of the rule not being observed occur, they can—and, Government have no doubt, will—be brought to notice by members of Local Advisory Committees at meetings of the Committee.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Will Government issue instructions to the station masters to see that the rule which they have prescribed is strictly followed ? As a matter of fact, at very important stations, where the booking is supposed to be for 24 hours, the rule is not followed in practice ?

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** It is unnecessary for Government to issue any such instructions. It would be better if my Honourable friend would bring to notice any particular case of breach of the rule, so that it may be taken up with the local administration.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** I say that station masters may be instructed to see that the rules are strictly observed in those cases.

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** The rules are intended to be followed. The mere fact that the rules are published implies that it is the duty of the station masters to follow them.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF THE RESERVE BANK OF INDIA.

79. **\*Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** When is the Reserve Bank of India likely to come into existence ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** The matter is under active consideration, and it is hoped that an announcement can soon be made.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** May I know if it has been decided as to who is to be the Governor and who are to be the Deputy Governors ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** I should be grateful if I am allowed to keep to the statement “ that it is hoped that an announcement can soon be made ”.

**Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya :** In view of the dissolution of this Assembly, we would like to know when and how many Members of the House have the chance of being nominated as Directors of the new Bank.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** I am afraid the Honourable Member is asking me to anticipate the announcement that I hope to make soon.

**Mr. B. Das :** May I know what will be the approximate time when the Government expect to call for shares for the Reserve Bank from the public ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** Surely my Honourable friend does not want me to give him advance information like that.

**Mr. B. Das :** Does the Honourable Member anticipate any fluctuation in the share market if an announcement is made now ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** I am not in the least responsible for market rumours.

**Mr. B. Das :** Does the Honourable Member anticipate that there will be any marked fluctuation in the market if the Government announce that such and such is the date when the shares of the Reserve Bank will be on sale in the market ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** Whenever an announcement of the issue of shares is made, the Government of India naturally take into account the possible effects on their own borrowing operations.

**Mr. B. Das :** May I enquire why this inordinate delay in coming to a decision about the starting of a Reserve Bank? This question of starting a Reserve Bank was decided as long ago as 1928 when the whole framework was settled.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** First of all, I deny that there was any inordinate delay for which the Government of India were responsible. I am not sure whether the Honourable Member himself has not certain responsibilities for a certain amount of delay in the matter.

**Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya :** Then, is the Secretary of State responsible for the delay in starting this Reserve Bank ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** Certainly not.

**Mr. B. Das :** Was there not a special Session of the Assembly held in Delhi to get this Reserve Bank Bill passed, and what is the reason for the Government in delaying the promulgation of the Reserve Bank ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** There is being no avoidable delay in making an announcement or promulgating any decision.

#### GOVERNMENT ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS AND ITS COMMITTEES.

80. \***Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** (a) Will Government be pleased to make a full statement of their present attitude towards the Indian National Congress, and its Committees ?

(b) Has civil disobedience ceased in the estimation of Government ?

(c) What is Government's view with regard to the All-India Congress Committee's decisions arrived at at Patna ?

(d) What is the opinion of respective provincial Governments in India with regard to the present attitude of the Congress and its Committees ?

(e) Is it a fact that Bombay Government have reported to the Government of India that the policy of civil disobedience movement of the Congress has not yet ceased ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** (a) to (e). I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the statement made by the Government of India in the Home Department Communiqué, dated the 6th June, 1934, to which I have nothing to add.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** Will the Honourable Member give me a reply specifically to (e) ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I think the Honourable Member may conclude from the fact that the Government of Bombay have just released Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel that in their view the Civil Disobedience Movement in Gujerat has now ceased.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** Am I then to understand that there was a report from the Bombay Government that the Civil Disobedience Movement had not ceased and that since then Government have seen fit to release Mr. Patel ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** No, Sir ; the position was that, in view of the special conditions in Gujerat, it was necessary for the Government of Bombay to observe those conditions carefully for some time.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Will Government be pleased to state whether the ban has been lifted from all the provincial branches of the Indian National Congress ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** As far as I am aware, the ban has been lifted from all the regular provincial branches. (Laughter.)

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Will the Honourable Member be pleased to state what he means by the word " regular " ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** There is a difference of opinion between me and my Honourable friend in regard to a particular organisation. I think, but the House did not show sufficient interest in the matter to debate the question the other day, and, therefore, I had no opportunity of dealing with it fully.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Are Government aware that the *Khudai Khidmatgar* organisation of the North-West Frontier Province is a branch of the Indian National Congress ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I am aware that it has been so described.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Has the Civil Disobedience Movement stopped in all the Provinces of India or is there any exception ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I have not received reports recently of any Civil Disobedience Movement activities.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Will Government be pleased to state whether they have lifted the ban from the *Khudai Khidmatgar* organisation of the North-West Frontier Province ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** Certainly not, Sir.

**Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad :** Will Government be pleased to state the reasons for not lifting this ban when they have lifted the ban from all the other provincial branches of the Indian National Congress ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I think my Honourable friend has a question on this subject a little later.

**Mr. B. Das :** Do I understand the Honourable Member to say that Government have released all the Civil Disobedience prisoners in all the regular Provinces, and that there are no Civil Disobedience prisoners in jail now ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** No, Sir ; I said nothing of the kind.

**Mr. B. Das :** But did not the Honourable Member say that the Government of Bombay have released the Civil Disobedience prisoners, including Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** No, Sir ; I said that the Government of Bombay have released Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel who was held under the Regulation.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Now that, according to the statement of the Honourable the Home Member, the Civil Disobedience Movement has ceased in all the Provinces, do Government propose to release the Civil Disobedience prisoners now in the jails ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** The Government of India and the Local Governments, Sir, propose to continue the policy which is already in existence of expediting the release of those prisoners.

#### REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS PLACED ON THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS AND ITS COMMITTEES.

81. **Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** Will Government be pleased to state if they have removed the restrictions and bans placed against the Indian National Congress and its Committees owing to their civil disobedience policy, if so, which restrictions and bans have been removed and how far ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I would refer the Honourable Member to the Communiqué of June 6th, which states the policy that is being carried out.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** I should like to have a specific reply to this question, *viz.*, whether all the restrictions that were placed upon these people, on account of the Civil Disobedience Movement, have been removed, or are there still some that have not been removed ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I think, if the Honourable Member refers to the communiqué, he will find an answer to his question.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** I do not remember that Communiqué now, and, therefore, I want the Honourable Member to tell me what it is, so that I may put further supplementary questions.

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I shall be very glad to lay a copy of the Communiqué on the table, in case Honourable Members have not had an opportunity of reading it.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** So the Honourable Member himself knows that there were restrictions and there were notifications. I am asking if that Communiqué now shows which restrictions have been removed and which have not been removed.

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** As far as I am aware, the restrictions to which the Honourable Member refers are merely notifications under the Criminal Law Amendment Act declaring certain Associations to be unlawful.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** Has it been decided now that the Congress and all the Committees including the Working Committees and the All-India Congress Committee have been declared to be lawful ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** The policy is very clearly stated in the Communiqué, and I really must ask my Honourable friend to be kind enough to read it.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** I only want to have one reply to my question, *viz.*, whether all the Associations and Committees have been declared lawful or not or are they still unlawful ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I will refer to the Communiqué :

“ The Government of India have decided, in consultation with Local Governments, that the notifications declaring the various constituent parts of the Congress organisation unlawful should be withdrawn.”

Later on, we went on to say :

“ During the course of the Civil Disobedience Movement, many revolutionary organisations were proscribed which were distinct from the Congress though working in more or less close association with its objects. Local Governments will not withdraw the notifications against any such revolutionary organisations or any organisations which, in their opinion, are a danger to the peace of the country.”

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** May I know if there are any revolutionary Associations connected with the Congress ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** Certainly, Sir.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** Are they connected with the Congress ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** The words were “ distinct from the Congress though working in more or less close association with its objects.”

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** Are there any such that are working in sympathy with the Congress ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** There have been, certainly. I cannot say what they are doing now.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** Will the Honourable Member mention them ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** No, Sir ; there are a great number of these Associations.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** Will the Honourable Member mention at least one or two ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig** : No, Sir ; I am afraid I cannot enter into details.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** : Is it the assertion of Government that there are terrorist associations affiliated to the Congress ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig** : No, Sir ; these are not merely terrorist associations. They are associations of various descriptions.

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi** : May I know who is the authority to determine what are the constituent parts of the Indian National Congress ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig** : This is an executive decision, and the determination must rest with Government.

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi** : Is not the Indian National Congress itself the authority and has not the acting President, Mr. Jammal Bajaj, made it clear to the Honourable the Home Member that the *Khud-i-Khidmatgar* organisation in the Frontier Province was affiliated to the Congress in August, 1931, and was acting in accordance with the principles of the Congress and is prepared to abide by the decision of the Congress as had been given at Patna in regard to the Civil Disobedience Movement ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig** : I am very sorry that I did not have an opportunity of putting the facts fully before the House in connection with the abortive motion of my Honourable friend opposite, because I think I should have had no difficulty in proving to the House that the Red Shirt organisation did not observe the professed principles of the Congress and was quite definitely a revolutionary body.

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi** : Is it not a fact that the authorities in the Frontier are confusing . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Order, order. The House had an opportunity of discussing the question of this organisation in the North-West Frontier Province, and the House deliberately decided not to discuss this question. The Chair cannot allow the occasion for supplementary questions to be utilised for raising a debate on that.

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali** : Do Government still hold that the object of the Indian National Congress is in any way of the terrorist or revolutionary type ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig** : The objects of the Indian National Congress at the moment seem to me to be somewhat uncertain.

#### FIGHTING OUT THE ISSUE OF THE WHITE PAPER REFORMS CONSTITUTIONALLY THROUGH THE INDIAN LEGISLATURE BY THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

82. **\*Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** : Is it a fact that Government threw a challenge to the Indian National Congress to fight out the issue of the White Paper Reforms constitutionally through the Indian Legislature ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig** : I think the Honourable Member has been placing too literal an interpretation on certain journalistic phrases.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** May I know from the Honourable Member if there was no challenge from the Government, whether there was a challenge from the Congress itself that it will come to this House and break this White Paper ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I think it is perfectly true that the Congress or rather the body which hoped to emerge as the revived Swarajist Party did show an inclination to adopt the constitutional line described by the Honourable Member.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** Was it, therefore, that the Government allowed this Assembly to come to a close and elections to take place ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** That decision was taken on full consideration of all the circumstances.

### SHORT NOTICE QUESTION AND ANSWER.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN COLONIZATION ENQUIRY COMMITTEE REPORT.

**\*Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer :** Will Government please state what action they propose to take on the South African Colonization Enquiry Committee Report ?

12 Noon.

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** The Government of India have informed the Government of the Union of South Africa that they will formulate their views on the Report only after Indian opinion, both in South Africa and in India, has expressed itself fully. They have so far received no indication of the reaction of Indians in South Africa to the Report. They propose to consult the Standing Emigration Committee of the two Houses of the Indian Legislature, as soon as they can place before the Committee representative expressions of Indian opinion in both countries. Communication of their own conclusions to the Government of the Union is, therefore, likely to take some time.

**Mr. B. Das :** Is it not a fact that the South African Indians made it clear that they will have nothing to do with the recommendations of this preliminary Colonisation Committee Report and that they will not like to get out of South Africa at the request of these people, and is it not ill grace on the part of this Committee to recommend and suggest how Indians can find a colony for themselves, and do the Government of India approve the method in which this Colonisation Committee have suggested how colonies should be found for Indians ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** So far as I know, the South African Indian community has not yet expressed any opinion on the recommendations made in the Report. There is a section of South African Indians who decided to non-co-operate with the Committee which was appointed by the Government of the Union. But the most representative organisation of Indians in South Africa, that is to say, the South African Indian Congress, appointed a representative to serve on the Committee and also gave evidence before it.

My Honourable friend's next question was as to whether the Government of India approved of the Committee in South Africa arrogating to itself the function of advising India as to where it should find an outlet for its redundant millions. Government would prefer to express no opinion

on either this or the other recommendations of the Committee until they have had time to consult Indian opinion here and in South Africa.

**Mr. B. Das :** Were the Government of India aware at the time of the investigation when they advised the Agent General in South Africa to render all help to that Committee, that the Committee was going to recommend ways and means as to how the Government of India should have colonies of their own for the Indian people ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** The Government of India at the time, when they invited their Agent to assist the Committee, had merely the terms of reference of the Committee before them. The procedure of the Committee and the formulation of the views of the Committee were undoubtedly subsequent processes.

**Mr. B. Das :** May I suggest to the Government of India to appoint a Committee to advise the South African Government as to how they should function as a civilised Government ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** I think that would be a labour of supererogation on the part of the Government of India.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Are Government aware that there is strong feeling in this country against the recommendations made in that Colonization Committee Report ?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai :** From my perusal of comments in the Press, I should say that my Honourable friend's conclusion is justified.

---

#### UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

##### RESOLUTIONS, PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS RECEIVED FOR OR AGAINST THE HINDU TEMPLE ENTRY DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL.

5. **Pandit Ram Krishna Jha :** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the number of (i) resolutions, (ii) petitions, (iii) memorials, and (iv) opinions received by them till the 15th of June, 1934, either for or against the Temple Entry Bill now pending in the Central legislature ? Will Government be pleased to state how many of each are for and how many against the Bill ?

(b) Will Government be pleased to lay a statement on the table showing :

- (i) the names of the individuals and their addresses,
- (ii) the names of the public bodies or associations,
- (iii) the names of the religious institutions or religious heads, and
- (iv) the names of the Government officials, the provincial Governments and the courts in British India,

from whom Government have received such resolutions, petitions, etc., as aforesaid against the said Temple Entry Bill ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** I will answer this and the next question, No. 6, together. Resolutions and memorials relating to the Temple Entry Bill which have been received either by the Legislative Assembly Department or through the Home Department have been already

placed in the Library of the House and I lay on the table two lists of such representations received upto the end of June, the great majority of which are against the Bill. The opinions received on the Bill will be printed and circulated to Honourable Members in due course. Some petitions on this subject have already been reported to the House and others will be reported in due course. According to the directions of the Committee on Petitions, all the petitions will also be printed and circulated. The material for the information required by the Honourable Member is either already available or will be supplied to him before the next motion relating to the Bill is taken up.

---

I

*List of resolutions, memorials, telegrams, letters, etc., protesting against the Temple Entry Bill received and placed in the Library of the Legislative Assembly.*

(a) *Protests against the Temple Entry Bill.*

1. Telegram dated 7th April, 1934, from Jairamdas, Lyallpur against the admission of Harijans into Temples.
2. Telegram dated 8th May, 1934, from Pujari Mandir Baghubir against Temple Entry Bill.
3. Telegram dated 9th May, 1934, from President, Sanatan Dharam Yavaka Mangal.
4. Telegram dated 8th May, 1934, from Satrugan Das, President, Village Ramdiri, Monghyr.
5. Telegram dated 8th May, 1934, from Secretary, Radharaman Temple, Brindaban.
6. Telegram dated 8th May, 1934, from Misral, regarding Sanatani Meeting, Bareilly.
7. Telegram dated 8th May, 1934, from Janardan Chaturvedi, Secretary, Vaishnavasevadal meeting, Hathras.
8. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Secretary, Vasgbav Sabha, Multan.
9. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Secretary, Sanatan Sabha, Hoshiarpur.
10. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Shankar Basudeb Tirtna Swami of Gopaltirtna Math, Town Puri, President, Public Meeting.
11. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Mahanthaudh Beharidass, President, Sanatanist Conference, Raipur.
12. Telegram from Abadh Behari Singh, President, Sanatanist Conference, Paroria.
13. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Pujari Balaji Mandir.
14. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Damodar Acharya, President, Dharm Bagebandhak Mandal.
15. Telegram dated Nowgong, 7th May, 1934, from Maheswar Borthakur, Secretary, Nowgong Brahman Sava.
16. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Dewakan Misra, President, Sanatan Meeting, Salempur.
17. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Anandibye Anandaballabh Temple.
18. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Dhanur Dhavavacharya Mohant, Totadrimath.
19. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from S. A. Pande, Pleader, President, Public Meeting of Sanatanist at Akola.
20. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Pujari Narsinghji, Mandir.
21. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Pujari, Ram Mandir.

22. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Pujari, Gausala Mandir.
23. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Pujari, Audh Behari Mandir.
24. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Mahanath Ramkhelesn Das, Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Bahadurpur, Thakurbari, Monghyr.
25. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Radha Ramon Das, Mohant, Tottysthan.
26. Telegram dated 6th May, 1934, from Achintya Sharma, Proprietor, Rashmadhab Temple.
27. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Dewan, Lalababu Temple.
28. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Fetej Chand Seth, Manager, Ramnaumi Temple.
29. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Pujari, Satyanarayan Mandir.
30. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Madan Mohan Goswami, Proprietor, Bankebehariji Temple.
31. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Harikant Misra, President, Sanatanist Meeting, Chanor.
32. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Pujari, Sankatadevi Temple.
33. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Manager, Marwari Temple.
34. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Kishorilal Goswami Advikary, Radhaballoy Temple.
35. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Busudeb Tarkalankar, President, Public Meeting, Mundamarai.
36. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from President, Warnashram Sangh, Tumsar.
37. Telegram dated Rajnagar, the 7th April, 1934, from 11,000 Sanatanist Hindus of Kailakh Nahar Birola Bhagbatpor, Bijai Haiderpur, Nirvapur, Bharan, District Darbhanga.
38. Telegram dated Kheri, 7th May, 1934, from Seth Brij Beharilal, Manager, Radhakrishna Temple.
39. Telegram dated Lachmangarh, the 8th May, 1934, from Mahant Shri Baghunath Mandir.
40. Telegram dated Jhansi, the 7th May, 1934, from Baijnath Tandon, Secretary, Samana Dharam Sabha.
41. Telegram dated Cawnpore, the 7th May, 1934, from Sanatanists, Old Cawnpore.
42. Telegram dated Piparia, the 7th May, 1934, from President, Sanatan Dharam Sabha.
43. Telegram dated Losal (through Sikar), 6th May, 1934, from President, Hindu Sabha.
44. Telegram dated Baidyabati, 6th May, 1934, from Ranjasingh, President, Sanatan Sabha, Chandari, Baidyabati.
45. Telegram dated Mandasaur, 5th May, 1934, from Pulchand Chichani, President, Hindu Sabha.
46. Telegram dated Mandasaur, 5th May, 1934, from Pandit Bansidhar, President, Sanatan Dharam Sabha.
47. Telegram dated Mandasaur, 5th May, 1934, from Jain Patthan.
48. Telegram dated Begusarai, 1st May, 1934, from Matukdhari Slugh, President, Sanatan Dharam Meeting at Rahoba.
49. Telegram dated Begusarai, 3rd May, 1934, from Ambica Singh, President, Hindu Meeting, Balahpur.

50. Telegram dated Jhan Jharpur, 10th May, 1934, from Shibeswar Jha, President, Mithila Barnasram Dharam Sabha, Lohana Dharbanga, regarding meeting of 15,000 Sanatanists of village Biresigar.
51. Telegram dated Nanigachi, 11th May, 1934, from Secretary, Barnasram Sabha Ujan.
52. Telegram dated Begusarai, 4th May, 1934, from Shesuratan Singh, President, Sanatan Dharam Meeting at Nayagaon.
53. Telegram dated Begusarai, 4th May, 1934, from Ghanshyam Singh, President, Sanatan Dharam Sabha at Singhpur.
54. Telegram dated Jhan Jharpur, 9th May, 1934, from Sanatan Dharam Sabha Sanskrit Pathsala, Jhan Jharpur.
55. Telegram dated Brindaban, 9th May, 1934, from Hetbavyuwak Mandal.
56. Telegram dated Udipi, 9th May, 1934, from Secretary, Vaidiaka Dharmaveer Sangha, regarding Sanatanist Meeting, Udipi, South Kanara.
57. Telegram dated Amritsar, 7th May, 1934, from Balyaram, President, Varnashram Surajsangh meeting, Amritsar.
58. Telegram dated Amritsar, 7th May, 1934, from Tirthram, Secretary, Dharmvir Dal Sanatanist Meeting, Amritsar.
59. Telegram dated Benares, 7th May, 1934, from Chandipd, Secretary, Gauri Shankar Endowment Trust.
60. Telegram dated Benares, 7th May, 1934, from Surondra Sanyal, Chairman, Mumukshabhawan.
61. Telegram dated Begusarai, 8th May, 1934, from Parmesar Choudhry, Bishunpur and Anandipd.
62. Telegram dated Begusarai, 8th May, 1934, from Kansalki Shore, President, Sanatan Dharam Meeting at Gorgawan.
63. Telegram dated Begusarai, 8th May, 1934, from Karimahton, President, Sanatan Dharam Meeting at Kharagpur.
64. Telegram dated Deoghar, 7th May, 1934, from Manokamana Pandit, President, Public Meeting.
65. Telegram dated Deoghar, 7th May, 1934, from President, Dharam Rakshini Sabha.
66. Telegram dated Jaswantgarh, 7th May, 1934, from Achhut Sanatan Dharam Sabha.
67. Telegram dated Jhan Jharpur, 7th May, 1934, from Varnashramdhar Sabha Kothia, Darbhanga.
68. Telegram dated Ladnun, 7th May, 1934, from Sanatan Dharm Sabha, Nimbi.
69. Telegram dated Mhow Bazar, 7th May, 1934, from Sanghi President, Hindu Meeting in Gopal Maudir.
70. Telegram dated Mirzapur, 8th May, 1934, from Shri Goswami Goverdhanlal Kavichuramani, President, Public Meeting.
71. Telegram dated Muttra Chauk, 8th May, 1934, from President, Govardhan Shastri, Varnashram, Muttra.
72. Telegram dated Nawalgarh, 7th May, 1934, from Manesi Dutt, Seasuri.
73. Telegram dated Teghra, 8th July, 1934, from Ramnaran Prasad, Secretary, Grand Sanatan Dharam Meeting.
74. Telegram dated 8th May, 1934, from Gajananad Pada, Honorary Secretary, Shree Sanatan Dharamawalambiya Manwar Brahma Sabha, Calcutta.
75. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Secretary, Varnashrama Sabha, Nellore.
76. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Kanallal Pujari, Calcutta.
77. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Sheo Dutt Ray, Pujari, Calcutta.
78. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Shanti Sikhavswar Roy, President, Public Meeting held at Calcutta.
79. Telegram dated Brindaban, 7th May, 1934, from Sarojendra Kamdar, Radhamohan Temple.
80. Telegram dated Monghyr, 8th May, 1934, from Raja Raghunandan, President, Orthodox Hindus.

- 80(a). Representations protesting against the T. E. Bill in the same printed form, from 208 residents of the Bombay Presidency.
81. From President, Ram Mandir, Public Meeting, Bombay, dated the 9th March, 1934.
82. From Mr. Ramdhan Tewari Manja Anoop.
83. From the Bombay Provincial Varnashan Swarajya Sangh, letter dated the 14th January, 1934.
84. From the President, Sanatanists Meeting, Byculla, dated the 17th February, 1934.
85. From Mr. G. K. Hathi, President, All-India Varnashram Swarajya Sangha Branch, Rajkot, dated the 26th March, 1934.
86. From Mr. G. K. Hathi, President, All-India Varnashram Swarajya Sangha Branch, Rajkot, dated the 26th March, 1934.
87. From the President, the Sanatanists Meeting Byculla, Bombay, dated the 29th March, 1934.
88. From the President, the Sanatanists Meeting, Dharavi, Bombay, dated the 27th March, 1934.
89. From Mr. Lakshman Prasad and 9 others, Nagina, District Bijnore, dated the 17th March, 1934.
90. From the Manager, Kanga Temple Committee, and 8 others, dated the 21st March, 1934.
91. From M. Parash Ram, Godhra, Panchmahal, dated the 24th March, 1934.
92. From the Secretary, Gayawal Sabha, Gaya, dated the 31st March, 1934.
93. From the President, Sanatan Vedic Dharma Sabha, Ahmedabad, No. G., dated the 31st March, 1934.
94. From the President, Sanatan Vedic Dharma Sabha, Ahmedabad, No. G., dated the 2nd April, 1934.
95. From President, Sanatanist Meeting, Sukhanandji Dharamshala, C. P. Tank, Bombay, dated the 31st March, 1934.
96. From the President, Panjrapola Lane, Meeting, Bombay, dated the 29th March, 1934.
97. From the District Harijan Sewak Sangha, Manipur, dated the 7th April, 1934.
98. From the Secretary, Vaidika Dharma Veera Sangha of South Kanara, Udipi, dated the 6th April, 1934.
99. From President, Mumbadevi Temple Meeting, Bombay, dated the 25th March, 1934.
100. From President, Public Meeting at Kheda Jalas (Dadar), dated the 7th April, 1934.
101. From President, Akola (Santa Cruz) Meeting, dated the 4th April, 1934.
102. From President, Colaba Meeting, dated the 4th April, 1934.
103. From President, Khar Road (Bombay) Meeting, dated the 4th April, 1934.
104. Printed protests from *thirty* persons against the Temple Entry Bill.
105. Protests from four public meetings against the Temple Entry Bill.
106. Protests from residents of (1) Taluk Sabha of Bapalle, Guntur, and (2) Pedili, Nallore in Madras Presidency.
107. Letters from the Secretary, The Guntur District Varnasrama Dharmoddhara Sabha, dated the 24th and 29th March, 1934, and 11th April, 1934, forwarding protests against the Temple Entry Bill, signed by 465 persons belonging to various places.
108. From the Bombay Provincial Varnashram Swarajya Sangh, dated the 5th April, 1934.
109. From His Holiness Srimad Goswain Sir Gokul Nathji Maharaj, Bombay, dated the 19th April, 1934.
110. From the Secretary, Nagar Varnashram Swarajya Sangha.
111. From the General Secretary, V. S. S. Khandun, C. P., dated the 29th April, 1934.

112. From the Secretary, V. S. S., Kared Branch, dated the 30th April, 1934.
113. From the President, V. S. S., Kundha Branch, dated nil.
114. From the Vice-President, U. P., Varnashram Swarajya Sangha, dated nil.
115. From Varnashram Swarajya Sangha, Branch Utran, E. Khandesh, dated nil.
116. From V. S. Sangh, Shahganj (Jampur), U. P., dated nil.
117. From the President, V. S. S., Ahsakha Brahmopore, Shahabad, dated the 8th May, 1934.
118. From V. S. S., Branch Sibpur, Howrah, dated the 6th May, 1934.
119. From V. S. S., Bankura Branch (Bengal), dated nil.
120. From the President, Barhiya, dated the 6th May, 1934.
121. From the Secretary, Sri Sanatan Dharma Mandal, Jaipur, dated the 7th May, 1934.
122. From the Sanatan Vedic Dharma Sabha, Surat, dated the 8th May, 1934.
123. From the President, V. A. S. Sangh, Dwarka, dated nil.
124. From the Panchmahal District, Varnashrama Swarajya Sangha, dated the 8th May, 1934.
125. From the Hindu Central Committee, Branch Nandyal, Kurnool District, dated the 6th May, 1934.
126. From the President, Purana Sravana Sabha, Madura, dated the 9th May, 1934.
127. Protests in the same printed form from—
- (1) Secretary, Varnashrama Swarajya Sangha, Bankura, Bengal.
  - (2) The Varnashrama Swarajya Sangha, Khandra, District Nimar.
  - (3) President, Sanatan Dharma Association, Tehta, P. O., Gaya.
128. Protests in the same printed form from meetings held at:—
- (1) Ambala, Sonapat and Ballabgarh and from Palwal.
  - (2) 18 different places in Hissar District.
  - (3) 10 different places in Bewari, Hissar District.
  - (4) 5 places in Meerut District.
  - (5) 15 places in Meerut City and 9 in Meerut Cantonment.
129. Protests in same printed form submitted by—
- (1) Six residents of Gurgaon District.
  - (2) 3 Residents of Faridabad.
  - (3) 2 residents of Palwal.
  - (4) 6 residents of Ballabgarh.
  - (5) 18 residents of Hissar District.
130. Letter from the Marwari Association, Calcutta, dated the 28th May, 1934.
131. Resolutions of the Managing Committee of the Vedashastrottejak Sabha, Poona, dated 26th May, 1934.
132. Resolution of Public Meeting held at Amalner, E. Khandesh, 29th May, 1934.
133. Resolutions of Sanatanist Meeting held at Karachi, on 6th May, 1934.
134. Letter from President, Varnashrama Swarajya Sangha, Sivaganga, dated 22nd May, 1934.
135. Resolutions of Public Meeting at Pandaypipra, Isri, Shahabad District.
136. Protest bearing signatures of 52 residents of Hosur, Salem District.
137. Resolutions passed by meetings held on 6th May, 1934, at six villages, Taluk Sattinapalle, Guntur District.
- Protests in the same form from—
138. President, Sanatana Dharma Sabha Chathapuram, Kalpathi, Palghat, S. Malabar.
139. Secretary, Provincial Varnashram Sanatan Dharma Sava, Jorhat, Assam.

140. President, Sanatan Dharm Mahasabha, Khurja, Bulandshahr.
141. Secretary, Shri Sanata Dharma Sabha, Ferozepur City.
142. Secretary, Mithla Pravtiya Varnashram Swarajya Sangha, Sitamarhi.
143. President, Dharm Sastra Sabha, Madura.
144. Pandit Ghanashyam Vedant Tirth, Panchrof, Midnapore.
145. Vice-President, Varnashrama Swarajya Sangha, Poona.
146. Secretary, Nellore District Varnashrama Dharma Sabha.
147. Secretary, Sanatan Vaidic Dharma Samrakshaka Mandal, Poona.
148. Secretary, Sanatan Dharma Sabha, Gaya.
149. President, Sanatan Dharam Pratap Bhavan, Srinagar.
150. President, Sanatan Dharma Sabha, Hyderabad, Sind.
151. President, V. S. Sangh, Rudain.
152. Secretary, Dharma Samrakshaka Sabha, Aryapur, Rajmundry.
153. President, Sanatan Dharma Bhardhani Sabha.
154. President, Sanatan Dharma Sabha, Battiah.
155. Secretary, Varnasrama Dharmodharaka Sabha, Pamad, Guntur.
156. President, Varnasrama Dharmodharaka Sabha, Repalle, Guntur.
157. President, Varnasrama Dharmodharaka Sabha, Tenali, Guntur.
158. President and Secretary, Varnasrama Dharmodharaka Sabha, Sattanapalle, Guntur.
159. President and Secretary, Varnasrama Dharmodharaka Sabha, Perthapuram Sabha, East Godavari.
160. Secretaries, Varnasrama Dharmodharaka Sabha, Razole Taluk Sabha, East Godavari.
161. President, Bombay, Provincial Varnashram Swarajya Sangh, Surat.
162. Joint Secretary, Shri Sanatan Dharam Yovak Sabha, Karachi.
163. President, Varnashram Swarajya Sabha, Satara.
164. President, Sri Vedhaitha Desika Baktha Sabha, Madura.
165. President, Tirukoilur Arya Dharma Abhikridhini Brahmana Mahasabha, Tirukoilur, South Arcot, Madras.
166. General Secretary, U. P., Varnashram Swarajya Sangha, Cawnpore.
167. President, Varnashram Swaraj Sangh, Deogarh.
168. Resolution passed by Sanatanist meeting forwarded by the Mandir Raksha Committee, Delhi, dated 6th May, 1934.
169. Resolution of Orthodox Hindu meeting, on 6th May, 1934, at Palakol, West Godavari.
170. Resolution by Hindu Meeting at Kavali, Nellore District, dated 6th May, 1934.
171. Resolution by Hindu meeting at Melkote, on 6th May, 1934.
172. Resolution by meeting at temple of Narasimha Akhara, Shillong, on 6th May, 1934.
173. Resolution by meeting at Ram Janaki Temple, Shillong, dated 6th May, 1934.
174. Resolution at Satyanarsin Thakurbari Temple, Shillong, dated 6th May, 1934.
175. Resolution by Sanatanist meeting at Lahore, on 6th May, 1934.
176. Protests in the same form from—
  - President, Kavali Taluk Varnasrama Dharmodharaka Sabha.
  - President, Sanatan Dharm Pravartuka Mandan, Bhavnagar.
  - Sri Mahanta Bhagawat Das, Bahiri Bara Math, Midnapur.
  - President, Contai Varnashram Swarajya Sangh, Midnapur.
  - President, Bahiri Jagunath Sabagat Sangha, Midnapur.
  - President, Varnashrama Swarajya Sangha, Balighai, Midnapur.
  - President, Pakur Sub-Divisional Varnashram Swarajya Sangha.

176.—*contd.*

President, Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Haldwain, Naini Tal District.

President, Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Monghyr.

Secretary, Sri Vaidika Dharma Bodhini Sabha, Secunderabad, Deccan.

Secretary, Shree Sanatana Dharma Sabha, Agra.

Secretary, Varnashram Swarajya Sangha, Agra Branch, Agra.

Secretary, Varnashram Swarajya Sangh Branch, Kundgol, Jamkhadi State.

President, Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Rai Bareilly.

Vice-President, Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Hoshiarpur.

Pandit Mahadeo Shastri.

177. Resolution of meeting at Jagannath Temple, Shillong, dated 6th May, 1934.

178. Resolution of meeting at Kalibari Temple, Shillong, dated 6th May, 1934.

179. Resolution of meeting at Satsanga Temple, Shillong, dated 6th May, 1934.

180. Resolution of meeting at Mahadebkhola Temple, Shillong, dated 6th May, 1934.

181. Protest forwarded by Ratneswar Barua, Jorhat, Assam, bearing 154 names.

182. Thirty Protests (printed in same form) from residents of Ferozepur City.

183. Protest from Battili village, Paelakunidi Taluk, Ganjam District, bearing 252 signatures.

184. Letter dated 5th June, 1934, from N. S. Parande, Nagpur, forwarding protests bearing about 2,680 signatures.

185. Eight Protests (printed in same form) from representative All-India Varnashrama Swarajya Sangha, Bellary, Benares, and certain places in Madras.

186. Letter from Secretary, Kaira District Varnashrama Swarajya Sangha, Nadiad, dated 11th June, 1934, forwarding four printed protests bearing about 120 signatures in vernacular.

187. Letter from Secretary, Guntur District Varnashrama Dharma Sabha, forwarding printed protests bearing 27 signatures.

188. Letter from Secretary, Sanatan Varna-asram Dharma Sabha, Darda, C. P., forwarding protests bearing 50 signatures.

189. Protest lists bearing about 600 signatures (vernacular).

190. Letter from the Secretary, Achhutudhar Committee, Meerut, dated 14th April, 1934, communicating resolutions passed by public meeting held on 12th April, 1934, against Temple Entry Bill.

191. Letter from the Secretary, Varnashram Swaraj Sangh, Belgaum, dated 30th April, 1934, forwarding protests bearing 3,428 signatures.

192. Letter from the President, Maharashtra Provincial Varnashram Swarajya Sangha, No. 2003/O.D.A., dated 4th May, 1934, forwarding protests bearing signatures of about 8,900 persons.

193. Letter dated 9th May, 1934, from V. L. Narasimham, All-India Varnashram Swarajya Sangha, Guntur, forwarding 15 petitions from Taluk and village Sabhas of Nellore District, bearing 254 signatures.

194. Letter dated Guntur, 9th May, 1934, from V. L. Narasimham, All-India Varnashram Swarajya Sangha, Guntur, forwarding nineteen petitions from village Sabhas bearing 307 signatures.

195. Letter dated Guntur, 17th May, 1934, from V. L. Narasimham, All-India Varnashram Swarajya Sangha, Guntur, forwarding thirteen petitions from taluk and village Sabhas, bearing 369 signatures.

196. Letter dated Guntur, 22nd May, 1934, from V. L. Narasimham, All-India Varnashram Swarajya Sangha, Guntur, forwarding thirteen petitions from taluk and village Sabhas, bearing 78 signatures.

197. Letter dated Guntur, 22nd May, 1934, from V. L. Narasimham, All-India Varnashram Swarajya Sangha, Guntur, forwarding seven petitions from village sabhas of Darri Division, Nellore District, bearing twenty-two signatures.

198. Protest by Sanatanists of Hyderabad Sind, dated 8th May, 1934.
199. Resolution by Andhra Desa Varnasrama Sangha, Bezvada.
200. Resolution by Barnasram Dharm Sangrakshini Sabha, at Netrakona, Mymensingh, Bengal, dated the 7th May, 1934.
201. Protest by President, Shri Hatkeswar Fund Committee, Rajkot, dated the 7th June, 1934.
202. Protest by Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Begum Bazar, Hyderabad Deccan, dated the 20th June, 1934.
203. Protest by Sanatanists of Dohad, dated 12th May, 1934.
204. Resolution by Varnashram Swaraj Sangh, Beyt Sankodhar, Kathiawar, dated 30th May, 1934.
205. Resolution by Sanatanist Meeting, Swami Narayan Mandir at Karachi, dated 31st May, 1934.
206. Memorial by Varnasrama Dharma Sabha, Nellore, Madras, dated May, 1934.
207. Resolution by Sanatanists Meeting at Porbandar, dated 18th May, 1934.
208. Resolution by Hindu Meeting at Erandol, East Khandesh, dated 24th May, 1934.
209. Resolution by Sanatan Dharamists of Mainpuri, dated 21st April, 1934.
210. Resolution by Hindu Meeting at Rajshahy, Bengal, dated 9th May, 1934.
211. Resolution by Hindu Central Committee, Cuddalore, dated 6th May, 1934.
212. Resolution by Hindu Meeting of Sylhet, dated 13th May, 1934.
213. Resolution by Sanatanists of Dhamoura, Champaran, dated 6th May, 1934.
214. Resolution by Hindu Meeting at Temple Mahadeb Khola, Shillong, dated 6th May, 1934.
215. Resolution by Hindu Meeting at Temple Jagannath, Shillong, dated 6th May, 1934.
216. Resolution by Hindu Meetings at Temples (1) Satyanarain Shakuroari, (2) Kali Bari, (3) Satsangh Bhawan, (4) Narshingh Akhara, (5) Bamjanki Jungli Akhara, dated 6th May, 1934.
217. Resolution by Shri Hari Sankirtan Mandal, Rawalpindi, dated 6th May, 1934.
218. Resolution by Sanatanists of Melkole, dated 6th May, 1934.
219. Resolution by Veranashram Swaraj Sangh, Bulandshar, dated 6th May, 1934.
220. Resolution by Benhar Provincial Association for Preservation of Hindu Temple, dated 6th May, 1934.
221. Protest by Iswar Chandra Nanda, President, Bahiri Jagannath Sebayat Sangha, Midnapore, dated 11th May, 1934.
222. Protest by Mahanta Bhagabat Das, Midnapore, dated 11th May, 1934.
223. Protest by Sanatan Dharam Conference, Naruar, dated 8th May, 1934.
224. Resolution by Hindu Meeting at Bindhachal, Mirzapur, dated 8th May, 1934.
225. Resolution by Mahajanams of Melmangalam, Madura, dated 7th May, 1934.
226. Resolution by Hindu Central Committee, Palakol, West Godawari, dated 6th May, 1934.
227. Resolution by Vaidika Dharma Veera Sangha of South Kanara, dated 6th May, 1934.
228. Resolution by Varnashram Swaraj Sangh, Pulgaon, dated 6th May, 1934.
229. Resolution by Barnasram Swaraj Sangha, Dinajpur, dated 6th May, 1934.
230. Resolution by Sanatan Dharamavalambiya, Agrawal Sabha, dated 6th May, 1934.
231. U. P. Varnashram Swarajya Sangh, Cawnpore, dated 19th May, 1934.
232. V. L. Narasimham, Secretary, Guntur District, Varnasrama Dharma Sabha, dated 14th May, 1934.

233. P. A. M. Garu, Secretary, Varnasrama Dharma Sabha, Nellore, dated 21st May, 1934.
234. Protest by residents of Hosur, Salem District.
235. Telegram dated Kaswabtgah, 12th May, 1934, from Laduram Shastari, Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Ledi.
236. Telegram dated Brindaban, 10th May, 1934, from Dijen Ganguly, Manager, Gobindji Temple.
237. Telegram dated Brindaban, 10th May, 1934, from Sachin Sarkar, Manager, Gopinathji Temple.
238. Telegram dated Brindaban, 8th May, 1934, from Swami Kethabanand Sri Katyaynipith, Brindaban.
239. Telegram dated 9th May, 1934, Brindaban, from Nilamber Prosad, Manager, Madan Mohan Temple.
240. Telegram dated Raipur, 5th May, 1934, from Mahant Bajrandas, Dudhadhari.
241. Telegram dated Sultanpur, Jadunath Singh, Zamindar, Athalsi.
242. Telegram dated Kakojan, Assam, 25th May, 1934, from Secretary, Kakajan Hindu Dharm Sabha, Jorhat, Assam.
243. Telegram dated Rikhikesh, 12th May, 1934, from Secretary, Balhitkarini Samiti Lakshman Jhula.
244. Telegram dated Jand (Attock), 21st May, 1934, from Secretary, Sanatan Sabha.
245. Telegram dated Baffa, Hza, 21st May, 1934, from Secretary, Sanatan Dharma.
246. Telegram dated Dalsingh Sarai, Post Ujiarpore, regarding protest meeting of Parrai Sanatanists.
247. Protest dated 22nd May, 1934, from President, Varnasrama Swarajya Sangha, Sivaganga Branch.
248. Resolution passed by Hindu Dharama Sabha Melatur, Janjore District.
249. Resolutions passed at Public Meeting held at Sri Sarangapaniswami Temple, on 6th May, 1934.
250. Resolutions passed by Sanatan Dharmavalambiya Agarwal Sabha Meeting, Calcutta.
251. Resolutions passed by Hindu Public Meeting of Tinnevelly, on 6th May, 1934, under auspices of The Hindu Dharma Sabha.
252. Resolution passed by Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Muzaffarnagar, dated 2nd April, 1934.
253. Resolution passed by Sanatanist Hindu Meeting at Gadarwara, C. P., dated 23rd April, 1934.
254. Letter dated 27th April, 1934, from President, Surat Sanatanist Meeting, Surat, dated 23rd April, 1934.
255. Protest, dated 1st May, 1934, from President, All-India Varnashrama Swarajya Sangha, Rajkot Branch.
256. Resolutions of Sanatanist Meeting, held at Coimbatore, on 6th May, 1934.
257. Protest, dated 6th May, 1934, from Rambalav Jagnani.
258. Protest from Trivedi Vasudev Shastri (Sahitya Ratna), Varanasi.
259. Resolution passed by Sanatanist Meeting at Delhi, on 6th May, 1934.
260. Resolutions passed by Sanatanist Meeting at Burhanpur, on 6th May, 1934.
261. Resolutions passed by Sanatanist Meeting at Busera, District Darbhanga (Bihar), on 6th May, 1934.
262. Resolution of General Committee of U. P. Mahabir Dal, Muzaffarnagar.
263. Letter dated 4th June 1934, from Devendra Nath Goswami, Tarajan Jorhat, Assam.
264. Resolutions (vernacular) passed by certain village Sabhas (12 in Guntur and Nellore Districts).
265. 30 protests in the same terms from residents in Sonapat.
266. 10 protests in the same terms from residents of Karnal.
267. 7 protests in the same terms from a resident of Ambala Cantonment.

268. Resolutions couched in the same terms passed by public meetings held in six different places in Ambala Cantonment.
269. Resolutions couched in the same terms passed by public meetings held in 17 different places in Karnal.
270. Resolutions couched in the same terms passed by public meetings held in 6 different places in Meerut City.
271. Resolutions couched in the same terms passed by public meetings held in 4 different places in Sonapat.
272. Letter from the Secretary, Guntur District Varnashram Sabha, dated 24th April, 1934, forwarding petitions addressed in the same terms to the Legislative Assembly, signed by 265 persons belonging to Guntur District.
273. Letter from the Secretary, Guntur District Varnashram Sabha, dated 25th April, 1934, forwarding similar petitions signed by 98 residents of Guntur District.
274. Protests bearing 157 signatures of residents of Godavari District.
275. Protests bearing 364 signatures of residents of Nellore District.
276. Protests bearing 679 signatures of residents of Karachi, Sind.
277. 5 protests lists bearing signatures of 74 residents of Ajmer.
278. Resolutions passed at 7 places in Ajmer in same form.
279. Resolutions passed in two places in Fyzabad, U. P.
280. Resolutions passed in two places in Hardwar, U. P.
281. Protests in same printed form from—  
 Secretary, Varnashram Swarajya Sangh, Hardwar.  
 President, V. A. S. Sangh, Dwarka.  
 Secretary, Sanatan Dharma Society, Delhi.  
 President, Pakur Sub-Divisional Varnashram Swarajya Sangha Waman  
 Ramchandra Kinjawadekar (without address).
282. Lists forwarded by the Secretary, Provincial Varnashram Swaraj Sangh, Rajputana, bearing 1,506 signatures.
283. Letter from the Secretary, Varnashrama Dharma Sabha, Nellore District, Madras Presidency, dated 21st May, 1934, forwarding  
 (1) Resolutions passed at 232 meetings held in various villages in Madras Presidency.  
 (2) Lists bearing signatures of about 14,800 residents of Madras Presidency.
- (b) *Protests against the Temple Entry Bill and the Untouchability Abolition Bills.*
284. Telegram dated Nagpur, 8th May, 1934, from Nagamal Amolakchand, Trustees Potdar Ram Mandir.
285. Telegram dated Bellary, 7th May, 1934, from Pullapant Rama Chandra Sastri, Secretary, Varnashrama Sabha, Bellary.
286. Telegram dated Bombay, 10th May, 1934, from H. H. Goswami Shri Gopinathji Maharaj of Vallabh Acharya Sampradaya, President, Sanatanists Meeting at Bada Mandir, Bombay.
287. Telegram dated Chowhat, 7th May, 1934, from President, Kerala Sanatana Hindu Sabha, Guruvayur, held at Punnathur.
288. Telegram dated Dera Ismail Khan City, 7th May, 1934, from Manager, Govardhanath Temple.
289. Telegram dated Dera Ismail Khan City, 7th May, 1934, from Manager, Gopinath Temple.
290. Telegram dated Dera Ismail Khan City, 7th May, 1934, from Manager, Girdhargopal Temple.
291. Telegram dated Dera Ismail Khan City, 7th May, 1934, from Manager, Nagarji Temple.
292. Telegram dated Dera Ismail Khan City, 7th May, 1934, from Manager, Mahaprabhu Temple.

293. Telegram dated Puri, 7th May, 1934, from Shankar Basudeo Tirtha Swami of Gopaltirtha Nath, Puri, President of Public Meeting.
294. Telegram dated Shamli, 8th May, 1934, from Secretary, Sanatan Dharam Sabha.
295. Telegram dated Rusera, 7th May, 1934, from President, Sanatan Dharma Sabha, Roserah, Darbhanga.
296. Telegram dated Pakaur, 7th May, 1934, from Gaispande, President, Pakur Sub-Divisional Varnashram Swarajya Sangha.
297. Telegram dated Hulu Bazar, 8th May, 1934, from President, Sanatan Dharam Sahayak Sabha, regarding Bhiwani Sanatanist Meeting.
298. Telegram dated Dera Ismail Khan City, 8th May, 1934, from Manager, Gopinath Temple.
299. Telegram dated Dera Ismail Khan City, 7th May, 1934, from Manager, Sanatan Ram Mandir.
300. Telegram dated Dera Ismail Khan City, 7th May, 1934, from Manager, Mudan Mohanji Temple.
301. Telegram dated Dera Ismail Khan City, 7th May, 1934, from Manager, Nar Singhji Temple.
302. Telegram dated Gurdaspur, 7th May, 1934, from Vaishnavacharya Shri Mahant Ramdass Gaddi Nashim Darbar Pandori, District Gurdaspur.
303. Telegram dated 7th May, 1934, from Sitaram Saraf, Secretary, All-India Sanatan Dharmawalambiy Marwari Yuvak Samelan, Calcutta.
304. Telegram dated Surat, 7th May, 1934, from President, Surat Sanatanist Meeting.
305. Telegram dated Nagpur, 7th May, 1934, from Shri Jagatguru Shri Shankaracharya Sankeshwar Karvir Muth Camp, Nagpur.
306. Telegram dated Madras, 11th May, 1934, from President, Meeting of Dharmasevaka Sabha.
307. Telegram dated Surat, 9th May, 1934, from Trustees, Dwarkanathji Temple.
308. Telegram dated Surat, 9th May, 1934, from Proprietor, Mahisaurihnata Temple.
309. Telegram dated Surat, 9th May, 1934, from Vahivatdar Surat Shrinathji Temple.
310. Telegram, dated Surat, 9th May, 1934, from Vahivatdar Bhataji Temple.
311. Telegram dated Surat, 9th May, 1934, from Proprietor, Datarya Temple.
312. Telegram dated Surat, 9th May, 1934, from Proprietor, Ashapurimita Temple.
313. Telegram dated Surat, 9th May, 1934, from Proprietor, Acharnyaji Temple.
314. Telegram dated Surat, 9th May, 1934, from Proprietor Shastriji Temple.
315. Telegram dated Surat, 9th May, 1934, from Vahivatdar Shrinathaji Padhi.
316. Telegram dated Surat, 9th May, 1934, from Vahivatdar Mahakalimata Temple.
317. Telegram dated 28th May, 1934, from President, Meeting of People of Bhawanipur and near villages, District Darbhanga.
- Protests in the same terms (printed form).*
318. 5 from residents of Chandani.
319. 2 from residents of Pora village, Tehsil Sambhal (Morabad).
320. 4 from residents of Majhola village, Tehsil Sambhal (Morabad).
321. 1 from resident of Namaini, Morabad.
322. 1 from resident of Jargaon, Morabad.
323. 35 from residents of Sambhal, Morabad.
324. Protest from Chodavarapu Devalrazu Pantulugaru and Manepalli Venugopala Krishnamoorty Sarmagrau, Bezwada.
325. Letter dated Ajmer, 26th April, 1934, from President, Meeting of Digambar Jains.
326. Letter dated Nagpur, 8th May, 1934, from Secretary to His Holiness Jagadguru Shri Shankaracharya Sankeshwar Karvir Muth, regarding public meeting in Nagpur.

327. Resolution of Sanatanist Meeting held at Shikarpur, Sind.
328. Resolution passed by Ladies Meetings at Rajkot.
329. Letter dated 7th May, 1934, regarding Hindu Sanatanist Protest Meeting at Sambhal, District Moradabad.
330. Letter dated 6th May, 1934, from President, Sanatanist Protest Meeting at Hyderabad, Sind.
331. Letter dated 6th May, 1934, from President, Sanatanist Protest Meeting, Larkana, Sindh.
332. Protest forwarded by Secretary of Sattenapalle Taluka Varnasrama (Guntur District), bearing 273 signatures.
333. Letter dated 3rd May, 1934, from President, Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Thasushak, regarding Sanatanist Protest Meeting.
334. Letter dated 9th May, 1934, from Lalldoss Chotadoss, Madras, communicating resolutions passed by meeting held in connection with "The All-India Temple Defence Committee Day".
335. Letter from Secretary, Kaira District, Varnashram Swarajya Sangh, regarding resolutions passed by Sanatanist Meeting at Nadiad.
336. Letter from Secretary, Guntur District, Varnasharam Dharamodharak Sabha, dated 11th May, 1934, communicating resolution passed by local Sabhas of ten villages.
337. Resolutions passed by the Sri Madura Varanshrama Dharma Swarajya Sangam Sanatanist Meeting.
338. Resolution passed by the Public Meeting of Hindus of Devakotta.
339. Resolutions passed by the "Sivaganga Varnasrama Swarajya Sangha, Bannad District.
340. Resolution passed by the Sanatana Dharma Conference, Bellary.
341. Resolutions passed by the public meeting of the Smartha Dharma Mandali, Tirupati.
342. Letter dated 4th May, 1934, from J. B. Durkal, President, Sanatan Vedic Dharma Sabha, Surat, enclosing "opinion" on Temple Entry Bill.
343. Letter dated 1st May, 1934, from J. B. Drukal enclosing "opinion" on Temple Entry Bill.
344. Letter from the All-India Varnashram Swarajya Sangha, Bombay, dated 1st May, 1934, enclosing "opinion" on Temple Entry Bill.
345. Letter from the Secretary to His Holiness Shrimad Goswami Shri Gokulnathjee Maharaj, Bombay, dated 19th April, 1934, enclosing "opinion" on Temple Entry Bill.
346. Letter from the Marwari Association, Calcutta, dated 28th May, 1934.
347. "Opinion" of the Shri Sanatan Dharma Shira Sabha, Delhi, on Temple Entry Bill.
348. Telegram dated 25th May, 1934, from Sanatanists Bakhri (Monghyr).
349. Telegram dated 20th May, 1934, from Public Meeting of Shree Maharashtra Digambar Jain Khandelwal Panch Mahasabha, Bombay.
350. Resolution by Sanatanist Meeting at Masulipatam, on 6th May, 1934.
351. Resolution by Meeting of Sandhus, Mahants and Mahatmas of Nasik, Panchwati and Tapowana held on 4th June, 1934.
352. Resolution passed by Sanatanist Meeting at Niwashi, Chiplun Taluka, Ratnagiri District, dated 26th May, 1934.
353. Resolution passed by Sanatan Dharam Sabha at Petlad, Baroda, dated 31st May, 1934.
354. Resolution passed by Sanatan Dharam Sabha of Masulipatam, dated 6th May, 1934.
355. Resolution passed by Sanatan Dharam Sabha at Satyamangalam, dated 6th May, 1934.
356. Resolution passed by Sanatan Dharam Sabha at Yeotmal, dated 6th May, 1934.
357. Resolution passed by Sanatanists of Rameshwaram, dated 6th May, 1934.

358. Resolution passed by Sanatanists of Rajkot (Jaganath Temple), dated 6th May, 1934.
359. Resolution passed by Sanatanists of Nungambakkam, dated 6th May, 1934.
360. Resolution passed of Samasta Sanatan Hindu Dharma Sabha, Ahmedabad, dated the 3rd May, 1934.
361. Resolution passed by Sanatanists at Bandra (Bombay), dated 26th April, 1934.
362. Resolution passed by Sanatanists at Andheri (Bombay), dated 21st April, 1934.
363. Resolution passed by Sanatanists at Vadgadi Mandvi (Bombay), dated the 18th April, 1934.
364. Resolution passed by Sanatanists at Matonga (Bombay), dated 14th April, 1934.
365. Resolution passed by Akola Santa Cruz (Bombay), dated 19th May, 1934.
366. Resolution passed by Sanatanists at Andheri (Thana), Bombay, dated the 5th April, 1934.
367. Resolution passed by Hindu Meeting at Sheth Sukhanandji's Wadi, C. P., Tank Bombay, dated 6th May, 1934.
368. Resolution passed by Sanatanists at Hanumanji's Temple, Duncan Road, Bombay, dated the 6th May, 1934.
369. Resolution passed by Sanatanists at Ram-Mundir, Takhordwar, on 6th May, 1934.
370. Resolution passed by Untouchables Dharavi Meeting, Bombay, dated 22nd April, 1934.
371. Resolution passed by Temple Dharm Rakshini Sabha, Saugor, dated 6th May, 1934.
372. Resolution passed by Hindus of Pandhana, Khandwa, District Nimar, dated the 27th March, 1934.
373. Resolution passed by Hindus of Makhan, Khandwa, District Nimar, dated the 16th April, 1934.
374. Resolution passed by Hindus of Dinapore Cantonment, dated 6th May, 1934.
375. Protest by Adekari Jamnadas Narainji, Lalbawa Mandir.
376. Protest by Goswami Narsinghlalji, Maharaja's Temple, Ahikari, Ramlal Virchand.
377. Protest by Bhuralal Girdharilal, Attorney to Goswami Shri Mangalalji Shri Gordhanlalji Maharaj.
378. Resolution passed by Hindu Central Committee (Rural Branch) Thiruvanaikoll, dated 6th May, 1934.
379. 8 petitions forwarded through G. M. Despande, Secretary, Varnashram Swarajya Sangh, Dhamungaon, R. S. Berar—protests.
380. From His Holiness Acharya Shri Purushottamlalji Maharaj, Camp Jafarabad (Kathiawar).
381. From the President of the V. Swarajya Sangh, Rajkot Branch, dated 10th April, 1934.
382. From the President, Public Meeting at Ghazipur City, held on 26th March, 1934.
383. From the President, Public Meeting at Tewaripur, held on 27th March, 1934.
384. From the President, Public Meeting at Dulia Newada, on 24th March, 1934.
385. From the President, Public Meeting at Restipur, on 14th March, 1934.
386. From the President, Public Meeting at Behabar, on 21st March, 1934.
387. From the President, Public Meeting at Sonharia, on 22nd March, 1934.
388. From the President, Public Meeting at Utarauli, on 25th March, 1934.
389. From the President, Public Meeting at Aunti, on 27th March, 1934.

390. From the President, Melang Sanatan Dharam Sabha, dated 10th April, 1934.
391. From the President, V. Swaraya Sangha, Rajkot, dated 15th April, 1934.
392. From the President, Sanatana Varnashrama Dharma Sabha, dated 10th April, 1934.
393. Statement of persons in Lolitnagar Vaziagapati who are opposed to the T. E. Bill.
394. From M. J. Mangiah, Lalitpur, dated 12th April, 1934.
395. From the Presidents of Public Meeting at Buscot and other places (14 protests).
396. From Secretary, Shri Sanatan Dharam Free Tract Society, Punjab, No. 7340, dated 16th April, 1934.
397. From the Secretary, V. S. S., Rajkot, Nos. 215/A., dated 16th April, 1934, and 216/A., dated 16th April, 1934, forwarding protests bearing over 170 signatures.
398. Resolutions passed by Public Meetings held in different places in the Gonda district (U. P.), protesting against the Temple Entry and Untouchability Abolition Bill (9 protests).
399. From the Secretary, Melang Sanatan Varnashram Dharma Sava, Jorhat, Assam, dated 18th April, 1934.
400. Resolutions passed by the Public Meetings in Kotah protesting against the Temple Entry Bill (3 protests).
401. From the President, V. S. S., Rajkot, No. 252/B.B., dated 1st May, 1934.
402. From the Secretary, Varnashrama Sabha, Bellary, telegram dated 7th May, 1934.
403. Telegram dated 6th May, 1934, from the President of the Public Meeting held in Puri, on 6th May, 1934.
404. Telegram dated 8th May, 1934, from President, Sanatan Dharma, Khagaria.
405. Telegram dated 8th May, 1934, protest by the General Meeting of Sanatanist citizens organised by All-India Sanatandharma Walambiy Marwari Yuvak Samelan held on 6th May, 1934, in Calcutta.
406. Telegram dated 8th May, 1934, from the President, Pakwe Sub-Divisional Varnashram Swarajya Sangha.
407. Telegram dated 8th May, 1934, from the President, V. S. S. Wardha.
408. Telegram dated 8th May, 1934, from the Secretary, Varnashrama Sabha, Nellore.
409. Resolutions of Meeting at the Ekambaraswatar Agraham, Madras, on 6th May, 1934.
410. Resolution of Sanatanist Meeting at Madura, on 6th May, 1934.
411. Resolution of Hindu Meeting held at Sheth Sukhanandji's Wadi, C. P., Tank, Bombay, on 6th May, 1934.
412. Resolution of Hindu Meeting held at Ram Mandir Thakordwar, Bombay, on 6th May, 1934.
413. Resolution of Hindu Meeting held at Hanumanji's Temple, Duncan Road, Bombay, on 6th May, 1934.
414. Telegram dated 1st June, 1934, protest from Sanatan Dharm Sabha, Dharmnala.
415. Resolutions of the Varnashrama Swarajya Sangha, Sivaganga Branch, held on 21st March, 1934.
416. Resolutions of Sanatan Dharma Conference, Bellary, held on 27th May, 1934.
417. Resolution of Sanatanist Meeting held at Sree Nageswaraswami Vari Temple, Khojillipet, Masulipatam, on 6th May, 1934.
418. Letter from Goswami Shree Narasingh Lalji Maharaja's Temple, Adlukari Ramal Virchand, without date.
419. Letter without date from Kurbari Bhagwandas Abhechand, on behalf of Purshottam Lalji Maharaj.

420. Letter without date from Adhikari Jamnadas Naranji, Lalbawa Mandir.
421. Letter without date from Bhojalal Gudharilal, constituted attorney to Oswami Shri Mangalaji Shri Gordanlalji Maharaj.
422. Resolution of Sanatanist Meeting held at Petlad, on 31st May, 1934.
423. Resolution of Public Meeting held at Lakhneshwardih, Behar, on 20th May, 1934.
424. Resolution of Public Meeting of Sadhus, Mahants and Mahants of Nasik, Panchwati and Tapowana, on 4th June, 1934.
425. Resolutions passed by Sanatanist Meeting held at Niwashi in Taluka Chiplum, in Ratnagiri District, on 26th May, 1934.
426. Telegram, dated 20th June 1934—protest meeting of Shree Maharashtra Digambar Jain Khandelwal Panch Mahasabha.
427. 24 identical printed representations against the Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills bearing 455 signatures.
428. Protests, dated the 26th January 1934, signed by 27 residents of Belgaum against the Hindu Temple Entry Disabilities Removal Bill and the Untouchability Abolition Bill.
429. Letter from the President, Varnashrama Swarajya Sangh, Nagpur, dated the 26th December, 1933.
430. Letter from the Chairman, the Tanjore-South Arcot Sanathan Conference, Shiyali.
431. Letter from the General Secretary, Shree Bharat Varshiya Digambar Jain, Seoni, C. P., No. 2412, dated 7th December, 1933.
432. Letter from the Secretary, the Hindu Dharma Sabha, Melatur, dated 16th November, 1933.
433. Proceedings of the Sri Bahthisara Vilas Sabah Meeting at No. 1, Alwarcoil Sathatha Street, Kumbakonam, S. India, dated 16th August, 1933.
434. Proceedings of Manavala Manuni Sabah Meeting at Shewapet, Salem, S. India.
435. Proceedings of the Nigamantha Thagiga Sabah, Shevapet, Salem, S. India.
436. Proceedings of Public Meeting of Sathachara Samrakchana Sabha held at Perani Wellianal, Taluk Karur, Trichinopoly District, on 24th August, 1933.
437. Resolutions passed at Sanatanist Public Meeting at Kohat, N.-W. F. P. on 8th November, 1933.
438. Resolution passed on 14th October, 1933, by the Shri Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Bannu.
439. Telegram, dated Amritsar, the 13th October, 1933—protest from Sanatan Dharam Free Tract Society.
440. Telegram, dated Mianwali, 6th December, 1933—protest from Sanatanist meeting.
441. Telegram, dated Mianwali, 6th December, 1933—protest from Hindu Meeting.
442. Proceedings of Protest Meeting forwarded by the Working Secretary, Sree Audhra Dada Sanatana Varnashrama Dharma Sabha, Vejjivada, Begwada, dated 24th December, 1933.
443. Resolutions passed by Sanatanist meeting held on 2nd/3rd December, 1933, by the Poona Sanatan Vaidik Dharma Parishad.
444. Resolutions passed by public meeting held under auspices of the Sanatan Dharma Sabha, Sialkot, on 17th December, 1933.
445. Resolutions passed at the Provincial Kerala Sanatanists' Conference held at Guruvayur on 16/17th December, 1933.
446. Resolution passed by Meeting of Sanatanists of Delhi, held 13th January, 1934.

- [From General Secretary, B. D. Jain Mahasabha, Secmi (Central Provinces), dated the 26th February, 1934, together with 2,147 signatures.]
- |      |  |     |
|------|--|-----|
| 447. | 1. Bombay Presidency including some other parts of the Deccan .. | 786 |
| 448. | 2. Central Provinces .. .. .                                     | 221 |
| 449. | 3. Gwalior States .. .. .  | 73  |
| 450. | 4. United Provinces of Agra and Oudh ..                          | 561 |
| 451. | 5. Rajputana .. .. .   | 232 |
| 452. | 6. Gujrat .. .. .  | 23  |
| 453. | 7. Assam .. .. .   | 151 |
| 454. | 8. Punjab .. .. .  | 36  |
| 455. | 9. Bengal and Bihar .. .. .                                      | 64  |
456. From President of Sind Prant, Mahant Bawa Gallaldas, Hyderabad, together with 2,307 signatures.
457. Letter from the President, Ram Mandir Public meeting, Bombay, dated the 9th March, 1934.
458. From the President, Nasik Municipality, No. 3042, dated 14th March, 1934.
459. From President, Monghyr, Public Meeting.
460. From U. P. Varnashram Swarajya Sangh, letter No. 1586, dated 17th March, 1934.
461. From President, Bada Mandir Bhuleswar meeting, Bombay, dated 14th March, 1934.
462. From President, Hira Bang, C. P. Tank meeting, Bombay, dated 15th March, 1934.
463. From President, Public meeting, Brindaban, dated 11th March, 1934.
464. From Rajah Sir Vasudeva, Rajah of Kallengode Kt., C.I.E.
- M. L. A., New Delhi, dated the 10th March, 1934, forwarding 69 resolutions.*
465. From Members of Legislative Assembly, Delhi with 278 signatures.
- 466.—2. From K. L. Narasinga Rao Municipal Committee, Gandhi Nagar, Bellary, dated the 14th February, 1934, with 51 signatures.
- 467.—3. From Secretaries, Varnashramaswaraj Sangh, Belgaum (Bombay Presidency), dated the 17th February, 1934, with 638 signatures.
- 468.—4. From Shree Jagatguru Shree Shankracharya Maharaj, District Belgaum (Bombay Presidency), dated the 16th February, 1934, with 654 signatures.
- 469.—5. From Shri Sanatan Dharma Sabha, Delhi, dated the 18th February, 1934.
- 470—471.—6. From K. M. De, Esquire, Lahan, Shillong (Assam), dated the 15th February, 1934.
- 472.—7. From Secretary, Brahman Seva Sunamganj Sylhet, Assam, dated the 18th February, 1934.
- 473.—8. From President, Bilhong Shillong (Assam), dated the 13th February, 1934.
- 474.—9. From President, Sanskrit Pathshala Ayodhia, Fyzabad (U. P.), dated the 20th February, 1934.
- 475.—10. Shankracharji Madhavrao—Chawl District, Kolaba (Bombay Presidency).
- 476.—11. From Secretary, the Vaidika Dharma Veera Sangha of South Kanara Udipi, dated the 28th February, 1934.
- 477.—12. From Mr. M. V. T. Sarma, Sanatanist of Manakkal Lalgudi Taluk, Trichinopoly, District of Madras, dated the 1st March, 1934.
- 478.—1. From Bevarao Shivaram Damdar Karabbari to His Holiness Shreemat Jagatguru Shree Shankaracharya Sanathan Matt Sunkeshwar—Harwar (District Belgaum), Bombay, dated the 6th January, 1934, with 72 signatures.
- 479.—2. Secretary Varnaasram Swarajya Sangh, Belgaum (Bombay Presidency), with 222 signatures.
- 480.—3. From President of Varnashram Swarajaya Sangha Hinganghat, dated the 4th February, 1934.
- 481.—4. From Mr. C. N. Mehta on behalf of Sanatanists of Kaira District, Nadiad, dated the 20th January, 1934.

- 482.—5. From Honorary Secretary, Shri Indraprastha, Sanatan Dharma Mandal, Delhi, dated the 10th February, 1934.
- 483.—6. Telegram from Vamasbram Swarajya Sangha, Calcutta, with 150 signatures.
- 484.—7. From President Sanatan Dharma Sabha, Dindigal, dated the 7th January, 1934.
- 485.—8. From the Secretary, Mandir Raksha Committee, Delhi, dated the 11th February, 1934.
- 486.—9. From President, Valdika Dharma Veera Sangha Udipi, South Canara, dated the 18th January, 1934.
- 487.—10. From Pandit Mandli Isakbel, Mianwali.
488. From the C. P. and Berar Varnashram Swarajya Sangha, No. 84, dated the 31st January, 1934.

Protests against the Temple Entry Bill and other religious Bills pending for discussion in the Legislative Assembly, mostly in the vernacular, received from :—

- 489.—(1) Various provinces, bearing 2,751 signatures.
- 490.—(2) Madras province, bearing 3,960 signatures.
- 491.—(3) Bombay province, bearing 3,139 signatures.
- 492.—(4) Bengal province, bearing 1,392 signatures.
- 498.—(5) United Provinces, bearing 7,865 signatures.
- 494.—(6) Punjab province, bearing 3,089 signatures.
- 495.—(7) Bihar and Orissa province, bearing 6,977 signatures.
- 496.—(8) Central Provinces, bearing 232 signatures.
- 497.—(9) North-West Frontier Province, bearing 176 signatures.
- 498.—(10) Rajputana Province, bearing 1 signature.

(C) *Protests against the Temple Entry and Untouchability and Hindu Divorce Bills.*

499. Telegram, dated the 22nd March, 1934, from President, Public Meeting, Darwha, protesting against the Temple Entry and Hindu Divorce Bills.
500. Telegram, dated Darwha, the 22nd March, 1934, resolutions passed at Public meeting at Boriarab, District Yeotmal, Berar, protesting against the Temple Entry, Untouchability and Hindu Divorce Bills.
501. Telegram, dated 22nd March, 1934, Public meeting, Ellichpur City, Berar, protesting against the above three Bills.
502. Telegram, dated 26th March, 1934, regarding meeting held at Mhow Cantonment, protesting against the Untouchability Bill.
503. Telegram, dated 26th March, 1934, regarding meeting at Mhow Cantonment, protesting against the Temple Entry Bill.
504. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 2nd April, 1934, from Gatooolal Patel Kodria, against the Untouchability Bill.
505. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 2nd April, 1923, from Gatooolal Patel Kodria, protesting against Temple Entry Bill.
506. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 2nd April, 1923, from Trustees, Gopal Mandir, against the Untouchability Bill.
507. Telegram, dated Mhow Basar, the 2nd April, 1923, from Trustees Gopal Mandir, against the Temple Entry Bill.
508. Telegram, dated Dacca, the 2nd April, 1923, regarding Annual Meeting, East Bengal Brahmin Samaj of 31st March, 1934, against the Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
509. Telegram, dated Mhow Cantonment, the 4th April, 1934, from Trustees Anant Beharijee Maharaj Mandeer, against the Temple Entry Bill.
510. Telegram, dated Mhow Cantonment, the 4th April, 1934, from Trustees Anant Beharijee Maharaj Mandeer, against the Untouchability Bill.
511. Telegram from Mahant Govindas, Lahore, dated the 3rd April, 1934, against the Temple Entry Bill.
512. Telegram from Mahant Siaramdas, Lahore, dated the 3rd April, 1934, against the Temple Entry Bill.

513. Telegram from Mahant Surastidas Bankobhari, Lahore, dated the 3rd April, 1934, against the Temple Entry Bill.
514. Telegram from Mahant Balramdas, Lahore, dated the 3rd April, 1934, against the Temple Entry Bill.
515. Telegram from Mahant Mahindranath, Lahore, dated the 3rd April, 1934, against the Temple Entry Bill.
516. Telegram from Mahant Hirasdas, Ravi Road, Lahore, dated the 3rd April, 1934, against the Temple Entry Bill.
517. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, 6th April, 1934, from Trustee Maijee Mandir, against the Temple Entry Bill.
518. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 6th April, 1934, from Narsinghji Mandir, Pujari Mamraj, against the Temple Entry Bill.
519. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 6th April, 1934, from Trustee, Vishavnathbag Mandir, against Temple Entry Bill.
520. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 7th April, 1934, from Chiranji Pujari Sidheshwar Mandir, against Temple Entry Bill.
521. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 7th April, 1934, from Mulki Pujari Kalimata Mandir, against Temple Entry Bill.
522. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 7th April, 1934, from Trustee, Satyanarain Mandir, against Temple Entry Bill.
523. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 7th April, 1934, from Badripd Pujari, Goverdhannath Mandir, against Temple Entry Bill.
524. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 7th April, 1934, from Gulaban Pujari, Gujarkhed Mahaji Mandir, against Temple Entry Bill.
525. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 7th April, 1934, from Dulchd Pujari Shani Maharaj Mandir, against Temple Entry Bill.
526. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 7th April, 1934, from Ramjilal Pujari, Kotwalka Mandir, against Temple Entry Bill.
527. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 7th April, 1934, from Trustees, Rambagh Mandir, against Temple Entry Bill.
528. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 7th April, 1934, from Ramjilal Pujari, Shree Ramchandarji Mandir, against Temple Entry Bill.
529. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 7th April, 1934, from Trustees, Hanoomanbeg Mandir, against Temple Entry Bill.
530. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 6th April, 1934, from Pujari Kaniyalal Pujari, Murlimanohar Mandir, against Temple Entry Bill.
531. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, the 6th April, 1934, from Pujari Ratandas Laxminarayan Mandir, against Temple Entry Bill.
532. Telegram, dated Dacca, the 9th April, 1934, regarding public meeting of Hindus held on 7th April, 1934, protesting against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
533. Telegram, dated Dacca, the 9th April, 1934, regarding protests by huge Hindu gathering, Shasikhanidhi Temple, against Temple Entry Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
534. Telegram, dated Amritsar, the 6th April, 1934, from Owner, Temple Mayanatha, against Temple Entry Bill.
535. Telegram, dated Amritsar, the 6th April, 1934, from Mahant, Temple Gangaram, against Temple Entry Bill.
536. Telegram, dated Amritsar, the 6th April, 1934, from Mahant Tejasingh Temple, against Temple Entry Bill.
537. Statements containing signatures of 640 persons against the Temple Entry Bill.
538. Telegram, dated Wardha, the 14th March, 1934, regarding resolutions passed at public meeting at Chanda, Central Provinces, against the Temple Entry, Untouchability and Hindu Divorce Bills.
539. Telegram, dated Wardha, the 14th March, 1934, regarding resolutions passed at public meeting at Warora, District Chanda, Central Provinces, against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Hindu Divorce Bills.

540. Telegram, dated Dinajpur Rajganj, the 14th March, 1934, regarding protests by Public meeting, Dinajpur Varnaarami Orthodox Hindus, against the three Bills referred to above.
541. Resolutions passed by the Hindu Central Committee, Karaikudi Branch, on 15th March, 1934, protesting against the above three Bills and certain other matters.
542. Letter from President, Sanatanists meeting, Dharavi, Bombay, dated the 27th March, 1934, communicating resolution passed against the Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
543. Resolution passed at Annual Ambehata Sanatan Dharam Sabha meeting in March, 1934, against the Temple Entry Bill.
544. Resolution passed at meeting of Sanatanists, held on 24th March, 1934, in the Panchanath Temple, against the Temple Entry, Untouchability and Hindu Divorce Bills.
545. Resolutions passed at meeting of devotees of Shree Hatkeshawara, held on 25th March, 1934, protesting against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
546. Resolutions passed at meeting of the Depressed Classes League, Cawnpore, on 27th March, 1934, against Temple Entry Bill.
547. Resolution passed at public meeting of Hindus held at Shrivaji Mandir in Byculla, Bombay, on 15th March, 1934, against Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
548. Letter, dated Bombay, the 29th March, 1934, from President, Public Meeting of Hindus on 17th March, 1934, at Panjrapole Lane, Bombay, communicating resolution against the Temple Entry Bill.
549. Letter, dated Bombay, the 31st March, 1934, from President of Sanatanists meeting held on 24th March, communicating resolutions against the Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills and on certain other matters.
550. Letter, dated Ahmedabad, the 31st March, 1934, from President, Sanatan Vedic Dharma Sabha, communicating the Shastric Declaration of the Sanyasins' Synod at Karnali on 20th March, 1934, against the Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
551. Letter, dated Ahmedabad, the 2nd April, 1934, from President, Sanatan Dharma Sabha, communicating resolutions passed at Hindu public meeting at Karnali, against the Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
552. Letter from H. H. Mahant Sir Shri Viragirajeshwar Chitrakuti, Dhandukha, dated 28th March, 1934, opposing the Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
553. Letter, dated Jalgaon, the 7th April, 1934, from President of public meeting of Sanatanists, Temple Owners and Managers in East Khandesh District held on 31st March, 1934, communicating resolution protesting against Temple Entry and Hindu Divorce Bills.
554. Telegram, dated Jhalda, 7th March, 1934, from President of Conference of 5,000 Hindus including 3,000 untouchables, regarding passing of resolutions against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
555. Telegram, dated Bankura, 7th March, 1934, regarding public meeting at Purandarpur, Bankura, protesting against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
556. Telegram, dated Kamptee, 8th March, 1934, regarding Meeting of Kamptee Hindus protesting against the above three Bills.
557. Telegram, dated Dhamangaon, District Amraoti, Berar, 8th March, 1934, regarding public meeting protesting against above three Bills.
558. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, 10th March, 1934, regarding public meeting held on 5th, protesting against Temple Entry Bill.
559. Letter, dated Bombay, 9th March, 1934, from President, Ram Mandir meeting, held on 23rd February, 1934, communicating resolution protesting against Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
560. Telegram, dated Dhandhuka, District Ahmedabad, 13th March, 1934, regarding protest meeting of Sanatanists, against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.

561. Telegram, dated Lala Musa, 13th March, 1934, regarding protest meeting of Sanatanists against above three Bills.
562. Telegram, dated Wun, District Yeotmal, Berar, 13th March, 1934, regarding public meeting held on 11th March, protesting against the above three Bills.
563. Letter, dated Bombay, 14th March, 1934, from President, Bada Mandir, Bhuleshwar Meeting, held on 9th March, 1934, communicating resolutions against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
564. Resolutions passed at Meeting of Sanatanists held at Hirasbag, C. P. Tank, on 10th March, 1934, protesting against Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
565. Resolutions passed in General Meeting of the Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Sangla, held on 12th February, 1934, protesting against Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
566. Resolutions passed on 29th March, 1934, at a meeting of Saraswat Brahmins, Larkhana, Sindh, protesting against the above two Bills.
567. Resolutions passed on 31st March, 1934, at a meeting of Pushkahnna Brahmins of Larkhana, Sindh, protesting against the Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
568. Resolutions passed on 31st March, 1934, at a meeting of all sections of Sadhus of Larkhana, Sindh, against Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
569. Letter, dated Bombay, 29th March, 1934, from President, Mumbadevi Temple Meeting of Hindus, communicating resolutions passed against Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
570. Letter from President, Sanatan Vedic Dharma Sabha, Ahmedabad, dated 31st March, 1934, communicating the Shastric Declaration of Sanyasins' Synod at Karnali, against Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
571. Letter, dated Bombay, 4th April, 1934, from President, Public Meeting of Hindus, held at Akola (Santa Cruz), communicating resolutions passed against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
572. Letter, dated Bombay, 4th April 1934, from President, Public Meeting of Hindus, held at Golaba on 1st April, 1934, communicating resolutions against Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
573. Letter from President, Hindu Public Meeting, held on 25th March, 1934, at Khur Road, Bombay, protesting against above two Bills.
574. Resolutions passed at Public Meeting, held on 4th April, 1934, at Narikombu, near Bantwal (South Kanara), against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
575. Letter, dated Bombay, April, 1934, from President, Sanatanist Meeting held at Dadar on 7th April, 1934, communicating resolutions against Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
576. Letter from President, Sanatan Vedic Dharma Sabha of Thasra, District Kaira, dated 8th April, 1934, communicating resolutions passed at Hindu meeting held on 27th March, 1934, against Temple Entry Bill.
577. Protest from Pandit Sree Basudeo Misra of Sokhera (Monghyr), Bihar, dated 11th April, 1934, against Temple Entry Bill.
578. Telegram, dated Indore City, from the Digamber Jain Samaj, against the Untouchability and Temple Entry Bills.
579. Protest, dated 26th December, 1933, from Hindus of Daiwer Kheira, Moradabad District, against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
580. Protest, dated 7th January, 1934, from Shikarpur Sanatanists, against the Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
581. Protest from public meeting of Sanatanists of Madhuban Bazar, Rajpatti, Bihar, against the Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
582. Resolutions passed at public meeting of Sanatanist Hindus of Devakotta, against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
583. Telegram, dated Akola, 16th January, 1934, protest of Vaishya Khandelwala Panchayet of Akola, against the above three Bills.
584. Protest, dated 19th January, 1934, from Hindu meeting held at Kankinara Sanatan Dharma Sabha, E. B. Railway, against the above three bills.

585. Resolution passed by the Annual Session of the Sylhet Vaidic Samity, held at Tengra, against the above three Bills.
586. Telegram, dated Deoghar, 15th January, 1934, regarding the Bihar Provincial Temple Defence Conference's resolution, against Temple Entry Bill.
587. Telegram, dated Burdwan, 23rd January, 1934, regarding meeting of Sanatanists and Untouchables at Kendubilla, Birbhum, against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
588. Resolutions passed by the Kistna District, Sanatana Dharma Conference, on 3rd December, 1933 at Masulipatam, against the above three Bills.
589. Protests against the Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills signed by a number of residents of each of the following Districts :—
- (1) Goriad, Baroda District, (2) Padra, Baroda District, (3) Rajupara, Baroda District, (4) Amla, Baroda District, (5) Sadhu, Baroda District, (6) Ganpatpara, Baroda District, (7) Veer-pura, Baroda District.
590. Telegram, dated Amritsar, 31st January, 1934, regarding protest of Sanatanists against Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
591. Protest against the Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills signed by a number of residents of (1) Sarsavani, and (2) Kelapur in Baroda District.
592. Resolutions passed by public meeting, Tinnevely on 28th January, 1934, against the Temple Entry Bill.
593. Telegram, dated Jhansi, 6th February, 1934, regarding public meeting against Temple Entry Bill.
594. Protests against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills from Hindus of :—
- (1) Pura, Moradabad District, (2) Anshhi, Post Chandasi, Badam District, (3) Bhulawai, P. O. Chandausi, Moradabad District, (4) Bakarpur Bhaitaru, P. O. Chandausi, Moradabad District.
595. Protest by 26 Digambar Jains of Phulera, Jaipur, Rajputana, dated 3rd February, 1934, against the Untouchability Bill.
596. Telegram, dated Burdwan, 18th February, 1934, regarding protest meeting of Hindus, against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
597. Protest, dated Akalkot, 6th February, 1934, from Akhil Bharat Varnashram Swarajya Sangh, Akalkot District, Sholapur, Bombay, against Temple Entry Bill.
598. Telegram, dated Indore City, dated 28th February, 1934, regarding protest meeting, against Untouchability Bill.
599. Telegram, dated Indore City, 28th February, 1934, regarding protest meeting against Temple Entry Bill.
600. Telegram, dated Amroati, 5th March, 1934, regarding public meeting at Kabanji, District Akola, Berar, against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
601. Telegram, dated Kankinara, E. B., 6th March, 1934, regarding Sanatanists public meeting against the above three Bills.
602. Telegram, dated Amraoti, 5th March, 1934, regarding public meeting at Mangrul, Pir, District Akola, Berar, against the above three Bills.
603. Letter from the Bombay Provincial Varnashram Swarajya Sangh, dated 14th March, 1934, communicating resolutions passed at public meeting, against the above three Bills.
604. Resolution passed by Hindu Public meeting at Byculla, Bombay, against Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
605. Telegram, dated Jalesar Town (Etah), dated 17th March, 1934, regarding protest of Digambar Jain Panchayat, against Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
606. Letter from the Sanatan Vedic Dharma Sabha, Ahmedabad, dated 2nd April, 1934, communicating resolutions of Hindu public meeting against Temple Entry Bill.
607. Letter from Youngmen's Association, Saidpuridarwaza, Rawalpindi, dated 2nd April, 1934, protesting against Temple Entry Bill.

608. Letter, dated Lahore, 13th February, 1934, from the Sanatan Dharma Pratinidhi Sabha, Punjab, against the Temple Entry Bill.
609. Letter from the Editor of the "Mahabir", Delhi, dated 21st February, 1934, against the Temple Entry Bill.
610. Letter from the President, Shri Ram Lila Committee, Delhi, dated 25th February, 1934, against the Temple Entry Bill.
611. Resolution passed by the U. P. Adi Hindu Depressed Classes Association at Lucknow, against the Temple Entry Bill.
612. Protest from the Sanatan Vedic Dharma Sabha, Thasara, against the Temple Entry Bill.
613. Protest from the Utkal Brahmin community of Sambalpur, against the Temple Entry Bill (101 signatures).
614. Resolution passed by the Shree Balkrishna Suddadvaita Maha Sabha, Surat, against the Temple Entry Bill.
615. Resolution passed by the Sanatana Varnashrama Dharma Sabha, Koondapoor, against the Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
616. Telegram, dated Havelian, 12th April, 1934, from Hindu Sabha Mandar, against Temple Entry Bill.
617. Telegram, dated Laheriasarai, 12th April, 1934, regarding protests by people of villages, Ragunathpur, Patore, Rambhadrapur, Sirdilpur, Pipra, Dekuli, Jogara, Harilpatti Thana, Darbhanga, against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
618. Resolution of Sanatanist public meeting at Jafarabad (Kathiawar), against the Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
619. Resolutions of meetings of (1) Vadnagara Nagar Brahmans of Rajkot, and (2) "Idolators", held at Lohanapara, against the Temple Entry Bill.
620. Protest, dated 12th April, 1934, from J. Mangish, Vizagapatam, P. O. Waltair, against the Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
621. Protest, dated 14th April, 1934, from Babindranath Chakrabarti, Calcutta, against the Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
622. Letter, dated 14th April, 1934, from General Secretary, Varnashram Swarajya Sangh, Khandwa, communicating resolution of public meeting, against the above three Bills.
623. Resolutions passed by the Varnashram Sarajya Sangh, Pulgaon, dated 8th April, 1934, against Temple Entry and Divorce Bills.
624. Resolutions of the Bharata people (Madras), against the Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
625. Letter from the Shri Sanatan Dharam Free Tract Society, Punjab, dated 16th April, 1934, forwarding signatures of over two thousand persons against the Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
626. Resolutions passed by the Brahmin Sabha of Nagpur, against the Temple Entry Bill.
627. Letter from the Temple Defence Committee (All-India Varnashram Swarajya Sangh), Calcutta, dated 20th February, 1934, communicating resolutions passed against Temple Entry Bill, etc.
628. Letter from President, Kaira District Varnashram Swarajya Sangh, dated 12th March, 1934, communicating resolutions passed against the Temple Entry Bill.
629. Letter, dated 12th March, 1934, from Chairman, Reception Committee, The Madras Tamil District Sanatanists Conference, Madura, communicating resolutions against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Divorce Bills.
630. Letter, dated 9th April, 1934, from Shri Kamalayannacharya, U. P. Kesari, against the Temple Entry Bill.
631. Resolutions passed by the Panchmahals District Varnashram Swarajya Sangh, Godhra, on 28th March, 1934, against Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
632. Telegram, dated Srirangam, 8th May, 1934, from Bala Subramanya, President, Public Meeting.
633. Telegram, dated Brindaban, 8th May, 1934, from Srudhar Acharyji, President, Public Meeting, Brindaban.

634. Telegram, dated Gurdaspur, 7th May, 1934, from Beharilal Sharma, Secretary, Sanatan Hindu Sabha, Babbehali, District Gurdaspur.
635. Telegram, dated Wardhaganj, 7th May, 1934, from Gangadhar Ghate, Pleader, President, Meeting of Varnashram Swarajya Sangha, Wardha.
636. Telegram, dated Netrokona, 8th May, 1934, from Mohoudranath Bagchi, President, Varnashram Dharam Sangrakshini Sava, Netrokona, Bengal.
637. Telegram, dated Tamsria, 7th May, 1934, from Biswanand Misir, President, Varnashram Sabha Mahabir, Mithila.
638. Telegram, dated Wardhaganj, 7th May, 1934, from Mahanta Chiataudas Balaji Mandir.
639. Telegram, dated 21st May, 1934, from Sanatan Dharm Sabha, Purulia, Maubum.
640. Telegram, dated 10th May, 1934, regarding Sanatanist protest meeting at Rawalpindi.
641. Telegram, dated 14th June, 1934, regarding Sanatanist protest meeting at Kulu.
642. Telegram, dated 16th June, 1934, from Chabildas, Tailor-master, Bannu.
643. Telegram, dated 13th June, 1934, regarding protest meeting at Habiganj, Sylhet.
644. Letter dated nil, from President, public meeting of residents of Sirsod village, Tahsil Khandwa, District Nimar.
645. Protest resolution of Sanatanist Meeting at Dacca in the Temple yard of Luxmi Narayanji at Luxmibazar.
646. Protest resolutions of Sanatanist meeting in Temple yard of Goddess Dhakeswari in Dacca City.
647. Resolutions of Hindu residents of Harsud village, Tahsil Harsud, District Nimar.
648. Letter from the President, public meeting held at the Town Hall, Benares.
649. Resolutions passed by Hindu public meeting at Gouripur, Mymensingh, Bengal.
650. Resolutions passed by the Contai Sanskrit Samiti, Midnapore.
651. Resolution passed by Hindu Public Meeting, Ramgopalpur, Mymensingh.
652. Resolutions passed by Meeting of Sanatanist ladies of Jubulpore.
653. Resolutions of public meeting at Krishnapur, Mymensingh.
654. Resolution passed at meeting of Varnagami Hindus of Dacca City.
655. Resolutions passed at Hindu Meeting at Khandwa on Dewalaya Day, 6th May, 1934.
656. Resolutions passed by the Karaikudi Branch of the Hindu Central Committee.
657. Resolutions passed at Public Meeting of Chopda Sanatanists, East Khandesh.
658. Protest list bearing 178 signatures (in vernacular).
659. Resolution passed at Public Meeting at Kalipur, Mymensingh.
660. Resolutions of the Sanatana Dharma Conference, hold at Kallidnikurichi, March, 1934.
661. Resolution passed at Meeting of Pukur Brahman Samaj, bearing 48 signatures.
662. Resolution passed at Meeting of Sri Sanatan Dharma Sabha, Rawalpindi Saddar.
663. Resolutions of the Sanatana Dharma Mahasabha, Athangudi, Ramnad District, S. India.
664. Resolutions of the Sanatanist Meeting at Chockalingampudur, Ramnad District, S. India.
665. Resolutions of Public Meeting held at Ahmedabad on 6th May, 1934.
666. Resolutions of the Samasta Sanatana Hindu Dharma Sabha, Ahmedabad, held on 3rd May, 1934.
667. Protest, dated 1st June, 1934, signed by number of residents belonging to the Sanatan Dharm Community of Bagpat, Meerut District.
668. Resolution passed at a General Public Meeting of the Vedic Sanatan Hindus of Saugor, C. P., on 31st May, 1934.
669. Resolutions passed at meeting of Sanatanist Hindus of Katni (Jubbulpore).

670. Telegram, dated 14th June, 1934, regarding Resolutions passed at Sanatani Hindus meeting at Narsinghpur, C. P.
671. Unsigned letter dated 15th June, 1934, from Secretary, Varnashram Svaraj Sangh, Rajputana.
672. Resolution passed at public meeting of Sanatani Hindus of Harda, dated 14th June, 1934.
673. Resolution passed at Meeting of Sanatani Hindus of Narsinghpur (C. P.) on 9th June 1934.
674. Resolution passed at Meeting of Sanatan Varnashram Hindus held at Bombay on 14th June, 1934.
675. Resolution passed at Public meeting held at Jewarin Khora, Post Padari Kala, District, Unao, U. P.
676. Telegram, dated Teghra, 21st April, 1934, regarding Sanatanist meeting at Hariharpur, Bidulia, against Temple Entry Bill.
677. Telegram, dated Lakhminia, 23rd April, 1934, regarding Hindu meeting at Mehan, District Monghyr, against Temple Entry Bill.
678. Telegram, dated Lakhminia, 23rd April, 1934, regarding Sanatanist meeting at Samsa, P. O. Parihara, Monghyr District, against Temple Entry Bill.
679. Telegram, dated Teghra, 23rd April, 1934, regarding Sanatanist meeting, against Temple Entry Bill.
680. Telegram, dated Teghra, 23rd April, 1934, regarding Sanatanist meeting at Jirhouli, against Temple Entry Bill.
681. Telegram, dated Teghra, 24th April, 1934, regarding Sanatanist meeting at Neyanagar, against Temple Entry Bill.
682. Telegram, dated Teghra, 26th April, 1934, regarding Sanatanist meeting at Hasanpur, against Temple Entry Bill.
683. Telegram, dated Teghra, 26th April, 1934, regarding Sanatanist meeting at Ajdha, against Temple Entry Bill.
684. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, 28th April, 1934, regarding public meeting Kalmis of 12 villages at Palasia, against Temple Entry Bill.
685. Telegram, dated 30th April, 1934, regarding Sanatanist meeting at Haripore, against Temple Entry Bill.
686. Telegram, dated 30th April, 1934, regarding Sanatanist meeting at Haripore, against Temple Entry Bill.
687. Telegram, dated 30th April, 1934, regarding Sanatanist meeting at Rudauli, against Temple Entry Bill.
688. Telegram, dated Begusarai, 30th April, 1934, regarding Hindu Sabha, held at Chanki, against Temple Entry Bill.
689. Telegram, dated Teghra, 30th April, 1934, regarding Sanatanist meeting at Arooa, against Temple Entry Bill.
690. Telegram, dated Hazaribagh, 25th April, 1934, regarding protest meeting, against Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
691. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, 28th April, 1934, regarding public meeting Kalmis of 12 villages at Palasia, against Untouchability Bill.
692. Telegram, dated 30th April, 1934, regarding All-India Maheshnari Maha-Panchayat (Marwari), protest meeting at Ajmer of three thousand delegates, against Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
693. Resolutions passed by Ladies' meeting at Puchmath Kathagraha, against Temple Entry Bill.
694. Resolutions passed by Ladies' meeting at Rajkot, against Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
695. Protests signed by 163 residents (voters) of Rajkot Puchmath, against the Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
696. Resolutions passed by Public Meeting at Yellur, South Kanara District, against Temple Entry, Untouchability and Hindu Divorce Bills.
697. Resolutions passed by Public Meeting at Kateel, South Kanara District, against above three Bills.

698. Resolutions of the Bharta People passed in Sanathana Dharma Sabha, held at five different places in the East Godavari District, Madras Presidency, during April, 1934, against the Temple Entry, Untouchability and Hindu Divorce Bills.
699. Resolutions passed at meetings of Ladies held under auspices of the All-India Varnashram Swarajya Sangh, Rajkot Branch, against the Temple Entry, Untouchability and Hindu Divorce Bills.
700. Letter, dated 30th April, 1934, from President, Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Lakhimpur, Kheri, forwarding protest bearing 7,102 signatures.
701. Telegram, dated Gurdaspur, 28th May, 1934, from Vaishnawa Charya, Durbar Pandori.
702. Telegram, dated Sylhet, 27th May, 1934, from meeting of Orthodox Hindus.
703. Resolutions by the Burma Sanatanist Leaders' Conference held at Yandoon on 25th May, 1934.
704. Resolutions by Sanatanist meeting at Niwashi, Taluka Chiplum, District Ratnagiri, on 28th May, 1934.
705. Resolution of meeting of Hindu Dharma Sabha, Sholavandan, dated 6th May, 1934.
706. Resolutions of meeting at O'Sriuvayal, on 6th and 7th May, 1934.
707. Resolutions of meeting at Ribong, Shillong, on 6th May, 1934.
708. Resolutions of meeting at Sanatana Dharma Sabha, Dindigul, on 6th May, 1934.
709. Resolution of meeting of Sanatan Dharmi inhabitants of Pilibhit, on 6th May, 1934.
710. Resolution of meeting held at Sathanamjeri village, Chingleput, on 6th May, 1934.
711. Resolutions passed at three meetings held in Gonda District, on 20th and 23rd April and 6th May, 1934.
712. Resolution of meeting of Brahman Samaj, Pakur, on 8th May, 1934, with 48 signatures.
713. Resolutions of Sanatanist Meeting at Chockalingampudur, Ramnad District, on 6th May, 1934.
714. Resolutions of Sanatanist Meeting at Athangudi, Ramnad District, on 6th May, 1934.
715. Resolution of Public Meeting at Kurla Sanatanists, Bombay, held on 29th April, 1934.
716. Resolution of Sanatanist Meeting held at Ghatkopar District, Thana, Bombay, on 3rd May, 1934.
717. Resolution of Sanatanist Meeting held at Mumbadevi Temple, Bombay, on 6th May, 1934.
718. Resolution of Sanatanist Meeting held at Shri Raghavandji's Math, Gulawadi, Bombay, on 6th May, 1934.
719. Resolution of General Meeting of the Vedic Sanatan Hindus of Saugor, Central Provinces, on 31st May, 1934.
720. Resolutions of East Godavari District Sanatanists' Conference held at Mandapeta, on 5th and 6th May, 1934.
721. Resolution of Public Meeting of Ellichpur Sanatanists, held on 22nd March, 1934.
722. Resolutions of Sanatanists Meeting at Katni, Jubbulpore, 4th June, 1934.
723. Telegram, dated Narsinghpur, 14th June, 1934, regarding resolution of Sanatanists Meeting.
724. Resolution of Sanatanist Meeting held at Harda on 14th June, 1934.
725. Telegram, dated 19th June, 1934, regarding Hindu Public Meeting held at Habiganj, Sylhet, on 9th June, 1934.
726. Resolution of Sanatan Varnashram Hindus held at Bombay in Madhav Baug, on 14th June, 1934.
727. From Vedantam Venkatachalapati Kuchipudi Agrataram, Krishna District (Madras), dated the 26th April, 1934.

728. Resolutions passed by two public meetings at Gangapur, Bareilly, on the 6th March, 1934, protesting against the Temple Entry Bill.
729. Resolution passed by the Public Meeting at Karanpure, Garda, on the 5th April, 1934, protesting against the Temple Entry Bill.
730. Telegram, dated the 9th May, 1934, from President, Goverdhanshastrī Varnashram Multra.
731. Telegram, dated the 9th May, 1934, from President of the Public Meeting convened by Vaidikadharam Sevaka Sabha, Srirangaru.
732. Telegram, dated the 10th May, 1934, from Secretary, Vaidika Dharma Veer Sangha, Udipi, South Kanara.
733. From the President, Public Meeting of the citizens of Dhanangaon, dated the 6th May, 1934.
734. Resolutions passed by the Brahmin Youths' League, Didigul, dated the 6th May, 1934, protesting against the Temple Entry, Untouchability, Removal and the Dissolution of Marriages Bills.
735. From the Varnasrama Dharmodharaka Sabha of Pithapuram, dated the 6th May, 1934.
736. Resolutions passed by the Public Meeting of Sanatanist Hindus of Colmbatore, dated the 6th May, 1934, protesting against the Temple Entry Bill.
737. From the Secretary, Hindu Dharama Sabha, Melative (Tanjore District), dated the 6th May, 1934.
738. From His Holiness the Jagadguru Shri Shankaracharya Sankashwar Karvir Nath, Nagpur, dated the 8th May, 1934.
739. Telegram, dated the 11th May, 1934, from Dharma Sevaka Sabha, Madras, Cintadripeta.
740. From the Secretary, Varnashrama Dharama Sabha, Nurvid (Kishan District), dated the 8th May, 1934.
741. From the President, All-India Varnashram Swarjya Sangha Branch, Rajkot, No. 256/B, dated the 8th May, 1934.
742. From the Hindu Central Committee (Branch), Nandyal, Kurnool District, Madras, dated the 6th May, 1934.
743. From the Secretary, Hindu Central Committee, Nungambakkan Branch, dated the 6th May, 1934.
744. Protest from Pandit Chiranji Lal of Lakshinarayan Temple and 13 others of Budn (14 Protests).
745. From Secretary, Varnashram Swaraj Sangh, Khandwa, dated the 6th May, 1934.
746. From Secretary, Hindu Central Committee, Cuddalore, dated the 8th May, 1934.
747. From Shri Hari Sankirtan Mandal, Rawalpindi, dated the 9th May, 1934.
748. From Secretary, The Vaidika Dharma Veera Sangha of South Kanara, Udipi, dated the 8th May, 1934.
749. From the Hindu Central Committee, Berhampore Branch, dated the 6th May, 1934.
750. From the Secretary, Hindu Central Committee, Karaikudi Branch, dated the 7th May, 1934.
751. From the President, Andhra Desa Varnasrama Sangha, Bezwada, dated.....
752. Resolution passed at a meeting of the Sanatanists at Rameswaram on the 6th May, 1934.
753. Resolution passed by the Hindu residents of the village of Kavati, of Kavati Taluk, dated the 6th May, 1934.
754. From the Secretary, Hindu Central Committee, Bhimvaram Talug (West Godawari District) Branch, dated the 7th May, 1934.
755. Resolutions passed by the public meeting of the Mahajanans of Malmangolan on the 6th May, 1934, protesting against the Temple Entry Bill.
756. Telegram, dated the 12th May, 1934, from President of the General meeting of the Maheshwari Community, Calcutta.

757. From Mr. V. K. Kulkarni, Pleader, Belgaum, dated 17th June, 1934. (Forwards 37 protests signed by 37 persons.)
758. From All-India Brahman Maha Saba, Delhi dated.....
759. From Secretary, V. S. S. Arrah, dated.....
760. From Secretary, Hindu Sabha, Delhi, dated.....
761. From President, Brindaban Branch of the All-India V. S. S., dated .....
762. From V. S. S. Branch Umreth (District Kaira), dated.....
763. From Secretary, Sri Brahmavart Sanatan Dharm Mahamandal, Cawnpore, dated.....
764. From Sanatan Dharm Sabha, Mokameh (Patna), dated 21st June, 1934.
765. From President, Mithila Prantiya Varnashram Dharma Saurakshini Sabha, Chandernagore, dated.....
766. From President of Public meeting held on 6th May, 1934, at Bishramghat Muttra (U. P.).
767. From President, V. S. S. Branch, Malegadu District, Nasik, dated.....
768. From Secretary, Sanatan Dharma Society, Delhi, dated.....
769. From the Sanatani of Tochi Valley (Waziristan), N. W. F. P. (with 11 pages of signatures).
770. From Shri Sanatan Dharama Shiva Sabha, Delhi, dated 22nd June, 1934.
771. From Sri Sanatan Dharma Sabha, Hyderabad Dv., dated 20th June, 1934.
772. From Vice-President, Vaidic Manbin Shastriya Mandal, Nasik, dated .....
773. From President, Mathur Chetund Parshad, Mathur, dated.....
774. From Secretary, Hindu Mathabhuama Sangha Neguputas, dated 23rd June, 1934.
775. From Sri Indraprasth Sanatan Dharma Mandal, Delhi, dated 26th June, 1934.
776. From Secretary, Sanatan Dharm Sabha, Gulzarbagh, Patna, dated 25th June, 1934.
777. From Sanatan Dharm Sabha, Delhi, dated 26th June, 1934.
778. From Savarna Kshethrodamaaka Samithy Peechanikkad, Angamally, Travancore State, dated.....
779. From President of Public meeting held at Tekanpura, district Shahabad, on 20th June, 1934.
780. From President of Public meeting held at Barahiya, on 25th June, 1934, letter dated 26th June, 1934.
781. From Secretary, V. S. S., Karachi, dated.....
782. From Varnashram Dharm Sabha, Virangam, dated 25th June, 1934.
783. From Mr. V. K. Kulkarni, Belgaum, dated 25th June, 1934. (Forwards 37 protests signed by 47 persons.)
784. From M. V. K. Kulkarni, Belgaum, dated 25th June, 1934. (Forwards 15 protests signed by 38 persons.)
785. Telegram, dated 28th June, 1934, from President of Public meeting held at Lakshanabanda in Sylhet (Assam).
786. From Secretary, Mandir Raksha Committee, Delhi.
787. From Gujrat Sanatan Dharam Pracharini Sabha, Cambay State, dated .....
788. From Secretary to Chaturvarna Samiti, Rajkot, dated 26th June, 1934.
789. Telegram, dated 29th June, 1934, from the President of the Sanatanists meeting held at Kheri.
790. From the President, V. S. S., Jhansi, dated 27th June, 1934.
791. From Secretary, Chaturvarna Samiti, Rajkot, dated 27th June, 1934.
792. From President, Sri Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Rawalpindi Cantonment.
793. From Secretary, Temple Defence Committee, dated.....
794. Thirteen protests against the Temple Entry Bill from Bombay.
795. From Dergaon Sanatan Dharma Sabha, Assam.

796. From Dharma Sabha Lakhimpur, Kheri, dated 6th May, 1934.
797. From Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Montgomery, Punjab, dated.
798. From President, Dharma Saurakhak Sangh, Bagalkot, district Bijapur, dated 22nd June, 1934.
799. From V. S. S., Rajkote Br., dated 25th June, 1934. (Forwards 1,932 signatures against the T. E. Bill, Untouchability Abolition and Dissolution of Marriage Bills.)
800. From President, Sanatan Vedic Dharma Sabha, Surat and Ahmedabad, dated 30th June, 1934.
801. From Sanatan Dharma Shikshan Mandal, Surat, dated 30th June, 1934.
802. From Sanatan Varnashram Dharm Samrakhaka Sabha, Ahmedabad, dated 21th June, 1934.
803. 5 protests against the Temple Entry Bill from 5 different organisations in Ahmedabad.
804. From Andhra Provincial Varnasrama Sabha, Ellore, dated
805. From President, U. S. S. Branch, Dhulkia, Khandesh, dated 6th May, 1934.
806. From President, Maharashtra Brahman Sabha, Poona, dated 19th May, 1934.
807. Resolutions passed by Public meetings at 7 different places in Bombay protesting against the Temple Entry Untouchability Removal and the Dissolution of Marriages Bill (7 protests).
808. Letter from the Chairman, Public Meeting held on 6th May, 1934, at Mannargudi, dated 7th May, 1934.
809. From Secretary, the Hindu Central Committee, Kumbakonam Branch, dated 17th May, 1934.
810. From Secretary, Gantur District, Varnashrama Dharmodधारaka Sabha, dated 14th May, 1934.
811. Letter from President, Public Meeting, held on 13th May, 1934 at Sylhet, dated 17th May, 1934.
812. From Secretary, Shri Sanatana Dharma Samatha, Gowlinguda, Hyderabad, Deccan, dated 19th May, 1934.
813. From Secretary, A. I. V. S. S., Bulanala, Benares District, dated
814. From President, Sanatan Dharam Association, Tekta (Gaya), dated 22nd May, 1934.
815. From President, V. S. S., Belgaum, dated
816. From Secretary, V. S. S., Dhamangaon, dated 22nd May, 1934.
817. From Secretary, V. S. S., Meerut, dated
818. From Secretary, Shri Sanatan Dharma Mahavir Dal, Meerut Cantonment, dated
819. From Secretary, Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Bareilly, dated
820. From Secretary, Shri Sanatan Dharam Rashin Sabha, Meerut City, dated
821. President, Panchnath Temple Committee, Rajkote, dated 20th May, 1934.
822. From Secretary, A. I. V. S. S., Triplicane, Madras, dated 21st May, 1934.
823. From Secretary, A. I. Sanatan Harnawalambiya Marwari Yuwak Sammelan, Calcutta, dated
824. From Secretary, Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Gauhati, Assam, dated
825. Mr. Shambho Datta Oppadhya Garda, dated 22nd May, 1934.
826. Protests against the Temple Entry Bill submitted by 5 different organisations in Ghaziabad (5 protests).
827. From Secretary, Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Gauhati, dated 23rd May, 1934.
828. From Secretary, the Akhil Bharat Varshiya Varnashram Swaraj Sangha Branch, Sudamapuri, Porbandar, dated 24th May, 1934.
829. Resolution passed by the Public Meeting held on 6th May, 1934, at Gobindganj, protests against the Temple Entry Bill.
830. From President Shri Sharada Mandal Dharam Samastha, Akola (Berar), dated 23rd May, 1934.
831. Resolution passed by Sanatan Dharma Conference, Bellary, dated 27th May, 1934.

832. Resolution passed by Sanatan Dharma Sangam, Chingleput District, dated 6th May, 1934.
833. Resolution passed by Pujaris and Trustees of Temples situated in Lakkhanwal, Gujerat, dated
834. Resolution passed by Sanatanists of Kurla, Bombay, dated 29th April, 1934.
835. Resolution passed by Sanatanists of Ghatkopar, Bombay, dated 3rd May, 1934.
836. Resolution passed by Akhil Bharat Varshiya Vernashram Swarajya Sang's Branch, Ahmedabad, dated 6th May, 1934.
837. Resolution by Hindu Meeting at Ratan Moti Sanaskeriti Patshala, Gokal, dated 19th May, 1934.
838. Resolution by Hindu Meeting at Mundi village, Khandwa, District Nimar, dated 6th May, 1934.
839. Resolution by Brahman Youths' League, Dindigul, dated 6th May, 1934.
840. Resolution by Hindu Meeting at Sri Sankara Hall, National High School, Mannargud, dated 6th May, 1934.
841. Resolution by Hindu Meeting at Narsingakhara Temple, Shillong, dated the 13th May, 1934.
842. Resolution by Sakti Brahmacharya Asram, etc., Dacca, dated 6th May, 1934.
843. Resolution by Hindu Meeting at Rilbong, Shillong, dated 7th May, 1934.
844. Resolution by Hindu Meeting at Bajapti, Tippera, dated 7th May, 1934.
845. Resolution by Sanatana Dharma Sabha, Dindigul, dated 6th May, 1934.
846. Resolution by Sanatanists of Brindaban, Gobinji's Temple, dated 6th May, 1934.
847. Resolution by Hindu Central Committee, Nandyal, Kurnool, dated 6th May, 1934.
848. Resolution by Sanatan Dharma Sabha, Kunnakudi, dated 9th May, 1934.
849. Resolution by Hindu Meeting at Pandhna, District Nimar, dated 6th May, 1934.
850. Resolution by Sanatanists of Calcutta at several places, dated 6th May, 1934.
851. Resolution by Hindu Meeting at Patgra, Dacca, dated 7th May, 1934.
852. Resolution by Sanatan Dharam Conference, Meerut, dated 8th May, 1934.
853. Resolution by Sanatan Varnashram Hindus Meeting, Bombay, dated 14th June, 1934.
854. Resolution by Sanatanists at Mambadevi Temple, Bombay, dated 6th May, 1934.
855. Resolution by Sanatanist Ladies and Gentlemen at Raghavanandji's Math, Gulawadi, Bombay, dated 6th May, 1934.
856. Resolution (same printed form) passed at meetings held in 21 different places in E. Godawari and one in W. Godawari.
857. Telegram dated 28th June, 1934, regarding protest from Hindu Meeting at Lakshanabanda, Sylhet.
858. Telegram dated Gurdaspur, 29th June, 1934, from Rai Sahib Ch. Kharak Singh, Honorary Magistrate, Dinanagar.
859. Resolutions in same identical printed form passed by meetings held at 9 different places in Madras Presidency.
860. Resolutions passed at meetings held at Dongargaon, Arud and Nimarkheri, Tahsil Khandwa, District Nimar in May and June.
861. Resolutions passed at Sanatanists Meeting, on 21st June, 1934, held at Amalapur, East Godawari.
862. Proceedings of the Andhra Provincial Varnashrama Sabha, Ellore, held on 25th and 26th May, 1934.
863. Resolutions in same identical form passed at meetings, held at 5 different places in Barisal, Bengal.

## II

*List of resolutions, memorials, telegrams, letters, etc., in favour of the Temple Entry Bill and the Untouchability Abolition Bill, received and placed in the Library of the Legislative Assembly.*

1. Resolution of All-India Jat Mahasabha.
2. Representation, dated 9th April, 1934, signed by 101 residents of Sambalpur, supporting the Temple Entry Bill.
3. Resolution by the All-India Jat Mahasabha, Aligarh, passed at its session held on 12th and 13th May, 1934, at Aligarh.
4. Resolution passed by Jangipur Town Hindu Sabha, Murshidabad, on 31st May, 1934.
5. Resolution by public meeting held at Anjangam, Surji, Berar, on 23rd June, 1934.
6. Letter, dated 13th June, 1934, from Honorary Secretary, East Indian National Congress Party, Bezwada.
7. Resolution passed by Hindu Public Meeting held at Dohad, Panch Mahals, Bombay Presidency.
8. Letter, dated 21st May, 1934, from President of Public Meeting held at Erandol (East Khandesh), Bombay.
9. Resolutions passed by the Madras Youth Congress.
10. Resolution passed by Public Meeting at Morshi on 1st June, 1934 (Berar).
11. Resolution passed by Public Meeting held at Benoda on 3rd June, 1934.
12. Resolution passed by Public Meeting at Warud on 2nd June, 1934.
13. Letter from the Hindu Sabha, Karwar, Bombay Presidency, dated 12th June, 1934, forwarding lists bearing 357 signatures in support of Temple Entry Bill.
14. Resolution passed by Sanatanist Meeting at Brindaban, on 6th May, 1934.
15. Statements containing signatures of 1,536 persons in support of the Temple Entry Bill.
16. Resolutions passed by Hindu public meeting held on 21st December, 1933 under auspices of the Harijan Sahaik Sabha, Bannu, in support of the Temple Entry Bill.
17. Letter from the Secretary, Madakasira Conference, Madakasira, dated 15th January 1934, regarding resolution in support of Temple Entry Bill.
18. Resolution passed by the Civil and Social Progress League in support of the Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
19. Letter from the Honorary Secretary, Bar Association, Fyzabad, dated 26th January, 1934, regarding resolution passed in support of Temple Entry Bill.
20. Letter from the Honorary Secretary, Cawnpore Bar Association, dated 29th March, 1934, regarding resolution passed in support of Temple Entry Bill.
21. Telegram, dated Mhow Bazar, 6th February, 1934, regarding Hindu Sanatanist meeting passing resolutions in support of Temple Entry Bill.
22. Telegram from Bhayyaji Kumbalwar, dated Mardha, the 21st March, 1934, regarding resolutions of public meeting in favour of Temple Entry Bill.
23. Letter dated 30th March, 1934, from General Secretary, the Azad Mazdoor Sabha, Deputy Ka Parao, Cawnpore, regarding resolutions passed in support of the Temple Entry Bill.
24. Letter, dated 31st March, 1934, from President, the Cawnpore Hindu Sabha, regarding resolution passed in support of Temple Entry Bill.
25. Letter, dated 1st April, 1934, from Secretary, the Cawnpore Scavengers Union, communicating resolution passed in favour of Temple Entry Bill.
26. Letter, dated 31st March, 1934, from Secretary, Harijan Sewak Sangha, Cawnpore, communicating resolutions passed at public meeting of Hindus on 30th March, 1934, in support of Temple Entry Bill.
27. Letter, dated 31st March, 1934, from Secretary, Harijan Sewak Sangh, Cawnpore, communicating resolution passed at meeting of the Sangha on 18th March, 1934, in support of Temple Entry Bill.

28. Telegram, dated Coondapur, 9th April, 1934, regarding Sanatanist meeting supporting Temple Entry and Divorce Bills.
29. Lists containing signatures of about 100 persons, residents of Tamluk District Midnapore, Bengal, supporting the Temple Entry and Untouchability Bills.
30. Resolution of the Bar Association, Mirzapur, supporting the Temple Entry Bill.
31. Resolution of the Municipal Board, Lakhimpur, dated Kheri, supporting the Temple Entry Bill.
32. Petition (vernacular), received from "residents" of Rajputana.
33. Letter from Secretary, Sanatan Dharam Sabha, Sialkot, Punjab, dated 12th February, 1934.
34. Letter dated 7th March, 1934, from Chairman, District Board, Bijnor.
35. Petition in Urdu, from Hindus of Isakhel District, Aliawali, dated 18th January, 1934 (together with 137 signatures).
36. Letter from Honorary Secretary, Kheri Bar Association, dated 5th February, 1934.
37. Letter from Chairman, Education Committee, District Board, Kheri, dated 10th February, 1934.
38. Letter from Sanatan Dharam Mahabir Dal, Lyallpur, dated 30th December, 1933.
39. Letter from Secretary, Women's Indian Association, Coonoor, dated 4th November, 1933.
40. Letter from Secretary, Harijan Seva Sangh, Tehsil Aliganj, District Etah, U. P.

RESOLUTIONS, PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS RECEIVED FOR OR AGAINST THE  
HINDU TEMPLE ENTRY DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL.

†6. **Pandit Ram Krishna Jha** : (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the Secretary, Legislative Assembly, has received any (i) petitions, (ii) resolutions, (iii) memorials, and (iv) opinions either for or against the Temple Entry Bill ? If so, how many, and from whom ?

(b) What action, if any, has so far been taken on such petitions, etc., by Government ?

COMPLAINT REGARDING THE UNSATISFACTORY MODE OF CIRCULATION FOR  
OPINION OF THE HINDU TEMPLE ENTRY DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL  
AMONGST THE SANATANISTS.

7. **Pandit Ram Krishna Jha** : (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether they have received any complaint from any quarter, individual, or public or religious body, regarding the unsatisfactory mode of circulation of the Temple Entry Bill, for opinion, amongst the Sanatanists of the different parts of the country ? If so, from which individuals or public or religious bodies ?

(b) Have Government received any complaint to the effect that opinions submitted by the Sanatanist individuals, and public bodies, to the local officers, are not accepted by such officers of the locality ?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state what steps, if any, have they so far taken to ensure a satisfactory mode of circulation of the Temple Entry Bill for opinion amongst the Sanatanist individuals and bodies likely to be affected by the Bill ?

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig** : (a) and (c). The Government of India received some representations. Steps were taken when the Bill was

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 5.

circulated to Local Governments to draw their special attention to the necessity of securing its effective circulation, and Local Governments were subsequently addressed on two occasions and asked to ensure that opinions were obtained from as wide an area as possible.

**COMMUNAL COMPOSITION OF THE STAFF IN THE INCOME-TAX DEPARTMENT,  
BIHAR AND ORISSA.**

8. **Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** : Will Government be pleased to state :
- (a) the total number of gazetted and non-gazetted officers employed in the Income-tax Department, Bihar and Orissa, and the number belonging to each of the following communities, *viz.*, Bihari Hindus, Bengali Hindus, Muhammadans, Oriyas and Christians ;
  - (b) the number of new appointments made after the passing of the Emergency Finance Act, 1931, in the following Services of the Income-tax Department, Bihar and Orissa, (i) Assistant Commissioners, (ii) Inspectors of Income-tax, and (iii) Clerks ; and
  - (c) the number of promotions made after the 1st April, 1932, from lower to higher grades of the gazetted and non-gazetted services of the Income-tax Department, Bihar and Orissa ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg** : I propose to answer questions Nos. 8, 9 and 10 together. The information is being obtained and will be laid on the table in due course.

**COMMUNAL COMPOSITION OF THE STAFF IN THE OFFICES OF THE ASSISTANT  
COMMISSIONERS OF INCOME-TAX, BIHAR AND ORISSA.**

†9. **Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** : Will Government kindly lay on the table a statement showing the number of Bihari Hindus, Bengali Hindus, Muhammadans, Oriyas and Christians employed as Head Assistants, Assistants and Second Assistants in the Offices of the Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax, Bihar and Orissa ?

**ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE SUPERINTENDENT IN THE OFFICE OF THE  
COMMISSIONER OF INCOME-TAX, BIHAR AND ORISSA.**

†10. **Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** : Is it a fact that the Superintendent in the office of the Commissioner of Income-tax, Bihar and Orissa, has much to do with the transfers, promotions, etc., of the establishment of the Income-tax Department, Bihar and Orissa ?

**PROPOSAL TO SHIFT THE OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF INCOME-TAX FROM  
RANCHI TO PATNA.**

11. **Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** : Will Government kindly state whether there is any proposal to shift the office of the Commissioner of Income-tax from Ranchi to Patna ?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg** : The answer is in the negative.

**MAINTENANCE OF THE FAMILY OF HYDER ALI AND TIPU SULTAN.**

12. **Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan** : With reference to the starred question No. 1, dated the 22nd August, 1933, will Government kindly lay

† For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 8.

on the table a copy of the original scheme regarding the maintenance of the family of Hyder Ali and Tipu Sultan ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe :** Sir, I lay on the table a copy of the relevant articles of the Partition Treaty of Mysore, 1799, which contains the original provision for the maintenance of the families of Hyder Ali and Tipu Sultan.

*Partition Treaty of Mysore—1799.*

Treaty for strengthening the Alliance and Friendship subsisting between the English East India Company Bahadur, His Highness the Nawab Nizam-ud-Dowlah Ausuph Jah Bahadur, and the Peishwa, Rao Pundit Pradhan Bahadur and for effecting a settlement of the dominions of the late Tippoo Sultan.

*Article 1.*

It being reasonable and just that the allies by this Treaty should accomplish the original objects of the war (*vis.*, a due indemnification for the expenses incurred in their own defence, and effectual security for their respective possessions against the future designs of their enemies), it is stipulated and agreed that the districts specified in the Schedule A hereunto annexed, together with the heads of all the passes leading from the territory of the late Tippoo Sultan to any part of the possessions of the English East India Company Bahadur, of its allies, or tributaries, situated between the ghats on either coast, and all forts situated near to and commanding the said passes, shall be subjected to the authority, and be for ever incorporated with the dominions of the English East India Company Bahadur, the said Company Bahadur engaging to provide effectually, out of the revenues of the said districts, for the suitable maintenance of the whole of the families of the late Hyder Ali Khan and of the late Tippoo Sultan, and to apply to this purpose, with the reservation hereinafter stated, and an annual sum of not less than two lakhs of Star Pagodas, making the Company's share as follows :—

	<i>Canterai Pagodas.</i>
Estimated value of districts enumerated in the Schedule A according to the statement of Tippoo Sultan in 1792 ..	7,77,170
Deduct provision for the families of Hyder Ali Khan and of Tippoo Sultan, two lakhs of Star Pagodas, in Canterai Pagodas .. .. .	2,40,000
	(Rs. 7,00,000)
Remains to the East India Company ..	5,37,170

*Article 6.*

The English East India Company Bahadur shall be at liberty to make such deductions from time to time from the sums allotted by the first Article of the present Treaty for the maintenance of the families of Hyder Ali Khan and Tippoo Sultan, as may be proper, in consequence of the decease of any member of the said families ; and in the event of any hostile attempt, on the part of the said family or of any member of it, against the authority of the contracting parties or against the peace of their respective dominions or the territories of the Rajah of Mysore, then the said English East India Company Bahadur shall be at liberty to limit or suspend entirely the payment of the whole or any part of the stipend hereinbefore stipulated to be applied to the maintenance and support of the said families.

**APPOINTMENT OF EX-APPRENTICES IN THE LILLOAH RAILWAY WORKSHOP.**

13. **Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen :** (a) With reference to (i) starred questions Nos. 828 to 834 of the 12th September, 1933, (ii) starred questions Nos. 1106 to 1110 of the 21st November, 1933, (iii) unstarred questions Nos. 213 to 215 of the 27th November, 1933, and (iv) unstarred

questions Nos. 265 to 266 of the 5th December, 1933, regarding the appointments of the *ex*-apprentices of the East Indian Railway Workshop, Lillooah, will Government please state whether they have now received the required information from the Agent, East Indian Railway? Are Government aware that the answers are long overdue?

(b) If Government have not received any information as yet, how long more will it take them to lay the replies on the table and what are the reasons for such long delay?

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** The information was laid on the table of the House on the 16th July, 1934.

#### WAITING LIST OF EX-APPRENTICES OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

14. **Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen :** (a) With reference to the answer to unstarred question No. 19 of the 5th September, 1932, will Government please state why the waiting list of the *ex*-apprentices on the East Indian Railway has not been arranged according to seniority and the divisions they passed in the Technical School (as is done everywhere)? Are Government prepared to arrange the waiting list according to seniority and the divisions they passed in the Technical School and send the copies of the same to the Deputy Chief Mechanical Engineers, the Chief Engineer, the Chief Operating Superintendent and the Controller of Stores, without further delay? If not, why not?

(b) If the answer to part (a) above be in the affirmative, will Government please lay a copy of the waiting list on the table of this House? If not, why not?

(c) Will Government please place on the table of this House a list showing the names of mechanics, chargemen and draughtsmen who have been appointed in the East Indian Railway Workshop, Lillooah, since 1932, with the following particulars :

- (i) dates of completion of apprenticeship training ;
- (ii) particulars of training ;
- (iii) divisions in which passed in Technical examination ; and
- (iv) starting salaries ?

If not, why not ?

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** (a) Government have no information. The matter is within the competence of the Railway Administration and Government are not prepared to interfere.

(b) and (c). The information is not available, and Government consider that the time and labour spent in the compilation is unlikely to be justified by results.

#### APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE LILLOOAH RAILWAY WORKSHOP.

15. **Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen :** (a) Are Government aware that it has been stated in reply to the unstarred question No. 26 of the 5th September, 1932, that one Anglo-Indian, who had no mechanical training at all, had been appointed as a mechanic in the Saw Mill in the East Indian Railway Workshop, Lillooah ?

(b) Are Government aware that it has been stated in reply to starred question No. 924 of the 7th November, 1932, that one outsider, who had

no training (except timber seasoning) in Carriage and Wagon Department, previously, was first appointed as a Kiln Seasoning Supervisor, that after the abolition of Kiln Seasoning Operation he was appointed as a mechanic, and that the claims of many *ex*-apprentices of the same workshop who were on the waiting list were ignored ?

(c) Will Government please state whether the Anglo-Indians and outsiders who had no mechanical training at all, as referred to in parts (a) and (b) above, are better qualified for the posts of mechanics in the Carriage and Wagon Department, East Indian Railway, Lillooah, than the *ex*-apprentices who were trained for five years in the Carriage and Wagon Department ? If so, will Government please state the reasons ?

(d) If the answer to parts (a) and (b) above be in the affirmative, and to part (c) in the negative, will Government please state :

(i) why the *ex*-apprentices who were trained for five years under them are not able to manage the works ; and

(ii) whether those two mechanics are proposed to be replaced by the *ex*-apprentices who were trained in the same workshop and who are waiting ? If not, why not ?

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** (a) The reply referred to will be found on page 1992 of the Legislative Assembly Debates, Volume III, No. 1, dated the 13th March, 1933. It contained particulars of the training and experience of a Foreman and Assistant Foreman in the Saw Mill.

(b) The reply referred to will be found on page 1985 of the Legislative Assembly Debates, Volume III, No. 1, dated the 13th March, 1933. It contained a statement showing the names of mechanics, chargemen and draftsmen appointed since January, 1930, in the Lillooah Carriage and Wagon Workshops.

(c) and (d). Government have no reason to believe that the selection made by the administration was not justified and are not prepared to interfere.

#### APPOINTMENTS IN THE LILLOOAH RAILWAY WORKSHOP.

16. **Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen :** (a) Will Government please state whether they have acted in accordance with the procedure cited in answers to starred questions Nos. 296 (b) and (d) of the 10th September, 1929 and 471 (d) of the 5th March, 1930 ?

(b) If the answer to part (a) above be in the affirmative, will Government please state why Mr. N. C. Nandy has not been given the Charge-man T. T. grade ?

(c) Are Government prepared to take immediate steps against such action of the Railway administration who are acting deliberately in contravention of the repeated assurance given by Government ? If so, in what way ? If not, why not ?

(d) Are Government prepared to promote Mr. Nandy in the Charge-man T. T. grade without further delay and issue necessary orders to the officer concerned ? If not, why not ?

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** Information is being obtained and a reply will be laid on the table later.

APPOINTMENT OF EX-APPRENTICES IN THE LILLOOAH RAILWAY WORKSHOP.

17. **Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen :** (a) Is it a fact that a vacancy will occur in the grade of mechanics owing to the retirement of a mechanic who is working in Production Department under the Deputy Chief Mechanical Engineer, East Indian Railway, Lillooah ?

(b) Is it a fact that arrangements have already been made to appoint a junior ex-apprentice of 1932, ignoring the claims of many seniors of 1930 and 1931 who are still waiting for appointment ?

(c) Are Government aware that it has been stated in reply to a question that many ex-apprentices of 1930 and 1931 worked in Production Department ?

(d) Are Government aware of the assurance given in reply to the unstarred question No. 22 (b) of the 5th September, 1932 ?

(e) Are Government aware that it has been stated in reply to starred question No. 472 of the 5th March, 1930, that the senior ex-apprentices have prior claims to their juniors who completed their training at later dates ?

(f) If the answer to parts (a) to (e) above be in the affirmative, will Government please state whether they are prepared to :

- (i) put a stop to such practice of appointing juniors ;
- (ii) take necessary steps to appoint a senior ex-apprentice from the waiting list ; and
- (iii) issue necessary orders to the Chief Mechanical Engineer to this effect ?

If not, why not ?

(g) If the answer to part (iii) of part (f) above be in the affirmative, will Government please lay a copy of the order on the table ? If not, why not ?

**Mr. P. B. Rau :** Government have no information in regard to the detailed points raised in the question which are within the competence of the Railway Administration to decide. They have forwarded a copy of it to the Agent in order that any assurances given by Government may be borne in mind by him.

APPOINTMENT OF EX-APPRENTICES IN THE LILLOOAH RAILWAY WORKSHOP.

18. **Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen :** (a) Are Government aware that three posts of draughtsmen had fallen vacant in 1933 under the Deputy Chief Mechanical Engineer, East Indian Railway, Lillooah ?

(b) Are Government aware that all the ex-apprentices were informed by letters ?

(c) Are Government aware that they were put to test by the Head Draughtsman ?

(d) Are Government aware that they were given Drawing No. 3203 to draw sections through certain portions of a first class compartment, but no dimensions were given to them ? If so, why ?

(e) Are Government aware that no drawing except some standard parts can be drawn without dimensions ?

(f) Are Government aware that arrangements were made beforehand to appoint a traecer and an Anglo-Indian junior *ex*-apprentice ?

(g) If the answers to parts (d) and (f) above be in the negative, are Government prepared to institute an early enquiry into the matter and take necessary step ? If so, in what way ? If not, why not ?

(h) Will Government please supply the names of those who were appointed as draughtsmen in 1933, with the following particulars :

- (i) general education (university examination passed),
- (ii) technical education (division passed),
- (iii) particulars of training, and
- (iv) starting salaries ?

If not, why not ?

(i) Will Government please state whether they propose to transfer or promote mechanics and chargemen from other workshops or section which are under the Chief Mechanical Engineer, in cases of all future vacancies, and appoint *ex*-apprentices from the waiting list to the successive vacancies and issue necessary orders to the East Indian Railway Administration to this effect without further delay ? If not, why not ?

(j) If the answer to part (i) above be in the affirmative, will Government please lay a copy of the order on the table of this house ? If not, why not ?

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** Government have no information. The selection is within the competence of the Railway Administration and Government are not prepared to interfere.

#### APPOINTMENT OF EX-APPRENTICES IN THE LILLOOAH RAILWAY WORKSHOP.

19. **Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen :** (a) Will Government please state the number of the vacancies that occurred in the grade of Train Examiners and Electricians under the Chief Operating Superintendent, East Indian Railway, since October, 1933, and the number of the *ex*-apprentices of Lillooah workshop who have been appointed, with the following particulars :

- (i) the name of the Division and the number of vacancies,
- (ii) names of the *ex*-apprentices, if any, and
- (iii) starting salaries ?

(b) Will Government please state separately the number of vacancies that have occurred under the Chief Engineer and the Controller of Stores since 1932 and the names, if any, of *ex*-apprentices of East Indian Railway Workshop, Lillooah, who have been provided there with posts, as referred to in the answer to starred question No. 918 (d) of the 7th November, 1932 ?

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** Government have no information.

## STATEMENTS LAID ON THE TABLE.

### ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE CONDUCT OF TROOPS IN MIDNAPORE.

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig (Home Member) :** With reference to the allegations against the conduct of the troops and civil officials in Midnapore made in this House on the 19th March, 1934, by Mr. S. C. Mitra, in the course of the debate on the Finance Bill and to the undertaking I gave on the 21st March to treat these allegations as I would a question and obtain a report on them from the Government of Bengal, I now lay on the table a statement showing the result of the enquiries made by the local authorities, which are fully endorsed by the Government of Bengal.

#### Statement.

Allegations. (Extracted from Mr. S. C. Mitra's speech in the Legislative Assembly, dated the 19th March, 1934.)	Remarks.
<p>The soldiers in batches of 20 to 25 with a circle officer or a special magistrate or a sub-deputy collector and one or two sub-inspectors of police and other police officers are sent to different thanas as from the sub-divisional town. Four or five camps are fixed up where they stay for three or four days. Each thana is being visited by different batches of troops in different routes.</p> <p>(1) <i>Reception.</i>—Police officers give verbal or written notices to shopkeepers and prominent villagers to decorate shops and to erect gates in the routes to be followed by a party of troops and to receive them. Teachers of schools within a distance of three to four miles have also to erect gates and to receive the soldiers with their boys who should carry flags and shout "jais" to give them ovation. The school sub-inspectors have to take particular care that no one remains absent. Absentee teachers though small in number, are being deprived of their grants-in-aid. Each school has generally to serve more than one turn and the little boys have to remain standing for hours on each occasion. Several hundreds are collected at the instance of thana officers by general subscriptions. Defaulters are threatened with condign punishment. Processions with flowers, festoons, bugles and drums are to be arranged by villagers.</p> <p>(2) <i>Extortion of Tea Parties, Dalies and other Entertainments.</i>—Well-to-do persons have no escape from giving either a tea party or a <i>dali</i>. A poor man, if he has sometimes incurred the wrath of even the chowkidar, has to pay for it and present <i>dalies</i>. The deputy Babu or the <i>dargaga</i> Babu would send for persons and bid them present <i>dalies</i> with such articles as are put in the list they would supply. Any pleading to be excused with less costly or more easily available things would earn for the offender the</p>	<p>(1) During the combined civil and military operations shop-keepers and prominent villagers were invited to welcome the troops and in accordance with the time-honoured custom of the country on account of ceremonial visits they erected arches and decorated their shops.</p> <p>It is not true that teachers and students were compelled to appear against their will to greet the troops; on the contrary, the school children in most places eagerly clamoured for permission to be present and evidently regarded the arrival of the troops as a festive occasion. In no case has any teacher been deprived of his grant-in-aid on account of his absence from such festivities, or threatened with such deprivation.</p> <p>(2) It is entirely untrue that any person was compelled to give tea parties or <i>dalies</i> to the troops; on the contrary, on the advice of the civil officials, the military in many places refused to accept tea parties or <i>dalies</i>. Only well-to-do persons of known loyalty and sufficient standing were allowed to entertain the troops and the entertainments consisted of simple tea parties at which the troops were supplied with country sweetmeats, etc.</p>

Allegations. (Extracted from Mr. S. C. Mitra's speech in the Legislative Assembly, dated the 19th March, 1934.)

Remarks.

filthiest language and the grossest insult. Man of position and honour have to remain standing for hours supplicatingly to receive orders from the officers just to avoid greater insult at their hands. Cash moneys are sometimes extracted in lieu of *dalties*. Teachers and members of school committees have in some cases to arrange tea parties or send *dalties*, as otherwise they would be deprived of their stipends. If they do not dance attendance on the visiting party, they are suspended or their aids are cancelled at the orders of the school sub-inspectors, who as a rule, play a most prominent part in the reception.

(3) "*Union Jack*" *Salutation*.—Notices are served particularly on Congress workers, to salute the Union Jack on a particular day at a particular camp. If they do not turn up, their houses are searched and household articles are pillaged. They are flogged and members of their families are insulted, roughly handled and sometimes assaulted. The workers are arrested and taken to the camp, and if they refused to salute the Union Jack, they are subjected to inhuman torture in the shape of flogging, kicking, knocking their heads against the grounds, and the like. They are also kept in confinement for long periods with their hands tied up or otherwise.

(4) *House searches and Destruction of properties*.—In these cases, too, the Congress workers are the targets. Besides, those persons, who have been deemed wanting in proper respect for the *daroga* Babu or any other officer, had their houses searched, household articles destroyed, and also received usual insults. Sometimes ladies are also assaulted and are subjected to humiliation.

Great excesses have so far been committed by searching parties. Properties have been destroyed, cash and ornaments have been robbed, houses have been desecrated, householders, from children to old men, have been flogged, ladies have been molested and even outrages on women have been committed.

(3) Prominent inhabitants of the villages concerned, whether Congress workers or not, were invited to attend flag saluting ceremonies and the great majority of them expressed satisfaction at being invited. At some of these ceremonies as many as 7,000 or 8,000 people were present, and great enthusiasm was shown. It is not true that those who were invited but did not attend were tortured, their houses pillaged and their families roughly handled. The Additional District Magistrate was on tour almost continuously during the operations and talked to many hundreds of the people concerned; in no case was any complaint of this nature made to him. Written complaints were afterwards received in respect of Ashutosh Roy Choudhury and Ramanath Maity, but enquiry showed that the complaints were either false or grossly exaggerated. Neither of these gentlemen made any attempt to represent their grievances to the Additional District Magistrate, although that officer was several times in their locality and twice sent for Ashutosh Choudhury.

(4) It is not true that houses have been searched because disrespect had been shown by their owners to the local police. During the course of the operations information was from time to time received which made it necessary to search houses; such searches were conducted by the Police, and the troops provided the necessary cordon. The troops did not enter the houses at all.

The allegations of flogging, looting, wanton destruction and molestation of women, are all utterly unfounded and not in a single case have such allegations been substantiated. Only one specific allegation of the molestation of a woman has been made and this was found on a judicial enquiry by a officer, quite unconnected with the operations, to be completely false. The complainant has since been prosecuted for giving false evidence and the case was still under trial at the time of the local Government's report.

Allegations. (Extracted from Mr. S. C. Mitra's speech in the Legislative Assembly, dated the 19th March, 1934.)

Remarks.

(5) *Durbars*.—The District Magistrate or the Additional District Magistrate holds a *darbar* in each *thana*. Notices are served particularly on Congress workers or Congress sympathisers for attendance. *Darbar* speeches are full of threats that the people should be careful to keep free from all sorts of movements, otherwise military help would be resorted to to suppress them.

(6) *Watch and Ward Committees*.—Watch and Ward committees are being formed by Circle Officers in villages. In the *durbars*, the members of such committees, who in many cases have been coerced to serve as such, are awarded *sasads* which warrant them to help in cases of dacoity in the villages. But in the *darbar* speeches they are directed that they must give information to the police whenever a library or a gymnastic club, or a school is started in the village or if there is any meeting, political or otherwise, or there is any newcomer and so on.

(7) *Notices on Congress workers*.—Those Congress workers, who have not submitted to the coercion by refusing to salute the Union Jack or to be a member of the Watch and Ward committee and those who have been considered incorrigible are being served with notices under the Bengal Suppression of Terrorist Outrages Act, 1932, to report to *thana* officers each week and to assist in the maintenance of law and order in connection with the combined civil and military operations to be carried out in the district from 15th December until the 31st April 1934.

A few significant cases will give some idea about the serious situation.

(8) During the small hours of the night of the 25th January, 1934, a number of Garhwali soldiers surrounded the house of Sj. Murari Mohan Sasmal of Jukhia in P. S. Bhagwanpur in the Contai sub-division, and one of the soldiers committed rape on the wife of Sj. Bhuban Chandra Sasmal, the elder brother of Murari Babu. Both the brothers were absent from home and the neighbours were prevented by soldiers and policemen from coming to the rescue of the unfortunate woman.

(5) The facts are that prominent gentlemen, including Congress adherents, were invited to the *durbars* and were told clearly that neither Government nor the District authorities were prepared to tolerate subversive or anarchical movements and that Government were determined to use every possible means to stamp out terrorism. Emphasis was placed upon the fact that the villagers themselves stood to lose by such movements and that it was their duty to come to the aid of Government in restoring order and tranquillity.

(6) The Watch and Ward Committees were told in the *Darbar* speeches that their main function is to keep their eyes open and to collect information relating to anything which may affect the public tranquillity. If for example a new school is opened, they are to ascertain whether it is a genuine school rendering useful service to the community or whether it is merely an institution for terrorist or Congress propaganda. Similarly the Watch and Ward Committees were told that if a stranger comes to the village, they are to satisfy themselves that he has not come with the intention of carrying on terrorist propaganda or otherwise disturbing the public peace. The duties thus entrusted to the members of the Watch and Ward Committees are the ordinary duties of a public citizen. Unwilling persons have not been compelled to serve on these Committees.

(7) During the operations, information came to light which made it necessary to keep in touch with the movements of certain persons, and notices under the Bengal Suppression of Terrorist Outrages Act were accordingly served upon them. The total number of persons on whom notices were so served was 43 out of a district population of three millions. In most cases the purpose of the notices has now been served and the orders have been or are about to be withdrawn.

(8) The case has already been mentioned above [*vide* item (4)]. A judicial enquiry was held and the complaint found to be false and a prosecution for false evidence was instituted against Murari Mohan Sasmal.

Allegations. (Extracted from Mr. S. C. Mitra's speech in the Legislative Assembly, dated the 19th March, 1934.)	Remarks.
<p>(9) On the 11th January, 1934, the junior sub-inspector of police of P. S. Kedgree in the Contai sub-division, with a party of Garhwali soldiers, constables and chowkidars, surrounded the house of Sj. Jogendra Nath Patra of Sillibari in P. S. Kedgree. Jogen Babu being absent from home, they enquired about Jogen Babu's wife, who at the sight of the soldiers, had run away from the house with her two children and had been trying to take shelter in a neighbour's house. The sub-inspector, with some constables, chased her from one house to another for a distance of 1½ miles, assaulted whomsoever they came across, held an identification parade of women to find her out and created a great panic throughout the village.</p>	<p>(9) No complaint of this kind has been made to the district authorities.</p>
<p>(10) During the search in the night of the 3rd January, 1934 (3 A.M.) in the house of Sj. Indra Narayan Bera of village Katranks in P. S. Pataapur in the Contai sub-division, one of the soldiers of the searching party, headed by Mr. Dhirendra Nath Mukherjee, the special magistrate of Contai, and Sj. Jagat Taran Chatterjee, the senior sub-inspector of police of P. S. Potashpur, with the apparent evil intention dragged Shrimati Rajanibala Bera, the daughter-in-law of Indra Babu, inside a room and the lady could only save her honour by threatening to make an end of her life with a knife. Shrimati Rajanibala was a Congress worker; she was asked to salute the Union Jack.</p>	<p>(10) No such complaint has been made to the district authorities. A complaint of a similar nature was received from Kumud Charau Bera of the same village and on enquiry by the District Magistrate was found to be totally and maliciously false. It may be noted here that the allegations made in paragraphs (10), (12), (17) and (25) should, if true, have been made the subject of criminal complaint. No such complaints were made and the fact that these allegations are now for the first time brought to the notice of the District authorities affords a very reasonable presumption that they are false.</p>
<p>Serious damages were done to the properties of the Beras, male and female members were seriously assaulted—not even children excepted, and gold and silver ornaments were robbed.</p>	
<p>(11) (i) After search in the house of Sj. Kumar Narayan Panda, on 27th December, 1933, a bundle of currency notes amounting in all to Rs. 2,635 was found missing.</p>	<p>(11) (i) See remarks against item 23.</p>
<p>(ii) Every article in the house of Kailas Chandra Maiti of Balichak, P. S. Kedgrec, was smashed during search, and ornaments and other articles were robbed.</p>	
<p>(iii) Cash payments were extorted from Jhatu Charan Maiti of Paschim Sarpai, Iswan Chandra Karan of Dakshin Nisehinta, P. S. Contai, and others on the 31st December, 1933.</p>	<p>(11) (ii) and (iii). No such complaints were made to local authorities.</p>
<p>(iv) On the 10th December, 1933, Sj. Ashutosh Ray Chowdhury and Sj. Ramanath Maiti (Congress workers) of Balyagovindpur, P. S. Potashpur, were flogged, threatened with their lives and kept in confinement for their refusal to salute the Union Jack, and their household articles were given over to pillage during search on the 9th December, 1933.</p>	<p>(11) (iv) A complete reply to these allegations was given in the statement laid on the Assembly table on the 31st January, 1934, in answer to Mr. S. C. Mitra's question No. 49.</p>

Allegations. (Extracted from Mr. S. C. Mitra's speech in the Legislative Assembly, dated the 19th March, 1934.)

Remarks.

(12) On the 16th January, 1934, Sj. Saahi Sekhar Mandal of village Ektarpur, P. S. Potaashpur, was arrested and taken to the soldiers' camp, and, on his refusal to salute the Union Jack, was flogged, slapped, kicked and otherwise assaulted for several times, was kept in confinement, tied up in a post, and his head was knocked against the ground before the Union Jack again and again and he was subjected to the most inhuman behaviour.

There are many other cases of the like.

(13) On the 3rd January, 1934, school masters and students were assaulted for no fault of theirs, and their stipends were suspended, because Mahatma Gandhi and Chittaranjan's photos were found in the school. Two little boys were also inhumanly treated.

(14) *Potashpur Police Station*.—The first instance of military excesses was committed on the 9th December last by a detachment of the Royal Garhwali Rifles, encamped at Manglamaro, in connection with house searches in the villages of Ballyagovindpur and Palpara under police station Potashpur; there Sjs. Ashutosh Ray Choudhury, Ramanath Maity and Kalipada Mahapatra were flogged and otherwise harassed for their refusal to salute the Union Jack. Another detachment encamping at the Argoal Bungalow, on the 1st January, 1934, led by the special magistrate, Mr. D. N. Mukherjee, and the sub-inspectors, Messrs. Jagat Taran Bannerjee and Khondakar, committed similar atrocities at the village Katranka on the occasion of searching the houses of the Beras on the 3rd January, 1934. Floggings, lathi blows upon the inmates, not excepting ladies, and loot and destruction of property were freely indulged in by the soldiery. Sjs. Kumud Chandra Bera, Churadhari Bera, with his wife and the son, Monaranjan Bera, Nilkanta Bera, Indra Narayan Bera, with his wife and the daughter-in-law, Sja. Rajani Bala Bera; Kartick Ch. Bera, with his sons, Priyanath, and Bholanath Haridhan Bera, Gajendra Nath Bera, with his sons, Arjun, Arun and Bharat, and Satis Ch. and Narendra Nath Bera were amongst the victims. Assaults were due to the refusal to salute the Flag and furnish information leading to the recovery of the Congress Cyclostyle Machine.

(15) *Contai Police Station*.—Prior to the arrival of the Royal Garhwali Rifles at Contai, the S. D. O. issued warrants to the local gentry directing them to join the reception of the troops and the Flag Salutation ceremony on the 16th December and the Ceremonial Parade

(12) See remarks against item (10).

(13) See remarks against item 26, which appears to refer to the same incident.

(14) This is a repetition of the allegations made in items (10) and (11) (iv) above.

(15) The use of the term "warrant" in this para, is wholly misleading. Notices were served upon the local gentry requesting them to join in the reception of the troops and these notices (which were in Bengali) were couched in the honorific or polite form of Bengali. It

Allegations. (Extracted from Mr. S. C. Mitra's speech in the Legislative Assembly, dated the 19th March, 1934.)

Remarks.

on the 18th December, 1933. Here *dalies* or, in lieu thereof, cash payments were extorted from the local people upon the threat of beletting the soldiery on their houses.

(16) *Ballyagovindpur*.—On the 9th December, 1933, a number of soldiers of the Royal Garhwali Rifles, headed by a havildar, surrounded the house of Sj. Ashutoah Ray Chaudhury of Ballyagovindpur village under Pataashpur police station. Sj. Ray Choudhury was asked to salute the Union Jack. But before he could understand the situation, he was secured with a rope, his hands being tied from behind, and was severely belaboured by the Havildar. In the meantime, on the plea of a search, the soldiers entered his house and pillaged everything inside. With Sj. Ray Choudhury in their custody, the house of Sj. Ramanath Maity was next visited. He too was given a good thrashing and his house was also given over to similar pillage. Both of them were then taken to the Soldiers' Camp at Manglamaro and detained there for two days. On the 10th, at 5 P.M., both of them were taken to the Parade Ground and ordered to salute the Flag. On their refusal, there they were mercilessly belaboured, and, moreover, threatened to be shot dead. At last they were forcibly made to salute the Union Jack.

(17) *Palpara*.—On the 9th December, the house of Sj. Kalipada Roy Mahapatra of Palpara was also surrounded by soldiers. Kalipada Babu was roughly handled for his refusal to salute the Flag and subsequently made a prisoner. His house was searched with considerable damage to property. But, persisting in his refusal to salute the Flag, he was again assaulted by the Havildar at the Parade Ground. They wanted him to execute a bond, but, as he was not agreeable to this, he was again given some fifty lashes.

(18) *Banamali Chatta*.—At this village, a detachment of the Garhwali Rifles searched the houses of Sj. Sree Nath Chandra Jana and Kungal Chandra Jana, on the 26th December. Although nothing incriminating was found, the searching party broke into pieces several glass jars, looking glasses and earthen pots; tore open mattresses and quilts and scattered rice and *dal* on the floor. At Kungal Babu's place, despite being offered keys, they wantonly broke open a safe and mutilated important documents inside. In the evening, the local gentry were summoned at the Parade Ground and ordered to send *dalies* for the troops. There Sj. Ananta Das of Kamardah and Bhagabat

is quite untrue that *dalies* were extorted from the local people. Attention is invited in this connection to the remarks made against item (2) above.

(16) This is a repetition of the allegations made in items (11) (iv) and (14) above.

(17) See remarks against item (10) above.

(18) The remarks made against items (10), (4) and (2) apply also to these allegations.

Allegations. (Extracted from Mr. S. C. Mitra's speech in the Legislative Assembly, dated the 19th March, 1934.)

Remarks.

Chandra Jana of Laudan were abused in the most filthy language, roughly handled and forcibly made to salute the Union Jack.

(19) *Bantrakunda*.—Here a party of soldiers searched the houses of Sj. Achinta Kumar Panday and Kumar Narayan Panday on the 27th December. At the former place, a box and a portmanteau were broken open and paper inside destroyed. Foodstuffs were all scattered on the floor and got mixed up. At the latter place, three boxes four portmanteaus, and one safe were broken open and the contents therein soiled pouring oil over them.

(19) The allegation as regards Kumar Narayan Panday is dealt with in item 23 below. The other allegation made in this item was found on investigation by the District Magistrate to be totally and maliciously false.

(20) *Behari*.—Here Sj. Byomkesh Das, a teacher of the Namaldiah, U. P. School, was summoned by the Havildar of a detachment, visiting the place on the 26th December, to salute the Union Jack with the local volunteers. In the absence of the Flag that day he had to salute the bare flag-staff then and there, and reappear the next day for proper salutation. *Dali* was also extorted from him, and also from Kumud Bandhu Panday, a local zamindar and the President Panchayat of Union No. IV. He had also to arrange for a dinner in honour of the Officer Commanding Captain Murray, where no less than 62 Garhwali soldiers were among the guests.

(20) Most of this is a repetition of the allegations made in item (10) above. As regards the allegations under the heading *Behari*, attention is invited to the remarks made against items (2) and (3) above.

*Katranka*.—Headed by the special magistrate Mr. D. N. Mukherjee, and a Havildar among others, a batch of soldiers surrounded the house of the Bera at 3 A.M. on the 3rd January, 1934. While searching the house of Sj. Kumud Chandra Bera, his younger brother, Sj. Churadhari Bera, was kicked and dealt with 20 or 25 stripes and lathi blows. He got a nasty cut in his head two inches long and serious injuries in the right cheek and the little finger of the left hand. Kumud Babu's nephew, Sreeman Manoranjan and his mother each got five to six stripes. A soldier tugged the portion of the *saree* covering her head and the breast. The searching party then broke open wooden safes and robbed gold and silver ornaments approximately worth Rs. 100. Important documents and papers in connection with the estate of Kumud Babu's master have also been destroyed. The cost of other damages amounts to nearly Rs. 30 to Rs. 40.

Sj. Nilkanta Bera's house was also ransacked. Here, among other things, a few Charkas were smashed. Not satisfied with this, the soldiers went to the length of answering calls of nature in two rooms. Apart from damage to pro-

Allegations. (Extracted from Mr. S. C. Mitra's speech in the Legislative Assembly, dated the 19th March, 1934.)

Remarks.

party, here they insulted Indra Babu's wife and a daughter-in-law, named Sja. Rajanibala Bera, a local Congress worker. A soldier enquired of her about the Cyclostyle Machine and asked her in Hindi to salute the Union Jack. Before she could make out what the soldier meant, she was struck with a lathi. Not satisfied with this, the soldier, with the apparent evil intention, tried to push aside the mother-in-law, while dragging the daughter-in-law inside the room. At this Sja. Rajanibala threatened to make an end of her life with a knife and thus saved her honour.

At Sj. Kartick Ch. Bera's house, his son, Priyanath Bera (16—17) years, was asked about the Cyclostyle Machine. Having no satisfactory answer from him, the special magistrate, Mr. Khondakar, and the Havildar, one after another flogged him 40 to 50 times. They broke two canes on his back. He was then removed to the Argaola Military Camp and forcibly made to salute the Union Jack in the evening. He had nothing to eat during the night and was let off at 4 P.M. the next day. Sreeman Bholanath (10 years), the youngest son of Kartick Babu, was also given a few stripes. The military visited the house of Sj. Haridhan Bera, who was laid up with dysentery for several months, and gave him 5 to 6 stripes for withholding information about the Cyclostyle. For similar supposed offences, his sons, Arjun, Arun and Bharat were also flogged. Sj. Gajendra Nath Bera got kicks and stripes; Sreeman Satish Chandra Bera (13 years) and Narendra Nath Bera (14 years) had their heads knocked against the wall and also flogged for not disclosing information leading to the recovery of the Machine.

I shall now give the English rendering of Notices of Reception and Flag Salutation Ceremonies :

“ WARRANT No. 1.

(21) You are hereby informed that the Royal Garhwali soldiers of the Government will reach Contai on the 16th December, 1933, at 3 P.M. You are, therefore, directed to be present at the Dak Bungalow compound for their reception and the salutation of the British Flag at 3 P.M.

(Sd.) D. M. SEN,

*Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Contai.*”

Dated 15th December 1933.  
Court Seal.

(21) The notices have already been discussed in item (15) above. The headings “ Warrant No. 1, Warrant No. 2 ” are misleading translations, presumably intended to suggest that some form of compulsion was connected with these notices. The actual heading of the notices was “ Parwana ”, a word which connotes notices of all kinds.

Allegations. (Extracted from Mr. S. C. Mitra's speech in the Legislative Assembly, dated the 19th March, 1934.)

Remarks.

"WARRANT No. 2.

You are hereby informed that the Ceremonial Parade of the Royal Garhwali Rifles will be held in the compound in front of Khas Mahal Office on the 18th December, 1933, at 11 A.M. You are directed to be present there at the appointed hour without fail.

(Sd.) D. M. SEN,

*Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Contai."*

Dated the 16th December, 1933.

Court Seal.

I shall now refer to some of the circulars issued by some of those reception committees. I read now one circular which was issued to all the male members in a village :

(22) "As you have been appointed a member of the newly constituted watch and ward committee of Union No.....you would be so good as to be present at the Janka police station compound on Monday, the 9th January at 10 A.M., for the reception of the honoured District Magistrate and the acceptance of the sanad to the satisfaction of all. Absence will be deemed as a mark of disloyalty.

Yours faithfully,

(Sd.) PROFULLA KUMAR MAITY,

*Chairman, Reception Committee."*

I want the House to note that absence is punishable as a mark of disloyalty. In the judgment of a famous sedition case, disaffection has been defined as want of affection.

(23) "On the morning of 27th December last, at about 8 A.M. a band of soldiers accompanied by the police Inspector..... and the sub-deputy collector, Contai, surrounded my house. No male members were then present. Ladies were ordered out, and one of them fainted away. Then they broke open three wooden boxes. The largest of these contained a bundle of currency notes made up of fourteen 100-rupee notes, one hundred and twenty-three ten rupee notes and one five-rupee note, amounting in all to Rs. 2,635 only. All these things were des-

(22) The notices in question were issued by a loyal gentleman who was himself taking considerable interest in the formation of the Watch and Ward Committees. He felt it to be the duty of his fellow citizens to attend the reception of the Additional District Magistrate and receive their sanads appointing them as members of the Watch and Ward Committees, and he expressed his opinion that absence would be deemed (by him) a mark of disloyalty. No suggestion of any kind was made in the notice that absence would be punishable.

(23) Kumer Narayan Panday made no attempt whatever to lodge a criminal complaint regarding the alleged destruction of notes amounting to Rs. 2,635. It is incredible that had such destruction taken place no attempt should have been made to seek redress or to recover from the authorities the value of the notes destroyed.

Allegations. (Extracted from Mr. S. C. Mitra's speech in the Legislative Assembly, dated the 19th March, 1934.)

Remarks.

troys in the presence of my brother, S. J. Ramanath Panday. I was at Amratala Chak for settlement work and reached home on receiving the news. On hearing from my brother, I searched for the bundle of notes. But I did not find it, it was missing.

(Sd.) KUMAR NARAYAN PANDAY.

Then, I should like to read the story of an attempted outrage. This is the statement :—

(24) " I was a Congress worker, but have given up Congress work for the last 1½ years owing to pecuniary difficulties, and have been practising medicine. On the 25th January last, I went out on a call and was informed on the next day that the soldiers and the police had visited my house, and rape had been committed on a female member of our family. On my return, I heard of the following incident from my sister-in-law and kinsmen. I wanted to send a wire to Mr. R. Maiti, M.L.C., but the post office at Kajlagarh refused to admit the wire as it was against the police."

This is how the Postal Department has been functioning —

" At about 4 A.M., that is, towards the later part of the night of the 25th January, a batch of police and soldiers surrounded my house and the house of my kinsmen. They got entrance inside the compound probably through the broken portion of the boundary walls. Finding nobody there, they went into the courtyard of my uncle (Girish Babu). As both my elder brother Bhuban Babu, and myself were away from home, my brother's wife, Sm. Janakibala Saamal with three children, was sleeping in a separate bed in Girish Babu's house. The sound of the steps of the soldiers and the flash of torch-lights awoke Girish Babu's mother who tried to awaken my sister-in-law by calling her. At this, some soldiers caught hold of her (Girish Babu's mother), while others of the party wrapped up my sister-in-law's face with a piece of cloth and tried to outrage her. She had a sudden break of her sleep. There were the shrieks of horror of my uncle's mother on the one hand and such a brutal attack on herself on the other, that she became so much nervous that she lost all power to fight against this outrage. At the cry my uncle's mother, my uncle (Girish Babu) and a brother tried to run up to the place, but they were prevented by some other soldiers from doing so. The wife of Girish Babu, who was sharing the same bed with my uncle's

(24) See remark against items (4) and (3) above.

Allegations. (Extracted from Mr. S. C. Mitra's speech in the Legislative Assembly, dated the 19th March, 1934.)

Remarks.

mother, was also being dragged with apparent evil intention by one of the soldiers, but she ran away, got into a room and barred the door. In the morning (26th January), the sub-inspector of police of the Bhagwanpore thana arrived with Sjt. Dwarkanath Sasmal, the collecting panchayat, and searched the house and got a statement signed by Girish Babu, Sjts. Abinash Chandra Sasmal, Hemanta Kumar Sasmal and Adhar Chandra Bera that 'Nothing incriminating has been found and no property damaged'. Before they had signed this, they informed the sub-inspector and the panchayat of the outrage and requested them to take down the information. But they said nothing, and went away to the Mugbaria Camp.

(8d.) MURARI MOHAN SASMAL,

Village Jukhia.

P. O. Bhagwanpur.

P. S. Bhagwanpur.

Midnapur."

Another case is :—

(25) (a) " My name is Chowdhuri Charan Patra, of village Sillibari, in P. S. Kedgree. On the 10th January, 1934, a batch of Garhwali soldiers, the junior sub-inspector of the thana (Kedgree P. S.) and some chowkidars and dafadars visited the house of Jogendra Nath Patra of our village who was not at home. They did not find Jogen Babu's wife, too, at her house, and they reached my house in search of her. They were assaulting whomsoever they came across. At this, there was a commotion and I began to flee away towards the north of my house. The sub-inspector assured me of safety, and, as I went up to him, he enquired of Jogen Babu's wife and, on my pleading ignorance, he began to belabour me. At this time, my wife, daughter and other female members of my family, being horrified, began to run off to the east. The sub-inspector asked me to call them back with an assurance of safety. As they came back, he enquired of me whether there was Jogan Babu's wife in their midst and, on being answered in the negative, he again belaboured me. Then, he arrested me and all the womenfolk and took us to Ramhari Babu's house. There he ordered the dafadars and chowkidars to see whether there was Jogen Babu's wife in their midst. They examined each one of the ladies who were

(25) (a) This is a repetition of the allegations in item (9) above.

See remark against item (10) above.

Allegations. (Extracted from Mr. S. C. Mitra's speech in the Legislative Assembly, dated 19th March, 1934.)

Remarks.

kept standing for an hour in the sun in Ramhari Babu's courtyard and were then dismissed. The assault committed on me was severe which caused a swelling of an inch in my right wrist which has no strength now. I had indecent abuses, too, from the daroga Babu.

(Sd.) CHOWDHURI CHAMAN PATRA."

(25) (b) "Mr. Muzaffer Hussain, the junior sub-inspector of P. S. Pataagar and the sub-deputy collector of Contai, with a party of soldiers, surrounded my house on the 10th January, 1934, and commenced searching my house. When I was informed that they wanted me, I went up to them and the sub-deputy collector gave me some stripes and the S. I. kicked me \* \*"

(25) (b) See remarks against item (10) above.

At about 11 o'clock, I was taken to the Palpara Camp. The subedar asked me to salute the Union Jack. On my refusal, he gave me 15 or 16 stripes. Then, my hands were tied up with a rope and I was tied from head to foot with a post. An hour later, I was brought down, was threatened to be shot dead and was made to sit with my face towards the sun for an hour. At about 1 P.M., I was taken inside the camp \* \* \* In the afternoon, the S. I. tried to convince me that I should salute the Union Jack. But I remained adamant. In the midst of the discussion, he suddenly began to administer fists and slapped me on my face and eyes, made me fall flat on the ground and kicked me freely. Then, I was taken to the Parade Ground and was ordered to salute the Union Jack. On my refusal, under orders of the officers, two chowkidars knocked my head against the ground. Not satisfied with that, the S. I. joined them and knocked my head 15 to 20 times against the ground. I was also given 15 to 20 kicks. There was a public gathering then at that time. I felt pain all over the body, there were bruises in the body and the head, and I was given no food or bed in the night. In this condition, on the 11th, I was made to walk a distance of 11 miles and I reached the soldiers' camp at Datalghat at 11 o'clock. I was again urged to salute the Union Jack, and, on my refusal, the senior S. I., with the help of some chowkidars, made my head knock against the ground three and turned me out at noon. No food was given this day too."

Allegations. (Extracted from Mr. S. C. Mitra's speech in the Legislative Assembly, dated the 19th March 1934.)

Remarks.

(26) This is another case :

" On the 3rd January, 1934, when the troops were passing through the village Karanji (P. S. Ramnagar), two boys of the village shouted " Bande Mataram ". The soldiers gave a chase after them and assaulted whomsoever they came across. They entered the Karanji upper primary school and seriously assaulted the head pandit, Sj. Ramkrishna Jana, and the students of the school. They searched the school and seized the photos of Mahatma Gandhi and Deshabandhu Chittaranjan. The teachers were asked to go to the Balisi camp with the boys who shouted " Bande Mataram " although they were not students of the school. In the afternoon, the two boys, Sm. Bijoy Krishna Sahoo and Sm. Abala Kanta Das, were made to stand in the sun for 2½ hours with their heads caught by their hands passing under the thighs and the hips upwards. They were crying piteously through pain. After 2½ hours, they fell at the feet of the subedar and the circle officer of Egra. The circle officer gave them kicks and flogged them, and at last made them rub their nose against the ground for a distance of 30 cubits. The sub-divisional inspector has stopped the stipend of the said upper primary school and has called for an explanation from the teachers asking them why they purchased the pictures of Mahatma Gandhi and Chittaranjan."

(26) It is a fact that when the troops were passing through the village Karanji, P. S. Ramnagar, two boys of the village shouted " Bande Mataram " with the obvious intention of annoying the troops. Enquiries were made at the Karanji Upper Primary School as to the identity of the boys, who had run away, but the Headmaster denied that they came from his school. No student of the school was assaulted but certain photos calculated to encourage subversive activities were found hanging on the school walls and for this reason the stipend of the school has been stopped.

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** Sir, I lay on the table the information promised in reply to starred question No. 376 asked by Mr. Lalchand Navalrai on the 6th March, 1934.

#### COLLECTION OF OPINIONS ON THE TEMPLE ENTRY BILL THROUGH THE POLICE AT KARACHI.

\*376. (a) and (c). No. It was the case however that the Superintendent of Police, Karachi and Tatta Districts, was asked by the District Magistrate, Karachi, to give his opinion on the Bill. The Superintendent asked for the views of his senior officers, and they doubtless consulted Hindu members of the force and non-officials with whom they came in contact.

(b) Yes.

**The Honourable Sir Harry Haig :** Sir, I lay on the table the information promised in my reply given on the 17th April, 1934, to Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal's starred question No. 765, regarding traffic control at Naya Bans, Khari Baoli and Nai Sarak in Delhi.

## TRAFFIC CONTROL IN KHARI BAOLI AND NAI SARAK IN DELHI.

\*768. (a) Yes.

(b) It is reported that there has been a very slight rise in tonga fares, but that there has been no increase in the rates charged by *thelawalas*.

(c) As stated in my reply to Mr. Bhagat Chandi Mal Gola's question No. 177, asked on the 10th March, 1934, the arrangement in question is reported to be working satisfactorily. Further enquiries made show that there has been no adverse effect on the business community residing in the areas mentioned. Government do not therefore propose to take any action.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg :** Sir, I lay on the table :

(i) the information promised in reply to starred question No. 735 asked by Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi on the 17th April, 1934; and

(ii) the information promised in reply to starred question No. 683 asked by Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya on the 11th April, 1934.

## EXTENSION OF TIME LIMIT FOR PAYMENT OF INCOME-TAX IN THE EARTH-QUAKE STRICKEN AREA IN BIHAR.

\*735. (a) and (c). Income-tax Officers of the areas affected by the earthquake have been instructed to grant time liberally for payment of tax in cases where the assesses have suffered from the earthquake. The Government do not think it necessary to postpone the issue of further notices for the realisation of income-tax.

(b) No.

(c) The Commissioner of Income-tax visited the earthquake affected areas twice once in January immediately after the earthquake and again in March.

(d) No. Each individual case of hardship is being dealt with sympathetically by the local officers.

## COINS MINTED AND ISSUED FROM INDIAN MINTS.

\*683. (a) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to pages 48, 49 and 52 of Part IV (a) of the Financial Statistics of British India published by the Director General of Commercial Intelligence in 1908, which gives the required figures from 1835-36 to 1906-07; the figures for 1907-08 to 1919-20, are contained in tables 8 and 9 at pages 20 and 21 of Volume II of the same publication issued in 1922, while the figures for 1920-21 to 1929-30 are given on pages 326-329 of the Statistical Abstract for British India published in 1932. Later figures are available in the Reports on the Administration of the Mints.

(b) (i) Silver half and quarter rupees were coined in pursuance of Act XVII of 1835. So far as can be ascertained, silver one-eighth rupees were first struck in 1842. Nickel eight anna and four anna pieces were introduced in 1919, two anna pieces were introduced in 1918 and one anna pieces were introduced in 1907.

Copper double pice, single pice, half pice and pies were also coined in pursuance of the Act referred to above.

Bronze pice, half pice and pies were introduced in 1906.

(ii) Silver one-eighth rupees are still legal tender but since June, 1925, they are being withdrawn from circulation because of the comparative unpopularity of the coin since the introduction of the nickel two anna piece.

Nickel eight anna coins were called in with effect from the 1st of October, 1924. This coin never became popular with the public mostly owing to the appearance of particularly good counterfeits shortly after its introduction and partly also owing to its resemblance in size and shape to the single pice.

The coirage of double pie has been stopped since 1880 owing to the inconvenient size of the coin. Other copper coins were discontinued from 1906 on account of their shorter life and greater cost in comparison with bronze coins.

(c) It is not possible to state the loss on destruction of each type of coin, as no separate accounts are maintained.

(d) (i) No.

(ii) Government have no information.

(e) (i) Nickel coins have been introduced because they last longer and are more convenient, cheaper and more difficult to counterfeit.

(ii) It is not considered desirable to publish the correspondence.

(f) The metal is purchased by the Secretary of State in London. Government do not consider it desirable to disclose the details of the transactions.

(g) The coirage of four anna nickel pieces was discontinued in 1923, and only silver quarter rupees are now being coined. It is not proposed to reintroduce the two anna silver coin, as the popularity of the hard-wearing nickel coin is attested by the absorption figures.

**Lieut.-Colonel A. F. B. Lumby :** Sir, I lay on the table :

- (i) the information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 111 asked by Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin on the 3rd March, 1934 ;
- (ii) the information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 115 asked by Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin on the 3rd March, 1934 ;
- (iii) the information promised in reply to starred question No. 408 asked by Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh on the 7th March, 1934 ;
- (iv) the information promised in reply to starred question No. 410 asked by Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh on the 7th March, 1934 ;
- (v) the information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 181 asked by Mr. S. G. Jog on the 10th March, 1934 ;
- (vi) the information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 223 asked by Mr. S. G. Jog on the 21st March, 1934 ; and
- (vii) the information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 285 asked by Mr. S. G. Jog on the 3rd April, 1934.

#### REVISION OF THE WATER AND SCAVENGING TAXES IN THE AMBALA CANTONMENT.

111. (a) Yes, except that, with reference to part (v), the minimum scavenging tax, in the case of a building having a rental of Rs. 3 per annum, is annas two per mensem, unless the house has a private latrine, when the tax is annas eight per mensem.

(b) No. Only two members voted against the proposals.

(c), (d) and (e). The revised proposals were published on February 14th, inviting objections up to 16th February, 1934. The latter date was a misprint. The following day they were re-published giving a period of thirty days and inviting objections. Under the Cantonments Act, these proposals did not require to be published by the Cantonment Authority for criticism. But as the connected bye-laws required previous publication, they were published along with the proposals for the convenience of the public.

**CRITICISM BY CANTONMENT BOARD MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT  
OF INDIA.**

115. (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) Government are not aware of the views of the elected members of the Board. The attention of those concerned is being drawn to the fact that criticism of a particular executive act performed by Government does not involve *per se* a failure to discharge the obligations recited in the oath of affirmation set out in section 18 of the Cantonments Act and that therefore the ruling was incorrect. At the same time Government are satisfied from the inquiries they have made that the ruling was given under considerable provocation and that the President has certainly no desire to stifle legitimate criticism of proposals coming before the Board.

**DISABILITY PENSION TO MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE  
GREAT WAR.**

\*408. (a) To the fullest extent possible. It is unquestionably the duty of administrative officials to watch the interests of men serving under them and to act as claimants for pension purposes. This only refers, however, to cases where a reasonable claim exists.

In the first case quoted the soldier was granted a temporary pension for the period his disability lasted, i.e., from June, 1918, to June, 1920. A medical board held on him in 1920 decided that he was suffering from no disability.

As regards the second I would invite attention to the reply laid on the table to the Honourable Member's question No. 414, dated the 7th March, 1934.

As regards third, medical boards held in 1922 and 1930, held the individual concerned to be suffering from no pensionable disability.

Having regard to the previous history in each case the commanding officers concerned acted within their powers in deciding not to submit the appeal to higher authority.

(b) It is not proposed to lay down any limitations, as commanding officers do not hesitate to submit any claim in which there is any degree of doubt.

(c) The right of petitioning higher authority already exists in paragraph 379 and Appendix VII of the Regulations for the Army in India.

**DISABILITY PENSION TO MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE  
GREAT WAR.**

\*410. Government are prepared to act up to their orders to the fullest extent. The answer to the Honourable Member's second question is in the affirmative. The first memorandum quoted by him refers to the case of a man who is suffering from a disability certified to be less than 20 per cent. There is no record of its ever having been more severe. The acceptance of attributability does not commit Government to the waiving of the other conditions governing the grant of disability pensions.

The second memorandum referred to deals with a case which was carefully investigated in 1932. The man concerned was invalided in 1915 with a gratuity at a time when a great many other reservists were also discharged on medical grounds merely because they were too old for further service. A medical board held in 1930, certified that he was not then suffering from a disability attributable to military service. In such circumstances Government would not be justified in granting a disability pension.

### DISABILITY PENSION TO MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE GREAT WAR.

181. (a) Cases in which individuals refused to undergo operations were covered by the provisions of paragraph 1039, Army Regulations in India, Volume I (1915), which read as follows:

“ Any person who aggravates, or retards the cure of, his wound or injury in the hope of obtaining a pension or gratuity will be dismissed the service, without reference to his claims.”

(b) Government are not aware of any such case.

(c) There is no conflict between the terms of the recommendation and the memorandum of instructions referred to. The latter merely gives discretion, when a man refuses to undergo an operation, to admit or withhold a disability pension according to certain specified principles.

(d) The effect of the memorandum was to explain an existing policy and perhaps enable deciding authorities to take a more generous view of refusal to undergo an operation than the letter of the regulations might suggest. There could be no question therefore of “adverse retrospective effect”.

(e) No. What the Deputy Controller of Military Pensions stated was that the acceptance of Recommendation No. V, did not concede that the mere statement of an individual uncorroborated by any documentary evidence should be accepted as conclusive proof of his disability having been contracted on field service. In the case referred to the available evidence consisted of the report of a medical board held in 1915 that the Indian officer's disability was not due to field or foreign service.

### DISABILITY PENSION TO MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE GREAT WAR.

223. (a) to (f). Government have on reconsideration decided to admit the claim to which the Honourable Member refers from the 1st January, 1922, instead of from the 24th January, 1924.

### DISABILITY PENSION TO MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE GREAT WAR.

285. (a) and (b). Yes.

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

(e) and (f). The individual case was submitted to the Government of India who passed orders after careful consideration. I may mention that the man concerned received a grant of Rs. 120 early in 1933, from the Indian Army Benevolent Fund, for the purchase of artificial limbs.

(g) Attention is invited to the Regulations for the Army in India, Appendix VII, and India Army Order No. 560 of 1933. Government are satisfied that commanding officers forward petitions in all cases in which the slightest element of doubt exists as to the finality of the previous decision.

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** Sir, I lay on the table :

- (i) the information promised in reply to starred question No. 13 asked by Mr. S. C. Mitra on the 22nd August, 1933 ;
- (ii) the information promised in reply to unstarred questions Nos. 135 and 136 asked by Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali on the 20th September, 1933 ;
- (iii) the information promised in reply to starred question No. 1188 asked by Mr. Lalchand Navalrai on the 28th November, 1933 ;

- (iv) the information promised in reply to unstarred questions Nos. 249 to 264 asked by Mr. S. C. Mitra on the 5th December, 1933 ;
- (v) the information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 310 asked by Shaikh Sadiq Hasan on the 14th December, 1933 ;
- (vi) the information promised in reply to starred questions Nos. 1425 and 1510 asked by Mr. S. G. Jog on the 16th December, 1933, and the 22nd December, 1933, respectively ;
- (vii) the information promised in reply to starred question No. 323 asked by Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney on the 2nd March, 1934 ;
- (viii) the information promised in reply to starred question No. 450 asked by Bhai Parma Nand on the 13th March, 1934 ;
- (ix) the information promised in reply to starred question No. 531 asked by Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen on the 19th March, 1934 ;
- (x) the information promised in reply to starred question No. 576 asked by Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah on the 3rd April, 1934 ;
- (xi) the information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 272 asked by Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad on the 3rd April, 1934 ;
- (xii) the information promised in reply to starred question No. 648 asked by Mr. Lalchand Navalrai on the 7th April, 1934 ; and
- (xiii) the information promised in reply to starred question No. 761 asked by Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad on the 17th April, 1934.

#### SUPPLY OF RULE BOOKS TO THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

\*18. (a) The Agent, East Indian Railway, reports that the service agreements of subordinate employees drawing Rs. 15 and upwards (except menials) contain an acknowledgment from all staff, other than clerical, that they have received a copy of the Government Servants' Conduct Rules, the General Rules for Indian Railways, and the Subsidiary Working Rules in force on the East Indian Railway, and that the clerical staff shall be supplied with a copy of the Government Servants' Conduct Rules and a copy of certain paragraphs of General Rules for Indian State Railways, which paragraphs form an enclosure to the agreement. The Government Servants' Conduct Rules have been published in full, as also extracts therefrom from time to time, in the East Indian Railway Weekly Gazette. As regards the General and Subsidiary Rules, these have been printed in three parts and copies of a part, or parts, supplied to the staff concerned, with the Rules contained in that particular part or parts.

(b) The Agent, East Indian Railway has been instructed to supply copies of the rules to such staff as are entitled to receive them in accordance with their service agreements or, in the event of it not being necessary to supply certain portions of the rules to certain staff, to make the necessary modification in the relevant clause in the agreement.

#### FILLING UP OF VACANCIES OF SUB-HEADS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

135 and 136. Controller of Railway Accounts reports that the matter was looked into and no further action was considered necessary.

**EMPLOYMENT OF STAFF ON WORKS OTHER THAN THOSE TO WHICH THEIR PAY IS CHARGED ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.**

\*1188. (a) The Agent, North Western Railway, reports that the orders referred to in Railway Board's letter No. 6862-F., dated the 26th March, 1931, are carried out at the Karachi Division:

(b) and (c). The Agent explains that there was surplus staff in certain categories, and the persons referred to, were utilised in other capacities, as an alternative to discharge. He has been informed that the pay of the persons in question should have been charged to the posts in which they were actually employed.

**RETRENCHMENT DUE TO THE AMALGAMATION OF THE EAST INDIAN AND EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY PRESSES:**

249. (a) 78 industrial hands were retrenched.

(b) Yes.

(c) I lay a statement on the table of the House.

(d) Staff surplus to requirements have been retrenched:

(i) No additional staff have been appointed during the past two months. In August, 1933, 2 Photo Litho Operators, 1 Litho Machineman and two Litho Fly boys were appointed. This is the only Press in India apart from the Survey Office which has such a plant and the staff pay for themselves owing to the pricing system. One Mono Learner was appointed in July, 1932, on account of the installation of additional plant. One of the Fly boys is a retrenched hand. Therefore only 4 new hands have been appointed with special qualifications.

(ii) No abolished posts have been filled up, but 25 boys have been engaged temporarily for specific work, such as stripping covers from old books in order that the Boards can be re-utilised for other purposes and sorting stocks of printed forms returned from stations.

(iii) The personal pay received by certain press employees is admissible under their conditions of service.

(e) 52 binders have been retrenched as they were surplus to requirements.

(f) Paper issuers are now classified as binders and it was necessary owing to their qualifications to retain the two men, named, Abdul Majid and Nawab Ali Chaudhuri, in the service.

(g) and (h). Advance copies of the memorials from the Eastern Bengal Railway Staff, which were forwarded by the Honorary Secretary, Press Employees' Association, Calcutta, have been received. I have placed copies of two sample memorials in the Library.

The matter is under reference to the Agent, East Indian Railway.

**RETRENCHMENT DUE TO THE AMALGAMATION OF THE EAST INDIAN AND EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY PRESSES.**

250. (a) Telegrams were received from the President, Press Employees' Association and General Secretary, Press Employees' Association, Calcutta. No action was taken on the said telegrams, as the matter was one which is within the competence of the Agent to deal with. A copy of the telegram in question is given below:

Member in-Charge Railway and Commerce, Simla.

Please postpone present retrenchment of Compositors, Distributors, Binders, in East Indian and Eastern Bengal Railway Presses Members. My Association facts in our possession prove retrenchment unnecessary and inequitable great discontent among workers letter follows:

President Press Employees Association, Calcutta.

Honourable Sir Joseph Bhow Windcliffe, Simla.

Arbitrary retrenchment and demotion in East Indian and Eastern Bengal Railway combined press, Calcutta. Beharilal Ghose's demotion is recent instance great panic and discontent prevails among workers all my members please take immediate steps and postpone demotions and retrenchment memorials of Beharilal Ghose and our memorandum follows.

*General Secretary Press Employees Association, Calcutta.*

(b) A letter was received from the Secretary, Press Employees' Association, dated 12th September, 1933, as the matter was within the competence of the Agent, East Indian Railway, to deal with, no action was taken at the time, but the Railway Board are now in correspondence with the Agent, East Indian Railway, on the question.

### RETRENCHMENT DUE TO THE AMALGAMATION OF THE EAST INDIAN AND EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY PASSES.

251. (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) Retrenchment of surplus staff has taken place. No reduction was made in the supervising staff, as there was no surplus.

(d) The total output from the amalgamated Presses is approximately the same as when the Presses were separated, but owing to the co-ordination of the work, fewer industrial workers are required. The Agent reports that the amalgamation did not justify any decrease in the supervising and clerical staff.

(e) No, the total amount is Rs. 13,328 per annum.

(f) The question has been given full consideration, the retention of the supervising and clerical staff is essential and not uneconomical.

(g) (i). I lay a statement on the table.

(ii) I lay a statement on the table.

(iii) The average savings per annum in the Cost of Staff is estimated at Rs. 1,33,276.

#### Statement 'A'.

*Men discharged from 1931 to 1933 owing to retrenchment and amalgamation.*

Question 249 (c).

Question 251 (c).

	1931.	1932.	1933.	Remarks.
Compositors .. .. .	19		6	Including temporary staff:
Distributors .. .. .	1	..	6	Ditto:
Binders .. .. .	25	14	13	Ditto.
Impositors .. .. .	1		1	
Assistant Superintendent .. .. .	..			
Overseer .. .. .	..	..	..	
Section holder .. .. .	..	1	..	
Readers .. .. .	..	..	..	
Copy holder .. .. .	..	..	..	
Computer .. .. .	..	..	..	
Clerks .. .. .	1	..	11	Including 1 Train Inspector

## Statement 'B'

Question 251 (g) (i).

*The present strength of industrial staff with their average pay.*

Designation.	Total strength.	Average pay.
Linotype operator .. .. .	2	134
Monotype operator .. .. .	7	469
Ludlow operator .. .. .	1	67
Mono Mechanic .. .. .	1	67
Mono Caster-in-Charge .. .. .	1	60
Mono Learner .. .. .	1	37
Compositor .. .. .	123	6,951
Impositor .. .. .	9	297
Head Distributor .. .. .	1	72
Distributor .. .. .	31	1,016
Proof Puller .. .. .	10	290
Machinemen .. .. .	36	1,728
Hand Pressmen .. .. .	3	144
Electro Typer .. .. .	1	37
Stereo Typer .. .. .	6	264
Type caster .. .. .	3	111
Binders .. .. .	184	5,844
Press mechanic .. .. .	1	222
Fitter .. .. .	4	272
Carpenter .. .. .	11	439
Tinsmith .. .. .	1	39
Litho Draftsman .. .. .	1	124
Photo Litho operators .. .. .	6	334
Litho machinemen .. .. .	5	255
Gestetner machineman .. .. .	1	33
Machine Makmen .. .. .	48	1,862

Designation.	Total strength.	Average pay.
Press Inkmen .. .. .	8	81
Press Flyboy .. .. .	2	34
Roller moulder .. .. .	5	160
Mono Caster .. .. .	7	224
Litho Layer-on .. .. .	3	87
Litho Polisher .. .. .	3	57
Litho Flyboy .. .. .	3	51
Packerman .. .. .	20	500
Packerboys .. .. .	8	112
Shop messengers .. .. .	6	60
Coolie Jemader .. .. .	2	54
Coolies .. .. .	51	969

Question No. 251 (g) (ii).

*Statement ' B. I. '*

*The present strength of technical supervising staff with their average pay.*

Designation.	Total strength.	Average pay monthly.	Duty.
	No.	Rs.	
Overseer .. .. .	3	1,113	Direct supervision over labour in all departments.
Foreman Composing .. .. .	1	248	In-charge of work in Composing Department.
Section-holder .. .. .	5	615	Distribution of work to Sections of staff of Composing Department.
Foreman Machine .. .. .	2	348	In-charge of work of the Machine Department.
Jamadar .. .. .	3	210	Distribution of work to section of staff of Machine Department.
Foreman Binding .. .. .	2	274	In-charge of work in Binding Department.
Jamadar Binding .. .. .	2	126	Distribution of work to section of staff of Binding Department.
Assistant Foreman .. .. .	1	69	Maintenance of work register and indenting for binding materials and disposal of completed work to despatch section.
	19		

### AMALGAMATION OF THE EAST INDIAN AND EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY PRESSES.

252. The Agent, East Indian Railway, reports : (a) Yes.
- (b) (i) Rs. 86,530-0-0 approximately.
- (ii) Rs. 40,090 approximately.
- (iii) Engineering Department of the East Indian Railway.
- (iv) Under the Agent's orders.

### EMPLOYMENT OF A HIGHLY PAID MECHANIC AND ASSISTANTS IN THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS.

253. The Agent, East Indian Railway, reports : (a) One Mechanic and 4 fitters are employed.

- (b) No.
- (i) All repair work was formerly sent to the Block Signal Workshops but when the Mechanical Composing Plant and Rotary Printing machines were installed, the Chief Engineer considered it advisable that the Printing Department should be in a position to undertake the major-portion of their own repairs.
- (ii) No outside experts have been employed other than those required for dismantling and re-erecting the Meible and Linotype machines owing to the amalgamation. The cost of this work amounted to Rs. 667-8-0.
- (iii) There have been considerable savings but as the practice of sending repair work to the Block Signal Shops practically ceased in 1927 it is not possible to supply figures.

### QUALIFICATION, PAY, ETC., OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS.

254. The Agent, East Indian Railway, reports : (a) and (b). The expression "Passed Printers" is not understood, and is not used in England.

- (i) The Superintendent of the East Indian Railway Press is a competent printer and efficient Manager.
- (ii) Assistant Printing Superintendent, East Indian Railway Press.
- (iii) Rs. 800 per month as substantive pay.
- (iv) Mr. E. E. Joy is a Printer of many years experience, both in England and in this country, and possesses a sound knowledge of printing in all its branches, he has been in the trade since boyhood and received his training in England where he worked about 10 years. He joined the railway in 1908, and has proved that he is exceptionally well qualified for the duties of Printing Superintendent. His management of the Printing Department has been most efficient and economical.
- (v) Mr. Joy was appointed by the Agent, East Indian Railway Company. His appointment to the post was confirmed by the Board of Directors and approved by the Railway Board. He was promoted to the post of Superintendent in July, 1924.
- (vi) Initial salary on promotion to the post of Superintendent Printing was Rs. 1,000 per mensem. His present salary is Rs. 1,000 plus sterling overseas pay £30 per mensem.
- (vii) Mr. Joy's age is 54 years and he has 20 years' service in the Railway.

### BINDERS OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS.

255. (a) Yes.

(b) Yes. In this connection, I would draw the Honourable Member's attention to paragraph 8, of the Government of India Comhumiqué, dated the 6th June, 1932, a copy of which is already in the Library of the House.

(c) Yes.

(d) No, but leave due and admissible was granted.

(e) Government are not aware of any such memorial.

(f), (g) and (h). The employees were reinstated in their former posts without loss of service, the intervening period being treated as leave to the extent due and in respect of the balances as *des now*.

### BINDERS OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS.

256. (a) Yes.

(b) No, but machine and press staff are occasionally employed in packing forms and on despatch work, when their machines, for various reasons, such as a breakdown or want of work, are idle.

(c) Overtime is only allowed in special circumstances to meet urgent demands. As regards extra hands engaged, I would draw the Honourable Member's attention to the reply given to part (d) of Question No. 249.

(d) Government do not see any reason to retain surplus staff to meet occasional demands.

### COMPOSITORS OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS.

257. The Agent, East Indian Indian Railway, reports : (i) 91, (ii) 102, and (iii) 123.

### INTRODUCTION OF NEW SYSTEM OF SERVICE IN THE EAST INDIAN AND EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY PRESSES.

258. The Agent, East Indian Railway, reports : (a), (b) and (d). Yes.

(c) The average monthly working hours of the East Indian and Eastern Bengal Railway Presses were not the same prior to the revision of scales of pay in 1930. Hence, the increase of pay allowed to the employees of the two presses also varied.

The average monthly working hours of the two presses were 145 hours of the Eastern Bengal Railway and 152 for the East Indian Railway.

The method of fixing the initial pay of the men in the new scales of pay, on the 200 hour basis was approximately the same for both Railways as shown below :

Category of staff.	Eastern Bengal Railway.	East Indian Railway.
Monthly rated staff ..	Pay × 200 145	Pay × 200 152
Hourly rated staff ..	As above ..	As above.
Piece workers ..	Piece earnings No. of hours work × 200.	Mean average of piece earnings rate per hour and class* rate × 200.
		* On the East Indian Railway the piece workers received pay at class rates for work which could not be piece rated.

### PROMOTIONS IN THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS.

259. The Agent, East Indian Railway, reports : (a) No.

(b) Yes, because some junior industrial hands owing to superior qualifications were recruited on higher initial hourly pay than some senior hands and their average earnings were also more when they were working on piece. Therefore when the monthly rates system was introduced in 1930 their average earnings were greater in some cases than the senior hands and their pay was fixed accordingly.

(c) Appointments are as a rule filled by promotion from a lower class or grade. To fill the posts of 2 overseers and one press mechanic, outsiders were engaged, there being no hands already employed in the Press with the necessary qualifications.

(d) (i) The present Assistant Binding Foreman was appointed to the service on 25th June, 1929 :

(ii) No, the post was created in 1930, as it was necessary for it to be held by a man who could read and understand work, orders and correspondence written in English.

(iii) So far as can be ascertained. No.

### PRINTING OF "ECONOMY REPORT" IN THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY PRESS.

260. The Agent, East Indian Railway, reports : (a) No Economy Report was printed in the Eastern Bengal Railway Press in 1930.

(b) Does not arise.

### CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, CALCUTTA, AND THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS.

261. (a) The proportion of supervising staff to industrial staff in the East Indian Railway Press is about 1 to 6.9 and that in the Government of India Press, Calcutta about 1 to 7.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) The number of men now holding the following appointments in the Government of India Press, Calcutta and East Indian Railway Press, Calcutta and Howrah is as follows :

East Indian and Eastern Bengal Railway Press amalgamated.	Total Number of men.	Government of India Press.	
Assistant Superintendent ..	2	Assistant Superintendent .. 1	Assistant Manager.
Office Superintendent ..	1	Office Superintendent .. 1	(There is no such appointment but it is presumed that the appointment corresponds to that of the Head Assistant which has been taken into account.)
Overseer ..	3	Overseers .. 2	
Section holder ..	5	Section holder .. 10	
Foreman ..	5	Foreman .. 4	
Assistant Foreman ..	1	Assistant Foreman .. 2	
Computer ..	1		
Checker ..	N/A.		
Clerks ..	43		

East Indian and Eastern Bengal Railway Press amalgamated.	Total Number of men.	Government of India Press.
Workshop Accountant ..	1	Computers .. 21
Time Keeper .. ..	3	Checkers (Cor- rection) .. 2
Jemadar .. .. .	5	Clerks .. 43
Storekeeper .. ..	Nil.	Workshop Ac- countant .. 1 (There is no such appoint- ment but the appoint- ment of the Accountant has been taken into ac- count).
Compositor .. ..	123	
Reader .. .. .	14	Time keepers 2
Copy holder .. ..	10	Jemadars .. 2 (Excludes peon Jemadar).
Distributor .. ..	31	
Binder .. .. .	184	Store keeper.. 1 (General Storekeeper).
Pressman .. .. .	3	Compositors 193 (Including 43 mono-type correctors who are really compositors).
Machineman .. ..	36	
Inkman .. .. .	51	Readers 44 (Excluding the appoint- ment of Head Reader).
Lino Mono Operator ..	9	Copy holders 44
Mono Caster .. ..	8	Distributors 12
		Binders .. 163
		Pressmen .. 20
		Machinemen 28
		Inkmen .. 20
		Linotype Opera- tors .. 6
		Monotype Operators .. 14
		Monotype (Cas- ter Attendants) 13
		Labourers .. 50

The figures given above are those for appointments and not "men holding appointments". The Calcutta Press is at present undergoing a substantial reduction of establishment, and the number of employees is therefore reducing. If figures for "men holding appointments" are required, the data with reference to which the figures should be prepared may kindly be specified.

(d) After the amalgamation of the East Indian and Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway Presses, the number of supervising and clerical staff in the East Indian Railway Press was increased by 6 per cent. After the amalgamation of the East Indian and Eastern Bengal Railway Presses the percentage increased in this connection was 18.

(e) Figures for 1930 are given below. Figures from 1919 are not available.

Superintendent .. .. .	1
Assistant Superintendent .. .. .	1
Overseers .. .. .	2
Foremen .. .. .	4
Section Holders .. .. .	4
Jemadars .. .. .	4
Assistant Foremen .. .. .	2
Clerks .. .. .	48
Compositors .. .. .	88 including temporary staff.
Readers .. .. .	10
Copy-Holders .. .. .	10
Monocasters .. .. .	6
Lino Mono Operators .. .. .	5
Distributors .. .. .	22 including temporary staff.
Binders .. .. .	184
Pressmen .. .. .	5
Machinemen .. .. .	29
Inkmen .. .. .	43

#### EXTRA WAGES OR CREDIT LEAVE FOR COMPOSITORS OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS WORKING ON HOLIDAYS.

262. (a) Compensation leave for attendance on gazetted holidays not falling on Sundays, on which the Press is closed, has been entirely abolished from 1st July, 1928, and the employees, both salaried and piece, are now entitled to extra payment for attendance on "closed" holidays only. The salaried industrial employees who were in service before the above date have, however, been given the option of either continuing to enjoy the compensation leave or to get extra payment for attendance on "closed" holidays. For attendance on a Sunday, a compensatory holiday is usually granted. In rare cases where the compensatory holiday has to be withheld, extra payment is made for attendance on a Sunday.

The Clerical Staff is entitled to compensation leave in lieu of attendance on all holidays, but the question does not evidently relate to them.

(b) No. Industrial staff are given 25 per cent. addition to their day's pay for working on shop holidays.

(c) No.

(d) Does not arise.

#### EXTRA WAGES FOR COMPOSITORS OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS WORKING AFTER 2 P. M. ON SATURDAYS.

263. (a) The press staff work 48 hours a week. Overtime is paid for any work performed in addition to 48 hours a week at a rate of 25 per cent. in addition to their pay.

(b) No. Overtime is allowed to compositors when they are required to work beyond normal hours of duty, namely 48 hours a week.

(c) Does not arise.

**CUT IN THE PAY OF THE INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYEES OF THE EAST  
INDIAN RAILWAY PRESS.**

264. (a) Yes, the emergency cut in pay is enforced on all employees of the East Indian Railway Press.

(b) For purposes of holidays, industrial staff are treated in the same way as workshop staff.

(c) Ministerial staff are eligible for holidays like similar staff of the headquarter offices at the discretion of the Agent. The industrial staff are allowed the leave sanctioned under Annexure II of the Government of India, Railway Department, Resolution No. 5373-E. of 20th February, 1930, viz 13 days shop holidays with pay.

(d) Yes, for purposes of economy overtime has been curtailed and is not allowed except in special circumstances to meet urgent demands.

(e) Overtime is worked to the extent necessary to meet urgent demands. Grade increases are sanctioned as they become due.

(f) Yes.

(g) It is a fact that they mentioned that they were made to work compulsorily for about 47 hours a month more than what they did under the old system, but this is not correct.

(h) Government do not see any reasons for exempting them from income-tax and emergency cut which is applicable to the other staff.

**WITHHOLDING OF HOUSE RENT ALLOWANCE FROM THE TRAVELLING  
TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.**

310. "Agent, North Western Railway, reports: (g) to (k). From enquiries, it transpires that on certain Divisions some of the present Special Ticket Examiners have been wrongly admitted to the concession of free quarters or house allowance in lieu.

The condition for the grant of free quarters or house allowance in lieu, only permits this concession to those who, at any time during the course of their previous service, held a post which carried the privilege of rent-free quarters or house allowance in lieu, whenever in the course of their subsequent service, they were transferred or promoted to posts which carried the same concession before 1st August, 1928. As the old Travelling Ticket Examiners never enjoyed this concession and the present category of Special Ticket Examiners has not been admitted to it, the old Travelling Ticket Examiners now classed as Special Ticket Examiners are not entitled to this concession; and steps are being taken to stop any further grant of this concession to them wherever it is now being given.

The irregular grant of this concession to some of the old Travelling Ticket Examiners now classed as Special Ticket Examiners will possibly be found to arise from the fact that when the scheme for old Special Ticket Examiners (Flying Squads) was introduced in 1926, as a trial, it was staffed with men drawn from different classes, some of whom were entitled to free quarters or house allowance in lieu in their substantive positions, and it was decided that those who formerly enjoyed the privilege of free quarters or house allowance in lieu would continue to do so during the period of their service with Flying Squads, the remainder being required to pay rent on the same basis as they did in their substantive posts."

**ALLEGED ABUSES OF RULES AND REGULATIONS BY THE AGENTS AND  
SUBORDINATE ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITIES OF RAILWAYS.**

\*1425. (a) The reply to the first query is in the affirmative. On the 1st September, 1933, the Railway Board drew the attention of Agents of State-managed Railways to the fact that the submission of advance copies of appeals serves no useful purpose and that instructions should be issued that the practice should be discontinued. The Railway Board do not consider that the practice of sending advance copies of appeals calls for disciplinary action and they have advised the Agent, East Indian Railway, accordingly.

(b) Government do not consider that special action is called for.

(c) Yes.

**APPEALS WITHHELD BY CERTAIN DIVISIONAL SUPERINTENDENTS ON THE  
EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

\*1510. (a) The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the reply to part (a) of his question No. 1425. The Financial Commissioner of Railways was not aware of Board's letter No. 2935-E.G., dated the 1st September, 1933, to Agents of State-managed Railways, when he replied to a supplementary question No. 795 on 12th September, 1933.

(b) and (d). The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to rules 10 and 11, of the rules regulating the discharge and dismissal of State Railway non-gazetted Government servants, copies of which are in the library. As stated therein in ordinary matters no appeal lies beyond the officer next above the officer passing the original orders. Appeals in contravention to these rules are not forwarded to the Agent and so obviously the Agent cannot and does not look into them.

(c) It is regretted that the detailed information asked for is not available. Government do not consider that the labour involved in collecting this would be commensurate with the results to be obtained.

**PROMOTIONS IN CERTAIN GRADES ON THE LUCKNOW AND MORADABAD  
DIVISIONS OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

\*323. A statement, showing particulars of all officers who have held permanent appointments in the Local Service or the Lower Gazetted Service, since the 1st July, 1925, when the late Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway was amalgamated with the East Indian Railway, is enclosed.

*Statement showing particulars of all officers who have held permanent appointments in the local service or the lower gazetted service since the 1st July, 1925, when the late Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway was amalgamated with the East Indian Railway.*

*N.B.—The lower gazetted service was established on 1st March, 1931.*

No.	Name.	Date of appointment or promotion to Local Service or Lower Gazetted Service.	From what source appointed.	Whether an old East Indian or old Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway employees.
1	2	3	4	5
1	Mr. Badri Dass ..	1st January 1922.	Temporary Engineer	Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.
2	.. A. N. Puri ..	1st January 1924.	Do. ..	Do.
3	.. A. N. Bhasin	13th October 1927.	Do. ..	Central Indian Coal Field Railway.
4	.. M. F. J. Hequet.	Do. ..	Subordinate ..	East Indian Railway.
5	.. E. J. Harris	Do. ..	Do. ..	Do.
6	.. K. C. Goswami	Do. ..	Do. ..	Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.

No.	Name.	Date of appointment or promotion to Local Service or Lower Gazetted Service.	From what source appointed.	Whether an old East Indian or old Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway employe.
1	2	3	4	5
7	Mr. C. M. Galvin	3rd January 1924.	Was appointed as a Junior Scale Officer from 11th March 1915 but subsequently relegated to Local Service from 3rd January 1924.	East Indian Railway.
8	,, N. O. W. Bennett.	21st June 1923.	Subordinate .. ..	Do.
9	,, E. L. M. Maroon.	1st July 1923	Do. .. ..	Do.
10	,, A. H. Satti ..	30th July 1924.	Apprentice A. T. Superintendent.	Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.
11	,, T. D. Bandey	26th November 1925.	Apprentice L. S. O. ..	East Indian Railway.
12	,, H. E. F. Watling.	27th August 1931.	Subordinate .. ..	Do.
13	,, P. C. Roy ..	27th August 1931.	Do. .. ..	Do.
14	,, C. Clarke* ..	Do. ..	Do. .. ..	Do.
15	,, J. W. Blacker	Do. ..	Do. .. ..	Do.
16	,, N. C. Sen ..	Do. ..	Do. .. ..	Do.
17	,, W. B. Robinson.	Do. ..	Do. .. ..	Do.
18	,, S. P. Chaudhury.†	1st August 1924	† .. ..	Do.
19	,, A. Gordon ..	27th August 1931.	Subordinate .. ..	Do.
20	,, E. D. Graham	Do. ..	Do. .. ..	Do.
21	,, D. R. Carmody.	Do. ..	Do. .. ..	State Railways.
22	,, A. R. Harmor	1st July 1932	Do. .. ..	East Indian Railway.

\*Since retired.

†Appointed as a Traffic Probationer (Superior Grade) on 20th March 1918. Confirmed as Assistant Traffic Superintendent on 11th March 1918. Relegated to Local Traffic Service on 1st August 1924 and again promoted to the Grade of Assistant Superintendent Junior Scale from 25th July 1931.

No.	Name.	Date of appointment or promotion to Local Service or Lower Gasetted Service.	From what source appointed.	Whether an old East Indian or old Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway employee.
1	2	3	4	5
23	Mr. Veda Mitra*	15th November 1921.	Apprentice Engineer ..	Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway.
24	,, W. H. Gillon*	18th October 1923.	Do. ..	Do.
25	,, N. K. Misra*	30th July 1924.	Apprentice Assistant Traffic Superintendent.	Do.
26	,, A. G. Khan*	26th July 1925.	Traffic Probationer ..	East Indian Railway.
27	,, J. N. Dass*..	19th November 1925.	Apprentice L. S. O. ..	Do.
28	,, R. E. Lazar†	1st August 1924.	Was appointed as a Junior Scale Officer from 1st April 1922 but subsequently relegated to Local Service from 1st August 1920.	

\*Promoted to the Superior Service.

† Since retired.

#### HEAD TICKET COLLECTORS IN THE MORADABAD DIVISION OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

\*450. The Agent, East Indian Railway, reports : (a) to (e). Yes.

(f) (i). The old head ticket collectors were not promoted to the posts of Assistant Head Ticket Collectors on restoration of their pay, as senior men had to be provided for and there are not sufficient posts to accommodate all.

(ii) No junior men are holding these posts.

(iii) Yes, on occurrence of vacancies and in order of seniority.

#### IMPOSITION OF FINES ON STAFF ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

\*531. (a) The Agent reports that Gokul Ram was not fined but his pay was reduced by Re. 1 for twelve months.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) The policy of the Railway Board in the system of fining staff on railways is as enunciated in paragraph 3 of their letter No. 1023-E., dated 25th August, 1925, an extract of which I lay on the table.

EXTRACT FROM A LETTER No. 1023-E., DATED THE 25TH AUGUST, 1925.

\* \* \* \* \*

*Fining System.*—The system of punishing by fines has already been abolished on State Railways in respect of clerical and office staff, but it still remains in force in respect of the remaining staff. The Government of India recognise the difficulty of maintaining discipline among the large staff of employees, many of whom are ignorant and illiterate men, and of punishing breaches of rules (many of which are concerned with the safety of the public) slackness carelessness absenteeism and the like, without resort to a system of fines, and they are aware that the fines are credited not to the Railway administration, but to separate fine funds. But they trust that Railway Administrations will make a careful survey of the various offences, at present punishable by fines, with the object of gradually reducing fines as much as possible so as to eliminate avoidable hardship.

\* \* \* \* \*

### REFRESHER COURSE AT KOT LAKHPAT, NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

\*576. The Agent, North Western Railway, reports : (a) The object of Refresher courses is to enable the staff to keep themselves up to date in their professional duties and so assist them to fit themselves for promotion when the time comes. Failure in a Refresher course does not result in forfeiture of appointment, unless the removal of an individual whose duties are connected with the safety of the travelling public is considered necessary because he is likely to endanger the lives and safety of those travelling and cannot be found alternative suitable employment.

(b) and (c). Staff of the following classes of the Commercial Branch are required to attend Refresher courses at intervals of 5 years, irrespective of whether they have previously failed or not, up to the age of 45 :

Goods clerks.  
Booking clerks.  
Parcel clerks.  
Ticket Collector, Grade I.

The result of each course has no immediate effect on commercial staff, but as promotion to higher posts is by selection, failure reduces an individual's chances of securing a recommendation of fitness for promotion to a higher post.

### CREATION OF A POST OF SUPERINTENDENT FOR CO-ORDINATION OF PERSONNEL BRANCHES ON VARIOUS DIVISIONS OF THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

272. The Agent, North Western Railway, reports as under : (a) to (d). The reply is in the affirmative.

(e) Steps already taken to ensure co-ordination of personnel work in the various offices on the Railway as alluded to in parts (c) and (d) of the question, were found to be insufficient, and it was therefore considered necessary to augment this, by placing an individual with experience in establishment matters on special duty to visit and inspect the various offices and assist them with advice in the proper organisation of the work of the personnel branch on a uniform basis. This step towards co-ordination has been taken with the object of securing uniformity, increasing efficiency, reducing correspondence and last, but not least, securing economy.

(f) A special standard report form has been designed outlining in detail the principal points to which special attention is to be directed by the Superintendent when visiting an office, and has been applied, so far, to three divisions, and copies of his report furnished to the divisions for the use of the Divisional Superintendent, his Divisional Personnel Officer and the office, to enable them to effect an improvement in methods and to secure a uniform procedure in all offices.

(g) The necessity has not arisen.

L179LAD

The special standard report form provides for observation during the inspections whether the business of all branches of a Divisional office is being conducted properly and in accordance with the orders of the Headquarters office.

#### PAY OF THE ASSISTANT CONTROLLERS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

\*648. The Agent, North Western Railway, reports : (a) The Assistant Controllers re-confirmed with effect from 1st January, 1931, retained the same scale in grade Rs. 500—10—350 previously held by them.

(b) No.

(c) Their re-confirmation was ordered after a detailed and careful examination of the whole question.

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

#### SUB-LETTING OF VENDORS' CONTRACTS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

\*761. (a) No.

(b) There are six such cases on record since 1927.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT *RE* INFORMATION PROMISED BY GOVERNMENT IN REPLY TO QUESTIONS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The Chair has to make an announcement regarding the practice which the House now follows in placing on the table information promised by Government in reply to questions. The present practice of reading out a list of such statements involves an unnecessary waste of the time of the House, and, in addition, involves some delay in actually placing such statements on the table. To avoid these two inconveniences, the Chair has directed that in future this list will not be read out to the House, but a circular will be sent to Honourable Members containing a list of such statements placed on the table as soon as possible after the statements are received in the Assembly Department. The statements will, as usual, be printed as part of the proceedings of the House.

#### THE FACTORIES BILL.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The House will now resume consideration of the Factories Bill.

The question is :

“ That clause 5 stand part of the Bill.”

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** (United Provinces Southern Divisions : Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That clause 5 of the Bill be deleted.”

Before I advance my arguments, I should like to mention a great piece of humour which I read in the newspaper today. The Associated Press reported that I suggested and pressed that this Factories Bill should be applied to the Navy. I thought it was a great humour. I suggested that certain provisions ought to be applied to the railway

workshops, but railway workshops are quite different from the navy, which the Associated Press reported as having been said by me. I was told by my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, the other day that I did not read so carefully all the papers supplied to me as I used to do when I was younger and a student in Cambridge. But unfortunately he does not take into consideration the fact that the papers which are supplied to his Secretary are not supplied to me by my Secretary, I mean the actual Acts, the amendment of which we are going to discuss, are certainly in the hands of the Honourable Member, but unfortunately they are not in the hands of Members of the Opposition.....

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** (Member for Industries and Labour) : I am always very happy to supply the Honourable Member with any copy of any Act that he desires. I take it that this Act and all the other Acts are in the Library of the House to which he has ready access.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : I was just coming to it. Sir, in the Library there are a limited number of copies, and there is always a race between Members as to who would take them first, and, I daresay, sometimes I win the race, but not always. If a few more copies are placed at the disposal of the Secretary of the Assembly Department for the use of those Members who would like to consult these Acts, it will be very convenient. We are handicapped by not having a copy of the original Act when we discuss its amendment. Very often we find that the Act is not available, because it has been taken away from the Library by a Member who is more enthusiastic than the one who goes to the Library a little later. Therefore, Sir, I would take this opportunity to request you to have several copies of the original Act placed at the disposal of the Legislative Assembly Department whenever we discuss its amendment, so that those Honourable Members who are interested in reading the original Act can have easy access to it.

Now, Sir, coming to the clause itself, I was told that this clause existed in the old Act, and this particular clause was copied from one of the old Acts. I should like to know whether this particular clause has ever been applied by any of the Local Governments. If it has never been applied, if it has remained a dead letter, then I think it is high time, when we are trying to consolidate the whole position, that this obsolete clause is deleted altogether. Sir, I have certain apprehensions that if this clause is applied by the Local Governments, some of them, who are more energetic, might very much misuse it. For example, there is nothing in the provisions of this Act barring any Local Government from applying this clause 5 to any places where wheat is taken out from husks. Now, the definition of "manufacturing process" is given in clause 2 (g), and it says :

"Manufacturing process means any process for making, altering, repairing, ornamenting, or packing or otherwise treating any article or substance with a view to its use, sale, transport, delivery or disposal."

Sir, husk is an article which is being transformed into wheat. Therefore, according to the definition given under 2 (g), all places where wheat is taken out of husk can be included in the category of factories. There are places where more than ten persons are employed on a particular day, and if these places are declared as factories, then it will mean

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

a great hardship to the poor people and agriculturists. It is a good thing that the Local Governments have not so far applied this Act to such places, but if they do apply it to such places, there is considerable room for misusing this particular clause. Therefore, I say that if it is not to be applied, then there is no use of retaining it ; if it is to be misused, then it will be mischievous. Therefore, in either case, it will be undesirable to retain it. The fact that this particular clause was in the original Act is no reason that we should incorporate it in the present Bill.

Then, Sir, the second apprehension which I have, if we retain this particular clause, is that *khandsaris*, which do not use power and which employ ten persons only, are now exempt from the excise duty, and I am afraid that if these *khandsaris* are declared as factories, then the excise duty may be imposed on them. Of course, great injustice has been done by us to the *khandsari* system on account of the propoganda of the sugar manufacturers, and, I am afraid that by this Bill further harm will be done to this cottage industry. If this clause is misused or misapplied by the Local Governments, then they will kill a large number of cottage industries. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Amendment moved :

“ That clause 5 of the Bill be deleted.”

**Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan** (Agra Division : Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, I would like to point out a difficulty which I experienced in this matter some time ago, while I was the Chairman of a Municipality, in the administration of this particular clause. There is the Water Works Department in which we employ only a few people, but there are a few other people who are employed as mechanics, labourers, and so on, and all people included in it were found that they had just one more number than the required number, and we were forced to.....

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : May I ask the Honourable Member what the required number was ? I presume it was 20 ?

**Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan** : Yes, it was 20, but this particular clause seeks to reduce that number to ten. I think, Sir, it will be a great hardship, because places which are not really intended to be included within the purview of this Act will *ipso facto* be brought under it. These people will have to apply for a licence and they will come under the Factories Act, which will mean great trouble and hardship. I think the arguments advanced by my friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, are sound to a certain extent in that we had experienced a difficulty in the past, but I feel that this amendment has some force behind it. So I support it.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** (Muzaffarpur *cum* Champaran : Non-Muhammadan) : Sir, I also support this amendment, and I would support it by the argument which my Honourable friend, the Law Member, used yesterday with regard to a similar amendment which was moved. In the definition of a factory, it was proposed yesterday to bring down the number of working people from 20 to ten, but the Honourable the Law Member in his admirable speech, to which we all

listened with interest, opposed that amendment. The very same argument applies *mutatis mutandis* to the present case. This particular clause seeks to empower the Local Government to declare any premises, in which a manufacturing process is carried on, whether with or without the aid of power, and in which there are ten or more persons employed, a factory.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** It is " may ", and not " should ".

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Yes, it is stated there " may be declared a factory " by the Local Government. This will work a great hardship in regard to some of the small cottage industries which are carried on by members of the same family with the aid of a few more persons, an example of which was given by my Honourable friend, the Law Member, yesterday. Therefore, I say this clause is objectionable, and, without taking any more time of the House, I would request the Honourable Member in charge of the Bill to accede to the request made by us on this side of the House and agree to the deletion of clause 5. With these few words, I support this amendment.

**Mr. Bhuput Sing (Bihar and Orissa : Landholders) :** Sir, I also rise to support this amendment. Besides the point mentioned by my friend, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh, the definition says that the factories which are run without the aid of power will be included in the purview of the Act if the Local Government so desires. Therefore, it will be better to delete the whole amendment, so that it may not be abused by the Local Governments, because small factories and cottage industries are likely to feel a great hardship.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai (Sind : Non-Muhammadan Rural) :** Ordinarily I will not oppose any measure that comes from our very able friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, but I feel compelled to oppose this amendment. It was only yesterday, when my amendment was before the House, that it was objected to—that the meaning of the word factory should be restricted to only 20 persons and more. If that amendment had been agreed to, I would have been in accord with this amendment that has been proposed by Dr. Ziauddin. Yesterday it was not done so. Now, here, they find a difficulty. The difficulty is, even those factories which are worked with hand are going to be also in the hands of the Local Government. I wanted to cover that defect yesterday, but it was not agreed to. Therefore, I am sorry to say that it would mean that if I now accept this amendment, a factory, in which ten or more men work, can never come under the Factories Act, and that will be a great disadvantage. Yesterday, when the Law Member for the first time spoke and spoke very ably, he gave us a distinction between factories where ten men will work with power and that factory which is smaller and has the same dangers and same risks will come under clause 5, and the Local Government will allow only such factories. He gave an example, but I think it is an extreme case. I have no such fear. Now that a factory means, according to our central legislation here, a factory which has 20 men and over, if I agree to this amendment, it would mean absolutely putting a bar on any factory, having only ten or more workers, being regulated and given the benefit and the privileges of a factory if this clause were deleted. On these grounds, I would even request my Honourable friend to withdraw this amendment.

**Mr. A. Hoon** (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : I am sorry I have got to oppose this amendment as proposed by Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, because I feel that clause 5 of the Bill is a very salutary one by itself. Yesterday we had a discussion on the floor of this House as to whether the number of workmen should be limited to ten in respect of what the Act calls a factory, and the Honourable the Law Member explained that it would entail an amount of hardship on those people who do their work on a small scale. That idea I had in my mind when the clause was gone through in the Select Committee, and if I remember well, I think I put forward the point of view that workmen, when they are only ten, should not ordinarily be considered to form a factory, because, in a business like a laundry, or a soda water factory, or a sugar making mill on a small scale, or a flour mill, what we call *Ata chakki*,—it is possible that members of the same family may all combine and work, and, when members of a family are working together under the head of the family, it could ordinarily be assumed that they would not be allowed to overwork.

Clause 5 leaves a discretion with the Local Government to declare a certain group of men working under certain circumstances a factory, and I think that the discretion would be exercised only when the Government come to know that it is not a combination of the members of the same family, but it is an employer employing ten men at a time. If an employer is employing ten men at a time and if he is doing things there in order to get more profit which the ordinary principles, on which the Factories Act is based, do not permit, I think it will be perfectly right that the Local Government should step in to declare that that combination of men should be called a factory.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : Sir, I might have taken exception to the amendment put forward by my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, on the ground that it was placed in my hands after I came into this House yesterday morning, and two clear days' notice of it had not been given, in spite of the fact that my Honourable friend has had at least six months in which to study the report of the Select Committee on this Bill. But I am quite prepared to deal with the amendment on its merits. It represents one extreme point of view, as does the subsequent amendment which my Honourable friend, the Deputy President, is moving to this clause the other, and I fear I shall have to oppose both of them. I cannot believe that this House would agree to what can only be described as a retrograde step. As my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, pointed out, this clause repeats the provision which is to be found in the existing Act. Our Bill is intended to mark an advance in the direction of regulation of factory labour and the omission of a clause dealing with small factories would, I consider, be a blot on the whole Bill. The Royal Commission on Labour wanted to go considerably further than we have been able to do. They wanted to extend the Act in a far greater measure to factories which do not at present come within its scope. We have not been able to accept that point of view at present, though we hope later on that it may be possible to deal further with some of the unregulated factories. But for the time being we have had to confine the scope of our Bill to such factories as already come within the scope of the existing Act. The reason is, as I explained yesterday, mainly the financial one as the

Provinces, in their present financial condition, are not in a position to engage the staff that would be necessary if any further large number of factories were to be placed under the operation of the Act. That, Sir, is the position, and it is for that reason that I regret I must oppose my Honourable friend's amendment. He wished to know how far the present section is being used. I am afraid I cannot give him any information on that subject as I do not know whether it is a dead letter or not. I hope it is not, but what I can assure him is that we do not intend that it should be a dead letter in the future. We hope that Local Governments will use all the powers which are conferred on them by this clause, and we have no doubt that they will use them with discretion and not to the harassment of the small industries. It seems to me quite obvious that it is the small factories which are in the greatest need of regulation. It is in such factories obviously that machinery is most likely to be carelessly looked after, or is most likely to be insecurely fenced, and that conditions of work of children are most likely to be of an unsatisfactory character. Sir, I oppose the amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 5 of the Bill be deleted.”

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury** (Assam : Muhammadan) : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That in sub-clause (1) of clause 5 of the Bill, for the word ‘ ten ’ the word ‘ five ’ be substituted.”

This clause, as will be evident from the further discussion which has taken place just now, gives power to the Local Government to declare any premises as a factory which employ ten or more persons. My amendment is to reduce that number to five. Sir, these powers that are being given to the Local Government are purely discretionary. A Local Government is not compelled to declare any factory that employs five persons as a factory ; but if they find that the circumstances are such, that the conditions are so revolting that they must interfere, then I submit they must have the power to deal with such factories. In the speech which I made, when the Bill was referred to Select Committee, I referred particularly to the case, of *biri* factories in Madras and bangle factories at Firozabad, and I pointed out what the conditions were in those factories. What we want is that if a Local Government find that they must interfere, so as to improve the conditions in those factories, they must have the power to deal with them. This only gives them power to deal with such situations, and it will act somewhat like a check on the small factories having unsatisfactory conditions in those factories, and it will operate as an incentive to them to improve their working. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Amendment moved :

“ That in sub-clause (1) of clause 5 of the Bill, for the word ‘ ten ’ the word ‘ five ’ be substituted.”

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** Sir, I have very little, if anything, to add to what I have already said in regard to this amendment. I have already pointed out the great difficulty that Local Governments would have in dealing with factories employing from ten to nineteen people. It is obvious that that difficulty would be very greatly enhanced if the number were reduced to five, and I would very much deprecate placing a provision on the Statute-book which would certainly be a dead letter for many years to come. Sir, I regret I am unable to accept the amendment.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty):** The question is :

“ That in sub-clause (1) of clause 5 of the Bill, for the word ‘ ten ’ the word ‘ five ’ be substituted.”

The motion was negatived.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 6 to 10 were added to the Bill.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty):** The question is :

“ That clause 11 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. G. Morgan (Bengal : European):** Sir, I move :

“ That in clause 11 of the Bill, for sub-clauses (b) and (c) the following be substituted :

- (b) make such examination of the premises and plant and take on the spot or otherwise such evidence of any persons as he may deem necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act ;
- (c) make, during working hours, such examination of any prescribed registers, and take on the spot or otherwise such evidence of any persons as he may deem necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act ; and
- (d) exercise such other powers as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act .”

The reason for this amendment, Sir, is that although in the first instance we thought of moving an amendment for “ a reasonable time ”, we came to the conclusion that that is a very difficult thing to define. We do feel, however, that in connection with the examination of registers and documents, which, I take it, are generally kept in the office part of a factory, it would be better if the words “ during office hours ” were inserted for the examination of any prescribed registers and documents. It is quite possible that Government may not view this in the same light as we do, but we feel that there might be a certain amount of trouble and harassment if people were coming at odd hours when offices were closed to examine documents and registers. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty):** Amendment moved :

“ That in clause 11 of the Bill, for sub-clauses (b) and (c) the following be substituted :

- (b) make such examination of the premises and plant and take on the spot or otherwise such evidence of any persons as he may deem necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act ;
- (c) make, during working hours, such examination of any prescribed registers, and take on the spot or otherwise such evidence of any persons as he may deem necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act ; and
- (d) exercise such other powers as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act .”

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** Sir, I regret I am unable to accept this amendment. I will give the House an instance of how it might work in practice. Suppose the Factory Inspector believes that a ten-hour day was not being adhered to. He endeavours to make a "raid" on the factory, but he finds on arrival that work has just stopped. Is he to be precluded from comparing the work registers there and then with the facts as known to him? If so, the register will probably be faked by the following day. That is the reason why I am unable to accept this amendment. The Inspector turns up at the factory out of working hours; the factory authorities who have or may have been guilty of an infringement of the Act are not called upon to produce their registers; by the time those registers are available for the Inspector's examination, it is perfectly possible that the entries in the register may have been altered. I think the House will agree that that is a very good reason for not accepting this amendment. The Local Governments have ample opportunities for taking disciplinary action in any case in which it is called for, in which this power of inspection is abused. All powers of inspection are, of course, open to abuse, and that is a risk which we have to face. We have to trust Local Governments and the Factory Inspectors to do their best to avoid unnecessary harassment. I may note in passing that in any case it would have been impossible to accept the amendment in the form in which it has been tabled, as Mr. Morgan does not seem to have been able to decide whether the taking of evidence should also be limited to working hours or not. Sir, I oppose the amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The question is :

"That in clause 11 of the Bill, for sub-clauses (b) and (c) the following be substituted :

- '(b) make such examination of the premises and plant and take on the spot or otherwise such evidence of any persons as he may deem necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act ;
- (c) make, during working hours, such examination of any prescribed registers, and take on the spot or otherwise such evidence of any persons as he may deem necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act ; and
- (d) exercise such other powers as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act.'

The motion was negatived.

Clause 11 was added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The question is :

"That clause 12 stand part of the Bill."

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** Sir, the amendment which stands in my name runs as follows :

"That after sub-clause (1) of clause 12 of the Bill, the following new sub-clause be inserted and the existing sub-clause (2) be re-numbered as sub-clause (3) :

- '(3) No person shall be appointed to be a certifying surgeon under sub-section (1), or, having been so appointed, shall continue to hold the office of certifying surgeon, who is or becomes directly or indirectly interested in a factory or in any process or business carried on therein or in any patent or machinery connected therewith.'

Clause 12, Sir, allows certain medical practitioners to be appointed to perform the functions which are required by this Bill, and those functions, I may say at the outset, are very important. The Bill aims at two

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

things. One is the protection and the welfare of children and the second is the protection to the employers also as well as to the workers. Now, these two things are very important—one, this business of holding that a certain person, a child, who is of twelve years of age or any adolescent, who is fifteen years of age, is fit for such work, has to be decided by a certificate given by a medical officer ; and also as regards the fitness of a person who can be allowed to go to a factory, that also has to be decided upon mostly upon the certificate that that surgeon gives. Now, the point is this. My amendment says that that person, who should be a medical officer, should be a disinterested person, should be an impartial person, should be a person who has no interest of his own to manipulate his certificate. In other words, I only want purity, honesty and impartiality of service. Sir, I do not think we can find anywhere else that a person can be the judge in any function in which he himself is interested. Take the Criminal Procedure Code which governs the whole of India. Under that Code, the Judges are appointed and if they are interested in any matter that comes before them, the law decides that the case will be transferred from their Courts. I cannot understand why in this Bill an unlawful procedure, an extraordinary procedure and a most objectionable procedure should be adopted. I really wonder how it came to be that this provision was deleted by the Select Committee at all. With due deference to the Select Committee, I must say that I do not understand what must be the motive behind their decision. I must, however, give the House the real facts before I go into the reasons given by the Select Committee. Referring to the old Factories Act, which is now going to be amended, I find that sections 6 to 8 refer to this very subject and under the old Act a surgeon had to be appointed by Government. It is mentioned in section 6 which I will read to the House. It runs thus :

“ The Local Government may appoint any qualified medical practitioner, as it thinks fit, to be a certifying surgeon for the purpose of this Act within such local limits as it may assign to him respectively.”

Then there is another section which says :

“ The certifying surgeon can delegate his powers to another registered medical practitioner.”

Now, Sir, these sections do not say that the certifying surgeon will be a disinterested person, but, ordinarily, when a man is taken into the service of a business like this, he must be disinterested in order to be impartial. The presumption is, according to the old Act, that if a person was interested, he should not be appointed. Now, what has happened is this. The changes were made in the present Bill by the framer of the original Bill before it went to the Select Committee. Instead of appointing a surgeon in the first instance and then asking him to delegate his powers to the medical practitioners, they simplified the matter. They found that at present any number of registered medical practitioners can be had who are fit enough. So, the framer of the Bill decided to put in only registered medical practitioners. Later on, it appeared to him to make it more clear by saying that the certified medical practitioner should be a person who should be disinterested. Therefore, they put in actually a clause, which is clause 2 in the original Bill, exactly in the same words as is my amendment. Then, when the matter went to the Select Committee, they, for ought I know, decided to delete clause 2. In other words, they say that they would be satisfied with any doctor. Let him

be a dishonest man, let him be concerned directly or indirectly with the factory, let him be even the manager of the factory itself. They do not mind all that. Sir, I cannot understand the reason of this deletion. Sir, I can only say that the Honourable Member in charge of the Bill is putting in a thing which has never happened in any law. I do not think the Honourable the Law Member will get up and speak on this motion and say that we want such persons who may be interested directly or indirectly with the factory. I, therefore, submit that if my amendment is accepted, it will make the law remain as it is and will make the Bill absolutely pure from this defect. In other words, if this Honourable House is to be a party to a measure like this, it must see that it is an impartial measure. Therefore, looking at it from that general point of view, I think it will be but right to revert back to the position in which we were when the Bill was framed by the Honourable Member himself. If the Select Committee has made this change, then we can reject it. After all, their decision is not the Gospel truth and the old clause can be put in. Sir, I do not wish to give any lengthy reasons, because the point is so clear. Therefore, I submit that my amendment should be accepted by this House.

Now, I wish to say one word more with regard to the reasons that the Select Committee have given and then I have done. I already referred to them yesterday at the consideration stage of the Bill, but for the benefit of those who were not in the House yesterday, I will just refer to them again. We find that in their report on clause 12 the Committee says :

“ This clause combines the provisions contained in clauses 13 and 14 of the Bill as introduced. We have modified them to provide that only registered medical practitioners may be appointed as certifying surgeons. Sub-clause (2) of clause 13 has been omitted.”

This sub-clause (2) referred to the surgeon being a disinterested person. They are going to omit this sub-clause and the reason that they have given for doing so is this :

“ On the ground that it might give rise to practical difficulties and might unduly limit the field of choice.”

I fail to understand, Sir, what difficulty can there be in finding out a suitable man from amongst hundreds of medical practitioners that we find in India ?

**Mr. E. Studd** (Bengal : European) : There will be the greatest difficulties.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** : I am surprised to hear that statement from a Member who hails from Calcutta where we can find so many surgeons and so many medical practitioners, and yet the Honourable Member says that there will be difficulties. What is the difficulty, may I ask ? I pause for a reply. (No reply.) Sir, I do not find any difficulty.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : I cannot allow that statement to pass unchallenged. I shall, in due course, explain what the difficulties are.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** : I hope you will consider the purity point of view also. I cannot understand how there can be any difficulty. Even supposing there is some difficulty in considering the question of finding out suitable certifying surgeons, you have to place the difficulties, if any, on the one side of the scale, and on the other you have to put impartiality

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

and see whether it will be right to appoint such surgeons. I, therefore, submit that even though there may be some difficulty which, I think, may only be fanciful or fantastic, yet these difficulties should not deter us from giving due consideration to the question of purity and impartiality of service. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Amendment moved :

“ That after sub-clause (1) of clause 12 of the Bill, the following new sub-clause be inserted and the existing sub-clause (2) be re-numbered as sub-clause (3) :

‘ (2) No person shall be appointed to be a certifying surgeon under subsection (1), or, having been so appointed, shall continue to hold the office of certifying surgeon, who is or becomes directly or indirectly interested in a factory or in any process or business carried on therein or in any patent or machinery connected therewith.’ ”

**Mr. S. C. Sen** (Bengal National Chamber of Commerce : Indian Commerce) : Sir, I have listened very carefully to the able arguments adduced by my Honourable friend, Mr. Navalrai, but they have not convinced me in any way to change my views which I, as a Member of the Select Committee, have expressed in the note which I have appended. The position is this. The medical officer to be appointed must be a registered one. We all know what that means. My Honourable friend does not know and I gather from his speech that he is apparently ignorant of the condition of mufassil villages, even of his own Province, not to say of Bengal or other Provinces of India. In the mufassil towns, you will scarcely find a doctor who is a registered one.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** : Question. There are several.

**Mr. S. C. Sen** : Because my Honourable friend has no knowledge of Bengal, he cannot speak of that Province. I should also say he has no knowledge even of his own Province.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** : I have of my own Province fully.

**Mr. S. C. Sen** : I can say without fear of challenge that mufassil towns and villages in Bengal, most of them, do not possess a single registered medical practitioner. There may be unqualified medical practitioners, such as *kavirajes* and *hakims*, but there are very few registered medical practitioners. Supposing there is one in a particular village, and supposing there is a factory open in that village, and supposing it is mainly controlled by people in whom the medical practitioner is interested, then, according to my Honourable friend, the onus is on the factory to get a medical practitioner who is not interested in the factory to function. My Honourable friend waxed eloquent on purity, etc. Now, Sir, what are the duties of this medical practitioner ? He shall have to certify whether a particular boy is below the age of 12 or he is an adolescent capable of working in a factory. Supposing he certifies a man who is unworthy to be certified, then whom does he favour ? Is he favouring the boy or is he favouring the factory ? The factory will lose by employing such a boy. Therefore, his being interested in the factory helps whom ? The factory loses by getting a man who is unfit. Therefore, this question of purity is all a moonshine. This question of purity haunts the minds of people who have no knowledge of the conditions in mufassil towns. Sir, I oppose the amendment.

**Mr. E. Studd :** Sir, I had not intended to speak on this amendment, but as my Honourable friend, Mr. Navalrai, has challenged me on the question of difficulty, as a plain straightforward businessman, I can tell him the difficulty as I see it. I will not deal at any length with his contention that, because a doctor happens to have some interest, he could not be trusted to give a perfectly fair and impartial opinion. I entirely disagree with that point of view. The point I want to lay stress upon is the practical difficulty. I, Sir, am not a legal expert, but reading his amendment in which he says "no person shall be appointed to be a certifying surgeon if he becomes directly or indirectly interested in a factory" which I interpret to mean "any" factory, the result would surely be that those who happen to hold shares in a tea company or a jute company could not be appointed to be a certifying surgeon even for a cotton mill.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** That is not my interpretation.

**Mr. E. Studd :** I have already said that I do not claim legal knowledge, but that seems to be the interpretation, to the ordinary plain man in the street, of the amendment as it is worded. But even if that is not so, how is it possible practically to know whether a doctor has any interest in a factory or not. Is it feasible to examine all his interests and all his investments and see whether amongst them there is anything which has either direct or indirect interest in any factory? I submit that even if that was feasible, if you found a doctor who was dishonest and who particularly wanted to get an appointment of this sort, it would be perfectly easy to cover up his interest by transferring his shares into the name of somebody else. I think, Sir, from the point of view of the plain man in the street, there are very grave practical difficulties in the way of this amendment, and, I, therefore, oppose it.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** I quite realise the difficulty which has been pointed out by my Honourable friend, Mr. Sen, and my Honourable friend, Mr. Studd. I should like to ask one question as to how the amendment of which notice has been given by my Honourable friend, Mr. Lalchand Navalrai, found a place in the original Bill when it was introduced for the first time last year. In the original Bill, when it was introduced, it was clause 13, sub-clause (2) of which reads as follows:

"No person shall be appointed to be a certifying surgeon under sub-section (1), or, having been so appointed, shall continue to hold the office of certifying surgeon, who is or becomes directly or indirectly interested in a factory or in any process or business carried on therein or in any patent or machinery connected therewith."

This is exactly the amendment which has just been moved by my Honourable friend. I should like to know from the members of the Select Committee or from the Honourable Member in charge of this Bill as to why this particular clause which found a place in the original Bill has been deleted. I would certainly assume that, before the Bill was originally introduced, all the difficulties, which have been pointed out by my Honourable friends, who have just preceded me, must have been present before their minds. I cannot really believe that they drew up the original Bill in a hurry without looking at all into the relevant circumstances, but, even as it was, I find that this clause found a place in the original Bill and the onus lies on the Government and on the members of the Select Committee to explain what considerations weighed with them in deleting that clause in the Select Committee.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. Navalrai, has advanced a curious theory of the position of the Member in charge of a Bill when it comes before a Select Committee and that theory appears to have found a certain measure of support from my Honourable friend, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** I am not supporting Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I am told by my Honourable friend, Mr. Navalrai, that I ought to have stood on my rights, that I ought to have insisted that this clause should remain in the Bill when it was under discussion in the Select Committee. Well, Sir, I have served on some Select Committees with my Honourable friend, and I have not noticed that he then held that the Member in charge of the Bill should stand strictly on the letter of the Bill, that he should accept no change at all in the course of the discussions in the Select Committee and that he should be entirely impervious to any arguments advanced in support of change. My Honourable friend would be the first to contest that view if it were brought forward in support of any other amendment than his own. It is obvious that the passage of legislation through Select Committees and through this House would hardly be facilitated if Government were to take that attitude. Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh is perfectly entitled to ask why we dropped this clause which Mr. Lalchand Navalrai now seeks to restore. The reason is that it was not a well considered clause. We do endeavour to take all relevant considerations into account when we are drafting Bills, but it is bound to be the case that sometimes they escape our notice and this was frankly a case of that character. It was only in Select Committee that the difficulty of working the clause was fully revealed.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** May I know if there is any such clause deleted in any other Act?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I have not the slightest doubt that many clauses in Government Bills are deleted in the course of their passage through Select Committee. I am quite certain that every Member who has served on any Select Committee could bring forward instances of that kind.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** I did not mean that. What I asked was whether there is any other instance where a clause like this has been deleted that no man should be appointed in any capacity if he has got an interest in that business either directly or indirectly.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I do not know whether any such clause has ever appeared in any Act, but, if the Honourable Member will allow me to continue, I will point out the difficulties in working this sub-clause. It runs:

“No person shall be appointed to be a certifying surgeon under sub-section (1), or, having been so appointed, shall continue to hold the office of certifying surgeon who is or becomes directly or indirectly interested in a factory or in any process or business carried on therein or in any patent or machinery connected therewith.”

The interpretation put on the sub-clause by Mr. Studd was perfectly correct and was upheld by our legal advisers. We found on further examination that the possession of a share in a company owning a factory anywhere in India would be a disqualification for appointment as a certifying

surgeon. I admit that we ought to have foreseen that, and it is a matter for regret that we did not. That is the position. My Honourable friend, Mr. Lalchand Navalrai, is at a disadvantage in that he does not know exactly what happened in the Select Committee. We did discuss in the Select Committee at very great length whether we could not get round this in some way or other and whether we could not insert a provision that a certifying surgeon should be disqualified from acting in respect of any particular factory in which he was directly or indirectly interested. But we found there were difficulties in regard to that. It is very difficult to define "direct" and still more difficult to define "indirect" interest. Take the case of a man who is appointed certifying surgeon for a factory, many of the superior officers of which are his patients. Would you say that he was directly interested or indirectly interested in that factory? He is obviously interested, but it is very difficult to say whether his interest is direct or indirect.

And then there is the case which has been brought forward from Assam, the difficulty of finding certifying surgeons for factories on tea estates in remote parts of Assam, or indeed in other parts of India. It is obvious that where a tea estate in such parts has its own doctor, it may be very difficult to find any other doctor near at hand to act as a certifying surgeon.

These are the reasons why we deleted this clause and they seem to me to be convincing ones. I trust that they will prove equally convincing to the House.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

"That after sub-clause (1) of clause 12 of the Bill, the following new sub-clause be inserted and the existing sub-clause (2) be re-numbered as sub-clause (3) :

'(2) No person shall be appointed to be a certifying surgeon under subsection (1), or, having been so appointed, shall continue to hold the office of certifying surgeon, who is or becomes directly or indirectly interested in a factory or in any process or business carried on therein or in any patent or machinery connected therewith.'

The motion was negatived.

Clause 12 was added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

"That clause 13 stand part of the Bill."

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** : Sir, I beg to move :

"That in clause 13 of the Bill, before the words 'Every factory' the following be inserted :

'Every factory shall be provided with drains for dirty, bad smelling and sullage water with suitable escapes outside the premises without causing any nuisance inside or outside, and.'

I need not say many words on this amendment, though I feel that it is a very important one which should also appeal to the Member in charge. Yesterday I gave examples of certain factories which are worked with

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

power which have no drains at all, and I gave my personal experience of several such factories where they throw the drain water into the premises itself, and the Inspectors who are in charge are unable to help them. If they throw the water outside, the municipalities come and prosecute them. If they throw water inside, there is a nuisance and the Inspectors say that there is no such rule that there ought to be a drain. There was in the former Bill also a similar provision about cleansing of drains, and it may be interpreted to mean that, where it is provided that the drain should be cleansed, it presupposes that there is a drain. But that is not the view that is being taken in practice. Therefore, I have put in this amendment to make it quite clear that when there is sullage water or some other dirty water which has got to be removed, there ought to be drains and also escapes outside which should be done by the factory owners. I, therefore, do not think this amendment should be opposed.

Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) :  
Amendment moved :

“ That in clause 13 of the Bill, before the words ‘ Every factory ’ the following be inserted :

‘ Every factory shall be provided with drains for dirty, bad smelling and sullage water with suitable escapes outside the premises without causing any nuisance inside or outside, and ’.”

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** (Law Member) : Sir, I should like to point out to the House that this amendment is wholly unnecessary. If the House will turn to the language, which has been used in the draft clause 13, it will be found that :

“ Every factory shall be kept clean and free from effluvia arising from any drain, privy or other nuisance, and shall be cleansed at such times and by such methods as may be prescribed, etc.”

So it is clear that all that is wanted in the amendment is covered by the provision about drains being cleansed at such times and by such methods as may be prescribed. I think, therefore, that the amendment is unnecessary. Moreover, the amendment, as it is drafted, is rather inappropriate. It says, “ Every factory shall be provided with drains, etc ”. There is no reason why every factory should be provided with drains for dirty water. It is quite conceivable that there are factories where there is no accumulation of dirty water. I ask the House to consider whether it is necessary at all to put in this amendment and I submit that it is not.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** : Sir, in view of the interpretation which the Honourable the Law Member puts upon it, and which, I say, is also an interpretation which is susceptible of being put, I would ask the House to give me leave to withdraw this amendment.

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

Clause 13 was added to the Bill.

Clause 14 was added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 15 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. G. Morgan :** Sir, I beg to move :

“ That in sub-clause (3) of clause 15 of the Bill, for the words ‘ specifying the measures which, in his opinion, should be adopted ’ the words ‘ that effective measures shall be taken ’ be substituted.”

This and my subsequent amendments are in identical terms and are moved for the same reason ; therefore, what I shall say on this amendment applies to them all. What we feel is that the powers given to the Inspectors are too varied and extensive. Under this clause and the following clauses, he has to specify the measures which should be carried out. There might arise the question, if we say merely “ effective measures ”, as to what “ effective ” means : I quite grant that, and I do not see any way out of that. Under clause 31 (3), an appeal can be lodged within 30 days. Now, suppose the Inspector specifies measures which have to be carried out and gives a short date for those measures to be carried out, what is to happen when an appeal has been lodged and the appellate Court has not got time to take up the case and come to an early decision on that matter ? The Inspector has already specified the measures and he has specified the date and an appeal has been lodged ; the appellate Court cannot sit at once ; and although the decision may be in favour of the owner of the factory, he may have already been compelled under the clause to carry out the measures specified by the Inspector. That, to my mind, is one of the difficulties of this definite wording of specified measures. What I say on this amendment applies to all my subsequent amendments—they are exactly on the same basis. The difficulty seems to be about the appeal in clause 31 (3). Section 16 is all right. But the appellate Court may not be able to come to a decision before the date expires, and meantime the specified measures have to be carried out. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Amendment moved.

“ That in sub-clause (3) of clause 15 of the Bill, for the words ‘ specifying the measures which, in his opinion, should be adopted ’ the words ‘ that effective measures shall be taken ’ be substituted.”

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** Sir, I must confess that I was under the impression that my Honourable friend, Mr. Morgan, represented the employers’ interests in this House. The amendment which he has just moved throws very considerable doubt on that point in my mind, for I trust that I shall be able to convince the House that this amendment is in the interests, neither of the employers, nor of administration. My Honourable friend, Mr. Morgan, is evidently of opinion that the employers should have an opportunity to decide what steps should be taken to remedy defects and that so long as effective steps are taken, that is all that should be required. But, as a matter of fact the effect of his amendment is to introduce fresh causes of dispute and to confuse the procedure at every possible stage. I will endeavour to show how that comes about. The position at present is that the employer has to be given full particulars of the measures he is expected to take and that he can appeal against the order on such grounds as that the conditions in his factory are satisfactory, that the measures are impracticable of execution, that they are not likely to be effective, and that there is a better way of achieving the end in view. Mr. Morgan proposes, in the first place, to remove the safeguard that the employer has to be given full particulars of the measures he is expected to take. I would remind the

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

House that, in the course of the discussion yesterday, great stress was laid on the necessity that, in administering this Act, we should be as definite as possible. If Mr. Morgan's amendment were adopted, the Inspector need not and should not specify the measures which the factory owner is called upon to take. I submit to the House that even a well qualified manager of a big factory would be greatly assisted in framing his appeal and in deciding whether to appeal or not, if he knew what the Inspector thought sufficient. The manager of a small factory may be in very considerable perplexity as to the measures he should take. A further result of Mr. Morgan's amendment would be that all the grounds of appeal would be cut out except the first, that conditions in the factory were satisfactory. Having given its finding on that point, whether conditions in the factory are satisfactory or not, the tribunal has no further authority, and all the other matters must be left for the decision of the less pleasant and much less well-qualified criminal Court before whom the manager may be dragged for failure to carry out ideas of which he is ignorant. In short, the manager has complete protection against unwise orders in the appellate provisions of the Bill, but Mr. Morgan reduces the appellate authority to one which can in most cases pronounce on the Inspector's initial finding of fact. From the point of view of the Inspector, the position would be equally unsatisfactory. If he and the manager fail to agree regarding the necessary measures, he can only get what he regards as necessary by prosecuting; then complicated technical issues may come before the Courts which are ill-equipped to examine them. I trust that the House will be convinced that it would be unwise to accept Mr. Morgan's amendment. The only reason he has put forward seems to be that he is in some doubt about the question of appeal. If that is the case, I should have thought that he would have moved an amendment to the clause relating to appeals which he has not done. I do not think there is really any very great danger of an Inspector being unreasonable. If his requirements are extensive, he must obviously give sufficient time in which to enable them to be carried out; and during that time, the appellant will be able to go to the appellate authority and get the order suspended. There is no real danger, I think, that the Inspector will direct that an order involving a factory owner in any considerable expenditure must be carried out within a period so short that he will not be able to go to the appellate Court and get the order suspended. Here, again, I think, we have to trust our Inspectors to see that orders are reasonable and leave the Local Government to see that the Inspectors carry out their duties in the proper spirit. Sir, I oppose the amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That in sub-clause (3) of clause 15 of the Bill, for the words ‘ specifying the measures which, in his opinion, should be adopted ’ the words ‘ that effective measures shall be taken ’ be substituted.”

The motion was negatived.

Clause 15 was added to the Bill.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Thirty-Five Minutes Past Two of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Thirty-Five Minutes Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) in the Chair.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Does Mr. Morgan wish to move his other amendments ?

**Mr. G. Morgan** : Yes, Sir, I should like to move them:

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 16 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. G. Morgan** : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That in clause 16 of the Bill, for the words ‘ specifying the measures which, in his opinion, should be adopted ’ the words ‘ that effective measures shall be taken ’ be substituted.”

I have nothing to add to what I have already said on clause 15. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That in clause 16 of the Bill, for the words ‘ specifying the measures which, in his opinion, should be adopted ’ the words ‘ that effective measures shall be taken ’ be substituted.”

The motion was negatived.

Clause 16 was added to the Bill.

Clause 17 was added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Where is clause 18 in the Bill ?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : Sir, there appears to be a misprint in the Bill. 18 should appear before (1) where it is stated that a factory shall be sufficiently lighted during all working hours. The number “ 18 ” is unfortunately missing.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Does the Honourable Member mean that the paragraph referring to lighting should be 18 ?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : Yes.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 18 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. G. Morgan** : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That in sub-clause (2) of clause 18 of the Bill, for the words ‘ specifying the measures which, in his opinion, should be adopted ’ the words ‘ that effective measures shall be taken ’ be substituted.”

Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That in sub-clause (2) of clause 18 of the Bill, for the words ‘ specifying the measures which, in his opinion, should be adopted ’ the words ‘ that effective measures shall be taken ’ be substituted.”

The motion was negatived.

Clause 18 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 19 to 22 were added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 23 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. G. Morgan** : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That in sub-clause (2) of clause 23 of the Bill, for the words ‘ specifying the measures which, in his opinion, should be adopted ’ the words ‘ that effective measures shall be taken ’ be substituted.”

Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That in sub-clause (2) of clause 23 of the Bill, for the words ‘ specifying the measures which, in his opinion, should be adopted ’ the words ‘ that effective measures shall be taken ’ be substituted.”

The motion was negatived.

Clause 23 was added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 24 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. G. Morgan** : Sir, I move :

“ That in sub-clause (2) of clause 24 of the Bill, for the words ‘ specifying the measures which, in his opinion, should be adopted ’ the words ‘ that effective measures shall be taken ’ be substituted.”

Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That in sub-clause (2) of clause 24 of the Bill, for the words ‘ specifying the measures which, in his opinion, should be adopted ’ the words ‘ that effective measures shall be taken ’ be substituted.”

The motion was negatived.

Clause 24 was added to the Bill.

Clause 25 was added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 26 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. G. Morgan** : Sir, I move :

“ That in sub-clause (1) of clause 26 of the Bill, for the words ‘ specifying the measures which, in his opinion, should be adopted ’ the words ‘ that effective measures shall be taken ’ be substituted.”

Sir, I move :

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That in sub-clause (1) of clause 26 of the Bill, for the words ‘ specifying the measures which, in his opinion, should be adopted ’ the words ‘ that effective measures shall be taken ’ be substituted.”

The motion was negatived.

Clause 26 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 27 to 31 were added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 32 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury** : Sir, I move :

“ That in clause 32 (c) of the Bill, the words ‘ other than Railways subject to the Indian Railways Act, 1890 ’ be omitted.”

This section gives power to the Local Government to provide against dangers arising from the use of mechanical transport in factories, “ other than Railways subject to the Indian Railways Act ”. If the use of mechanical transport involves a danger, they must be guarded against, and we do not understand why the Indian Railways should be excluded from the category of mechanical transport from the use of which dangers may arise.

Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Amendment moved :

“ That in clause 32 (c) of the Bill, the words ‘ other than Railways subject to the Indian Railways Act, 1890 ’ be omitted.”

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : Sir, I understand, during the course of the general discussion, that the provisions of this Bill would also apply to railway workshops, and I do not see why in this particular clause the railway workshops are explicitly excluded. In fact, if there is any need for protection anywhere, it is in the railway workshops, because they are not regularly inspected by non-railway men, and it is, therefore, very desirable that the safety of the men employed in railway workshops should be properly looked into by the executive and judicial officers in the same manner as they would do in regard to men working in any other factory. Therefore, I support this motion.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : Sir, In the first place, I should like to point out to the House that there is no special exemption for railway workshops in this provision. The provision is against the danger arising from the use of mechanical transport in factories other than railways subject to the Indian Railways Act of 1890, and the position is that all railways within the precincts of factories, whether they are railway factories or not, are subject to the Indian Railways Act of 1890. There is no discrimination here in favour of railway factories. They are exactly in the same position as other factories, and other factories are exactly in the same position as railway factories. In the minute of dissent, Mr. Joshi, Mr. Thampan and Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury said that they were not sure whether there was adequate provision to guard against dangers arising from the use of mechanical transport in those factories within the precincts of which there are railways subject to the Indian Railways Act, 1890. I can assure the House that there is adequate provision, and I will explain to the House exactly what that provision is. As I said at the outset, all railways within the precincts of a factory are subject to the Railways Act. Under section 47 (i) of the Railways Act, General rules must be made for regulating the

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

mode in which and the speed at which rolling stock used on the railway is to be moved or propelled. General Rules 147 to 155 made under section 47 (i) of the Act refer particularly to shunting and securing of vehicles in station yards and sidings, while certain others of the General Rules, e.g., those relating to signals, points and speed, are also applicable to the movement of vehicles on railways in factories. Each railway administration has issued subsidiary rules to those General Rules, giving more detailed instructions to meet local conditions. Every accident such as is described in section 83 of the Indian Railways Act, which includes any accident attended with, or of a description usually attended with loss of human life or with grievous hurt, has to be reported to the Inspector appointed under section 4 of the Act. The duties of these Inspectors in connection with enquiries into and reports on such accidents are detailed in rules 7 to 12 of the rules issued under the Railway Department Notification No. 1926-T., dated the 19th March, 1930. Furthermore, these Inspectors have power to inspect any railway or rolling stock used thereon, under section 5 of the Act. Our position in this matter is that the Railway Administrations and the Railway Board know much more about the railway working than the Factory Inspectors, and, if there is any question of choice between rules under the Railways Act and rules under this Act, we prefer rules under the Railways Act. It is not advisable that there should be any conflict in this matter between rules issued by the Local Government and rules issued under the Railways Act. I think I have said sufficient to show that adequate provision to guard against dangers arising in the use of mechanical transport in factories within the precincts of which there are railways subject to the Indian Railways Act does exist and that there is every justification for excluding such railways from the operation of the Factories Act. Sir, I oppose the amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That in clause 32 (c) of the Bill, the words ‘ other than Railways subject to the Indian Railways Act, 1890 ’ be omitted.”

The motion was negatived.

Clause 32 was added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 33 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury** : Sir, I move :

“ That in sub-clause (1) of clause 33 of the Bill, after the word ‘ factory ’ the words ‘ or a class of factories ’ be inserted.”

This clause provides that, when in any specified factory 150 persons or more are employed, the Local Government may make rules providing adequate shelter for the use of workers during periods of rest. Our suggestion is this. If the Local Government is empowered to make rules with regard to any specified factory, it should also be empowered to make rules in regard to a “ class of factories ”, because what may be considered necessary for a specified factory may be equally applicable to the case of a class of factories of that kind. That is why I move this amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Amendment moved :

“ That in sub-clause (1) of clause 33 of the Bill, after the word ‘ factory ’ the words ‘ or a class of factories ’ be inserted.”

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : I regret that I am unable to accept this amendment. The matter was very fully discussed in the Select Committee which came to the conclusion that it was desirable that the Local Government should have the circumstances of each individual factory before them when deciding whether a room should be reserved for the use of children under the age of six years. Conditions in different localities, and, indeed, in the same locality, may vary considerably, and the Select Committee wanted the Local Government to give attention to each individual case before making a rule. That, I think, is the simple explanation of the change made in the Select Committee. Sir, I oppose the amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That in sub-clause (1) of clause 33 of the Bill, after the word ‘ factory ’ the words ‘ or a class of factories ’ be inserted.”

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury** : Sir, I formally move the next amendment :

“ That in sub-clause (2) (a) of clause 33 of the Bill, after the word ‘ factory ’ the words ‘ or a class of factories ’ be inserted.”

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Amendment moved :

“ That in sub-clause (2) (a) of clause 33 of the Bill, after the word ‘ factory ’ the words ‘ or a class of factories ’ be inserted.”

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury** : Sir, I move :

“ That after sub-clause (4) of clause 33 of the Bill, the following new sub-clause be inserted :

(5) The Local Government may also make rules, requiring that in any factory or class of factories, where the conditions and circumstances of employment of the nature of the processes carried on are such, as to require special provisions to be made at the factory for securing the welfare of the workers or any class of workers employed therein, in relation to matters regarding the supply of protective clothing, ambulance and first-aid arrangements, arrangements for preparing or heating and taking meals, the supply and use of seats, accommodation for clothing, facilities for washing, supply of drinking water, arrangements for supervision of workers and the provision for rest rooms :

Provided the rules made under this sub-section are placed on the table of the Legislative Council of the Province concerned and provided further that the Council does not pass a resolution within forty days after the rules were placed on the table, disapproving of those rules.”

By the insertion of this sub-clause, we want to insert matters with regard to welfare orders. The Labour Commission very specifically recommended that the Local Government should be given power to issue welfare orders, and these welfare orders relate to matters like protective clothing, ambulance and first-aid arrangements, facilities for washing and matters of that kind. In England, the Ministry of Health has got power

[Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury.]

to issue such welfare orders, and the Labour Commission was convinced that these welfare orders have contributed materially to the wellbeing of the workers. I have not been able to understand why the Government of India chose to reject this recommendation of the Labour Commission, particularly when the Governments of Bombay and Madras supported the recommendation of the Royal Commission and when they also said that there was no danger of this power being abused by the Local Governments. We have also laid down a provision that the views may be placed before the Local Council, and, if they are not approved by the Council, they may be rejected.

Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Amendment moved :

“ That after sub-clause (4) of clause 33 of the Bill, the following new sub-clause be inserted :

- (5) The Local Government may also make rules, requiring that in any factory or class of factories, where the conditions and circumstances of employment of the nature of the processes carried on are such, as to require special provisions to be made at the factory for securing the welfare of the workers or any class of workers employed therein, in relation to matters regarding the supply of protective clothing, ambulance and first-aid arrangements, arrangements for preparing or heating and taking meals, the supply and use of seats, accommodation for clothing, facilities for washing, supply of drinking water, arrangements for supervision of workers and the provision for rest rooms :

Provided the rules made under this sub-section are placed on the table of the Legislative Council of the Province concerned and provided further that the Council does not pass a resolution within forty days after the rules were placed on the table, disapproving of those rules’.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : Sir, I should like to point out, in the first instance, that much of the contents of this motion are already covered by the existing provisions in the Act. As far as I have been able to discover, the explanation for the form which this amendment has taken is to be found in section 7 of the British Police, Factories, etc., (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1916, the provisions of which have been copied without any regard to the extent to which they are already covered by the other provisions of our Bill. It is very dangerous to copy legislation in other countries without rather more detailed examination than I venture to think has been given in this instance. Now, Sir, I would invite the attention of the House to the extent to which we have dealt with the matters mentioned in this amendment in the provisions of our Bill. Take the supply of protective clothing. It is possible to make rules under clause 33 (4) (d) which will enable the imposition of a liability on the management to supply protective clothing to workers employed in hazardous operations. Ambulance arrangements are more a business of a hospital than of the factory management. First-aid arrangements are covered by clause 32 (b) which makes a provision for the maintenance of first-aid appliances. Facilities for washing can be secured for workers employed on dirty processes under sub-clause (3) of clause 19, and sub-clauses (1) and (2) of the same clause provide for the supply of drinking water. Rest rooms can be secured for workers under sub-clause (1) of the clause to which the amendment is tabled. As regards accommodation for clothing, I do not think that the Indian labourer has much clothes for which he requires accommodation when he is at work. I do not quite know what is

meant by the supply and use of seats. If by that phrase the use of seats in rest rooms is meant, I do not think the Indian labourer requires much in that direction. He usually prefers to lie on the ground than to sit on a seat. There are only three items in this amendment which are really not covered by our Bill in some way or the other. These are firstly arrangements for cooking and eating meals. I cannot say how far they would be a success in any place in India that I know of. Cloak rooms, I have already mentioned. What is meant by arrangements for the supervision of workers, I am not certain.

Now, Sir, I come to the reasons which led the Government to take a view in this matter which differs from that of the Royal Commission on Labour. They were very fully explained in our letter on the subject to Local Governments which I will read to the House :

3 P. M.

“ In one important respect the recommendations of the Commission have been varied in the Bill. On page 64 of their Report, the Commission suggest that, following the principle embodied in British Legislation, Local Governments should be empowered in general terms to pass orders applicable to particular classes or groups of factories relating to welfare. ‘ Welfare ’ is a wide term and the Commission have given some indication of the variety of subjects which can be included under this head. The Government of India are provisionally opposed to such wide extension of the rule-making power as this recommendation would involve. They consider it preferable and more in consonance with the principles underlying the Act, that fresh requirements of the kind regarded by the Commission as desirable should have the approval of the Legislature and should not be imposed on factory-owners by the Executive Government. While, therefore, they have embodied in the draft Bill amendments designed to carry out the specific recommendations of the Commission in respect of welfare, (that is a point on which I would lay special emphasis) they have not made provision for any such general order-making power as the Commission contemplated.”

It seems to me that whatever we do on this side of the House in this matter of rules, we certainly cannot please all the sections of the House on the opposite Benches. When we take power to make rules, the criticism is brought forward that we are placing too much power in the hands of the Executive. When we say that we do not wish to take power to make rules and that we would prefer to bring concrete measures before this House or that concrete measures should be brought before the Provincial Councils for their approval, we are also subjected to criticism. My own view naturally is that which has been accepted by the majority of Local Governments and also by the majority of the Select Committee, namely, that it is desirable that these welfare orders should be embodied in definite and concrete amendments to the factory legislation which should receive the sanction either of the Central Legislature or of Provincial Legislatures. It is for that reason that I am compelled to oppose the amendment.

**Mr President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That after sub-clause (4) of clause 33 of the Bill, the following new sub-clause be inserted :

- (5) The Local Government may also make rules, requiring that in any factory or class of factories, where the conditions and circumstances of employment of the nature of the processes carried on are such, as to require special provisions to be made at the factory for securing the welfare of the workers or any class of workers employed therein, in relation to matters regarding the supply of protective clothing,

[Mr. President.]

ambulance and first-aid arrangements, arrangements for preparing of heating and taking meals, the supply and use of seats, accommodation for clothing, facilities for washing, supply of drinking water, arrangements for supervision of workers and the provision for rest rooms.

Provided the rules made under this sub-section are placed on the table of the Legislative Council of the Province concerned and provided further that the Council does not pass a resolution within forty days after the rules were placed on the table, disapproving of those rules."

The motion was negatived.

Clause 33 was added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

"That clause 34 stand part of the Bill."

**Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury** : Sir, I move :

"That in clause 34 of the Bill, for the word ' fifty-four ' the word ' forty-eight ' and for the word ' sixty ' the word ' fifty-four ' be substituted."

The purpose of this amendment is to reduce the working hours in perennial factories from 54 to 48 and in seasonal factories from 60 to 54. This provision in the Bill is based on the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Labour. I would like to point out that that recommendation was not unanimous. Three of the Members of the Commission, Mr. Chiff, Mr. Joshi and Diwan Chaman Lal, have advocated 48 hours a week for the Indian factories and they based their arguments mostly on the climatic and physical grounds. I regret very much that my friend, Mr. Mody, is not here, because he is one of the vigorous opponents of this 48-hour week. Yesterday, while giving his reasons for opposing the 48-hour week, he said that the conditions in India and in Western countries are not similar. We quite agree with him that the conditions are dissimilar. For example, as my friend, Mr. Jadhav, yesterday very lucidly explained, if you cannot expect a worker in the cold climate of England to give his best if he is required to work for more than eight hours a day, how can you expect efficient work from the Indian workers in this tropical heat of India if they are required to work for ten hours a day. This very dissimilarity of climatic conditions makes it all the more necessary that Indian workers should have lesser hours of working than even what prevails in England. Then Mr. Mody said that the Indian workers were inefficient. Sir, if you want efficiency, you must give them lesser working hours, because you cannot expect your Indian worker, working under Indian conditions, to keep up sustained effort for ten hours a day. Efficiency depends upon other factors also. It depends upon the standard of life of the worker, and that again depends upon his wages. If Mr. Mody is not prepared to give American wages to the Indian workers, then he cannot expect American efficiency from them. Mr. Mody said that he would be agreeable to accept 48 hours if, simultaneously with the reduction in working hours, we reduced the wages also and if we gave him protection without grumbling. Sir, we gave him protection all right, though we grumbled to a certain extent, and as regards reducing the wages simultaneously with the reduction of working hours, well, if Mr. Mody were here, I would have reminded him of what is happening in America. There, Sir, in the textile industry, under the new law, the working hours have been reduced by 25 per cent., and, at the same time,

the wages have been increased by 30 per cent. That only shows a reduction of working hours and an increase in wages are not incompatible. Then, again, Mr. Mody took great credit for having induced the Employers' Federation in India to agree to fifty-four hours a week. Well, that is no advance from the present position. If you take the case of the jute industry—I think my friend, Mr. Morgan, will correct me if I am wrong—workers in the jute mills which work single shifts do not work more than 54 hours, and, with double shifts, more than 44 hours a week; and, in the case of the engineering trade, they do not work for more than fifty hours a week, and, in the metallurgical works at the Tata Iron and Steel Workshops at Jamshedpur, the workers do not work for more than 50 to 54 hours a week, and, in some cases, not more than 48 hours a week. So, it is no credit for Mr. Mody to say that he induced the Employers' Federation to grant this so-called concession, because that means no advance at all on the present position. Actually, many workers are working a less number of hours: and if you want to make an advance in the direction of reducing the hours of work, it should be in the direction of reducing them to 48 hours. Sir, I have reminded the House on many previous occasions of what is being done in other countries, particularly in Geneva, about working hours. Only last year a Conference at Geneva adopted a Resolution supporting 40 hours a week for the workers. We are satisfied with forty-eight. Though it is too much to expect Government to accept our suggestion, still we contend that our claim is a modest one. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Amendment moved :

“That in clause 34 of the Bill, for the word ‘fifty-four’ the word ‘forty-eight’ and for the word ‘sixty’ the word ‘fifty-four’ be substituted.”

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : Sir, the discussion on this particular amendment very much depends upon the subsequent clause which is to follow, but at any rate I take it for granted that the clause will continue to exist. Now, in this case, I should have thought that it would always be correct if we fixed the wages of labour for each hour. Taking the average wage of a worker to be fifteen rupees a month, I think it will work out to about one anna per hour. If we fix up wages at that rate, then we will find that the labourers will always be willing to work as long as they possibly can in order to get more wages, and I think if we fix the wages in proportion to the amount of work done, then we will find that the labourers will always be clamouring for more work, because, each hour will bring more money to them and you will find that the pull will be from the opposite direction. Labour would always try to work more and draw more wages, and employers will try to give them less work in order to employ a larger number of men in the hope of getting more efficient work. Now, if we fix the whole thing not in the manner of the time spent actually on work and fix it at one anna per hour, that will come to Rs. 15 a month and that will be a good method of adjustment and then the tug-of-war as to whether the working hours should be 54 or 50 or 48 will come to an end, and then there will be no definite test by means of which you can decide this particular question. That, to my mind, is the simplest way of doing it, and the Local Governments should, for each district, fix up the minimum wage on which a person can comfortably live under conditions in which labour usually lives in that particular locality, and then they should

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

fix the wage for each hour and leave it to the employers and the workmen to decide as to what should be the amount of work, but it is not fair for us to lay down that a man should not work for more hours. By working for more hours he will earn more and we should not prevent him from doing so. Therefore, I believe we ought to change our formula altogether, and, instead of fixing the number of hours for each week, we should always regulate the value of each hour in a particular locality dependent upon the nature of the work and also upon the nature of the workmen and then leave it to the employers and the workmen, and, as long as there is room for work, the workman should get as much as possible and as much as he likes and then this struggle between capital and labour will practically disappear.

There is one more point which I have been thinking about. Since there was a joke about it in the morning, I have been thinking about one other thing. I was wondering whether a book is an article or not. I think everybody will say that a book is an article. Then, I thought it over in my mind as to whether a Bill is an article. A Bill is an article. Then, naturally, under the definition in clause 2 (j), the Legislative Assembly can be declared under clause 5 to be a factory by the Chief Commissioner of Delhi. Well, we are otherwise treating an article here and this can be declared to be a factory. Then in that case I think all these things will apply to us. I think the Associated Press ought to have used the words "Legislative Assembly" to which this Factories Bill will apply instead of Navy. Sir, I should like to emphasize that, in this matter of fixing the hours, we ought not to discuss what is the minimum number of hours a worker should work, because many workers can work for ten or twelve hours a day, provided they are paid for it. The objectionable thing is that you ask them to work, but do not pay them for it. Sir, the value of each hour ought to be fixed by the local conditions and once these have been fixed by the Local Government, then the whole question about hours of work will automatically be settled. Under normal conditions, eight hours a day I consider to be a good amount of work which a person may be expected to do. I think this is really fixed practically everywhere, and, really speaking, in factories, which work continuously for 24 hours, they usually have three shifts, each shift consisting of eight hours. It is automatically settled that every workman will have to work for eight hours if you agree to the following amendment which I am going to move to delete, but if you do not agree to delete, then six days will become the week and six times eight will become 48. Either you have eight hours a day and keep the following condition, or, otherwise, the Government have no alternative but to accept the amendment moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury, that is, 48 hours, though I myself would prefer that there should be no maximum or minimum and the wages should be settled according to the amount of work done by each worker.

**Mr. B. V. Jadhav** (Bombay Central Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, I rise to support the amendment. The fifty-four hour week has been put in the Bill, and, taking into consideration the present work that is exacted from the labourers in factories, it is a great advance in favour of the labourers. But it must be pointed out that the hours of

labour in Western countries are still further reduced and for very good reasons, because it has been found that a man cannot work efficiently for longer hours, and, therefore, he must get sufficient rest. In England, the hours of work are 44 or 48, and, as was pointed out yesterday, the Indian conditions require that the hours of work here should be even less ; because, in the enervating climate of India a man cannot put much energy for longer hours.

I was really interested in the mathematical problem placed before the House by our Professor of Mathematics, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad. In the Arithmetic classes, I have worked examples in which it was said that if a work could be done by ten men working four hours a day, how many men will be required to do the same work if the hours of work are raised to six. Of course, according to mathematical calculation, the number of men will be found to be about two-thirds. But there one great assumption is made that a man works uniformly the same quantity of work every hour that he is working. But it is not found to be actually the case. Early in the morning, when a man is fresh and has taken his breakfast, he could put in more work than when he is exhausted or when he is hungry. In the same way, if, as the Doctor says, the wages should be fixed on the number of hours put in, he assumes that the work done for every hour, whether it is ten or nine or eight, will be the same, and, therefore, it will be to the advantage of the employer and also of the employee. But actually it is not so. The employer himself has come to realise that it is more to his advantage to have fewer hours than to have longer hours.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** On a point of personal explanation. I said if we accept the formula, the position would be reversed, that is, the capitalist employers would demand less hours and the labourers would demand longer hours, just the opposite of what we are doing now.

**Mr. B. V. Jadhav :** I do not think I need enter into this discussion further, because the absurdity of the Doctor's proposition is self-evident. In the printing presses, whenever there is pressure of work, the owners ask the compositors to put in longer hours of work, and they do get more wages certainly. But the compositors, who have already worked for eight or nine hours, find it very tiresome to work any further and they usually grumble. So the point which the Doctor wants to make that the labourer will be very willing to work longer hours is not borne out by experience even if he is to get more wages. I need not take any further time of the House. I do feel, Sir, that the Government are not in a mood to accept this amendment at present, and I would, therefore, request them to make a note of it and to bring in an amending Bill at the earliest opportunity reducing the working hours to forty-eight.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** Sir, this provision is undoubtedly the most controversial one in the Bill, but it has already been so thoroughly discussed in the general discussion that there is very little that I can add to the arguments which have been already adduced. I would, however, remind the House of what the Royal Commission said on this subject and add that our position on these Benches is exactly that of the Leader of the Opposition. He expressed the view yesterday, with which I entirely agree, that we should not be justified in going any further than is recommended by the Royal Commission which explored

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

the subject most thoroughly and whose ability and capacity to come to a decision on the subject cannot be questioned. As I said, I should like to remind the House, as probably Members have not looked up the report of the Royal Commission for sometime past, of the reasons why the Commission was unable to accept anything below 54 hours. They point out :

“ The introduction of the lower limit would involve a change of hours in the great majority of the perennial factories and it would mean a very heavy reduction in the factories now working 60 hours. Many operatives would have to face large reductions in their earnings and, while we do not doubt that part of this loss would be made good before long, we are not convinced that the operatives as a whole are in a position to regain their old standard in any reasonably short period. From the point of view of industry, the employer is entitled to claim that, until the worker is ready to approximate more nearly to western standards of discipline, it is unreasonable to attempt an eight hour day, and even an eight and half hour day would involve an amount of dislocation that would be serious. It may be possible in the future, when efficiency has risen further, to go lower than 54 hours. But efficiency is not likely to be raised so surely by a sweeping reduction as by a smaller one, and there will be nothing to prevent a further reduction if the results of the smaller change which we advocate indicate that this is desirable. Finally, we believe that the 48 hours limit which some of our colleagues advocate could only be operative at present if great latitude was given in the matter of exemptions. In our view, the worker will be better protected by a limit which can only be relaxed in exceptional circumstances than by one to which many exceptions have to be attached.”

That, Sir, was the view held by seven of the eleven members of the Royal Commission, the dissentients being Mr. Cliff, Mr. Joshi and Diwan Chaman Lall, who wanted a 48-hour week and Sir Victor Sassoon who, at that time, was not prepared to go below sixty. The point which I wish to emphasise is that this Bill is only an instalment of progress. It is undoubtedly the biggest instalment which has been made since the Factories Act was passed, but it is only an instalment.

**Mr. H. P. Mody** (Bombay Millowners' Association : Indian Commerce) : I hope the next instalment will be long in coming.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : I am afraid I cannot altogether subscribe to my Honourable friend, Mr. Mody's view. There are many directions in which I should like to see more rapid advance made than he may wish. But my point is that, as I have said, the Bill is an instalment. Let us try the effect of the 54-hour week before we move in the direction of anything shorter. I do not think, Sir, that there is any further argument that I can adduce in opposition to my Honourable friend, the Deputy President's amendment. The matter was, as the House knows, discussed in the Select Committee, and, as in the case of the Royal Commission, there was a minority view. Government stand by their original proposal, and I have to oppose the amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That in clause 34 of the Bill, for the word ‘ fifty-four ’ the word ‘ forty-eight ’ and for the word ‘ sixty ’ the word ‘ fifty-four ’ be substituted.”

The motion was negatived.

Clause 34 was added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 35 stand part of the Bill.”

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That clause 35 of the Bill be omitted.”

Clause 35 runs thus :

“ No adult worker shall be allowed to work in a factory on a Sunday.....”

and then certain provisos follow. Sir, if it is intended to give some relief to the workers, I do not see why Sunday or any other day should be specially selected. As far as the Muslim workers are concerned, they would prefer to have a half-holiday on Fridays and in the whole month of *Ramzan*, and a few other holidays, such as the two *Id* days, so that the total may come up to 52 days, instead of giving them 52 holidays on the 52 Sundays of the year. Similarly, the Hindu workers would, I am sure, prefer a week's holiday during the *Dusserah*, four days during *Holi*, two days on the occasion of the *Diwali* and other holidays on religious festivals, and it should be arranged in a manner so that the total may come to 52 days in a year which would be equivalent to the 52 Sundays. So, instead of giving them 52 holidays on the 52 Sundays, it would be better appreciated if you give them holidays on religious festivals. And, I am sure that the holidays given on the occasion of festivals will be employed usefully and in social and religious work which will be appreciated by the family and the society, and these holidays will not be misused. As regards the holidays on Sundays, of course leaving out the morning hours when some workmen may go to church, if you take the opinion of the wives of the workmen in the west, probably they would in large majority be against giving them a holiday, because they employ their time in a manner which their wives seriously object to. So, if they are given holidays on days when they have no work and nothing to do in the way of recreation, I am afraid their time will be spent in a manner which, not only their wives would object to, but possibly the police may also object to, and this is a thing which may possibly develop. So it is really not a good thing to keep these workmen free without any work. Although I appreciate the idea of giving them some kind of relaxation, I do not like that they should be given relaxation in the manner provided in this clause, so that they may spend the time in the manner I have just described, which would be objectionable to two categories. So it would be much better if this relaxation were given on the occasion of religious festivals which certainly the workers would appreciate, society would appreciate, and the capitalists and employers of labour who follow some religion or other would not seriously object to. Therefore, I do not see any reason why this particular clause should be there.

The other objection which I have is that if they regularly take off one day in a week, then the amount of work per day will work up to about nine hours, and I think nine hours is not really a suitable limit for each day's work. Eight hours in a day has always been considered to be a good limit. There is an old slogan which I think still holds good, that a day is divided into 24 parts and one-third is reserved for sleep, one-third for recreation including time spent on meals, and one-third for work.

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

I think that is a good slogan and we ought to follow that. But if we accept this particular clause, this slogan will be violated, because he will have to work for 54 hours in six days, that is, about nine hours a day, which is really not very desirable. Therefore, I would very much like that this clause should be removed altogether and that some new clause may be added according to which holidays may be given on the days on which there are religious festivals and not on days when these workmen have nothing to do and might possibly utilise these holidays in a manner which may not be considered to be desirable by one class or the other whom I have mentioned.

Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Amendment moved :

“ That clause 35 of the Bill be omitted.”

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : Sir, I have seldom listened to more confused thinking aloud than has been given us in my Honourable friend's speech. His amendment is that clause 35 of the Bill should be omitted ; in other words, that all the workers in this country shall be deprived of their weekly holiday. I do not think that an amendment of that character is likely to commend itself to this House, if for no other reason,—and there are many and very important reasons,—than that we are bound by international obligations to the weekly holiday. We have ratified the Weekly Rest-Day Convention for Industrial Undertakings. My Honourable friend suggests that something should be substituted for the weekly holiday. There is no amendment to that effect before the House. He has not thought out the effect of his proposal and put it in a concrete form and we have to take this amendment at its face value and realise that, if we accept it, there will no longer be any weekly holiday. My Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin, suggests that Muhammadan employees should have their weekly holidays on Fridays and that Hindu employees should have their holidays on other days. He sees no reason why Sunday should be a general holiday. There is no reason why Sunday should be a general holiday, and, in point of fact, Sunday is not a general holiday ; there is nothing whatever to prevent employers of labour, under this provision, fixing any day of the week they like for the weekly holiday, any day that suits them or their employees. The reason why Sunday is mentioned here is that, it is the first day of the week and is, therefore, a convenient starting point ; but the weekly holiday can be arranged according to the circumstances of each factory. I trust that I have said sufficient to convince the House that there is really less to be said in favour of this amendment than of almost any other amendment that has so far been brought forward, and I trust the House will reject it.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 35 of the Bill be omitted.”

The motion was negatived.

Clause 35 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 36—42 were added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 43 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. G. Morgan** : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That in sub-clause (2) (b) of clause 43 of the Bill, after the figures ‘ 34 ’ the figures ‘ 35 ’ be inserted.”

This is an amendment to claim exemption under clause 35 for workers on preparatory or supplementary work. Preparatory and supplementary work is generally done before the factory is started or after the factory has closed ; and generally work in connection with transmission of power and water supply which may have to be done probably on every day of the week. We think, therefore, that the exemption from clause 35 also should be included amongst the exemptions which have been given in this clause. There are generally long intervals of rest between the periods during which they are employed and they may be required to work on a Sunday for a few hours. We think, therefore, that it should be within the power of a Local Government to grant exemption from clause 35 for preparatory and complementary work. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Amendment moved :

“ That in sub-clause (2) (b) of clause 43 of the Bill, after the figures ‘ 34 ’ the figures ‘ 35 ’ be inserted.”

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : Sir, I oppose the amendment. I trust that the House will by this time have discovered that I am opposing amendments equally whether they are put forward on behalf of labour or from representatives of capital. I oppose this amendment on general grounds. We are allowing exemptions from the weekly holiday of workers engaged on urgent repairs, the production of articles of prime necessity, seasonal or irregular processes and engine room work. The point is that in all these cases there is a common factor, which is, that, for widely varying reasons, continuity of work is essential. This factor is not necessarily present in the categories with which this amendment and the following amendment that Mr. Morgan has put forward deal. For the sake of convenience and, with your permission, Sir, I am dealing with the two amendments together. In many cases intermittent workers might come under the exemptions allowed for urgent repairs. I cannot see any reason why workers engaged on preparatory or intermittent work should not as a rule get their weekly holiday ; where there is exceptional press of work, clause 44 (2) would apply. Workers, who are engaged in complementary or preparatory work, have, I think, if anything, an even stronger claim to a weekly holiday than other workers as their hours on week days are normally longer. The same argument also applies to persons whose work is intermittent except in continuous process factories ; and, if they work in such factories, exemption from the weekly holiday can be granted under clause 43 (2) (d). For this reason, I oppose both this amendment and the following one. I can see no reason why these two classes of workers should be deprived of their weekly holiday.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The question is :

“ That in sub-clause (2) (b) of clause 43 of the Bill, after the figures ‘ 34 ’ the figures ‘ 35 ’ be inserted.”

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. G. Morgan** : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That in sub-clause (2) (c) of clause 43 of the Bill, after the figures ‘ 34 ’ the figures ‘ 35 ’ be inserted.”

This refers to intermittent workers and the clause explains what “ intermittent ” means. I think I am correct in saying that under the present Bill, section 30, exemption can be granted from the provisions of clause 22 of that Act,—and I do not see why any exception should be made in the Bill before the House ; though the Honourable Member has already replied, I move my amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That in sub-clause (2) (c) of clause 43 of the Bill, after the figures ‘ 34 ’ the figures ‘ 35 ’ be inserted.”

The motion was negatived.

Clause 43 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 44—48 were added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 49 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. G. Morgan** : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That for clause 49 of the Bill, the following be substituted :

‘ 49. The Local Government may, subject to the previous sanction of the Governor General in Council, make rules providing that in any specified class or classes of factories work shall not be carried on by a system of shifts save with the permission of the Local Government and subject to such conditions as it may impose either generally in such rules or in the case of any particular factory. Such shifts, if permitted, shall be so arranged that not more than one relay of workers is engaged in work of the same kind at the same time.’ ”

This, I may say, at the outset, is an amendment put forward by special constituents whom I represent here. The Bill is of general application, and, therefore, there is no other way by which they could put forward their views. Sir, with your permission, and, in order to save a long description of the reasons for this amendment, I will read out the views expressed by the Jute Mills Association desiring me to put forward this amendment. They say :

“ The Association finds it difficult to see how the position of the Factory Inspection Department will be greatly improved so far as the checking of registers and working hours is concerned so long as ‘ end-on ’ shifts are allowed. For unless machinery is stopped between shifts and the mill cleared, it will always be possible for a worker employed in the first shift to continue at work throughout the whole or part of the succeeding shift. ‘ End-on ’ shifts are of course necessary in certain industries where the process is continuous, but in the jute mill industry they are not, and if the control aimed at is to be effective, separate legislation in respect of jute mills is essential, and that is impossible under the present Act.”

Sir, the interests represented by this Association put forward this view ; they think it would strengthen the hands of the Local Government in preventing any abuse of the “ end-on ” shift system if this clause were amended as proposed by me. Sir, I have nothing to add to the views I have expressed, and I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Amendment moved :

“ That for clause 49 of the Bill, the following be substituted :

‘ 49. The Local Government may, subject to the previous sanction of the Governor General in Council, make rules providing that in any specified class or classes of factories work shall not be carried on by a system of shifts save with the permission of the Local Government and subject to such conditions as it may impose either generally in such rules or in the case of any particular factory. Such shifts, if permitted, shall be so arranged that not more than one relay of workers is engaged in work of the same kind at the same time ’.”

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : Sir, I oppose this amendment very strongly. It is not designed to control labour in factories, but to control production. The object aimed at in the amendment is, as I have said, to secure control of production, and to bring that about it is proposed to impose a restraint which I can only call absurd on the employment of labour in factories throughout India. We propose to control over-lapping shifts, while Mr. Morgan proposes to control all shifts and to prohibit over-lapping shifts altogether. It is a great pity that my friend, Mr. Mody, is not here. He would have explained that, as a part of the schemes for the rationalisation of the cotton industry in Bombay, it might be desirable to resort to over-lapping shifts which this amendment seeks to prohibit. Mr. Morgan may answer that what is good enough for the cotton industry may not be good enough for the jute industry and that special exemption should be made in favour of the jute industry. We might be prepared to accept that view if we could be convinced that this exemption was in the interests of the factory labour. But it is our considered view that it has nothing whatever to do with labour at all. It is merely designed to reduce over-production, and, for that reason, Sir, I am emphatically opposed to it.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That for clause 49 of the Bill, the following be substituted :

‘ 49. The Local Government may, subject to the previous sanction of the Governor General in Council, make rules providing that in any specified class or classes of factories work shall not be carried on by a system of shifts save with the permission of the Local Government and subject to such conditions as it may impose either generally in such rules or in the case of any particular factory. Such shifts, if permitted, shall be so arranged that not more than one relay of workers is engaged in work of the same kind at the same time ’.”

The motion was negatived.

Clause 49 was added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 50 stand part of the Bill.”

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That for clause 50 of the Bill, the following be substituted :

‘ It shall be the duty of the Manager to send every child worker, who has not completed the twelfth year, to a recognised school for at least three hours in a week ’.”

but it should be three hours in a day.

In the original clause, it is stated that no child who has not completed his twelfth year shall be allowed to work in any factory. This particular clause is practically taken from other countries where education

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

is compulsory. Boys up to the age of 12 in all civilized countries of the world attend schools, but in India we all know that education is not compulsory, and a very small proportion of the children actually attend schools. Besides that, Sir, our country is a very poor country, and very often every member of the family has to work in order to earn a living. We have seen that in country places, men, boys and girls, all work together in the fields to complete their daily work. We also know that at present wages are so meagre that every member of the family has to work to make both ends meet. Very often both father and mother go out for work, and if the child which is, say, between six and 12 is not allowed to work and there is no school which it can attend, what will it do the whole day? The child will really waste the time in a society which is anything but desirable. So when such children are employed, the managers of factories ought to be compelled to send the children to schools for at least three hours every day, so that they may get some education and be able to earn a better living. In the absence of facilities of schools, the boys will practically waste their time in the streets and spend it in a manner, as I said, which is anything but desirable. The original provision in the Bill might be very salutary in countries where every child has to attend a school up to the age of 12, but, in our country, where the Government unfortunately have not provided sufficient educational facilities for want of funds, it is very necessary that boys between the ages of six and 12 should be kept occupied, but they should be sent to school by the managers for at least three hours every day. We should not merely follow the conditions prevailing in the civilized countries in all respects; we should see our own conditions and judiciously apply them to this country. In this particular case, our conditions are different from those obtaining in other civilized countries where they have compulsory education. In those countries, every boy at the age of 12 is at school and he is not found in the streets as we see them here. In this country, the majority of the boys below 12 do not attend schools, but waste their time. Such a state of things is not good for society. Therefore, the managers should be compelled to send the children working in factories to schools for at least three hours a day, so that they may learn something, and they will also get into the habit of doing some work. If you allow a boy up to the age of 12 to do absolutely nothing, then he practically loses the habit of doing work, and, if at the age of 13, he is asked to do some work, he would refuse to do it, because in all the previous 12 years he had never done any serious work. Therefore, I suggest that the situation in India being very peculiar on account of the absence of educational facilities, and on account of the absence of compulsory education, we should not follow blindly the practice of the West. Therefore, we should impose a condition that if these boys are employed in factories, the managers should be compelled to send them to schools for three hours every day. With these words, I move my amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Amendment moved :

“ That for clause 50 of the Bill, the following be substituted :

‘ It shall be the duty of the Manager to send every child worker, who has not completed the twelfth year, to a recognised school for at least three hours in a week.’ ”

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** May I put in an amendment? "Three hours a week" must be changed into "three hours a day".

**Mr President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Very well.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** I support this amendment. It is very necessary in the interests of giving education, and a provision of this kind must be made. I recommend that the amendment be accepted.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** Sir, according to this amendment it is to be the duty of the manager to send every child worker, who has not completed his twelfth year, to a recognised school for at least three hours a week—that has been altered into three hours a day. The necessity for alteration is, if I may say so, evidence of the haste with which this amendment was formulated, and also of haste in other directions. The amendment refers to child workers who have not completed their 12th year. From the speech of my Honourable friend, I gathered that he thinks that children under 12 work in factories. If he had studied the Bill, he would find that no children under 12 can be employed in a factory.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Do you mean to say, not in one created under clause 5 of this Bill?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** Clause 5 deals with power to declare premises to be factories. "No child, who has not completed his twelfth year, shall be allowed to work in any factory"—that is the clause he is dealing with.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** I want to delete that and substitute the other.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** That makes it even worse. I did not realise that. I am sorry I misunderstood my Honourable friend. I apologise for doing so. I gather that his proposal is that children under 12 should be allowed to work in a factory. That is his proposal. If this clause is deleted, you can send children of the age of three or four to a factory, as unfortunately they did in England at the time of the Industrial Revolution. If the House accepts that position, well and good, but I know this House better than that. As I have said before, every Member of this House is a member for the protection of children, and I am quite certain that they will not agree. I strongly oppose this amendment, even more strongly than I did when I did not realise its full implications, and I am astonished that it should ever have been put forward.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

"That for clause 50 of the Bill, the following be substituted :

"It shall be the duty of the Manager to send every child worker, who has not completed the twelfth year, to a recognised school for at least three hours a day."

The motion was negatived.

Clause 50 was added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

"That clause 51 stand part of the Bill."

**Mr. G. Morgan :** Sir, I move :

“ That for clause 51 of the Bill, the following be substituted :

‘ 51. No child who has completed his twelfth year and no adolescent shall be allowed to work in any factory unless—

- (a) a certificate of fitness granted to him under section 52 is in the custody of the manager of the factory, and
- (b) he carries while he is at work a token giving a reference to such certificate ’.”

The clause, as it is in the Bill, only necessitates that while at work in the factory they should carry either the certificate itself or a token giving reference to it. We hold that it will be very much better to prevent children wandering from factory to factory and getting employment elsewhere, if the certificate remains in the custody of the manager of the factory and the child or adolescent carries a token with reference to the same. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Amendment moved :

“ That for clause 51 of the Bill, the following be substituted :

‘ 51. No child who has completed his twelfth year and no adolescent shall be allowed to work in any factory unless—

- (a) a certificate of fitness granted to him under section 52 is in the custody of the manager of the factory, and
- (b) he carries while he is at work a token giving a reference to such certificate ’.”

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** My Honourable friend will, I am sure, rejoice to hear that he has at last put forward an amendment which we are able to accept. There is no doubt that children never do carry their certificates of fitness with them when they are at work, and it is, therefore, rather absurd to retain a provision which recognises this alternative. I am, therefore, prepared to accept this and the next amendment.

4 P.M.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That for clause 51 of the Bill, the following be substituted :

‘ 51. No child who has completed his twelfth year and no adolescent shall be allowed to work in any factory unless—

- (a) a certificate of fitness granted to him under section 52 is in the custody of the manager of the factory, and
- (b) he carries while he is at work a token giving a reference to such certificate ’.”

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 51, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 51, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clause 52 was added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 53 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. G. Morgan** : I move :

“ That in sub-clause (1) of clause 53 of the Bill, for the words ‘ carries either the certificate itself or a token giving reference to it ’ the words ‘ carries a token giving reference to the certificate ’ be substituted.”

This is consequential on clause 51, as amended. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That in sub-clause (1) of clause 53 of the Bill, for the words ‘ carries either the certificate itself or a token giving reference to it ’ the words ‘ carries a token giving reference to the certificate ’ be substituted.”

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 53, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 53, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clauses 54 to 57 were added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 58 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. G. Morgan** : Sir, I move :

“ That at the end of clause 58 of the Bill, the words ‘ such certificate to be granted within a period to be specified in the rules ’ be added.”

The clause, as it stands in the Bill, does not provide for any date by which the certifying surgeon is to grant the certificate, and we feel that it is necessary to have some time limit with regard to the granting of the certificate. Therefore, the period should be specified in the rules within which such certificate should be granted. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty.) : Amendment moved :

“ That at the end of clause 58 of the Bill, the words ‘ such certificate to be granted within a period to be specified in the rules ’ be added.”

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : I am afraid I cannot accept this amendment. For one thing I think my Honourable friend has omitted to notice that the amendment assumes that a certificate will be granted. That assumption is entirely unfounded. There is no reason why a certificate should be granted in every case, and for that reason alone the amendment is unsuitable. But apart from that, I think the point which he has in mind is sufficiently covered by the rule making power given under clause 59 (c), which provides that the Local Government may make rules regulating the procedure of certifying surgeons under the Chapter. The Local Government could, under that rule, direct that no undue delay shall take place in the medical examination and the grant of a certificate under clause 58. It would be difficult, I think, to prescribe a time limit suitable to all cases, and a general provision of the type that my Honourable friend is

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

asking for does not seem either necessary or desirable. For these reasons I regret that I am unable to accept his amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The question is:

"That at the end of clause 58 of the Bill, the words 'such certificate to be granted within a period to be specified in the rules' be added."

The motion was negatived.

Clause 58 was added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The question is:

"That clause 59 stand part of the Bill."

**Mr. G. Morgan**: Sir, after what the Honourable Member has said in regard to clause 58, I do not think it is necessary for me to move my amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The question is:

"That clause 59 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 59 was added to the Bill.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad**: Sir, I beg to move.

"That after clause 59 of the Bill, the following new clause be inserted and the subsequent clauses be re-numbered accordingly:

'60. The medical fee for obtaining certificate shall be paid by the manager.'

Sir, this thing is not quite clear from the Bill as to who will pay the medical fee—whether it will be free or some fees will have to be paid; and I am afraid if such fees have to be paid by the labourers, then most of them will go without medical certificates and will not get employment. Sir, a good many of these labourers, when they come, are just on the point of starvation and do not have even a pice with them to pay for a fee for the medical officer. So, unless some provision is made for inspection being either free or at the expense of the Government or of the manager, most of these people will never get employment: and, instead of securing employment for those who are unemployed and who are really destitute, you will really be giving employment to people who are sufficiently rich to pay medical fees. I would request my Honourable friend, the Member in charge, to consider this point. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Amendment moved:

"That after clause 59 of the Bill, the following new clause be inserted and the subsequent clauses be re-numbered accordingly:

'60. The medical fee for obtaining certificate shall be paid by the manager.'

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce**: Sir, I think I can re-assure my friend on the subject-matter of this amendment. As far as we know, no medical fees are charged for this inspection at all. We have looked up the rules of three Provinces, Bombay, Bengal and the Central Provinces, and find that no fee is ordinarily levied for the medical examination of workers in general. I imagine the position is the same elsewhere, and, therefore, it does not seem necessary to include any explicit provision on the subject. For that reason, I oppose the amendment.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** This point is not specifically mentioned in this Bill, but we are expecting that it will be regulated by the rules of the Local Government ?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** All the rules we have been able to trace show that no medical fees are charged.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** In none of the Provinces ?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** I imagine the position is much the same elsewhere as it is in Bombay, Bengal and the Central Provinces. I have no reason to believe that medical fees are charged, though I cannot speak definitely except for these three Provinces.

**Mr. F. W. Hockenhull (Assam : European) :** No medical fees are charged for this purpose in Assam.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** I am obliged to the Honourable Member for the information, which goes to confirm my own conviction.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Will these doctors examine these labourers free, or somebody pays them the fees ? If so, who would pay the fees ?

**Mr. F. W. Hockenhull :** Such examination is part of the routine work of the doctor's business.

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi (Tirhut Division : Muhammadan) :** Sir, there must be some indication in the Bill itself as to who will pay the fee of the medical officer. It is easy to say that the rules in three Provinces provide like that, but the Honourable Member ought to provide for this specifically somewhere as they are giving powers to the Local Governments to make rules, so that on that head the Local Government may make rules with regard to the party that will pay if at all for the medical inspection of the labourer. There must be some indication somewhere in the Bill. This word of mouth won't do.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** Sir, I am glad to say that the point has now been verified by my Department, we know that nowhere in India are fees charged for this medical inspection, and, as far as I know, there is no intention of charging such fees. It is regarded as part of the duty of the certifying surgeon whose pay as a whole-time or part-time officer is met by the Government.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** What is the objection to making it express in some part of the Bill ? What is the objection to making this point clear ?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** The objection on the part of the Government is, that there is no specific amendment before us except this one that the medical fees for obtaining certificates should be paid by the manager. As there is no fee charged at present for a medical certificate, why throw a new burden on the manager ? There is no specific amendment here.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Who is going to pay such fees ?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** As I have already explained, this is regarded as part of the duties of the certifying surgeon who, whether as a whole-time or part-time officer, is paid by the Government, and there is no intention whatever of altering that practice, and, therefore, there does not seem to be any necessity for making any specific provision in this Bill.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : Take the case of a particular district, say Aligarh, and there is a factory there. Then the labourer will have to go to the Civil Surgeon or the Assistant Surgeon. Do I understand that it is the duty of the Civil Surgeon or any of his Assistants to give them certificates free of charge ?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : Yes, certainly.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : But this is not the case in practice.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : If the Honourable Member's information differs from mine, I shall be glad to have full particulars as to how it differs.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : The fact is, anyone who wants a medical certificate is charged a fee of, I believe, Rs. 16 in the case of the Civil Surgeon, except in the case of those persons who are already in the employ of Government. At least this is the practice in the smaller towns.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : Do I understand my Honourable friend to say that the United Provinces certifying surgeons charge a fee for this purpose ? Is that my Honourable friend's statement ?

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : That is my information.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : I shall be very glad to have that definitely verified from the United Provinces Government, and, if the facts are as stated, to consider the question further, but at the moment my own information is that no fees are levied anywhere, and, for that reason, it does not seem necessary to make any specific provision here.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : Then, with the assurance given that my Honourable friend will have further inquiries made, I beg to withdraw my motion.

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

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 60 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. E. W. Perry** (Government of India : Nominated Official) : Sir, I move :

“ That in sub-clause (a) (iii) of clause 60 of the Bill, the words and figure ‘ of sub-section (2) ’ be omitted.”

At present, there are no sub-clauses in clause 32 of the Bill, and the words and figure in question were not eliminated at an earlier stage of the consideration of the Bill by an oversight.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That in sub-clause (a) (iv) of clause 60 of the Bill, the words and figure ‘ of sub-section (2) ’ be omitted.”

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. E. W. Perry** : Sir, I move :

“ That in sub-clause (a) (iv) of clause 60 of the Bill, for the words and figures ‘ or under section 32 ’ the words, figures and letters ‘ or under clause (b) clause (c) or clause (g) of section 32 ’ be substituted.”

This amendment merely makes matters more precise, by omitting from this sub-clause reference to those clauses of section 32 which are

provided for elsewhere in clause 60 or are not clauses which should be made subject to penalties.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That in sub-clause (a) (iv) of clause 60 of the Bill, for the words and figures ‘ or under section 32 ’ the words, figures and letters ‘ or under clause (b), clause (c) or clause (g) of section 32 ’ be substituted.”

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. E. W. Perry** : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That for sub-clause (e) of clause 60 of the Bill, the following be substituted :

‘ (c) there is any contravention of any of the provisions of sections 39 to 41 inclusive or of any rule made under section 39, section 41 or section 47, or of any condition attached to any exemption granted under section 41 or to any modification or relaxation made under section 44, or ’.”

This amendment, together with the amendment which I will subsequently move, is designed to make this clause complete as regards all offences by managers or occupiers.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That for sub-clause (c) of clause 60 of the Bill, the following be substituted :

‘ (c) there is any contravention of any of the provisions of sections 39 to 41 inclusive or of any rule made under section 39, section 41 or section 47, or of any condition attached to any exemption granted under section 41 or to any modification or relaxation made under section 44, or ’.”

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. E. W. Perry** : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That in sub-clause (f) of clause 60 of the Bill, the words, figures and letter ‘ or under clause (d) of section 59 ’ be inserted at the end.”

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That in sub-clause (f) of clause 60 of the Bill, the words, figures and letter ‘ or under clause (d) of section 59 ’ be inserted at the end.”

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** : Sir, I move :

“ That in clause 60 of the Bill, for the words ‘ five hundred ’ the words ‘ two hundred ’ be substituted.”

I find that four amendments prior to this have fortunately been accepted, and I hope mine will also have the same fate. However, I submit that my amendment refers to a penalty clause that is provided in this Bill. Clause 60 refers to offences or acts which have been penalised, and it will be noticed that clause 60 refers to those offences which are first offences. That is to say, in clause 60, the punishment of Rs. 500 has been provided for a first offence under the Bill. My submission is—and I would request the House to consider it—whether for the very first offence the punishment should be to the extent of Rs. 500. I have referred to some clauses which go to show what offences are going to be punished. Amongst them there are such trivial offences as not keeping sufficient water in the factory for drinking, and I think the maximum fine of Rs. 500 is too much for such an offence.

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

[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 should say it is ridiculous. It might be said that it is in the hands of the Magistrate to give the minimum punishment, which might be a fine of one or two rupees. But, Sir, experience has shown that the maximum fixed is the standard from which they make the minimum and the middling course. It may be that the Courts will impose a very small fine in trivial cases but in a way the fear is there. And why should we leave that fear to remain and to leave the Court to its whims. It is just possible that a man might be punished very heavily for a trivial offence. I, therefore, submit that for the first offence the maximum should be reduced to Rs. 200.

Sir, I move.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury) :** Amendment moved :

“ That in clause 60 of the Bill, for the words ‘ five hundred ’ the words ‘ two hundred ’ be substituted.”

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** Sir, I am sorry that in spite of my Honourable friend's appeal, I am unable to accept this amendment. This maximum fine of Rs. 500 was introduced in 1922 and no cause has at any time been shown since then as to why it should be reduced. Unscrupulous employers often grow rich in various ways, such as employing children in out of the way ginning factories and I think it is desirable that, when those offences are discovered, the defaulter should be heavily dropped upon. I doubt if the experience of many Members in this House who have knowledge of the working of the factories is the same as that of Mr. Lalchand Navalrai. I am quite certain that Inspectors of Factories would be very glad if it were. The complaint which they always make is that the fines imposed are altogether too trivial and that instead of working from the top downwards, Magistrates are inclined to work from the bottom upwards and to impose fines of a few rupees for what are really serious offences. I see no reason why we should alter any of the penalty figures suggested in the Bill, all of which have the approval of the Select Committee. The arguments which I have adduced in the present instance apply to the similar amendments brought forward by my Honourable friend, Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury) :** The question is :

“ That in clause 60 of the Bill, for the words ‘ five hundred ’ the words ‘ two hundred ’ be substituted.”

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury) :** The question is :

“ That clause 60, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 60, as amended, was added to the Bill.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury) :** The question is :

“ That clause 61 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** Sir, the fate seems to be against my amendments, and I, therefore, do not want to move my amendments.

Clauses 61 to 65 were added to the Bill.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury) :** The question is :

“ That clause 66 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. G. Morgan :** Sir, I do not wish to move amendment No. 41, but I move amendment No. 42 which runs as follows :

“ That to clause 66 of the Bill, the following *Exception* be added :

‘ *Exception.*—This provision does not extend to the use, in accordance with such precautions as may be prescribed, of a naked light in the course of a manufacturing process.’ ”

It is now known that naked lights are used for some particular processes of manufacture and the clause in the Bill would prevent those lights being used. I hope Government will see their way to accept my amendment which lays down that in accordance with such precautions, as may be prescribed, naked lights can be used in the process of manufacture.

Sir, I move.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury) :** Amendment moved :

“ That to clause 66 of the Bill, the following *Exception* be added :

‘ *Exception.*—This provision does not extend to the use, in accordance with such precautions as may be prescribed, of a naked light in the course of a manufacturing process.’ ”

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** Sir, I am quite ready to accept this amendment. We have ourselves made inquiries on the point and we have found that naked lights are used in singeing jute and that this is in practice which is free from danger. Mr. Morgan, as the House will see, has drafted his amendment in such a form that precautions may be prescribed for the use of naked lights, and that removes all our objections. I am prepared to accept the amendment.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury) :** The question is :

“ That to clause 66 of the Bill, the following *Exception* be added :

‘ *Exception.*—This provision does not extend to the use, in accordance with such precautions as may be prescribed, of a naked light in the course of a manufacturing process.’ ”

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury) :** The question is :

“ That clause 66, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 66, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Clauses 67 to 69 were added to the Bill.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury) :** The question is :

“ That clause 70 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. E. W. Perry :** Sir, I beg to move :

“ That clause 70 of the Bill be omitted and that all amendments consequential on the omission including the re-numbering of clauses and the correction of references be made accordingly.”

Sir, clause 70 of the Bill provides a sweeping up clause as regards offences by managers and occupiers. Clause 60, by reason of the amendments made in it, has become complete as regards those offences. Clause 70 also provides that any workman, who contravenes any of the provisions of the Bill, is liable to punishment. This Department, after examining the question very carefully, is of opinion that clause 72 provides adequately for all ordinary offences by workmen which are not covered by such special clauses as clause 66 which provides penalties for using naked lights. Clause 70 also provides for breaches of the Act by third parties. Important breaches of the Act which might be committed by third parties are also provided for in other clauses. Therefore, for two reasons, it is now considered by the Department that this clause is better omitted. The first reason is that all the necessary provisions are made by other clauses and the second consideration is that a number of acts and omissions which should not be made penal, such as the failure by the Judge to appoint assessors under clause 31 (2), are made penal by this clause. After a very exhaustive examination by this Department and the Legislative Department, Government have come to the conclusion that this clause should be omitted. Sir, I move.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury) :** The question is :

“ That clause 70 of the Bill be omitted and that all amendments consequential on the omission including the re-numbering of clauses and the correction of references be made accordingly.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 71 was added to the Bill.

Clause 72 was added to the Bill.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury) :** The question is :

“ That clause 73 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. E. W. Perry :** Sir, I beg to move :

“ That clause 73 of the Bill be omitted and that all amendments consequential on the omission including the re-numbering of clauses and the correction of references be made accordingly.”

Sir, clause 73 of the Bill repeats section 45 of the existing Act. This clause seems to have escaped criticism in the Select Committee and also

when the draft Bill was circulated for opinion. But soon after the report of the Select Committee was published, the Honourable Member from the Bombay Millowners' Association pointed out the objectionable characteristics of this provision. We then had it carefully examined and we find that it has very little to commend it. The repetition of offences is provided for by section 71 of the Indian Penal Code and the best course in a matter of this nature is to allow the general law of the land to apply to the special Act. Apart from that, this clause is very difficult to interpret, and, as far as we know, has never been called into use in any proceedings of any Court. I, therefore, move the omission of this clause.

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

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 73 of the Bill be omitted and that all amendments consequential on the omission including the re-numbering of clauses and the correction of references be made accordingly.”

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 74 and 75 were added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 76 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That in sub-clause (1) of clause 76 of the Bill, before the word ‘ Inspector ’ the word ‘ Chief ’ be inserted.”

Sir, I find clause 76 reads thus :

“ No prosecution under this Act, except a prosecution under section 66, shall be instituted except by or with the previous sanction of the Inspector.”

Sir, my object in moving this amendment is that there ought to be some safeguard against prosecutions specially when the offence is detected by the Inspector himself. It would mean that the person who detects an offence also goes to Court and brings the accused before the Court without any other safeguard. In this Act, it has been provided that wherever there is an Inspector who finds that any offence has been committed of a certain nature, there he has to give notice to the factory owner or occupier with regard to that offence. Then the factory owner or the occupier has got the right of going to an appellate Court to have that order set aside. In some offences, where the Inspector has not got to give notice in writing, no appeal lies. I, therefore, submit that why should it not in all cases be that there should be a safeguard with regard to the doings of Inspectors, and, specially when the Bill provides for a Chief Inspector, why should it not be that he should get the sanction of the Chief Inspector to drag the man to Court. In that case, no delay will happen and the papers could be laid before the Chief Inspector who could go into the matter and give sanction to go to Court if necessary. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Amendment moved :

“ That in sub-clause (1) of clause 76 of the Bill, before the word ‘ Inspector ’ the word ‘ Chief ’ be inserted.”

L179LAD

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : Sir, I regret I must oppose this amendment. In permitting Inspectors to sanction the institution of proceedings, we are merely following the present Act. If we were to transfer that duty to the Chief Inspectors, it would throw an intolerable burden of work upon them and the result would undoubtedly be congestion and delay. My Honourable friend talked about safeguards. Surely the safeguard is, in reality, the Magistrate before whom the case is brought. If it should be discovered—I know of no cases in which it has been discovered—that Inspectors are instituting vexatious prosecutions, that fact would undoubtedly come to the notice of the Chief Inspector. All the reports of cases in which prosecutions are instituted are brought to the notice of the Chief Inspector, and if we were to find that an Inspector brought forward a number of cases which proved unsuccessful, he would doubtless take suitable action and bring the matter to the notice of the Local Government, so that any disciplinary action necessary could be taken. I do not think there is any sufficient reason for altering the present procedure, and I must, therefore, oppose the amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That in sub-clause (1) of clause 76 of the Bill, before the word ‘ Inspector ’ the word ‘ Chief ’ be inserted.”

The motion was negatived.

Clause 76 was added to the Bill.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That clause 77 stand part of the Bill.”

**Mr. Lalohand Navakrai** : Sir, I move :

“ That in clause 77 of the Bill, for the word ‘ six ’ the word ‘ three ’ be substituted.”

Clause 77 refers to the time within which a prosecution under this Bill can be instituted, and a period of six months has been provided within which the Inspector can file a prosecution. It appears to me that so much time is not needed for offences under the Factories Act. There is no reason why the matter should hang on for six months. I have put in three months, and I hope the amendment will be accepted. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Amendment moved :

“ That in clause 77 of the Bill, for the word ‘ six ’ the word ‘ three ’ be substituted.”

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : Sir, I am afraid I must also oppose this amendment. This six months' limitation was provided by the Act of 1911 in section 49. It has, therefore, been in force for over twenty years, and there does not seem any good reason for reducing it. My Honourable friend says he sees no reason why matters of this kind should hang on for six months, but the point is that the factory staff, as the House is aware, is not very strong, and that it takes them a good deal of time to get round and inspect all the factories in their charge. It is for that reason that a six months' limit is necessary and my Honourable friend's complaint is the first that has ever been voiced against that limit. In these circumstances, there is no justification for a change.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That in clause 77 of the Bill, for the word ‘ six ’ the word ‘ three ’ be substituted.”

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That the proviso to clause 77 of the Bill be omitted.”

This proviso is a new one altogether, and I do not think the Honourable Member would be in a position to say here that the former Factories Act provides a certain thing and, therefore, it should be maintained. There is no reason that because the former Act provides for a certain matter, therefore we should stick to it. It may be that the Factories Act at present needs certain improvements, and we must make those improvements. With regard to this amendment, I may say that it is a new proviso altogether and it reads thus :

“ Provided that when the offence consists of disobeying a written order made by an Inspector complaint thereof may be made within twelve months of the date on which the offence is alleged to have been committed.”

I cannot understand any logic in this that if it is a written order, the matter should hang on for 12 months, otherwise it will be six months. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Amendment moved :

“ That the proviso to clause 77 of the Bill be omitted.”

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : Sir, my Honourable friend is perfectly correct in stating that this is a new provision. It was suggested by the Chief Inspectors of Factories and was inserted in the Bill by the Select Committee for reasons which appeared satisfactory to them, and will, I trust, also prove satisfactory to this House. The point is that there are certain remote factories which are inspected and indeed can only be inspected not more than once a year. As I have said, the provincial factories staff is small and it takes a good deal of time to get round all the factories to be inspected. The Inspector goes to a certain factory, he finds that something has to be done, he gives an order in writing that it should be done, he gets a report that it has been carried out, but when he goes there again, which may be several months later, he finds that the statement that his orders had been carried out is not correct and that the offence continues.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** : He must be an idle Inspector who goes there only after 12 months.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : I would invite my Honourable friend to read the reports of the Factory Inspectors. He would know a little more of what their duties are and not make statements of that kind. I submit to the House that when definite orders are given and those orders are not carried out, it is equitable that the complaint should be instituted when it is found that the orders have not been obeyed, that is, when the Inspector next visits the factory. I cannot see any injustice to the factory owner in that. It is obviously desirable that some period

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

of limitation should be fixed, and with the approval of the Select Committee, it was fixed at twelve months. I oppose the amendment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That the proviso to clause 77 of the Bill be omitted.”

The motion was negatived.

Clause 77 was added to the Bill.

Clauses 78 to 84 were added to the Bill.

The Schedule was added to the Bill.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : Sir, I move :

“ That the Bill, as amended, be passed.”

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Motion moved :

“ That the Bill, as amended, be passed.”

**Mr. B. Das** (Orissa Division : Non-Muhammadian) : Sir, I have refrained so long from taking part in the debate on this Bill, as I thought that it is a salutary measure and it has given some *stronghold* to the workers all over India. Sir, something has been attempted and something done, and I can say that my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, deserves the congratulations that he received from both sides,—from the workers' representatives and from the representatives of the Employers' Federation, my Honourable friend, Mr. Mody. Mr. Mody particularly paid a compliment to Sir Frank Noyce that he was an admirable Chairman or rather he balanced well both sides, the employers and the workers, and that he anthropometrically analysed Mr. Mody's constitution. He perhaps found that the employers have become a little rickety and the workers have become a little stout. However, if the Honourable Member for Industries and Labour maintains that impartial attitude and tries to give the workers their just dues, much will be done to ameliorate the condition of the workers.

Sir, I was a little pained to hear the speech of my friend, the Deputy President, Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury. I know that he is working singlehanded and has no helpmate in this House due to the unfortunate absence of Mr. Joshi owing to the illness of his daughter which we all deplore. Yet Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury, in spite of his great love for the workers, ought to realise that a landmark has been reached in the matter of legislation on behalf of the workers; My friend, Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury, ought to realise also that this legislation is placing a certain amount of handicap on the employers. Each piece of beneficent social legislation places handicaps whereby the employers will have to spend more money. Although, when this Bill was introduced and was under the consideration stage, I made certain observations, after the speech of my friend, Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury, that the

time has come when the workers in India must think that they must get an economic wage, they must not follow the Third International ideals of Russia and demand standard wages which, in the present economic conditions of India, the industries cannot pay. This is a subject which requires very careful attention both from the employers and from the workers. I am equally a good friend of the workers and of the employers ; and the recent strike in Bombay demonstrates—although I know it was not inspired or started by sober labour leaders like Mr. N. M. Joshi or our Deputy President, but by a batch of men who rather want to keep up strikes, not so much for the benefit of the workers, but to keep up their leadership and their flag flying with their undigested ideas of third internationals and other socialist ideals which our present labour leaders in India have not themselves digested. That is a phase which I advise labour leaders in India to cogitate upon. It is for them to meet—whether it is Mr. Giri of the Railway Labour Federation or whether it is the Trade Union of workers in mills and factories—they have to see whether their demand of standard wages is not something ephemeral and ethereal. Have not the prices gone down ? Has not the ordinary man, the middle class man, been putting up with wages which are 30 to 40 per cent. below the standard of income which he was getting three or four years ago ? Today, if the Indian workers go on demanding increments in wages—I have not seen one single labour leader in India who says that the economic depression and the low prices prevalent all over India require that the wages should be reduced—I hope sanity will be restored amongst the labour leaders all over India and that they will think of all these things.

I will also offer one word of advice to the employers, particularly to Mr. Mody, the President of the All-India Employers' Federation, who is present here. The employers and workers must work harmoniously. It is no use my friend, Mr. Mody, saying "I have graciously condescended and agreed to a 54-hour week". Unfortunately world ideals, socialist ideals and ideals from Moscow are wireless and broadcast, and so the labour leaders in India, though they may not digest them fully, get hold of these ideals and demand a 48-hour week in India. Whether the time is ripe in India to have a 48-hour week, I am not at present in a position to give an opinion. But I think the time has come when the employers in India, however big and however aristocratic they might be.—they are Indians mostly and I even appeal to my friend, Mr. George Morgan, and other capitalist employers sitting in those Benches,—should understand and appreciate the workers' difficulties and the workers' conditions and they should have harmonious and human relations with the workers. If that is done, there would be no strikes ; there would be no bad blood between the workers and the employers.

I am grateful, and the House is grateful to Mr. Mody for referring to one aspect of the issue in his note of dissent, which he also mentioned in his speech. It is the advantageous position in which Indian States are placed owing to the incompetence and ineptitude of the Government of India. Today, the Government of India, as they stand, cannot apply and enforce humanising legislation on the Indian States. Yet I have seen representatives of Indian States and Indian princes visiting Geneva as representatives of India. I cannot understand how they are

[Mr. B. Das.]

allowed to grace those International Conferences, whether it is the League of Nations or the I. L. O., when they do not submit and subscribe to the Conventions, and when they do not ratify these Conventions. If they are within the British Empire—I am not here discussing questions of paramountcy, I am glad my Honourable friend, Mr. Metcalfe, is here, I am not talking of sovereignty or paramountcy—these two things I have talked about often and I will get ample opportunity to talk later—but if they are in the British Empire, they are part of the British Empire, and they must ratify these Conventions which the British Government and the Government of India ratify ; and, however much these princes may bluff and blubber outside, they are still subordinate to the Government of India ; and if the Government of India do ratify these labour Conventions, I want to know what justification there is why the Government of India are so incompetent that they cannot enforce on these princes to adopt these Conventions in their States. There is forced labour prevalent in almost every State. The Honourable Mr. Glancy admitted that there exists forced labour in the Indian States. How can over-worked capitalists like my friend, Mr. Mody, with all this legislation and Factory Inspectors, and the Honourable Member for Industries and Labour keeping an eye on behalf of the workers, how can he compete with industries that are started in these Indian States and may be worked by forced labour, and this Government has no means today to abolish forced labour in the Indian States ? This Government has no means to compel these Indian States that they must adopt a 54-hour week. There are other things too. There is no income-tax in many of these States. In India, the employers pay so much income-tax—if the British Indian employer had not to pay income-tax and super-tax to the Honourable the Finance Member, then he would have been able to pay one or two annas more a day to the workers.

**An Honourable Member :** Question.

**Mr. B. Das :** He might spend more money to start social welfare work and to start creches for the children of the women workers that work in mills and factories for which Dr. Dalal gave us such a delightful speech and advice which I do not think the present Government of India will ever accept. But we have noted it down in our minds, and when the time comes and when we get that opportunity, we will see that some of those beneficial measures are carried through. But, Sir, the Government of India stand pilloried. The Honourable Member for Industries and Labour was silent in his reply to the particular charge which Mr. Mody levied in his note and also in his speech, but if Government sleep over it today, they will have to face it tomorrow ; the problem will certainly have to be faced. Whether there is going to be a Federation or no Federation, the present Government of India or their successor will have to face that problem, and they will have to face that problem, not only for the sake of humanity to keep one uniform standard in the so-called Indian Empire of His Majesty the King-Emperor, but to maintain an equal standard of working conditions for all working classes, both in British India and in Indian India. It is no use penalising the working classes in these Indian States, and if they are penalised, it is the Government of India and the British Government, under the dictates of high political issues, who are parties to penalising

the working classes in the Indian States, and the indirect consequence of it is that the employers in India are penalised ; they are working at a certain disadvantage. Sir, I do hope that my friend, the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce, will be able to say something as to what steps the Government of India have taken in the matter, whether they are in touch with the administration of these Indian States, and whether they are trying to make the Indian States, the princelings and princes conform to the conditions obtaining in British India, whether the Government of India will make them accept all those labour legislations that exist here, particularly all those Conventions that the Government of India have ratified and to which the I. L. O. is a party.

---

#### STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The Honourable the Leader of the House will make a statement with regard to the list of business for tomorrow.

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré** (Leader of the House) : Sir, I ask your permission to make a statement with reference to the List of Business for tomorrow which is already in Honourable Members' hands. The order in which legislative business is shown in that list proceeded on the assumption that the business entered on the original list for the 16th, 17th and 18th July would be disposed of before the House rose today. That assumption has not been realised ; and, therefore, Government desire to dispose of the business entered on the original list for the 16th, 17th and 18th before embarking on the new business entered in the list for tomorrow. A revised List of Business will be issued accordingly.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 19th July, 1934.

---