

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

MONDAY, 18th FEBRUARY, 1929

OFFICIAL REPORT



CONTENTS.

Questions and Answers.

Statement laid on the Table.

Election of the Standing Finance Committee.

Presentation of the Railway Budget for 1929-30.

DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1929

CONTENTS—*contd.*

PAGES.

Monday, 11th February, 1929—*contd.*

The Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill—Passed	665-70
The Indian Patents and Designs (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	671
The Trade Disputes Bill—Referred to Select Committee	671-702
Election of Members to the Standing Advisory Committee for the Department of Education, Health and Lands and the Standing Finance Committee	702
Amendment of Standing Orders	703

Tuesday, 12th February, 1929—

Questions and Answers	705-08
The Hindu Law of Inheritance (Amendment) Bill—Amendments made by the Council of State agreed to...	708-38
The Inland Steam Vessels (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	738-52

Wednesday, 13th February, 1929—

Questions and Answers	753-56
Short Notice Question and Answer	756-60
Amendments of Standing Orders	760-806

Friday, 15th February, 1929—

Questions and Answers	807-12
Unstarred Questions and Answers	813-14
Statement of Business	815
Resolution <i>re</i> Compulsory Physical Training, etc., for Indian Boys—Adopted, as amended	815-32
Resolution <i>re</i> Circumstances of Lala Lajpat Rai's death—Adopted, as amended	832-74

Monday, 18th February, 1929—

Questions and Answers	807-12
Unstarred Questions and Answers	888-58
Election of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, and the Panel for the Central Advisory Council for Railways	896
Demands for Excess Grants for 1926-27	896-904
Demands for Supplementary Grants	905-15

Tuesday, 19th February, 1929—

Questions and Answers	917-68
Statement laid on the Table	968-69
Election of the Standing Finance Committee	969
Presentation of the Railway Budget for 1929-30	970-80

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 18th February, 1929.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

SAFEGUARDING OF THE INTERESTS OF INDIANS IN KISMAYU, ITALIAN SOMALILAND.

553. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that in July, 1925, the British Government handed over the territory of Kismayu to the Italian Government, and the Indian residents were assured that their interests had been duly safeguarded? Why was this transfer made?

(b) Is it a fact that on the 1st January, 1926, Captain R. Dick was appointed British Consul at Kismayu, but towards the end of September, 1927, the said Consulate was closed for want of funds?

(c) Are Government aware that there are about 208 British Indian subjects, most of whom had been domiciled in the territory since the advent of the British Government there, and they possess large buildings, stone houses, and are engaged in extensive trade?

(d) Are Government aware that a large number of the Indian residents of Kismayu (Somalia Italiana) sent a representation dated 3rd July, 1927, to His Britannic Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, London, protesting against the closure of the Consulate as detrimental to their interests?

(e) Are Government aware that a large number of Indian residents of Kismayu have also represented their grievances to the Indian Association of Mombasa, regarding the closure of the Consulate there?

(f) Will Government kindly explain how the interests of the Indian residents in Kismayu are safeguarded; and what steps have been taken to revive the Consulate in that territory?

Sir Denys Bray: The facts are generally as stated. British subjects in Jubaland (which was transferred to Italy by His Majesty's Government as part of a general settlement between the two countries) are always able, if they need assistance, to appeal to the Kenya authorities. The Consulate was closed as the expenditure involved was not justified by the amount of work, and there is no present intention of re-opening it; but though Captain Dick is no longer Consul, his assistance and advice are still available.

TREATMENT BY THE ITALIAN AUTHORITIES OF MOHAMEDALI EBRAHIMJI ADAMJI BOHORA, A MERCHANT OF KISMAYU, ITALIAN SOMALILAND.

554. *Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: (a) Are Government aware that the following cable, dated 16th February, 1928, was sent by the Indian Association of Mombassa (Kenya Colony), to H. E. the Viceroy, to Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and to myself:

"British subject Mohamedali Ebrahimji Adamji Bohora, merchant of 50 years' standing in Kismayu, a place handed over by the British Government to Italy in 1925, had on the 15th January last, occasion to visit Collectorate on business, and passing Government House, distance 50 yards, not seeing Governor or Secretary in garden did not salute. Governor observing this, sent Secretary take name, who complied orders, and dismissed Mohamedali. Next day Commissioner sent for Mohamedali, asked why he had not saluted the Governor. Mohamedali replied he neither had seen nor noticed Governor, and that, had he seen the Governor, he certainly would have saluted him in desired Roman style, as salute would not have cost him anything. Governor returned headquarters, and his orders directing deportation of Mohamedali were verbally communicated to deportee who accordingly left the Colony on 19th instant and arrived here. He has a large family and considerable property in Kismayu. Regrettable British Consulate closed in September last for want of funds. The ex-British Consul certifies character Mohamedali exemplary, and facts stated by him true. Same day for similar imaginary offences Ali, Motor Lorry Driver imprisoned one month. Tahirali, passenger, imprisoned 10 days. Abduali owner fined Liras 1,000. Use Lorry stopped one month. Indians in Kismayu terrified. Governor Kenya given full particulars"?

(b) Are Government aware that the said Mohamedali Ebrahimji submitted a petition to H. E. Sir Edward Grigg in February, 1928, which was supported by his affidavit, dated Mombassa, 20th February, 1928?

(c) Are Government aware that Captain R. Dick, the late British Consul of Kismayu, Somalia Italiana, also substantially supported the incident in his letter to the Honourable Colonial Secretary, Nairobi, Kenya Colony?

(d) Have Government made any enquiry, or do they propose to make one and place the facts before the House?

Sir Denys Bray: Yes, Sir, and on receipt of the telegram the Government of India addressed His Majesty's Government, as a result of whose representations the expulsion order against Mohamedali Ebrahimji Adamji has been revoked.

INDIAN EXPORT TRADE TO MAURITIUS.

555. *Mr. Ghanshyam Das Birla: 1. Are Government aware:

- (a) that the population of the colony of Mauritius is mostly Indian and is almost entirely dependent for its food-stuff supplies on India and Burma?
- (b) that in 1927-28 India's exports to Mauritius were valued at Rs. 190 lakhs while her imports were valued at Rs. 57 thousand?
- (c) that the currency of Mauritius consists of Government of Mauritius notes and silver rupees coined in India?
- (d) that there is at present an embargo on the export of silver coin from the Colony and its Government provides no facilities for exchange, though it has done so on occasions?
- (e) that the Banks in India are generally reluctant to buy bills on Mauritius in the absence of facilities for getting their funds back?

(f) that the Sugar Syndicate of Mauritius form the biggest exporters in the Colony and it is almost impossible for any merchant there to import any commodity from anywhere unless the Syndicate is prepared to arrange for him credits in the country from which the imports are to be made?

(g) that those engaged in the Indian export trade to Mauritius have, as a result of all this, to experience considerable difficulty in arranging finance?

2. If the answers are in the affirmative, are Government prepared to consider the desirability of taking such action as may be necessary for the relief of the Indian merchants?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Part 1.—From the particulars which they have been able to collect, for the purpose of replying to the Honourable Member's question, the Government of India have reason to believe that the facts of the situation are substantially as described by the Honourable Member. But they have received no representation on the subject and they have no precise information as to the alleged difficulties of the Indian merchants.

Part 2.—The Honourable Member will appreciate that the matter is not one within the direct control of the Government of India, and I do not know what possible course of action the Honourable Member has in mind. If he has any concrete suggestions to offer, I shall be glad to discuss them with him outside the House.

NON-MILITARY RIFLE PRACTICE CLUBS IN INDIA.

556. ***Dr. B. S. Moonje:** With reference to the reply given by the Honourable Mr. J. Crerar to my question No. 350, will the Government be pleased to collect information from the Provincial Governments on the details as asked for in the question and place it on the table of the Assembly?

The Honourable Mr. J. Crerar: The information is being collected.

FORMATION OF AIRCRAFT SECTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE AUXILIARY FORCE AND INDIAN TERRITORIAL FORCE.

557. ***Dr. B. S. Moonje:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the notes on "Auxiliary Force and Flying" in the *Pioneer* of 4th February, 1929?

(b) If so, is it a fact that if an "Aircraft Section be started in connection with the Auxiliary Force", it will undoubtedly lead to economy in internal security arrangements and form the nucleus of an efficient reserve"?

(c) Do Government propose to start such an Aircraft Section, and if so, when?

(d) Do Government propose to take the similar claims of the Territorial Force also into consideration?

Mr. G. M. Young: (a) Yes.

(b) The question is hypothetical, but I do not think that there is any reason to anticipate any economy in internal security arrangements from such a proposal.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) Does not arise.

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN THE PROVINCE OF DELHI MAINTAINED BY
THE ARYA SAMAJ.

558. ***Mr. Mukhtar Singh:** Are Government aware that the Arya Samaj in the Province of Delhi maintains the following educational institutions in the Province:

- (a) Gurukula Indraprastha, Tughlaqabad.
- (b) D. A. V. High School, Daryaganj, Delhi City.
- (c) D. N. High School, Patodi House, Delhi City (with its branches).
- (d) Arya Orphanage, Patodi House, Delhi City.
- (e) Arya Kanya Pathshala, Chaori Bazar, Delhi.
- (f) Rajput Kanya Pathshala, Sadar Nala, Delhi City.
- (g) Birla Arya Pathshala, Sabzimandi, Delhi.
- (h) Schools for the depressed classes in the City and the Province?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Yes, Sir.

NUMBER OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS MAINTAINED BY BODIES REPRESENTED ON THE DELHI UNIVERSITY.

559. ***Mr. Mukhtar Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the names of the bodies which have representation on the Delhi University?

(b) Will Government be further pleased to state the number of educational institutions maintained by the aforesaid bodies in the Delhi Province?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) and (b). A statement giving the information required is laid on the table.

Statement placed on the table in reply to Mr. Mukhtar Singh's question regarding the Delhi University.

- (a) 1. The Municipal Committee, Delhi.
2. The Bar Association, Delhi.
3. The Committees of Management of Juma Masjid and Fatehpuri Mosque, Delhi, jointly.
4. The Khalsa Diwan, Delhi.
5. The Shri Indraprastha Sanatan Dharam Mandal, Delhi.
- (b) 1. The Municipal Committee, Delhi—4 Middle and 38 Primary Schools.
2. The Bar Association, Delhi—Nil.
3. The Committee of Management of Fatehpuri Mosque, Delhi—1 Oriental Institution.
4. The Khalsa Diwan, Delhi—3 Primary Schools.
5. The Shri Indraprastha Sanatan Dharam Mandal, Delhi, maintains 1 High School, 1 Orphanage and several Pathshalas and is also connected with the management of the Hindu College, Delhi.

REPRESENTATION OF THE ARYA SAMAJ ON THE DELHI UNIVERSITY.

560. ***Mr. Mukhtar Singh:** Is it a fact that the Delhi University Court unanimously recommended that the Arya Samaj be represented on the Delhi University? If the answer be in the affirmative, will the Government be pleased to place a copy of the said resolution on the table?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: With your permission, Sir, I shall deal with Questions 560 and 561 together. The Court of the Delhi University recommended that of the seven bodies which had been given representation by His Excellency the Chancellor in 1923, five should continue to have representation and for the remaining two, the Arya Samaj, Delhi, and the Delhi Medical Association should be substituted. As no change had taken place since 1923 in the educational status and importance of the two bodies whose replacement was proposed by the Court, His Excellency the Chancellor decided to give his approval to the recommendations in favour of continuing the representation of the five other bodies, and to take no action in regard to the new nominations. It seemed invidious to the other two bodies, which had enjoyed representation since 1923, to approve of their replacement by others without adequate reason. This decision did not, of course, imply any disparagement of the educational importance of the new institutions (of which one was the Arya Samaj), whose representation was recommended. A communication has been received from the Arya Samaj, Delhi, on the subject and is now under consideration.

REPRESENTATION OF THE ARYA SAMAJ IN THE DELHI UNIVERSITY.

†561. ***Mr. Mukhtar Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that in spite of the unanimous resolution of the Court of the Delhi University and the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor, the Government did not allow the Arya Samaj to have the representation? If the answer be in the affirmative, will the Government be pleased to state their reasons for withholding their sanction in this behalf?

(b) Is it a fact that great dissatisfaction prevails on account of this decision of the Government?

(c) Has any representation in this behalf been received by the Government from the All-India Aryan League? If the answer be in the affirmative, will the Government be pleased to state what they have done in the matter?

EMPLOYMENT OF MUHAMMADANS ONLY IN THE POST OF SUPERINTENDENT OF POST OFFICES, BHAGALPUR DIVISION.

562. ***Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha:** (a) Will Government state whether the charge of the Superintendent of Post Offices, Bhagalpur Division, was held from the 10th January, 1916, as follows:

1. Mr. S. M. Mansoor—10th January, 1916 to 18th May, 1919.
2. Mr. Abdul Rahim—19th May, 1919 to 5th August, 1919.
3. Mr. S. A. Haq—14th October, 1919 to 19th December, 1921.
4. Mr. S. A. Majid—21st December to 21st May, 1923, and 17th July, 1923 to May, 1927.

(b) If so, does it follow that the charge was held uninterruptedly by Muhammadan Superintendents for a period of about 11½ years, but for short gaps of 2 months in 1919 and about 1½ months in 1923?

(c) Are Government aware that Mr. J. J. Newton, the then Superintendent of Post Offices, Cachar Division, was transferred from Silchar to Bhagalpur in September, 1919 and again from Bhagalpur to Patna in October, 1919?

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 560.

(d) What necessitated the transfer of the officer from Bhagalpur to Patna after so brief a stay at Bhagalpur? Is it a fact that the transfer was ordered to accommodate Mr. S. A. Haq the then Superintendent of Post Offices, Gya Division?

Mr. H. A. Sams: (a) and (b). The facts, as stated by the Honourable Member, and the inference which he draws from them, are approximately correct.

(c) Yes.

(d) At this distant date it is impossible to state the reason definitely, but it seems that the transfer was made at Mr. Newton's own request.

**EMPLOYMENT IN THE BHAGALPUR DISTRICT OF MUHAMMAD RAFIQ KHAN,
A MUHAMMADAN INSPECTOR OF POST OFFICES.**

563. ***Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha:** Will Government state the total period of service of M. Abdul Rafiq Khan as Inspector of Post Offices in the district of Purnea and Bhagalpur separately? Is it a fact that he has been kept on in that division because of there being Muhammadan Superintendents all the while?

Mr. H. A. Sams: The answer to the first part of the question is:

in Purnea 7 years 11 months and 10 days;

and

in Bhagalpur 8 years 19 days up to date;

and to the second part: No.

**PROVISION OF A DEAD LETTER OFFICE IN THE BIHAR AND ORISSA POSTAL
CIRCLE.**

564. ***Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha:** Is it a fact that all the Postal circles in India have a Dead Letter Office each except the Bihar and Orissa Postal Circle? Did the Postmaster General, Bihar and Orissa, propose the opening of one in his circle, and if so, with what result? If the proposal has been rejected, will Government state the reason therefor?

Mr. H. A. Sams: The reply to the first part is in the negative. As regards the second, a proposal was received from the Postmaster General, Bihar and Orissa, but it was not accepted. With respect to the third part, the Honourable Member's attention is invited to the reply given by me to part (b) of Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan's starred question No. 1992 in the Legislative Assembly on the 3rd September, 1924.

**PAUCITY OF HINDUS APPOINTED TO POST OFFICES IN THE BHAGALPUR
DIVISION.**

565. ***Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha:** (a) Will the Government state whether the following appointments were actually made in the Post Offices in the Bhagalpur Division and on the date noted against each:

1. Abdul Latif—1st August, 1921.
2. Muhammad Arif Hussain—1st August, 1921.
3. Allauddin Khan—1st August, 1921.
4. Muhammad Akhtar—1st September, 1921.

5. Nurul Huda—16th November, 1921.
6. J. A. Quadri—27th November, 1921.
7. Moinuddin Ahmed—2nd May, 1922.
8. Abdul Qudus—3rd June, 1922.
9. A. Rauf—15th August, 1922.
10. Najib Hussain—30th January, 1923.
11. Amir Ali—18th February, 1923.

(b) How many Hindus were appointed during this period?

Mr. H. A. Sams: (a) The facts are not entirely as stated by the Honourable Member. Nos. 6 and 7 were appointed on 10th December, 1923, and 2nd May, 1924, respectively, while the name of No. 9 does not appear on the divisional list.

(b) None.

Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha: Regarding part (b) of my question, is there any reason why no Hindu has been appointed?

Mr. H. A. Sams: I must have notice of the question. I cannot say off hand why no Hindu was appointed.

PROMOTION OF HINDUS AND MUHAMMADANS EMPLOYED IN POST OFFICES
IN THE BHAGALPUR DIVISION.

566. ***Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha:** (a) Will the Government state whether the following appointments were made in the Post Offices in the Bhagalpur Division and on the dates noted against their names:

1. H. M. Sinha—13th January, 1924.
2. B. B. Chakravarti—30th January, 1924.
3. Kalimuddin Ahmed—3rd February, 1924.
4. Sk. Abdul Aziz—14th April, 1924.
5. Manzoor Ali—23rd April, 1924.
6. R. B. Jha—14th June, 1924.
7. Rameshwar Prasad—16th June, 1924.
8. S. K. Sinha—12th December, 1924.
9. M. L. Jha—1st May, 1925.
10. K. L. Mandal—28th April, 1926.
11. A. H. Khan—1st July, 1926.
12. A. Majid—1st October, 1926.
13. Fida Hussain—1st November, 1926.
14. Imamuddin—1st November, 1926.
15. Sheonandan Prasad—1st December, 1926.
16. Ashraf Hussain—26th January, 1927.
17. Girdhari Maharaj—26th January, 1927.
18. Nand Kishore Ram—29th January, 1927.
19. C. P. Dutt—31st May, 1927.
20. Aradat Hussain—31st May, 1927.
21. Jahangir Ali—31st May, 1927.
22. Ramjilal Dass—31st May, 1927.

(b) Were these appointments made on a population basis? Did the proportion of Hindus to Muhammadan population in the Bhagalpur Division justify the recruitment of 10 Muhammadans against 12 Hindus?

Mr. H. A. Sams: (a) Yes, except that in some cases the dates given by the Honourable Member are not quite accurate.

(b) The answer to the first part is in the negative. The second part of the question does therefore not arise.

Kumar Ganganand Sinha: Will the Honourable Member kindly say in what respect the table given by the Honourable questioner is not accurate?

Mr. H. A. Sams: I cannot say, Sir, at the present moment in what respect it is inaccurate. I must consult the records.

Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha: What is the reason for the Honourable Member to say that the table given by me is not accurate?

Mr. H. A. Sams: I can only say that on examining the table it appears that it is not accurate. If the Honourable Member wants details, I shall be glad to furnish them to him.

Mr. Siddheswar Prasad Sinha: Will the Honourable Member kindly give a correct table stating the number of Hindus and Muhammadans employed during the period?

Mr. H. A. Sams: Yes, Sir. I shall give a correct table.

RESTRICTION BY THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY AUTHORITIES OF THE
NUMBERS PERMITTED ON THE PLATFORM TO MEET THE PRESIDENT-
ELECT OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

567. ***Kumar Ganganand Sinha:** (a) Is it a fact that the East Indian Railway authorities refused to allow more than 50 persons on the station platform on the occasion of the arrival of Pandit Motilal Nehru, President-elect of the 43rd session of the Indian National Congress?

(b) If so, is it a fact that no such restriction was made when the President-elect of the previous sessions of the Congress held in Calcutta, arrived or when a public reception was given to any honoured guest?

(c) If the answer to (b) is not in the affirmative will Government be pleased to enquire and state the occasions of such restrictions and the nature of the restriction on each occasion?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: I believe that some restriction was placed on the number of persons allowed on the station platform on the occasion mentioned by the Honourable Member, and a similar restriction was also imposed on the occasion of the arrival of the Statutory Commission. I am, however, ascertaining the exact facts for the Honourable Member and will communicate with him on receipt of the Agent's reply.

RUMOURED ALLIANCE BETWEEN BRITISH COMMERCIAL INTERESTS AND THE
EXECUTIVE IN INDIA, AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A SYNDICATED PRESS.

568. ***Kumar Ganganand Sinha:** (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the following extract of the "Free Press Beam Service" message dated London December 18 which deals mainly with the Coastal Reservation Bill:

"Lord Inchcape, it is understood, has even suggested that the Coastal Reservation Bill should be made the acid test of British supremacy in India and that, until the Coastal Reservation Bill is got rid of, it might even be advisable to defer the offensive

against banking and insurance. Important pourparlers are expected to take place at Calcutta during the Christmas week between the spokesmen of the Government, British Chambers in India and the British vested interests in England, and a common plan of action is to be laid down. In this connection it is rumoured on high authority in England that certain proposals were made to the head of the Government in Simla during the last Assembly session for an offensive and defensive alliance between the British commercial interests and the Executive, including the promotion and establishment of a syndicated Press, and the scheme fell through on the one hand due to conflict of ambitions of individuals and on the other hand to the refusal of the Head of the Government to pledge the Executive to the blind support of British vested interests in their far-reaching demands to emasculate the Indian Legislature. In Indian circles, which are in the know of the full facts tributes are paid to Lord Irwin for refusing to stoop to conquer. Important disclosures are expected any time."

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that certain proposals were made to the head of the Government in Simla as reported in the message?

(c) If answer to (b) is in the affirmative will the Government be pleased to state what the proposals were, how the matter developed, how far it progressed and in what stage it is?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: (a) The Government have seen the Press message.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

SHORTAGE OF CARRIAGES FOR AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS ON THE BENGAL AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

569. ***Kumar Ganganand Sinha:** (a) Are Government aware of the fact that a very large number of agricultural labourers have to go to the districts of Purnea, Maldah, Dinapur, etc., for harvesting paddy by the Bengal and North Western Railway?

(b) Are Government aware of the fact that the railway has not got a sufficient number of carriages to meet the heavy traffic, and in almost every train a very large number of 3rd class passengers have to travel on the carriage foot-boards at the risk of their lives?

(c) Are Government aware of the fact that the over-crowding and heavy traffic cause great delay in the arrival and departure of trains and consequently annoyance to every one concerned?

(d) Are Government aware of the fact that these passengers have to stay for three or four days at times at the railway stations for want of accommodation?

(e) Are Government aware of the fact that the stations do not generally have arrangements for even drinking water for these passengers?

(f) Are Government aware of the fact that the Bengal and North Western Railway earn a very large amount by the fare paid by such passengers?

(g) Will the Government be pleased to inquire and state why some arrangement is not made for accommodating these passengers?

(h) If no provision for adequate accommodation is possible why are tickets issued in excess of the maximum capacity of the train?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) Yes. (f) Yes.

(b), (c), (d), (e), (g) and (h). I am enquiring from the Agent what the position is, and, if there is overcrowding and a lack of facilities for drinking water on these sections of his line, as alleged by the Honourable Member, what steps he is taking to remedy matters. The Railway Board are aware that more third class coaching stock is required on the Bengal and North Western Railway, and provision for its purchase has been made in next year's programme.

HARASSMENT OF PASSENGERS BY CREW TICKET CHECKERS AT HOWRAH JUNCTION STATION.

570. ***Kumar Ganganand Sinha:** (a) Are Government aware of the fact that the travelling public, specially those old men and ladies who hold lower class tickets, are subjected to great harassment by crew ticket-checkers particularly at Howrah junction, who, in spite of the heavy rush of passengers, open the platform gates very late, keep the passage so small that it becomes very difficult even for one man to pass through it, unnecessarily question the weight of luggage, for nothing cause it to be weighed, and do similar things which cause annoyance to them?

(b) If so, what steps are the Government going to take to remedy this inconvenience?

(c) If not, will Government be pleased to state whether Government have at any time verified facts or tried to know public opinion in this matter? If answer to last part is in the affirmative, when? If negative, why?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) No; but I am sending a copy of the Honourable Member's question to the Agent of the East Indian Railway, particularly with regard to the complaint made by the Honourable Member that the platform gates are opened too late.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) In 1928 the Railway Board received a statement of cases brought against the crew staff from January to October, 1927, and the results of such cases as had been settled. I shall be very glad to show the Honourable Member this statement if he so desires.

NUMBER OF CRIMINAL CASES INSTITUTED AGAINST CREW EMPLOYEES OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

571. ***Kumar Ganganand Sinha:** Will Government be pleased to state how many criminal cases, if any, have been instituted against the East Indian Railway crews during the last three years, how many of them were convicted and against how many, if any one, charges of rape, kidnapping, etc., were proved?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: The information is being obtained from the Agent of the East Indian Railway and will be furnished to the Honourable Member.

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE BENGAL AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY MADE
IN THE *AMRITA BAZAR PATRIKA*.

572. *Kumar Ganganand Sinha: (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the letter appearing in "Our Post Bag" section of the dak edition of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of Sunday No. 11, 1928 on page 9 under the heading "Bengal and North Western Railway and its employees" written by Mr. Ram Prasad, Secretary, Bengal and North Western Railway Association from Gorakhpur?

(b) Are the allegations contained therein correct?

(c) If the answer is in the negative will the Government be pleased to say in which respect they are incorrect?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). Government are aware that the salaries of some of the employees of the Bengal and North Western Railway—including, I may say, the superior staff—are lower than those given on adjacent railways, but they do not accept the arguments which the writer of the letter bases on this fact.

PROVISION OF A DEAD LETTER OFFICE IN THE BIHAR AND ORISSA POSTAL
CIRCLE.

573. *Kumar Ganganand Sinha: (a) Will the Government be pleased to state if the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs received any representation in December last bearing on the answers given to my unstarred questions Nos. 9 and 10 regarding Dead Letter Office in the Bihar and Orissa Postal Circle answered on the 4th September, 1928?

(b) If so, will the Government be pleased to lay a copy of the same on table?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) Yes. One signed by five people of village Bonjaria, Post Murar, District Arrah.

(b) No, as the document contains nothing of general public interest my Honourable friend must have received a copy of the document as one of his questions is based on it.

CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEAD LETTER
OFFICE AT PATNA.

574. *Kumar Ganganand Sinha: Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a copy of the correspondence between the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, and Mr. Tulloch, late Postmaster General of Bihar and Orissa Circle, regarding the establishment of a Dead Letter Office at Patna that took place in 1914 or thereabout?

Mr. H. A. Sams: Government do not propose to lay on the table copies of the correspondence referred to which took place 15 years ago and was of an informal character, as they do not consider that any public purpose will be served thereby.

Kumar Ganganand Sinha: May I know, Sir, whether that letter will not throw light on the question of the Dead Letter Office at Patna?

Mr. H. A. Sams: No, Sir. It can throw very little light on it. (Laughter.)

STATUS OF POST OFFICES IN ASSAM AND IN SIND OR BALUCHISTAN.

575. ***Kumar Ganganand Sinha:** Will the Government be pleased to state if the status of the Shillong range offices for Assam is the same or different from the Sind or Baluchistan circle stating clearly the points of similarity or difference?

Mr. H. A. Sams: The status in the two cases is not the same. The points of difference are chiefly:

(1) Sind and Baluchistan is an independent Circle in direct correspondence with the Director-General: whereas the Shillong Range is a minor charge within the Bengal and Assam Circle.

(2) Sind and Baluchistan is a unified Circle controlling the Postal, Telegraph Engineering and Telegraph Traffic Branches within its jurisdiction, while in the case of the Shillong Range the Deputy Postmaster-General's control is confined to the business of the Post Office.

NUMBER OF CLERKS EMPLOYED IN THE DEAD LETTER OFFICE AT CALCUTTA.

576. ***Kumar Ganganand Sinha:** (a) With reference to answer given to part (a) of my unstarred question 10 on the 4th September, 1928, will the Government be pleased to state whether or not the information wanted in that question could be given by referring to the establishment files and office copies of the gradation list?

(b) If the answer is in the affirmative, why was no information supplied?

(c) If the answer is in the negative to what kind of paper was a reference necessary which was not available?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a), (b) and (c). The information asked for could be compiled only by extensive researches in gradation lists and personal files for a period extending over 20 years, supplemented by personal enquiries. The labour involved would be out of all proportion with the value of the result.

NAMES OF FOUR BIHARI CLERKS APPOINTED IN THE DEAD LETTER OFFICE IN CALCUTTA.

577. ***Kumar Ganganand Sinha:** With reference to answer given to part (c) of my unstarred question on 4th September 1928, will the Government be pleased to state the names of the four Bihari clerks appointed in the Dead Letter Office, Calcutta, during the last 14 years?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: The names are:

- (1) Harihar Prasad,
- (2) Abdesch Kumar Lal,
- (3) Mahamad Musa, and
- (4) Monchar Lal.

TEST OF SUITABILITY FOR APPOINTMENT AS MANAGER OF THE DEAD LETTER OFFICE, CALCUTTA.

578. *Kumar Ganganand Sinha: With reference to the answer given to part (e) of my unstarred question 10 on 4th September, 1928, will the Government be pleased to state what was the test of suitability for the post of Managership when vacancies occurred during the last 14 years, which no senior Bihari could satisfy?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: The post in question is filled by selection, the essential qualifications demanded being knowledge of departmental rules, and a capacity for the efficient supervision and control of the staff.

NUMBER OF CLERKS EMPLOYED IN CERTAIN DEAD LETTER OFFICES.

579. *Kumar Ganganand Sinha: (a) Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the number of hands working in the Dead Letter Office, Calcutta, and in the Dead Letter Office, Dinapur, in 1905 and the number of hands working in Calcutta now?

(b) How many hands of the Calcutta Dead Letter Office are required to handle letters of the Bihar and Orissa Circle at present?

Mr. H. A. Sams: (a) Calcutta Dead Letter Office:

1905 ... 40

1929 ... 87

Dinapur Dead Letter Office:

1905 ... 16

(b) It is not possible to furnish accurate information, as the work for the Bihar and Orissa Circle is not done by a separate unit. Fourteen may, however, be regarded as a rough estimate of the number of clerks engaged on the work in the Calcutta Dead Letter Office.

THE DACCA DEAD LETTER OFFICE.

580. *Kumar Ganganand Sinha: Is it a fact that the Dacca Dead Letter Office was converted into an Assistant Managership in 1914, after the abolition of Eastern Bengal and Assam Circle, and it had a staff of only 28 hands?

Mr. H. A. Sams: The case is not as stated. On the formation of the new Circles of Bengal and Assam and Bihar and Orissa in 1914 the Managership of the Dacca Dead Letter Office was abolished and a clerkship in the Calcutta Dead Letter Office was converted into an Assistant Managership. The Dacca Dead Letter Office had a staff of 20 clerks.

COST OF ESTABLISHING A DEAD LETTER OFFICE AT PATNA.

581. *Kumar Ganganand Sinha: Will the Government be pleased to lay on table an approximate estimate of the expenditure involved in establishing a Dead Letter Office at Patna?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: Government do not possess the information, nor do they propose to call for it until they find that the requirements of the public service necessitate the establishment of a separate Dead Letter Office at Patna.

TERMS OF CHARTER BY GOVERNMENT OF THE STEAMER " AHMEDI ".

582. ***Mr. W. S. Lamb:** (a) What are the terms upon which the steamer " Ahmedi " has been chartered by Government?

(b) What was the period of the charter and what period now remains?

(c) What is the cargo capacity of the " Ahmedi " ?

(d) What are the duties of this steamer?

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerár: (a) Government have hired the " Ahmedi " at the rate of Rs. 28,500 per calendar month. The terms of the charter are briefly indicated in paragraph 6 of the notice dated the 5th of January, 1927, calling for tenders, a copy of which has been placed in the library.

(b) The period of the charter is 3 years from the 19th May, 1927. About 15 months have still to run.

(c) 92,500 cubic feet.

(d) The duties are detailed in paragraph 3 of the notice to which I have referred.

Mr. W. S. Lamb: Is it a fact, Sir, that part of the duties of the steamer is to pay four visits to Burma lights during the monsoon?

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerár: The " Ahmedi " is employed, as required by the Chief Commissioner, to carry cargo to Port Blair from Burma, Madras and Bengal and for performing certain light-house duties and other coastal work.

Mr. W. S. Lamb: Is the Honourable Member aware that during the last monsoon, the ship paid only two visits instead of four and that there was a case of serious illness on one of the lights which could not be evacuated and the delay gravely affected the patient owing to the failure of the " Ahmedi " to pay the proper visits?

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerár: I have received no information to that effect.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

POSTMEN KILLED BY TIGERS, DROWNED, ETC.

225. **Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the paragraph published in the issue of the *Statesman* of January 20, 1929, page 25, under the heading "Where they kill the Postman"?

(b) If so, will they please state if the statement made therein, namely, "According to the last Annual Report of the Posts and Telegraphs Department a year's work entailed the killing of two postmen by tigers, four from drowning, eighteen postmen were the victims of highway robbery, four men were murdered" is correct?

(c) If correct, will Government please state the circumstances under which the deaths of postmen, as referred to, were caused and what steps Government have taken or propose to take to save the lives of postmen?

Mr. H. A. Sams: (a) Government have seen the paragraph alluded to. I would point out to the Honourable Member that the article referred to is a reprint of an article appearing in the *Sunday Express* and that it does not refer only to India.

(b) The details in the statement are inaccurate. The casualties shown in the Annual Report of the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department for 1926-27 include 2 runners who were killed by tigers and 4 deaths from drowning. Only one porter and not 4 was murdered. One runner was killed by lightning, and a village postman jumped out of a running train and sustained severe injuries to which he succumbed. In addition, a runner in one of the 18 cases of highway robbery was fatally wounded.

(c) The two runners who were killed by tigers were conveying mails in the Kalahandi State when traversing the road between the Kalapat branch office and the Ampadar State. Two of the runners were drowned in attempts to cross rivers in boats, which they used in the absence of the boatmen, and the third owing to the river coming down in flood. A postman was drowned owing to his attempting to cross a bridge which was already under water, despite warning from a sub-postmaster and the runners in his company to desist. The murder of the porter occurred when he was not on duty, while the single fatal case in which a runner was done to death was in the case of a dacoity between Bahyapada and Bhopali in the neighbourhood of the Bargharh post office.

It has already been ordered that in specially dangerous places a runner should not travel unescorted, and arrangements have been made that, in localities infested by wild beasts, the road establishment should be supplied with weapons for their defence. In some cases mails travel under escort of overseers who are provided with fire arms.

PAY OF CLERKS TRANSFERRED FROM THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE, WESTERN CIRCLE, TO THE OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL, BOMBAY.

226. **Mr. N. C. Kelkar:** (a) Is it a fact that the clerical staff of the late Railway Mail Service, Western Circle Office, transferred to the office of the Postmaster General, Bombay, in consequence of an administrative measure, are not being paid the same pay as their colleagues in the Postmaster General's office?

(b) If so, do Government propose adequately to raise their pay? Is it a fact that their transfers to the town of Bombay were effected on administrative grounds?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) No: they are paid on the same scale, though they may be at different points of the scale from their colleagues who rendered the whole of their service in Bombay.

(b) Government do not see any necessity to alter their pay, which has been determined in accordance with the orders applicable to their cases. The transfers were made for administrative reasons.

PAY OF RECORD SUPPLIERS AND DUTRIES TRANSFERRED FROM THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE TO THE OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL, BOMBAY.

227. Mr. N. O. Kelkar: (a) Is it a fact that the record suppliers and dutries transferred as such from the office of the late Railway Mail Service, Western Circle, to the office of the Postmaster General, Bombay, have been graded with peons?

(b) Has this grading resulted in loss of pay?

(c) If so, do Government propose to issue orders for setting the matter right?

Mr. H. A. Sams: (a) Record suppliers and dutries were grouped with peons in the late Railway Mail Service, Western Circle office, and were in the scale of Rs. 20-1/8-27. They were transferred to the Postmaster General's Office, Bombay, as menials in the same scale and are actually performing duties as menials.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

CURTAILMENT OF CASUAL LEAVE OF CLERKS IN THE OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL, BOMBAY.

228. Mr. N. O. Kelkar: (a) Is it a fact that the policy of the Government of India, so far as leave is concerned, is to give equal treatment to all the subordinate employees in the Provincial as also in the Imperial services? If so, why has the casual leave of the clerks in the office of the Postmaster General in Bombay been curtailed to 12 days?

(b) If the curtailment is due to their enjoying the usual number of holidays in a year as replied to by Government last year to my question No. 87, are not other offices in Bombay, enjoying the same concessions, allowed 20 days' casual leave on account of the peculiar climatic conditions in Bombay?

(c) Is it a fact that Mr. Sams as Postmaster General, Bombay, has himself recommended to the Director-General that no curtailment in casual leave from 20 to 12 days should be made, owing to climatic and peculiar conditions prevailing in Bombay?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) Yes, in so far as the Fundamental Leave Rules are of general application. Casual leave however is not recognised leave and its grant is regulated by appropriate special orders.

(b) I refer the Honourable Member to the answer given on the 15th February 1928 to his own unstarred question No. 87. Government have no further information.

(c) The recommendation has not been traced.

PAY OF CLERKS IN CERTAIN OFFICES IN THE POSTAL DEPARTMENT IN BOMBAY.

229. Mr. N. O. Kelkar: What was the scale of pay of the clerical staff in the office of the Directorate before 1920 and that in the office of the Postmaster General, Bombay, before that year? If it was the same for

both the offices before 1920, will the Government state the reasons for the difference in the scales of pay in both these offices after 1920 and up till now?

Mr. H. A. Sams: Before 1920 the scale of pay in the Directorate of Posts and Telegraphs ranged from Rs. 40 to Rs. 600; in the office of the Postmaster-General, Bombay, it ranged from Rs. 30 to Rs. 400.

Part II does not arise.

PAY OF CLERKS IN THE OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL, BOMBAY.

230. Mr. N. C. Kelkar: In 1927 did Government give an assurance that the case of clerks doing important work in the Office of the Postmaster-General, Bombay, was under consideration; and will the Government state what revision of pay has been effected in consequence? If the reply to this is in the negative, will the Government state what hinders the revision of pay of clerks in the administrative offices in view of the fact that all other branches (including officers) of the Department have been drawing revised pay?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: In the course of debate on the 11th March 1927 it was stated that the case of clerks doing really important work in the postal administrative offices would receive due consideration.

Subsequently the pay of the non-gazetted selection grades, namely, Rs. 145 to 170 and Rs. 175 to 225, was altered to Rs. 160 to 250 in a single scale.

The last part of the question does not arise.

EXAMINATION FOR CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS IN THE POSTAL DEPARTMENT.

231. Mr. N. C. Kelkar: (a) Will the Government state whether there is any examination for higher appointments in the office of the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, or in both the Imperial and Provincial Secretariats? If not, will the Government state the reasons for imposing an examination for promotion to selection grade appointments in the administrative offices of the heads of Circles of Posts and Telegraphs?

(b) Has the Postmaster General, Bombay, stopped appointing sorting inspectors attached to this office from amongst those of his clerks who may be capable of holding the appointment just as was done in the office of the Deputy Postmaster General, Railway Mail Service, Western Circle, Poona?

Mr. H. A. Sams: (a) Assuming that the Honourable Member refers to higher appointments in the ministerial establishments, the answer to the first part of the question is in the negative, so far as the Office of the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs and the Government of India Secretariat Offices are concerned; but there is an examination for promotion from the 2nd division to the 1st division in the latter. As regards Provincial Secretariats, Government have no information. In reply to the second part of the question, the examination referred to is for the lowest selection grade appointments and is a departmental measure designed to secure efficiency.

(b) The information is being collected and will be furnished to the Honourable Member in due course.

**RECRUITMENT OF MEN FROM OTHER PROVINCES FOR THE OFFICE OF THE
POSTMASTER GENERAL, ETC., BOMBAY.**

232. Mr. N. C. Kalkar: Is it a fact that men belonging to other Presidencies are being recruited in the Office of the Postmaster General, Bombay, Central Telegraph Office, Bombay, General Post Office, Bombay and Dead-Letter Office, Bombay? Is there a Resolution of the Government of Bombay to the contrary? If so, will the Government state the number of such appointments in each of the offices during the last three years and also the reasons for making such appointment?

Mr. H. A. Sams: The reply to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. The Government of Bombay are not concerned with the methods of recruitment followed in the Post and Telegraph Department. The number of such appointments is as follows:

Office of the Postmaster-General	3
Central Telegraph Office	9 (including 3 temporary.)
General Post Office	7
Dead Letter Office	1

The reason is the desirability of having in these offices some men with a knowledge of the vernaculars of other provinces.

**REPRESENTATION FROM THE CLERICAL STAFF OF THE OFFICE OF THE
POSTMASTER GENERAL, BOMBAY.**

233. Mr. N. C. Kalkar: (a) Is it a fact that the clerical staff of the Postmaster General's Office, Bombay, has been making representations to Government for the last eight years for the restoration of the status enjoyed by them prior to 1919? Is it a fact that a special officer has been deputed by the Government to inquire into the working of the administrative offices since 1926, and that the case of the administrative offices is under consideration?

(b) If the reply to the above is in the affirmative, will Government please state when the said inquiry is likely to be completed?

(c) Will the Government please also state the expenditure incurred by Government in this inquiry up to now, as also the probable expenditure to be incurred till the inquiry is complete?

Mr. H. A. Sams: (a) Part I. Yes.

Part II. Yes, the special officer has been deputed to inquire not only into the working of the administrative offices but also that of large Post and Telegraph Offices.

(b) The end of August next.

(c) Expenditure up to January 1929 is Rs. 39,322. It will amount approximately to Rs. 54,322 by the time the inquiry is completed.

REPORT OF THE AGE OF CONSENT COMMITTEE.

234. Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: Will Government be pleased to ascertain from the President of the Age of Consent Committee the approximate date when he expects (1) to have the Report of the said Committee ready and (2) submit the same to Government?

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: The Chairman of the Committee hopes to have the Report ready by the end of April, and to submit it to the Government of India by about the 15th of May next.

NUMBER OF FRAUDS COMMITTED IN POST OFFICES IN THE BHAGALPUR DIVISION.

235. Kumar Ganganand Sinha: Will Government state (a) the number of frauds committed in the Post offices of the Bhagalpur division during the period 1924 to 1926 and (b) the names of the officials involved, and (c) the manner in which those cases were disposed of?

Mr. H. A. Sams: (a) Fourteen.

- (b) (1) Ramlal Bhagat Koeri,
 (2) Kailoo Dhanuk,
 (3) Kameshwar Prosad,
 (4) Golam Nabi,
 (5) Sharafat Husain,
 (6) Momaddin,
 (7) Habibullah,
 Hamid Ali,
 Rishikesh Mitra, }
 (8) Kabirali,
 (9) Basdeo Singh,
 (10) Ulfat Hussain,
 (11) Ahmed Hussain,
 Sakhawat Ali,
 Rishikesh Mitra,
 Allauddin, }
 (12) Chanchal Jha,
 (13) Abdul Karim,
 (14) Madhosaran,
 Rajdhari Pershad,
 Fazalalla. }

(c) (1) and (8) are absconding from justice. (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (10) and (12) were convicted of the offences with which they were charged and sentenced to terms of imprisonment ranging from 3 months to 2 years. (9) was reduced in status from a postman to a mail peon. Pecuniary responsibility was enforced against all the parties mentioned under (7).

Of the parties mentioned under (11) the first three were acquitted of blame while Allauddin was dismissed.

(13) was acquitted while of the three parties mentioned against (14) the first two had pecuniary liability enforced against them and Fazalalla was dismissed.

NUMBER OF NATIVES OF PURNEA APPOINTED AS CLERKS IN POST OFFICES
IN THE BHAGALPUR DIVISION.

236. **Kumar Ganganand Sinha:** Will Government state the number of appointments of clerks made in the Post offices of the Bhagalpur division, from September, 1921 to May, 1927 and the number that went to the natives of Purnea?

Mr. H. A. Sams: Thirty-two appointments were made out of which four went to the natives of Purnea.

PROPORTION OF HINDU AND MUHAMMADAN CLERKS IN THE POST OFFICE IN
PURNEA.

237. **Kumar Ganganand Sinha:** What is the proportion of Hindus to Muhammadans in the Post office in Purnea? Are appointments and postings of clerks in the post office in Purnea regulated accordingly?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: Approximately 2 to 1;— assuming that the Honourable Member refers to the postal employees of the Purnea District. The reply to the second part of the question is in the negative.

NUMBER OF HINDUS AND MUHAMMADANS EMPLOYED AS CLERKS IN POST
OFFICES IN BHAGALPUR AND PURNEA.

238. **Kumar Ganganand Sinha:** Will Government place on the table a statement in the following form:

	Number of clerks on the 1st September, 1927.		Number of clerks on the 1st August, 1928.	
	Purnea.	Bhagalpur.	Purnea.	Bhagalpur.
Hindus				
Muhammadans				

Mr. H. A. Sams: The following is the statement asked for:

	Number of clerks on the 1st September, 1927.		Number of clerks on the 1st August, 1928.	
	Purnea.	Bhagalpur.	Purnea.	Bhagalpur.
Hindus	7	9	10	9
Muhammadans	4	5	3	5

NUMBER OF HINDUS AND MUHAMMADANS EMPLOYED AS CLERKS IN POST
OFFICES IN THE BHAGALPUR DIVISION.

239. **Kumar Ganganand Sinha:** Will Government state the number of appointments of clerks made in the Post offices in the Bhagalpur division from 1st September, 1927 to 1st May, 1928 and how many of them went to Hindus and how many to Muhammadans? Were these appointments made on a population basis? If not, on what basis were these appointments made?

Mr. H. A. Sams: Total three, namely two Hindus and one Mussalman. The answer to the second part of the question is in the negative.

The answer to the third part is that appointments are made with the general orders of Government, reserving one-third of the vacancies for the adjustment of communal preponderance.

PAUCITY OF HINDUS APPOINTED AS CLERKS IN POST OFFICES IN THE BHAGALPUR DIVISION.

240. Kumar Ganganand Sinha: Is it a fact that all the appointments made in Post offices in the Bhagalpur division between 1st August, 1921 and 18th February, 1928 went to Muhammadans and that no Hindu was appointed during that period? If not, will Government state the names of the Hindus appointed?

Mr. H. A. Sams: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative; the second part of the question does not arise.

APPOINTMENT OF A NON-MATRICULATE AS A CLERK IN THE POST OFFICE IN THE SAMBALPUR DIVISION.

241. Kumar Ganganand Sinha: Is it a fact that Muhammad Abdul Hafiz, a non-matriculate, was appointed clerk in the post office in the Sambalpur division without the sanction of the Postmaster General? Did it come to the notice of the Postmaster General and if so, how was it treated by him? Who was the appointing authority?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: Government have no information, nor do they propose to call for any information, as the subject matter of the question is one within the competence of the Head of the Circle to dispose of finally.

APPOINTMENT OF RELATIVES OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL TO POST OFFICES IN THE PATNA DIVISION.

242. Kumar Ganganand Sinha: Referring to the reply given to starred question No. 127 in the Legislative Assembly Debates on the 5th September, 1928, regarding 5 non-matriculats being recruited in the Patna division for clerkship, will Government state how many of them were Muhammadans and how many Hindus? Is it a fact that of the five, Abdul Mazed, Mohammed Taha, and Mohammed Sibli were three and they were all relatives of the then Postmaster General, who sanctioned their recruitment as special cases?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: The answer to the first part of the question is: four Muhammadans and one Hindu. The answer to the second part is in the affirmative.

PROVISION OF QUARTERS FOR CLERKS OF THE KISHANGUNJ AND ISLAMPUR POST OFFICES.

243. Kumar Ganganand Sinha: Is it a fact that the Kishanganj and Islampur post offices in the district of Purnea suffered badly during the outbreak of malaria in those parts in November and December 1928? What arrangements exist at those places for the quarters of clerks? Do Government propose to provide them all with quarters at the usual rate of rent in view of the unhealthiness of those places?

Mr. H. A. Sams: (1) Yes.

(2) The clerks make their own arrangements; there are no departmental quarters for them at present.

(3) The matter is under consideration.

LATER RECEIPT OF THE CALCUTTA MAILS IN THE KATORIA POST OFFICE,
BHAGALPUR.

244. Kumar Ganganand Sinha: Is it a fact that the Calcutta mails are now received at the Katoria Post Office in the district of Bhagalpur one day later than what it was before? If so, has the change been made to the public advantage and if not, what is the gain therefrom?

Mr. H. A. Sams: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. The change made has resulted in the acceleration of mails exchanged within the sub-division and particularly with the head-quarters at Banka.

The Postmaster-General is being asked to restore the arrangements for the direct despatch of mails from Simultala to avoid the delay now suffered by the mails from Calcutta.

ELECTION OF THE STANDING FINANCE COMMITTEE FOR
RAILWAYS, AND THE PANEL FOR THE CENTRAL ADVISORY
COUNCIL FOR RAILWAYS.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy (Member for Commerce and Railways): Sir, I move:

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect in such manner as may be approved by the Honourable the President, eleven Members from the Assembly who shall be required to serve on the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, as provided for in clause 6 of the Resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly on the 20th September, 1924, on the subject of the separation of Railway Finance."

The motion was adopted.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: Sir, I move:

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect in such manner as may be approved by the Honourable the President, a Panel consisting of eight Members from which six shall be selected to serve on the Central Advisory Council for Railways, as provided for in clause 6 of the Resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly on the 20th September, 1924, on the subject of the separation of Railway Finance."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: I may inform the Assembly that for the purpose of election of Members to the Standing Finance Committee for Railways and the Central Advisory Council for Railways, the Assembly office will be open to receive nominations up to 12 noon on Wednesday the 20th February, 1929, and that the elections for both the Committees, if necessary, will take place in this Chamber on Wednesday the 6th March, 1929. The elections will be conducted in accordance with the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

DEMANDS FOR EXCESS GRANTS FOR 1926-27.

CIVIL.

A.—*Expenditure charged to Revenue.*

STAMPS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster (Finance Member): Sir, I move:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 89,127 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1926-27 in respect of 'Stamps'."

There are 15 items of excess grants to be moved, which are fully dealt with in paragraphs 8 to 18 of the Public Accounts Committee Report and I do not propose to offer any explanations, unless they are asked for by Honourable Members.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadian): Sir, this is the only occasion when recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee come up before the House in a certain form for discussion. In 1926 and in 1927 my redoubtable friend Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar brought to the notice of the previous Finance Member on the floor of this House the question whether the House should not be given an opportunity to discuss the Report of the Public Accounts Committee and that when the demands for excess grants came before the House we could take up the discussion of the Public Accounts Committee's Report. Last year

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: On a point of order, Sir. I suggest that the Honourable Member, on your ruling in the discussion on supplementary grants last year, is raising a question of policy which does not arise on the votes that are being asked for now.

Mr. B. Das: Sir, may I speak before you give your ruling now? Last year you were pleased to give a ruling that on supplementary demands for grants we are not to discuss questions of policy. You quoted, at the time, the Parliamentary practice, where questions of excess grants were also not allowed in the House of Commons; but your ruling was definitely on the supplementary demands for grants. But before you give us to-day a ruling on the demands for discussing excess grants, I would like to draw your attention to what passed before the Public Accounts Committee when the Government witness gave evidence, and certain matters were referred to which ought to be brought to your notice. I refer to the Public Accounts Committee's Report, Volume II—Evidence—on page 4. There was a question by myself:

"I would point out that no day was allotted during the last session to discuss the report of the Committee."

To which Mr. Burdon, the Government witness, replied:

"Sir Basil Blackett fulfilled his promise and had the matter carefully considered. As Financial Secretary, I noted that, if there was to be a discussion in the Assembly, they had yet to solve the problem of the form in which the matter was to be put before the Assembly. 'A discussion followed by a vote seems out of the question, and it seems to me the Assembly might resent having a novel procedure being imposed upon it without being given an opportunity to consider this question of form, and I think we should consult the Legislative Department at once as regards this aspect of the matter.' The Legislative Department were consulted and a reference was made to the President of the Legislative Assembly; and the view of the President was this, that if the Secretary of the Assembly is satisfied that Members desire to have a general debate on the first motion for excess grants, he has no objection. Later I made enquiry as to what happened and the Secretary in the Legislative Department answered 'The reply is in the negative. I would draw attention to the President's ruling of the 27th March.'"

[Mr. B. Das.]

That is the ruling to which my Honourable friend just now referred :

"The ruling was that in which it was held that questions of general policy could not be raised or discussed on a motion for a supplementary grant. That means that one avenue for the projected discussion was finally closed; and thereafter the action that has been taken is to refer the point to the officer in the Finance Department who is preparing material for the Statutory Commission. We have in this connection also studied the procedure which is followed in the House of Commons in England."

Sir, my submission is there may be a Statutory Commission, of which I have no knowledge, nor have any other Members on this side of the House any knowledge; but as far as we are concerned we would point out that, in the Government Resolution of the 5th January, 1928 the Governor General in Council decided that they would allot this House a day for discussion of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee. I do not therefore understand how my Honourable friend Mr. Graham stated that there was no desire on the part of Members of this House to have a day for discussion of this subject. My submission is that when Government issue their annual Resolution on the recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee, they ought to allot us a day to discuss that very Resolution on the floor of this House, to discuss important questions of policy and principles raised in that Report. I submit, Sir, that, so far, no day has been given to us, and if your ruling to-day is that we cannot discuss it on excess grants I will bow to your ruling; but I would, on the other hand, ask the Honourable the Finance Member and the Government to give us definitely a day for this purpose. It is no use telling us the matter should be referred to some outside body which is inquiring into certain matters.

Mr. President: Who wants a day?

Mr. B. Das (and others): The House, Sir.

Mr. L. Graham (Secretary, Legislative Department): We have not given any special day for this purpose. Sir, because, so far as I am aware, nobody in any part of the House has asked for it.

Mr. B. Das: We have asked for it on every occasion when excess grants have been discussed on the floor of the House; and here I am suggesting once again that a day should be given. When Government practice is to issue their Resolution on the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, why don't they bring that very Resolution for discussion on the floor, of the House?

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muham-madan Rural): Sir, I am afraid both the Honourable the Finance Member and the Secretary of the Legislative Department are in error as to the exact scope of your ruling. The whole point is this: are we or are we not going to discuss the Report of the Public Accounts Committee in this House, and whether the Government are going to allow us facilities for such discussion or not. Sir Basil Blackett certainly was willing that this House should discuss this Report. In fact he was anxious that we should discuss it, and suggested that, if Members showed a desire to discuss it, he would be able to afford facilities therefor. The matter was somehow allowed not to be put on a proper footing because Government always draw a red herring across the path whenever questions affecting the rights and privileges of

this House are concerned. "The Statutory Commission is coming: we will put every available question between us and the House into the sink of the Statutory Commission!" That is the attitude which the Government have all along taken up. Therefore the result of it is that, when the matter was brought before you, you very properly ruled that it is not right that, on a motion for supplementary grants, any question of policy, any question of general policy of Government should be discussed. But as I understand Mr. Burdon's reply to the question about the matter at the last meeting of the Public Accounts Committee, he said the view of the President was this: that if the Secretary of the Assembly is satisfied that Members desire to have a general debate on the first motion for excess grants, he has no objection. Therefore, Sir, there are only two ways in which the Report of the Public Accounts Committee as such could be discussed, apart from the specific motions for the excess grants that are being made by the Honourable the Finance Member. One is by a kind of general motion which I believe is the practice in Parliament, by which the Honourable the Finance Member moves that this House do now proceed to consider the Report of the Public Accounts Committee; and, arising therefrom, move the several excess grants that have been recommended by the Public Accounts Committee in their Report; or, if that motion is considered superfluous, we can raise the general debate on the Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the very first motion for excess grants.

Mr. President: Can you settle this question on the floor of the House, or should you not rather do it by having a conference with the Finance Member?

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: I have no objection to consulting the Honourable the Finance Member; and if the Finance Member will give us a day for discussing the matter and is prepared to allow us facilities, I am prepared to agree, I have not the slightest objection. I am waiting to hear what the Honourable the Finance Member has to say.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, the passage in the last Report of the Public Accounts Committee dealing with this subject reads as follows:

"Our predecessors recommended last year that Government should consider the best method of giving effect to the strong desire expressed in the Assembly that the House should be given an opportunity to discuss, in general terms, the Report of the Public Accounts Committee on which the excess grants were based. We have been informed that efforts made by Government in this direction have proved infructuous and that steps are being taken in connection with the deliberations of the Statutory Commission to provide a constitutional procedure which would meet the wishes of the Committee in the matter. We desire, however, to reaffirm the recommendation made last year and suggest that the Government of India should reconsider the matter without waiting for the deliberations of the Statutory Commission."

Sir, I think that a constitutional issue is involved in this question and I myself desire to have an opportunity of discussing that constitutional question with the Commission of which Mr. Das and others on that side have no knowledge, but which is actually going to visit Delhi some time after the middle of next month. I propose to take the opportunity to discuss it with them, and after I have had that discussion, I should be very glad to meet any representatives whom Honourable Members opposite might select to discuss this question. Speaking for myself, it is my desire to meet their wishes in this matter, but I am not in a position to say anything further today on the subject.

Mr. B. K. Shanmukham Chetty (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, says that he would have to consult the Statutory Commission about the constitutional procedure involved in the discussion of the Public Accounts Committee's Report on the floor of this House. Well, Sir, we know that the Public Accounts Committee is constituted in virtue of the provisions of the Government of India Act itself. I do not know whether there is any constitutional difficulty in enabling the Government to allot a day for the discussion of the Public Accounts Committee's Report in this House. So far as I have been able to read the Government of India Act and the Legislative Rules I do not see that there is any constitutional objection to the Government allotting a specific date for the discussion of the Report in this House. We know, by observing the practice in the House of Commons and other Legislatures, what an important part the Public Accounts Committee and its Report play in the management of the finances of the country; and I take it that, from the very fact that the Government of India Act contains provision for the constitution of a Public Accounts Committee, we must presume that the authors intended that the Report of the Committee, when published, ought to be discussed on the floor of this House and that the Members ought to be given an opportunity of expressing their view-point on the Report. I do not see what difficulty there is for Government, even under the powers vested in this House and the Government of India, under the present Act, to allot a day for the discussion of the Public Accounts Committee's Report in this House, and I really cannot understand what constitutional difficulty there is in the way of the Government of India in acceding to the desire expressed by the House and the Public Accounts Committee in this matter.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): I only wish to add one thing, Sir. I am very glad that this point has been raised by my friend Mr. Das. The Public Accounts Committee is appointed by this House for the sake of scrutinising the accounts and is under the statutory obligation, not only of examining the accounts and making its appropriate recommendations, but is also further entrusted with the obligation of bringing to the notice of this House all the irregularities and the recommendations which they have made, and all the items which they think are irregular and so on; that specific responsibility has to be discharged by the Chairman of the Committee, who is the Finance Member himself, by giving this House a specific day to consider those recommendations. If such a day is not allotted by Government, then the alternative was that the House should avail itself of the opportunity when Excess Demands are made by him. That is the only other remedy. If you, Sir, think that a discussion cannot be raised on the excess demand over the Public Accounts Committee's Report, then I think the Finance Member must find out a clear day for the discussion of the Public Accounts Committee's Report and allot that day to this House; otherwise I do not know how they can satisfactorily fulfil the statutory obligations, or comply with the requirements of the provisions laid down in Legislative Rule 52 (2).

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: May I say a word, Sir?

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is not entitled to speak twice, as he knows. Is there any rule which the Honourable Member can cite which would enable him to do so?

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: The Honourable the Finance Member, Sir, made an explanatory statement

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is again making a speech which he is not entitled to do.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: I hope I will be excused for interrupting. I said in the course of my observations, when the Finance Member said

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is explaining his own speech. I do not know under what Standing Order or rule I can allow the Honourable Member to do so.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: All right, Sir.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas (Indian Merchants' Chamber: Indian Commerce): Sir, I want to say very little on this. Mr. Graham said, that, as far as he was aware, there was no demand from the House for a special day for the purpose of discussing the Committee's Report.

Mr. L. Graham: When I said there was no demand, I meant that nobody had actually asked that a particular day should be given. That I think is not quite the same thing.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: I do not know how "anybody is actually to ask for a day", but I understand from my friend Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury, who represents my Party on the Public Accounts Committee, that he expressed a very strong desire for this—and I understand that representatives of most of the Parties on the Public Accounts Committee were unanimous in this. I want to have it made clear for the guidance of the House, Sir, that if there is any other method which is desired for the purpose of making clear the wish of the various Parties in the House we would like to know it. I myself am very strongly of opinion—and my Party share that opinion—that there should be a day allotted for the Public Accounts Committee's Report being discussed; otherwise the Report serves little useful purpose.

Mr. President: I am sure the House will be grateful to the Honourable Mr. Das for drawing its attention to this most important point. The question raised by him is whether Government should not afford facilities for the discussion of the Public Accounts Committee's Report. The Public Accounts Committee is a creation of this House, and it is only proper that the Report made by that Committee must be discussed on the floor of this House. [The procedure to be adopted in doing so is a different matter. The Honourable the Finance Member raises objection to the procedure now proposed to be adopted by Mr. Das, namely, to discuss on this item the question of policy. But as I understand, the implication of what the Honourable Member desires is not that he wants to discuss the particular question of policy involved in this particular grant, but he wants really and frankly a full discussion on the whole of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee]

Mr. B. Das: Yes, Sir.

Mr. President: Therefore, the particular ruling quoted by the Honourable Finance Member does not apply to the question raised. I am clearly of opinion that we should establish a practice in this House by which the Report of the Public Accounts Committee can be discussed fully. I know in some of the provinces the practice has been for the Finance Member to

[Mr. President.]

make a motion "that the Report of the Public Accounts Committee be taken into consideration"; and if that motion is carried, he proceeds to make the next motion "that the Report of the Public Accounts Committee be adopted", on which amendments are moved by Honourable Members and carried or rejected on their merits. I think that is a practice which we might well copy in this House. But I see the difficulties of the Honourable the Finance Member. This point has been sprung on him as a surprise I understand. As no notice was given to him, I do not think he was ready to meet this point and it is necessary that we should allow the Honourable the Finance Member to consider the whole question and come out with a definite proposal. I make these observations with a view to enlighten the House and for the Finance Member to consider how best to proceed in this matter and explain what the correct procedure should be. It is not possible in this session, at any rate, to introduce this new departure because we have got the excess grants now before the House, and unless the Honourable the Finance Member is prepared to drop them at present and bring them forward at a later stage, such departure cannot be made. I think however he must have some time to consider the whole question, in consultation with the leaders of Parties. In this view I do feel very strongly that the time has arrived when we must adopt the correct practice of affording opportunities for the discussion of the Report of a Committee which is the creation of this very House, and ask the Government to look into the matter at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 89,127 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1926-27 in respect of 'Stamps'."

The motion was adopted.

INTEREST ON MISCELLANEOUS OBLIGATIONS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I move:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 74,283 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1926-27 in respect of 'Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations'."

The motion was adopted.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I move:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 42,501 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1926-27 in respect of 'Executive Council'."

The motion was adopted.

EMIGRATION—INTERNAL.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I move:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 1,045 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1926-27 in respect of 'Emigration—Internal'."

The motion was adopted.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I move:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 3,364 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1926-27 in respect of 'Joint Stock Companies'."

The motion was adopted.

SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES AND PENSIONS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I move:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 28,594 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1926-27 in respect of 'Superannuation Allowances and Pensions'."

The motion was adopted.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I move:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 5,22,571 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1926-27 in respect of 'Miscellaneous'."

The motion was adopted.

CENSUS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I move:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 1,991 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1926-27 in respect of 'Census'."

The motion was adopted.

B.—Expenditure charged to Capital.

CAPITAL OUTLAY ON CURRENCY NOTE PRINTING PRESS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I move:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 4,839 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to capital actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1926-27 in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Currency Note Printing Press'."

The motion was adopted.

COMMUTED VALUE OF PENSIONS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I move:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 2,87,124 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to capital actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1926-27 in respect of 'Commutated Value of Pensions'."

The motion was adopted.

C.—*Disbursement of Loans and Advances.*

INTEREST FREE ADVANCES.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I move:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 4,25,746 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1926-27 in respect of 'Interest Free Advances'."

The motion was adopted.

RAILWAYS.
A.—*Expenditure charged to Revenue.*

RAILWAY BOARD.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I move:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 82,000 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1926-27 in respect of 'Railway Board'."

The motion was adopted.

COMPANIES' AND INDIAN STATES' SHARE OF SURPLUS PROFITS AND NET EARNINGS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I move:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 4,26,000 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to revenue actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1926-27 in respect of 'Companies and Indian States' Share of Surplus Profits and Net Earnings'."

The motion was adopted.

B.—*Expenditure charged to Capital.*

NEW CONSTRUCTIONS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I move:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 13,01,000 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to capital actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1926-27 in respect of 'New Constructions'."

The motion was adopted.

OPEN LINE WORKS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I move:

"That an excess grant of Rs. 11,65,000 be voted by the Assembly to regularise the expenditure chargeable to capital actually incurred in excess of the voted grant in the year 1926-27 in respect of 'Open Line Works'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS.

CUSTOMS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster (Finance Member): I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 99,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Customs'."

Sir, this is not a grant from general revenues, but only represents the repayment of Sunday fees money held in trust by the Government of India. The money is to be devoted to assisting in the construction of a building for the Mayo Marine Institute in Rangoon. The question of the application of these Sunday fees was fully discussed before the Standing Finance Committee this year and I have given an undertaking to the Standing Finance Committee that the whole question of the distribution of these fees will be put before the Standing Finance Committee next year.

***Mr. N. O. Chunder** (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadian Urban): With regard to this item, there is one thing which is not quite clear to me and I should like an explanation before I vote on this item. Turning to the proceedings of the meeting of the Standing Finance Committee, it appears that the Committee was asked to approve of a grant of Rs. 78,500, but, as a matter of fact, the grant which is asked for here is Rs. 99,000. How this Rs. 21,000 came to be added requires an explanation.

Mr. K. Sanjiva Row (Finance Department: Nominated Official): The amount of the grant actually proposed to be given to the Institute is Rs. 98,500. It was originally anticipated that it would be possible to meet a sum of Rs. 20,000 by reappropriation from the existing budget grants. (*Some Honourable Members*: "Louder please".) But later on it was found that it was not possible to meet this amount by reappropriation and so a supplementary grant has been presented for the full amount.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 99,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Customs'."

The motion was adopted.

SALT.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 75,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Salt'."

The motion was adopted.

* Speech not corrected by the Honourable Member.

STAMPS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 24,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Stamps'."

The motion was adopted.

INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 8,79,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department'."

The motion was adopted.

INTEREST ON DEBT AND REDUCTION OR AVOIDANCE OF DEBT.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 21,47,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Interest on Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt'."

Mr. B. K. Shanmukham Chetty (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadan Rural): In connection with this supplementary demand I would like to know from the Honourable the Finance Member whether, as was reported in the papers, it is a fact that about 23 per cent. of this loan, that was raised in London, was left unsubscribed in the hands of the underwriters?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: My Honourable friend's statement is quite correct.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhammadan Rural): May I know what is the reason for it?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: The reasons for it would take a very long time to explain in detail, but the reason why every responsible borrower that issues a loan in London has the loan underwritten, is because there is a certain amount of risk that the loan will not be subscribed for by the public. The fact that in this case the whole of the loan was not subscribed for by the public shows the value of that provision, which is really an insurance provision. It so happened, as a matter of fact, that the last sterling loan of the Government of India was brought out at a time when there was a certain amount of depression in London owing to the illness of His Majesty the King Emperor, and that accounts partly, for the fact that the whole of the loan is not subscribed. A loan for £10 millions is considered quite a large sum in the London market, and the result of this particular loan, brought out at that particular time was generally considered extremely satisfactory. It is of course, impossible to choose exactly the moment at which one will bring out a loan of this kind. The loans that have to be issued in

London have to be arranged for in advance and they have to take their place on the list of loans, and one has to take one's place when one can get it. I think, as a matter of fact, the Government of India may congratulate themselves that they did take advantage of the opportunity to issue this particular loan when they did, because financial conditions have become much more stringent since then, and if this particular loan was brought out to-day, there is no doubt that it would have to be offered at a very much lower price and that the response to the offer would not be so favourable as that which we actually received.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 21,47,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Interest on Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt'."

The motion was adopted.

INTEREST ON MISCELLANEOUS OBLIGATIONS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,51,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations'."

The motion was adopted.

LEGISLATIVE BODIES.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 50,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Legislative Bodies'."

The motion was adopted.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, HEALTH AND LANDS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 8,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of the 'Department of Education, Health and Lands'."

The motion was adopted.

POLICE.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 8,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Police'."

The motion was adopted.

METEOROLOGY.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 45,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Meteorology'."

The motion was adopted.

MEDICAL SERVICES.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 21,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Medical Services'."

The motion was adopted.

PUBLIC HEALTH.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 37,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Public Health'."

The motion was adopted.

CIVIL VETERINARY SERVICES.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 9,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Civil Veterinary Services'."

The motion was adopted.

INDUSTRIES.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move.

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 19,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Industries'."

The motion was adopted.

EMIGRATION—EXTERNAL.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 31,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Emigration—External'."

The motion was adopted.

INDIAN STORES DEPARTMENT.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 70,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Indian Stores Department'."

The motion was adopted.

MINT.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 7,77,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Mint'."

The motion was adopted.

STATIONERY AND PRINTING.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 60,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Stationery and Printing'."

The motion was adopted.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 5,89,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Miscellaneous'."

Kumar Ganganand Sinha (Bhagalpur, Purnea and the Santhal Parganas: Non-Muhammadan): I rise to move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,89,000, to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of Miscellaneous, be reduced by Rs. 3,02,000."

Sir, I do not think that the House needs much persuasion in accepting my motion. The amount by which I want the grant to be reduced represents the sum required for meeting the expenses of the Auxiliary Committee on the Growth of Education and the expenses of the Indian Central Committee. Both of these are Co-operating with the Simon Commission. The House, as it is well aware, has registered its decree against the Simon Commission, and it has affirmed that it shall not have anything to do with the Simon Commission in any shape or in any form. When a motion was made in connection with the Budget votes for the year 1928-29, for a grant to the Indian Statutory Commission, the House is well aware that it refused the grant and it was restored by the extraordinary power that the Governor General has got.

[Kumar Ganganand Sinha.]

Now, these two items did not find a place in the previous budget estimate. It is for the first time that these two items have been brought before the House, and, of course, as these are Committees which are to work in connection with the Simon Commission, I think it is only proper for this House to reduce this grant also.

I need not repeat here the old, old tale about the appointment of the Simon Commission and the insult that was offered to India on that account. The country has amply demonstrated its resentment, and it must be fresh in the memory of the Honourable Members of this House how that Commission was greeted throughout the country, especially at Lucknow and in the Punjab. The Members of the Indian Central Committee . . .

Mr. President: The Honourable Member comes from Bihar?

Kumar Ganganand Sinha: Yes, but I submit that nowhere in this country had the Simon Commission any other reception but that of black flags. I mention particularly the Punjab and Lucknow, because in regard to the Punjab we had just the other day a discussion on the assault committed upon Lala Lajpat Rai and the consequences of it; and in regard to Lucknow we all know how wantonly the police behaved and how the Government was taxed to keep down the demonstrations against the Simon Commission.

Now with regard to those happenings, if the Members of the Central Committee had any respect for their country and their countrymen, they ought to have resigned their seats, without regard to the fact that they had accepted at first to serve on that Committee, but they did not do so and are shamelessly there (Laughter), and it is for us in this House, who have resolved not to have anything to do with the Simon Commission in any shape or form, to give an effective reply to the brazen faced affront that is being shown to us by the Government in asking us to accede to the demand, thereby adding injury to the insult that has already been offered to us.

Sir, I move.

The Honourable Mr. J. Crerar (Home Member): Sir, I intend to reply in the very briefest terms to the observations that have fallen from the Honourable Member opposite.

The circumstances in which the Indian Central Committee were appointed are very well known to the House. The whole question of the policy underlying the matter was fully discussed on the occasion referred to by the Honourable Member, and it would be superfluous for me—indeed I think I would be out of order if I did so—to recapitulate the circumstances even in the most restricted manner.

The Honourable Member opposite cannot expect me to agree with, nor can he expect me to allow his observations to pass without a very strong expression of dissent in respect of the terms which he used with regard to the Members of the Central Committee. Whatever views may be entertained by Honourable Members opposite, my own view and the view of the Government is that those gentlemen performed a very great public service. (Ironical Cheers from the Opposition Benches.) As regards the

other item which the Honourable Member has taken objection to, I shall merely point out that section 84A of the Government of India Act lays special stress upon enquiring into the state of education in the country, and the warrant of appointment of the Committee especially empowered them in that behalf. That the investigations of that Committee and their Report will be of very material assistance both to the country and to everyone interested in the future progress of this country is, I think, a matter which cannot be denied.

Sir, I oppose the motion.

Pandit Motilal Nehru (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I wish only to add a word in regard to the Central Committee which has been appointed, and the expenses of which are now demanded from us.

It has been said that the appointment of the Simon Commission was an insult to this country, and it has been repeated from a thousand platforms that it was an insult. But, Sir, nothing could be a greater insult, nothing could have gone further beyond all limits of ordinary decency, than the appointment of the Central Committee. The Honourable the Home Member has resented, and entered a strong protest against, the reference made to that Committee by the Honourable Member who moved this amendment. I wish to say, Sir, that that Committee, in accepting the degrading position which has been allotted to them by the Government, have stultified themselves and stultified the whole of this House. We know that the Government had not the courage to come to this House for the election of this Committee. That Committee has been appointed in spite of the wishes of this House and over the head of this House. Now, if these gentlemen who are serving on this Committee only appreciated their responsibility to themselves, and to the House of which they are Members, it was their obvious and plain duty to refuse to act upon it, but they have decided otherwise, and are now touring all over the country giving such assistance as they can to the Simon Commission. They are quite welcome to give whatever assistance they can, but there can be no gainsaying the fact that they have insulted the House and have degraded themselves.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunru (Agra Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, you have on more than one previous occasion ruled that, the question of co-operation with the Simon Commission having been decided in the negative by this House, it is not open to us to consider it further unless Government choose to bring forward a motion asking the House directly to rescind its former decision. I will not therefore deal with that question now. The Resolution passed by this House, deciding not to co-operate with the Simon Commission at any stage and in any form, therefore stands. Why have then, Sir, Government brought forward a demand for about three lakhs of rupees, asking us to vote money for the activities of certain Committees which are meant to help the Simon Commission in its enquiry? I should like to invite attention to one particular point which, so far as I know, has not been referred to in any of the debates that have taken place in this House in this connection. Lord Birkenhead, in proposing the appointment of the Statutory Commission in the House of Lords, felt himself called upon to reply to the objections of those who were doubtful whether a purely Parliamentary Commission consisting of Britishers, and Britishers

[Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru.]

alone, would afford to Indians any opportunity of contributing to the decisions that it might arrive at. He said :

"It may indeed be very reasonably said : 'Are Indians to be denied any opportunity of contributing to these decisions?'"

And he replied to this question as follows :

"It is our purpose that the Commission when it visits India should establish contact with a Committee appointed for that purpose by the Central Legislature. I pause there to point out that constitutionally the Central Legislature is the body who most authoritatively can appoint members from its own Members to confer with the Members of the Commission. I assume that appointment will be made, because I cannot believe that those who are anxious to persuade the Government of this country that they are fit for a further measure of self-government will undertake the deep and most unwise responsibility of refusing to associate themselves with us in the first and genuine efforts which we make to ascertain the road which we must tread in common together if we are indeed to reach that goal. I therefore do not, and will not, assume that they will be guilty of the unwisdom of refusing to appoint such a Committee."

Why was it, Sir, that Lord Birkenhead, whose sympathy with Indian aspirations is so well known, refused to contemplate the contingency that the Central Legislature might decline to have anything to do with the Simon Commission? His object, when he made the speech from which I have quoted, was to assure Parliament that it was the elected representatives of India who would be asked to place their views before the Commission. For him to assume at that moment that the Central Legislature would decline to co-operate with the Commission would have been to give away his whole case. He could not therefore prevail upon himself to consider the possibility of the Central Legislature going against the wishes of His Majesty's Government. If the Central Legislature has done what His Majesty's Government did not expect it to do or did not wish it to do, I ask whether it is constitutionally appropriate, or whether it is politically honest, for Government now, in the face of that declaration made by the Secretary of State, to ask us to vote money for a body which is not elected by the Central Legislature. I know that some of the Members of the Indian Central Committee have been elected by the other House, but the Assembly, which is really the most representative body of the people of this country, has declined to associate itself in any way with this affair. Government possess large executive powers. They could, by the exercise of those powers, have appointed anybody they liked to confer with the Simon Commission. But by choosing men from the Members of this House to co-operate with the Simon Commission, they have tried to show to the world at large that their original expectations have been realised and that it is really the Central Legislature which is co-operating with the Commission. I venture to say, Sir, that Government in doing so have perpetrated a fraud and they cannot expect us to help them in carrying out their object, and thus impose on India and the world at large and make it appear that this House had directly or indirectly reversed its former decision. If there were nothing else, this cause alone, I think, would prevent the House from voting the money that Government has asked for. There are, however, other considerations which ought also to make us stick to the course which we chalked out in February last. They were referred to by my Honourable friend Kumar Ganganand Sinha. Considering the manner in which the Simon inquiry has proceeded, considering the results of that inquiry, so far as the maintenance of law and order are concerned, considering what happened in the Punjab and the United Provinces, from which I come,

I think, Sir, we shall be less than human if we did not view with indignation the attempt of Government to persuade us to vote money for an inquiry which we regard as an absolute violation of our rights, an enquiry which is meant more to consolidate the position of the Britishers than to advance the constitutional position of the people of this country. I, therefore, Sir, associate myself with those who have gone before me and oppose and strongly oppose, this motion, and trust that the House will throw it out.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): Sir, my reason for intervening in this debate is simply this. I am not opposing this motion simply as a Member of a certain Party in this House, or as one who has already opposed it before on behalf of my constituency, but I oppose it now also on behalf of the Government which represents that constituency. (Hear, hear.) It is a well known fact to this House, and to all the Members of this House, I believe, that the Central Provinces Government refused to send any official witnesses before the Auxiliary Committee of the Simon Commission. A demand for a grant for that Committee is being made here in this supplementary demand, but no official witnesses having appeared from my Province before that Committee, I am justified in assuming that the indignation which the Honourable Members on this side of the House feel against the appointment of the Simon Commission, and the appointment of the Auxiliary Committee for which this grant is being demanded here, is shared to a certain extent by the Government of my Province also, and so I maintain that I am echoing the sentiments of my constituency, of my Party, and, to some extent, of the Government of the Province from which I have come. Sir, for these reasons I have to oppose the grant.

Mr. President: The question is :

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,89,000 to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Miscellaneous' be reduced by Rs. 3,02,000."

The Assembly divided :

AYES—47.

Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Maulvi.
Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswamy.
Aney, Mr. M. S.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. S. Sessa.
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
Belvi, Mr. D. V.
Birla, Mr. Ghanshyam Das.
Chaman Lall, Diwan.
Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
Chunder, Mr. N. C.
Das, Mr. B.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
Gulab Singh, Sardar.
Haji, Mr. Sarabhai Nemchand.
Hans Raj, Lala.
Iswar Saran, Munshi.
Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
Jayakar, Mr. M. R.
Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
Jogiah, Mr. V. V.
Kalkar, Mr. N. C.
Kidwai, Mr. Rafi Ahmad.
Kunzru, Pandit Hirday Nath.

Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.
Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.
Misra, Mr. Dwarka Prasad.
Mitra, Mr. S. C.
Moonje, Dr. B. S.
Mukhtar Singh, Mr.
Murtuza Saheb Bahadur, Maulvi
Sayyid.
Naidu, Mr. B. P.
Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
Pandya, Mr. Vidya Sagar.
Phookun, Srijut T. R.
Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.
Shervani, Mr. T. A. K.
Siddiqi, Mr. Abdul Qadir.
Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
Singh, Mr. Narayan Prasad.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
Sinha, Mr. Siddheswar Prasad.
Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.
Yusuf Imam, Mr.

NOES—49.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
 Alexander, Mr. William.
 Allison, Mr. F. W.
 Ashrafuddin Ahmed, Khan Bahadur
 Nawabzada Sayid.
 Bajpai, Mr. G. S.
 Bower, Mr. E. H. M.
 Bray, Sir Denys.
 Chalmers, Mr. T. A.
 Chatterjee, the Revd. J. C.
 Coatman, Mr. J.
 Cocke, Mr. H. G.
 Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.
 Crawford, Colonel J. D.
 Crerar, The Honourable Mr. J.
 Dalal, Sardar Sir Bomanji.
 French, Mr. J. C.
 Gavin-Jones, Mr. T.
 Ghasanfar Ali Khan, Mr.
 Ghuznavi, Mr. A. H.
 Graham, Mr. L.
 Hyder, Dr. L. K.
 Jowahir Singh, Sardar Bahadur
 Sardar.
 Keane, Mr. M.
 Lall, Mr. S.
 Lamb, Mr. W. S.

Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
 Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra
 Nath.
 Mohammad Ismail Khan, Haji
 Chaudhury.
 Moore, Mr. Arthur.
 Mukharji, Rai Bahadur A. K.
 Mukherjee, Mr. S. C.
 Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.
 Rainy, The Honourable Sir George.
 Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur
 Makhdam Syed.
 Rao, Mr. V. Panduranga.
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
 Roy, Mr. K. C.
 Roy, Rai Bahadur Tarit Bhusan.
 Sams, Mr. H. A.
 Sassoon, Sir Victor.
 Schuster, The Honourable Sir George.
 Shah Nawaz, Mian Mohammad.
 Shillidy, Mr. J. A.
 Simpson, Sir James.
 Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
 Stevenson, Mr. H. L.
 Webb, Mr. M.
 Yamin Khan, Mr. Muhammad.
 Young, Mr. G. M.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. President: The question I have to put is :

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 5,89,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Miscellaneous'."

The motion was adopted.

MISCELLANEOUS ADJUSTMENTS BETWEEN THE CENTRAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move :

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,08,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments'."

The motion was adopted.

REFUNDS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move :

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 4,66,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Refunds'."

The motion was adopted.

NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 86,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'North-West Frontier Province'."

The motion was adopted.

BALUCHISTAN.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 17,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Baluchistan'."

The motion was adopted.

DELHI.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 93,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Delhi'."

The motion was adopted.

FOREST CAPITAL OUTLAY.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Forest Capital Outlay'."

The motion was adopted.

COMMUTED VALUE OF PENSIONS.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 4,76,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Commuted Value of Pensions'."

The motion was adopted.

LOANS AND ADVANCES BEARING INTEREST.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I move:

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 4,31,14,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1929, in respect of 'Loans and Advances Bearing Interest'."

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 19th February, 1929.